Latvijas Universitātes
Filozofijas un socioloģijas institūts

# Reliģiski-filozofiski raksti

# XXIII

Rīga
2017

UDK 2+17 (066) (08)
Re 515

Izdevums ir sagatavots *Latvijas Universitātes* Akadēmiskās attīstības projektā Nr. 2017/66.

Izdevums rekomendēts publicēšanai ar *LU Filozofijas un socioloģijas institūta* Zinātniskās padomes 2017. gada 2. oktobra sēdes lēmumu.

Galvenā redaktore: **Solveiga Krūmiņa-Koņkova**
Redaktori: **Jānis Nameisis Vējš**, **Māra Grīnfelde**
Izdevuma redaktore: **Nadežda Pazuhina**
Literārā redaktore: **Arta Jāne**
Maketētāja: **Margarita Stoka**
Vāka dizaina autori: **Kārlis Koņkovs**, **Matīss Kūlis**

Izdevumā izmantoti fotoattēli no Aleksandra Bertaša un Aleksandras Budanovas personiskajiem arhīviem. Vākam izmantots foto no LNA Latvijas Valsts kinofotofonodokumentu arhīva fondiem.



*Reliģiski-filozofiski raksti* ir anonīmi recenzēts periodisks izdevums ar starptautisku zinātniskās redakcijas kolēģiju. Tā mērķis ir padziļināt lasītāju zināšanas par reliģiski filozofisko ideju vēsturi, attīstību mūsdienās un to vietu Latvijas un Eiropas kultūrā. Iznāk vismaz vienu reizi gadā latviešu un angļu valodā.

*Reliģiski-filozofiski raksti* pieejami arī Centrālās un Austrumeiropas Interneta bibliotēkā (Central and Eastern European Online Library, CEEOL), EBSCO un SCOPUS datubāzē.

*Religious-Philosophical Articles* is a double-blind peer-reviewed periodical with the international editorial board. It publishes articles aimed at deepening readers' knowledge and understanding on history of religious-philosophical ideas, their development in nowadays and their place in the Latvian and European culture. It is published at least once a year in Latvian and English.

Editions *of Religious-Philosophical Articles* are available in Central and Eastern European Online Library, CEEOL, as well as in EBSCO and SCOPUS databases.



ISSN 1407-1908

# CONTENTS

# THE CHURCH AND TOTALITARIAN REGIME: SECULARIZATION AND STRATEGIES OF SURVIVAL

Religious-philosophical writings XXIII are devoted to the international conference "The Church and the Totalitarian Regime: Secularization and Strategies of Survival". This conference was organised by the researchers of the Institute of Philosophy and Sociology of the University of Latvia within the framework of the project of the Latvian Council of Science *"Thematization of Religious Experience in the Situation of Post-Liberal Spirituality: Latvian Case."* The conference took place in Riga on the 27th –28th of October 2016.

In the view of the organisers of the conference, understanding and analysis of totalitarian heritage is one of the essential tasks for the modern day scholars in Europe. Interactions between the totalitarian power and the Church, regime's attitude towards religion, religious tradition, and cultural and religious aspects of the secularised education system, which were tightly controlled by the totalitarian state – all these aspects are part of shared recent past of Europe. If we do not identify it, this past can be both our present and our future.

The conference was attended by scientists from Latvia, as well as Poland, Germany, Ukraine, Poland, USA, Estonia and Lithuania. The conference was also attended by a large group of academics from Russia, which included researchers from the St. Petersburg State University and Moscow's universities and institutes of the Russian Academy of Sciences, as well as religious educational institutions such as St. Filaret Orthodox Christian Institute.

Such a substantial interest of Russian scholars on the topic of the conference was related to the tasks of the conference. As the organisers formulated it in the informative materials of conference, the aim of the conference is "to look at the processes that had taken place in the Church, interactions between the Church and society and its forms, paying attention to the context of secularisation and socio-political situation during the age of totalitarian regime, especially in the Soviet Union".

The conference discussed the following issues: Church-power relations in a totalitarian state; politics and legislation in the field of religion; administrative control in Church affairs; the repression against representatives of the Church and religious organisations under conditions of totalitarian regimes; Church and national ideology in a totalitarian state; Church and political propaganda. The researchers presented papers also on the relations between The Church and informal social-political movements in the conditions of totalitarian regimes; Church and school; religious education and education; inheritance of tradition and education problems of church servants and attitudes towards religious values and religiosity in the context of the secularised educational system.

Participants of the conference were agreed that the topic of scientific discussions and research proposed by the scholars of the Institute of Philosophy and Sociology of the University of Latvia in this conference should be continued. A proposal was made that the Institute of Philosophy and Sociology could become one of the centres for international cooperation of researchers on this topic of in future.

In RFR XXIII, we publish a part of the extended texts of the reports that have been read at the conference. They represent different themes, approaches and methodologies, but they all try to understand what is the mechanism of functioning of the totalitarian political system and what is its influence in religious life, especially under the conditions of the Soviet regime. At the same time, they also provide insights into the history of the Church's survival, showing examples of spiritual feats that were stronger than totalitarian power in its most brutal manifestations.

**Solveiga Krumina-Konkova**
**Nadezhda Pazukhina**

# BAZNĪCA UN TOTALITĀRAIS REŽĪMS: SEKULARIZĀCIJA UN IZDZĪVOŠANAS STRATĒĢIJAS

*Reliģiski-filozofiski raksti XXIII* ir veltīti starptautiskajai konferencei "Baznīca un totalitārais režīms: sekularizācija un izdzīvošanas stratēģijas", kuru organizēja Latvijas Universitātes Filozofijas un socioloģijas institūta pētnieki LZP projekta "Reliģiskās pieredzes tematizācija post-liberālā garīguma situācijā: Latvijas gadījums" ietvaros. Konference notika Rīgā 2016. gada 27.–28. oktobrī.

Konferences rīkotāju skatījumā totalitārisma mantojuma izpratne un analīze ir viens no svarīgākajiem uzdevumiem mūsdienu situācijā. Mijattiecības starp totalitāro varu un Baznīcu, režīma attieksme pret reliģiozitāti, reliģiskajām tradīcijām un kultūras reliģiskajiem aspektiem sekularizētajā izglītības sistēmā, kuru stingri kontrolē totalitārā valsts, – visi šie aspekti ir Eiropas nesenā pagātne, kura, ja to neapzinām, var būt gan mūsu tagadne, gan kļūt par mūsu nākotni.

Konferencē piedalījās zinātnieki no Latvijas, kā arī no Polijas, Vācijas, Ukrainas, ASV, Igaunijas un Lietuvas. Konferencē piedalījās arī liela zinātnieku grupa no Krievijas, kurā bija pētnieki gan no Sanktpēterburgas Valsts universitātes, gan Maskavā esošajām augstskolām un Krievijas Zinātņu akadēmijas institūtiem, kā arī tādām garīgām mācību iestādēm kā Sv. Filareta Pareizticīgais Kristīgais institūts. Šāda liela Krievijas zinātnieku interese par konferences tēmu bija saistīta ar konferences uzdevumu, kas, kā to konferences informatīvajos materiālos formulēja tās rīkotāji, bija "aplūkot procesus Baznīcas dzīvē, Baznīcas un sabiedrības mijiedarbību un tās formas, ņemot vērā sabiedrības vispārējās sekularizācijas kontekstu un

sociāli politisko situāciju totalitāro režīmu apstākļos, galvenokārt Padomju Savienībā". Konferences diskusijās tika aplūkoti šādi jautājumi: Baznīcas un varas attiecības totalitārajā valstī; politika un likumdošana reliģijas jomā; administratīvā kontrole Baznīcas lietās; pret Baznīcas un reliģisko organizāciju pārstāvjiem vērstās represijas totalitāro režīmu apstākļos; Baznīca un valsts ideoloģija totalitārajā valstī; Baznīca un politiskā propaganda; Baznīca un neformālās sabiedriski politiskās kustības totalitāro režīmu apstākļos; Baznīca un skola; reliģiskās audzināšanas un izglītības problēmas; tradīcijas pārmantojamība un Baznīcas kalpotāju izglītības problēmas un attieksme pret reliģiskajām vērtībām un reliģiozitāti sekularizētās izglītības sistēmas kontekstā.

Konferences gaitā tās dalībniekiem veidojās pārliecība, ka LU Filozofijas un socioloģijas institūta pētnieku ierosinātā zinātnisko diskusiju un pētījumu tēma būtu jāturpina un ka LU FSI nākotnē varētu kļūt par vienu no šīs tēmas pētnieku starptautiskās sadarbības centriem.

RFR XXIII laidienā publicējam daļu no konferencē nolasīto referātu paplašinātajiem tekstiem. Tie pārstāv dažādas tēmas, pieejas un metodoloģijas, bet tos visus vieno mēģinājums izprast to, kāds ir totalitārās politiskās sistēmas darbības mehānisms un tā ietekme reliģiskajā dzīvē, īpaši padomju režīma apstākļos. Vienlaikus tie sniedz arī ieskatu Baznīcas izdzīvošanas vēsturē, rādot to garīgo varoņdarbu piemērus, kuri izrādījās spēcīgāki par totalitāro varu tās visnežēlīgākajās izpausmēs.

**Solveiga Krūmiņa-Koņkova**
**Nadežda Pazuhina**

Marianna Shakhnovich

# THE ACTIVITY OF THE COMMISSION ON THE HISTORY OF RELIGION OF THE COMMUNIST ACADEMY (MOSCOW, 1928–1930) AND THE STUDY OF RELIGIOSITY IN USSR[1]

In 1918, the Socialist Academy of Social Sciences was created in Moscow, conceived as the world center of socialist thought. Initially, not only prominent Soviet Marxists, including Lev Trotskii, Gregorii Zinoviev, Lev Kamenev and Nikolai Bukharin, were elected to it, but also well-known European socialists. The Academy was to become a research and educational institution, but very quickly not only the list of the academicians was changed (all foreign members were excluded from it), but the name of the Academy as well. Since 1924 it was called the Communist Academy, and in 1929 the Institute of Philosophy of the Communist Academy was organized. In April 1928 at the Communist Academy, the Commission on the History of Religion was created on the initiative of Professor Michail Reisner[2]. At the beginning of June 1928, the Presidium

[1] *The publication was prepared with the support of the grant of Russian Science Foundation № 16-18-10083 "The Study of Religion in Social and Cultural Context of the Epoch: the History Religious Studies and Intellectual History of Russia 19th- first half of 20th century".*

[2] Michael Reisner (1868-1928) was a lawyer, historian of religion, sociologist. Since December 1917, he was the head of the Department of the People's Commissariat of Justice, took part in the creation of the first Soviet Constitution of 1918 and the Decree on the Separation of Church and State.

of the Communist Academy approved the "Statute of the Commission on the History of Religion", which stated that the main task of it was "to conduct research on religion in the spirit of Marxist methodology"[3]. The main problems that should have been addressed by the Commission were the questions of the origin of religion, the history of early Christianity; the Church's role in the international labor movement; Islam; socio-economic roots of religion in the Soviet Union and some others. In 1930, the Commission joined the Institute of Philosophy of the Communist Academy as an anti-religious section. Alexander Lukachevskii (1893–1937), became the head of the section. He was a deputy chairman of the Union of Militant Atheists; he made the difference between the believers and a church as a social and political institution. He was eager to criticize the church, ignorance and superstition, but he believed in enlightenment and wanted to study religion, not to expose it. For that classical Marxist ideas expressed in his publications and speeches, he was repeatedly subjected to condemnation by the propagators of the brand new radical understanding of Marx's theory of religion. In 1937, Lukachevskii, who was one of the most educated persons in the governing of the Union of Militant Atheists, was subjected to "comb-out" in the Institute of Philosophy, then arrested and killed.

In 1928-1929 several public discussions on religion took place in the Communist Academy. It was the period when the debates were still formally encouraged and gave the possibility to express different positions.

The archival documents show that during the meetings at the Communist Academy in 1928-1930 different scholars, well acquainted with classical and modern theories of the religious studies, were criticized for their position on the origin and social roots of religion. Among them were Vladimir Rumiantsev[4] with the astral theory of the origin of religion,

[3] Archive of Russian Academy of Science. Fund 350, inventory 1, file 83, pp. 48-49.

[4] Rumiantsev Nikolai (1892–1956), publicist, historian of religion, member of the scientific society "Atheist", a member of the Union of Militant Atheists. The main works were devoted to early Christianity and Orthodoxy.

Fedor Kapeliush[5] with the theory of the natural origin of religion and some others with the theory of preanimism and theory of collective representations.

There was a discussion about the origin of religion at the meetings of the Commission on the History of Religion in the Communist Academy in 1928-1929. Vladimir Nikolskii[6] in 1926 was in Europe, where he spent a lot of time in libraries studying contemporary literature on early forms of religion. In the same year he published in the magazine "Antireligioznik" a long article devoted to various theories of the origin of religion, where he paid considerable attention to the theory of pramonotheism of Wilhelm Schmidt, and in 1929 in the Communist Academy, he made a report on this topic. After the report, a discussion unfolded during which Sergei Ursynovich[7] made a remarkable statement: "From the report, it is clear that all Western European bourgeois science on religion is under a shadow of father Schmidt, and because it stands on the idealistic point of view, it with different speed goes towards father Wilhelm Schmidt. From this, there is a conclusion that all the idealistic systems of religion should be rejected"[8]. One of the participants in the discussion, demonstrating his "deep knowledge" in the field of the subject under consideration, nevertheless, was extremely concerned about the possible publications of Western scholars or religious literature: "We must weed out all that is worthless, not to ignore, without a critical appraisal of any book, not to

[5] Kapeliush Fedor (1876–1945), a writer, journalist, author of articles and brochures on political history, economics and the history of religion. He translated into Russian the works of M. Weber, J. Mélieux, K. Marx, K.Kautskii.

[6] Nikolskii Vladimir (1894– 1953), historian, professor of Moscow State University. His early works were devoted to the history of Russia in the 17th century; in the 1920s, one of the first in Russia began researching the history of primitive society.

[7] Ursynovich Sergei (1891 – after 1940), a historian of religion, sociologist, publicist, active member of the UMA; private-docent of Moscow State University at the Faculty of Law in Church Law; in 1920-1930-es he was a participant in expeditions to study the state of religiosity and anti-religious work.

[8] Archive of Russian Academy of Science. Fund 350, inventory 2, file 388, p. 31.

publish a single, more or less common work without appropriate criticism and analysis" [9].

In this discussion, Lukachevskii demonstrated professional knowledge in the field of classical and contemporary literature, a genuine interest in the study of religion. He in short speeches mentioned and cited the works of S*ö*derblom, Strehlov, Lang, Gillen, Marett, Durkheim[10] and criticized them from the standpoint of Marxism. In particular, he called "passion for Durkheim" "dangerous", because "Durkheim is working to prove the eternity of the cult and religion, and in fact, Durkheim's definition of religion, his *sacré* and *profane*, is very weak… the religion of Durkheim is the deification of the society itself"[11]. The words about Durkheim were addressed to the young ethnographer, an employee of the Moscow anti-religious museum Sergei Tokarev[12], who did not share the views of Ursynovich and his supporters. He claimed that it was wrong to hope that the "clerical direction" in religious studies, would decay itself. Tokarev noted that Marxist ethnographers and historians of religion in the USSR did not live on the moon, did not live in isolation from Western European science[13], so they ought to collaborate with those scholars who were against the clericals. It was about the anthropologists of "American school", which paid tribute to the erudition of Schmidt, but was not under the spell of his theory and in their works on religion expressed such considerations as may be acceptable to Marxist researchers. He noted that there was a con-

[9] Archive of Russian Academy of Science. Fund 350, inventory 2, file 388, p. 40.

[10] Spencer B. and Gillen F. J. *The Native Tribes of Central Australia*. London: Macmillan,1899; Strehlow C. *Die Aranda- und Loritja-Stämme in Zentral-Australien. Ed. Städtisches Völkerkunde-Museum Frankfurt am Main and Moritz Freiherr v. Leonhardi*, Vol. 1-5, Frankfurt, 1907-1920; Lang A. *The Making of Religion*. London: Longmans, 1909; Marett R. R. *The Threshold of Religion*. (Second, revised and enlarged ed.). London: Methuen and Co. Ltd., 1914; Söderblom N. Das *Werden des Gottesglaubens*. Leipzig, 1916.

[11] Archive of Russian Academy of Science. Fund 350, inventory 2, file 388, p. 47.

[12] Tokarev Sergei (1899-1985), ethnographer, historian of ethnography, professor of Moscow State University, head of the department in the Institute of Ethnography of the Academy of Sciences.

[13] Archive of Russian Academy of Science. Fund 350, inventory 2, file 388, p. 35.

sensus between the representatives of different directions in science on the issue not about the origin of religion, but what religion was in essence: "If formerly dominated in science that idea of the essence of religion, which was best expressed in his time by Tylor, who said that religion is faith in spiritual beings, belief in supernatural beings, etc.; now more and more that understanding of religion is beginning to be established, which was best formulated by Durkheim, an understanding, that religion is nothing but the mentally singling out of a certain class of objects into a special sacred world, an understanding, that coincides with the definition of Reynach's *taboo*"[14].

The politicization of the philosophical discussions that began in Russia before 1917 gradually became acuter and became repressive by the early 1930s. It was then that the former "mechanists" were declared revisionists, and the former "dialecticians" were called the Trotskyites[15]. The debates of 1928-1930 showed the presence of a sharp confrontation between the educated Marxists of the old school and their disciples and the new generation of Stalin's propagandists.

The discussion on Boris Gorev[16] presentation "The essence of religion", which took place at the beginning of 1928, demonstrated the freedom of expression, which was still possible at the moment. Gorev payed attention to the idea of religion as the "organizing source", he claimed that authoritarian thinking is typical in religion; the main feature of it is a faith in authority, in recognition of teacher's words, recognition of books, etc.

---

[14] Archive of Russian Academy of Science. Fund 350, inventory 2, file 388, p. 39.

[15] Iahot I. Podavlenie filosofii v SSSR v 1920-1930-e gody. *Voprosy filosofii.* 1991. Nr. 9, pp. 44–68; Nr. 10, pp. 72–138; Nr. 11, pp. 72–115.

[16] Gorev Boris (Goldman, 1874–1938), writer and publicist. He was a member of the "Union of Struggle for the Liberation of the Working Class" (founded by G. Plekhanov). He was excluded from St. Petersburg University for revolutionary activity (1897); until 1917, repeatedly subjected to arrests and exile. He was a member of the Foreign Bureau of the Central Committee of the RSDLP, a member of the Central Committee of the RSDLP (a Menshevik from 1907), a member of the All-Russian Central Executive Committee of the 1-st convocation. In 1920 he left the party, and then was arrested several times as a Menshevik. In 1938 he was arrested for the last time and shot.

He reminded Alexander Bogdanov's book "Faith and Knowledge" (1910), where he tried to prove that Lenin was definitely a religious type. He tried to explain that after revolution the new form of religiosity appeared in Russian people: "From that point of view, I think that, if we establish a correct outlook on religion, on the one hand, we know, that it should be approached with caution, religion cannot be destroyed only with enlightenment, that radical restructuring is necessary to destroy the social grounds of religion, and on the other hand, we must correctly illuminate the religious impulse that has gripped the broad masses. They do not pray, do not ask, just feel the need of any religion. This desire has a social nature; it can be called a political antipathy to the regime, who preaches atheism openly"[17].

On December 4, 1928, the Commission on the History of Religion organized a public meeting on the topic "The social roots of religion in the USSR". Vladimir Sarabianov[18] presented the report "The social roots of religion in the USSR", Fedor Putintsev[19] – "The social roots of sectarianism" and Michael Scheinman[20] – "The social roots of the urban population of the USSR religion". At the meeting a discussion about the features of the transformation of religiosity after the revolution was held.

---

[17] Archive of Russian Academy of Science. Fund 350, inventory 2, file 260, pp. 24–25.

[18] Sarabianov Vladimir (1886–1952) was a Soviet philosopher, historian and economist. Since 1903 in the revolutionary movement, until 1918 - Menshevik, in 1930 joined the CPSU (b). In 1922–1930 he worked in the newspaper "Pravda".

[19] Putintsev Fedor (1899–1947), propagandist, author of works on sectarianism, member of the Central Council of the Union of Militant Atheists from 1925. In 1932–1934 he was the editor of the newspaper and magazine "Bezbozhnik".

[20] Sheinman Michail (1902–1977), a historian of religion, one of their founders and leaders of the Union of Militant Atheists; Deputy Editor-in-chief of the newspaper "Bezbozhnik". In 1950–1960s he worked in the Sector of the History of Religion and Atheism of the Institute of History of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR under the leadership of V. Bonch-Bruevich; he was responsible for publishing activities in the field of the history of religion and atheism in the USSR Academy of Sciences.

Sheinman indicated the growth of mystical sentiment among intellectuals linked with the past society and a decrease in religiosity among the working class. He said that it was necessary to seek the social form of religion of the urban population in the position of classes, in their position in building socialism. Those groups, which did not participate in socialist construction, they were found in religion. Those groups of intellectuals who were actively involved in the building of socialism, they were exempt from religious prejudices. It was different with the former aristocracy. A large part of it was involved on the side of the Whites in the Civil War. But now they were in Soviet Russia; many worked as clerks and in other jobs. But that class, once prevailed, now having lost his supremacy – that class had no right to participate in the cooperative organizations and had no right to vote at the elections – that class sought consolation in religion, sought consolation in mysticism, mainly in mysticism. He mentioned some secret organization of Masonic lodges, the Academy of cosmic sensations, which were revealed in Leningrad etc. The social composition of the organizations, its leaders were, as he put it, lawyers, dentists, former officers, merchants, as well as fortune tellers, and other speculators, who had been formerly the princes. Sheinman explained their mysticism due to their confusion because of the lacking power and the rule by the October revolution, they tried to comfort themselves, and they thought that they would find the consolation in those secret religious and semi-religious organizations.

On the contrary to the position of those ex-people (byvshie), Scheinman indicated a sharp decrease in religiosity among the working class. He demonstrated the results of the comparison of the costs of the workers for religious purposes before the revolution, and in 1926: "This is the annual budget of the Kiev workers in 1913. A worker spent in a year 1 ruble 13 kopecks for religious purposes. The budget of the workers in the USSR for religious needs per month: in 1922 – 6 kopecks, in 1923 – 4 kopecks, in 1924 – 4 kopecks, in 1926 – 3 kopecks. There are some areas where, the budgetary inspection did not put the religious expenses in attention

because, they are very small, and these costs for religious purposes are very small. In Moscow region in 1928 a survey in three unions were done: weavers, printers and metalworkers. On the religious needs, the weaver spends 7 kopecks per month, printers and metalworkers – 3 kopecks"[21]. He explained that the weavers were mostly women, whose religiosity was higher than that of men, they were less educated, and their life is much more difficult.

Putintsev explained the high interest of the rural (village) people to sectarianism mainly with the activity of the rich peasants (who were called *kulaki* – "fists"). He presented the reasons of the spreading of sectarianism among the peasantry: the collapse of the authority of the Orthodox Church with simultaneous simple mystical sentiment due to remote local causes (crop failure, banditry, syphilis, fire, lack of land, flood, etc.); the low level of culture and disorganization of the poor peasantry, especially the female part of the poor; revolutionary phrases and forms of sectarianism; proclaiming and practicing morality and virtues, mutual assistance, services on the national language. He claimed that the kulak used all this. The wavering of the middle peasantry, especially the prosperous middle peasants, distortions in class politics and the party leadership in the village, the change in tax policy, lack of manufactured goods served as the baits to the spreading of the sects as well. The main reasons for the poor and middle peasants of gravity in the sectarianism, according to Putintsev, was the increasing and growth of cultural needs of peasants, insufficient deployment of our political-educational network and tardiness of anti-religious propaganda for this growth. The *kulak* used all that as well. Putintsev underlined, that the attack of the *kulak* caused with a special resistance to the most diverse and varied forms: open sabotage, opportunism, the boycott of secular and non-governmental organizations. The *kulak* tried hastily to be organized. The only legitimate organizations allowed to him were religious organizations, and he liked sectarianism most of all.

[21] Archive of Russian Academy of Science. Fund 350, inventory 2, file 336, p. 142.

Some participants in the discussion, analyzing the presentations, pointed to the similarity of the processes occurring in the country, with a history of the Reformation. They were talking seriously about the possibility of further spread of Protestantism, and even the flourishing of it (especially Baptism) as that form of Christianity, which corresponded to the new economic and political conditions of life of the population. Lukachevskii talked about the need to study the nature of modern religiosity: "We have before us a very difficult question, whether we have in the USSR religious Reformation ... When people ask to close the church, then to a large extent, we can talk about the fall of religion, but this for some part of the population does not testify about the fall of religiosity ... After that many of former Orthodox move into sectarianism, and it is not because of their religiosity increases, no, but because the sectarian ideology is more acceptable for them, more in line with the environment in which we are now, more consistent than the essentially feudal, Orthodox ideology"[22].

The large group of disputants led by Putintsev and Innokentii Stukov[23] made sharp accusations against researchers of religion, "flirting" with the "enemies of the revolution" in favor of sectarians and other believers, claiming the danger and fallacy of their "idealization".

For example, Stukov stated: "You cannot say that the sects are not our enemies. No, they are our enemies, it is our enemies. «The sectarian-democrat», as the bearer of the democratic (i.e., bourgeois) values is the enemy of the socialist proletarian revolution"[24].

---

[22] Archive of Russian Academy of Science. Fund 350, inventory 2, file 336, p. 137.

[23] Stukov Innokentii (1887 - 1936), revolutionary, party-statesman, member of the RSDLP since 1905. He spent six years in the prisons during the tsarist power; in 1911 he fled from the Siberian exile. After February 1917, a member of the Petrograd Committee of the RSDLP (b), from June 1917 – a member the Moscow Regional Bureau of the RSDLP (b); member of the Bolshevik fraction of the All-Russian Constituent Assembly. Since 1921 he was the editor of the newspaper "Moskovsky Rabochii", the editor-in-chief of the magazine "Bezbozhnik at the Machine-Tool" (1928–1932), deputy chairman of the Council of the UMA. Arrested in 1936 as a member of the "Left Opposition", shot.

[24] Archive of Russian Academy of Science. Fund 350, inventory 2, file 336, p. 98.

Vladimir Bonch-Bruevich[25], in his long response pointed out that it was necessary to consider the problem of religiosity of the population regarding sociological, economic and historical reasons, stated that it was impossible to declare 20 million of Christians, leaving in the country, as counter-revolutionaries and enemies. He claimed: "But how can a communist say that they are our enemies. No, sectarians are not our enemies, the Orthodoxies or Mohammedans or Jews or Buddhists are not our enemies as well because their religious ground for us is least interesting. We understand, why they are in religion, we are struggling for the economic and social changings to change it"[26]. It is clear from his long speech that he was very annoyed by the position of his opponents, he realized the difficulty in convincing them, but he attempted, talking about the spiritual culture of the Old Believers and sectarians. But his words did not convince the left-wing critics. Lukachevskii as the chairman tried to intervene and closed the debate, offering to summarize the discussion.

That heated debate coincided with the struggle against the "right deviation" in the Bolshevik party: September 18, 1928, Stalin's article "Comintern [Communist International] about fighting the right deviation" was published in the main newspaper "Pravda". November 19, 1928, Stalin made a report on the dangers of "right deviation" at the Plenum of the Moscow Committee and the Moscow Control Commission of the CPSU (b). That was followed by the complete defeat of the "Right Opposition" at the Plenum of the Central Committee and Central Control Commission and at the XVI Party Conference (April 23–29, 1929). The

[25] Bonch-Bruevich Vladimir (1843–1955), statesman and public figure, historian of religion. In 1917–1920 he was the secretary of the Council of People's Commissars, later engaged in scientific work; he was the head of Department of the history of religion and atheism of the Institute of History of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR (1947–1955), combined this post simultaneously with a number of positions, including the director of the Museum of the History of Religion and Atheism of the Academy of Sciences (1946–1955).

[26] Archive of Russian Academy of Science. Fund 350, inventory 2, file 336, p. 69.

plenum finished by the defeat of Nikolai Bukharin's group, while Bukharin himself was removed from his posts[27].

At the same time, the "right deviation" in the activities of the Union of Militant Atheists was strongly criticized. The main blow was aimed at Emelian Yaroslavskii[28] and Alexander Lukachevskii. On the June 7, 1929 Mikhail Galaktionov, a member of the Moscow Council of Atheists Union published in the newspaper "Komsomolskaia Pravda" an article with the title "On the occasion of a conciliatory attitude towards religion (Ideological mistakes in the work of Atheists' Union)", in which he criticized the activities of the Central Council for the lack of a class approach and conciliatory attitude towards religion. Galaktionov wrote, that while the "working masses, sensing the danger from the class enemy, acting under religious cover, wider and increasingly rising the struggle against religion", the Union of atheists does nothing to enhance the anti-religious work. He called it an "an ideological mistake of leadership". It is necessary, in the opinion of Galaktionov, to take a clear class line, because "our goal is not to replace religion, but to destroy it"[29].

The inner struggle in 1928–1929 split the atheistic movement, which originally had not been homogeneous. Now two trends were clear: one worked in favor of maintaining the existing enlightening propaganda methods (Lunacharskii, Lukachevskii supported it), the other – in favor of radical struggle with religion and believers. The majority of the new leaders of the Union of Atheists took a radical position, based on the Stalin's attitude towards the "right deviation". The position of the "moderate antireligiosnik" in many respects coincided with the position of the "right deviationist": "Right deviators believe that the difficulties of socialist construction and the cultural revolution are such that it is more expedient to make concessions to the *kulak*, not to irritate him by the

[27] Khlevniuk O. V. Khoziain. *Stalin i utverzdenie stalinskoi diktatury*. Moscow: ROSSPEN, 2010, 478 pp.

[28] Emelian Yaroslavskii (1878–1943) revolutionary, party and statesman, the leader of anti-religious policy in the USSR. Chairman of the Union of Militant Atheists.

[29] *Komsomolskaia Pravda*, 7 iiunia 1929.

consistent implementation of the party line, and to make it thus easier for the *kulak* to gradually grow into socialism"[30]. In the course of the general line the "moderate antireligiosniks", and along with Yaroslavskii himself was severely attacked. The victory of Stalin's position against the "right deviation" also meant a victory for a new option of anti-religious policy.

In the document "On the right deviation in the anti-religious propaganda" (the project of the guidelines), which we found in the Russian State Archives in Political and Social History, the "right deviation" in the anti-religious propaganda and conciliatory attitude to religion was expressed in the following major provisions: 1) The underestimation of class exploitative nature of religion, and in particular those of its forms, which are installed by priests terminology we call sectarianism: a) the recognition of "positive" qualities sect: their "sobriety", "mutual assistance"[31], etc.; b) assessment of sectarianism as the middle peasant-poor peasants movement; c) the theory of non-religious education in schools; d) the overstatement of the cultural values of religious monuments. 2)The substitution of anti-religious propaganda with the talking about "culture": a) the sufficiently raising of the cultural level, the increasing of knowledge of scientific facts and theories make "religion to die out by itself"[32]; b) need only to promote the information about the natural-scientific data, reference to the issues of chemistry, physics, biology, geology, astronomy to undermine the faith in God; c) the allocation the prevailing values the elements of archeology, ethnography, history in the anti-religious propaganda. 3) The liberal view of the relationship of church and state: a) to oppose the closure of churches despite the demand of the general public, the issue of a building permit for new churches, a waste of public funds for the museums of religious objects, saving a huge number of churches "antique and

[30] Russian State Archives in Political and Social History. Fund P5407, inventory 1, file 60, p. 79.

[31] Idem, p. 80.

[32] Idem, p. 81.

valuable in terms of architecture and painting"[33]; b) the liberal attitude towards the existence of the groups teaching children from priests, the acceptance of priests in public places, first of all in hospitals and dormitories, performances of honored artists in the churches, approval for the individuals working in state institutions to participate in the liturgy; c) permit the printing of religious literature and magazines, organization of schools for the training of clergy; d) desire not to "not touch religion", the preservation of "respect for good priests"[34].

Simultaneously with the struggle against the "right deviation" in anti-religious activity a new wave of persecution of believers began. On April 8, 1929, the Resolution of the Central Executive Committee and Council of People's Commissars of the RSFSR "On Religious Associations" was issued. That document regulated the position of religious associations more than 50 years. In 1929 – early 1930s some regulations were adopted that severely restricted the rights of religious organizations and clergy and gave local authorities the right to close churches.

We may conclude that the attack against the "liberal" scholars of religion was simultaneous with the struggle with "right deviation" in anti-religious activities and repressions against believers, undertaken in the perspective of the political course of "the Great turning-point". The discussions on the problems of the history of religion were stopped. In 1929–1930 the reorganization of the Communist Academy was carried out, and six years later it was completely abolished by a special resolution of the Central Committee of the party. The Communist Academy fulfilled its task, and her staff joined the institutions of the Academy of Sciences.

---

[33] Russian State Archives in Political and Social History. Fund P5407, inventory 1, file 60, p. 81.

[34] Idem, p. 82.

Summary:

The article treats the Activity of the Commission on the History of Religion of the Communist Academy in the context of the political and ideological situation in the country in 1928–1930. In April 1928 at the Communist Academy, the Commission on the History of Religion (founded in Moscow in 1918) was created on the initiative of Professor Mikhail Reisner. At the beginning of June 1928, the Presidium of the Communist Academy approved the "Statute of the Commission on the History of Religion", which stated that the main task of it was "to conduct research on religion in the spirit of Marxist methodology". The main problems that should have been addressed by the Commission were the questions of the origin of religion, the history of early Christianity; the Church's role in the international labor movement; Islam; socio-economic roots of religion in the Soviet Union and some others. In 1928–1929 several public discussions on religion took place in the Communist Academy. It was the period when the debates were still formally encouraged and gave the possibility to express different positions. The archival documents show that during the meetings at the Communist Academy in 1928–1930 different scholars, well acquainted with classical and modern theories of the religious studies, were criticized for their position on the origin and social roots of religion. The politicization of the philosophical discussions that began in Russia before 1917 gradually became acuter and became repressive by the early 1930s. It was then that the former "mechanists" were declared revisionists, and the former "dialecticians" were called the Trotskyites. The debates of 1928–1930 showed the presence of a sharp confrontation between the educated Marxists of the old school and their disciples and the new generation of Stalin's propagandists.

During the discussion "The social roots of religion in the USSR" in December 1928 Mikhail Sheinman indicated the growth of mystical sentiment among intellectuals linked with the past society and a sharp decrease in religiosity among the working class. He stated that those groups, which did not participate in socialist construction, they were

found in religion, those groups of intellectuals who were actively involved in the building of socialism, they were exempt from religious prejudices. Fedor Putintsev explained the high interest of the rural people to sectarianism mainly with the activity of the rich peasants (*kulaki*). He underlined, that the attack of the *kulaks* caused with a special resistance to the most diverse and varied forms: open sabotage, opportunism, the boycott of secular and non-governmental organizations. The *kulaks* tried hastily to be organized, but the only legitimate organizations allowed to them were religious organizations, and they liked sectarianism most of all.

Some participants in the discussion, analyzing the situation, pointed to the similarity of the processes occurring in the country, with a history of the Reformation. They were talking seriously about the possibility of further spread of Protestantism, and even the flourishing of it (especially Baptism) as that form of Christianity, which corresponded to the new economic and political conditions of life of the population. The large group of disputants made sharp accusations against researchers of religion, "flirting" with the "enemies of the revolution" in favor of sectarians and other believers, claiming the danger and fallacy of their "idealization". That heated debate coincided with the struggle against the "right deviation" in the Bolshevik party. At the same time, the "right deviation" in the activities of the Union of Militant Atheists was strongly criticized. The main blow was aimed at Emelian Yaroslavskii and Alexander Lukachevskii. The inner struggle in 1928-1929 split the atheistic movement. The victory of Stalin's position against the "right deviation" also meant a victory for a new option of anti-religious policy.

A new wave of persecution of believers began simultaneously with the struggle against the "right deviation" in anti-religious activity. On April 8, 1929, the Resolution of the Central Executive Committee and Council of People's Commissars of the RSFSR "On Religious Associations" was issued. That document regulated the position of religious associations more than 50 years. In 1929 – early 1930s some regulations were adopted that severely restricted the rights of religious organizations and clergy and gave local authorities the right to close churches.

In conclusion, the author of the article claims that the attack against the "liberal" scholars of religion was simultaneous with the struggle with "right deviation" in antireligious activities and repressions against believers, undertaken in the perspective of the political course of "the Great turning-point". The discussions on the problems of the history of religion were stopped. In 1929-1930 the reorganization of the Communist Academy was carried out, and six years later it was completely abolished by a special resolution of the Central Committee of the party.

*Marianna Shakhnovich is a Professor at Saint-Petersburg State University.*

Tatiana Chumakova

# POLITICAL PROPAGANDA AND SCHOLARLY RESEARCH IN PERIODICALS OF THE LEAGUE OF MILITANT ATHEISTS (1925–1935)

The article deals with some issues of studying magazines published in the U.S.S.R. by the League of Militant Atheists ('Antireligioznik', 'Bezbozhnik'), as well as the 'Ateist' Magazine. The period of 1925 – 1935 is chosen purposefully: from the year of the foundation of the League of Militant Atheists (Soyuz voinstvuyushchikh bezbozhnikov) up to 1935, when many researchers were repressed in the course of political cases, and when propaganda displaced scholarly research, especially if specific studies embraced contemporary religious organizations.

In the ideological history concerning the sphere of the religion of the USSR, there are some periods, which greatly influenced the developing of religious studies. The first one – since 1917 is a period of anti-religious, mostly anti-clerical, agitation. The second one – since 1922, since the edition of a Lenin's article "On the Significance of Militant Materialism", in which he urged to make "untiring" atheistic propaganda. The major ideas of the article, called "Lenin's philosophical testament" were taken as a basis for the Party's decisions on questions of the anti-religious fight[1].

[1] Shakhnovich M., Chumakova T. *Ideologiya i nauka. Izuchenie religii v ehpokhu kul'turnoj revolyutsii v SSSR*. Sankt-Peterburg: Nauka, 2016, p. 10.

The second period began from discussing atheistic propaganda questions at the 10th Congress of the Russian Communist Party (Bolsheviks) (March 8 – 16, 1921). Speaking at the 10th Congress Krasikov[2] declared: "The question of religion, comrades, in Russia, as you know, is crucial. However, this "anti-religious front" is a bit in a state of neglect. Our different local organizations made more or less scattered, more or less uncoordinated agitation and propaganda in this respect. You know, comrades, that we have the 8th Department of the separation church from state by the Commissariat of Justice. It primarily addressed this question…. nevertheless, we must admit that anti-religious propaganda is not its main task. It edits a journal "Revolution and Church", which was spread only in 40 thousand copies. You understand that such a quantity for our country is rather small"[3]. Krasikov also admitted that in the country the anti-religious propaganda increased, which, from his point of view, became an instrument for the reunion of the bourgeoisie and kulaks. Particularly protestants are very active in creating agricultural communes. Moreover, these people's political management is slipping out of the Party's hands. Moreover, that is the reason why the time has come for reinforcing of

[2] Krasikov Pyotr Ananyevich (1870–1939), a revolutionary and a politician. Graduated from the Law Faculty at St. Petersburg State University (1908). Member of the League for the Liberation of Labour ("Osvobozhdenie truda"), a member of the Russian Social Democratic Labor Party RSDLP(b). Repeatedly arrested. Member of St. Petersburg Committee of the RSDLP(b) (1905). Since 1908 - attorney-at-law assistant (advocate). In February 1917 took part in creation the Petrograd Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies ("Petrosovet"). Since 1918 – deputy of the People's Commissar for Justice. Took part in creation of the soviet legislation. Since May 1918 – head of the Cult Department by the Commissariat of Justice, head of the Commission on Questions of Cults to the All-Russian Central Executive Committee (VTsIK). Put in force the law "Of the Separation Church from State" (1918). The Supreme Court attorney (1924–1933), Deputy Head of the Supreme Court of the USSR (1933–1938). Since 1919 until 1924 – editor of the journal "Revolution and Church", a member of the Central Soviet of the League of Militant Atheists.

[3] Protokoly X s'ezda RKP(b). Protokoly i stenograficheskie otchety s'ezdov i konferentsij Kommunisticheskoj partii Sovetskogo Soyuza. Moskva: Gospolitizdat, 1963, p. 175.

anti-religious propaganda and agitation. And primarily in the way of scientific enlightenment: "spreading natural-science, natural-historical information among wide masses of peasantry"[4]. At this RKP(b)'s Congress, there were accepted resolutions according to the work of The Chief Committee for Political Education ("Glavpolitprosvet"), including anti-religious work[5]. On Krasokov's demand, there was particularly put stress on a danger of incompetent anti-religious work: "One of the Glavpolitprosvet's fundamental work is a vast organization, management and assistance in anti-religious agitation and propaganda among broad toiling masses. For this aim, the Glavpolitprosvet must, by the way, make natural-scientific knowledge evaluable for different broad masses by publishing journals, books, textbooks, organization of systematical lectures sets and using for spreading all this information by means of modern technologies (photo, cinema, etc.)[6].

In 1922 P.A. Krasikov and I.A. Shpitsberg opened an edition "Ateist". Edition's tasks in many respects coincided with the program declarations, published in the journal "Ateist" in 1925: "Our aim – scientific fight with religion as an ideological superstructure, unscientific and harmful for toiling masses… Our journal – a doable help for active atheists and those, who want to and must be like them…"[7] In this programming article, the "Ateist's" chief editor A.I. Shpitsberg demonstrates a good knowledge of modern western journals, devoted to religious studies. He mentions famous German "Archiv für Religionswissenschaft", German journals on the Bible studies "Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft", "Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft". However, he criticizes as liberal "Archiv für Religionswissenschaft" as well as journals on the Bible studies. He criticizes them not from the scientific, but the

[4] Protokoly X s'ezda RKP(b). Protokoly i stenograficheskie otchety s'ezdov i konferentsij Kommunisticheskoj partii Sovetskogo Soyuza, pp. 175–176.

[5] Ibid. pp.147–152.

[6] Ibid. p. 482.

[7] Editorial note. *Ateist*. № 1. 1925, p. 1.

ideological point of view. Moreover, this break-up between ideology and science, strictly fixed in the article, would influence not only soviet but also post-soviet, religious studies.

The Museum of the History of Religion[8] from the very beginning of its existence was criticized for "religious propaganda", although all that its staff did – it was telling about different religions. A considerable part of scholars of religion now and then was willing to work out of the ideological field, but it is quite curious, that in the soviet time and the present time, as well, they have been criticized by ideologists. If in the USSR it was a Marxist-Leninist ideology, in modern Russia the most frequently it is a forming national-orthodox ideology, resting on ideas of Russian conservatives, like Konstantin Pobedonostsev, as well as on ideas of soviet dissidents-nationalists[9].

Despite the ideological bias, introduced by the decisions of the X$^{th}$ Congress of the RCP(b) (The Russian Communist party of the Bolsheviks), where a question about "Glavpolitprosvet (The Chief Committee for Political Education) and agitational-propagandistic work of the party"[10] had been discussed, and decisions of anti-religious work had been taken, there was also a scientific component in these editions. An ideological component, which became dominant through the years, makes understanding of the position of the researchers of the late 20s – mid-30s very complicated for a modern researcher, acquainted with totalitarian societies through books.

There is another danger for modern researchers, especially for those, who negatively treat the authors, connected with the League of Militant

---

[8] On the activities of the Museum of the History of Religion of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, see more Shakhnovich M. M., Chumakova T. V. *Muzej istorii religii.* Akademiya *nauk SSSR i rossijskoe religiovedenie (1932–1961)*. Sankt-Peterburg, Nauka, 2014, 458 p.

[9] As an example, it is possible to bring the works of the Soviet dissident writer Gennady Shimanov (1937–2013). For example, Shimanov G. *Spor o Rossii*. Moskva: Profizdat, 2003. 400 p.

[10] Protokoly X s"ezda RKP(b), pp. 141–148.

Atheists. They treat them only like enemies of the church, supporters of executors, etc., refusing to note, that in journals and organizations, connected with the activity of the SVB, there were many scholars, some of whom, indeed, negatively considered religious institutions.We can trace it by remembering the fact, that the Church in the Russian Empire became a bureaucratic organization, realizing supervisory functions, as well.

However, that did not prevent them from being scholars. It is entirely explicable that they held that people's enlightenment must be a scholar's aim in the country, most of which was illiterate (belief in kulturtragery is also explained by the fact, that there were many Narodniks (populists) among researchers of religion, for example, W. Bogoraz[11]). Their attitude to anti-religious propaganda was not as formal as in Brezhnev's period. They (and here we may mention Nicolai Matorin[12], repressed in 1935) truly believed in wonderful future, that never came.

In this system, there were also academic scholars, who most likely were not interested in any politics at all, for example, Kagarov[13]. In the late 20s, when the Great Break (Velikii perelom) had begun, their personal life

[11] Bogoraz (Bogoras) Waldemar (Vladimir Germanovich) (1865–1936), a member of "NarodnayaVolya", ethnographer, linguist, historian of religion, writer and publicist, public person, member of the Museum of Anthropology and Ethnography since 1918, professor of ethnography in the Leningrad institute for Philosophy, Literature and History (LIFLI), founder of the Institute of Northern Peoples (1929), founder and first director of Museum of the History of Religion of Academy of Sciences of USSR (1932–1936).

[12] Nicolai Mikhailovich Matorin (Motorin)(1898–1936) – a researcher of religion, ethnographer, activist of the SVB. Deputy Head of IPIN (Institute for the Study of the Nationalities of the USSR), Head of the Institute of Anthropology and Ethnography Academy of Science of the USSR, Head of department of the history of religion at LIFLI (Leningrad institute for Philosophy, Literature and History), Head of the section of the USSR people's religions studies at The Academy of Sciences' Museum of the History of Religion (1934). The author of the first course in Russia on popular religion "Dvoeverie in Russian Village", which he read at Leningrad State University. Arrested in 1935, shot out in 1936. Rehabilitated in 1958.

[13] Eugenii Georgievich Kagarov (1882–1942), a historian of the antique culture, philology-classic, ethnographer, historian of religion.

as well as academic life, was changing[14]. Many of them were repressed in future. F.F. Perchenok admitted very precisely, that "Generally, in the 20s there still were some conditions for "organic" science's growth and "natural" self-preservation and self-reproduction of thought and knowledge. The ideas of the rebuilding of science wandered in the revolutionary air, and among people, employed by the new authorities, some projects were born, the gist of which was the creation of the overwhelming scientific department. The authors partly proceeded from recognition of some statements, seemed to them axiomatic: 1) in science, passed down from the old regime, there ruled "the sacerdotes of science", and their predominance had to be thrown down; 2) the science should be mobilized to serve the revolution; 3) "concentration and centralization" of the science is necessary; 4) for achieving these aims a new special command structure should be formed in the state apparatus. The authors of the projects saw themselves on the top of their invented administrative pyramid"[15].

Moreover, those, who saw themselves on the top, – the propagandists, that occupy scholars' place in the works of some modern researchers. In this case, the whole anti-religious literature seems as politically charged one, and sometimes as not very competent one[16]. It should be considered in the context of the epoch, using methods of intellectual history, looking researchers' biographies through the prism of intellectual biography.

The attitude of researchers and propagandists to religious organizations and studying religious phenomena differed much as may be seen not only from the archive materials, but an analysis of the published works is also productive. Among authors of these journals, there were propagandists,

---

[14] See more Joravsky D. Soviet Scientists and the Great Break. *Daedalus*, vol. 89, no. 3, 1960, pp. 562–580.

[15] Perchenok F.F. "Delo Akademii nauk" i "velikij perelom" v sovetskoj nauke. *Tragicheskie sud'by*: *repressirovannie uchenye Akademii nauk SSSR*. Nauka, 1995, p. 201-235.

[16] About this phenomenon of modern studies on the history of religious studies see more: Shakhnovich M. Ethos istorii nauki: o rekonstruktsii rossijskogo religiovedeniya sovetskogo perioda. *Gosudarstvo, religiya, tserkov' v Rossii i za rubezhom*. 2015. № 1 (33), p. 185–197.

like F. Putintsev[17], but works of the western authors were also published as well as of the soviets scholars, like V.G. Bogoraz and others. The possibility of academic work in the sphere of religion retained due to the resolution of the XII Congress of the RKP(b) "Of the statement of anti-religious agitation and propaganda" (1923), in which it was spoken of religious studies[18]. With the appearance of the resolution, there increased publishing of the books and articles, devoted to religious problems (all the party periodicals published articles with atheistic content and printed overviews).

In the last quarter-century there appeared quite some works, in some way dealing with studying of anti-religious literature. They can be roughly divided into two groups: the smallest one – the works, not containing value judgments, authors of which are eager to analyze this problematic, polysemantic phenomenon. The second one can also be divided into two antagonistic groups, who permanently appeal to personal judgments, thus confusing journalists, propagandists with scholars, having been published in anti-religious periodicals of the League of Militant Atheists. If authors of the first group are eager to show difficulty and dissimilarity of approaches to anti-religious propaganda inside the most relative "atheistic-publicistic society", in which we may separate "pure' propagandists, like Maria Mikhailovna Kostelovskaya, the editor of the journal "Bezbozhik u stanka", who, from my point of view, in no way can be considered a researcher of religion, scholar of religion, or even a "scientific communist". This is a Soviet bureaucrat, making propaganda. It is impossible to compare these "atheistic" bureaucrats with scholars, like Bogoraz and Matorin, though the latest actively did organizational work and were forced out to immerse also into the Soviet bureaucracy problems, being heads of different institutions. Those modern researchers, who are not prone to

[17] Putintsev Fedor Maximovich (1899–1947), a researcher of sectarianism, member of the Central Committee of the League of Militant Atheists' of the USSR from 1925. In 1932-1934 – editor of the newspaper and journal "Bezbozhnik".

[18] *Dvenadtsatyi s"ezd RKP(b). 17-25 aprelia 1923 g. Stenograficheskii otchet*. M.: Politizdat, 1968. P. 716–717.

differentiate propagandists and scholars, have a merit in the sense that for them for some propagandistic reasons it is possible to show academic society of those times as propagandists' society, laying blame on scholars, but not politicians, for the repressions. Some authors declare: "I do not care if Lukachevskiy and Yaroslavskiy were good or bad people in their everyday life. However, they and their comrades made such a context of existence and understanding of religion, which persecutions were inevitable. Because of their activity, despite all the remarks, was an ideological ground for persecutions[19]. It will be reminded, that in 1937 Alexander Timofeevich Lukachevskiy[20] was shot.

These authors seek to equalize executors and victims. They prove that it does not matter who and how was studying religion, and considering it as an atavism (yes, it was their position, they believed in religion's dying), they are guilty of persecutions for belief. It is a strange method. Yes, even Bogoraz used to compare an ethnographer and a missioner, who brings enlightenment, knowledge to the masses. He considered that due to knowledge (and not to bloody violence) it is only possible to overcome religion. Neither he nor his students called for burning icons and destroying churches. Contrariwise, in Nicolai Matorin's documents, also mentioned by these authors, we see the words of the need to save "ritual complexes" (a well, a tree, a chapel, for example), but we never find in his writings and speeches the demands of reprisals against believers. A tendency, which would also be called ideological, replaced ideological statements of Stalin's time and is manifested in rejection of freedom of conscience, and supposing the world's evil in atheists, leads to mythologization of research field and even to the demonization of the particular researchers.

---

[19] Pushhaev Yu. *Kak v SSSR izuchali religiyu, chtobi s nej borot'sia.* Read on September 20, 2016, in electronic format: http://foma.ru/kak-v-sssr-izuchali-religiyu-chtobyi-s-nej-borotsya.html

[20] Lukachevskiy Alexander Timofeevich (1893-1937), head of antireligious section of the Institue of Philosophy, deputy-head of the Central Committee of the League of Militant Atheists. Arrested in 1937 on the counts of espionage and participation in anti-soviet Trot terroristic organization. Shot out, posthumously rehabilitated.

Now a short reminder, what journals were published in 20s-30s. Since 1919 a journal "Revolution and Church" (1919-1924) of the People's Commissariat of Justice had been published, in which the official documents of the state and the Church's mutual relationship were printed. In the early 20s anti-religious journals "Science and Religion" (1922, Moscow, the editor M. Gorev (Galkin), a previous priest), "The Tower of Babel" (1922, Petrograd, the publisher and editor M. Kortsov) were issued.

The first Soviet journal, devoted to religious study, was "Atheist", published by the scientific society "Atheist". Its chief editor was I.A. Shpitsberg[21]. The most of its articles was devoted to the history of religion (first of all, to the history of Christianity), the evolution of religious beliefs, religious syncretism and folk religiosity. In every number, there were published works of the western scholars: M. Weber, S. Freud, etc. In the articles of religious communities, the stress was on business activity of religious organizations. There were also gender type works, where one could feel the influence of a first wave feminism. There was much stronger agitprop influence in editions of the SVB, appeared in 1925. In these editions (newspaper and journal "Bezbozhnik", journal "Antireligioznik"), too, was the same problematic, as in "Atheist".

Until 1935 in these editions there were published modern works on the anthropology of religion, the notes of expeditions, studying a "live religion" in the USSR, the subject, in which the Soviet science did not fall behind the Western one during that period. These journals were for the prepared public, intended to make atheistic propaganda. The most interesting one was a scientific methodological journal "Antireligioznik",

[21] Shpitsberg Ivan Anatolyevich (1881-1933), a lawyer, translator, publicist. Before the revolution - attorney-at-law; form February until October 1917 – the Synod's official. From 1919 until 1923 – a member of cult department of the People's Commissariat of Justice, an authorized representative of the All-Russian Extraordinary Commission (VCHKA). Since 1923 – the head of a scientific society and edition "Atheist", the editor of the scientific journal "Atheist". Published translations of the Western European philosophers, historians and anthropologies on religion problems (P. Golbach, J. Frazer, J. Robertson, etc.).

which was a press organ of the Central Committee of the SVB USSR and published from 1926 till June 1941. It lighted not only a way of anti-religious work but contained numerous articles on the history of religion and atheism, methodological materials for agitators, narrated of expeditionary work of anthropology of religion researchers. In "Antireligioznik", they also published the results of expeditions to the Central Asia, Central Russia and Russian North[22]. A great part of those publications was prepared by Nickolay Matorin and his colleagues. With the support of the Academy of Sciences, the League of Militant Atheists, and regional studies organizations (the Central Bureau of regional studies and its branches were exterminated in 1937), they studied 'living religion', i.e. popular piety. The analysis of academic articles in "Antireligioznik" shows that their publication decreases and even stops in 1935 when after S.M. Kirov's murder (1934) in Leningrad there started processes, connected with «Trotskyist-zinovievsky blok»[23]. Many religious scholars, connected with the Leningrad school of studying religion, became the repressions' victims. This academic school was formed in Petersburg-Petrograd-Leningrad due to the fact it was a centre of academic science before the Academy of Science's move, started in 1934[24]. In Moscow, since 1917 ideological centres began to form, such as the Institute of Red Professors[25] and the Communist Academy (Komacademia)[26]. One may also find valuable information in the journal "Bezbozhnik", which was also a central

[22] For example: Matorin N. Nizhnevolzhskaia ehkspeditsiia Leningradskogo universiteta. *Antireligioznik*, 1930, № 8–9, pp. 123–125.

[23] See more *Repressii uchenykh. Biograficheskie materialy*. Read February, 14, 2017, in electronic format: http://www.ihst.ru/projects/sohist/repress.htm

[24] See more Chumakova T.V., Dmitriev A.N. Istoriya nauki v Peterburge-Petrograde-Leningrade: XX vek, pervaya polovina. *Naukovedenie*, № 1 (21), 2004, p. 194–210.

[25] See more David-Fox M. *Revolution of the Mind: Higher Learning among the Bolsheviks, 1918–1929*. Ithaca: London, Cornell University Press, 1997. 320 p.

[26] See more David-Fox M. Symbiosis to Synthesis: The Communist Academy and the Bolshevization of the Russian Academy of Sciences, 1918-1929. *Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas. Neue Folge.* Bd. 46, H. 2, 1998, pp. 219-243; Katz Z. Party-Political Education in Soviet Russia 1918–1935. *Soviet Studies*, Vol. 7, No. 3, 1956, pp. 237–247.

edition of the League of Militant Atheists. If journals "Atheist" and "Antireligioznik" were meant to be read by propagandists and educated people, then the journal and newspaper "Bezbozhnik" – for poorly educated people. Emelyan Yaroslavskiy in his work "Tasks and Methods of Anti-religious Propaganda" (1925) wrote: "Although we have already got an anti-religious literature in a rather big quantity, it is hardly adopted to a village"[27] and admitted that the only similar edition is a newspaper "Bezbozhnik", that is published twice a week and sets its task in organizing anti-religious propaganda in a village. Editions of the "League of Militant Atheists" were published everywhere. Regional editions were published in cities (for example, a newspaper "Achinsk Bezbozhnik"), in republics, also in national languages (for example, in Yiddish[28]). The journal "Bezbozhnik", managed by E. Yaroslavskiy, in 1932 joined to "Bezbozhik u stanka" and from this moment it was managed by Putintsev. The most radical among them was the "Bezbozhik u stanka", an illustrated thin monthly journal, addressed to workers and peasants. Its chief editor was M.M. Kostelovskaya mentioned above, and since July 1928 – I. Stukov. A painter D. Moor headed an artistic part. The Moor's illustrations made this journal famous.

Besides above-noted journals, in the 20s – early 30s many journals were published: "Derevenskiy bezbozhnik" (1928–1932); "Yunyie bezbozhniki" (1931–1933) and even "Bezbozhniy krokodil" (1924–1925, chief editor Yaroslavskiy).

It is worth admitting, that not everybody, making propaganda, liked everything in these journals, particularly in those, addressed not to propagandists, but to "propaganda consumers", like in the journal "Bezbozhik u stanka", where it was told about the history of religion. Some ideologists are inclined to consider it a latent form of religious propaganda. It was

[27] Yaroslavskii E.M. *Zadachi i metody antireligioznoi propagandy.* Moskva: Izdatel'stvo «Bezbozhnik», 1925, p. 30.

[28] On the criticism of Judaism in the USSR in 1920s, see more Weinberg R. Demonizing Judaism in the Soviet Union during the 1920s. *Slavic Review*, vol. 67, 2008, No. 1, pp. 120–153.

discussed at the Antireligious session (Vsesoyuznoe soveshhanie po antireligioznoj propagande) in Moscow, April 1926.

Summarizing the above, it is worth noting, that an essential task for modern researchers of religion and for those, who deal with the intellectual history of studying religion, is developing a methodology of studying the history of humanities in totalitarian societies. It is mainly the study of religion, from my point of view, that may become a subject of these historical-intellectual studies, because, as many researchers admit, for becoming a research subject in intellectual history's frames, an "idea" must stay apart from a certain social discourse, become an autonomous monad, able to migrate from one cultural sphere to another: from philosophical reflection to political demagogy, from academic discussions to frontpage news, from religious beliefs to literary play – or vice versa. The history of ideas becomes itself only when it begins to study not only filiation but adaptation of ideas as well, their "translation" into different cultural languages – including, of course, a literal translation from one national language to another, but also a re-thinking, re-issuance according to various forms of public conscience[29].

*The publication was prepared with the support of the grant of Russian Science Foundation № 16-18-10083 "The Study of Religion in Social and Cultural Context of the Epoch: The History Religious Studies and Intellectual History of Russia 19th - first half of 20th century".*

*Tatiana Chumakova has DSc in Philosophy. She is a Professor at the Department of Philosophy of Religion and Religious Studies of St. Petersburg State University.*

[29] Zenkin C. *Russkaia teoriia i intellektual'naia istoriia//Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie.* 2003, № 61. P. 331.

Ekaterina A. Teryukova

# RELIGIOUS SITUATION IN DAGESTAN IN THE 1930'S: CASE STUDY OF CHOKH RELICS

## (On expedition materials of Evgenii Shilling)

The subject of this article is a set of ritual objects from the collection of the State Museum of the History of Religion. In 1934, Evgenii Shilling (1892-1953), a Russian expert in Caucasus studies, brought it to Moscow from a small mountain village in Dagestan. Regarding Shilling's body of work, researcher Z. Mahmudova writes:"He was one of the most prominent Russian ethnographers - researchers of Caucasus of the XX$^{th}$ century. His personality and scientific heritage are of the great interest till nowadays. ... The untimely death of Schilling did not allow him to fulfil all plans. A lot of little-known articles, notes, expedition reports, explanations on gathered museum collections, photographs and sketches are stored in the archives of Moscow, St. Petersburg and are waiting for their researcher"[1]. Our case study approves this suggestion. In 2016, in the Scientific and Research archives of the State Museum of the History of Religion unpublished manuscripts of Shilling's expedition notes were discovered. That allowed for the accurate attribution of the objects from the village of

[1] Mahmudova Z.U. Dagestanskie ekspedotsii kafedry etnografii Istoricheskogo fakulteta MGU pod rukovodstvom E.M. Shillinga: tvorcheskii poisk, nachodki, rezultati issledovanii. *Dagestanskie etnograficheskie ekspeditsii E.M. Shillinga (1944–1946).* Moskva: Trikvadrata, 2013, s. 3.

Chokh. The set of these object is an excellent example of the change that many of the religious objects underwent in the early modern and modern period, having turned from sacred to profane, from relics of the sacred history of the village into museum objects.

Shilling was one of the researchers who brought fame to the Russian school of Caucasus studies. As a researcher at the Institute of Ethnography, a founder of the Central Museum of Ethnology in Moscow (1923–1948)[2], and a professor at the Chair of Ethnology at the History Department at Moscow State University, Shilling systematically carried out fieldwork. Between the mid-1920s and mid-1940s, he made over twenty expeditions to the Northern Caucasus. Like many of the serious researchers of his time, Shilling was a scholar of universal scope: he simultaneously studied both the material and the spiritual cultures of the region in their every manifestation[3]. During his expeditions, Shilling collected the materials that later entered the collections of several museums: the Central Museum of Ethnology, the Museum of Anthropology and Ethnography, the State Museum of the History of Religion, and the State Museum of Oriental Art.

Shilling's work at Moscow's Central Museum of Ethnology and the Chair of Ethnography at Moscow State University, as well as his expeditions in the 1940s, have been well-researched primarily due to the existence of expedition reports that he had published himself. For example, one of the results of his 1945 expedition was the discovery of "relics of pagan cults and elements of semi-pagan Christianity beneath the Muslim layer" of religious beliefs and rituals of the local population of Dagestan[4]. Therefore, the researcher concluded that "Islam, which was brought to Dagestan

---

[2] Ippolitov A.B. Istoria muzeia narodov SSSR v Moskve. *Etnograficheskoje obozrenie*, Nr. 2. Moskva: Nauka, 2001, s. 144–160.

[3] Lysenko I. M. Pol' nauchnich uchrezhdenii Tsentral'noi Rossii v izuchenii istorii I kulturi Dagestana (30-e gg. XXv.) *VestnikIIAE*, Nr. 1. Mahachkala: Dagestanskiinauchniycenter, 2013, 47. s.

[4] *Dagestanskie etnograficheskie ekspeditsii E.M. Shillinga (1944-1946).* Moskva: Tri kvadrata, 2013, 32 s.

during the Arab rule, eventually established itself in 'the mountainous country' between the thirteenth and the fifteenth centuries (at different times in different places)"[5].

In the 1940s, Shilling often visited the mountain settlement of Chokh in Gunibsky District, which used to be one of Dagestan's most extensive trade centres. The researcher defined it as "a place where traditional Avar people culture or, rather, it is a very colourful local version, is concentrated", a place where "one cannot help feeling an old tradition of artistic skill and a significant level of culture…"[6].

Unfortunately, Shilling's collaboration with another museum – Moscow's Central Antireligious Museum – in the 1930s never became the subject of focused research. Today, due to the discovery of Shilling's expedition notes in the archives of the State Museum of the History of Religion in 2016, this gap can be partially repaired. This is especially important for our museum because, in 1947 after the Central Antireligious Museum was closed down, all of its collections, including the objects that Shilling had brought from Dagestan, were handed over to the State Museum of the History of Religion in Leningrad. It was probably then that the ethnographer's archives were brought to the Museum along with the museum object collection.

The Dagestan object collection at the State Museum of the History of Religion comprises 138 objects, all of them brought by Shilling from his expeditions in 1934, 1935, 1936, and 1940. The set of ritual objects from the settlement of Chokh that we are going to discuss in the present article consists of the lock of the Kalani Mosque, two Muslim banners, a flagpole topper, a ritual sabre, a rahlah (a Koran lectern), and handwritten pages from the Koran.

What was the particular sacred status of these objects that defined their fame as the sacred objects from Chokh?

---

[5] Shilling E.M. Amuleti vostochnogo Kavkaza. *Nauchno-istoricheskii archive GMIR*. F.1. Op.380. D.230, 25. pp.

[6] Dagestanskie etnograficheskie ekspeditsii E.M. Shillinga (1944–1946), s. 97.

The sacred nature of these objects dated back to an old legend that is still remembered by the residents of Chokh today. The Chokh relics – the banner and the sabre - presumably, belonged to the legendary Sheikh Abu Muslim, who had undertaken a military campaign in the mountainous areas of Dagestan to convert their population to Islam. The sabre, the white banner and the flagpole topper were preserved in Djuma Mosque located in the Kalani Quarter in Chokh.

This legend has long influenced the official historiography of the issue. Muslim historiography of the early 20th century, as well as several papers by twentieth-century historians, ascribed the first attempts to bring Islam to Dagestan to Abu Muslim, a famous Arab politician and religious leader, who had played an outstanding role in bringing down the Umayyad Dynasty and installing the Abbasid Dynasty on the throne in 750.

However, a Dagestani manuscript preserved at the Institute of History, Language and Literature of the Dagestan Branch of the Academy of Science and dated to mid-thirteenth century gives a different account of Islam's first steps in Avaria: three descendants of the Prophet Muhammad, Sheikh Ahmed, Aballah and Abd al-Muslim, were devoted to the spread of Islam in the Eastern Caucasus. Sheikh Ahmed and Aballah were killed in action. After that, Abd al-Muslim, the surviving 'descendant of the Prophet', and his army finished what they had started. Abd al-Muslim became an imam in Arabia … and this happened in 654, i.e. in 1256 according to the Christian calendar[7]. This source makes it possible to conclude that Islam came to Dagestan much later than it was previously believed—as late as the thirteenth century[8]. It also raised doubt as to the historical truth of the persons mentioned in it.

As a result, we were faced with the need to determine the truthfulness of the historic legend that connected Islam in Dagestan with the name of Abu Muslim – an issue especially crucial for the attribution of the Chokh objects.

---

[7] Shahsaidov A.R. Kogda i kak dagestantsi stali musulmanami. *Religia vchera I segodnia*. Machackala: Dagknigoizdat, 1968, s. 29.

[8] Ibid., p. 32.

It is well-known that Abu Muslim was widely popular during the rise of Islam in Iran and Central Asia. His political influence was so significant that it was deemed dangerous by the ruling Abbasid Dynasty, which eventually led to his murder in 755. The fame of his martyrdom made Abu Muslim even more famous. It is, probably, the authority of Abu Muslim as the protector of the common people and his alleged role in the spread of Islam in Central Asia that led to his name appearing in many Medieval Dagestani sources in place of the name of Maslama ibn Abdal-Malik, the Arab military leader from the House of Umayyad, who often led his army to the Eastern Caucasus and supervised the building of mosques in Derbent and several other places.As for Abu Muslim, Dagestani historians proved that he had never been in Dagestan[9].

Modern research has also shown that the conversion of Dagestan into Islam was long and violent. The struggle for Dagestan lasted over a thousand years. For almost 150 years, beginning in the mid-seventh century, Arabs undertook regular attempts of military takeover and implemented a persistent migration policy in the Eastern Caucasus. In the tenth century, the conversion into Islam became a peaceful process[10].

Here is what Shilling wrote about the Islamisation of Dagestan in his unpublished article "The Amulets of the Eastern Caucasus" from the Archives of the State Museum of the History of Religion: "In the Eastern Caucasus, the two manifestations of Islam… were firmly established earlier and stronger than in the other parts of the Caucasus. Its first appearance dates back to the time of the Arab rule (the 8th century). However, the process was long, slow, and uneven. In the tenth century, the boundary of the Muslim world in the Caucasus… did not touch on the inner country. In the times of Timur (the 14th century), the residents of the mountainous

[9] Gadzhiev M.G., Davudov O. M., Shihsaidov A.R. *Istoria Dagestana s drevneishich vremen do kontsa XV v.* Mahachkala: DNTSRAN, 1996, s. 225.

[10] Ibid., p. 199; Achmedova A.S. Charakternie osobennosti protsessa proniknovenia islama v oblast' religioznich verovanii narodov Dagestana. *Religiovedenie,* Nr. 3. Blagoveshensk: AGU, 2010, s.17.

Central and Southern Dagestan were considered bad Muslims by the true faithful. Evliya Çelebi's description of the Turkish offensive in Dagestan in 1578 confirms this. In the nineteenth century, Shamil himself had to work on strengthening the foundations of Muhammad's religion among the mountain residents and fight against the relicts of pre-Islamic tradition… All of the above makes it evident why the beliefs of the people from the areas where our objects were obtained preserve the pre-Islamic layer, tightly bound with the official religion (its two manifestations)"[11].

Our Chokh collection from the Kalani Mosque is an example of such mix of religious traditions (the official Islam and pre-Islamic beliefs related to agricultural practices).The inventory of the objects collected by Shilling in June–July 1934 for the Central Antireligious Museum lists the objects we have mentioned before: a flag from the mosque and a copper flagpole topper, a sabre in a casing, a large banner with an embroidered motto in Arabic, a stone lamp from the mosque, an iron lock from the mosque, a Koran lectern, etc[12]. A more detailed explanation can be found in the field notes signed by Shilling and dated June 13–15, 1934[13].

According to the data published earlier, the origins of the Chokh collection were connected with the history of the origins of Chokh itself and reflected in the script of the annual ritual that played out an essential episode of the village's 'sacred history'. According to legends, Abu Muslim brought the residents of Chokh to Islam twelve times and twelve times the residents of Chokh went back to their faith. According to the legend written down in 1931, Sheikh Abu Muslim stuck his banner in a rock that he took over, on the spot where the best of the Chokh mosques would later be erected. On top of the banner, a swallow made a nest, and the victorious conqueror ordered to bring twelve small villages into a larger

[11] Shilling E.M. Amuleti vostochnogo Kavkaza. *Nauchno-istoricheskii archive GMIR*. F.1.Op.380.D.230, s. 23.

[12] Ibid., p. 45.

[13] Ibid., p. 61.

settlement. The residents of the nearby villages left their homes… They built their new houses around Sheikh's banner out of stone, wood, and clay. According to the legend, the same happened in Ruguja, a village in Gunibsky District, 12 km to the west of Gunib. They, however, refused to convert to Islam and killed the missionary sent by Abu Muslim. Then, Abu Muslim ordered the residents of Chokh to send several people who were respected in the community to persuade the residents of Ruguja to convert into the new religion. The villagers of Chokh sent two of their respected citizens, but they, too, were killed. Then, the village of Chokh attacked Ruguja. As a result of the battle, the residents of Ruguja had to give up and convert to Islam. In gratitude and memory of these events, Abu Muslim granted the villagers of Chokh with the white banner with the copper topper and the sabre.

The ritual itself is described in Shilling's field notes from the Museum's archives: "During the celebration of Uraz and Kurban, twice a year, the Kalani Mosque conducted the following procedure: the elder of the Abu-Muslim family took up the flag and the sabre. The mullahs supported him by his right and his left arm. The procession went out into the yard. The flag was put up and left to stand there for twenty-four hours. By the door of the lower door of the mosque, the elder of the Abu-Muslim family turns to face the neighbouring village of Rugudja and shakes his sabre. The crowd cheers the procession. The village elder throws old clay pots in the air, and the crowd tries to break them with stones before they fall on the ground. If the clay pots break, it is a sign of a good harvest for the following year. The sabre is taken back to the mosque. Threatening the village of Ruguja with the bare sabre is an evocation of the sword of Abu Muslim, who, according to the legend, had to conquer the unyielding Ruguja, where he was trying to establish Islam, a number of times. At present, the ritual is no longer observed, and the Kalani Mosque has been closed down"[14]. So as there is a surviving visual depiction of the ritual painted by Halil Bek Musayasul, a Chokh artist, in the

[14] *Nauchno-istoricheskii archive GMIR*. F.1. Op.380. D.230, 64 ob. pp.

1920s, it is possible to conclude that the ritual was still performed at the time of making the picture. The description cited above is confirmed by Omar Karanailov, who wrote about the ritual in 1884[15]. Thus, we can be confident that the script of the ritual remained unchanged for a long time until the 1930s.

The ritual has a variety of slightly interesting interpretations. According to one of them, the oldest of the Chokh residents said that the breaking of the clay pots was supposed to remind the villagers of Ruguja of the clay pots where they stored pickled pig heads - they promised to convert into Islam as soon as they would eat them all up. Shilling, however, emphasizes the agricultural significance of the ritual intended to ensure good crops[16]. Possibly, these two interpretations are not contradictory and only serve as proof of the Shilling's idea cited above that Islamic and pre-Islamic beliefs have long co-existed in Dagestan.

"The huge two-storied mosque" built by Abu Muslim, according to the local legend, failed to survive to present day. In 1884, a Chokh resident, wrote that it was destroyed by the army of Imam Shamil in 1845. In 1864–1865, a new mosque was built, of which only a few fragments survive.

The Osmanov family had the central role in the pot-breaking ritual. According to legend, they descended from a companion of Abu Muslim, who came to Dagestan with his army. In 1946, Shilling wrote the following about the Osmanov Tukkhum: "Among the Chokh families, a small, but an influential family of the Osmanovs stands out"[17]. "This family believe themselves to be descended from Abu Muslim–toxom Osmani (from Abul Musslim Osmanli); they call their clan (tukkhum) 'tukkhum Abu

---

[15] Karanailov O. Aul Chokh. *Sbornik materialov dla opisania mestnostei i plemen Kavkaza*, Nr. 4. Tiflis: Kantselaria glavnonachalstvuiushchego grazhdanskoi chastiu na Kavkaze, 1884, s. 1–25.

[16] Shilling E. M. Iz istorii odnogo dagestanskogo zemledelcheskogo kulta. *Kratkie soobshchenia Instituta Etnografii*, Nr. 1. Moskva: Izdatelstvo Akademii Nauk SSSR, 1946, s. 33.

[17] Shilling E. M. Iz istorii odnogo dagestanskogo zemledelcheskogo kulta, s. 32.

Musslim'. The Kalani Mosque is the epitome of the Abu Musslim cult. Members of Tukkhum Abu Musslim perform the priest functions"[18].According to their family legend, as he left Dagestan, Abu Muslim left his flag and sabre as the sign of power to his companion and relative, Osman", which was supposed to be confirmed by the Arabic sign on the flag: *"(1) Oh, he that pardons the prisoner! Oh, he that brings up the conquered! (2) Oh, he that enriches the poor! Oh, he that feeds the small! (3) Oh, he that heals the sick! Date–115, (4) he that takes up this {flag}, the eldest of the family of governor Osman, (5) The ruler of the faithful. {This is} the relic of Abu-l-Muslim, the conqueror of Dagestan"*[19].The date on the flag, 115 since Hejira, or 733–734 AD (the date often encountered in the numerous memorial signs) signifies the year of the arrival of Abu Muslim's army in Dagestan and the acceptance of Islam by the residents. It was a member of clan Osmanov, Sharaf Osmanov, from whom Shilling purchased the large ritual flag with an Arabic inscription, according to his field notes. Shilling's notes also inform us that the sign was embroidered in 1914 at a factory in Moscow as commissioned by Sharaf's uncle, Gadji Magomed Sharafov, who wrote the Arabic inscription down on paper and bequeathed that his descendant's commission a good flag bearing this text for the Kalani Mosque. In 1911, after his uncle's death, Sharaf commissioned a private factory in Moscow to produce the flag and copy the sign. The flag was "only prepared for the effort of the clan of Abu Muslim but never got to the mosque"[20].

Shilling brought two banners from the Chokh Mosque. Here is what he wrote about the second one: "A) a flag—bajra from the Kalani Quarter Mosque (the mosque is presently closed), on white cotton cloth, there is an Arabic inscription in black paint; B) a copper flagpole topper—a ball out of tin-coated copper. Both objects come from the Kalani Mosque. The topper was placed on top of a long wooden stick (pole); the flag was

[18] *Nauchno-istoricheskii archive GMIR*, s. 64.

[19] Shilling E. M. Iz istorii odnogo dagestanskogo zemledelcheskogo kulta, s. 33.

[20] *Nauchno-istoricheskii archive GMIR*, 64 ob. pp.; Shilling E. M. Iz istorii odnogo dagestanskogo zemledelcheskogo kulta, s. 32.

sewn onto the pole. The flag was kept in the mosque, leaning against the inside wall of the Caaba. On the ritual purpose of the object, see Item 11. P.S. The flag is a substitute for an older one, which was more ornate, but failed to survive"[21]. The inscription stated: *"(1) Oh, he that pardons the prisoner! Oh, he that brings up the conquered! (2) Oh, he that grants needs! Oh, he that elevates things! Oh, he that removes cares, Is Allah"*. The flag topper also bore an Arabic sign: *"This is a flag of the Muslim and a teaching to the taught"*[22].

Finally, few words must be said of the sabre that was stored along with the flags in the Kalani Mosque and, according to local legend, belonged to the legendary Sheikh Abu Muslim. On the other hand, it was chronologically linked to the history of Chokh's origins. According to Shilling's 1934 field notes, "the blade, old and of poor quality, in poor condition, from the mosque in Kalani Quarter" consisted of a wooden casing with a broken-off tip, with black leather glued on top, with two iron belts, and a blade with a round local stamp and a wooden handle. "The blade and the flag were in the mosque near the Caaba. On its ritual purpose, see Item 11. E. Shilling. P.S. The expensive ancient blade with a gold inscription in Arabic, finely executed and highly priced, which used to be kept in the mosque, in 1910, was stolen by a member of clan Abu Muslim, an officer in the imperial army (E. Shilling)"[23].

Therefore, from the surviving visual and field ethnographic sources, we can conclude that the State Museum of the History of Religion possesses a unique set of ritual objects connected with the legend of the Islamisation of the Eastern Dagestan. In 1920s–1930s, at the time when the Soviet Union had just launched its antireligious campaign, Shilling purchased the objects for the Central Antireligious Museum in Moscow, and after it was closed down, due to the change of the state attitude to religion during World War II, along with other collections, they found their way to the

[21] *Nauchno-istoricheskii archive GMIR*, s. 62.
[22] Shilling E. M. Iz istorii odnogo dagestanskogo zemledelcheskogo kulta, s. 33.
[23] *Nauchno-istoricheskii archive GMIR*, s. 63.

State Museum of the History of Religion, where they have been preserved to the present day.

## Summary

The article examines a set of ritual objects from the collection of the State Museum of the History of Religion (Saint-Petersburg, Russia). In 1934, Evgenii Shilling (1892-1953), a Russian expert in Caucasus studies, brought it to Moscow from a small mountain village in Dagestan. Due to unpublished manuscripts of Shilling's expedition notes discovered in 2016in the Scientific and Research archives of the State Museum of the History of Religion the accurate attribution of the objects from the village of Chokh was done. The set of these object is a good example of the change that many of the religious objects underwent in the early modern and modern period, having turned from sacred to profane, from relics of the sacred history of the village into museum objects.

The Dagestan object collection at the State Museum of the History of Religion comprises 138 objects, all of them brought by Shilling from his expeditions in 1934, 1935, 1936, and 1940. The set of ritual objects from the settlement of Chokh that are discussed in the present article consists of the lock of the Kalani Mosque, two Muslim banners, a flagpole topper, a ritual sabre, a rahlah (a Koran lectern), and handwritten pages from the Koran.

According to the data published earlier, the origins of the Chokh collection related to the history of the origins of Chokh itself and reflected in the script of the annual ritual that played out an essential episode of the village's 'sacred history'.

From the surviving visual and field ethnographic sources, we can conclude that the State Museum of the History of Religion possesses a unique set of ritual objects connected with the legend of the Islamisation of the Eastern Dagestan.

*The publication was prepared with the support of the grant of Russian Science Foundation № 16-18-10083 "The Study of Religion in Social and Cultural Context of the Epoch: the History Religious Studies and Intellectual History of Russia 19th- first half of 20th century".*

*Ekaterina A. Teryukova has PhD (Philosophy). She is an Associate Professor at State Saint-Petersburg University and a Deputy-Director of State Museum of The History of Religion.*

Nadezhda Beliakova, Kliueva Vera

# SPECIAL FEATURES OF THE EVANGELICAL COMMUNITY IN THE SOVIET UNION: DIFFICULTIES OF CO-EXISTENCE IN CONDITIONS OF HARASSMENT AND DISCRIMINATION

**Summary**:

We analyze practices of communication which were formed within the official Evangelical communities in the late USSR. Representatives of various Protestant denominations were forced to become members of the communities. Such religious heterogeneity was related to the Soviet policy, which brought similar, but theologically different denominations to coexist in a single religious and organizational space. Both compromise and conflict practices of communication were typical for either of the denominations. For example, the Pentecostals could refuse ecstatic prayer practices and participate in joint religious services, or they might consider a joint service as an opportunity to preach among the Baptists. The latter could also allow the Pentecostals to participate in the worship or to deny them such opportunity, though formally they were members of the community.

The case under consideration is interesting because it shows conflict communication at the grassroots level (at the level of one church, one community) between the two "religious rivals": the Baptists and the Pentecostals. They both perceived their coexistence in a single religious space as a forced one. Moreover, the Pentecostals, as seen by the Baptists, were a potential threat to the unity of

the community because of their religious practices of baptism with the Holy Spirit and glossolalia. In addition, the Pentecostals undermined the system of official authority with their religious practices, claiming that the words of those who received the baptism of the Holy Spirit had an advantage over the statements of the senior elders and the church leaders. In turn, the Pentecostals considered the Baptists as already prepared to perceive Pentecostal ideas, and they "proselytized" among them. Moreover, so, the conflict became the most vivid form of their communication.

We approach the issue of why co-existence was so difficult for the Baptists and the Pentecostals; how believers of different denominations treated each other; who initiated conflicts, what the ways to resolve a conflict were, what part religious leaders and activists played in resolution or escalation of a conflict. The primary way to resolve a conflict was a rupture of relations and secession of the Pentecostals from an officially registered Baptist community. Another way was a punishment (sometimes, exclusion from the Church membership) of certain believers who adhered to the Pentecostal creeds. At the same time, the state, which destroyed mechanisms of legal change of leadership in a religious community, performed a certain role in that situation.

Of course, there were communities where the believers had no conflicts, as they managed to find an opportunity to come to a compromise, maintaining their religious identities. However, they were much less than those communities which had tensions in one way or another.

Ego documents (letters and memoirs) and interviews gathered according to the Oral history method are the main sources for the analysis.

**Keywords**: Baptists, Pentecostals, religious community, communicative practices, the late USSR

Usage of various sources, including documents and materials of Oral History, provides abundant information on interactions among believers with similar but not identical theological grounds in single communicative space. The suggested study aims to describe the experience of communicative practices between the representatives of the two largest Post-Reformation Protestant denominations: Evangelical Christians and Baptists,

and Pentecostals (Christians of Evangelical faith). We analyze the way communication evolved, and how conflicts were resolved at the grassroots level in communities that were part of a legal, religious structure – the All-Union Council of Evangelical Christians and Baptists (AUCECB)[1]. This storyline is important because two historical and doctrinal competitors were forcefully united in one religious space. The study addresses the following questions: were Pentecostal-charismatic leaders a kind of "wolves in sheep pens", or the struggle for influence was typical of the whole Evangelical community? Did representatives of state departments influence the nature of the communication?

During World War II, it became evident that there was a dynamic Evangelical community in the USSR, and the authorities could not ignore its presence. The totality of the factors, which led to a change in the Soviet religious policy, strengthened the tendency to legalize religious life and create organizational structures of those denominations which were loyal to the Soviet government[2]. The state policy towards unification of religious movements and registration of centralized religious organizations led to the fact that the All-Union Council of Evangelical Christians and Baptists (AUCECB) became the second largest religious structure in the Soviet Union, basing on the number of registered communities.

On the one hand, an opportunity to exist legally contributed to the growth in the number of open believers, who were given a free hand to exercise their religious needs, on the other hand, it provided the authorities with one more tool of control of such specific environment,

---

[1] About Church-state, relationships in the late Soviet Union see: Sawatsky W. *Soviet Evangelicals since World War II.* Kitchener, ON: Herald Press, 1981.

[2] ex. Huhn U. *Glaube und Eigensinn. Volksfrömmigkeit zwischen orthodoxer Kirche und sowjetischem Staat 1941 bis 1960*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2014; Chumachenko T.,*Church and State in Soviet Russia. Russian Orthodoxy from World War II to the Khrushchev Years*. M.E.: Sharpe, 2002; Savinskii S. *Istoriia evangel'skikh khristian-baptistov Ukrainy, Rossii, Belorussii.* Volume 2. 1917-1967. St. Petersburg: Bibliia dlia vsekh, 1999; Sawatsky W. Soviet Evangelicals since World War II.

as the Evangelical community. The authorities gained a unique advantage to control and influence representatives of different faiths after it introduced the procedure of registration of religious organizations and clergy, and after it focused its efforts, together with the new religious structure (AUCECB), on legalization and unification of liturgical life of the Evangelicals. In case of an accusation of waiver of the strict requirements of the "Soviet legislation on religious cults", a community and its presbyter could be deprived of registration, and in some cases, religious activists and leaders faced criminal prosecution. After the war, heads of registered communities had to manoeuvre between rigid observance of the Soviet law and preservation of prayer communication of their co-religionists.

Pentecostals did not get an opportunity to register an independent structure for several reasons. First of all, it was due to social isolationism, which was more prominent than that of Evangelical Christians and Baptists, as well as due to the religious practice of glossolalia, which was considered harmful to health. The authorities, of course, pursued their own aims when they refused Pentecostals an opportunity to register their communities and forced their leaders to seek a compromise with the AUCECB. The authorities considered Pentecostals ideologically unacceptable to the Soviet state and decided to engage the All-Union Council into their "education" because that structure had demonstrated great loyalty and willingness to cooperate. At the same time, the presence of obvious competitors in a common space gave the authorities a unique opportunity to control processes inside the AUCECB and amplify conflicts in the early relatively homogeneous community. That was a tried practice of the Soviet state. The level of distrust, disunity and conflict increased as a result of such "forced unification", and the leaders of the officially recognized religious structure felt an urgent need for support and legitimization of their authority with the help of the state agencies.

Pentecostals joined the AUCECB after the so-called "August Agreements" were signed, according to which they had to abandon prac-

tices of praying "in tongues" in public (i.e., the practice of glossolalia) and of ritual feet washing before taking the communion. In turn, Evangelical Christians and Baptists recognized the baptism of the Holy Spirit[3].

It should be noted that a number of strategies of communication with Baptists had developed within the Pentecostal movement from the moment of signing the "August Agreements" (1945): (1) rejection of any association with Baptists and conduction of independent prayer meetings (illegal ones from the authorities' point of view), as long as there is no legal independent Pentecostal Union; (2) union with Baptists for common worship and rejection of ecstatic prayer practices (glossolalia, feet washing, baptism in the Holy Spirit); (3) entry into Baptist communities for drawing the believers over to the side of Pentecostals.

That association was unwelcomed in the Baptist community. As the believers remembered complex relationships of the 1920s, initially there were concerns that Pentecostals would begin "to set up their own rules and to split our joint close-knit family"[4].

In its turn, a stable narrative about infringement of Pentecostal believers in Evangelical communities was formed among Pentecostals: "the ministers were suspended from the ministry, the rights of believers were infringed, and their religious views were criticized and ridiculed"[5]. These facts are confirmed by the official AUCECB documents. A report of the Union leaders about a trip to Central Asian communities mentions the Tashkent Baptist community, whose leaders "not only excluded

---

[3] Nikol'skaja T. Avgustovskoe soglashenie i pozicii pjatidesjatnikov v 40-50-h gg XX v. *Gosudarstvo, religija i cerkov' v Rossii i za rubezhom.* 2010. № 4. P. 124-133; Kliueva V. Ne oni ustupili, a s nimi soglasilis'»: evangel'skie hristiane-baptisty i pjatidesjatniki v pervoe poslevoennoe desjatiletie. *Sovetskoe gosudarstvo i obshhestvo v period pozdnego stalinizma. 1945-1953.* Moscow: Politicheskaja enciklopedija, Prezidentskij centr B.N. El'cina, 2015, P. 586-594.

[4] op. cit.: Mickevich A. *Istorija evangel'skih hristian-baptistov*. Moscow: n.p., 2007, pg. 305.

[5] Franchuk V. *Prosila Rossija dozhdja u Gospoda.* Volume 3. Kiev: Svitankova zorya, 2000, pg. 225.

Pentecostals but declared the tongues to be languages of satanic origin, deepening thereby a gulf between them and the community"[6].

It should be mentioned that there is also evidence about a conflict-free life of united communities, which Pentecostals did not leave even after independent Pentecostal unions had appeared (the most well-known community is the Church of St. Olaf in Tallinn, as well as a number of communities in Volyn region). Conflict-free status did not force believers to articulate their positions, while the conflicts were deposited in the memory, spawning a number of sources of epistolary genre, which illustrate the formation of religious identity through a conflict.

## Pentecostal prayer practices: attractiveness and rejection

Why Pentecostal practices were so tempting for believers and conflictogenic at the same time? Specific religious Pentecostal practices were the key point of the conflict at the grassroots level that practices caused a severe emotional distress in attendees. Mainly, it is referred to glossolalia. Attitudes to powerful emotional experiences, accompanied by specific sounds and actions (prohibited in the AUCECB communities according to the "August Agreements"), which were supposed to be visible manifestations of the presence of the Holy Spirit, divided believers into those who wanted to live that experience and those who acutely rejected it.

Such Pentecostal practices as speaking in tongues and prophecies were emotionally perceived as visual manifestations of the Holy Spirit by some believers and as "demonic" manifestations by others. In addition, Pentecostal rites could undermine the system of official authorities, i.e. senior presbyters and church leaders. Pentecostals pointed out that the Holy Spirit could speak through anyone who had been baptized with the Spirit,

[6] *Doklad zamestitelya predsedatelya VSEKHB M.I. Golyayeva i general'nogo sekretarya A.V. Kareva o poyezdke v Alma-Atu, Frunze i Tashkent*. Archive of the Russian Council of Evangelical Christians and Baptists.

and such word would be more important than a decision of the Council of Brothers or that of the presbyter. For example, in Kalinin, Baptists and Pentecostals initially decided to conduct joint worships, but then Pentecostals demonstratively refused to come to the Baptist church. "After the senior presbyter, brother Orlov M.A., extensively told about the unity of God's children, who are obliged to be united, as the Word of God says, and not to separately meet in flats, everyone agreed to join the community. However, at the morning meeting on Sunday, January 13th, the hall was full of people, but there were only 5 Pentecostals. When I asked Kruglov V.N.: "Why did not Pentecostals come to the meeting?," Kruglov answered: "There was a revelation of the Spirit in the night, that we should not join, and I have to be with the people of God and to go away from insincere people". Then Kruglov V.N. left the meeting without even saying goodbye, and he even did not approach his father and mother, who were at the meeting"[7].

Spiritual visions and prophecies were an important part of the believer's mystical life; they could be considered as attractive and allowing people to live a new religious experience by a part of believers. One Pentecostal woman recalls: *"I came to her place, and when we began to pray, I said: oh, dear sister Dusia, how do you pray like that? She says: it is the baptism of the Spirit, sister Zoia. I said: how can I have the same? She said: when you turn to Pentecostalism, they receive spiritual baptism there in the first place, and then they get baptized in the water. Moreover, I wanted it so much"* (Z. Teploukhova, Tyumen, 2007). Those believers who had had a powerful emotional experience could not apparently imagine any other way of communication with God. *"And I just want to pray. I have had it seething inside for a long time, just let me loose. When we began to pray, we knelt, and the power came – it was like current passing through! And my inner eyes, my heart opened, and the sky became open. And such a joy, such a force filled me! I could not imagine where my modesty had gone. <…> And that was the baptism*

[7] *Otchet M.A.Orlova o poseshchenii obshchiny baptistov v gorode Kalinin. 16.01.57*. Archive of the Russian Council of Evangelical Christians and Baptists.

*of the Holy Spirit. Of course, I got the sign of tongues, I prayed... It is not just meager speaking; it fills you from inside, it is a transformation! It is a delight; it is filling with power. Well, it is hard to explain...*" (Vl. Damansky, Petropavlovsk, 2013).

However, Pentecostal practices caused a negative reaction of other, non-Pentecostal believers. It is known that Pentecostals complained about the fact that people considered their prayers "in tongues" as "demonic", "misguided", "not receiving the power from God"[8].

Why Pentecostal practices seemed wrong and dangerous for those who did not approve them? We can see it in a letter of the believers from the Odessa Baptist community, which also included Pentecostals. The letter's fragments quoted below are interesting because they represent argumentation of ordinary Baptists. The letter begins with a description of practices that emerged in the community after Pentecostals had joined it[9].

*"This is just a small part of those episodes which we see in different variants almost every day in our community. We could talk about how they told a dying sister, who cannot speak already, that she was anyway lost until she received "other tongues". B. Doronin and Vissarion prophesied to brother Ekimov I. Ia. that he would die in a year and a half. It was five years ago. Moreover, that the meeting would be closed very soon. "The sisters manipulated" a young sister Svetlana Ivanovna, who was to be baptized soon, and distracted her to Pentecostals who had not joined the community; they took E.I. Gogonenko, a sister who was baptized in 1969, to Tatiana M. Garmashova and suggested her to be zealous for "other tongues". M.S. Ivanova received the tongues there... There are rumors that the wife of senior presbyter A.M. Tsap "eagerly desires" the tongues in the same place; on the 1 August this year, sister Valia /we don't know*

---

[8] Odincov M. *"Vy primite silu, kogda sojdet na vas Duh Svjatoj…" Istorija Pjatidesjatnicheskoj cerkvi v Rossii. XIX-XX vv.* St. Petersburg: Rossijskoe ob'edinenie issledovatelej religii, 2012, pg. 388-391; Glushaev A."Ob'edinilis' po Duhu Svjatomu…" *Protestantizm v sovremennoj Rossii. Vklad v razvitie obshhestva, religii, istorii i kul'tury.* Perm, n.p. 2012, pg. 46-52; Franchuk V., Op.cit. pg. 252-254.

[9] Real names changed or omitted during publication.

*her last name/ entered a trance, with the whole body shaking /during the water baptism/, and she continuously uttered: "Holy, Holy, Hallelujah" and so on, and she repeated it in the prayer during the service in the church.*

*All this fanaticism intensified when open Pentecostals with influence and authority in the community entered the church, as, Desiatnik A., who openly encouraged to be zealous for the signs, that is, other tongues in sermons and at the Council of Brothers; Trukhanov D., who protects them, as well as there is protection on the part of senior Presbyter Tsap A.M."*[10].

According to this letter, the emergence of Pentecostals in communities was a dynamic process: among them, there were both old members of the church and those who came recently and behaved defiantly. Ordinary Baptists perceive their co-religionists as victims of aggressive actions on the part of Pentecostals, which the senior presbyter has to tolerate because of political reasons. At the same time, we see that Baptists use a concept of "fanaticism", which was very typical of the Soviet propaganda and which served as the basis for criminal prosecutions. They accuse Pentecostals of destabilizing the community with eschatological prophecies about the closure of churches, and with threats of death and diseases to "wrong" believers, etc. It should be noted that this passage emphasizes the role of women and their informal leadership, manifested in the form of prophecies and rejoicing of the spiritual baptism.

Religious practices are based on theological attitudes and values. The next fragment of a letter proves this, bringing us back to a long-standing theological dispute between Pentecostals and Baptists: to what extent can the gifts and signs of the Holy Spirit, observed at Pentecost, be evident in the world today. *"Are all these phenomena to be recognized as the signs of the Holy Spirit? We recognize that the signs of the Holy Spirit were during the descent of the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost, but in our time, there are no such signs. <…> This nonsense of meaningless sounds, can it be considered as the gift of tongues, which the apostles spoke on the day of Pentecost, and three*

[10] Published in: Beliakova N., Dobson M. *Zhenshhiny v evangel'skih obshhinah poslevoennogo SSSR*.Moscow: Indrik, 2015, pg. 143.

*thousand people came to believe then. Because simple Galileans spoke languages of other peoples, who understood them well. However, even frogs in the swamp will not understand bo, bo, bo or shonde, shonde, shonde, etc. Is it possible that these are signs of the Holy Spirit? <…> After all, if you recognize these so-called tongues as the signs of the Holy Spirit, you should believe in them and be zealous for them, or accept them hypocritically. Moreover, say that the baptism of the Spirit can be accompanied by the signs /Pentecostal tongues/, because there no other signs such as miracles, healings, etc./ and also can be without the signs, and at the same time to be internally sure these are not signs. However, you cannot be joking about such things! Only unbelievers can do so! All these diseases in those communities with an illusory unity of Baptists and Pentecostals came from here. It is necessary to directly raise a question about the correct and healthy Gospel doctrine for the church members to re-educate such "spiritual sisters and preachers of the signs", and if somebody does not like it and want to have their opinions different of the Gospel doctrine, they can leave. It would serve for the benefit of the children of God, and would bring a real unity and peace into churches"*[11].

The above-cited letter also provides an insight into how Baptists intended to "re-educate" deluded Pentecostals in Odessa. This attitude was not unique. For example, a woman, who was born in a Pentecostal family, but who was a member of a united community in Krivoy Rog, wrote about "repressive" measures in her church: *"Should I be blamed for the fact that I was born in a Pentecostal family? Is this any disgrace and shame for me? Do they have a right to warn young people about me, so that they were aware of me and did not welcome me because I am a heretic. My fault is that I do not recognize that all Pentecostals are deceived. Can I believe the words of brother Sh. [____], who said at the Council of Brothers on 10 June 1971, that the spirit of Satan is in you (i.e. in me) and all Pentecostals. We will not welcome Pentecostals. <…> Now, they blame me for that I myself left the choir. If I had not left it, everything would be as before, but now /they want me/ to give up my per-*

[11] Published in: Beliakova N., Dobson M. *Zhenshhiny v evangel'skih obshhinah poslevoennogo SSSR*, pg. 144.

*ception, and everything will be as before. I have not been participating in the Fraction for a year; I cannot agree that the Council of Brothers took a right decision – that I should refuse and repent before the whole church, and only then, I will have a right to work in the church. I do not feel guilty*"[12].

So, Baptists thought that it was impossible to come to a compromise with Pentecostals because for them, the signs often were an indicator of authenticity of someone's faith. However, Pentecostals themselves, even those who were not going to leave the community, were not ready to agree with the opinion of their presbyters, as the above-quoted letter proves. Manifestations of the Holy Spirit could be much unexpected, and they caused constant turbulence among Pentecostals, however, they, without any doubt, performed regulatory functions.

## Spiritual quest as a basis for a conflict

Need for the spiritual experience of the presence of "the living God", freshness and vividness of eschatological paradigms often mobilized Evangelical environment, resonated with people seeking for spiritual growth. Believers could receive spiritual experiences in many ways, for some of them, adherence to the principle of "bodily" purity was the most important thing, which was manifested in rejection of marital relations, and others were exaggeratedly pious and accused their co-religionists of insufficient religious ardour. It was this community of believers, who was zealous for piety, which became a fertile ground for Pentecostal sermons. *"Visiting meetings of Baptists and Mennonites, Nikolai Andreyevich /Dikanov/ drew his attention to spiritual "turmoil" of the youth in the community. The issue of "the baptism of the Holy Spirit" was actively discussed in the Molotov Baptist community. Probably, in the winter of 1953, at a general membership meeting of Mennonites and Baptists in Eranichi, the opinions about "verity of the baptism of the Holy Spirit" divided. <...> Dikanov N.A., Sholopov brothers,*

[12] Published in: Beliakova N., Dobson M. *Zhenshhiny v evangel'skih obshhinah poslevoennogo SSSR*, pg. 150-151.

*Milia Kazimova and a number of active young people separated from the Baptist community. They became the backbone of a Pentecostal community in the city of Molotov"*[13].

A narrative about the presence of "zealous" people looking for something more in Evangelical churches, people who turned out to be sensitive to the preaching about the baptism of the Holy Spirit is stable among the narrators who left religious communities under the influence of strong Pentecostal leaders. One woman, who left a Baptist community with a group of "zealots" and turned to Pentecostalism, remembers: *"We prayed hard, we met, it was such a small amateur group who wanted something more <...> And that small group consisted mainly of women. Well, they were ten people, maybe. My mom was there, and my friends' mother, one more, one more. Well, about ten people, maybe twelve, those who were zealous".* (O. Murashkina, Maloyaroslavets, 2014)

"Wandering" preachers were often spiritual authorities; this tradition had preserved since the 1920s. In the post-war Soviet Union, such preachers were less constrained by the conditions of existence in the united Evangelical space: they did not preach in a secular environment, but they did it in existing religious groups and churches. Small provincial groups, consisting mainly of believers, were a breeding ground for the perception of revelations about the necessity of the baptism with the Spirit.

What happened when Pentecostals had an opportunity to preach in a provincial Baptist community? The following fragment colourfully describes the appearance of a Pentecostal preacher at a Baptist worship: *"Brother Ivan, he is, of course, an active and energetic person. He says: "Well, are we really going to be sitting here with six old men? We should probably go to Baptists". They kept a five-day fast, and then they come to our service. Well, the Anointing, of course, was top level. Moreover, when... Well, our presbyter said in his innocence, without knowing who and what: "Are you our brother?" – "Yes, I am your brother". – "Do you preach?" – "Yes, I do". – "Well, say a*

[13] "Ob'edinilis' po Duhu Svjatomu": iz vospominanij Cjurpity *M.A. Vestnik Permskogo gosudarstvennogo instituta iskusstva i kul'tury*. 2010. № 9, pg. 98–103.

*word". Moreover, when he took the stage and began to talk, we, especially that zealous group, thought: "Well, it is something different, something not of our level". We immediately felt because he spoke in the Spirit. Although he said... He began with the ode "God" by Derzhavin. He got up and began "Oh, You, infinite in the space". Well, and then, I do not even remember what he said. He spoke in such Spirit that we immediately focused on him. "This is something that, perhaps, we need". And then, when the meeting was over, and he was leaving, so we went behind him in single file..."* (O. Murashkina, Maloyaroslavets, 2014).

How could the leaders of the communities protect their lambs from the "heresy" and "errors" of Pentecostalism? The most obvious option was the isolation of alternative leaders or, at least, a ban on preaching at prayer meetings. Such tactics contradicted democratic traditions of Evangelical worship, and it corresponded to the strategy of ignoring. Personal competition promoted it. Such requirements of the public authorities as to limit the number of preachers, legalization of the latter through ordination and state registration, in general, corresponded to aspirations of formal community leaders who wanted to preserve their power. At the same time, leaders of the AUCECB tried not to force excommunication of Pentecostals, because they understood, that otherwise, they would create a separate, illegal community where a considerable number of church members could go. *"Tashkent Pentecostals merged with the Tashkent community of Evangelical Christians and Baptists two years ago, but after they gave 17 Evangelical Christians and Baptists an ability of speaking in tongues, the Tashkent community excluded every of them, because they were degrading the community, on 7th September this year, and now, when they are outside the community, they met in different flats"*[14].

Believers communicated not only during prayer services in the private space of a religious community but also in everyday communication in the public non-religious space. A Brotherly Mennonite remembers about how

[14] *Doklad zamestitelya predsedatelya VSEKHB M.I. Golyayeva i general'nogo sekretarya A.V. Kareva…*Archive of the Russian Council of Evangelical Christians and Baptists.

a Pentecostal community was formed in Chelyabinsk: *"At work, they met with believers baptized in the Holy Spirit, who spoke to them and opened their eyes to the baptism of the Holy Spirit. As Klassen did not accept it and resisted it, then those, who agreed to ask for being baptized with the Holy Spirit, separated.* <...> *And so, our brother Karzan, who had been in prison, was released and he worked well before the departure, and as I understood, they began to meet without Baptists at all"*[15]. It should be noted that such sermons were also conducted among "prepared" interlocutors, i.e. among Mennonite believers, who attended a united community of Evangelical Christians and Baptists.

As we can conclude basing on the above-cited passages, the practice of communication and conflict situations between Baptists and Pentecostals often ended with disaffiliation of new Pentecostals from the registered community.

## After separation: fraternal communication or refusal of communication?

A rupture of relations between the former members of a community could be initiated by either of the parties, Pentecostals themselves or Baptists. In this case, the leaders of the church were in a less favourable position, because the official AUCECB point of view was to retain Pentecostals in the registered communities, although the leaders of local communities often thought of the exclusion as the only way out. That is how they tried to do it in the Korolev community (Moscow region) in 1957. "There was a suggestion made to exclude all the Pentecostals. Otherwise, there will be no order at the meetings, they violate the order by screaming, and they agitate. There were only three women, but now they are 40". However, the AUCECB leaders did not support that decision: "Finally, brother Orlov M.A. clarified that it was not necessary to

[15] From the *memoirs of Ivan Richter*. The manuscript is kept in the personal archive of Vladimir Krieger. Bishop of Pentecostal churches in Chelyabinsk.

hurry and that they should not exclude them. It is necessary to take measures to re-educate them. They unanimously decided not to excommunicate Pentecostals without the senior presbyter, and if they did not mend their ways, then to call brother Orlov M.A."[16].

When a decision to leave a Baptist community was made, "spiritual" believers were not interested in the future of their former co-religionists and relations with them anymore; all these remained in the past for Pentecostals. Baptists, in this case, were considered as "incomplete Christians", and they were disregarded in many ways. *"He /a Baptist pastor/ called me, saying: what shall we do with you? We need to exclude you from the church somehow so that you go with peace, or what? We do not know what to do with you; you are members of the church, and, according to the rules, we have to do something. I say: Sergei, do it as you see fit, let us go in peace, as you wish! If you think that we sinned, exclude us, if you think that we were not aggressive, let us go in peace, as you wish! However, I do not know what they did with us; I was no more interested in it", a Pentecostal woman from Surgut told us»* (K. Liubov', Surgut, 2007). Indifference to the lives of their former co-religionists illustrates an inner conviction of their superiority over those who stayed in the community. To justify their superiority and to construct Pentecostal identity, they compared themselves with Baptists and made conclusions that they needed to communicate with "the living God", which can be obtained only through the spiritual baptism: *"My grandmother was Baptist, they are good people, they love God very much, they are sincere, sympathetic, ready to help – anything for a person. However, they did not know communication with the living God. Lord baptized me with the Holy Spirit very early, even though I did not know how it all happens"* (T. Kubata, Maloyaroslavets. 2014).

Pentecostals themselves tell about how they ended up in Baptist communities in different ways. Some people went out peacefully and quietly; some did it "throwing out a challenge", being convinced of the correctness

[16] *Otchet M.A.Orlova* … Archive of the Russian Council of Evangelical Christians and Baptists.

of their actions. Public analysis of Pentecostal "errors" in a Baptist community could become an impetus which triggered an open phase of the conflict. However, if there were no sharp radical actions, Pentecostals could remain in the registered communities until the early 1990s. We see it, for example, in Tyumen: *"But we all, Pentecostals, went to the Baptist church"* (Z. Teploukhova, Tyumen, 2007).

The final rupture of relations between Pentecostals and Baptists took place in the late 1980s when a period of religious freedom came – even conflict-free communities were split by denomination. Pentecostals began to create their own communities.

Spiritual prophecies were a sphere where women could develop their leadership skills, and where men – even community leaders – did not claim a formal superiority. The role of the prophetess was undeniable. Pentecostals believe that the Holy Spirit talks through these women. In a conflict situation of elections or case of a split, prophetess could play the role of so to say ultimate authority, turning the tide in their favour. For example, in the city of Kalinin, a prophetess, "a young girl, of seemingly 17-19 years old, called Liuba, raised her hand and shouted trying to resolve a conflict: "The people of God, stand firm in your faith, there is one God, there are no three gods. The saint people of God, come out from the wicked and be separate, what fellowship can light have with darkness?", moreover, this statement contributed to a final split in the community[17].

The data, presented above, show a variety of communicative strategies between Baptists and Pentecostals in registered communities. The dominant paradigm of both denominations was to secure their own religious identity. At the same time, the strive of Pentecostals for expansion was obvious, as they found a unique opportunity for "proselytism" in conditions of forced unification, and such "proselytic" activities inevitably reinforced a conflict component in communication. Such propensity towards

[17] *Otchet M.A.Orlova* … Archive of the Russian Council of Evangelical Christians and Baptists.

conflict was predetermined by the theological doctrine of Pentecostals, which focuses not so much on repentance and change of life after establishing personal relationship with God, but on the change of certain properties of human nature occurring after the baptism "with the Spirit" and after receipt of "the gifts of the Holy Spirit", which was commonly understood as the gift of tongues, i.e. glossolalia. Theological differences in interpreting "the gifts of the Spirit" were formed in discussions, and practices which caused complaints on the part of Baptists were determined and also discussed. However, unequivocal conviction of Pentecostals of that only they were "spiritual Christians", and Evangelicals and Baptists were incomplete bodily Christians, and that they needed to be "spiritually baptized" to be saved, predetermined direction of the conflict.

Communication between Baptists and Pentecostals was held in conditions of presence of alternative spiritual authorities in the Evangelical community, besides; "the zealots" strived to search for a better spiritual path, which prepared the ground for internal turbulence. Such turbulence was intensified by interventions of the state authorities, which aimed to consolidate the hierarchical structure in the Evangelical community and to participate in elections of the official community leaders, presbyters, to "normalize" the movement and to weaken its missionary beginnings. Our materials proved that there were influential leaders in the Evangelical environment, which sometimes directly opposed the official hierarchy in the community. They could be both male and female, who possessed special "spiritual gifts". However, the attitude to break with a legal community and to create a new community appeared only when there was a male leader, who needed his own flock. A strategy which consisted in separation of one's flock was not only typical of Pentecostals, but it actually fits into the struggle for leadership in a community, which is basically a typical feature of Post-Reformation Protestant communities, on the one hand, and on the other hand, it was related to a particular situation of religious communities in the USSR, as they were deprived of the possibility to establish a legal mechanism of changing religious leaders and could not form religiously homogeneous communities.

## List of the interviews:

1. Damansky Vl., man, Pentecostal, Petropavlovsk, Kazakhstan (2013. Taken by V. Kliueva // personal archive of V. Kliueva)
2. Liubov' K., female, Pentecostal, Surgut, Russia (2007. Taken by V. Kliueva // personal archive of V. Kliueva)
3. Murashkina O., female, Pentecostal, Maloyaroslavets Russia (2014 Taken by N. Beliacova// AHRC AH/1025883/1/37
4. T. Kubata, female, Pentecostal, Maloyaroslavets, Russia (2014. Taken by by N. Beliacova // AHRC AH/1025883/1/36
5. Teploukhova Z., female Pentecostal, Tyumen, Russia (2007. Taken by V. Kliueva // personal archive of V. Kliueva)

## List of unpublished references:

1. *Doklad zamestitelya predsedatelya VSEKHB M.I. Golyayeva i general'nogo sekretarya A.V. Kareva o poyezdke v Alma-Atu, Frunze i Tashkent [Report by M. Golyaev (the vice-chairman of* AUCECB *) and A. Karev (secretary general of* AUCECB*) about a business trip to Alma-Ata, Frunze and Tashkent]* //Archive of the Russian Council of Evangelical Christians and Baptists.
2. *Otchet M.A.Orlova o poseshchenii obshchiny baptistov v gorode Kalinin. 16.01.57* [Orlov's report on the visit of a Baptist community in the Kalinin City 16.01.57 ] // Archive of the Russian Council of Evangelical Christians and Baptists.
3. *Memoirs of Ivan Richter* // the manuscript is kept in the personal archive of Vladimir Krieger, Bishop of Pentecostal churches in Chelyabinsk, Russia.

## References

1. Beliakova N., Dobson M. *Zhenshhinyvevangel'skihobshhinahposlevoennogoSSSR. 1940-1980-egg. Issledovanie i istochniki [Women in the Evangelical communities of the post-war USSR. 1940-1980-ies the Research and sources].* Moscow: Indrik, 2015.
2. Chumachenko T. *Church and State in Soviet Russia. Russian Orthodoxy from World War II to the Khrushchev years*. M.E.: Sharpe, 2002.
3. Franchuk V. *Prosila Rossija dozhdja u Gospoda [Russia asked for rain from the Lord].* Volume 3. Kiev: Svitankova zorya, 2000.

4. Glushaev A.L. "Ob'edinilis po Duhu Svjatomu…»: pjatidesjatniki Permskogo Prikam'ja (konec 1940- 1950-e gody) ["United by the Holy Spirit...": the Pentecostals of Perm Kama region (late 1940 - 1950-ies)]. *Protestantizm v sovremennoj Rossii. Vklad v razvitie obshhestva, religii, istorii i kul'tury. [Protestantism in contemporary Russia. Contribution to the development of society, religion, history and culture]*, Perm: n.p., 2012, Pp. 46-52.
5. Huhn U. *Glaube und Eigensinn. Volksfrömmigkeit zwischen orthodoxer Kirche und sowjetischem Staat 1941 bis 1960* Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2014.
6. Kliueva V. "Ne oni ustupili, a s nimi soglasilis'": evangel'skie hristiane-baptisty i pjatidesjatniki v pervoe poslevoennoe desjatiletie [They are not lost, and agreed with them": the Evangelical Christians-Baptists and Pentecostals in the first postwar decade]. *Sovetskoe gosudarstvo i obshhestvo v period pozdnego stalinizma. 1945-1953 [The Soviet state and society in the period of late Stalinism. 1945-1953]*, Pp. 586-594. Moscow: Politicheskaja jenciklopedija, Prezidentskij centr B.N. El'cina, 2015.
7. Mickevich A. *Istorija evangel'skih hristian-baptistov [The History of Evangelical Christians-Baptists]*. Moscow: n.p., 2007.
8. Nikol'skaja T. Avgustovskoe soglashenie i pozicii pjatidesjatnikov v 40-50-h gg XX v. [The August agreement and the position of Pentecostals in the 40-50-ies of XX century]. *Gosudarstvo, religija i cerkov' v Rossii i za rubezhom*. 2010. № 4, Pp. 124-133.
9. "Ob'edinilis' po Duhu Svjatomu": iz vospominanij Cjurpity M.A. (Zapisal i obrabotal Glushaev A.L., mart–aprel' 2010) [ "United by the Holy Spirit..." from the memoirs of Cjurpity M.A. (Recorded Glusev A. L., March–April 2010)]. *Vestnik Permskogo gosudarstvennogo instituta iskusstva i kul'tury*. 2010. № 9. Pp. 98–103.
10. Odincov M. *"Vy primite silu, kogda sojdet na vas Duh Svjatoj…" Istorija Pjatidesjatnicheskoj cerkvi v Rossii. XIX-XX vv. ["You shall receive power when the Spirit comes on you…" History of the Pentecostal Church in Russia. XIX-XX centuries]*. St. Petersburg: Rossijskoe ob'edinenie issledovatelej religii, 2012.
11. Savinskii S. *Istoriia evangel'skikh khristian-baptistov Ukrainy, Rossii, Belorussii. [History of Evangelical Christians – Baptists of Ukraine, Russia, Belarus].* Volume 2. 1917-1967. St. Petersburg: Bibliia dlia vsekh, 1999.
12. Sawatsky W. *Soviet Evangelicals since World War II.* Kitchener, ON: Herald Press, 1981.

*The article is written with the financial support of Russian Science Foundation. Project # 15-18-00135 "Individual, ethnos, religion in intercultural communication: history of shaping of the civil identity in Russia and internationally" and the financial support of Basic Project of IPDN SB RAS "Social space and cultural landscape of Western Siberia in the XVII–XXI centuries: trends, structure, functions" (# 0372-2016-0003).*

*Nadezhda Beliakova has PhD in History. She is a Researcher at the Centre of Religion and Church History of Institute of World History, Russian Academy of Science and an Associate Professor at National Research Nuclear University MEPhI (Moscow, Russia).*

*Kliueva Vera has PhD in History. She is a Senior Researcher of the Laboratory of Anthropology, Institute of the Problems of Northern development, Siberian Branch of the Russian Academy of Science and an Associate Professor at National Research Nuclear University MEPhI (Moscow, Russia).*

Dmitriy Weber

# THE RELIGIOUS STUDIES ON THE EVE OF TOTALITARIANISM. THE ISSUE OF REFORMATION

Religious studies are often influenced by religious, political, or both sets of beliefs. The birth of scientific ideas is also largely determined by political and social transformations, which is a tendency to which the XX century provides an excellent example. The events of the Russian revolution had not only led to socio-political transformations but had also modified the scientific paradigm on the territory of the former Russian Empire and the newly created Soviet Union. One of the indicators had to do with the emergence of new approaches to religious studies, which was associated with the growing popularity of atheistic and anti-clerical views. Other kinds of research ideas, if not forgotten entirely, had at least, played a much smaller role in the formation of scientific knowledge.In this article, I would like to focus on the studies of Reformation processes since they were also associated with social change. The Reformation was the event of crucial importance to the world history, which was marked by its exceptional influence on the religious situation in Europe, the balance of political forces, social processes and culture. As a broad and complex socio-political and ideological movement with diverse social and ethnic composition, it took the form of struggle against the Catholic Church and the foundations of medieval

society and had spread over the 16th and 17th centuries over most of the countries of Western and Central Europe. Attempts to understand Reformation, its causes, place and role in European history have been made almost since its beginning. Both the traditional Catholic and emerging Protestant movements were characterized by a common perception of Reformation as a broad religious movement of European dimensions. The importance of Reformation, as a stage of European history was also recognized at a later time, especially at the time of change. These considerations give rise to the question of the original scientific views on the religious transformation of society. The works of scholars N. Kareev and A. Vulfius were chosen as examples to illustrate this point.

The choice was determined by a number of considerations. On the one hand, some of these scholars' works were published or reprinted in the early 1920s, with the Civil War barely ended. One of the best examples is the work of A. Vulfius *On Problems of Spiritual Development. Humanism, Reformation and Catholic Reform*, published in 1922[1]. On the other hand, their ideas were viral over the former Russian Empire, which is mostly right for N.Kareev. There is also proof that the researcher had kept up his popularity in Poland despite the Soviet-Polish War of 1919–1920.

Another important indicator is the resonance caused by the rumours of his death during the Civil War. An article on this event was published in Poland in 1921. It is noteworthy that the author of the article, Jacob Glass, was also one of the researchers of Reformation in Poland. Besides, his article had appeared in the *Reformacija w Polsce* journal. In his article, the Polish researcher had noted that "...according to newspaper reports, Nikolai Kareev had died during the Russian revolution in St. Petersburg in 1921. Since the deceased historian had among his many interests engaged in the history of Poland, including the issues of Reformation, we

[1] Vulfius A. *Problemi duhovnogo razvitiya. Gumanizm, reformatsiya i katolicheskaya Reformatsiya*. Petrograd*:* Nauka i shkola, 1922, 168 s.

have placed a commemorative word in our magazine"[2]. The given excerpt shows how much Kareev's views on Reformation were appreciated outside Soviet Russia.

For better perception, the article is divided into two main bodies, dedicated to the research of N. Kareev and A. Vulfius respectively. More considerable attention is paid to the scholars' scientific views on Reformation, rather than to fragments of their biographies.

## N. Kareev

The main reason that prompted the researcher's interest in Reformation was, in his own words, the considerable attention that his Polish students at the Warsaw University had paid to the subject while attending his lecture course on modern history in 1879-1880[3].

N. Kareev's research paradigm regarding the religious processes associated with the spread of Reformation is a promising field in the context of historiographical research. This is partially true, in view that the concept of confessionalization is gaining popularity not only in foreign but also in Russian philosophic and historical circles. The researcher distinguishes two eras of religious history: that of Reformation and that of reaction.

According to the scholar, Protestantism had succeeded not so much due to religious as to social reasons. He explained Reformation in Poland as happening due to the complicated relations of the gentry and clergy. In the second volume of his book *The History of Western Europe,* where he considers the preconditions which had led to the event, he focuses on the

---

[2] "...Według doniesien dziennikow – w r. 1921 smiercia tragiczna, jako offiara wspolczesnej rewolucji rosyjskej zmarł w Peterburgu Mikolaj Korejew. Poniewaz zmarly historik, zajmujac sie miedzyinnemi i dziejami polski, nie pominał rowniez polskiej reformacji, nalezymu sie słówkow spomnienia w naszym kwartalniku". See Glass J. *Reformacija w Polsce*. 1921. Nr. 4. Pp. 319-320. Fragment of this article was found in the Archive of the Russian Academy of Science. St. Petersburg branch. Fond 980 . Op. 1. Nr. 29.

[3] Kareev N. I. *Ocherk istori i reformatsionnogo dvizheniya v Polshe*. – Moskow: Tip. A.I. Mamontova i K°, 1886, s. 3.

social rather than the religious component, while in particular comparing Reformation in the Holy Roman Empire to the French Revolution[4].

N. Kareev noted that Reformation had been brought about by the 'corruption' of the Church Institute, and social opposition. In his opinion, this process in the Empire was conditioned by two factors, of which the first was the specific character of religious spirit, with the second factor being severe pressure on the part of the papacy. Thus, the specific German character was emphasized. Unlike his conclusions of the history of Reformation in the Holy Roman Empire, during his investigation of the same process in Poland in Warsaw, the researcher emphasized different processes[5]. According to N. Kareev, the absence of national opposition to the Pope and the lack of their Protestant leaders on the background of Protestant heterogeneity resulted in the ousting of Protestant ideas and the strengthening of the Jesuit order.

Different ways of cooperation in the Reformation era fit into N. Kareev's philosophy of history, which tended to perceive the flow of history not as a single but as a set of parallel coexisting processes[6]. What is noteworthy is the significant role played by the social component in N. Kareev's research on religious transformations. In this regard, it is possible to draw some parallels with his ideas of the so-called historiology, a discipline including history and sociology[7].

Based on the thesis that Reformation had split the history of the secularization of European culture into two periods: Renaissance and rationalist Enlightenment of the 18th century, which Kareev considered as "continuation of Humanism, weakened and almost extinguished in the era of religious reformation and reaction, but of the already mutated and com-

---

[4] Dunaeva Yu. Ideya evropeyskogo edinstva v tvorchestve N. I. Kareeva. *Sotsialnie i gumanitarnie nauki. Otechestvennaya i zarubezhnaya literatura*. 1999, Nr. 1, s. 27.

[5] Kareev N. I. Ocherk istorii, s. 37.

[6] Kareev N.I. *Osnovnyie voprosy ifilosofii istorii*. St. Petersburg: Izd. L.F. Panteleeva, 1897, s. 10.

[7] Kozlovskiy V. V., Osipov I. D. Sintezistorii i sotsiologii v trudah Nikolaya Kareeva. *Zhurnal sotsiologii i sotsialnoi antropologii*. 2000, Vol. II, .Nr. 4, s. 94.

plicated nature"[8]. Enlightenment had inherited from Renaissance a worldly spirit, a feeling of respect for human dignity and the interest in reality and rationalism, thus synthetically combining the most advanced results of humanistic and reform movement. While Protestants looked for inspiration and models to Israel's history, the eighteenth century found them in classical antiquity[9]. In N.Kareev's view, it is the turn to antiquity with the negative attitude to the Middle Ages that brings together Renaissance and Enlightenment: "…It is as if the new European culture felt a greater inner affinity with the secular civilization of the ancient world than with the more recent Middle Ages, the return to which had always been considered as the call for the reaction, whether after the religious storm of Reformation or after the turmoil of political revolution"[10].

N. Kareev believed Renaissance to be inferior to Reformation in importance and influence. While the former was just a secular, intellectual protest against the control of the Church, Reformation aimed to reform religion itself, as it was associated with the social, political and economic problems of Europe. N. Kareev wrote on the subject: "...the importance of Reformation is that the opposition of the Catholic and the socio-cultural systems that proclaimed purely human principles, interests and rights happened under the banner of the reformed religion.[11]" As a result of the reforms, medieval Catholicism that pervaded the entire society was due to become a source of arguments and changes both in the society and the state.

Comparing the results of Renaissance and Reformation, N.Kareev considers Reformation to be the more significant event of the two.

---

[8] Kareev N. I. *Literaturnaya evolyutsiya na Zapade*. Voronezh:Tip. V.I. Isaeva, 1886, s. 164.

[9] Filimonov V. A. N. I. Kareev o retseptsii antichnogo kulturnogo naslediya. *Dialog so vremenem.*2012, Nr. 40, s. 249.

[10] Kareev N. Po bolshoy doroge istorii. NIOR RGB. F. 119. P. 34. D. 1–25. (a part "secularization of spiritual culture"); Filimonov V. *N. I. Kareev o retseptsii antichnogo kulturnogo naslediya*, s. 249.

[11] Kareev N. *Istoriya Zapadnoy Evropi v novoe vremya*. Petrograd: Tip. I.A.Efrona, 1915, Vol. 2, s. 5.

Renaissance had meant secularization of science and art, promoting the principles of individualism and freedom of thought. The coup occurred only in the intellectual sphere, affecting small layers of society. In contrast, one way or another, Reformation had affected virtually every aspect of life. The issue of the formation of the national state and its interaction with the Church was resolved in politics. Agrarian relations had changed significantly in the sphere of economy. Due to the redistribution of former Church lands, landowners received new lands, which resulted in more advanced forms of management. The emergence of Protestantism and similar creeds meant practical embodiment of the principle of freedom of conscience. Renaissance and Reformation had produced irreversible transformations in human history, marking European transition to Modern Time.

## Vulfius

In contrast to the opinions of N.Kareev, one of the main concepts in the research of A. Vulfius was the idea of religious individualism. According to A.Vulfius, religious development comprised two important points: the subjective act of faith and the objective system of religious norms, as represented in the dogma and rites. The church history of the West unfolded insight of these two sides of religious life interacting and mutually influencing each other while progressing religious subjectivism demanded the restructuring of the institution of the Church as a whole. Under this perspective, the history of the Middle Ages and Early Modern Time is viewed in the form of interconnected reformation movements. For example, the Cluny reform, and the emergence of mendicant monks of different heretic movements. Reformation appeared as one of the stages of this process[12]. However, when we consider the role of individualism, it is important to note immediately that some discrepancy with L. Karsavin, a

[12] Poddubnyiy N. V., Trunov A. A. Reformatsiya i hiliazm (ideynyie istoki sovremennosti). *Istoricheskaya psihologiya i sotsiologiya istorii*. 2015, Nr. 1, s. 8.

well-known specialist in the study of the medieval religious culture of that time, occurs in this case. "Karsavin's religious sense" is quite different from religious individualism as it was understood by. A. Vulfius. This difference may have prompted A. Vulfius to rethink his definition of humanism and the religious split in Europe in the XVI century. The researcher's views regarding Reformation are reflected in his articles *Renaissance and Reformation* and *What is Reformation*[13]. The articles reflected his ideas about the relationship of medieval individualism and Reformation. One of the main insights of the researcher is the idea that it is impossible to distinguish between Reformation and Renaissance, as they are closely interrelated, both among themselves and with the previous spiritual development of European culture. According to his opinion, the changes of the sixteenth century were not opposed to the previous religious development but stemmed from it directly. In A.Vulfius' view, Reformation played a significant role. Another circumstance confirms this. If you compare the published versions of his textbook on Modern Time, you will notice one difference. In the 1912 edition, this historical period began with the Great Geographical discoveries[14], while in the edition of 1916, the focus of the first section is shifted to Renaissance and Reformation[15]. Thus, by the year 1922, his system of beliefs had already been formed. In the already mentioned work dated that year, these ideas are reflected very clearly. Moreover, the researcher talked about the cultural unity of Europe, achieved by the 11$^{th}$century, that would eventually lead to Reformation, which influenced the socio-economic map of Europe. Humanism was associated with the religious culture, including the world outlook. However, A. Vulfius also believed there were some regions with specific characteristics. The

[13] Vulfius A. G. Renessans i Reformatsiya. *Zhurnal Ministerstva Narodnogo Prosvescheniya*. St. Petersburg, Vol. 10, s. 1-18.

[14] Vulfius A. G. *Uchebnik novoy istorii.* St. Petersburg: Izd.Ya. Bashmakova i Ko, 1912, s. 1 – 73.

[15] Vulfius A. G. *Uchebnik novoy istorii.* St. Petersburg: Izd.Ya. Bashmakova i Ko, 1916, s. 1 – 41.

combination of the antique factor with the pagan elements was stronger in Italy than in the Holy Roman Empire. According to A. Vulfius, class interest or social relationship of faith and society are absent from Reformation process, contrary to Max Weber's opinion[16]. At the very beginning, A. Vulfius noted the imprecise and narrow character of the term 'Counter-Reformation' or 'Reaction', which, in his opinion, '...was able to cause some confusion. The word 'Reaction' highlighted the opposition against Reformation, and thus upstaged a very deep and interesting inner rebirth of Catholicism in the 16th and 17th centuries, which had happened along with the struggle against Protestantism. Meanwhile, the power and success of this struggle could not be completely understood independently of this internal process. In other words, the Catholic movement of the XVI and XVII centuries did not limit itself to attempts to push back or destroy Protestantism but also embodied elements of Catholic Reformation. That is why it was time to replace the term 'Catholic Reaction' to 'Catholic Reformation' or 'Catholic Reform[17]. This attitude may have formed shortly before his research was published because the textbooks of both 1912 and 1916 still used the old Ranke's concept of 'Catholic Reaction'. As we have already noted, A. Vulfius saw the interrelationship between Reformation and medieval processes. "...The Church had begun to resolve these problems, even before Luther appeared on the scene' and had already achieved considerable success first in Spain and then in Italy[18]". This fragment shows an important thought. Catholic revival was derived from the previous development and was paralleled by Reformation movement. The idea is then further developed: "Catholic Reformation in Spain had achieved great success irrespective of Protestant Reformation. By the beginning of its relationship to the Lutheran movement, its associates had created a creed permeated with the consciousness of duty and loyalty to the national interests of the clergy... This kind of Church had nothing to

[16] Vulfius A. *Problemi duhovnogo razvitiya*, s. 99-100.
[17] Ibid., s. 130.
[18] Ibid., s. 133.

fear from the storms of the Protestant Reformation"[19]. Thus, A.Vulfius indicated the presence of not two opposing sections in the history of the 16th century, namely, Reformation and Counter-reforms, but of two parallel processes of religious reforms in Protestant and Catholic forms. Also, Catholic reform movement, according to A. Vulfius, had typological similarities with the precursors of Protestantism. Mysticism, national consciousness, preachers were all, in a sense, components of the social support of the Lutheran Reformation. The Council of Trent, on the other hand, was, in the opinion of A. Vulfius, not a response to the Protestant challenge, but the logical result of centuries of reform and internal renewal. In this regard, it is important to pay attention to the opinion of the Jesuit order. As A. Vulfius stated in his work: "...the struggle with Reformation had an important place in the concept of the order. However, the objectives and activities of the order were not limited to fighting heresy, though the struggle took the dominant position in its history. It was Loyola himself who had originally come up with the idea of missionary work in which the Jesuits had achieved such amazing success, as in anti-Protestantism. In education, which was also extremely successful, as well as in scientific theology and in their effort to raise the religious awareness of the masses by means of preaching by personal example, the Jesuits renewed the power of the reforming Catholic Church, which was revived and strengthened by the Catholic reformation irrespective of battling Protestantism. In other words, the Jesuit order had not only embodied the fight for Catholic Reformation, but also the positive content of the revival of the Church"[20]. That means that the researcher did not perceive this order solely in 'reactionary', terms, but considered it in a broader cultural context, analyzing not only religious, but also educational activities.

[19] Vulfius A. *Problemi duhovnogo razvitiya*, s. 136.
[20] Ibid., s. 155.

## Some words on differences and similarities.

Since both authors lived and worked at the same time, their ideas may have similar thoughts. However, the number of differences is much more significant, because they were influenced by different schools. Unlike A. Vulfius, N.Kareev apparently had a more conservative view on the understanding of the nature of the relationship between the Protestants and the Church. This is evident in his use of the term 'Catholic Reaction'. For the researcher, it is the only response to Reformation. Throughout his scientific activity, this point remained virtually unchanged. Despite the fact that we occasionally see him use the terms 'Catholic revival' or 'Catholic Reformation', his understanding of the nature of this phenomenon remained unchanged. This point of view might have been influenced by sociology. For the socio-historical school, it is typical to perceive social development through the prism of 'progressive' and 'reactionary.' The same opinion circulated in the scientific community on the eve of the change of the political regime. For example, A. Trachevsky noted that "...after the brilliant success in the first half of the 16$^{th}$century there arose in Protestantism a strife and the weakening of the spirit, and the old forces had recovered from the first shock and started to take advantage over the weakness of the enemy skillfully. Reaction marked by the religious wars came into being, and came to be called the revival of Catholicism"[21]. That is, this revival only came in answer to the success of Protestantism. It should be noted that the estimation of R.Vipper was less strong. He spoke of, "...an increasing movement for the purification of morals and the glorification of religious repentance in the southern Latin countries of Europe. This was a kind of reformation, but it did not break with the old order of the Church or the primacy of Rome; it went against everything that wanted to separate from Catholicism. Therein, Catholic reformation

[21] Trachevskiy A. *Novaya istoriya*. St. Petersburg: Tipografiya M.M.Stalyusevicha, 1900, Vol. 1, 1500–1750. S. 70.

used the means of new enlightenment coming from the humanists[22]." Despite a more cautious assessment, the preservation of causality is notable. If it had not been for Reformation, Catholic revival would have been unlikely. A. Vulfius differed with the opinion mentioned above, most likely, due to the influence of German historical school[23].

This is especially evident if you pay attention to the literature A. Vulfius used, giving preference to non-protestant historians. He remarked upon the works of E. Troeltsch[24], which "represented a very remarkable attempt to assess Reformation regarding its impact on the social structure in the family, the state and economic society[25]".He also mentioned the works of E. Gothein[26], who engaged in the study of the Jesuits. From Protestant authors, he singled out V. Maurenbrecher[27], who was one of the first to use the term 'Catholic reform'. Perhaps it is because A. Vulfius tended to see Trent Council Catholicism as Catholic 'reform', that he hardly ever used the works of N. Kareev marking him to a great extent as 'reactionary'[28].

However, there are also some similarities to be found in the research of N. Kareev and A. Vulfius. They refer to breaking down the era into historical periods. The latter scholar distinguished two main phases of this

---

[22] Vipper R. *Novay aistoriya. Kniga pervaya. 1500–1789*. Petrograd: Izd-vo"Proletariy", 1923, 266 s.

[23] Prokopev A. Yu. Zabyityiy istorik rannego novogo vremeni: Aleksandr Germanovich Vulfius. *Problemyi sotsialnoy istorii i kulturyi Srednih vekov i rannego novogo vremeni*. 2005, Nr. 5, s. 139.

[24] Troeltsch E. Renaissance und Reformation. *Historische Zeitschrift*, 1913, Bd. 110, S. 521–556.

[25] Vulfius A. *Problemi duhovnogo razvitiya*, p. 120.

[26] Gothein E. *Ignatius von Loyola und die Gegenreformation* (=SchriftendesVereinsfür Reformationsgeschichte; 11). Halle: M. Niemeyer, 1895, 178 s., Gothein E. *Staat und Gesellschaft imZeitalter der Gegenreformation*. Berlin, Leipzig: B.G. Teubner, 1908, S. 137–230.

[27] Maurenbrecher W. *Geschichte der katholischer Reformation*.–Nordlingen: Verlag der C. H. Beck'schen Buchhandlung, 1880, Bd. 1, 417 s.

[28] Vulfius A. Problemi duhovnogo razvitiya, s. 114; s. 134. Prokopev A. Yu. *Zabyityiyi storik*, s. 138.

historical period. The first one lasted till the middle of the 16th century and was characterized as the era of development of scientific and religious ideas determined by three characteristics: 1) Reformation 'connected with international relations and internal situation in European countries'; 2) rise of Humanism and urban Signoria; 3) social unrest and Reformation. The second stage lasted from the middle of the 16th century to 1648, i.e. until the end of the Thirty Years' War and the signing of Westphalia Peace Treaty[29]. It was a time of religious unrest and wars, which the scholar also identified by three characteristics: 1) Catholic Reaction; 2) rise of Absolutism; 3) religious turmoil. N.Kareev used similar periods, although without special characteristics. He also united the 16th and 17th centuries into a single Reformation era, 1520–1650 to be exact. It was then subdivided into smaller time periods: until 1555, of Augsburg peace, which was characterized by the influence of German and Swiss Reformation, emerging Lutheranism and Anglicanism and royal forms of Reformation. The second stage lasted until 1598 and was associated with the development of Calvinism and growing of Catholic reaction, while the third period mainly covered the Thirty Years' War. It is possible that L. Ranke's periodization influenced both scholars[30].

As we have already noted, we see more specific differences than similarities in the works of A. Vulfius and N. Kareev. This is mainly due to the influence of different schools, which not only manifested itself in the events they emphasized while describing Reformation (with A. Vulfius paying more attention to the spiritual and religious development at that time, and N.Kareevto the social one), and in assessing the nature of the relationship between Reformation and Trent Council Catholicism. Regardless of this, it is important to note that there had existed on the territory of the Russian Empire a rich scientific tradition, devoted in part to the study of Reformation, at the time of both religious and social trans-

[29] Vulfius A. G. *Zapadnaya Evropa v Srednie veka*. Petrograd: Nauka i shkola, 1920, s. 16.

[30] Prokopev A. *Zabyityiy istorik*, s. 140.

formations before the advent of the totalitarian regime. We can also trace the influence of European schools, mainly German ones, including historical and sociological ones, on both scholars whose works we reviewed in this article.

## Summary

The article shows the approaches to the religious studies of the Reformation that existed on the eve of totalitarianism. Transformations during the Soviet era not only in the political but also in the ideological spheres stipulate an interest to this research area. The consideration to Reformation was given because as well as the Revolution it changed the system of social and religious relationships in society. The primary emphasis was made on the economic and class consequences, which explained an influence of Marxism theory. The article considers other scholarly approaches to this problem, popular before the revolutionary events. Of course, not all concepts are considered. The article is divided into two main bodies, dedicated to the research of N. Kareev and A. Vulfius respectively. More considerable attention is paid to the scholars' scientific views on Reformation, rather than to fragments of their biographies. Some considerations determined the choice. On the one hand, some of these scholars' works were published or reprinted in the early 1920s, with the Civil War barely ended. One of the best examples is the works of A. Vulfius, which were published in 1920–22. On the other hand, their ideas were very popular over the former Russian Empire, which is mostly true for N. Kareev. There is also proof that the researcher had kept up his popularity in Poland despite the Soviet-Polish War of 1919–1920.

Their systematic work on the study of the religious beliefs and practices in everyday life has been designed and created by large-scale field research in accordance with the achievements of modern theoretical works.

Their hypothesises are of interest because later they will not be popular, including further political events. Nevertheless thrust forward to the

fact that in the first years after the end of the Civil war their works were still published. Despite the change of regime, their opinions reflected in these studies were in connection with the past, pre-revolutionary historiographic tradition. In the foremost, it was an influence of European, primarily French and German, ideas.

According to the N. Kareev, Protestantism had succeeded not so much due to religious as to social reasons. He explained Reformation in Poland as happening due to the complicated relations of the gentry and clergy. The researcher believed that the Reformation was conditioned on church institution's "spoiling" and on a social opposition. In his opinion, in the Holy Roman Empire this process was due to two circumstances. Firstly by a specificity of the religious spirit, and secondly, by pressure from the papacy. Thus he emphasized the German specificity.The researcher noted other processes in Poland, unlike the Holy Roman Empire. According to N. Kareevthe absence of national opposition to the Pope and own Protestant leaders against the background of heterogeneity within Protestantism led to the rapid ousting of Protestant ideas and the strengthening of the Jesuit order. That is, the researcher drew attention to the fact that the reform events had their specifics depending on the region, especially between Central and Eastern Europe.

A. Vulfius noted the imprecise and narrow character of the term "Counter-Reformation' or "Reaction". It was able to cause some confusion. The word 'Reaction' accentuated the opposition against Reformation, and thus upstaged a very deep and interesting inner rebirth of Catholicism. However, one can also talk about similarities in their work. It refers mostly to a periodization of the reformation time. It is possible that L. Ranke's periodization influenced both scholars.

More specific differences can be noted than similarities in the works of A. Vulfius and N. Kareev. This is mainly due to the influence of different schools, which not only manifested itself in the events they emphasized while describing Reformation but also and in assessing the nature of the relationship between Reformation and Trent Council Catholicism. For example, A. Vulfius was paying more attention to the spiritual and

religious development at that time, and N. Kareev to the social one. Regardless of this, it is important to note that there had existed on the territory of the Russian Empire a rich scientific tradition, devoted in part to the study of Reformation, at the time of both religious and social transformations before the advent of the totalitarian regime. We can also trace the influence of European historiographic traditions, mainly German, including historical and sociological ones, on both scholars.

*The publication was prepared with the support of the grant of Russian Science Foundation No 16-18-10083 "The Study of Religion in Social and Cultural Context of the Epoch: the History Religious Studies and Intellectual History of Russia 19th-first half of 20th century".*

*Dmitriy Weber has a PhD (in history). He is an Assistant at Institute of Philosophy of Saint – Petersburg State University.*

Konstantin Oboznij

# THE RUSSIAN ORTHODOX CHURCH IN PSKOV AND NOVGOROD DURING THE STALIN ERA WITH SPECIAL FOCUS ON THE ACTIVITIES OF THE COUNCIL FOR RUSSIAN ORTHODOX CHURCH AFFAIRS IN THE GIVEN REGIONS

## Introductory note on the 'new religious policy' of the Soviet Government

It is fair to say that one of the key events influencing the development of church-state relations in the USSR was the second restoration of the Patriarchate in September 1943 and the "new" trajectory in religious politics begun by Stalin's government at that time. Quite a lot of research – from various angles – has been dedicated to the exploration and analysis of the Soviet government's complex and ambiguous, yet decidedly resonant, decision to embark upon this new trajectory. We will not here retell in full the events of those days. Instead we will focus on one particular important innovation, the author of which was, without doubt, Stalin himself, as he was the first one to mention the idea of a new government agency – the Council for Russian Orthodox Church Affairs – in a meeting on 4 September 1943, at which three Orthodox Metropolitans were present. Stalin immediately proposed a candidate to head the new committee and disclosed the committee's remit: "…the Council will be a meeting place between Church and State, and its Chairman should report

to the government on the life of the Church and questions arising within it."[1]

The policy statement "On the Council for Russian Orthodox Affairs of the People's Council of Commissars of the USSR" was approved in October 1943. The document listed the main functions and areas of authority of the Council. Within the context of our discussion, the most important tasks of the Council were: "oversight of correct and timely implementation of… rules of the government of the USSR, relating to the Russian Orthodox Church…; general accounting for churches and the creation of statistical records by data collected by local authorities."[2]

In addition to the central agency of the Council, which was located in Moscow and headed by Colonel for state security G. G. Karpov, positions within the Council for Russian Orthodox Church Affairs were created at the level of regional executive power. By order of the government, positions were first created in the regions which had just recently been liberated from German occupation.[3]

Formation of the Council structure proceeded with some difficulty, primarily in sourcing the correct staff. Only in 1946 were all the staff vacancies finally filled. By that time, across the USSR's republics and regions, there were 112 authorized representatives of the Council for Russian Orthodox Church Affairs.[4]

Since that time, more than a half a century has passed, and today one hears rather contradictory information about the activities of the Council

---

[1] Zapiska Predsedatelia Soveta po delam R.p.ts. pri SNK SSSR G. G. Karpova o prieme Predsedatelia SNK SSSR I.V. Stalinym ierarkhov R.p.ts. *Odintsov M.I. Vlast' i religiia v gody voiny. Gosudarstvo i religioznye organizatsii v SSSR v gody Velikoi Otechestvennoi voiny. 1941–1945*. M. 2005. S. 311 (Note from the Chairman of the Council for Russian Orthodox Church Affairs of the People's Council of Commissars of the USSR, G. G. Karpov, on Stalin's reception of ROC hierarchs. *Odintsov, M. I. Power and religion in the war years. The state and religious organizations in the USSR during the Great Patriotic War (WWII). 1941–1945*. M. 2005. S. 311).

[2] Odintsov M.I. *Vlast' i religiia v gody voiny. Gosudarstvo i religioznye organizatsii v SSSR v gody Velikoi Otechestvennoi voiny. 1941–1945.* M. 2005. S. 82–83.

[3] Ibid.

[4] Ibid., p. 85.

and its representatives from different sources. In the recent past, we hear more and more that the activities of the Council had a positive effect on the development of church-state relations in the USSR, strengthened the authority of the ROC (the ROC within Russia, as opposed to ROCOR) in the international arena and within the country, and created a positive dynamic for processes within the church. To get to the bottom of such a difficult question, let us have a look at the practical activities of the Council's Representatives in the Pskov and Novgorod Regions during the period of Stalin's leadership (1945-1953).

Despite a definite softening as compared to the Big Terror of the 1930's, it is still fair to characterize this historical period in the development of Russia's government as totalitarian. Alongside the various executive, judicial and punitive agencies of the USSR, the Council for Russian Orthodox Church Affairs and its local representatives behaved toward religious organizations as might be expected of a totalitarian power structure, focused on the repression of freedom and of the rights of believing citizens. In official records documenting the activity of Council representatives, we do not find anything of the sort. For the most part, their job descriptions included the following types of practical tasks, regarding the functions of accounting-control and statistical analysis: "establishing relationships with diocesan hierarchs and archpriests, registration of clergy…considering applications from among the faithful for the opening and/or closing of churches…, accounting and registration of all functioning and non-functioning Orthodox churches and chapels, informing the Council on the activities of religious associations, and informing local law enforcement agencies about religious groups, and for execution of and control over the execution of decisions taken by the Council."[5]

We will try to get an objective picture of what was going on by looking at the Council's activity in the Pskov and Novgorod regions.

---

[5] Odintsov M. I. *Vlast' i religiia v gody voiny. Gosudarstvo i religioznye organizatsii v SSSR v gody Velikoi Otechestvennoi voiny. 1941–1945*, p. 86–87.

Our choice of the regions is not random. These are not only the adjacent regions to Leningrad – in the pre-war period they were part of the Diocese of Leningrad. During the period of German occupation, the Pskov Diocese and the western parts of the Novgorod Diocese were under the control of the Orthodox Mission in the liberated regions of Russia. In the post-war years, despite the fact that the Pskov and Novgorod Dioceses were granted independent status, they lacked diocesan leadership structure and bishops and were run by the Metropolitan of Leningrad, Grigory (Chukov). These favourable conditions, allow for the study of the Council of ROC Affairs in such a way as we can determine the degree and quality of its influence over church life in the two adjacent regions.

## Representative of the Council for ROC: Job description and positive impact on the position of religion

In October 1945, Alexander Ivanovich Luzin was appointed to the position of Representative of the Council for ROC Affairs under the Executive Committee of the Pskov Region Workers' Council of Deputies. The question of his appointment was decided at a meeting of the Bureau of the Pskov Regional Committee of the All-Union Communist Party (of Bolsheviks) on 17 October, 1945, at which Luzin was also relieved of his responsibilities as the Deputy Director of Department 5 of Division 2 of the Directorate for State Security of the People's Commissariat of the Pskov Region.[6]

A year before this, in September 1944, Petr Nikolaevich Tikhonov took up the post of Representative for the Council on ROC Affairs in the Novgorod Region.[7] These dates are conditioned by the timing of liberation from German occupation. While a significant portion of the Novgorod Region was liberated from German occupation in 1943, Red Army

[6] GANIPO (Gosudarstvennyi arkhiv noveishei istorii Pskovskoi Oblasti / State Archive of Recent History of the Pskov Region). F. 1219. Op. 1. D. 59. L. 77.

[7] GANO (Gosudarstvennyi Arkhiv Novgorodskoi Oblasti / State Archive of the Novgorod Region). F.R-4110. Op. 1. D.#2. L. 3.

divisions only moved into Pskov in July 1944. This does not mean that church life only began to appear after the appointment of Council Representatives. By autumn 1944, there were two priests serving in the ruins of Soviet Pskov, having escaped German evacuation. These were both members of the recent Pskov Mission, an Archpriest, Fr. Petr Zharkov, and a Priest, Fr. Alexander Chernavskii.

In autumn 1945, Moscow began to receive the Council's first reports from Luzin on religious life in the Pskov Region. It is noteworthy that Luzin was unable for a long time to shed the professional habits he picked up while working within the state security structure – five years of work for the security agencies (1940–1945) couldn't help but leave its mark. For instance, in one of his reports back to the Council for ROC Affairs back in Moscow, Luzin tells of his involvement in the search for one Orthodox priest, who was living in illegal conditions: "Fr. Iakov Legkii, who was hiding with a group in the forest, and is being sheltered and aided by the priest of Korovskoe, a village in the Pytalovskii Region. The priest is called Sokolov, and he was formerly an officer in Iudenich's army. To establish these facts, the Priest in charge, Arkhangelskii, and I went to the site, where we learned that the priest does, in fact, show up in Korovskoe, and in particular at the isolated farmstead where Sokolov lives."[8]

Luzin's specific professional style also came out later in the most diverse areas of his activity: in his particular style of communication with believing clergy and citizens, in his particular way of putting together reports for his superiors, in the recommendations he makes with regard to improved cooperation between state agencies and religious organizations, and finally, in his reactions to violations of laws on religious gathering by Orthodox priests and laypeople.

At the same time, there is no mileage in artificially demonizing the particular figure of Representative to the Council, even in light of what we have said above. As a whole, the system of state agencies, which worked

[8] GAPO (Gosudarstvennyi Arkhiv Pskovskoi Oblasti / State Archive of the Pskov Region). F.R-1776. Op. 1. D.#7, L. 4.

in a secretive way, had the definite totalitarian character of a system which repressed the rights of citizens. So, for instance, the documentation of the Council on Religious Affairs and the Council on ROC Affairs which regulated the activities of local Representatives, specifies that instructions provided are only for the personal use of the serving representative, so that to refer to the text of the manual "in conversation with believing citizens or clergy" was strictly prohibited.[9]

It is worth noting, that in cases of egregious infraction of the law on religious gathering by local authorities – especially in the first two years of his activity – the Representative more often than not taking the side of the religious organization, thereby underscoring the irreproachability of socialist justice.

In 1945, in the village of Verkhnii Most, the Chairman of the district executive committee (Raiispolkom) forbade the local priest, by the name of Fr. Ogloblin, from serving liturgy. In the city of Porkhov and the village of Vel'e, in the Pushkinogorskii district, local authorities tried to forbid the ringing of church bells, and in the village of Tolbitsa, in the Pskov district, there was an attempt to forcibly take the church building and its contents and use it as a grain distribution point for the local collective farm.[10]

In 1946, the priest in charge of the Ostrov district approached the Representative with a complaint regarding the Pytalovskii district executive committee (Raiispolkom), which had taken over a church parsonage as housing for persons of no permanent residence. In that same year, the Palkinskii executive committee (Raiispolkom) ordered the priest in charge at Loknia to use the church horse to plough and plant three hectares of land belonging to the "Krasnyi Bereg" collective farm. In the village of Krasnye Gorki, local authorities – specifically bureaucrats from the Dedovichskii executive committee (Raiispolkom) – took conscious steps to frustrate the professional responsibilities of the local priest, Fr. Petrochenkov. More than once, liturgies were interrupted – especially

[9] GANO. F. R-4110. Op. 4. D. 23. L. 3.
[10] GAPO. F. R.-1776. Op. 1.D#2. L. 4.

on the great Christian holidays, and believers were summoned without an obvious reason to the office of the State Security Ministry, etc.[11]

In 1947 the rural council of a village called Borovik, in the Seredkinskii district, illegally seized the church building of the local Orthodox community and used it to store grain, which had been gathered in the fields. Priest Preobrazhenskii, dean of the Church of Our Lady of Kazan, in Pskov, complained to the Representative that the doctor in charge at the local hospital forbade the administration of the sacraments to a sick man under his care. A priest called Dobrianskii, dean of the church in the village of Videleb'e, in the Karamyshevskii district, complained to the Representative that the chairman of the local rural council had confiscated the church key with the words, "you have served your liturgies, and that is enough. Soon they will begin to close all the churches."[12] All of these violations of the law on religious gathering are noted in the Representative's report, and his direct intervention in these affairs helped both clergy and believers to defend their rights in situations of conflict.

Of course, not all such clashes ended with the interests of the local religious community prevailing. At times, the Representative himself did not have an interest in supporting the representative of the church or religious society in question, and sometimes the Representative's authority was not sufficient to smooth over difficulties in church-state relations. This was the case, for instance, in the affair of unjustifiably high-income tax levied on orthodox clergy by the district and regional financial authorities.

## Representative of the Council for ROC: Restricting functions

Despite the presence of several positive examples of where the Representative's activities helped the church, for the most part, representatives remained followers and pipelines for Soviet religious policy, which

[11] GAPO. F. R.-1776. Op. 1. D#7.L. 17.
[12] GAPO. F. R.-1776. Op. 1. #18. L. 42.

even during this "new" period of leniency, viewed the church as a potential competitor, meaning an opponent, or, when taken to extremes, an enemy of those who wished to build the socialist state. It was for this reason in particular that precise control over the activities of religious organizations and any and all possible limitation of their activities were the primary focus of the work of the Council for ROC Affairs and its local representatives.

From Representative Luzin's correspondence with Council leadership, it is apparently visible that one of the most serious problems in the day-to-day life of the Pskov Diocese was the so-called phenomenon of "touring" ("gastrolerstvo") of orthodox clergy. This is the term that the Soviet bureaucrat used to refer to a situation – common in church life at that time – in which one priest was simultaneously being "fed" by several parishes. This was a result of a critical lack of priests to serve the diocese at this time, as was also the case when German forces occupied the Pskov and Novgorod regions. While the German administration, however, had not hindered clerics from serving in more than one (sometimes five to seven) parishes, the Soviet documentation of the Council for ROC affairs was unambiguous on this point: a person in holy orders was only legally allowed to carry out his cultic activities in the single parish in which he was registered to serve.

Registration certificates for religious organizations and priests were issued by the Representative of the Council for ROC Affairs, giving him a handy instrument for the regulation of relations between believers and local authorities, as well as in their way providing leverage over internal church processes at both the diocesan and parish levels. In other words, if a parish group – or so-called "dvadtsatka" (group of 20) – became unnecessarily active, if the priest in charge began to work to strengthen religious propaganda, the unity of the parish, or to enlighten the faithful in the Christian faith further – if he tended toward independence from controlling councils or party authorities – then all the Representative had to do was to find a pretext for the removal of both the parish's license and the incorrigible priest's license to serve. This, then, would lead to the

closure of his church and to the limitation of religious propaganda amongst the local population, which was one of the priorities – naturally not widely spoken of-of the Council on ROC Affairs.

Here we will provide a single, obvious example of this sort of activity. The Chairman of the Kislovskii Rural Council of the Pskov district informed Representative Luzin by letter, that on the 24th of July, on the Saint's day of Princess Olga who is equal to the Apostles, that Fr. Nikolai Verkhoustinskii served the liturgy in the village of Vybuty under the open sky. (Incidentally, Vybuty is, according to the tradition, the home region of Princess Olga.) Insofar as the church building was in a ruined condition, approximately 700 faithful served liturgy and received communion outside, next to the ruined church. After this, the priest performed a baptism. Furthermore, as Luzin remarked in his letter, Fr. Nikolai, in recent years, had more than once lead processions from the Palkinskii district to Pechory, had served liturgies in other half-ruined and ruined church buildings. With this actions, the priest was violating the instructions of the Council on ROC Affairs and was therefore deprived of his license to serve, thereby losing the ability to fulfil his pastoral and liturgical obligations.

Members of the Palkinskii parish did apply to the Representative with a petition, which was signed by 230 people. In this letter, the members of the parish attempt to take all the responsibility for what happened, and petition for the return of their disgraced priest's registration. In defence of their pastor, the lay people wrote that they had been the initiators of liturgies served in cemeteries and outside ruined church buildings, not realizing that these actions were serious violations of the law on the religious gathering. According to the document: "…instead of forgiving and warning our priest, Fr. Nikolai Verkhoustinskii, you have forbidden him to serve. We find this action to be unfair and hurtful and request that you leave Fr. Nikolai, whom we all love and respect, to serve among us. He always meets us halfway, fulfils his responsibilities dutifully, never insults us by asking us to pay for sacraments or liturgies and always finds a way to help. The priest has a family with six children who go to the school in

Palkino, and one son serving in the Red Army. In what he says, Fr. Nikolai always instructs us to be honest and faithful citizens of our great homeland, calls us to participate in state events and is, for us, an irreplaceable teacher and friend."[13]

Despite the detailed, positive recommendation of his parishioners, the Representative was uncompromising, and let the parishioners' petition go without an answer. It is possible that the love and deep compassion that this flock had for its priest actually strengthened the Representative's decisiveness in driving out Verkhoustinskii. According to Luzin's reports, Fr. Nikolai continued to serve liturgies even after being deprived of his license to do so, thereby underscoring his independence in the face of the Soviet bureaucrat, which lead Luzin to apply for help to the Regional Committee of the All-union Communist Party (Bolsheviks) in his efforts to stand against the obstinate cleric. The episode ended when a new head priest was sent to the parish in Palkino, and Fr. Nikolai Verkhoustinskii, supported by Metropolitan Grigory (Chukov) of Leningrad, was transferred in October 1951 to the Novgorod Diocese, to Holy Trinity Church in the village of Chizhovo.[14] However, after a short time, he was arrested and charged with alleged financial irregularities.

We can assume that several facts from Verkhoustinskii's biography form the real backdrop – or hidden motive – in his case. Father Nikolai came from the family of an archpriest from the Pechory district, Fr. Elia Verkhoustinskii. It is worth noting that Luzin also related to the senior Verkhoustinskii in an extremely negative way. Moreover, most importantly, Fr. Nikolai was ordained by the Exarch of the Baltics, Metropolitan Sergii (Voskresenskii) in Riga, on 6 November 1941, and first served in the occupied territory of the Pechory district.[15] This was plenty enough to put someone on the list of untrustworthy priests, as far as Soviet bureaucrats in charge of church affairs were concerned.

---

[13] GAPO. F. R-1776. Op. 1. D.#35. L. 19.
[14] GANO. F. R-4110. Op. 1. D.#152. L. 2.
[15] GANO. F. R-4110. Op. 1. D.#152. L. 4, 5.

From the first reports that Luzin sent back to Moscow, it is clear that one of the factors which complicated his activity was the significant number of priests who remained in the Pskov Diocese from the time of German occupation. As such, one of the principal assignments of the Representative was not merely to register the clergy of the Diocese, but also to subsequently weed out and replace with more loyal and obedience priests those who had "shady" pasts, working in occupied territories under the Pskov Orthodox Mission or in the Baltic Exarchate or who had been charged with anti-Soviet and counterrevolutionary behaviour.

We might speak of the peculiar "selection" of Orthodox clergy, which the Representative of the Council on ROC Affairs carefully and constantly carried out. Under pressure from Luzin and with his active involvement, some of the finest clerics in the Pskov region were "smoked out", including priests Pavlov, Ivanov, Verkhoustinskii, Preobrazhenskii and others. In addition to violations of the Councils rules – and it was difficult to honestly serve the Church without breaking some sort of rule relating to religious organizations – Luzin's contempt for active priests or priests who behaved independently shouldn't be underestimated, where "independent behaviour" means nothing more than putting service to God and his Church before cow-towing to Soviet authorities.

It is very telling that in his first report from the Pskov diocese in 1948 there is a list of the best clerics in the diocese, next to which in Luzin's hand there are notes next to the names mentioned above say such things as "German facilitator," "Article 58 from 1937 to 1938", "former kulak", "ace-trickster", "former officer in the White Army", and others.[16]

This seemingly insignificant detail bears witness not only to the interests of the church being at odds with those of state bureaucrats but to an internal ideological conflict between the Christian and Soviet worldviews, which had merely, during this period, taken on a latent character.

[16] GAPO. F. R-1776. Op. 1. D.#27. L. 9.

## Registration of Orthodox clerics and parish communities: The Representative's 'selection' work

This thought is also supported by the fact that the Representative had, as one of his specific responsibilities, to review and consider written requests from the faithful regarding the opening of new churches. Statistical data underscore the "success" of the Council's Representative in Pskov. Between April 1945 and September 1950, 27 churches which had functioned under the Germans were closed. Over the same period, only six new churches were built.[17]

These figures do not signify the passivity of the faithful in the Pskov Diocese. From other documents, we learn that just in the period from 1944 to 1946 Luzin received more than 30 petitions to open new churches from the believers in Gdov, Strugi Krasnye, Elizarovo, Borovsk, Lukomsk and other parishes. In total, 2,623 people had personally signed these petitions.[18] Moreover, here we are speaking only about officially registered petitions; the more considerable portion of petitions, for one or another reason, was not considered by the Representative, which means that the statistics require further refinement.

In his reports, the Pskov Representative more than once reassigned responsibility for the slow pace at which churches were being opened to local authorities. In one of his reports from 1946, Luzin has provided the following explanation: "Indecisiveness in the matter of opening new churches is coming from comrade Semin of the Regional Executive Committee (Oblispolkom), as well as from chairpersons of district executive committees (raiispolkoms). The following facts evidence this: comrade Semin of the Regional Executive Committee, rather than discussing materials about the opening of new churches, has redirected me to the Regional Committee of the All-Union Communist Party, which is nothing more than an insurance policy. Chairmen of district executive committees

[17] GANIPO. F. 1219. Op. 1. D.#1075. L. 30.
[18] GAPO. F. R-1776. Op. 1. D.#18. L. 11.

try not to respond to my requests concerning the opening of new churches."[19]

Without calling into question this picture of Soviet and Party bureaucrats as ineffectual in the matter of implementing the rights of believing citizens, it should be noted that Luzin himself played a leading role in complicating the registration of new religious groups on the territory of the Pskov Diocese. As such, he was closely following those goals that were determined by Moscow in 1943 when the Council was just beginning its work. In mid-1943, when being received by the Soviet head-of-state, Chairman Karpov of the Council on ROC Affairs heard the following words from Molotov: "we will have to open some churches, but it makes sense not to rush about it!"[20]

At the end of November the same year, the Council of People's Commissars (Sovnarkom) passed a resolution "On Procedure for Opening Churches", although the document was put together in such a way so as it would be possible at the legal level to slow the speed at which churches were opened, and, in places, to influence the course of church life as a whole. Moreover, it makes sense to note that entirely failing to react to believers' petitions was impossible, insofar as this would lead to growth in the number of unregistered (catacomb) parishes, functioning outside of the control of state authorities from the Council on ROC Affairs.

It is possible to say that the powers invested in the representatives of the Council on ROC Affairs enabled their likely power abuse vis-à-vis the faithful and their church life, as a result of their over-all vision of how the religious situation should develop in the region. In their hands, control over registration of clerics and parishes was an extremely powerful instrument of influence over life in the diocese as a whole. The threat of losing one's registration was very real for any active cleric and his parish, in addition to which the secret instructions of the Council, which

[19] GAPO. F. R-1776. Op. 1. D#7. L. 9. ob. st.
[20] Odintsov, M. I. Ibid., p. 89.

were not uncommonly applied, lent an additional factor of unpredictability and power abuse to the picture. So, for instance, Luzin actively opposed the initiative of Metropolitan Grigory (Chukov), who managed the affairs of the Pskov Diocese and, to address the disturbing lack of clergy serving in the region, appointed monks and abbots from the Pskov-Pechorski Monastery to parishes. This action helped parishes without a priest defend themselves against being removed from the registry. The Representative, for his part, refused to register such monastics in the parishes, citing the fact that they were temporary and not permanent parish priests.[21]

Regarding his manner of relating to clerics of the diocese, the Representative was guided not only by Soviet legislation and the instructions of the Council – but he was also lead by his personal sympathies and antipathies. This fact is apparently visible in the way in which Luzin showed concern for the Pskov-Pechorski Monastery, and how he made petitions to the Council for their needs: he helped the monastery to acquire a new car for domestic work and made sure that the number of young, energetic monks was kept stable, bring them in from other monasteries across the USSR.[22] The attention on the part of the Representative is explicable given his personal sympathy for the Monastery's priest-in-charge, Archimandrite Vladimir (Kobets).

It is possible that the compassionate and almost friendly relationship between Luzin and Archimandrite Vladimir can be explained by the fact that they both ended up in Pskov after working in Leningrad at the time of the blockade – Luzin in the security services and Archimandrite Vladimir serving in the Prince Cathedral of St. Vladimir. Moreover, during this period Fr. Vladimir actively took part in raising funds for the defence and aid of the Red Army. In 1943, after the appointment of Patriarch Sergii (Stragorodskii), he was judged worthy of a state honour – the Medal for the Defence of Leningrad. These facts might have caused

[21] GAPO. F. R-1776. Op. 1. D.#35. L. 18.
[22] GAPO. F. R-1776. Op. 1. D.#7. L. 12.

the Representative of the Council on ROC Affairs to relate to the Abbot of the Pskov-Pechory Monastery with trust and even to pose the question of Kobets's being awarded a medal "For valiant labour".[23]

Along with these facts, Luzin writes frankly in his reports that he is trying to make up for the lack of clergy and to cover up for the insufficiencies of clergy who lead an objectionable lifestyle, thereby embarrassing parishioners and becoming the object of ridicule for local communists and Soviet authorities. In his report for the third quarter of 1949, Luzin wrote to Moscow of a personal meeting with Metropolitan Grigory, at which he complained about difficulties in the management of the Pskov Diocese, "relating the antics of various priests, about whom I have long known and whose transgressions I endeavour to soften when reporting to the Metropolitan."[24]

The Representative's behaviour is perfectly explicable – it was specifically morally unstable clerics who became obedient weapons in the hands of Soviet bureaucrats and employees of the security agencies, while on the other hand, such clerics were proof of the regression of the orthodox church and its spiritual degradation. This process of secularization within the church itself took place not only because of the extreme lack of clergy in the period immediately after the war – the level of education, both spiritual and general, was also sadly insufficient. Also, the brightest representatives of orthodox Christianity were repressed in the 1930s, or arrested and charged with anti-Soviet activity, after the liberation of North-West Russia and the Baltics from German occupation. All the while the Council on ROC Affairs laboured over the creation of a new type of clergy, which fit the internal political needs of the Soviet government. At base, the process could be called "selection" of clerics, who were useful to the Council on ROC Affairs. In his report for the 1st quarter of 1950, Luzin frankly writes that he has satisfied the request of the manager of the Regional Financial office, Comrade Sakharov, and "removed"

[23] GAPO. F. R-1776. Op. 1. D#26. L. 6.
[24] GAPO. F. R-1776. Op. 1. D#30. L. 43.

Fr. Preobrazhenskii and Fr. Ivanov from the Pskov Diocese, after they demonstratively refused to pay inflated income tax and called for other clerics of the region to join them in their defiant act.[25]

In his 3rd quarter report for the same year (1950), the Pskov Representative shares his plans "…to replace, little by little, all the clergy in the Kachanovskii, Pechorskii and Pytalovskii districts." Later, Luzin explains the logic of his plans saying, "the majority of them had large farms before 1944; so, for instance, the priest of the church in Vyshgorod, whose name was Ovsiankin, had 12 cows and three permanent farm hands."[26]

In addition to the property related eligibility criteria for the priests of these regions, it is essential to underscore that nearly all the clerics were practising priests already in the time before these districts of Latvia and Estonia came to be part of the USSR.

We should note that the selection-related work of the Representative also applied to parishioners chosen at the parish general meeting to serve on the parish executive committee and audit committees. In the village of Vel'e, the selected churchwarden was the daughter of the priest in charge, whose name was Gornostaev, and her husband was the parish bookkeeper. The Representative refused to register them, due to their family connections with the priest. Repeat elections were held, and the Representative also refused to recognize these: as warden, the parish chose a woman by the name of Iliinskaia, whose mother had been charged by the State Security Ministry for her refusal to accept a Soviet passport. As warden's helper, a man by the name of Mikhailov was chosen, whose son had served as Burgermeister in Vel'e during the period of German occupation. Furthermore, from a source which is no longer available to us Luzin learned that at the meeting of the "dvadtsatka" where the elections were held, the priest's daughter had declared that, "we should choose Iliinskaya for the warden, because her mother suffered for the Church." At the end of recounting this episode, Luzin remarks: "The newly elected church

[25] GAPO. F. R-1776. Op. 1. D#35. L. 12.
[26] GAPO. F. R-1776. Op. 1. D.#35. L. 21. ob. st.

council has not yet come to me for registration, but I will have to refuse them. The strengthening of anti-religious propaganda will help expose similar groups in and around the church and lower the number of new applications to open churches."[27] From all this, the primary goal of the Representative of the Council on ROC Affairs is visible – to restrain religious activity among the population and lower the number of active parishes in the Pskov Diocese.

## Survival tactics and the fruit of 'selection'

To see the matter in the most objective light, we should look briefly at the reactions of the bishop, priests and laypeople to the Representative's work. Undoubtedly it would have been impossible for church life in the USSR to develop without any compromises whatsoever. How far believing Christians were willing to compromise is another matter.

To retain the right to serve liturgy and carry out pastoral responsibilities legally, some clerics endeavoured to conform to the demands and conditions for survival which the Soviet authorities proposed. Others publicly endeavoured to leave open the possibility of preaching the Christian faith as based in Gospel principles, which was not always possible in everyday life and sometimes led to sharp conflict with the Representative of the Council on ROC Affairs and local representatives of Soviet authority, and sometimes even ended in legal proceedings and court convictions of "disobedient" Christians. Other means of fighting back that we could name are open disobedience, complaints to higher authorities and hidden sabotage of rules created by the Council on ROC Affairs.

We can give a couple of examples of how orthodox clerics tried to get into the "in crowd" with Soviet authorities and bureaucrats from the Council on ROC Affairs. In one of his reports from 1947, Luzin noted that the more "progressive" clergy in the diocese, is primarily made up of priests who had recently been ordained or who had had a long hiatus since

[27] GAPO. F. R-1776. Op. 1. D.#26. L. 38.

their last period of service and who had previously worked in Soviet institutions. The Representative underscores that the "group last mentioned has a vested interest in having close contact with state institutions." It is not without some level of private enjoyment that Luzin adds, "representatives of this group come to me with questions of all sorts – even of an internal character."[28] As an obvious example of loyalty to the Soviet regime that, in the Representative's opinion, simultaneously bore witness to a "zealous relationship to the church," Luzin points particularly to the priest from the village of Zapol'e, in the Pliusskii district. This priest had "appealed to the local Communist Party to give him people that he could prepare as candidates for ordination, primarily from among party members."[29]

A similar instance was related by the Representative from Novgorod, a man by the name of Tikhonov, in the spring of 1945. The priest in charge of the Rechinskii parish of the district of Volot, Fr. Ioann Kopylov, cancelled the traditional daily services that usually take place during Bright Week (the week following Pascha), so as not to disturb the spring planting work of the local collective farm. In his report to Tikhonov, Fr. Ioann also related the following story: "After the liturgy on the 6th of May I made announcements to the faithful, wishing them success in their farm work and staunch health at this important moment of the spring planting season. I appealed to them to use their energy carefully, to have some left over to finish this year's farm work and bring home a bountiful crop. For the remaining days of the Paschal week, we did not serve liturgy, so as not to hinder farm work, given that some people might use church services as an excuse to beg off-farm work."[30] When priests made such reports, they did so very much in the style of Soviet bureaucrats, underscoring on more than one occasion that religious practices distract farm hands from their collective farm work for the benefit of the Soviet homeland.

---

[28] GAPO. F. R-1776. Op. 1. D.#18. L. 44.
[29] Ibid., L. 44.
[30] GANO. F. R-4110. Op. 1. D.#2. L. 30 ob. st.

Among clergy from Pskov and Novgorod, there were also those who tried, in one way or another, to maintain independence from the custodial eye of the Representative in church affairs, and to insist that the right to freedom regarding confession of faith was built into the Soviet Constitution, though overridden in practice. This sort of position, more often than not, led to clergy being deprived of their license to practice, transferred to another diocese, to administrative punishment, and sometimes to a criminal investigation of trumped-up crimes relating to the violation of Soviet laws.

Cases of disobedient believers might exhibit themselves in very different ways, from open accusation of the Soviet system's oppression of religious life, as in the case of the priest called Preobrazhenskii, who refused to pay the inflated income tax and called others to do the same,[31] to hidden resistance exhibiting itself in the sabotage of the Representative's demands or those of local Soviet authorities, such as when Fr. Nikolai Verkhoustinskii continued to serve liturgies and perform his pastoral duties even after being deprived of his license.[32] In the first years after the war, parishes were very poor at reporting to their appointed Representative on financial matters and parish council membership, and clergy continued to see to the spiritual needs of people outside of their parishes as narrowly, geographically defined in their registration documents, in contradiction to the rules of the Council on ROC Affairs.

In the situation as it developed in the Pskov and Novgorod Dioceses in the post-war years, Metropolitan Grigory (Chukov) of Leningrad, who ran the affairs of the two dioceses, was a worthy example of independence from the dictate of the Representative. From Luzin's reports, it is possible to discern several areas in which the Representative was unable to subordinate Metropolitan Grigory to his will. First, the Metropolitan did not obtain preliminary agreement before appointing priests to parishes.[33]

[31] GAPO. F. R-1776. Op. 1. D.#26. L. 4-5.
[32] GAPO. F. R-1776. Op. 1. D#35. L. 29.
[33] GAPO. F. R-1776. Op. 1. D#7. L. 4 ob. st.

Secondly, Metropolitan Grigory always supported petitions from the faithful to open new parishes, which, to the mind of the Representative from Pskov was untimely, given the shortage in the clergy.[34] Moreover, this is a situation where, as Luzin describes it, Metropolitan Grigory "supports every petition, if it is for opening a parish, and local representatives of Soviet authority, on the contrary, as a rule answer petitions negatively, citing the reason that those from whom the petitions come do not represent a majority of the population."[35] Thirdly, Metropolitan Grigory, on more than one occasion, registered complaints to high-ranking offices within the Soviet government about the actions of the Representative from the Pskov region, when such actions were aimed at reducing the level of religious activity amongst the population.[36]

However, Representative Luzin did not remain in the Metropolitan's debt for long and complained about Metropolitan Grigory, more than once requested that the leadership of the Council appoint a separate hierarchy for Pskov, more amenable to cooperation than the Metropolitan of Leningrad.[37]

Parishioners from among the local population in the Pskov and Novgorod regions, as a rule, endeavoured to solve their problems relating to freedom of worship by addressing complaints to Metropolitan Grigory, to the Council on ROC Affairs and the Soviet government. Often parish members came to speak to the Representative in his office, in the hope of solving parish problems through personal interaction with the Soviet bureaucrat, and sometimes resorted to bribes.[38]

In connection with such situations, the Council on ROC Affairs warned its employees at the local level of the inappropriateness of receiving bribes or "…particular material favours … on the part of clergy and leaders of religious groups and other people related to them." The

[34] GAPO. F. R-1776. Op. 1. D#7. L. 9 ob. st.
[35] GAPO. F. R-1776. Op. 1. D#26. L. 14.
[36] GAPO. F. R-1776. Op. 1. D#30. L. 31.
[37] GAPO. F. R-1776. Op. 1. D#26. L. 38.
[38] GANO. F. R-4110. Op. 1. D#2. L. 43.

leadership of the Council spoke out about its particular concern for those of whom any of the following conditions would apply "… familiar relationship between the Representative and representatives of religious organizations. Those who without particular need visit clergy or parish leaders at their homes or invite them to their flats, who in receiving hospitality also receive one or another service or favour…Such is, in fact, promoting the development of graft." The leadership of the Council on ROC Affairs insisted that Representatives should "…strictly observe a "work only" relationship with representatives of religious groups."[39]

The concern of the Council on ROC Affairs is perfectly understandable; after all, any human relationship may bring about not only the violation of socialist regulations relating to religious groups but even create conditions under which feelings of compassion and solidarity may arise between the Soviet bureaucrat and representatives of the orthodox church. This fact once again underscores that rigorous traits of totalitarianism in the activity of representatives of the Council on ROC Affairs were not their individual traits, but the direct demand of a system of freedom repression and total control over the lives of citizens of the Soviet state.

In concluding this small investigation into the particularities of the negative impact of the Representative on church life in the Pskov and Novgorod in the years immediately following the war, it makes sense to share a quote from a secret report on the work of the Representative of the Council on ROC Affairs of the Pskov Regional Executive Committee (Pskov Oblispolkom), made in the years between 1945 and 1950: "…I believe, and it is necessary to note that church people, making use of weak work regarding propaganda, are trying to increase their influence on the masses. Every closure of a church is interpreted, in particular by their leader Metropolitan Grigory, not as a drop in religiosity, but as an intended action on the part of Soviet power, and in particular of the Representative of the Council on ROC Affairs."[40]

---

[39] GANO. F. R-4110. Op. 4. D#23. L. 30.

[40] GANIPO. F. 1219. Op. 1. D.#1075. L. 43.

These words of the Representative confirm the true goal of the Council on ROC Affairs and of Soviet authorities, who first and foremost were striving to place the orthodox church at the service of their atheistic interests. The dynamic process of secularization inside the church itself, meaning amongst clerics and bishops, took on a particular character in the post-war years, thanks to the "selection" of church staff through the staffing policy of representatives to the Council on ROC Affairs. The first results of this "selection" were felt toward the end of the 1950's when there was a new wave of attack against the orthodox church in the USSR. The fruits of this "selection", however, were felt especially sharply after the fall of the Soviet empire and the end of the period of Communist Party dictatorship and the liquidation of the Council on ROC Affairs. Today within the orthodox church in Russia and the majority of former republics of the USSR, the functions of the Soviet bureaucrats who controlled religious life and repressed church parish life are very ably performed by and within the very diocesan management structure of the church, with bishops at the head. This bears witness to the fact that the secular spirit which broke into the church under the atheistic regime of the 1940s and 1950s far from being expunged, is actually mounting to the new power.

*Konstantin Oboznij is a candidate of historical sciences and a Head of the Department of Church-Historical Disciplines of the St. Philaret Christian Orthodox Institute.*

Ivan Petrov

# THE ORTHODOX CHURCH AND THE TOTALITARIAN REGIME IN THE POST-WAR CRIMEA: A SURVIVAL STRATEGY OF ARCHBISHOPS JOASAPH (ZHURMANOV) AND LUKA (VOYNO-YASENETSKY)

The Crimean peninsula has always been not only a territory of acute controversy between the states but also a bone of contention for different church jurisdictions and denominations. This fact was proved by the historical events of the previous century. At different times the following groups were standing against each other in the Crimea: Renovationists and Sergians, Non-Commemorationists, Ukrainian Autocephalists and even members of the Romanian Orthodox Church. However, the representatives of civil administration played the leading part in these controversies, as they had authority to allow or forbid religious activities on the peninsula. Apparently, each political actor had its favourites in the religious community, who were used to transmit to people the political stance of the Soviet authorities. We are particularly interested in the last months of the Second World War - the time, when the Crimea was already liberated from the Nazis, and the new Soviet rule was being established on the territory, defining its religious policy according to the so-called 'Stalin New Religious Course', as well as in the first post-war years. The relationships between the Soviet authorities and the two archbishops, Joasaph (Zhurmanov) and Luka (Voyno-Yasenetsky), who served as heads of the Crimean cathedra, are of particular concern.

First, let us briefly describe the life of the religious community in the Crimean territories occupied by the Wehrmacht. M. V. Shkarovsky, a contemporary historian from St. Petersburg, notes that according to the SD (Security Service of the Reichsführer-SS)reports of the end of 1942, the Orthodox clergy, who followed the Romanian army, have baptized 200 000 people since the start of the occupation (the number seems to be overestimated). In the research, it is also stated that according to German archives, there were 125 functional Orthodox churches established by the end of 1942.[1]Shkarovsky also mentions that the religious Renaissance in the Crimea was developing mostly under the auspices of the Romanian Orthodox Church, which sometimes lead to significant collisions with those pastors and laymen who were against many of the changes introduced by the Romanians.

However, the fullest picture of Orthodox life in the Crimea during the occupation by the German and Romanian troops was offered by Y. A. Katunin, a Crimean historian who deceased quite recently, in his work 'Russian Orthodox Church during the Second World War (1939–1945)'.[2] Using the information available in the Crimean archives and published periodical media, particularly the famous newspaper 'The Voice of the Crimea', the author has scrupulously restored almost all the aspects of the life of Orthodox priests and laymen. He also paid attention to the crucial question of canonic controversy between two jurisdictions in the Crimea: Autocephalous Romanian Orthodox Church and Autonomous Ukrainian Orthodox Church that remained loyal to the Church authorities in Moscow. The historian also considers the pro-Soviet attitude of some of the Crimean Orthodox clergy. The tendencies of opening and closing of Orthodox churches in the Crimea after its liberation from the occupants is described as well. However, there is no comprehensive anal-

[1] Shkarovsky M. V. *The policy of the Third Reich regarding the Russian Orthodox Church in the archive materials (collection of documents*). Moscow, Krutitskoye Podvorie Publishers, 2003.

[2] Katunin Y. A. *Russian Orthodox Church during the Second World War (1939–1945).* Simferopol: Piramida Krym, 1999, p. 120.

ysis of the Soviet authorities' religious policy and causes for the persecution of some priests and laymen.

Nevertheless, it is possible to make the following conclusion: during the war, religious life of the local parishes was controlled by civil authorities, in particular, the Ecclesiastical Subdivision of the Department of Culture, Simferopol City Council, headed by A.D. Semenov, the local geography teacher who had a pre-revolutionary religious education. Mr Semenov was loyal to the Nazi rule and stood against religious radicals: for example, he did not allow for religious service a self-proclaimed Renovationist bishop Vikenty (Nikiporchik), who was rumoured to cooperate with the NKVD and lead a sinful private life. The Ecclesiastical Subdivision sought support from the Ukrainian Autonomous Church, had connections with the representatives of the Russian Orthodox Church outside Russia and was interested in them pervading the Crimea. Later this organization was reformed to the R.D. Committee whose leaders became political prisoners during the Soviet rule (in the archive of the Crimean Department of the Ukrainian Security Service there was a single investigative case for every person who participated in the administration of religious life of the Orthodox Crimea, available to researchers before 2014).[3]

After the liberation of the Crimea from the Nazis, the post of the local bishop was passed over to Bishop Joasaph (Zhurmanov). Let us consider in brief the biography of this eparchy. In 1922–1923 he participated in the Renovationist movement. During this time he was elevated to the archimandrite and appointed as vicar, on September 14, 1922, he became archpriest of the Alexander Nevsky Monastery. In the autumn of 1923, he repented of being a Renovationist and served as R. D. of the Leningrad eparchy. From 1933 he served in one of the Leningrad parishes and later was shifted outside the permanent staff. In Leningrad he lived

[3] *Archives Administration of the Ukrainian Security Service Crimean Department. (Archive of the Federal Security Service in the Crimea and Sevastopol)* D. 8152. V. 1 Case of A. D. Semenov, Y. A. Kovalsky.

through the first, hard and terrible, winter of the Siege and after was evacuated to the town of Alapaevsk. Only in the end of summer there appeared an opportunity for a new service appointment, and on August 13, 1944, he was chirotonized in Moscow to be archbishop of Simferopol and Taurida.

The service in this region was quite hard for the new bishop: the occupation of the peninsula had just ended, but the Soviet policy was already on its way to obstruct the religious life of the locals. Under the German rule, the Crimea experienced a true religious Renaissance: by the time of liberation there existed 70 functional Orthodox churches, 69 of which were opened during the occupation, 24 were located in the public buildings: clubs, schools, administrative buildings, manufacturing facilities, etc.[4] Soon the civil authorities would take measures to unite some of the parishes and to desanctify those shrines and preaching houses that were located in the public buildings. [5] In some places, these activities were peaceful and unnoticed, but sometimes active local priests and laymen protested against such policy. However, in a short period, the Soviet authorities managed to reduce the number of parishes from 70 to 58.[6] The total number of the Orthodox clergy was over 60, most of them were from 50 to 70 years old.

What was the behaviour of the local archbishop in the Crimea during this time? From the beginning, he chose a very conformist policy in administering the eparchy. Jacob Zhdanov, the local Authorized Representative on the Russian Orthodox Church Affairs, noted that archbishop Joasaph visited him 38 times from December 1944 to November 1945, the meetings went as planned and there were no serious conflicts between the civil and church authorities.[7] During this time archbishop Joasaph paid more attention to various 'patriotic' meetings. In 1946 Mr Zdanov

[4] SAAPC (State Archive of Autonomous Republic of Crimea). F. P-2647. Op. list 1, d. 2. L. 54.

[5] Ibid. Letter 57.

[6] Ibid. Letter 63.

[7] Ibid. Letter 61.

wrote the following about the initial period of the archbishop Joasaph administration in the Crimea: 'Together with this, I report that Joasaph, prior bishop of Simferopol and Crimea, current bishop of Tambov, from the moment of his arrival to the Crimean eparchy in the August 1944 performed a significant patriotic work in the Crimean churches by patriotic proclamations and sermons; actively participated in food and money collection for the Motherland Defence Fund and for orphans of the deceased Red Army soldiers. Due to this, in December 1944, he was awarded the benedictory telegram from Com. Stalin.'[8]

However, such activity on the patriotic front was contrasting to the amount of attention he paid to other matters of interest of the Orthodox Church. The most critical matter at those times was the closing of churches, the number of them that could remain functional. By the start of the occupation, the first opened church was the Cemetery Cathedral headed by the Romanian military priest, and later six other Orthodox cathedrals were opened: Pokrovsky, Troitsky, Konstantino-Yeleninsky, Vladimirsky, Trechsvyatsky and Cathedral of the Annunciation). Such wide-scale religious Renaissance in the Crimean capital could not remain unnoticed by the Soviet authorities, who decided to close several cathedrals. Surprisingly, archbishop Joasaph cooperated to satisfy this policy.

His logic was quite simple and very pragmatic: he agreed that 7 cathedrals is a lot for one city and told Mr Zhdanov that it is better to keep only 4 of them: Cathedral of the Annunciation were he lived, the Troitsky Cathedral and two cathedrals located on the outskirts of the city – Cemetery and Vladimirsky.[9] The others could be handed over to the state.

Sometime later the fate of the local Peter and Paul Cathedral was at stake. The Moscow Patriarchy wanted to return the cathedral under its jurisdiction, but archbishop Joasaph did not pay attention to the problem. In his letter №49 on October 20th, 1944 he wrote the following to the local Representative on the Russian Orthodox Church Affairs: 'At depar-

[8] SAAPC. F. P-2647. Op. 7. D. 1. L. 26.
[9] SAAPC. F. P-2647. op. 7 d. 2. L. 4.

ture to Simferopol I was told at the Moscow Patriarchy that they had a request to have the former building of the Peter and Paul Cathedral passed over to the ecclesiastical parish and to make efforts to bring it to the state, appropriate for an Orthodox cathedral. After visiting the former cathedral building on the spot and inspecting its state, he concluded that it required major capital works, a lot of construction material, man power and money – the expenses impossible to cover at the moment. Therefore he abstains from filing the request for repair and resuming religious service in the building.'[10]

Besides his inability to revive and save the parishes, archbishop Joasaph could not in any way influence the wave of arrests of Orthodox clergy that started in the Crimea. That is why the ecclesiastical authorities in Moscow decided to make a bold castling: appoint archbishop Luka (Voyno-Yasenetsky), a prisoner of Stalin camps, world-famous surgeon, laureate of the Stalin award, to the Crimean cathedra, and send Joasaph to Tambov, where archbishop Luka used to serve.

Archbishop Luka (Voyno-Yasenetsky) was appointed to the Crimea in 1946 after transfer from Tambov. The Tambov eparchy was not very big regarding some functional churches, and much calmer compared to the Crimea. Archbishop Luka, famous around the whole Soviet Union, accepted the new appointment with happiness and understanding of the grave situation in the Crimean eparchy: 'Regardless of the sorrow expressed by my Tambov flock and the efforts they took to convince the Patriarchy to leave me in Tambov, I had to go to Simferopol. It was the will of God, as I am needed there. I have to restore the demolished eparchy.'[11]

By 1946 there were 54 registered parishes on the peninsula. In one year three new were opened, and none were closed or transferred to another eparchy. The eparchy was divided into 8 R. D. districts. The staff consisted of 79 Orthodox priests. More than half of them were Russian,

[10] SAAPC. F. P-2647. op. 7. d. 2. L. 6.

[11] Luka (Voyno-Yasenetsky). *I came to love suffering...* Autobiography. Moscow: Obraz, 2006, p. 101.

26 Ukrainian and only 9 Belorussian. It is quite hard to estimate the number objectively: the Crimean eparchy was not small but not very big, and most of its problems rose from the destructions of the war period.[12] However, it is important to note, that with the appointment of the new archbishop, the closing of churches, mainly explained by the conformism of his predecessor, stopped.

What were the reasons for appointing archbishop Luka to this post? The archbishop was born in the Crimea and could quite well imagine the challenges that the local parishes were facing. Moreover, the archbishop was a very talented man who was able to change the lives of the Crimean clergy and laymen.

Archbishop Luka started his work with the personnel's affairs. Three Orthodox priests were removed from the permanent staff for alcohol abuse. In turn, he appointed for service in his eparchy four new priests: two of them arrived from the Ukraine, one was shifted to the permanent staff and the fourth, while visiting his daughter in the Crimea, was asked to return to service. There was another wave of persecution of Orthodox clergy and laymen, associated with the liberation of the territories temporary occupied by the Nazi troops: the Ministry for State Security (MGB) arrested father Alexey Soluha, a priest at the Ekaterininsky Cathedral of Sarygol village near Feodosiya.[13]

Let us consider in detail the arrival and the first period of archbishop Luka's service in the Crimea and the attitude towards him of the clergy, laymen and civil authorities. Archbishop Luka returned to the Crimea on 24th of May, 1946, and immediately sent John Miloslavov, archpriest of Simferopol, to the local Representative on the Russian Orthodox Church Affairs with a request to visit him.[14] However, the Representative asked

---

[12] *The Crimean eparchy in the documents of archbishop Luka (Voyno-Yasenetsky) and State Organs. 1946-1961: Collection of documents/compiler archpriest Nilolai Donenko, R. A. Zamtaradze, S.B. Filimonov*. Simferopol: N. Oriadna, 2015, p. 57.

[13] Ibid.

[14] Ibid., p. 66–67.

archbishop Luka to visit him instead, and archbishop followed the request. It is important to note that in the conversations with the civil authorities archbishop Luka always emphasized that he had to be called by his ecclesiastical name, not by his civil name 'Valentin Felixovich', as was usual among secular people. During his stay in the Crimea, he taught some of the officials to do that. The archbishop also asked the Representative about the clergy that was entrusted to him. The Representative always emphasized that most of the clergy became priests during the Nazi occupation (disregarding whether they returned to service or were consecrated). The archbishop had his demands to the authorities: a private car, a diploma and a badge proving that he was a laureate of the Stalin award. He also reminded that he would like to combine his religious service with holding lectures on medicine.

Even more radical seemed another request of introducing a travelling priest to the Crimean eparchy. A travelling priest was to hold service instead of Rural Deans while they were absent inspecting the parishes. In response, the Representative said that every priest is assigned to a specific parish and visits of a travelling priest would be undesired and non-regulated. However, the new archbishop suggested that this idea should be discussed not at the local but at the nationwide level, in particular by the Russian Orthodox Church Affairs Committee, to facilitate solving of this contradiction.[15]

The Representative did not like the fact that the archbishop invited priests from other eparchies for religious service in the Crimea. According to the documents, this practice was habitual of the archbishop in Tambov. However, as the Crimea was considered a strategical region for the state, it was impermissible to appoint 'random' priests for religious service there. The archbishop agreed to that and suggested that he should visit the Representative in person on such vital issues instead of sending archpriest John Miloslavov as his messenger.[16]

---

[15] The Crimean eparchy... P. 68.

[16] Ibid., p. 69.

J. I. Zhdanov, the Authorized Representative on the Russian Orthodox Church Affairs Committee of the Crimean government, for a long time was unable to establish good relationships with the new archbishop. The archbishop demanded to alleviate the restrictions on assigning priests to the eparchy from outside the Crimea, to improve his living conditions, to receive a private car promised to him by the Head of the Russian Orthodox Church Affairs Committee. However, sometime later the valuable advice given by Mr Zhdanov on life in the Soviet Crimea defused tension between the Representative and the archbishop.

The archbishop was under surveillance by the Ministry for State Security. According to the reports of the Head of the MGB Crimean Department to his supervisors, the new archbishop was not trusted and mainly disliked. The agents who infiltrated the Russian Orthodox Church reported that the Crimean archbishop was critical of the situation in the Soviet Union: the local people were living in miserable conditions while the Soviet government provided substantial financial support to the countries that became part of the Bolshevist alliance. It is hard to say whether this was true or false, as the informers of the post-war period tended to lie that outstanding Orthodox priest were looking forward to new wars and social upheavals, which is reflected in the corresponding documentation.[17]

As archbishop Luka was a medical scientist, he was interested in the conflict between science and religion. Some of his ideas on life on Earth could not have been well-received by the civil authorities.Here is an illustrative example of the archbishop's sermon in the Simferopol Cathedral on May 11, 1947: 'In atoms, molecules, through all living and dead things the water of life is running. This water is a symbol of existence. Where does this life source come from? It comes from the Holy Spirit's grace. Rivers, seas, oceans arise from the womb of all saints. Our only system is God. We need to disregard all other truths invented by men in favour of the God's truth.[18]

---

[17] The Crimean eparchy..., p. 84.

[18] Ibid., p. 166.

The MGB agents immediately surrounded the independent archbishop. For example, after he was provided with a private car, his driver was recruited by the organs.[19] Other agents informed of the archbishop's attitude to the Soviet school policy, raising of young people, the restrictive role of the authorities in the process of shaping a normal religious life.

The archbishop had another feature that was unpleasant to the authorities. As he was a reputable world-famous scientist, his lectures were attended by a large number of listeners - he was much more popular than the local Crimean professors. This was a reason for envy among the local academic community. Probably this envy leads to claiming the archbishop to be an anti-Semitist: according to rumours, he was against naming the local streets after the famous representatives of the international Communist movement and Marxist classics who were Jews.[20]

After Archbishop Luka started his service in the Crimea, the most frightening thing for the Soviet authorities was the changing attitude of students. Most susceptible were students of medical schools who attended archbishop's lectures on purulent surgery. Many of them were inspired to go to Orthodox churches for religious services and later wrote to their relatives about their changed attitude towards religion. Here are some abstracts from such letters: '...Yesterday at 11 p.m. I went to church for the service held by our surgeon-archbishop. It was wonderful, the service lasted until 5 a.m., and there were many people. I have no idea how I managed to stand till the end - I was not tired at all. Usually, I cannot stand for more than an hour. I saw our students with curd puddings and eggs. In the morning I ate holy bread with my friends.' Moreover, another abstract: 'I was agitated to join Komsomol (Communist Youth League), but instead I went to church on Easter and lit a candle.'[21]

Another question is archbishop Luka's attitude towards the Crimean parishes entrusted to him. He considered the condition of the Orthodox

[19] The Crimean eparchy..., p. 87.
[20] Ibid., p. 168.
[21] Ibid., p. 159.

parishes on the peninsula 'terrible', and in 1948 he was not afraid to mention it to Patriarch Alexey I (Simansky). The independent archbishop could not put up with the closing of Orthodox cathedrals.

There is an exciting example of an argument between archbishop Luka and the local authorities on the Vladimirsky Cathedral in Simferopol. The authorities stated that before the war the cathedral was used as a community centre, and not as a church. Therefore they wanted to relocate the church to a different place and resume the use of the building as a cultural centre (the number of functional Orthodox cathedrals in the city was already reduced at the time of the obliging archbishop Joasaph). Archbishop gave a smart response to the possibility of opening a church according to canonical rules in such a building: 'It was at the time of German occupation when churches were opened even in pigsties.'[22] As we can see, archbishop Luka was very different from his predecessor and other compliant hierarchs of the Russian Orthodox Church Moscow Patriarchy of those years.

It is important to note that position held by the Moscow Patriarchy in the Soviet state had changed. The first post-war years, from 1945 to 1948, are considered to be quite moderate regarding the church-state relationships, as the leader of the Bolshevist state regarded the Church as a tool to implement his foreign policy, a counterbalance to such anti-Bolshevist organizations as the Vatican and Russian Orthodox Church Abroad. However, the changes in the Constantinople Patriarchy and criticism of the policy taken by the Russian Orthodox Church Moscow Patriarchy, expressed by many Orthodox parishes abroad, was not just annoying to the 'Father of the people'but convinced him to restore the previous practices of putting the Russian Orthodox Church under firm control.

In 1948–1949, the number of baptismal services decreased from 10394 to 10093, wedding ceremonies – from 382 to 242, funeral services – from 1913 to 1513.[23] In the same year, the archbishop noted that

[22] The Crimean eparchy... P. 309.
[23] Ibid., p. 446.

psalm readers and priests from other eparchies were almost forbidden to enter the Crimean territories, that is why he had to select candidates from excellent and hard-working peasants, but it was a hard choice to make because many of them were twice married.[24]

The local Representative Zhdanov felt the changes in the church-state relationships and on March 8, 1949, wrote the following in the character reference report on the archbishop: 'He is vain and arrogant, boastful, always reminding everyone that he is a big authority not only for the clergy but the medical community, that he is famous in the Soviet Union, as well as abroad, and the Soviet government largely supported this fame. In conversations, he sometimes shows a negative attitude towards the Soviet government, as in claiming that he spent 11 years in camps without guilt. He also claims that all the clergy sent to detention centres and camps are innocent, justifying his tendency to bring closer and appoint to better parishes those who, as he says, suffered for the faith.'[25] Zhdanov also noted that there was a rumour of relocating archbishop Luka to the Kazan eparchy. According to him, such an appointment would be a relief for many people.

The Crimea could not escape the wave of persecutions. The case of priest Evgeny Rudenko from Yalta is very illustrative. It is interesting to note that the accusation against this priest contained all the stereotypical crimes usually ascribed to Orthodox priests by the Soviet security services of the post-war years: collaboration with the German punitive organs during occupation that lead to death of the Soviet citizens; connection with the leading anti-Soviet emigration organization of the post-war period – the National Alliance of Russian Solidarists; luring children and teenagers with presents and money to serve in church and skip school. It was emphasized that Evgeny Rudenko took the gown in 1947 because he did not want to participate in social labour activities.[26] The lawsuit contained

[24] The Crimean eparchy... P. 446

[25] Ibid., p. 472.

[26] *Archpriest Donenko N. Yalta - a city of amusement and death.* Simferopol, N. Oriadna, 2014, p. 546–550.

much false evidence and defamation provided by secret agents of the State Security Service. The priest was also accused of anti-Soviet statements. The decision of the court was ten years in camps that he spent near Solikamsk. In 1955 the priest managed to return to the Crimea. Archbishop Luka tried to support him as much he could. Archpriest Nikolai Donenko, a famous contemporary researcher on the Crimean New Martyrs, describes the actions of Archbishop Luka as follows: 'Archbishop Luka knew father Rudenko to be a decent priest, and he accepted him to his eparchy, which was very hard at the times of total control by the local Representative.'[27] However, the pro-Soviet activists resumed their persecution campaign against the priest and, exhausted of denunciations; he died in 1961.

The archbishop understood the complicated situation in the Crimea and did not hesitate to express his attitude to those whom he suspected of being cooperative with the Soviet security services. For example, Jacob Kovalenko, archpriest of the Peter and Paul Cathedral at Partizansky village of Bakhchisarai district, was caught by secret agents inviting local schoolchildren to his house and showing the portraits of the Royal family while telling them that life was better in those times. When Archbishop Luka learned about this, he sent for father Jacob and in front of the secret agents reproved him of anti-Soviet propaganda and gave a warning of possible imprisonment. Later Archbishop Luka, worrying about Jacob's fate, shifted him outside the permanent staff stating the cause just as 'old age'.[28]

The Crimea witnessed another sad tendency among the clergy of the Russian Orthodox Church of the 20th century: renunciation of the sacerdotal rite. Thus a young priest Peter Gorbanev from Kerch (archbishop Luka's native city) renounced his rite in 1950. The young priest did not agree to be transferred to a different parish and decided not only to re-

[27] *Archpriest Donenko N. Yalta - a city of amusement and death.* Simferopol, N. Oriadna, 2014, p. 552.

[28] The Crimean eparchy... P. 526.

nounce his rite, but also to expose in a negative light the Moscow Patriarchy. He claimed the following: 'During my service, I witnessed vulgarity, hypocrisy, greed, envy and hideous bargains demonstrated by the clergy. Therefore I decide to cut all the connections with the Church.'[29]

An unusual event, one of those that sometimes happen in the Orthodox community, occurred in the Crimea of the described period. In the house of Olga Konevets, a local woman who ironically lived on the Bezbozhnaya (Godless) street, people witnessed a miracle of icon's renewal. The rumours of the miracle spread fast, and soon many believers gathered in the woman's house. The local government and policemen demanded that Olga Yevgraphovna stop the meetings and cease to misinform the people. The authorities decided to investigate the case of the icon's renewal together with the Crimean eparchy. Priest Nikolai Yeremeev arrived by the archbishop's request and withdrew the icon to place it in the choir gallery of the Cathedral for people to observe it. The archbishop held a service on the icon's renewal, which attracted to it even more locals. However, the agents of the Soviet special services undercover decided to denounce the fact of the icon's renewal and create a special committee to investigate the miracle. As the Soviet agents also infiltrated the committee, they testified that the miracle never happened. After this, the Crimean archbishop wrote to Patriarch Alexey I (Simansky) and asked to consider this icon as unremarkable.[30] Such decision was an absolute victory of the atheistic authorities: the number of people who worshipped the icon decreased, as did the credibility to the archbishop because the people did not believe the investigation results offered by the special committee.

Sadly, this example illustrates a certain conformism showed by archbishop Luka. Even such a prominent archbishop could not defend the independence of the Orthodox Church in the face of the Soviet state and had to make compromises. Probably this is why Archbishop Luka, now stigmatized as a Stalinist and right-winger, would continue to resist the

[29] The Crimean eparchy..., p. 534.
[30] Ibid., p. 626–631.

Khrushchev waves of persecution against the Church during the next post-Stalinist period of his service in the Crimea. He would be a significant obstacle for godless people in their atheist activities.

In this article, we considered two different strategies taken by two archbishops of one eparchy: archbishop Joasaph (Zhurmanov) and Luka (Voyno-Yasenetsky). The first from the very beginning was conformist to the civil authorities, and the local Representative encouraged the closing of Orthodox cathedrals, did not defend clergy from persecutions. The other put the local Representative in place, struggled against the closing of cathedrals, cultivated the flock and tried to defend the clergy from arrests. These strategies represent different paths of the Russian Orthodox Church in the previous century: conformism and opposition, sometimes inconspicuous and implicit, but still supporting the struggle for believers' rights. Unfortunately, most of the Moscow Patriarchy clergy preferred the first path.

*This research is realised with the support of a President grant №7379.2016.6.*

*Ivan Petrov is a Candidate of History and an Assistent at the Institute of History of the Saint-Petersburg State University.*

Alexandra Budanova

# ORTHODOX BROTHERHOOD OF BISHOP MAKARI (OPOTSKY) IN THE SOVIET RUSSIA

## Commencement of the Brotherhood at the beginning of XX century

Nikolay Mikhaylovich Opotsky was born on November 16, 1872, in a family of an official of the Ministry of Internal Affairs. Having graduated from the Belozersk spiritual school and the Novgorod theological seminary, in 1896 has been imposed in the deacon, and less than in a year, his presbyteral hirotoniya was taking place on March 6, 1897. In 1902, after the sudden death of his spouse, Nikolay Mikhaylovich made a firm decision to continue the spiritual education and to take monastic vows. By this time he already had real vicarial experience. In the characteristic given to him by the Novgorod diocese for receipt in the spiritual academy it has been written that he is "a person absolutely sober and in vicarial activity hardworking and vigorous[1]". Serious reflections about Jesus Christ's identity as an example for personal imitation in the life of a Christian have begun by the priest Nikolay Opotsky in the academy. His final composition

[1] Central historical archive of Moscow. Fond 229. Schedule 4. Case 2788. P. 8. Quoted accg. to: Dmitrenko A. I cannot refuse Christ's doctrine. *Opotsky Nikolay, priest. Ideal community and way to its restoration: (Two reports on arrival and reform)*. Moscow: KPF "Preobrazheniye", p. 58.

Bishop Makari (Opotsky), 1925. From the private archive of families Pikiny-Braginy and Belyaevy. Cherepovets.

carried the name "Lord Jesus as Teacher of Life" and has been highly appreciated by the rector of the spiritual academy. At the same time, he got acquainted with N. N. Neplyuev, the founder of the Krestovozdvizhenskoe labour brotherhood. He visited it several times and left there his three young daughters for education and care. Experience of the brotherhood as real embodiment of communal life on bases of evangelical love, realized in modern conditions, having connected to reflections over Christ's identity, have been deeply apprehended by father Nikolay. He also considered "education in belief" as a paramount need for all Christians. On his deep belief, it is impossible to live in accordance with the Gospel without it. Upon termination of the academy, he was full of determination to begin to realize all this. The first brotherhood was created in 1908, straight on arrival in the village of Velebitsy – the place where he was appointed to serve. On July 14, 1921, Father Nikolay was tonsured with a name Makari. On September 14, 1922, his episcopal hirotoniya took place. In 1924, seven years after the beginning of the revolution, Bishop Makari wrote to Patriarch Tikhon that, especially nowadays, when the belief and love have become scanty, Christian education and organization of circles of "adherents", consisting of priests and laymen, is necessary[2]. Moreover, he is ready to work in this field. He was supported by the interim manager of Novgorod diocese – Bishop Seraphim Velitsky. However, because of the urgent need of Cherepovets region, which com-

[2] Dmitrenko A. I cannot refuse Christ's doctrine, pp. 58–68.

pletely was taken over by obnovlenets, Bishop Makari was sent there by Patriarch Tikhon.

## The period of open service in Cherepovets in the mid-twenties

When Bishop Makari arrived at Cherepovets, despite their pronounced "Tykhonoff" line item, until 1926 the relation of civil authorities was reserved and benevolent. When the bishop Makari came to Cherepovets as the suffragan bishop, the main resistance was observed from obnovlenets who constantly wrote denunciations to civil administration (Admotdel) with requirements to stop activities of the Bishop Makari. However, Admotdel decided to wait and did not take any actions. It is possible that the reason was the letter, which the Bishop Makari sent to Administration straight on arrival. There he stated the desire to organize parish work, having formed something like a commune. As it was noted by the Bishop Makari later in 1926 when he had been arrested: "From last two chiefs of GPU - of Kalnig and Shilkind I did not encounter any resistance and even met some sympathy for such original parish work"[3]. Thus, he managed to win time to lay the foundation and to bring together some adherents who would wish responsible active and adult life in Christ. Such people very quickly began to gather around him. Two of his closest assistants arrived at Cherepovets from different places of Novgorod region. These were protodeacon Ioann Pokrovsky and the deacon Andrey Artamonov. The deacon Andrey was imposed by priests and appointed as a private secretary of Bishop Makari. They began to preach actively, went on arrivals much, communicated with people. All of them very quickly gained great authority: churches (parishes) began to leave obnovlenchestvo. For example, one of the young people, Nikolay Lobanov, who voluntarily went in novices to the Bishop Makari, said that Bishop Makari "very well

[3] Archive of FSB Division of Vologda region. Case P-3711, p. 66.

reads sermons and very well explains, so, that to everyone it becomes much more clear"[4].

Assistants of Bishop Makari began to live with him together as a brotherhood in the house provided to him. There were nine people: protodeacon Ioann Pokrovsky with the wife Maria and daughter Vera, father Andrey Artamonov with the wife and three novices from the Parfyonovsky monastery. They not only lived together, but they also had common cash desk and complete agreement of opinion. All of them actively helped the Ruler and also were held in huge respect by people. The Ruler preached after each church service, communicated with parishioners, answered their questions, brought together persons interested in conversations. It was done as in the church, and at home of the brotherhood. Maria Fyodorovna Pokrovskaya was engaged with women, explaining to them how to live together with Christ. She conducted a Bible circle. The protodeacon Ioann taught everyone the church singing. Father Andrey Artamonov was elected unanimously as the prior of Church of the Nativity and was hotly loved by believers. In this church, it was even necessary to move out a wall as it could not accommodate everyone. During this period around the Bishop Makari gathered several dozens of people who did not leave him and each other until the end of mortal life[5].

## Living under different powers of repression

### 1928–1933[6]

Of course, such comfortable existence could not continue for a long time. Despite primary lack of resistance from the authorities, the observation from OGPU was at once established for the Ruler. There was a

[4] Archive of FSB Division of Vologda region. Case P-3711, p. 24.

[5] Ibid., pp. 1–105.

[6] Life of brotherhood in 1928–1937 is reconstructed from the following sources: Archive of FSB Division of Novgorod. Case 1a/12983. Case 1a/3428, Pp. 1–99; State archive of recent history of Kostroma region. Fond R-3656. Schedule 2. Cases 2008 (1), 6220, 6389, 6416; Archive of FSB Division of Vologda. Case 4733.

detailed report provided by its representative Andrianov. As soon as somewhat compromised materials were collected, prosecutions began. In particular, it was written that in the areas, which were under the influence of the Bishop Makari, elections of women delegates failed, nobody entered Komsomol, most people spent all free time in church.

During 1926 and 1927 both the Bishop Makari (Opotsky), and his assistants were arrested and sent out of borders of Cherepovets region: Pokrovsky' family and Artamonov' family. The Bishop Makari was sent to a concentration camp to the Solovki, Pokrovsky and Artamonov – to the Kostroma region[7]. However, the people who gathered around the Ruler and his assistants were not scattered and continued to keep together. They were peasants or ordinary persons, with the education of several classes in parish school but loving God and interested to live in a Christian way.

At the beginning of 1928, the Ruler returned from the camp. However, Metropolitan Alexy (Simansky) under whose supervision he was at that time, didn't recommend him to return to Cherepovets because of availability of a criminal record. The Ruler arrived in Novgorod where he had his own house inherited from parents. It was the land area with two houses and an outhouse. The Ruler went against the state and with the blessing of the Metropolitan Alexy (Simansky) served in various churches of Novgorod. From this time he never had the own parish. Despite this, he at once began to recover a brotherhood, having sent letters to people gathered in Cherepovets. He invited them to move to Novgorod to continue to live together on the same basis as before. There were about twenty people who responded: Kozlov', Pikin', and Belyaev' families moved directly to the bishop's Makari house, to the address Sovetskaya St., 7. They had to arrange dummy purchase of parts of the house, that allowed to legalize their living in Novgorod. Each family had a separate entrance to the house. In the same place, there were living several single members of the brotherhood: Eudoxia Vasilyevna Kapitonova, Feoktista Nikiforovna

[7] Archive of FSB Division of Vologda region. Case P-3711, P. 66, Case P-5722. P. 105.; Interview with E. Pikina.

Aflnicheva, Ekaterina Afinogenovna Hazova. In 1929 another two families: Gorshkovy and Domakovy sold their premises in Cherepovets and purchased a large house in Novgorod, on Srednyaya Konyushennaya Street, 7. There were also some other people living there. Besides, new people from Novgorod also joined the brotherhood. In each house, there was the senior: on Soviet street, 7 – the Bishop Makari himself, on Srednyaya Konyushennaya - Maria Pokrovskaya. Not all those who joined managed to maintain the high requirements which were imposed by the brotherhood. In this case, they could leave it freely. For example, Vasily Nikonovich Korenkov, who arrived with his wife and two daughters Anna and Maria from Cherepovets, did not want to give all the earnings to the common cash desk. After a while, he left brotherhood and went back to Cherepovets together with the wife and the younger daughter. The senior daughter Anna remained to live in the brotherhood in Novgorod.

Seven people oversaw the housekeeping including two cows – one in each house. All others worked in different places, usually Soviet institutions. In the characteristics attached to investigative affairs, it was noted that they worked honestly, having agreed to any social works, except anti-religious ones. There was still common cash desk. This money was being spent not only for needs of Brotherhood members but also for some external things. They regularly sent money to repressed clergy, for example, provided monthly aid of twenty-five rubles to the former Novgorod metropolitan Arseniy (Stadnitsky) banished to Tashkent (Uzbekistan). With the blessing of the lord, there were some other inhabitants: a woman whose son was killed in the war; the brother and sister whose parents had died. They lived in brotherhood's premises, on its complete maintenance, without having any relation to them.

All members of the brotherhood regularly went to church services to the church. Besides that, every day several times prayed at home, read the Scripture on a daily basis. The Ruler still preached continuously during any church services. The main subject of his sermons was: gathering around Christ and treating each other with love. These sermons caused bewilderment in some people, but some, on the contrary, were attracted.

Bishop Makary with clergymen and laymen in Novgorod, 1928–1933. Before the lord in a white scarf – Mariya Pokrovskaya. From the private archive of Borisov' family. Novgorod

There were several priests gathered around the Ruler. They regularly came to his home for consulting on different church problems. They also raised money for the aid to victims of the Soviet regime. So, there was a circle of people, including priests, who communicated with the brotherhood and looked attentively at it. Some of them were considering to join it. Also, there were several people from the broken-up St. Petersburg community of the Father Ioann Egorov "Religion in combination with life". They were utterly different from those arrived from Cherepovets – many of noble families, with high education. Gradually almost all of them, despite these distinctions, after entering the brotherhood, really loved other people not similar to them. On the contrary, they helped people who needed it with the learning of reading and writing.

Despite living permanently in Novgorod, Bishop Makari did not lose communication with spiritual children in Cherepovets. Even more, another brotherhood appeared in Galich, where Ioann and Maria Pokrovskie were banished. Eight people began to live together in Valentina Mikhaylovna Lebedeva's house. Maria Pokrovskaya maintained the connection between these three cities: Novgorod, Cherepovets and Galich going there to help the Bishop Makari to take care of all Brotherhood members.

They were faced with many difficult choices. Where compromises did not concern area of belief, but were necessary for survival, and concerned only with formalities, they accepted them. As it was already stated above, the house of the Ruler was fictitiously sold to three members of the brotherhood. Sometimes, in exceptional cases, they had to make fictitious evil deeds, sham marriages. However, it did not influence any real relationships.

Political apathy was a principled stand of Ruler Makari. He considered that the main reason for a disastrous state of Russia at that time was lack of real Christian education for the majority of people. He conferred the primary responsibility on clergy, and especially, on the hierarchy to which he belonged. He was sure, that the condition of civil power is the consequence, but not the cause. Therefore, he never incited the spiritual children against the Soviet power, but also never called for cooperation with it. Despite this, of course, all charges brought against him and his adherents, were for counterrevolutionary activity.

## 1933–1937

The new wave of repressions swept in 1933. Many people were arrested at the same time in Novgorod and Leningrad. In Novgorod, almost all members of the brotherhood and almost all priests who supported Ruler Makari were placed in prison. Finally, some of them were condemned conditionally; many were banished out of large cities or were sent to corrective-labour camps for three to five years. Bishop Makari and some other people were banished to Arkhangelsk, several people – to the

settlement of Hobda in Kazakhstan. However, even there they managed to live together: in Hobda there were three women: Mariya Alexandrova, Mariya Pokrovakaya and Elena Kozlovskaya. Ruler Makari even created a small brotherhood of five people in the place of exile – the village Zaostrovye near Arkhangelsk. There were three people from Novgorod's brotherhood: Bishop Makari, Eudoxia Kapitonova, Feoktista Nikiforovna Afonicheva; Mariya Arkadyevna Vereshagina from former community of Ioann Yegorov and a priest from St. Petersburg Vladimir Burak. Meantime, people, who were not arrested continued to care for them. They had regular correspondence with people banished to different places, with each other and those, who were living freely. On blessing of the Ruler, several people from the brotherhood visited banished persons. For example, Elena Tyshchenko went from Leningrad first to Arkhangelsk to bring the exiled warm clothes and then visited other sisters in Hobda in Kazakhstan. In both places, she spent several months helping them.

Despite physical absence of Bishop Makari and Marya Pokrovsrkaya, neither in Cherepovets, nor in Novgorod, nor in Galich brotherhoods did not disappear. Fortunately, at the beginning of 1934 Bishop Makari was released from Arkhangelsk on disability and went on retirement. He lodged in Galich, in the house where the small Galich brotherhood lived. To serve in temples with such political unreliability (after two banishments) was not possible. However, it did not mean that spiritual life stopped. A prayer communication was not interrupted but continued. Seven new people from a community "Religion in combination with life" joined the brotherhood. Members of the brotherhood were coming to visit the Ruler in Galich, correspondence continued. In each city, there was a senior – person who could bear responsibility for other people and support Christian life up to high-level standards. In Novgorod in 1936, after return from exile to Kazakhstan, a woman of noble origin - Maria Alexandrova became senior. However, in Cherepovets, there was senior from peasants – Anastasia Gonostaryova. Now there were different types of people leaving together, including women from former aristocratic families to poor peasants from Cherepovets. These were people of absolutely

different social status, origin, education: Lidiya Aleksandrovna Shpynyova was a daughter of the former admiral from Kronstadt, Maria Aleksanlrova was the daughter of a high-ranking official of the imperial government. She was brought up with the governess and a member before the revolution of court circles. Elizaveta Aleksandrovna Drannitsyna was a wife of the former prosecutor of Cherepovets. Larisa Nikolaevna Shtiber graduated from Mariinsky high school. There was a daughter of merchant Nina Titova, and also teachers, workers, shoemakers, middle- class persons, peasants, the former nuns, illiterate women from institutions of deaf persons. There were those who graduated from the Leningrad University, from the Leningrad Institute of technology. However, there were also people with just two or three classes of education in rural schools, people who were completely illiterate who learned to write and read already in the brotherhood as all tried to support each other. "Nothing separated them, neither education, nor rural ignorance. All of them were tightened, wanted to learn everything, it was not necessary to pull, they were brought up themselves," remembered in an interview given 2012 one of brotherhood members Ekaterina Ivanovna Pikina, the middle daughter of Ivan Pikin[8]. For example, Anna Aleksandrovna Patukova, an orphan, she learned in the brotherhood not only to write and read but also she begun to write verses: very simple from the literary point of view but at the same time, with deep spirituality. The spiritual fullness of life along with prayer was expressed in verses about many people: verses were dedicated to (written by!) twenty different people**.** Many verses remained written down in thin notebooks. Of course, it would be incorrect to tell that the common life of such different people in such severe conditions was frictionless. There were both difficulties and contradictions. The letters of one sister to the lord in some places speak about the arising claims and conflicts. Some pages are intentionally cut out, and some names crossed out not to show them to everyone.

[8] Interview of A. Budanova with E. Pikina, 08.08.2012, Cherepovets.

However, daily prayers, the creation of an internal life, tolerance to small miscalculations and uncompromising stand against the evil, sin, violations of norms of Christian life, allowed to keep the relations at the high level and stopped penetration and fixing of unhealthy tendencies.

Contacts between the cities continued. All incoming letters were read during the general meal, so all knew how it was going on in other places. Bishop Makari, living at that time in Galich, repeatedly came both to Cherepovets, and to Novgorod continuing care for the spiritual children. At the beginning of 1937, the brotherly circle totalled about 70 people. It is known that contacts were kept with father Andrey Artamonov, who came to visit Galich's brotherhood at that time. At the same time, on the blessing of Bishop Makari, some people were sent to the place where father Andrey served to help him and his followers on agricultural works. Whether there was a brotherhood or just some people around Father Andrey, remains unknown.

It is known that in 1937 the church situation sharply worsened everywhere. In summer, 1937, bishop Makari made the decision, that due to the strengthening of persecutions on Christians from the godless state, it was necessary for him to pass to illegal status. He understood that he would not be able to survive in case of arrest. His fears were not vain: all Novgorod priests entering Ruler Makari's circle in 1933, in 1937 were arrested. All of them were shot. However, the Ruler worried mainly not about himself, but about the brotherhood which in case of this loss would remain at such hard time without the spiritual care. As it was clear that communication between the cities, in this case, would be complicated, the lord suggested that all who can move to one city – to Novgorod.

The Ruler after moving to Novgorod lodged not in his house, on Sovetskaya Street, 7, but in another brotherhood's house – on Srednaya Konyushennaya Street, 7. There was also the third house on Krestyanskaya zastava St, 31. There began to live five sisters. It was left to the brotherhood by Elizaveta Drannizyna, who was banished to Galich in 1933 and remained to live there. She joined brotherhood in 1935 being in exile.

With this illegal status, Bishop Makari lived until his death in 1941, without going outside. There was no opportunity to serve in any temples. However, it did not mean the extinction of Eucharistic communication and church prayer. Church services continued at home, as the Bishop Makari had for this purpose all necessary things. As the Ruler had an antimension, there was an opportunity to serve even a liturgy. It was regularly celebrated at night so as not to draw attention; all windows were densely curtained. Most likely, at this particular time, the Ruler ordained Vasily Aleksandrovich Kozlov to the priests. The church service took place exceptionally simply. Ekaterina Ivanovna Pikikna recalled that the lord had two big candles which were lit, as a throne the ordinary desktop was used and all walked around it. Brothers and sisters participated in church services in turn not to cause excess suspicions. Fears were not vain: in the fall of 1937, there took place arrests in all three cities: Cherepovets, Galich, Novgorod. NKVD people came at night and therefore a maximum number of people was arrested. In Galich, all members of the Brotherhood were arrested on October 7, 1937. In other two cities, it was the majority, but not all of them. The fact that arrests took place almost at the same time did not give a chance to investigators from the different cities to use each other materials. In the analysis of investigative affairs, it was visible that investigations were led independently from each other. However, the brotherhood suffered very heavy losses. Ruler Makari was hidden under a bed and by miracle avoided arrest. The one who searched looked for under this bed, but either did not see it or saw but pretended that he did not notice. However, all men and some women were shot or sent to the camp. Mariya Alexandrova, Ivan Pikin, Petr Alexeevich Belyaev, priest Vasily Kozlov were shot in Novgorod, priest Ivan Alexandrovich Savichev and Alexey Ivanovich Belyaev were shot in Cherepovets. One sister – Apollinariya Ivanovna Domakova died during the investigation in Novgorod's prison. Many women were banished. It was visible that in case of interrogations defendants were exposed to physical impact: hardness and definition of signatures in protocols of repeated interrogations often strongly differs from signatures of the same people in case of the first interroga-

tions. Ekaterina Pikina also recalled that when her aunt, Pelageya Kirillovna Pikina who was in the brotherhood, went to prison to visit her brother Ivan Pikin, she told that all teeth were beaten out.

However, despite all these things in interrogations, nobody even approximately told about the location of the Ruler, including those people who precisely knew it.

### 1938–1941[9]

In 1938, one more, the weaker wave of arrests took place, but most likely, in connection with a change of a political situation, all have been liberated after just keeping in prison for one or two months.

This time, about three dozen of woman and children who were not arrested, including ones whose parents were repressed, left in the care of brotherhood and bishop Makari. There were three daughters of Ivan Pikin, who became orphans after their father was shot; Belyaevy, Kozlovy. In all there cities only women remained, but all men were sent out or shot.

Despite the illegal status, Ruler Makari kept the communication through correspondence with those who have been banished, also with those who were in other cities. Letters were taken on dictation by any of the sisters and were signed by either their names or assumed names: for example, "Mara" or "The soul loving You". Letters are full of love, care and hope, despite the heavy external living conditions. They managed not to succumb under the circumstances, haven't given in to the total fear which had overtaken many people. There are several poems written in the late thirties by sisters in Novgorod. These verses are full of joy and gratitude to God that hardly corresponds to the surrounding situation. One of them written by Zoya Nikolayevna Gorshkova is called: "Good morning, all on the light!"

[9] There are no official sources after 1937, the reconstruction was made according to interviews with E. Pikina supported by documents from private archive of Families Pikiny-Braginy and Belyaevy.

Ekaterina Ivanovna Pikina, last member of brotherhood, 2012. Photo of E. Ogurtsov. Cherepovets.

The Great Patriotic War aggravated external difficulties of life even more, but couldn't destroy the created unity. In the summer of 1941, Novgorod underwent massive bombardments and fires: according to the words of Ekaterina Pikina, the city burned under legs. From day to day it became more and more dangerous to remain in Novgorod. For example, one elderly sister was strongly hit with a brick during the bombardment. So, the decision to move beyond city boundaries of all children and a part of women was taken: in total there were twenty six people who left Novgorod[10]. Ekaterina Pikina remembered that packing took place very harmoniously: everyone was responsible for collecting of some part of the joint property. For example, Ekaterina Pikina was responsible for taking all books and papers. Every child had a small sack to carry. It contained his document, an icon and some money. All of them went to the wood nearest to Novgorod and stayed there until snow appeared. Some people remained in Novgorod together with Ruler Makari for some days more but then had to leave as well. As Bishop Makari was already very weak and moved with great difficulty, they could reach only the village Vitke five kilometres from Novgorod, where they lived in a deserted rural house. To get some food, they had to visit Novgorod. Usually, two or three people

[10] Ekaterina Pikina produced list with names of people left Novgorod according to this decision. See private archive of a families of Pikiny-Braginy and Belyaevy.

went there. During one such campaign, fortunately, they met other sisters coming out of a forest, for the reason of the absence of any food. Then they lived all together in an ordinary rural hut; they slept by turns on beds, the rest had to sleep on the floor and under beds. Ekaterina Pikina remembered that despite such difficulties they were preserving unity and peace. On November 9, 1941, the Bishop Makari died. Spiritual children buried him in Novgorod, near walls of Archangel Michael Church on Prusskaya Street, having managed to find a priest for the burial service.

## After 1941 – life without Bishop Makari – attempts of preservation of unity and spiritual bonds

After the death of Ruler Makari, the Brotherhood did not manage anymore to get together in a large number. However, they did everything that was in their forces, using any opportunity for shared accommodation, at least for two or three people. They always did the best to get it. For example, when in 1942 many women and girls were sent for works to Germany, several sisters managed to get work with the same owner and lived together. They had tolerant living conditions – they did not starve. They continued to pray together, supported each other, even continued to write verses. They sent food parcels to other sisters who had got work in a factory and were fed very severely.

There was an arrangement to meet after the war in Cherepovets. Here, around three sisters Pikinykh the centre of communication was formed. Of course, not everyone could gather. Many, including all men from the Brotherhood, had died in exile and camps. There was no place to live together, but at first, they managed to meet every day, then it became rarer. They tried to find a priest who could take care of them, but nobody wanted – all of them were afraid very much. They did not manage to find a senior. Some people settled near Novgorod, some in Leningrad. All got a job. For example, Ekaterina Pikina the rest of her life worked as a nurse, her younger sister Maria – as a designer. However, a daily pray and the

Bible and other spiritual reading remained. Ekaterina Pikina had taken with herself a small suitcase with the sermons of Bishop Makari and the Metropolitan Grigory (Chukov), which were written down by hand. There were also some thin notebooks with prayers for the traditional morning and evening rule, and the prayers used in the brotherhood[11].

In the forties and later the remaining members of the brotherhood did not set anymore the purpose of distribution of belief, only maintenance among themselves. However, they tried to pass on this experience to children. Anna Ivanovna Pikina, the senior sister of Pikiny, had four children who since early years were told about Ruler Makari, about his heritage, about the brotherhood. When gathered at a festive table, they read his sermons, held conversations. The photo of the Ruler in episcopal vestments was held during the whole Soviet period in the best place of the living room. The children perceived the sisters of the brotherhood as relatives. All of them took care of each other until the last days of life: taking for permanent care in their families. For example, Mariya Pokrovskaya, then Anna Patukova lived with the Belyaevy until their death. When someone needed care, all sisters decided together who and how could help. After the death of any sister, Ekaterina Pikina collected at her home everything that was related to the brotherhood. Thanks to her several hundreds of notebooks with letters, verses, sermons, conversations, prayers had been preserved – these may pass on further the experience of life and belief and love in challenging conditions of the totalitarian state. Ekaterina died on November 28, 2012, in the hope that this experience will be demanded in the future by the Orthodox Church.

[11] Now part of them is published.: Chosen prayers: from heritage of a brotherhood of the Bishop Makari (Opotsky): author of the preface professor-priest G. Kotchetkov, publisher D. Gasak.- 2nd edition, corrected, added. Moscow: KPF "Preobrazheniye", 2016. Pp. 15–115.

## Conclusion

Summarizing up the results, it is possible to conclude that the position of believers, especially having an active attitude, together with the status of the Church in the totalitarian regime did not allow to develop and to extend to the described spiritual experience, limited it, reduced it to underground or semi-underground status. However, at the same time, it also couldn't destroy and prevent it entirely or to transfer it. The situation of the brotherhood changed in direct dependence on the Church-State relations: from open service, the sermon and collecting of people till 1933, to a gradual transition to a semi-underground situation in the second half of the thirties, and further preservation of spiritual experience in a close circle in the second half of the XX century.

*Alexandra Budanova is a Researcher at the St Philaret`s Christian Orthodox Institute (SFI).*

Solveiga Krūmiņa-Koņkova

# CHURCH AND STATE SECURITY INSTITUTIONS IN THE LATVIAN SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLIC FROM 1944 TO 1970

When we are talking about the situation of the Church during the Soviet regime, it can be summed up as a comprehensive control over the Church, which was implemented by the Communist Party, on the one hand, and the executive bodies, above all, state security institutions, on the other. In this respect, the situation in the Latvian Soviet Socialist Republic was similar to the situation in other Soviet republics.

The primary goal of this paper is to show what might have been relations between state security institutions and the Church in Latvia in the period from 1944 up to 1970. It is necessary to note that the Archives of the State Security Committee or the KGB are still secret in our country, and therefore researchers have to use only secondary sources. In this study, it was also possible to use only such sources as the documents of the archives of the Latvian Authorized Representatives of the USSR Council for the Affairs of Religious Cults and the USSR Council for Religious Affairs as well as personal files of the Representatives of that time. Besides, the correspondence of the Council of Ministers of the Latvian SSR, the so-called "secret folder" of the Central Committee of the Latvian Communist Party and criminal cases of some arrested clergy were studied. Finally, some witnesses of the described events were also interviewed.

Documents found in the archives of the Representatives indicate that the Authorized Representative's institution can be regarded as a front or cover organisation of the Ministry of State Security up to 1954 and the State Security Committee (KGB) after 1954. Biographies of the Representatives of the post-war period also are a good illustration for this suggestion. For example, Jūlijs Restbergs, the Representative of the USSR Council for the Affairs of Religious Cults from 1948 up to 1960, worked in Cheka-OGPU-NKVD in various command and operational positions since 1919[1]. From 1934 up to 1938 he was a member of the Board of the Military Tribunal of the NKVD troops in the Leningrad Region. He played an active role in the Great Terror in 1937 and 1938, along with Georgij Karpov, a major general of the State Security and a Chairman of the USSR Council for the Affairs of Russian Orthodox Church[2]. He had worked together also with Ivan Poljanski, a colonel of the State Security, who became a Chairman of the USSR Council for the Affairs of Religious Cults[3].

It has been found, that the Representative's staff regularly collected compromising materials about the clergy and active church workers. Besides, the Representatives participated in the recruitment of the KGB

---

[1] For a complete biography see: Krūmiņa-Koņkova S. Sadarbība starp LPSR drošības iestādēm un PSRS Reliģisko kultu lietu pilnvaroto LPSR (1944–1954). *Totalitārisma sabiedrības kontrole un represijas. VDK zinātniskās izpētes komisijas raksti.* 1. sējums. Rīga: LU, 2016, 175. lpp.

[2] For his biography see: Krūmiņa-Koņkova S. Sadarbība starp LPSR drošības iestādēm un PSRS Reliģisko kultu lietu pilnvaroto LPSR (1944–1954). [Collaboration between the LSSR KGB and the Representative of the Council for the Affairs of Religous Cults of the USSR in the LSSR (1944–1954]). *Totalitārisma sabiedrības kontrole un represijas. VDK zinātniskās izpētes komisijas raksti. 1. sējums* [Control and Repressions of the Totalitarian Society. Articles of the Government Commission for KGB Research. Volume 1]. Rīga: LU, 2016, 96.–100. lpp.

[3] For his biography see: Krūmiņa-Koņkova S. Kontrole pār baznīcu Latvijas Padomju Sociālistiskajā Republikā un PSRS valsts drošības institūcijas. [Controlling the Church in the LSSR and the State Security Institutions of the USSR]. *Lielais Brālis Tevi vēro: VDK un tās piesegstruktūras.VDK zinātniskās izpētes komisijas raksti. 3. sējums* [The Big Brother Watches You: the KGB and its cover structures. Articles of the Government Commission for KGB Research. Volume 3]. Rīga: LU, 2016, 95.–96. lpp.

agents. Based on the interviews and some documents, we can create a possible scheme of the impressing of a new agent. Here is a quick look at this scheme:

**Step 1.** A potential candidate speaks with a clergyman known to him which might already be an active agent, or a candidate is called up for the conversation with the Representative. In this case, the Representative already has some information about the candidate.

**Step 2.** A visit the Representative, who evaluates the candidate's motivation. Here it should be noted that grounds on which one or another clergyman was ready to become an agent were changing. It was not only compromising materials on the so-called "anti-Soviet activities" during the pre-Soviet times or in the period of German occupation but since the early 1960s the importance to gain practical considerations increased. Such factors were, for example, the opportunity to go abroad, the desire to serve in the most prestigious that is, in the largest and therefore the wealthiest congregations. Other reasons could be the desire not to be regularly sent from one parish to another, or to enjoy the benefits offered by the Soviet system, and so on.

**Step 3.** A meeting with the KGB employees, either in the office of the Representative or in the so-called neutral territory. There already started a conversation about more specific topics and tasks for a potential agent.

There are also documents which point at independent operations conducted by the Representatives with the widespread support of Soviet security institutions. One of such activities was a set of measures to prevent the pilgrims' going to the Basilica of Aglona (in Latgale) to an annual celebration in honour of Our Lady on the 15th of August. Besides, the Representatives also took part in joint operations conducted by the state security institutions which will be briefly discussed further.

From 1941 to 1953, the 'cleaning' of the clergy from the 'anti-Soviet elements' and methodical closure of churches continued throughout the USSR. Such repressions, of course, also hit the two main Christian Churches, that is, Latvian Roman Catholic Church and Latvian Evan-

gelical Lutheran Church. Faithful priests and pastors were discredited and declared as enemies of the Soviet power, and the Churches were gradually remade to marionettes obedient to the Soviet regime. Here is how Bishop Valerijans Zondaks[4] described the atmosphere of that time: "Every Catholic priest in the Metropolia of Riga was waiting when the round of his arrest could come. One waited quietly; another was very nervous"[5].

As an example, an insight into the history of persecution of the Roman Catholic Church in the first decades after the World War II and the restoration of Soviet rule in Latvia will be given. According to the statistics, more than 75 priests of the Latvian Roman Catholic Church were persecuted during the Soviet time[6]. Five priests were already shot in 1941 when the Red Army retreated from the territory of Latvia.[7] The priest and well-known cultural and public figure Aloizs Broks[8] was arrested twice during the Nazi regime and murdered in the concentration camp in Germany in 1942. However, the most of all persecuted priests

[4] Valerijans Zondaks was born in 1908, graduated from the Gymnasium of Aglona and the Theological Seminary of Riga, ordinated as a priest in 1932. After serving in some churches in Latgale, in 1946, he became a Professor at the Seminary. In 1952, he became a Chancellor of the Curia. In 1953, he was arrested and sentenced to 25 years after the Article $58^{1}$, Part 1, and the Article $58^{10}$ of the Russian SFSR Criminal Code. He spent a total of almost seven years in various Soviet prisons and labour camps. In 1966, he became a Professor of the Ecclesiastical Seminary of Riga for the second time. He was also a Rector of the Seminary from 1969 up to 1986. He was consecrated as a Bishop in 1972. He died on the 27th of September 1986.

[5] The State Archives of Latvia, record group 1986, descript. 1, case 21659, vol. 2., 320.

[6] Henriks Trūps-Trops, *Latvijas Romas katoļu baznīca komunisma gados, 1940–1990* [Latvian Roman Catholic Church in the Communist Years, 1940–1990]. Rīga: Romas katoļu metropolijas kūrijas izdevums, 1992, 68–73.

[7] Those priests were Eduards Bekers (1894–1941), Vitolds Paškevičs (1882–1941), SigismundsTabare (1890–1941), Kazimirs Strods (1906–1941) and Vladislavs Litaunieks (1909–1941).

[8] Aloizs Broks was born in 1898, graduated from the Theological Seminary of Aglona, ordinated as a priest by the Bishop Antonijs Springovičs in 1921. From 1921 to 1925 he studied at the Faculty of Theology of the University of Vienna. He was a director of the Gymnasium of Aglona from 1932 to 1940.

were arrested and sentenced by the Special Council[9] of The People's Commissariat for Internal Affairs (NKVD)[10] and Ministry of State Security (MGB)[11]to ten or more years in corrective labour camps after 1944. Some of them died in prison already before the decision of the Special Council. For example, Staņislavs Trojanovskis[12] was arrested on the 30th of January 1945, and he died during the torture in prison on the 15th of February 1945.[13] The same fate befell Viktors Terenkevičs[14], who was arrested in 1950 and died before the court on the 13th of April 1951.[15] Some of the priests simply disappeared. For example, one of such missing priests was Stanislavs Šamo[16], who got lost in 1944 after the arrival of the Red

[9] The Special Council of the USSR NKVD (*Особое Совещание при НКВД СССР*) was created by the decree of Sovnarkom of July 10, 1934. In 1937, the Special Council was allowed to sentence to imprisonment up to eight years. In November 1941, after the beginning of the Second World war, the Special Council was authorised to sentence to death. After the end of the war, the maximum available punishment condemned by the Special Council was 25 years of imprisonment. When NKVD was renamed, the Special Council remained within the corresponding organisation: MGB. Special Council was eliminated in September 1953.

[10] In 1946, the People's Commissariat for Internal Affairs (*Народный комиссариат внутренних дел* or NKVD) was renamed as the Ministry of Internal Affairs (MVD).

[11] The Ministry of State Security (Министерство государственной безопасности СССР) or MGB was the primary Soviet intelligence agency from 1946 to 1954. In 1954, it was reorganised as the Committee for State Security (KGB).

[12] Staņislavs Trojanovskis was born in 1910, graduated from the Theological Seminary of Riga, ordinated in 1938. He served in the several churches in Latgale. After the end of the Second World War, he was accused of "the cooperation with the German occupiers".

[13] Cakuls J. *Latvijas Romas katoļu priesteri, 1918–1995. Uzziņas* [Latvian Roman Catholic priests from 1918 to 1995. References]. Rīga: Rīgas katoļu metropolijas kūrijas izdevums, 1996, 294. lpp.

[14] Viktors Terenkevičs was born in 1907. He graduated from the Theological Seminary of Riga and was ordinated as a priest in 1930. He was a vicar in Rēzekne and Ludza. From 1931 to 1934 he was a teacher at the Gymnasium of Aglona. From 1947 up to 1950 he was a Professor at the Seminary. He was accused of "the cooperation with the anti-Soviet underground group and the agitation against the Soviet regime."

[15] Cakuls J. *Latvijas Romas katoļu priesteri, 1918–1995. Uzziņas* [Latvian Roman Catholic priests from 1918 to 1995. References], 297. lpp.

[16] Staņislavs Šamo was born in 1913, studied at the Theological Seminary of Riga, ordinated as a priest in 1938 by the Archbishop Antonijs Springovičs. From 1939–1940 he was a vicar in Cesis and from 1941–1944 he was a dean of several congregations in Vidzeme.

Army[17]. Antons Juhņevičs[18], in his turn, was arrested in 1946 for his participation in an active struggle against the Soviets. He was sentenced to death by the Special Council and shot on the 4th of February 1947.[19]It is also noteworthy that in 1944, 36 clerics from Latvia went into exile.[20]

A new wave of arrests began in 1948–1949 when in 1948 were arrested eight, but in 1949 – eleven Roman Catholic priests. Among those arrested in 1949 were several priests who were closest to the Metropolitan Archbishop Antonijs Springovičs[21].

On the 25th of July 1947, Springovičs consecrated two bishops: Pēteris Strods[22] and Kazimirs Duļbinskis[23]. On the 12th of May 1949, Kazimirs Duļbinskis was arrested. Several interrogation protocols of Duļbinskis show that investigators are particularly interested in his "criminal relations

---

[17] Cakuls J. *Latvijas Romas katoļu priesteri, 1918-1995. Uzziņas* [Latvian Roman Catholic priests from 1918 to 1995. References], 136. lpp.

[18] Antons Juhņevičs was born in 1905. He learned at the Theological Seminary of Riga and one year – in Poland, at the University of Lublin. From 1945 to 1946 he was a leader of the national partisans' group.

[19] Cakuls J. *Latvijas Romas katoļu priesteri, 1918-1995. Uzziņas* [Latvian Roman Catholic priests from 1918 to 1995. References], 294. lpp.

[20] Ibid., p. 293–294.

[21] Antonijs Springovičs was born in 1876, graduated from the Theological Seminary of Saint Petersburg in 1897. From 1987 up to 1901 he learned at the Theological Academy of Saint Petersburg. He was ordinated as a priest in 1901. He became a Bishop on the 22nd of April 1920 and an Archbishop on the 25th of November 1925. He died on the 1st of October 1958.

[22] Pēteris Strods was born in 1892. From 1911 to 1916, he learned at of Saint Petersburg. In 1916, he was ordinated as a priest. From 1916–1918, he studied at the Saint Petersburg's Roman Catholic Theological Academy. From 1923 to 1926, he studied in Austria – at the Universities of Viena and Innsbruck. In 1926, Strods defended his doctoral theses "*De vita eiusque prima origine*", got the grade of the doctor of philosophy and became a Professor of the Theological Seminary in Riga. When the Seminary resumed its work in 1946, Strods became a Rector. After the death of Springovičs, in October 1958, Strods took all the responsibility of Metropolia's spiritual life.

[23] Kazimirs Duļbinskis was born in 1906. In 1932, he graduated from the Theological Seminary of Riga. In the same year, he was ordinated as a priest. After the consecration, he became an auxiliary Bishop of the Riga Archdiocese. He was *sede impeditus* up to 1988. He died in 1991.

with the Vatican and the national underground"[24]. Duļbinskis was accused after the Article 58[3] and the Part 1 of the Article 58[10] of the Russian SFSR Criminal Code and sentenced to ten years in the corrective labour camp serving his sentence in the special regime camp Mineralny (better known as Minlag)[25]. The Special Council adopted a decision on conviction of Duļbinskis on the 26th of November 1949, but Duļbinskis himself got to know about this judgment only a year later: on the 30th of November 1950[26].

There could be several reasons why Duļbinskis did not know about the verdict of the Special Council for such a long time. First, it was an opportunity to continue the interrogation of Duļbinskis. Second, we should also remember about the psychological consequences which such ignorance could leave on the Bishop. Third, perhaps the most important reason for keeping the isolation of Duļbinskis was to make impossible his communication with other prisoners, thus excluding the chance that he could try in some way to alert them about possible MGB agents or, for example, to find out about what is happening outside the prison's walls. This reason can be evidenced by the letter of Colonel Bokovikov from the LSSR MGB Directorate "A" to the director of the 1st Prison of the Ministry of the Interior of the LSSR Major Apins on the18th of January 1950. Bokovikov wrote: "Before sending to the camp Duļbinskis has to be locked up in solitary confinement, isolating him from other accused persons, depriving of any link with detainees"[27]. Duļbinskis remembered later: "I said that it is illegal and unjust. The investigator answered me: "We are not doing it by ourselves. The minister, the prosecutor and even Moscow know about it""[28].

The criminal case of Duļbinskis contains some documents indicating that the conviction of Duļbinskis is a part of so-called "agency's combina-

[24] The State Archives of Latvia, record group 1986, descript. 2, case 5360, vol. 1, 153.

[25] Mineralny was a special camp for political prisoners within the Gulag system of the Soviet Union. It was established on the 28th of February 1948, based on the Inta labor camp in Komi ASSR.

[26] The State Archives of Latvia, record group 1986, descript. 2, case 5360, vol. 2, 82.

[27] The State Archives of Latvia, record group 1986, descript. 2, case 5360, vol. 2, 62.

[28] The State Archives of Latvia, record group 1986, descript. 2, case 5360, vol. 1, 173.

tions" implemented by the MGB. These materials do not allow to conclude whether those combinations were aimed to the replacement of the leadership of the Latvian Roman Catholic Church, or at least for directing it to the target desired by the VDM, or whether they were a part of a much more extensive operation.Regarding timing, these activities coincide with the "Lursen-S" – the spy game of the Latvian SSR MGB/ KGB with the Great Britain's intelligence service from 1948 till 1954, and possibly that the combinations were related directly to this game.[29]

The isolation of Duļbinskis from the Church also continued in later years, after his release from custody in 1955. On March 1957, Duļbinskis was arrested and imprisoned again. Even after the second release on November 1958, Soviet authorities forbade him to live in the territory of Latvia. After returning in Latvia in 1964, he lived in his father's home in Viļaka and worked in the rural brigade. As Duļbinskis wrote in 1966, Soviet power allowed him to live at the church, but it was forbidden for him to fulfil his episcopal duties, or even serve in the church. Duļbinskis was rehabilitated only on the 20th of December 1988, but, as the historian of the Latvian Roman Catholic Church Jānis Cakuls writes, "the Bishop was already 82 years old, and the episcopal duties he could not fulfil anymore"[30].

In any case, the isolation of Springovičs in the late 1940s was also reached, and it became easy to manipulate him. Similarly, already in 1946,

[29] There are some publications about the possible involvement of Springovičs and some other Catholic priests in this spy game. Nevertheless, in my opinion, the role of the Catholic clergy has not yet been fully elucidated. For this, see: Arhīva lieta "Lursens-S" (LPSR VDK operatīvā spēle ar angļu izlūkdienestu no 1948. gada līdz 1954. gadam) [Archival case "Lursens-S" (USSR KGB operative game with the English Intelligence Service from 1948 to 1954)]. Available in: http://www.historia.lv/dokumenti/arhiva-lieta-lursens-s-lpsr-vdk-operativa-spele-ar-anglu-izlukdienestu-no-1948gada-lidz (01.04.2016.); Turčinskis Z. Katoļu baznīca un čekas operācija "Lursen-S" [Catholic Church and the operation of cheka "Lursen-S"]. *Latvijas Avīze*, 13.03.2016. Available: ww.la.lv/katolu-baznica-un-cekas-operacija-lursen-s-kas-palicis-neizstastits/ ( 20.03.2016.)

[30] Cakuls J. *Latvijas Romas katoļu priesteri, 1918–1995. Uzziņas* [Latvian Roman Catholic priests from 1918 to 1995. References], 294. lpp.

state security authorities replaced the Supreme Board[31] of the Latvian Evangelical Lutheran Church, arresting the Bishop Kārlis Irbe[32] and several other pastors who were loyal to him. Thereby, at the beginning of 1950s leaders of both Churches were willing to make compromises with the Soviet regime.

One such compromise was their involvement in the so-called peace movement. Some archive documents (for example, the correspondence between Restbergs and the Deputy Minister of the LSSR State Security Jānis Vēvers) show that this movement was the operation carried out by state security institutions from the very beginning. For example, one of such documents is the Restbergs' cover letter of the message of Springovičs and Strods addressed to the World Peace Council and dated on the 6th of March 1951. This cover letter contains the following recipients: the Chairman of the LSSR Council of Ministers Vilis Lācis, the Secretary of the Latvian Communist Party Arvīds Pelše and the Deputy Minister of the LSSR State Security Jānis Vēvers.[33]Restbergs forwarded to Vēvers also a copy of a telegram sent by Springovičs and Strods to the delegates of the All-Union Peace Congress. The papers for different peace conferences written by Strods also were coordinated and edited in the highest level of the Latvian government.

Why were state security authorities interested in the involvement of the Church in such actions? Here we could name at least three reasons. First, support and participation of the Church underlined the importance of the peace conferences and other activities of this movement. At the same time, it served as a "proof" that there is religious freedom in the USSR. Second, the clergy's delegations were a cover for activities of the Soviet intelligence service. Third, it was another way to control the

---

[31] *Virsvalde* in Latvian.

[32] Kārlis Irbe was born in 1885. He assumed the responsibilities of the Secretary-General of the Supreme Board of the Latvian Evangelical Lutheran Church in 1944. On September 27, 1944, he was appointed the temporary Archbishop and the President of the Supreme Board.

[33] The State Archives of Latvia, record group 1448, descript.1, case 2, 55.

clergymen involved in the movement, sometimes recruiting them as agents or – just the opposite – discrediting and neutralising them.

Control over the Church remained unchanged also at the time of the Khrushchev's "thaw". The authorities chose only other methods by which they tried to eliminate the influence of the Church: they replaced physical abuse of the clergy less loyal to the Soviet regime with psychological coercion of the clergymen.

As it was mentioned above, the Representatives of the USSR Council of the Affairs of Religious Cults from 1944 until 1960 were professional state security officers.After 1960 they were replaced by party workers with a specialisation in the work of propaganda and agitation. Together with the Department of agitation and propaganda of the Central Committee of the Latvian Communist Party, they were the primary institution that planned and implemented the campaigns of anti-religious or scientific atheistic propaganda in Latvia. However, this does not mean that state security agencies did not take part in these actions.

One of the most visible activities of such campaigns was an abandonment of their posts of several Roman Catholic clergymen. The waiver usually happened with the publication of the clergy's refusal in the central press, and their subsequent involvement in the anti-religious agitation. There is a version that regarding some of those priests the denial of the priesthood was not their own choice, but the KGB forced them to do so. Of course, such a version asks for evidence.

This time it is possible to mention only one event, pointing at such an eventuality. It is linked to the Julijan Vaivod's[34] case. Here it should be

[34] Julijans Vaivods was born in 1895. He studied at the Roman Catholic Theological Academy of Saint Petersburg. He was ordained as a priest for the Metropolitan Archdiocese of Mohilev by Bishop Jan Cieplakin 1918 in St. Petersburg. He came under the jurisdiction of the restored Diocese in the same year. He was sent to serve as a priest in Kurzeme (*Courland*) in 1925. He later came under the jurisdiction of the Diocese of Liepāja when it was created in 1937 and served as the vicar general of that diocese till 1949. He became a vicar general of the Metropolitan Archdiocese of Riga in 1962. He was the Apostolic Administrator of Riga and Liepāja from 1964 and the Cardinal Priest of *Santi Quattro Coronati* from 1983. Vaivods died in 1990.

noted that on the 13th of May, 1958, a court sentenced Julijans Vaivods for two years on the bases of his theological works under Article 58 of the Criminal Code of the RSFSR. This Article was applied for "propaganda or agitation, which invited to subvert, undermine or weaken the Soviet power, as well as for the distribution, manufacture or storage of literature of the same content"[35]. In this case, one of the witnesses was a priest Boļeslavs Zvejsalnieks[36]. He was one of four priests, who kept copies of Vaivod's works. None of them, including Zvejsalnieks, had been arrested and sentenced. However, just a few days after the last hearing, on the 18th of May, Zvejsalnieks renounced priesthood, publishing his "Submission" in the "Cīņa" (Fight), the official newspaper of the CC of the LCP. He wrote: "Convinced that more than ten years I have gone the blind and purposeless road, now I wish to participate actively in the work of communism building. I decide to withdraw from the position of priest and ask to give me a chance to join in work which would be valuable for the society"[37]. A little later Zvejsalnieks became one of the leaders of the anti-religious campaign. Freedom from arrest and imprisonment versus a public renunciation of the priesthood –it is likely that the KGB offered him just such a deal.

A few days later, in the same way, that is, by sending an open letter to the editorial staff of the "Cīņa", one more cleric – Andrejs Mocāns[38] – also

[35] Article 58 of the Criminal Code of the RSFSR. Available: http://www.cyberussr.com/rus/uk-rsfsr.html (07.01.2017.)

[36] Boļeslavs Zvejsalnieks (1927–1993) studied at the Theological Seminary of Riga from 1948 till 1950. He was ordinated as a priest by the Archbishop Springovičs in the Archibishop's Chapel in 1951. From 1951 up to 1958 he served in several congregations in Courland and abandoned the priesthood in May 1958. After leaving the Church, he worked at the Museum of State History and actively read anti-religious lectures throughout Latvia. He was a member of the Knowledge Society of the LSSR. In 1977, he was awarded the title *the Honoured Cultural Worker of the LSSR*.

[37] Zvejsalnieks B. Laikraksta "Cīņa" redakcijai [To the editorial staff of the newspaper "Cīņa"]. *Cīņa*, May 18, 1958.

[38] Andrejs Mocāns (1927-?) studied at the Theological Seminary of Riga. In 1950, he was ordinated as a priest by the Archbishop Springovičs in the Archbishop's Chapel. From 1950 till 1958 he served in several congregations in Kurzeme.

refused from his priesthood. In his letter, Mocāns sharply criticised other priests and also Metropolitan Springovičs: "Many colleagues are only interested in kopeck. I also understood the rude behaviour of our primary setter Archbishop Springovičs who acts inhumanely with the priests which are subordinate to him, as with slaves"[39]. Interestingly, that those two abandonments of priesthood coincided with an ongoing anti-religious campaign, which began directly in May 1958 and took place simultaneously across the USSR. Several publications of the Latvian emigration press of that time characterised those events not only as a part of an anti-religious campaign but also as a KGB operation. For example, the newspaper "Austrālijas Latvietis" (Australian Latvian News) stressed that "in fact, these are the smartly created events. The two "deserters" – there is no doubt about it – are from the Communist midst infiltrated in the Catholic Church, so after these spies could prepare a revolution and vilify the Church. It is significant that they work as priests only since 1950. There is no wonder if shortly "Cīņa" will report that a new "deserter" will arise among Latvian Catholics"[40].

It turned out that the newspaper of Latvian emigrants had been right. In later years, there were still some similar cases with the same scenario. From 1959 to 1970, six more priests refused the priesthood. Those were Jānis Bērtulis, Jāzeps Trukšāns, Jāzeps Šnepsts, Konstantīns Bojārs, Eduards Ūsāns un Alberts Peipiņš. Interestingly, that five of the eight priests who abandoned the Church were from Courland and three of those five – Boļeslavs Zvejsalnieks, Andrejs Mocāns and Jāzeps Šnepsts – at different times had served in the congregation of Tukums.

During anti-religious campaigns, the LSSR press published not only news about the resignation of the priests, but also a variety of feuilletons that exposed the "greed, sexual immorality and other sins" of priests. It

[39] Mocāns A. Laikraksta "Cīņa" redakcijai [To the editorial staff of the newspaper "Cīņa"]. Cīņa, May 28, 1958.

[40] Spiegi sevi atmasko. "Dezertējuši" divi katoļu "garīdznieki" okupētajā Latvijā [Spies unmask themselves. "Deserted" two Catholic "priests" in the occupied Latvia]. *Austrālijas Latvietis*, Nr. 444, July 12, 1958.

should also be noted that some former priests were among the authors of feuilletons. For example, the signature of Jāzeps Trukšāns was below the feuilleton about the priest Gregors Ķibuls.[41] As Ķibuls witnessed, Trukšāns had later said that he signed already a pre-prepared text.

Different feuilletons were often used to launch further campaigns of persecution of individual priests who did not want to fulfil the requirements of Soviet occupying power or were famous in their congregations. Soon after such publications, numerous complaints were written by individual Soviet citizens, and as a result, the Representative urged the Church to think about whether such an "immoral person" can be a priest in general. Perhaps also that the KGB inspired such campaigns to force some of the clergies to cooperate with this state security agency or, vice versa, to revenge when the recruitment was unsuccessful.

A new wave of a close surveillance of the KGB over religious organisations began in 1967, on the 3rd of July, with the Special Report of the head of the USSR KGB Jury Andropov to the Central Committee of the CPSU. The result of this Report was the decision of the Politburo of the Central Committee on the 17th of July about the establishment of the 5thDirectorate of the KGB. The task of this new body was the organising of the "counter-intelligence" work to combat possible "ideological sabotage".[42] The strategy of the 5th Directorate set its attempts to use the Church for the infiltration of KGB agents in various international church organisations, as well as in Western religious schools. This new branch planned to use agents in the misinformation and intelligence work, as well as to form a new layer of the clergy, which would be loyal to the Soviet regime, closely related with the KGB and involved in the Church leadership and the Boards of different international Church organisations.

Currently, we do not have accurate figures on how many operational employees, agents and so-called "KGB trustees" went abroad from the

---

[41] Trukšāns J. Lai nodreb elle [Let hell trembles]! *Darba Uzvara [Labour victory]*, Nr. 113. October 24, 1968.

[42] Lubianka. Organy VChK-NKVD-MGB-MVD-KGB [Lubyanka. The bodies of the Cheka-NKVD-MGB-MVD-KGB]. Moskva: MFD, 2003, 713.

Latvian SSR as members of different Church delegations. Nevertheless, the archival documents show that the membership of delegations offered by the Church was often changed because the so-called "interested organisations" were not satisfied with someone from the delegation, or the Representative recommended to include the persons apparently earning the trust of the officials. Instructions about what should be the report on a foreign trip as well the reports of the clergy on such tours also can be found in archives.

Work on the infiltration of the KGB agents in the international religious organisations had already begun before 1967. For example, on the 10th of April 1962, the Chairman of the USSR Council for Religious Affairs Aleksei Puzin[43] invited the Representative Prolet Liepa[44] to come to Moscow for discussing how to implement the Directive concerning the joining of the Latvian Evangelical Lutheran Church to the World Council of Churches. Liepas' archives stored the extract from the protocol of those consultations. The document proves the existence of instructions about the preparation of materials for accession to the World Council of Churches. There was a list of Churches, which would be appropriate for this Council. The involvement in the Council was to take place according to a calendar plan. In 1995, Russia made public some KGB documents which show the functioning of the KGB agencies in the Russian Orthodox Church and also between its delegates in the World Council of Churches. For example, on August 1969 in the Central Committee of the

[43] Aleksei Puzin (1904–1987) was was a party worker, engaged in the organisation of propaganda and agitation. He was the Chairman of the USSR Council for Religious Affairs from 1957 up to 1965. Mor about him see: Krūmiņa-Koņkova S. Kontrole pār baznīcu Latvijas Padomju Sociālistiskajā Republikā un PSRS valsts drošības institūcijas. [Controlling the Church in the LSSR and the State Security Institutions of the USSR], p. 106.

[44] Prolet Liepa (1923–1978) was the Representative of the USSR Council for the Affairs of Religious Cults, and the USSR Council for Religious Affairs from 1962 to 1978. For his complete biography see: Krūmiņa-Koņkova S. Kontrole pār baznīcu Latvijas Padomju Sociālistiskajā Republikā un PSRS valsts drošības institūcijas. [Controlling the Church in the LSSR and the State Security Institutions of the USSR], p. 111–113.

Council as representatives of the Russian Orthodox Church participated seven KGB agents.[45] We can assume that a similar agency work also took place in Latvia.

Most likely that some of the clergymen of the Latvian Church agreed to cooperate with the state security bodies, but the majority of the clergy and their parishes lived in constant psychological stress and fear to be subjected to questioning in the so-called "Corner house", the headquarters of the LSSR KGB. Moreover, such mental persecution continued until the end of the Soviet occupation regime in Latvia.

*Solveiga Krumina-Konkova is a Doctor of Philosophy. She is a leading researcher at the Institute of Philosophy and Sociology of the University of Latvia.*

---

[45] CA KGB SSSR. F. 5, op. 14, № 529, d. A 63, l. 204. Publicēts: Aleksei Chelnokov. *"Bogorodica progoni!" Kto zakazal "naezd" na cerkov'?* Moskva: Litres, 2013. S.7.

Galina Sedova (Sister Euphrosyne)

# THE CHURCH AND STATE RELATIONS IN LATVIAN SSR: WORK OF THE AUTHORIZED COMMISSIONERS OF THE COUNCIL FOR THE RUSSIAN ORTHODOX CHURCH IN 1944–1954

After World War II, the attitude of the state to the Russian Orthodox Church in the Baltic region was much more negative than in the USSR in the whole.[1] It was connected with the service of the Metropolitan of Lithuania and Vilna Sergius (Voskresensky; 1897–1944), Exarch of the Baltic States. During the war Pskov Orthodox Mission was created by him, its activities extended to the territory of Latvia and the north-west of Russia, occupied by the Nazis. Metropolitan Sergius quite boldly and publicly said about "the greatest evil that Bolshevism is for the civilized world".[2] In the future, his statement was qualified as

[1] Shkarovskii M.V. *Russiaia Pravoslavnaia Tserkov' pri Staline i Khrushcheve* (1999). Moskva: Obshchestvo liubiteleitserkovnoi istorii. P. 332.

[2] Latvijas Nacionālā arhīva Latvijas Valsts kino foto fono dokumentu arhīvs (etc.– LNALVKFFDA) LNALVKFFDA P-1028. K/ž "OstlandWoche" Nr. 95. Režisors nav zināms. 1944. g.–1.; Shkarovskii M. V., sviashchennik Il'ia Solov'ev. *Tserkov' protiv bol'shevizma* (2013). Moskva: Izd. Obshchestva liubitelei tserkovnoi istorii. P. 4.

anti-Soviet one. In 1944, he was killed under mysterious circumstances, and many clerics were subsequently arrested for "active aiding the German invaders."[3]

With the establishment of the communist regime in Latvia, violent Sovietization concerned traditional churches, including the Latvian Orthodox Church. By the resolution Nr 628 of The Council of People's Commissars (from now on – CPC) dated May 29, 1944, the structure of authorized commissioners of the Council for Russian Orthodox Church at the Council of People's Commissars in Latvian SSR was set up.[4] It had All-Union subordination to the Council of the Russian Orthodox Church at the Council of People's Commissars of the USSR, and its main activity was the implementation of the relationship between the supreme executive authority – the CPC of Latvian SSR and the authorities of the Orthodox associations operating in the territory of Soviet Latvia. According to the instructions concerning the activities of the Council for Russian Orthodox Church at the Council of People's Commissars in Latvia SSR operating in the territory of the republic, their functions and competencies included the following things: to monitor the enforcement of laws and government regulations relating to religious cults; to inform the government of state of the Diocese, its situation and activity. Finally, to give the party and government conclusion in all matters which concerned the activities of religious organizations; to carry out registration of existing (Orthodox) religious associations and groups, churches, prayer houses, as well as the clergy; to take measures to prevent underage participation in the worship, to weaken the material base of the "clergy" and the organization of scientific-atheist propaganda in the territory of Latvian SSR, the

---

[3] LNALVA, 1986. f., 2., apr., 2. l., 158. lp.; Golikov A., sviashchennik. Fomin S. Krov'iu ubelennye. *Mucheniki i ispovedniki Severo-Zapada Rossii i Pribaltiki (1940–1955). Martirolog pravoslavnih sviashchennosluzhitelei i tserkovnosluzhitelei Latvii, repressirovannyh v 1940 –1952 gg. Zhizneopisanie i materiali k nim.* (1999). Moskva: Palomnik. P. 107.

[4] Obrazovanie Soveta po delam Russkoi Pravoslavnoi Tserkvi (14.9.1943). *Izvestia,* 1943, 8.10; Gosudarstvennyi Arhiv Rossiiskoi Federatsii (etc. – GA RF) GA RF. F. P-5446. Op. 44. D. 779. L. 1.GA RF. F. P-6991. Op. 2. D. 29. L. 4.

prevention of religious pilgrimage to the holy places; to carry out registration of existing religious organizations and groups, churches, prayer houses, as well as the clergy.[5]

In 1945, the Council of People's Commissars of Latvian SSR adopted a resolution Nr 914, which demanded the entire county, municipal and central institutions and agencies to solve all ongoing activities related and relevant to the issues of the Orthodox, with the Council for Russian Orthodox Church at the CPC in Latvian SSR.[6] As already noted, in the period under review N. Smirnov (1899–1949) and A. Sakharov (1919–2013) were the Authorized Commissioners, who played a key role in the establishment of a relationship between the leadership of Latvian SSR and the Riga diocese. Status of the position was stipulated at the highest level. There was an illustrative fragment of a secret letter by the manager of the CPC of Latvian SSR O. Stanke to the Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party (B) of Latvia Y. Yurgens with the directives of Molotov addressed to the Chairman of the CPC of Latvian SSR V. Lacis regarding the creation of conditions for the work of the newly organized structure. According to the official directive, they should be provided with "food and manufactured goods on par with the heads of the departments."[7] Thus, from April 1, 1945, those authorized received monthly food limit for 300 rubles and manufactured goods for 750 rubles per quarter.[8]

## Sovietization of Church

Post-war life of the Orthodox Church in Latvian SSR was gradually restored. However, as the chair of the Church was vacant for a long period, then the decision of the Patriarch of Moscow and All Russia Alexis I

[5] Latvijas Nacionālā arhīva Latvijas Valsts arhīvs (etc. – LNA LVA), LNA LVA, 1452. f., vēst. izziņa, 3. lp.

[6] LNA LVA, 938. f., 6. apr., 91-a l., 85. l.

[7] LNA LVA, 270. f. 1-c. apr., 1/2. l., 29. lp.

[8] Ibid.

(Simansky; 1877–1970) temporarily determined to rule the Riga diocese by Archbishop Gregory of Pskov and Porkhov (Chukov; 1870–1955). In March 1945, he arrived in Riga. With his participation, the autonomous Latvian Orthodox Church was reunited with the Russian Orthodox Church, which had been in the jurisdiction of the Patriarchate of Constantinople. Archbishop Gregory was to direct church affairs of the Riga Diocese properly.[9] The Moscow Patriarchate built vertical ecclesiastical authority on the canonical territory of the Russian Orthodox Church, and in particular in the Baltic that regime subsequently used for the Sovietization of the Church. By the end of 1945, Archbishop Gregory was released from obedience entrusted, and soon the Diocesan Council received an order from the Moscow Patriarchate for the appointment of a temporary administrator of the Riga Department. It became Archbishop of Vilnius and Lithuania Cornelius (Popov; 1874–1966)[10], who was in Vilnius. After its approval, he began to build the inner life of the Riga Diocese and the dialogue between the State and the Church.

According to Communist doctrine, the Church was separated from the state and the governing parties in Latvian SSR needed to create conditions for the development of church-state relations. As stated previously, for this mechanism to work, it was necessary to incorporate the Church in the Soviet system, using tactics to neutralize it, or, if to use the official language –to "Sovietize the church". So it was written in a memo to Moscow by the chairman of the Bureau of the Central Committee of the CPSU (b) of Latvian SSR Ryazanov.[11]Using the tactics of the "neutralization" of the Church, the NKVD carried out operations to eliminate the active hierarchy, followed by the arrests and sending to the camps, and then picking up and promoting people more loyal to the regime. It concerned both the Primates of the Roman Catholic Church

[9] LVA LVA, 7469. f., 1. apr., 79. l., 133. lp.
[10] Ibid., 87. lp.
[11] Zubkova E. Iu. *Pribaltikai Kreml'* (2008). Moskva: ROSSPEN. P. 201–202.

and the Evangelical Lutheran Church of Latvia.[12] In this connection it is appropriate to point out the so-called "special folders" of MGB and the MVD, containing reports on the activities carried out after the war to clean Latvian SSR from "hostile elements", the reports were sent in the names of Stalin, Molotov and Malenkov. In the secret reports, security officers reported the country's leadership about the development and implementation of plans for the agent-operative activities related to religious cults in Latvian SSR. Thus, the church life of the Riga diocese was under the direct control of the security services and party-ideological apparatus.

An important stage in the church-state relations took place in January 1945 after the Local Council of the Russian Orthodox Church, where the "Regulations of the Russian Orthodox Church" were adopted.[13] The main theses of the "Regulations" states: "In the Russian Orthodox Church, the highest authority in the field of doctrine, church government and ecclesiastical court – legislative, administrative, judicial – belongs to the Local Council, periodically convened and composed of bishops, clergy and laity."[14] The first section identified, "the rights and duties of the patriarch in the real existence of the church in the Soviet state."[15]Subsequent sections were dedicated to the activities of the Synod, the diocese and the parish. The last section caused arguments and was accepted, but with the wording: "At the head of each parish community of believers there is rector appointed by the diocesan bishop for the

[12] Latvija Padomju Savienības sastāvā. 1945–1968. Padomju režīma īstenotā politika pret Baznīcu. 1945–1947. Dokumentu krājums. *Latvijas Vēsturnieku komisijas raksti. 22. sējums.* Rīga: Latvijas vēstures institūta apgāds, 2008. 281.–285. lpp.

[13] GA RF. F. P-9401. Op. 2. D. 92. L. 212–219.

[14] Polozhenie ob upravlenii RPTS, priniatoe Pomestn'm Soborom RPTS 31.1.1945 //Pravoslavnii tserkovnii kalendar' *na 1946 g.*(1946). Moskva: Izd-vo Moskovskoi patriarhii; Polozhenie ob upravlenii Russkoi Pravoslavnoi Tserkov'iu (31.1.1945). Dokument № 137. V knige: *Russkaia Pravoslavnaia Tserkov' v sovetskoe vremia (1917–1991). Materialy i dokumeiti po istirii otnoshenii mezhdu gosudarstvom i Tserkov'iu.* Kn. 1. Shtriker Gerd (red.) (1995). Moskva: Propilei. P. 349–355.

[15] Ibid. C. 349.

spiritual guidance of believers and clergy, and their control."[16] Thus, the "Regulations" endowed patriarch, the bishop and the clergy broad rights in that the historical situation and was a concession to external conditions.[17] The "Regulations" raised doubts and a lack of confidence among church people, but everything was blamed on "ambiguities of political necessity."[18]

The "Regulations" did not contradict the current legislation of the USSR and were approved by the CPC for the implementation of the executive power in the field.[19] In this regard, the Chairman of the CPC of Latvian SSR V. Lacis and authorized Smirnov prepared the first order to all the chairpersons of county, city and district executive committees of Soviet Latvia to place the activity of the Orthodox societies in»organized channel».[20] The Soviet regime imposed strict control over the activities of the Orthodox Church. Starting from June 1945, in the Diocese of Riga registration was initiated of the following: Orthodox religious communities, the executive bodies and audit commissions of parish communities, clergy, churches and houses of worship.[21]Local authorities and the NKVD had to watch together the public order in the parish meetings.[22] The control over the execution of the "Regulations" was put on the commissioner Smirnov.All materials for registration of parish communities had to be sent to the office in the name of the official.[23] It should be repeated, that according to the "Regulations" officials did not have the function to interfere in the administration, and even more so in the canonical and dog-

[16] Ibid. C. 349–350.

[17] *Russkaia Pravoslavnaia Tserkov' v sovetckoe vremia* (1995). Ukazannoe coch. P. 351–355.

[18] *Russkaia Pravoslavnaia Tserkov'XX vek.* Beglov A.L.,Vasil'eva O.Ia.,Zhuravskii A. V. i dr. (red.) (2008). Mokva: Izd-vo Sretenskogo monastyria. P. 359.

[19] Ibid. C. 360.

[20] LNA LVA, 270. f., 1-c apr., 161. l., 32. lp.

[21] Ibid., 32. lp.

[22] Ibid., 34. lp.

[23] Ibid.

matic life of the Church, but as subsequent events show, in practice it was not respected.[24]

The next stage of the state-church relations was the procedure of registration of religious communities, which was as follows: to ensure that the faithful could come and pray in the church, it was necessary to create a parish community, which would have to consist of at least 20 people and was called the "twenty".[25] In addition, the parish active believers elected their board and audit committee of the community. According to the "Regulations" of 1945 the Church Council consisted of 3 people and the Rector. He served as Chairman of the Church Council and recommended for the posts – the elder, his assistant and the treasurer. All nominations were personally approved by the local authorities, then the parish "twenty" wrote the petition: the first –to the executive committee of the local Council, and the second –to the official of the Council for Russian Orthodox Church at the CPC of Latvian SSR for registration.[26]

The procedure included a requirement to list believers with detailed personal data, for the founders of the community, as well as for candidates to the church council: name, age, nationality, place of work, place of residence, a conviction if it was, as well as a personal signature.[27] All data were personally checked and authenticated by a notary or local government. It is interesting to note, that if the community did not find a person who could serve the cult for three months, it was closed.[28] The similar questionnaire was filled by the clergy and provided details of the following: name, ordained, the year and month of birth, a detailed list of previous service or employment, residence, if the person was in German-occupied territory, and what he did during the occupation, and the

[24] LNA LVA, 270. f., 1-c apr., 161. l., 35. lp.
[25] LNA LVA, 1452. f., 1. apr., 72. l., 2. lp.
[26] LNA LVA, 270. f., 1-c apr., 161. l., 21. lp.
[27] Ibid., 22. lp.
[28] Ibid.

criminal record.[29] The correctness of the information was personally certified by the priest of the parish and the chairman of the executive committee. After registration the Soviet authorities issued two normative acts: a certificate of registration of the parish community and the certificate of registration of the Audit Committee of the parish community. The registration act said: "The parish enjoys all the rights and obligations laid down by current USSR laws and regulations of the Government on religious associations, as well as the Regulation on the management of the Russian Orthodox Church adopted on the 31 of January, 1945 at the Local Council of the Russian Orthodox Church and approved by Resolution of the CPC".[30]

These regulations were stored in the church council and were presented at the first request of the Soviet authorities. Minutes of the meeting of the parish community and the list of those elected to the executive body and auditing committee of executive authority were forwarded to the authorized state official.[31] In addition, at the request of officials: first, all county and city executive committees, as well as executive committees of Riga had to provide the number of active churches and chapels, as well as all the materials for registration. Second, the Diocesan Council was obliged to submit detailed information on churches, the clergy of the diocese and the parish active people. As it was mentioned earlier, the authorized official had to perform control and operational supervision over the activities of religious communities, the clergy and the faithful. Thus, the regime received a wealth of information, which was used not only against the Church but against their own citizens.

[29] LNA LVA, 270. f., 1-c apr., 161. l., 22. lp.
[30] Ibid.
[31] Ibid.

## The struggle against bourgeois ideology

The distinctive and characteristic feature of the internal situation of those years in Latvian SSR according to the power structures, was misreading of the nature of the Soviet system by the public, which contributed to a favourable soil for anti-Soviet activities.[32] The security services tracked and collected detailed information about the mood of the population in the liberated areas. For example, the chairman of the Bureau of the Central Committee of the CPSU (b) in Latvia N. Shatalin in a letter to Stalin in 1945, noted that the mood was difficult to describe precisely, but in his opinion, it was cautious, and in some cases hostile.[33] The authorities had many problems of the postwar period, but the primary goal was a vital integration of Soviet values into the general ideological system, based on fundamental ideological issues. The Soviet propaganda machine in the face of Glavlit (main structure of literature), sought out and suppressed dissent manifested in Latvian SSR, and actively worked on clean-up of book collections in libraries, warehouses. They destroyed politically harmful literature, where they found "fascist, bourgeois nationalist and White emigre ideology of literature, published in Berlin, Riga, Paris and other cities."[34] The information of a person in charge of political education institutions of the Central Committee of the VC (b) of Latvia showed that the withdrawal of "outdated and politically harmful books"

---

[32] LNA LVA, 270. f. 1-c apr., 161. l., 22. lp.

[33] *Latvija padomju režīma varā 1945–1986. Dokumentu krājums*. Atb. red. I. Šneidere. Rīga: Latvijas vēstures institūta apgāds, 2001, 102.–108. lpp.; Levits, E. Latvija padomju varā. *Latvijas Vēsture.* 1991., 1/2. 9., 54.–57. lpp. Sovetskaia propaganda na zavershaiushchem etape voiny (1943–1945 gg.). *Sbornik dokumentov*. Livshin A.Ia. I Orlov I.B. (red.). Moskva: ROSSPEN, 2015, s. 92.

[34] Rossiiskii gosudarstvennii arhiv sotsial'no-politicheskoi istorii (etc. – RGASPI). RGASPI. F. 17. Op. 125. D. 320. L. 146–149; Elena Zubkova.«Drugoi SSSR»? Osobennosti realizatsii sovetskogo proekta v respublikah Baltii (1950–1960-e gg.) Pirmā un otrā padomju okupācija (1940–1941, 1945–1990): sovetizācija un tās sekas. *Latvijas Vēsturnieku komisijas raksti. 25. sējums.* Rīga: Latvijas vēstures institūta apgāds, 2008, 680. lpp.

was slow, sometimes even confiscated literature was lying in the rooms of libraries unpacked and sealed.[35] At that time, the Orthodox parish library did not come to the attention of specialized services and was not touched, but they came back to it a little later.

The Soviet regime used different techniques as an ideological propaganda, such as religious traditions of holidays in Latvia SSR, as well as the traditional song festivals which were made "into major cultural and political events in the lives of working people."[36] However, as it was shown by educational work among the youth, religious communities continued to have an impact on young minds, preventing them from "participation in the building of socialism".[37] Interestingly there was also a list of specific topics discussed by ordinary people; it concerned not only the issue of the Red Army, government, economics, earth, international environment, but also topics of religion. For example, such as: "Will a church service be allowed in churches?" "Where can we get a pastor for worship?" "Will the churches be closed?" Moreover, the most important: "Is it true that believers are persecuted, and even shot in Russia?"[38] With probability, we can say that in Latvia SSR there was still a high percentage of practising Christians, and they showed themselves very active, which caused some concern of the Party and the ideological apparatus and intelligence.

The first few years after the war, the authorities collected information on the Riga Diocese; it came from the Diocesan Council from rectors of parish communities.[39] Orthodox Church ranked third after the Evangelical Lutheran and Roman Catholic churches in Latvia. Orthodox Church

---

[35] LNALVA, 270. f., 1-c apr., 111. l., 2. lp.

[36] LNA LVA, 270. f., 2. apr., 5599. l., 9. lp.

[37] Butulis I. Padomju kultūrpolitikas aspekti dažos latviešu padomju preses izdevumos (1945–1949). *Latvijas Vēsturnieku komisijas raksti, 13. sējums.* Rīga: Latvijas vēstures institūta apgāds, 2004, 428.–429. lpp. Latviia navstrechu 100-letiiu strany. Feldmanis I. (red.) (2016). Rīga: Jumava, s. 425; *Sovetskaia natsional'naia politika: ideologiia i praktiki 1945–1953.* Sbornik dokumentov. Kosheleva L. P., Khlevniuk O. V. (red.). Moskva: ROSSPEN, 2015, s. 242.

[38] RGASPI. F. 17. Op. 118. D. 466. L. 66–70.

[39] RGASPI. F. 17. Op. 125. D. 235. L. 140–142.

of Latvia after World War II, consisted of 123 active parishes that that belonged to 9 deans' districts. The number of the Orthodox faithful was about 60 000 people with children. Orthodox communities were in all areas of Latvia SSR, but in more significant quantities, they were in Latgale, Vidzeme and Riga.[40] Influence of the Church on social and political life in Latvia SSR was characterized by authorities as negative, concerning the facts of everyday life.

As an example, if the big religious holidays Christmas and Epiphany fell on weekdays, the peasants went home and did not go to work, which naturally caused an adverse reaction from the authorities.[41] In contrast to the near Pskov region, where Orthodox churches after the closure were used in the best case for museums and granaries, Christian traditions were alive in Latvian society. Churches were not closed, and the faithful attended the service, the faithful families read the Bible, and religious literature was published before the war in the Republic of Latvia. Many icons were in the home, and the priests were respected among the population, and they wore church clothes but not casual ones. All these things the authorities evaluated as elements of the bourgeois foundations. According to believers, everything began to change after the deportation of 1949. As an example, after the searches and detentions of people the icons were lying in the yards in Riga, they could not be picked up and carried up. For the purpose of care, all religious objects were hidden in homes to remove from prying eyes, or taken in the churches because people lived in anticipation of new repression.

## Activities of the authorized commissioner

By studying of the activity of the authorized commissioner Smirnov, we should indicate that his job was lined up in close cooperation with the party-ideological apparatus of Latvia SSR. He always coordinated all

[40] LNA LVA, 270. f., 1-c. apr., 161. l., 4.–5. lp.
[41] Ibid., 5.–7. lp.

issues with the nomenclature, even at the expense of the line recommended by Moscow in their relations with the Orthodox. As an example, there was a document to the Council, in which he reported on the work done in 1947. It indicated that Smirnov several times visited the Secretary of the CC CP (B) of Latvia and other employees of the Central Committee with the reports "about the situation and the activities of the Orthodox Church in the country".[42]It is known that the secretary of the CC CP (B) of human resources F. Titov was visited by the Commissioner quarterly with reports on his activities, including those concerning the issue of the arrival of Metropolitan Veniamin (Fedchenkov; 1880 – 1961) from the US to the Department of Riga.[43] Regularly Smirnov visited Secretary of propaganda and agitation A. Pelše. At these meetings, they had detailed coverage of the topic including the conclusion of agreements with the Orthodox communities to transfer their churches and church property. The arrival of the Metropolitan Veniamin was also on the agenda of talks.[44] At the meeting with the First Secretary of the CC CP (B) of Latvia J. Kalnberzins main topics were the activities of the Orthodox Church in Latvia SSR, everyday work of the authorized commissioner, in particular, the reception of visitors - the clergy, their complaints to other organizations. The arrival of the bishop of the United States was not unnoticed as well.[45] The Commissioner repeatedly visited the Chairman of the CPC of Latvia SSR V. Lācis, but unfortunately, the details of the meeting were not disclosed in the report. Characteristically, all meetings took place at the initiative of Smirnov, and he did not send written information of reports to the heads mentioned and reported them only personally and orally. As it can be seen, the official was prudent and cautious. Therefore, the work of the authorized commissioner Smirnov in the Central Bureau of CP (b) Latvia was never discussed, and he always previously negotiated

[42] LNA LVA, 1452 f., 1. apr., 53. l., 16. lp.
[43] Ibid., 44.–45. lp.
[44] Ibid., 44. lp.
[45] Ibid.

the topics with the deputy heads of the propaganda department of the CC CP (b) and Latvia Tolmadzhev and Strods.[46]

We cannot but say about the difficulties encountered in the initial stage of the official. For example, when peaceful life started in 1945, various departments began to receive requests addressed to the Commissioner on the situation in the Riga diocese of Latvian SSR. One of the first letters was received from the Deputy Chief of the Baltic Military District, Major-General Shadilov. The Commissioner prepared materials about Orthodoxy and added comments about the negative impact of the Church on workers.[47] About all these things he reported to his superiors in Moscow, but the centre sent strict instructions – without coordination, information about Orthodoxy could not be given to anyone. Apparently here we faced the struggle of interests of the authorities, and it can be emphasized that intelligence agencies supervise religious questions.

Under the constant supervision, there was the situation associated with the return of immigrant priests who were forcibly taken away by the retreating Nazis to Germany. Arriving home, the clergy, of course, appealed to the Diocesan Council with a request for obtaining the parish to serve first and foremost a certificate of registration, but how to deal with newcomers, no one knew. As directed by the state security services, people arriving in Latvia SSR passed through filtration points.[48]At the same time, there was a statement from Moscow dated 13 August 1948, which stated on the application of the passport regime regarding priests in Latvian SSR.[49] A secret document noted the revision of the composition of the clergy, and especially those who had passport restrictions. All actions had to be consistent with the organs of the MGB, and Council for Russian Orthodox Church would have information indicating the

[46] LNA LVA, 1452 f., 1. apr., 53. l., 44. lp.
[47] Ibid., 45. lp.
[48] Ibid.
[49] Ibid., 16. lp.

motivation regarding not appropriate residency of the clergy. The cities for such restriction were mainly Riga, Liepaja and Ventspils, with the further instructions: "In the future, it is necessary to remove those whose presence is considered undesirable ... for one reason or another. However, this should not have a mass character".[50] Further work was carried out with clerics who returned from Europe, and those who had been imprisoned under particular scrutiny. First of all, the authorities paid attention to those who were returning from Germany, Poland, and also from Kurzeme.[51]

## Strict control over diocesan life

The Commissioner had difficulties associated with the nationalization of the property of religious organizations, which could be realized only in 1948.[52] Nevertheless, at the direction of Moscow, registration of the Orthodox parishes of the Riga diocese was conducted since 1945, though the work took place very slowly, and it was not possible to complete the process. One of the main reasons was the factor that the Commissioner did not understand the way of life of the Latvian society, and did not know the Latvian language. At the same time, disadvantages of the official overlapped with his unquestioning execution of instructions of the local authorities,

During the short period of his tenure, Smirnov proved himself as a strict official. This was due to the following reason, as the Riga Department after the war did not have a permanent bishop, so the authorized commissar was the master of the situation. It is true that with the arrival to the chair of the Metropolitan Veniamin (Fedchenkov) the situation changed in 1948. However, first, the bishop had in a letter to the patriarch

---

[50] Beika, A. Filtrācijas dokumenti liecina. *Latvijas Arhīvi,* 1994, Nr. 1. 48.–63. lpp. Riekstiņš, J. Ar varu un viltu. Repatriantu atgriešanās Latvijā 1945.–1953. gadā. *Latvijas Arhīvi,* 1994, Nr. 1, 55.–59. lpp.

[51] LNA LVA, 1452. f., 1. apr., 85. l., 32. lp.

[52] Ibid., 32. lp.

of Moscow and All Russia Alexis I (Simansky) and the Council for Russian Orthodox Church in CPC in the name of Karpov to report on the difficulties encountered by the bishop in the diocese of Riga due to the intervention of the official.[53] It should be noted that after such a solid defence of the interests of the church by the bishop who newly arrived from the United States, the high Soviet officials considered it appropriate to remove such an independent person from Latvia SSR due to his anti-Soviet activities.[54]

As previously stated the law on the nationalization of the property of religious organizations regarding the transfer of churches for long-term lease to communities was adopted only in 1948.[55] This fact caused some difficulties in the work of the authorized official Smirnov. He did not know how to enter into a contract with the church communities for such transfer of buildings and churches "of the Latvia Orthodox Church-owned property: Church worship buildings, church houses, lodges, and religious property in perpetuity and free use".[56]Therefore, the conclusion of contracts with the church communities was delayed and caused many problems for the Soviet officials.

Subsequent relations between the ruling bishop and the authorized person after the above incident, which was resolved at the highest level in Moscow, were already more than constructive. However, the Commissioner did not work for long, because in August 1949 he died and was succeeded by a new employee – Sakharov. Metropolitan Veniamin (Fedchenkov) wrote about the meeting with the new authorized official: "It is easy ... Thank God. I can be honest".[57]As subsequent events showed, the Bishop was naïve in his assessments. The new commissioner, the former security services officer, knowing the specifics of the Baltic

[53] LNA LVA, 270. f., 1-c apr., 111. l., 217. lp.
[54] LNA LVA, 1452. f., 1. apr., 72. l., 21. lp.
[55] LNA LVA, 1452. f., 1. apr., 85. l., 57. lp.
[56] LNA LVA, 1452. f., 1 apr., 57. l., 43.–44. lp.
[57] LNA LVA, 1452. f., 1. apr., 72. l., 21. lp.

countries, including the Latvian language, scrupulously delved into everything. During 1949, he arranged the paperwork and documentation, because his predecessor had not been adequately involved in the writing chores and had not introduced regular registration and accounting of the clergy.

The Authorized official Sakharov strictly followed the general party line, while remaining pragmatic to achieve his goals. All questions were coordinated with Moscow, for example, in the appointment of clergy in the parishes he apparently followed the specified rate from the centre, not interfering in the jurisdiction of the bishop, but with regard to the clergy, previously convicted for anti-Soviet crimes, he was categorical.[58] It should be noted that the percentage of the repressed was half of the clergy of the Latvian Orthodox Church.

There is an exciting report for 1950, in which the Commissioner reported about the Soviet achievements and in particular that "with the help of the fraternal republics, and especially the great Russian nation, Soviet Latvia became a socialist republic with a developed industry, large collective and mechanized agriculture and growing culture, national in form and socialist in content."[59] Speaking of "achievements", the Commissioner reported cheerfully for his superiors that a breakthrough in the anti-religious front in Latvia SSR was not observed since Orthodoxy "had an insignificant place in the life of the workers."[60] In this context, it is interesting to mention a statistical report for 1946, the data of which are contrary to what had been said. So the number of Orthodox people was 42 546, but four years later, there was a progressive increase in the number of parishioners by 7 626 people. Further on Sakharov succinctly stated: "... The decline occurs in all faiths, except for the Orthodox Church", and the main problem of such statistics, according to him, was a weak atheist

[58] LNA LVA, 1452. f., 1. apr., 72. l., 21. lp.

[59] Veniamin (Fedchenkov), mitropolit. *Za Pravaslavie pomiluet menia Gospod'*. Dnevnikovye zapisi (1998). Sankt-Peterburg: Izd-vo Tsarskoe delo. P. 69.

[60] LNA LVA, 1452. f., 1. apr., 56. l., 29. lp.

work.[61] We can believe that at the early stages of work the official did not manage the situation, and somewhere did not give correct information to his superiors in Moscow. Later the centre pointed out his mistakes in the work, in particular on the historicity of his reports, because they expected analytical information of an operational nature.

Taking into account the above, however, we can use this information to help create a picture of the church life in the Riga diocese. For example, daily services were held in churches of Riga and Daugavpils, which gathered 30 – 40 people on Sundays and public holidays.[62] However, the official reports noted irregularities of church services. He received all the information from the parishes, but as far as it reflected the state of affairs, there was no complete clarity. The issue of church statistics in the Soviet period is fascinating and requires more examination. However, it is sure precisely that the post-war period was a period of secularization and the weakening of the Church's life. Moreover, that was caused by good reasons, mentioned earlier, for a long time the Department did not have a permanent bishop, so liturgical practice was rather weak. Nevertheless, the church life was gradually restored, primarily in the cities and in the capital. Moreover, the essential role in the fact was played by the intellectuals of the teaching staff.[63] This fact for the Soviet authorities became a problem of concern, as faithful teachers could adversely affect the outlook of the younger generation and youth. Therefore, the authorized official`s information note was addressed to the Secretary of the CC CP (B) J. Kalnberzins "On religiosity among the intelligentsia and their participation in the activities of the Orthodox Church of the Latvia SSR, as of March 15, 1950".[64] The document was accompanied by a list of activists who were selected from the personal information of Riga church parishes. Thus, the number of intellectuals was 215 people: teachers – 52, doctors

[61] LNA LVA, 1452. f., 1. apr., 56. l., 128. lp.
[62] Ibid., 129. lp.
[63] Ibid.
[64] Ibid., 130. lp.

and medical personnel – 28, technical workers – 15, pupils and students – 8 as well as employees of Soviet institutions – 112 people. The list was handed over to the Minister of State Security A. Noviks.[65]

## Does not allow to strengthen the Church

If Smirnov's information reports to Moscow only stated the facts, then his successor - Sakharov prepared detailed materials with commentaries, and sometimes with proposals. Skills of his operational work in the KGB were not in vain; this helped Sakharov to handle things at the new location. So, with constant regularity, he noted in the reports that the bishops had taken some steps to intensify the activities of the church in Latvia SSR, and including the ethnic Latvian parishes. The last question was under exclusive control in the centre. As we can see, the Commissioner thoroughly delved into the life of the Riga Diocese, thoroughly examined all registration files of the Diocese. He had planned constant trips to the provinces to instruct employees of district executive committees regarding the nature of the relationship with the communities. In the study of parish life, he paid particular attention to the characteristics and activities of the church active people to identify their "reactionary work".[66] He also noticed sharp internal church matters, such as the reaction of the Latvian parishes to the decree of Patriarch Alexis I of the Easter celebration according to the old style.[67] It was the typical practice for Latvian parishes due to the established tradition, as they had many mixed families with some Orthodox and some Lutheran or Catholic members. However, to the dismay of officials, this question did not cause conflict in the Orthodox parishes of the Riga Diocese.

Gradually Sakharov examined the things and diligently performed his duties, but superiors always pointed out at his failures in work. So, in

[65] LNA LVA, 1452. f., 1. apr., 53. l., 119.–120. lp.
[66] Ibid., 131. lp.
[67] LNALVA, 1452. f., 1. apr., 56. l., 131.–132. lp.

1954, when he prepared a report in Moscow, he received a negative review.[68] The authorities emphasized the insufficient informative value of its reporting due to the extensiveness and historicity in the provided materials. The employee indicated no profile information, in particular about the situation in the Latvian Lutheran parishes.[69] Moscow demanded in the first place to give information on the direct operation of an authorized official, that is, to study issues, describing the situation of the Riga diocese, as well as observation of the individual church communities and clergy activity. Secondly - the information about the present situation of the Church in Latvia SSR and especially its impact on workers and its strengthening.[70] It is possible that the lack of official vehicles also restricted the activities of the official, so that information from the field came too late or was not accurate, and indeed required further verification.

Assessing the activities of the authorized officials in the period considered, it should be stated that their work was closely associated with the structures of the party and ideological apparatus, propaganda of which was directed at suppressing every kind of dissent, and the more religious one. However, each Commissioner had their preferences, so Smirnov more relied on the party-ideological resources, and Sakharov, to achieve these objectives, also worked with the secret police. So, the mutually beneficial cooperation between the state and the Church as it was thought by some idealistic ruling bishops, was out of the question, because the Marxist-Leninist ideology treated religion as a class-hostile phenomenon. However, the techniques of anti-church struggle had evolved from direct attacks to sophisticated events for the release of Soviet citizens from the "religious prejudices". The opinions of the believers of Latvia SSR were not interesting for the regime, so they tried, as repeatedly pointed out, to carry out anti-clerical measures with "church hands" in the face of the Commissioners, and they succeeded very much. Moreover, any means

[68] LNA LVA, 1452. f., 1. apr., 56. l.,131. lp.
[69] Ibid., 198. lp.
[70] LNA LVA, 1452. f., 1. apr., 60. l., 81. lp

were good against those who resisted, as far as possible to use the concept, at best, they were blamed for using "non-democratic" management of religious communities. The device of the Authorized Commissioners in the person of its employees became a tool in the hands of the security forces and the Communist propaganda in the struggle against religion, and this was demonstrated in the example of the church life of the Riga Diocese in the post-war period.

*Galina Sedova (Sister Euphrosyne) is a Master of theology and an editor of the Synodal newspaper «Grapevine» of the Latvian Orthodox Church.*

Jana Kalnina

# SERVICE OF THE ARCHIMANDRITE TAVRION (BATOZSKY) IN SPASO–PREOBRAZHENSKY MONASTERY NEAR JELGAVA AS AN EXAMPLE OF RESISTANCE TO TOTALITARIAN REGIME

*„For you, brethren, have been called to liberty; only do not use liberty as an opportunity for the flesh, but through love serve one another." (Gal. 5.13)*

*"As a Christian, you should live every day of your life so as to be worthy of accepting Christ. For if you are not worthy of accepting Him daily, you are not worthy of accepting Him even once a year."*

From Fr. Tavrion's sermon

We are approaching the 40th anniversary since Archimandrite Tavrion (Batozsky) has taken rest in the Lord. He was a spiritual leader of Spaso-Preobrazhensky Monastery near Jelgava. Fr. Tavrion was one of the most prominent figures in the Russian Orthodox Church, one of the most remarkable Russian preachers of the 2nd half of the 20th century. He spent more than 25 years in the Stalin's concentration camps and exile. Not all of his teachings have yet been studied, neither his many lessons learned.

This article will give an account of the most important events of his life as well as the priesthood, all of which may serve as an example of how the church can resist the Totalitarian secular government. It is of particular importance to us to show how Fr. Tavrion saw the role of the Church in the Soviet times if it was possible to change the situation and how he personally approached it.

We will focus on the final years of Fr.Tavrion's life (1969–1978) in Latvia. A substantial amount of his sermons date back to this particular period. Many of them reflect his views on the role of the Church in the totalitarian society and his contribution to the Church's daily activities directed at reinforcing its influence. We also believe the accounts of the people who personally knew Fr. Tavrion to be of exceptional value. Among them Abbot Yevgeny (Roumyantsev), Fr. Vladimir Vilgert, Fr. George Kochetkov, Sister Olimpiada (Ius).

## 1. Preparation for Service

Tikhon (in monkhood – Tavrion) Danilovich Batozsky (1898–1978) was born in the city of Krasnokutsk, the Kharkiv district, Ukraine, in a large religious family. Early in his life, Tikhon felt a calling to monastic life, which he later described as, "I could not see myself doing anything other than sincerely loving the Heavenly Father and also felt strongly that I walked and lived in the very presence of God"[1].

At fifteen Tikhon, blessed by his parents came to Glinskaya Monastery as a novice. At the monastery, he studied icon painting, established the discipline of daily reading of the Gospel. Around this time he concluded, "Christianity is harmony, Christianity is a way forward, the Christianity is sacrificial service" (from the sermon 08.11.1973)[2].

---

[1] "My God will Take Me Through the Wall [..]." *Archimandrite Tavrion's courageous spiritual journey*. Editor, rev. V. A. Kostina. Perm, 2010, pg. 14.

[2] Vladimir Vilgert, priest. New Wine – New Wineskins. *Hristianos.* Riga, 2008, XVII, pg. 129.

The Glinsky monastery had an open door policy welcoming the faithful with the monks engaged in sacrificial service to all the visitors. It is here at the monastery that the foundation of Fr. Tavrion's future spiritual service is laid. He sees his pastoral duty in merciful and selfless love and care for the people.

In January 1920, Tikhon was recruited in the Red Army for a compulsory military service. At recruiting station in Kursk, he explained that he could not serve in the military service since as a monk "he dedicated his life to the service of God". This daring act could cost him his life, but astonishingly, the Bolsheviks let him go[3]. Nevertheless, Fr. Tavrion demonstrates an impervious will and devotion to his chosen path.

Rushing to get back to the monastery he nearly died. Later, in his memoirs,[4] Fr. Tavrion told the story of how the monks had rescued him after having stayed in the ice-cold water for more than four hours. While submerged under the ice, he fervently prayed to God to spare his life, promising to dedicate himself to service of God and his people. Three months after that Fr. Tavrion's satchel was found in the river. Inside it was his bible open in the page where Jesus says to Martha: "I am the resurrection and the life. He who believes in Me, though he may die, he shall live."(John 11: 25). Fr. Tavrion called this satchel and its contents the "[..] the proof and the testimony of the faith in Our Lord Jesus the Savior"[5]. Fr. Tavrion kept his promise; his entire life became a testimonial to the Power of The Cross and the Resurrection as well as our resurrection in Christ our Lord. Shortly after, the 22-year-old Tikhon took his monastic vows and was tonsured with a name Tavrion. This was the pivotal point in his spiritual journey.

---

[3] "My God will Take Me Through the Wall [..]." Editor, rev. V. A. Kostina, pg. 17.

[4] Tavrion (Batozsky), archimandrite. Miraculous Escape from death in 1920. *Orthodox Community*. Moscow, 1991, № 1, pg. 53–60.

[5] Tavrion (Batozsky), archimandrite. *Miraculous Escape from death in 1920*, pg. 53–60.

## 2. Spiritual Opposition in Camps and Exile

During the Easter of 1928, the Abbot Tavrion was ordained to serve as the archimandrite by his spiritual father bishop Rylsky Pavlin (Kroshechkin)[6] and received his blessing to serve daily Liturgy[7]. Fr. Tavrion wrote how he did not know about his upcoming ordination. The Bishop Pavlin congratulated him saying, "Don't think it is an appreciation of your accomplishments, it will come in handy in the future since some (*in the government – J. K.*) believe that I think you will be imprisoned for the rest of your life[8]". He then continued with the laughter, "The Bishop's prophesy indeed came true"[9].

In 1929, Archimandrite Tavrion was arrested for the first time and sentenced by the board of OGPU to three years of imprisonment in a concentration camp on a false charge of anti-Soviet propaganda[10]. The true reason for his arrest was his fighting the so-called "obnovlenets" who took over the Feodosiyevsky Church in the city of Perm where Fr. Tavrion served at the time[11]. At the trial, he testified: "The charges brought against me are false, but I will consider this to be a test worthy of suffering in the name of Christ."[12] Subsequently, Fr. Tavrion was sent first to the Visher camps to build the Berezniki Chemical plant. After, to the Turin concentration camp, 1948–1956. Fr. Tavrion did not like to talk about those years.

---

[6] Bishop Pavlin (Kroshechkin) was canonized in 2000 (was executed in 1937 in the concentration camp in Siberia) Vladimir Vilgert, priest. New Wine – New Wineskins, pg. 129.

[7] "My God will Take Me Through the Wall [..]." Editor, rev. V. A. Kostina, pg. 92.

[8] Ibid., pg. 31.

[9] Kopirovsky A. M. The Last "Mohegan". Remembering Archimandrite Tavrion (Batozsky). *Kifa*. 2004, №9 (24), pg. 11.

[10] Bichkov S.S. Archimandrite Tavrion (Batozsky). *Three monks explain the Orthodox Sacraments*. / Editor, introduction by S. S. Bichkov. Moscow: Sam&Sam, 2002, pg. 9.

[11] "My God will Take Me Through the Wall [..]." Editor, rev. V. A. Kostina, pg. 30–32.

[12] CA FSB. D. № P-8887. L. 47. Bichkov S.S. *Archimandrite Tavrion's Walk of Passions*. Moscow: Tetis Publition, 2007, pg. 117.

Metropolitan Anthony (Bloom) described his meeting with Fr. Tavrion as follows, "There he sat before me, the person of the same generation as myself; and his eyes shone with such gratitude and amazement, and he told me: "You cannot fathom how inconceivably kind our Lord God was to me! During the revolution when priests were not permitted near the prisons or camps, He chose me, the unworthy and inexperienced priest and placed me where I was most needed, I was arrested and spent one year in prison and the next 26 years in the camps[13]amidst the very people who so desperately needed God and the priest". What he had taken out of his years of awful suffering was the immense gratitude to God for the honour of being chosen to perform his sacrificial duty of serving the needy and destitute."[14] This incredible heroic act of survival in the tremendously inhumane conditions prepared him for his future serving the people in the name of God. According to Fr. Tavrion's earlier promise to God, he by the word of the Gospel "kept giving his life for his friends."

Later in one of his sermons Fr. Tavrion talked about another episode from his camp years, "I remember several of us hiding underneath the bunk beds, everywhere around us there was filth and spit and swear. However, those few of us did not pay attention to it. We felt surrounded by light as if in Haven. One of the inmates whispered in my ear, "Father, I am so happy that I am here, I know tomorrow they will again interrogate and torture me, and I probably will not make it out of here alive. However,

---

[13] The chronological research done by Bychkov S. S and V. A. Kostina suggests that Archimandrite Tavrion remained a total of 19 years in the camps and exile: 1929–1932, arrest, imprisonment; 1930–1932, 1940–1948 arrest, sent to Turinsky concentration camp; 1948–1956, exiled to the Kustanai region of Kazakhstan. (Bychkov S. S. *Archimandrite Tavrion's Walk of Passions. Moscow*. Tetis Publishn, 2007, pg. 131–196 and "My God will Take Me Through the Wall…" Editor, rev. V. A. Kostina, pg. 30–94).It appears that Fr. Tavrion referred to his years of illegal ("catacombs") serving in 1932–1940s when he was talking about his "26 years in the camps and exile."

[14] The Status of Faith. Metropolitan Antony (Bloom ) of Surozh. *The Journal of Moscow Patriarchy*, 1997, No 9. Read on September 16, 2016, in electronic format website: http://porechje.zachalo.ru/surojsky.htm

I am not afraid because I feel a huge burden lifted off my conscience for the first time in my life.""[15]

## 3. Final Years of the Earthly Service

In the 1960s one saw the increased persecution of the Church and the clergy as well as the faithful in the Soviet Union. Under the Secretary-General of the Soviet Communist Party Nikita Khrushchev, many churches had been closed or destroyed. The government viciously attacked the few monasteries that remained in the country for it was there that the faithful looked for spiritual guidance and it was behind those walls that the omnipresent Communists Party could not successfully exercise their control[16]. Little changed when a new Nikita Khrushchev assumed the power. The Church was largely left in peace, but the laws did not allow it to grow or spread its influence.

In 1968, Fr. Tavrion came to Spaso-Preobrazhensky Monastery as its new Abbot following the passing of Fr. Superior Kosma (Smirnov). Fr. Tavrion stayed there for the remainder of his life.

### 3.1. Revival of the Monastery

At the time of Fr. Tavrion's arrival, the Convent had for a while been in a state of vast disrepair. There was only one working Church heated by a wood stove, and there were no more than ten nuns in residence. Fr. Tavrion had ordered the restoration of the two existing churches. Then the dining hall and rooms for the pilgrims had been built. In pursuing all the reconstruction, Fr. Tavrion defied the authorities since the existing laws forbade any building for the religious purposes. Fr. Tavrion found the way

[15] The Holy Confessor, Fr. Tavrion / Made by m. T. 2002. Read on September 4, 2016, in electronic format: http://www.fatheralexander.org/booklets/russian/starets_tavrion.htm

[16] Pospelovsky D. V. *Russian Orthodox Church in the XX century*. Moscow: Republic. 1995, 511, pg. 305.

around the law. Thus, he had permission to build a shed for storing the firewood. "And so we laid the foundation for our shed, built the walls, put the roof over it, sectioned off one-tenth of the building for storage [..] and what we have in the back is a beautiful spacious dining area complete with the kitchen and pantry."[17] Another permission to put up a building intended for the showers would also have a few "additions" that became guest rooms for the visitors and pilgrims. Fr. Tavrion personally oversaw every step of the construction, purchased the building materials. In the winter of 1970, the Monastery welcomed the first pilgrims. Fr. Tavrion was at the door greeting them and immediately sending them over to the kitchen to be fed and settled in for the night. Very few other Monasteries in the country at that time could offer such care and attention to the visitors.

Fr. Tavrion understood very well the people's need for spiritual guidance. His mission for the monastery became "[..] to carry out the evangelization of the godless Soviet society"[18]. That was his way of resisting if not fighting back the oppressive Soviet ideology. This was by no means an easy task. Local authorities and the stealthy KGB kept a watchful eye over the Monastery's activities. One of the nun's jobs was carefully to register every visitor and to check their passport (an ID in the Soviet Union). The sister did that with the utmost diligence[19]. Fr. Tavrion not only had to deal with external authorities, internally, but he was also met with resentment from some of the nuns, who had grown accustomed to the old comfortable ways and were not willing to adjust let alone join forces with the Father's "Enlightening of the Masses" program.

Nevertheless, Fr. Tavrion had achieved his goal; he had managed to restore the Monastery turning it into an oasis in the desert, which is a perfect allegory that describes the status of the Orthodox Church in the Soviet era. To many and all the pilgrims who came to him, Fr. Tavrion

[17] The Holy Confessor, Fr. Tavrion / Made by m. T. 2002.

[18] Bichkov S.S. *Archimandrite Tavrion's Walk of Passions. Moscow*. Tetis Publishn, 2007, pg. 277.

[19] Ibid., pg. 291.

was the living testimony of the Holy Resurrection of Christ. Remarkably, Fr. Tavrion not only had made a living in the Light of Resurrection his personal spiritual journey, but also called everyone to learn from and share in this experience and, most importantly, to follow in Christ's footsteps.

Sister Olimpiada, who served as Fr. Tavrion's personal secretary recalls his story about the hardships in the camps told during his sermon, "I remember pushing the wagon, and I'm out of my last ounce of strength, and I fall to my knees, exhausted and spent [..], but the next thing I know is I'm exclaiming, 'Glory to you, Oh, God! It is bright and Holy Pascha, and although I am stuck pushing this wagon, I feel so blessed and happy! God bless my parents who gave me my life! It is for the Truth which is Christ; it is for the Church, for the word of God and the life in Christ that I will gladly give my life!' It was such deep spiritual joy! Never think that the bright Paschal joy can only be experienced inside the church?"[20]

At the monastery, a great effort was put into welcoming all of the visiting pilgrims. An average of 150-200 people at a time stayed on the grounds during the summer months. People came from all parts of the country, including the Far East, Asia Minor and Siberia. What attracted them all was the "Truth proclaimed to them that human worth and dignity is in that each and every one is the cherished child of God who bestowed His unconditional Love upon them and granted them all salvation and freedom in Christ. All those truths were conveyed to them by the person who strived to live every moment of his entire life in this God-given dignity, Freedom and Love."[21]

The everyday routine at the Monastery was simple. Different chores, communal meals, prayerful conversation. The social atmosphere was very warm and welcoming and had the air of early Christian community[22]

---

[20] Bichkov S. S. *Archimandrite Tavrion's Walk of Passions. Moscow*. Tetis Publishn, 2007, pg. 127.

[21] Vladimir Vilgert, priest. New Wine – New Wineskins, pg. 128.

[22] The Holy Confessor, Fr. Tavrion / Made by m. T. 2002.

bound by faith and spiritual closeness. People treated each other with kindness and respect; even the most reserved would soon start smiling and talk to each other more freely.

### 3.2. Fr. Tavrion's Liturgical Legacy

Fr. Tavrion had carried out the blessing to serve the daily Liturgy for 50 years, including the time of his imprisonment.

"I had found myself many a time in some slums, in the gutter but serving the Liturgy all the same. For I had felt the Lord is calling, I had studied the history of the Church, the lives of the many Saints. I yearned to emulate their life" ( from the sermon of sept.27, 1976).[23] According to Fr. Tavrion, quite often "your own chest and heart should suffice to stand in place of The Sacrifice and the Temple and the tin can in place of the Chalice".[24] Serving daily Liturgy was Fr. Tavrion's way of following the example of his renowned predecessors, St. John Kronshtadtky, St. Tichon Zadonsky (whose name he had in his secular life) and St. Theophan (Zatvornik), whose spiritual teachings he highly valued.

The daily Liturgy served at 5 AM by Fr. Tavrion at Spaso-Preobrazhensky Monastery was at the centre of monastic life. Fr. Tavrion's services have always been exciting and full of energy and life. He had valued the deep connection with the people in the church; he most always faced the people during the service[25]. Fr. Tavrion could be equated to a torch burning with spiritual fervour. In addition, he expressed it by changing into the Paschal vestments[26] right before the reading of the Eucharistic canon. At the same time, the two choirs and all the parishioners united into one in the centre of the church to sing "with one heart and one mouth"[27], sending the prayer unanimously. Fr. Tavrion was at the same

---

[23] The Holy Confessor, Fr. Tavrion / Made by m. T. 2002.

[24] "My God will Take Me Through the Wall [..]." Editor, rev. V. A. Kostina, pg. 171.

[25] Viktor (Mamontov), archim. The Priest of the Desert. *The Heart of the Desert*. Moscow, 2001, pg. 44.

[26] Kopirovsky A. M. The Last "Mohegan" [..], pg. 11.

[27] Ibid.

time the leader and the part of this church assembly in the way every parish and its pastor should be. This was a nonconformist and unprecedented act of pastoral freedom and courage, but Fr. Tavrion feared nothing because "there's nothing left but Love"[28] for God and the neighbour. Just as fearlessly, Fr. Tavrion would augment the Liturgy with the necessary in his opinion explanations, as in, "Let us pray for our ailing Church, for those who have fallen asleep in the Lord. Let us pray for those abandoned and forgotten. Everyone, please sing together The Lord's Prayer."[29] "[..] brothers and sisters try to sing together as one, as one heart and one mouth, proclaim your faith openly, be confident, do not be shy. Let us praise the Lord our God and show him our devotion"[30], all those things Fr. Tavrion used to say during the Liturgy calling people to actively participate in the service, eager to see their hearts burn with the same prayerful energy as he was burning. By doing so, he attempted to erase the gap between the clergy and the laity.[31]

Fr. Tavrion saw the expression of the Power and the Spirit of the Church in singing together of both the choir and the people. He thought it to be essential.[32] "This is the true spirit of the apostolic Church when you see everyone singing together as one! If that were always to happen, there would be no misunderstanding, no any kind of difficulty in our Churches. Therefore, we should all try to do it. When you come to Church, you have to read together and sing together. Especially this day and age

---

[28] *Let everything burn away. Except Love*. Read on September 20, 2016, in electronic format: http://www.psmb.ru/aktualnye-temy/usvoen-li-cerkovju-ves-opyt-82novomuchenikov/statja/pust-vse-sgorit-krome-ljubvi/

[29] Tavrion (Batozsky), archimandrite. Our Purpose is to Serve You. *Three monks explain the Orthodox Sacraments*. Editor, introduction by S.S. Bichkov. Moscow: Sam&Sam, pg. 83.

[30] Viktor (Mamontov), arhim. The Priest of the Desert. *The Heart of the Desert*, pg. 43.

[31] Lepyochina A. N. *The article Possibility for Archimondrite Tavrion's canonization, collecting facts and data. Chair for Theological Studies and Liturgy*. Moscow: St. Filaret's Institute, 2013, pg. 50.

[32] Ibid., pg. 51.

when everyone *can* read. You have to actively participate in the service with all your heart and soul".[33]

The most important part about the Eucharist at the Monastery was that everybody was expected to participate in this Sacrament actively. Everyone was called by Farther to take part in the Eucharist daily, which was unheard of in those times. He would say to people, "What do you think you came here for? To drink from the Cup of Christ and to partake of our Lord Jesus Christ's body. In the Eucharist is your salvation to its fullest. His Cup is meant to be shared by all and every one of you, the miracle of this Sacrament brings us all together, so we become one with Him, so we become deified".[34] For many visitors participating in Liturgy at the Monastery was the only chance to partake in the Eucharist for there were no churches where they lived. For those people to partake in the Eucharist was a deeply moving meaningful act. All of a sudden their suffering, religious persecution, constant hiding of their faith made sense. They knew they did not have to live in the function of their fear and difficulties. The freedom is within and always comes from the heart. Archimandrite stressed, "Our entire life is an ongoing battle! Nevertheless, there is nothing on this earth that can imprison your heart and soul! What makes us strong is our constant awareness of impending death and inevitable hardship that must keep us vigilant and praying at all times. We must have a strong faith in the Grace of God that will always keep us upright and steadfast and will help us endure any difficulty and deprivation."[35]

Partaking in daily Eucharist to Fr. Tavrion was a way to overcome our differences, selfishness, personal discord and all manner of disagreement. He believed that coming together in Eucharist should enable people to take full responsibility for their own life and the lives of those immediately

[33] Tavrion (Batozsky), archimandrite. Sermons. *Orthodox Community*. Moscow, 1991, № 2, pg. 5.

[34] Tavrion (Batozsky), archim. The sermon for Festal Nocturnal service of Annunciation. *Orthodox Community*. 1995, № 26, pg. 5.

[35] "My God will Take Me Through the Wall [..]." Editor, rev. V. A. Kostina, pg. 86.

around them and in the world at large. "Just look at the present state of the world around us. Who will keep us safe and prevent us from blowing each other up? The Cup of Christ will! [..] the world needs more of the divine piety that will purify us and will keep us safe. The Cup of Christ will keep us from rotting in our sins and despicable transgressions. Therefore, listen, the faithful! It is through your zealous and prayerful effort and partaking in the Eucharist that the humanity will live and will be saved by the gracious power of God".[36]

Fr. Tavrion's fervour inspired many. Fr. George Kochetkov, who frequented the Monastery, noted, "Fr. Tavrion's many years in camps became an invaluable, primordial life experience and served as a blueprint for his subsequent teachings. Those lessons never lost their power and meaning to him".[37]On any given day at the Monastery Fr. George witnessed a Eucharistic gathering of people who often barely knew each other but looked not only extremely at ease but very excited to be together.[38]

Fr. Tavrion had always been seeking a deeper meaning in everything he did. He did not like excessive embellishments or Byzantine splendour. He freely used modern Russian and Latvian language during the services[39] as well as off-the-book prayers that were not part of the traditional catechism.[40] For many those non-traditional services made most striking and vivid memories.

The prolonged and inhumane suffering Fr. Tavrion endured during his camp years and in exile led him to the very personal and unique understanding of Christianity. He had known the real Freedom and urged his followers the importance of finding it for themselves.

---

[36] *Life is a Paschal Journey. Archimandrite Tavrion (Batozsky). Biography, sermons, testimonials* / Editor, rev. priest Vladimir Vilgert. Moscow: Otchy Dom, 2001, pg. 127.

[37] Liturgy of Fr. Tavrion. Conversation with priest George Kochetkov. *Hristianos*. Riga, 1998, VII, pg. 61.

[38] Ibid., pg. 67.

[39] Vladimir Vilgert, priest. New Wine – New Wineskins, pg. 130.

[40] George Kochetkov, priest. Legacy of Russian Priests (ispovednik), *Martyrs, and difficulties of Spiritual Revival of the Church in its fullness*, pg. 82.

### 3.3. Revival of the Church through the Word of God

Fr. Tavrion was acutely aware that the revival of the Church and the society as a whole would have to start with the spiritual revival of each person. He urged every member to lead a responsible and sacrificial life in Church and Christ craving salvation. "Let us live a Godly life as we are His beloved children and the others will see us and will want to live like us".[41] His exhortation was convincing because he was speaking from a deeply faithful spiritual conviction tested in one the harshest and most cruel circumstances. In the camps, Fr. Tavrion witnessed the worst human misery and despair but never stopped believing in humanity. He believed that all people were created in the image and likeness of God and that image would always be there no matter how tainted. Thus, it would always be possible for the word of God to reach the human heart and change it. One of his favorite quotes from the Gospel was from the Hebrews, "For the word of God is living and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing even to the division of soul and spirit, and of joints and marrow, and is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart."[42]

During Fr. Tavrion's Liturgical service, everyone always felt personally addressed. Many would hear their questions answered, although Farther welcomed anyone seeking advice even after the service. He accepted and listened to everyone, the old and the young, those new to the Church and the more experienced faithful who had inherited their faith from their parents, cherished it as a legacy but lacked the knowledge and deeper understanding.

Spiritual literature was not often readily available for many. No wonder, people "turned into stone" without the word of God. Arch. Tavrion insisted upon the importance of daily reading of the scripture and incorporating its teachings in one's daily life. He reminded us that our duty as

---

[41] Tavrion (Batozsky), archim. *The sermon for Festal Nocturnal service of Annunciation*, pg. 6.

[42] Vladimir Vilgert, priest. New Wine – New Wineskins, pg. 129–130.

Christians was to liken ourselves to Jesus Christ, especially in how we treat other people in the Church and outside it. "Christians today seem to have forgotten their true calling that Lord our God asked us to strive to emulate him [..] Your mere presence in this world should exude aroma that will transform people around you, your behaviour should be exemplary and show others the way."[43]

Fr. Tavrion's had worked out a method that he recommended other priests to use as well: instead of trying to teach everybody, first try to teach those who will later teach the others. This approach allowed him to engage the Churches all over the Country. His daily routine besides serving was dedicated to his substantial correspondence, comforting, exhorting and advising many of his followers.

Fr. Tavrion paid particular attention to the youth, rightfully recognizing them as the future of the Church. He often would have young men who were preparing to be ordained serve the Liturgy alongside him, while the parishioners would read from the Psalms and Apostle in the Desert. For many of them, that was the first-time experience. Farther loved it when people did the readings with gusto, in a loud and clear voice that was full of joy, as if they were on fire. Then he would offer the reader his praise, saying, "Well done! Now we know our Church is standing strong!" Some readers felt they were walking on air, after having heard the Father's cheerful encouragement[44]. It is a well-known fact that Archbishop of Riga and Latvia Leonid sent many prospective priests to the Monastery to be trained by Fr. Tavrion[45]. One of them, Fr. Yevgeny (Rumyantsev) particularly credits Fr.Tavrion for his choosing the priesthood as well as his eagerness to preach openly.[46]

---

[43] Tavrion (Batozsky), archimandrite. Sermons. *Orthodox Community*. Moscow, 1993, № 1–3 (13–15), pg. 5.

[44] Kopirovsky A. M. The Last "Mohecan"[..], pg. 11.

[45] Vladimir Vilgert, priest. Remembering Fr. Tavrion. *Orthodox Community*. Moscow, 2000, № 55, pg. 92.

[46] Yevgeny (Roumyantsev), abbot. *Remembering Archimandrite Tavrion (Batozsky)*. Part 1. Read on September 9, 2016, in electronic format: http://www.pravoslavie.ru/arhiv/050818105609 .

Allowing the young people actively to participate in the daily life of the Monastery, including liturgical services and the Eucharist instilled in them the spirit of Christian servitude and brotherly love and further inspired them to continue on their spiritual path in the Church, thus feeling strong in their faith to be able to oppose the Soviet totalitarianism. On the other hand, Fr. Tavrion did not hold an idealistic view of the Church. In his sermons, he urged every faithful to stay vigilant. He did not call out the atheists or outsiders, but his "own": Pharisees, sticklers to the rituals and rules, "practical Monophysites" and spiritually inflexible and "immobile"[47], "Can you tell me what the future of the Church will be like?" [..] We have to have a clear understanding of where we stand and what might happen to us as a result. We can be left with nothing. We have to try to create the future! Moreover, start living our life creating! [..] You have a wonderful opportunity to do that [..] And any good deed requires an act of courage [..] we cannot afford to be selective, we have to make the best of the circumstances we are in right now. First, you have to accept your present circumstances and see that they are wonderful and then start labouring in the name of God! That would be your sermon! Then we can hopefully expect that our Church will grow and prosper. Should we decide, however, to just leave it [..] thinking it is not our responsibility than we shall be doomed. For it is said, "The Kingdom will be taken away from you and will be given to those who believe in Me. Moreover, who will not follow Me will lose Me! "So, we will not only then help our Church but destroy even what we have."" (Sermon, 1970-s)[48]

It is important to emphasize that Fr. Tavrion lived during extremely challenging times for everybody in the Soviet Union. With atheism, being the official "religion", the Church was relentlessly persecuted and defamed. The life of an individual human being was insignificant in the eyes of those in power. Personal dignity was devalued and denigrated. The purpose

[47] Lepyochina A. N. *Possibility for Archimondrite Tavrion's canonization, collecting facts and data*, pg. 64.

[48] Tavrion (Batozsky), archim. *Our Purpose is to Serve You*, pg. 61–62.

of Fr. Tavrion's servitude was to restore the "image and Likeness of God" and revive the sense of personal dignity in people. "By this we know love because He laid down His life for us. Moreover, we also ought to lay down our lives for the brethren", (1 John 3:16) became his motto in his attempt to rehabilitate back to life the feeling of self-worth in people humiliated by the system, and teach them what it meant to be Free in the eyes of the God.

The partaking in the holy sacraments of the Church were according to Fr. Tavrion the means by which to achieve personal transformation and ultimately salvation. The Church would be renewed and restored to its Glory, but not before Her faithful members and the society as a whole will have renewed themselves. Archimandrite Victor (Mamontov) testifies, "His fervour to create a new man in Christ was met with the fervent pursuit of faith and truth of those who resisted the lies and decay of the society."[49]

Fr. Tavrion endured wrenching hardship during his years in the camps and exile. This experience had become indelible to his servitude. Fr. Yevgeny (Roumyantsev) notes about Fr. Tavrion, that, "his prolonged suffering had resulted in a unique understanding of the Christianity [..]. He had emulated the spirit of the Apostles, which had further inspired the others to accept Christ and enter the fullness of the church. He helped people to rid themselves of fear and distrust of confession that were keeping them from coming to God, but, most importantly, he had been able to unite the faithful into a spiritual family bonded in their mutual strive to find God. As a leader, that was Father's very special gift."[50]

Fr. Tavrion's unquestionable calling was to bring the Church and its faithful together as one. For the complete transformation of the Church to happen, the people needed to change in the way that they needed to learn to love and forgive one another and to accept the "Fatherhood" of their God who loved ALL of his children without exception perfectly and completely.

---

[49] Tavrion (Batozsky), archim. *Our Purpose is to Serve You*, pg. 42.

[50] The Holy Confessor, Fr. Tavrion / Made by m. T. 2002.

Fr. Tavrion's love of Christ was deep and very strong in part thanks to his unique spiritual experience[51]. This powerful Love of Christ not only made it possible for him always to resist the evil and violence around him but also to confront and defeat it with compassion and mercy. His opposition to both the godless government and the unfortunate schism in the church had always been peaceful but firm and unequivocal.

His exemplary selfless life had demonstrated to the outside world that the Church could effectively stand up against the totalitarian government had it rid itself from its ostentatiousness, excessive focus on rituals, overall ignorance, and, most importantly, had considered its members as the most valuable asset. That would lay the ground for a real personal transformation and freedom that are essential to be able to withstand iniquity and injustice, to shed the constant fear and the resulting need to conform and bow to the authorities.

## Summary/Conclusion

**1.** Fr. Tavrion considered the spiritual transformation of the people both as members of the Church community and as separate individuals central to his pastoral work. The people serve as the bridge between the Church and the Society. On the other hand, the spiritually strong Church community united in Holy Eucharist present a solid opposition to the Totalitarian regime or any other form of oppressive government.

**2.** Fr. Tavrion firmly believed that partaking actively and willingly in the Sacrament of Eucharist and listening to the sermon would transform the people and ultimately lead to the transformation and revival of the Church.

**3.** Fr. Tavrion believed in any man to be genuinely created in the image and likeness of God. That image could never be erased, and therefore any man had the potential to hear the Word of God and be saved.

---

[51] Bezdetko J. *Archimandrite Tavrion's Gospel*. Moscow: The Orthodox Moscow, 1994, № 16, pg. 51.

**4.** Fr. Tavrion called upon every faithful to take responsibility for their Church, the church community, regularly attending the services regardless of the obstacles. In his sermons, he condemned the sins of sloth, indifference and inactivity, schism. His words had a powerful influence on people due to his admirable example of peaceful but firm opposition to threat and violence. Having given himself fully and unequivocally to God, he had shown us the way to spiritual freedom and God's Love. Anyone who would follow that path would never again live in the function of fear.

**5.** His life and service is an example of how the Church can rid itself of anything that does not belong to it, return to its original state, and resist the totalitarian regime not only in the 20th century but also in the 21st century.

*Jana Kalnina holds a bachelor's degree in theology, and she has graduated from St. Philaret Christian Orthodox Institute.*

Inese Runce

# PRESERVING LATVIAN CATHOLIC FAMILY TRADITIONS IN SIBERIA

*"I am willing to die, but let there be a church in this place, and church bells ringing to summon people to worship."*

*(Memories of an anonymous prisoner in Kazakhstan)*

After the completion of the Second World War around 45 000 Latvian inhabitants, mainly rich farmers, including many Catholics were exiled to Siberia on 25th March 1949. There were no Catholic congregations or possibilities of a sacramental life during detention in Siberia, and it was upon each believer and his family to keep to their spiritual life. Moreover, it should be kept in mind that family life was destroyed in detention. Families were separated in labour and detention camps with women and children often in one camp and men in another. As shown by various interviews it was women who mainly took care of the Catholic upbringing of their children; however, often it was also fathers who were imprisoned in the same camps with their older children. Return to normal faith and traditional practices was only possible for those who survived and returned to Latvia in the latter half of the 50s.

Victims of the deportations of 14th June 1941 and 25th March 1949 faced unprecedented tragedy. Without any investigation, trial or proof of guilt thousands of people from occupied Latvia were deported to labour and concentration camps as enemies of the Soviet state. In 1963, the "Tāvu zemes kalendars" in Munich published the life story of an anonymous Latvian Catholic woman[1] exiled to Siberia and Kazakhstan. Describing her Catholic experience in detention the author also described the experience of prisoners of other beliefs (Muslims, Orthodox Christians, and Old Believers) and their views of the occurrences. The reference to the alleged "antichrist" as cited in prison by some women of the Old Believers' faith was a spiritual consolation in her memories.[2] The understanding of the Soviet regime as the "Antichrist" helped many Christians in the USSR to overcome and accept the existing blatant injustice and helped them to distinguish the ideology from the people.

Staņislavs Zvīdris (born in 1940, Varakļāni) noted in his memoirs that they did not know where they would be led to after their arrest at night, because he thought that he would be shot somewhere in the city of Varakļāni: "On 25th March 1949 my father, mother and I planned to go to the church to celebrate the Feast of Annunciation. When it was dawn, we passed the Varakļāni church, to which many believers were going. The only thing my father could scream was: "Pray for us too!"[3]

Not just the physically strong but also the spiritually strong were able to withstand the cruel conditions of exile. According to the collected memoirs, the consolation and faith of the prisoners in Soviet concentration camps was in their prayers and relationship with God: "My only consolation was prayer. I prayed and felt someone standing on my right,

---

[1] Apparently, the anonymity protected the woman and her family in Latvia from KGB persecution. Most likely, this manuscript appeared in West Germany thanks to the first foreign tourists who travelled to Soviet Latvia and delivered it to the Latvian publishing house that published it.

[2] Tāvu zemes kalendārs. (1963). Munich, p. 30.

[3] Interview with Staņislavs Zvīdris (born 1940). February 15, 2015. The interview is in the author's archives.

saying: "Do not be afraid, I am with you!" Then I became courageous and peaceful; it gave me patience, and I felt that I had some support, although I was in a strange land and lonely."[4] Often, those who survived recalled in their memories various miracles that had taken place and the help of the Mother of God, which saved people from certain death:" "People could not find compassion and mercy, then I turned to the Mother of God for assistance, and she always helped me in miraculous ways."[5]

A profound, unforgettable and very interesting collection of memories unsearched in Latvian historiography relates to the experience of exiled Latvian Catholics with regard to other Christian denominations and religions and their practices during exile in Siberia, as well as their experience with locals who were not imprisoned in camps, but with whom the detainees often came across during their work. Episodes from these stories show a strong understanding of the faithful towards each other, mutual support and religious dialogue to a certain extent. Staņislavs Zvīdris stressed in his memoirs that although atheism was taught at a school in exile, all the local Russians also celebrated Christmas without fear of the Soviet regime.[6] In turn, an anonymous witness, observing the local inhabitants, Siberian Old Believers, mentioned in his memoirs: "The reality, in fact, is that: they are irreconcilable opponents of the Soviet regime. They do not recognize the government at all and do just the opposite. These Russians do not recognize and fulfil anything the authorities command. They do not put their signatures anywhere, do not state their true name, do not go to work and do not celebrate national holidays."[7]

Whereas remembering her first encounter with Muslims, this anonymous Latvian woman was deeply surprised, moved and strengthened by seeing the resolute and firm conviction of these prisoners: "Their prayers and praises of God left a deep impression on me; they did not just pray

[4] Tāvu zemes kalendārs. (1963). Munich, p. 28.

[5] Ibid., p. 41.

[6] Interview with Staņislavs Zvīdris (born 1940). February 15, 2015. The interview is in the author's archives

[7] Tāvu zemes kalendārs. (1963). Munich, p. 29.

but praised God, their Creator, and even in such a desperate situation found their only comfort in prayer. I then also immersed myself in prayer, repeating what my mother had taught me: God, our Savior and strength, help us in times of distress…"[8]

Those who were deported during the first round of deportations in 1941 suffered much more persecution and lived in special labour and concentration camps. In such type of detention camps, as evidenced by memoirs, any act of public praying or demonstration of faith was severely punished. However, prisoners always found a way to pray secretly or unnoticed: "It was most strictly forbidden in prisons to carry out any religious practices, and the administration strictly oversaw that none of the prisoners would show themselves as a believer. And we were very careful not to let the guards notice any of us praying or talking to each other on religious subjects."[9]The prisoners also received great help in maintaining their religious traditions from their relatives in Latvia. Prayer and religious books, rosaries etc. that helped maintain religious practices and beliefs in essential matters were sent. There were no churches or clergy near these Catholic prisoners, and the only exception was the occasional meeting with a priest who was also a prisoner. The church as an institution was unable to help Catholic prisoners in Siberia under the Soviet regime. A complete sacramental life was not possible, and therefore the spiritual life and practice of each believer were dependent on himself/herself and his/her family.

The return to Latvia was a strong spiritual experience for the deportees. The specific religious and transcendental significance of this return is reflected in a way in this story that was sent anonymously: "Entering into the yard, I greeted my mother: Glory be to Jesus Christ."

The majority of the Catholic prisoners, who survived and returned from exile in Siberia, renewed their sacramental, spiritual life immediately without delay. Those who had not attended any confessions hastened to confess; children who had not been baptized or confirmed were individu-

[8] Tāvu zemes kalendārs. (1963). Munich, p. 51.
[9] Ibid., p. 50.

ally trained in the churches. As S. Zvīdris states: "Returning to Latvia, I was prepared for the First Communion individually by the then vicar A. Boldāns. In August 1956, when Bishop Strods visited the Varakļāni church, I received my First Communion and the Sacrament of Confirmation." As evidenced by the witnesses' memoirs, it was a matter that needed to be addressed urgently, and no one doubted its correctness or its necessity.

## Conclusions

The narrative themes of social history and Catholic families in the history of Latvia is a topic for extensive research in the future that will reveal a much more detailed social and religious policy of the Soviet totalitarian regime and the various forms of non-violent resistance in Soviet-occupied Latvia. Moreover, it is a remarkable illustration of the story of preservation and transfer of faith and tradition to future generations in different political and economic conditions for the Roman Catholic Church and believers in Latvia. This is a story about the persecution and suffering of the 20th century Christians, which is not just a personal story, but can serve as a bridge to help better understand the realities of the modern world: war, the persecution of Christians, the problem of refugees and to raise the empathy of the Catholic community towards the victims, and to teach solidarity.

During the Soviet occupation, Latvian families were at the core of life and service of territorially and ideologically split Catholic communities in Latvia; the family was the place to learn, practice and inherit tradition and spiritual life. The most important role and mission of families were to preserve the Latvian identity and the Latvian Catholic community. In exile, Latvian Catholic parishes and organizations offered a whole range of services and social activities to hold together all generations of the community and pass on the cultural experience.

During deportation in Siberia, the Church, as an institution, could not help the Catholic prisoners under the Soviet regime. Complete sacramental

life was not possible. Therefore, the spiritual life and practice of every believer were dependent on himself and his family. Most of the Catholic prisoners, who survived and returned from the exile, renewed their sacramental, spiritual life after returning from Siberia during the second half of the 50's in the 20th century.

During the Soviet occupation, the Catholic Church in Rome was concerned about maintaining the tradition of Catholic families in three equally significant dimensions: in occupied Latvia, in exile abroad and exile in Siberia. Each of these places had their specific circumstances, which, from faithful maintenance of tradition and preservation and transfer of faith required great responsibility, hard work and tremendous courage.

*The article was prepared in the grant of the Latvian Council of Science No. 101-2012 "Thematization of Religious Experience in the Situation of Post-Liberal Spirituality: Latvian Case."*

*Inese Runce is a Doctor of History. She is a Leading researcher at the Institute of Philosophy and Sociology of the University of Latvia.*

Irena Saleniece

# TEACHERS' RELIGIOUS BEHAVIOUR IN THE LATVIAN SSR (1945–1985)

Human's attitude to God is a mandatory component of all world models that have existed in the history of humankind.[1] Depending on the essence and character of this attitude, the human conduct was formed within a community. The Soviet society based on the communist ideology, which rejects God and any religious manifestations, recognized as a norm atheistic world outlook with own conduct of society members including teachers.

The teacher's profession is undoubtedly one of the most responsible occupations.[2] The teacher's role is providing an example, and thus select regulations[3] and higher demands are set to them than to the public at large. In the Soviet society responsibility attributed to teachers made them immutable objects of surveillance, subjecting them to requirements of politically correct behaviour, ignoring of which as a rule brought along punishments.[4] Especially during the time of political transformations, as it

[1] Veinbergs J. *Piramīdu un zikurātu ēnā: cilvēks seno Tuvo Austrumu kultūrā.* Rīga: Zinātne, 1988, 17. lpp.

[2] Jaspers K. Dukhovnaja situacia vremeni. *Smysl i naznachenie istorii.* Moscow: Respublika, 1994, s. 352–355.

[3] Fitzpatrick Sh., Geyer M. (ed.) *Za ramkami totalitarizma: sravnitelnye issledovania stalinizma i nacizma*. Moscow: ROSSPEN, 2011, s. 304, 347.

[4] Ewing E. T. *Uchitelia epokhi stalinizma: vlast', politika i zhizn' shkoly 1930-h gg*. Moscow: ROSSPEN, 2011, s. 16–17.

was in Latvia in 1940ies, when "return to the conditions of life in peace after one of the most inhuman wars in history was impossible without the involvement of teachers into the process of reconstruction aimed to educate the new generation"[5]. The policy of Sovietization was purposefully implemented in the field of education in post-war Latvia,[6] to prepare the local youth for life in the Soviet society. At the beginning of the Soviet occupation, Latvian teachers had been placed in a contradictory position – they were simultaneously both the instruments of power and objects for re-education.[7] Their views of the period of independence had to be denounced, all assessments expressed in the class had to be in line with the communist directions. Teachers had to be able to represent the regime as its propagandists.

The paper aims to specify how teachers in Latvia treated the positions of the communist ideology in the sphere of religion, as well as reconstruct the models of their religious conduct in the Soviet period of the history of Latvia.

## Sources

Source materials for this research are composed of archival documents and teachers' memories. Mostly were used documents of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Latvia from the Latvian National Archives, the State Archives of Latvia (hereafter LNA, LVA).[8] Archival materials provide an insight into the action of the power bodies that is characterized by a very well-developed bureaucracy. Under the conditions of a totalitarian regime, the documents produced by power institutions were

[5] Mannheim K. *Diagnoz nashego vremeni.* Moscow: Jurist, 1994, s. 466.

[6] Bleiere D. Vispārējās izglītības sovjetizācija Latvijā: vēsturiskais konteksts, institucionālās vadības sistēma un kadru politika (1944-1964). *Latvijas Vēstures Institūta Žurnāls.* 2012, Nr. 4, 105.–137. lpp.

[7] Saleniece I. Teachers as Object and Subject of Sovietization: Daugavpils (1944–1953) O. Mertelsmann (ed.) *The Sovietization of the Baltic States, 1940–1956.* Tartu: KLEIO, 2003, pp. 197–206.

[8] *Latvijas Nacionālā arhīva Latvijas Valsts arhīvs.* http://www.archiv.org.lv/index3.php?id=8

mostly passed over to be kept in the archives[9]. Therefore they usually express the official position and show the situation from the perspective of power.

Another group of sources entails memories of teachers from the Eastern Latvia represented in the collection of the Oral History Centre of the Daugavpils University (DU OHC).[10] The Centre, from its very inception in 2003, has focused on an audio recording of the historical experience of the Eastern Latvia's (Latgale region and South Sēlija) residents of diverse ethnical and religious backgrounds, professions, social status, and education level. At the same time, although the collection is formed as a regional one that reflects the situation of the eastern part of Latvia, these sources offer insight not only in the history of the region but the history of Latvia and Central Europe as well. Individual and local particularities do not veil the human – individual personality's feelings in the course of the historical process, human attitude towards the events and mechanisms of relations with other people and powers. The DU OHC has a systematic collection of living people's testimonies, experiences from persons who might never have thought to record their memories. The DU OHC has compiled 1100 life histories including about 200 life histories of local teachers.

Archival materials, as well as press periodicals, represent the situation from the official power position. The legal acts issued by the regime determined the preferable conduct of teachers, that was accepted by the power and expected from teachers. Sources of personal origin, including oral history sources, provide an opportunity of investigating the actual individual conduct of people in the sphere of religion and faith and judge the determining factors of it.

The individual life is "the actual vehicle of historical experience". Oral history source reveals the past from the position of a particular person and gives us the possibility of trying to reconstruct from the present perspective the way the narrators provided motivation and explanation of their

---

[9] Sokolov A. (ed.) *Istochnikovedenie noveishei istorii Rossii: teoria, metodologia, praktika.* Moscow: Vysshaja shkola, 2004, s. 65.

[10] *Daugavpils Universitātes Mutvārdu vēstures centrs*. https://du.lv/fakultates/humanitara-fakultate/strukturvienibas/mutvardu-vestures-centrs/

behaviour in the diverse situations. In comparison with other historical sources, oral history has the advantage of presenting a person's life in full, allowing one to see the consequences of choices made henceforth in life. Moreover, the evidence in each life-story can only be fully understood as part of the whole life. Oral history makes it possible to address contemporaries directly, that leads to producing a 'more realistic and fair' reconstruction of the past.[11] No doubt, to obtain veritable information, the source base must be sufficiently representative; besides, it is necessary to take into consideration impact of political, ideological and other realia on the narrator, etc. During those years that separate us from the period we investigate, people have experienced much, and many of their notions have been transformed.[12] Using oral history sources, careful testing of the validity of the information they contain is needed[13]. Imperfections of oral history sources may be partly overcome by comparing the information from diverse kinds of historical sources. To reconstruct the past using these sources, in the article, there have been employed two of the four possible methods ("ways") described by Pol Thompson.[14] Namely, they are a narrative analysis and a reconstructive cross-analysis, which is conducted by a historian, who „constructs arguments" related to the patterns of behaviour or historical events by oral evidence.

## Teachers' religious life in Latvia

It should be taken into account that though in the pre-war Republic of Latvia church was separated from the state, in schools religion was taught for learners of Christian and Jewish religious confessions, and fun-

[11] Thompson P. *The Voice of the Past: Oral History*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000, pp. 7–8.

[12] Friedlander P. Theory, method and oral history. *The Oral History Reader.* R. Perks and A.Thomson (eds). London and New York: Routledge, 1998, p. 318.

[13] Grele R. J. Movement without aim: Methodological and theoretical problems in oral history. *The Oral History Reader.* R. Perks and A. Thomson (eds). London and New York: Routledge, 1998, p. 41.

[14] Thompson P. *The Voice of the Past: Oral History*, pp. 267–282.

damentals of ethics for unbelievers. The absolute majority of children attended lessons of religion.[15] This means that they not only were accustomed to their families to observe religious traditions and church rituals but also were familiar with the issues of church dogmatics and organization.

From the beginning of the Soviet occupation of Latvia, the task to fight against 'religious remnants' was set. As religious life undoubtedly belonged to the 'bourgeois' past, LPSR had as an ideological objective the elimination of religion and its replacement with atheism. After the Second World War, all traditional church denominations continued to operate in Latvia, despite the regime and the official ideology. Residents of Latvia who had become a 'Soviet people' were often unable to abandon their faith. The main factors that determined individuals' devotion to religious practice were the demands of the parents or other authoritative persons and just the inability of a particular person to live by denying his/her faith. Religious believers had to adapt to the atheist ideology, based on official guidelines.

Study of archival materials shows that the first post-war years could be characterised by both 'cleansing' and attempts to engage the intelligentsia in more active collaboration with the communist regime. In the minutes of the meetings of the Central Committee of the Latvian Communist (Bolshevik) Party, there are reflected annual discussions about the situation in the field of education in 1944-49. The main remarks concerning the teacher's profession included criticism of the 'wrong' views and conduct of teachers. Among other shortcomings religiosity was also mentioned and marked as unsatisfactory 'political qualification' or 'political level', the 'remnants of bourgeois ideology', etc. In the minutes of the LC(b)P CC meeting in November 1944 the "examination of teaching staff and improvement of their professional and political qualification" were demanded.[16] In 1945 it was decided "to purify the schools from the

[15] Staris A., Ūsiņš V. *Izglītības un pedagoģijas zinātnes attīstība Latvijā pirmās brīvvalsts laikā*. Rīga: Zinātne, 2000, 78. lpp.

[16] LNA LVA PA. R. 101-3-13.

elements alien and hostile to the Soviet power replacing them by honest and loyal employees".[17] In 1947 it was stressed again that "most teachers are still not completely free from the remains of bourgeois ideology"[18], and in May 1948 the first Secretary of the Latvian C(b)P CC J.Kalnbērziņš promised "to purify schools from alien and unsuitable workers".[19] It was done by August 1948 when "significant work on purification, promotion and reinforcement of personnel had been done".[20] The following year (1949) again there was a requirement "to improve the work aimed to raise the teachers' political level"[21], and it was noted that "many teachers have not given up religious prejudices, go to church, observe religious rituals. In the apartments of some school headmasters and teachers, there are still some icons hanging".[22]

Nevertheless, party leaders continued to share the opinion that intelligentsia, including teachers, could be reformed and re-educated. Secretary of the Latvian C(b)P CC A. Pelše claimed in 1949 that teachers who were ready honestly to serve ideas of the working class were likely to be liberated from their bourgeois ideology.[23] Re-educating was to take place by way of re-assessment of earlier views and adopting Marxism-Leninism. However in 1951 "there remain some socially alien and politically dubious people in teachers' work in a range of places.."[24]

The situation with the teachers' personnel in Latvia began to stabilize in the second half of the 1950s when the teachers' educational level improved, and labour turnover decreased. By the school year 1956/57 more than 92% of all teachers in Latvia had passed teacher training education (mostly obtained in the Soviet institutions).[25]

---

[17] LNA LVA PA. R. 101-7-12, pp. 154–159.
[18] LNA LVA PA. R. 101-10-22, pp. 5–7.
[19] LNA LVA PA. R. 101-11-57, pp. 73–74.
[20] LNA LVA PA. R. 101-11-12, pp. 13-14; R. 101-11-15, pp. 27–31.
[21] LNA LVA PA. R. 101-12-22, pp. 30–38.
[22] LNA LVA PA. R. 101-12-74, p. 60.
[23] LNA LVA PA. R. 101-12-74, pp. 61, 64.
[24] LNA LVA PA. R. 101-14-25, pp. 227–231.
[25] LNA LVA PA. R. 101-19-73, pp. 4, 7.

The main part of the educational reform launched in 1958-59 included the requirement to consolidate communist education of a Soviet person so that students were better prepared to real life; it also emphasized internationalism, patriotism, atheism, labour training. The role of atheist propaganda which concentrated mainly on schools increased considerably.[26]

In the Eastern Latvia, where religious traditions were fundamental, the population has preserved the Christian faith. The DU OHC has many testimonies of teacher's secret visits to the church for baptisms and marriages, which took place under the circumstances resembling a conspiracy. For participation in religious ceremonies (including funerals), they would often pay with their jobs or their CPSU membership card, but news about these practices frequently spread in the local community and often increased the respect of such teachers in the eyes of the local population.

We have at our disposal the memories of the first generation trained as Soviet teachers – youth of the transition period who was born in the 1920-30s and grew up in the 1940-50s. This generation experienced the change of different political regimes, the Second World War, the occupation of their native land, terror, etc. Their socialization in the pre-war independent state society had started but, with the entrance of alien powers, they had to revise their intellectual, moral, and psychological "luggage", get adapted to entirely different rules. They had to make tough choices. The analysis of oral history sources clarifies people's motivation when making choices and strategies of everyday life as well as consequences of carrying out those choices and the perception of the behaviour of teachers in society.

Each life history is an individual, and to some extent even unique, but at the same time allows us to make some generalizations and determine the most common types of human behaviour in the Soviet period,

[26] LNA LVA PA. R. 101-21-30, p. 58; R. 101-22-24, p. 55,79/94; R. 101-22-30, p. 40/43.

including religious behaviour. In the religious sphere individual's choices varied over a broad spectrum, from the denial of religion and involvement in its destruction to the complete devotion to God, becoming a priest or monk.[27] About teachers, it should be noted that in this area they have had fewer opportunities than their fellow citizens, because the pedagogical activity was recognized to be incompatible with open participation in Church life, not to mention public speeches in defence of freedom of conscience.

Judging by the life histories from the collection of the DU OHC, the most common types of behavior of the local teacher of the Eastern Latvia during the Communist totalitarian period were: the rejection of religion, public anti-religious activities with simultaneous secret religious practice; and evasion (not demonstrative) to participate in anti-religious activities and discreet church attendance.

### The rejection of religion

The communist system unconditionally demanded teachers to have an atheistic world outlook and engage in the organization of anti-religious events with the aim of the atheistic upbringing of the would-be builders of communism. Under the conditions of the post-war Latvia, where the regime had to take into consideration the mass religiousness of the local population, it was considered that working teachers and especially students of pedagogical specialities would reject religious faith to comply with their mission in the Soviet society. It may be supposed with a rather significant certainty that all who worked at schools in the Latvian SSR in the period of the 1950-80s, to a certain extent followed this requirement. Analysing the oral history sources makes it evident that among former teachers who worked in the Soviet period there are people who grew out

[27] Saleniece I. Mutvārdu vēstures avotu izmantošana 20. gadsimta 60.–80. gadu Latvijas vēstures pētīšanā: reliģiskā dzīve // *Latvija un Austrumeiropa 20. gadsimta 60.–80. gados. Starptautiskās konferences referāti: Latvijas Vēsturnieku komisijas raksti*. 20. sējums. – Rīga: Latvijas vēstures institūta apgāds, 2007. – P. 157.

of the custom of going to church and rejected religion. By the moment of being interviewed (no less than 20 years after the downfall of the communist system) they had made no attempts at returning to the church and gave a clear evidence of secularization that had happened in the Soviet period.

For instance, Ilga B.[28] (born in 1926, teacher 1953-1990) in the process of acquiring higher pedagogical education had been indoctrinated to the communist ideas and, disregarding her 'dubious' biography, had joined the Communist Party in the 1950s, yet in the late 1980s partially changed her views. However, this 'revision' did not concern her atheistic convictions. Moreover, despite the post-Soviet fashion for religious rites, the narrator expressed her unconditional support to the new secular traditions that appeared in the Soviet period. For instance, the Catholic rite of burial, in her opinion, does not stand criticism in comparison to the secular one, because of the lack of individualized treatment of the deceased:

> [..] that funeral was so impersonal because we were used to no priests in the Soviet time but the public funeral directors; they were so personal about the life course of the deceased, everything. Here he [priest] started speaking Latin, at least mentioned the name and surname in Latin. However, said nothing, just related everything to that religion and all.

The above mentioned consequently nihilistic treatment of religion is not characteristic of the former Soviet teachers in eastern Latvia; the majority of sources reveal that the former conductors of atheistic upbringing gave up their atheist convictions in the post-Soviet period, preferring either traditional religion or esoteric teachings, paganism, etc. Often there happened individual informal turning to God, as was the case with Raisa Zh.[29] (born in 1934, History teacher 1956-1987):

---

[28] Interview undertaken by Irēna Saleniece, Aknīste of Jēkabpils district, 3 July, 2008, 179 minutes, in Latvian. DU MV 548.

[29] Interview undertaken by Zane Stapķeviča, Vabole parish of Daugavpils district, 30 June, 2003, 95 minutes, in Latvian. DU MV 54.

> Historian's job did not allow that, social science could not be taught by non-communist, one had to join the communist party, and how could a communist go to the church. No, no I did not go [to church] because one could not do it secretly. Such secrecy would be discovered sooner or later. Moreover, that was a risk of losing job, losing a career. [..] My daughter is not baptized. She did not have a church wedding, just civil registry at the village council, but now they have baptized their children, and herself got baptized as a Catholic because her husband is Catholic. [..] During the independent Latvia I started going to Daugavpils, to Boris and Gleb Church. Not often, a couple of times a year, ordering a service for the dead, lighting candles for the excellent health of my grandchildren and daughter. In my heart, I believe…

Hence, addressing individual cases and regarding not only the Soviet period but the time afterwards, it is possible to note a change in the conduct and convictions of former teachers, who had lost connection to the church. Some people have lost God from their world picture, but for the majority God exists, though sometimes in a much-transformed way.

### Public anti-religious activities with simultaneous secret religious practice

There is no shortage of cases regarding teachers who publicly broke from religious practice during the Soviet period, but before death sought to catch up for the past and prayed for redemption.

Leonora's D.[30] (born in 1931, a teacher from 1950, headmaster from 1970, from 1977 – kolkhoz party organisation's secretary) life history is typical of local young people, who tried to adapt themselves to the Soviet order in professional and everyday life.

The religious practice of Leonora deserves particular attention. She was raised in a family of firm believers and since childhood grew fast into Catholicism:

---

[30] Interview undertaken by Irēna Saleniece, Dviete parish of Daugavpils district, 27 June, 2005, 180 minutes, in Latvian. DU MV 244.

> I lived in a very such firm believers' family, Catholic family. All prayers, *Paternoster*… Mother spinning the yarn and a book of prayers before her. Moreover, I am sitting by her side, and I need to know it all by heart. I learned catechism, *Paternoster*, *Hail Mary*, all that was needed. My mother had taught me.

Knowledge received from her mother and religious upbringing in the family were consolidated by Leonora at school that she graduated during the war. Having entered Daugavpils Teacher Training Institute already in the Soviet period, in the second half of the 1940s, she secretly went to the church service together with other students. The girls knew that the would-be teachers were forbidden to practise religion, but they could not imagine their life without faith in God. Moreover, in the post-war Latvia, the majority of the local population continued supporting the religious tradition. For instance, a landlady with whom Leonora was renting a flat in the town reminded that she was from a family of believers and had to go to the church, despite the official ban.

> [..] I lived by a landlady; she was a firm believer – a Polish woman, Madam Helena. She worked in a hospital as a nurse. She said, 'Lyonya, you are from a family of believers.' I said, 'But I fear, fear that they will get to know at school.' They told us if you go to the church, you will not get a diploma. You will not be allowed to be a teacher, yes, we had such propaganda. [..] then we dressed and at twelve gathered some four-five girls, and a couple of boys and went by tram to Virgin Mary church. I remember at twelve Shepherds' Mass, we all went there.

Leonora with deep sympathy remember the academic staff at the teacher training institute who unobtrusively, by means of hints, taken only by those in the know, reminded of traditional rules and values: "Such a wonderful teacher [Lebedeva] – real Latvian – she taught us geography so that we felt: this is our person, she loved Latvia so much [..] once on Christmas morning she says: 'Girls, I will not delay you by my class today, you may go home. Today there seems to be a festive day if someone remembers'. We all ran home at once."

Having started working as a teacher in Kārsava, Leonora continued secretly go to church services, but a local tractor-driver noticed her and her friend in the church and threatened to inform on them. The young teachers bought vodka to the blackmailer and lived in fear of being informed on.

Also, the professional career ran smoothly, and she did not want to take more risks. Later, when Leonora's children were born, she "did not teach them anything [related to religion] because then it was scary just to look at the church when passing by". Nevertheless, the narrator recalled an episode when she, already a school headmaster, managed to organize a ball on Easter with the participation of a brass band from the neighbouring sovkhoz.

> [..] we all Latgalians, we all know that it will be Easter, yes, and you know that you are not allowed to mention in class, children also watching, they seem to understand that it is a great festival, it is Easter. Now, talking to teachers, I say: you know, on first Easter day let us organise a big ball at school. Are you crazy? Ball? On Easter? I said that I do not need a permit, it is Sunday, just Sunday. Where to get music? Malnava brass band, I say, I will go to them.

In sovkhoz, it was possible to arrange the celebration without obstacles. Describing her trickery when preparing this, Leonora could not with certainty account for the fact that the party organizer of the sovkhoz gave his agreement, though being a high-principled person, a veteran and invalid of the Great Patriotic War – either he did not realize where he was sending musicians or did not object in his soul.

After moving to Dviete and starting a career in the Communist party in 1977, the narrator was engaged with anti-religious propaganda and was personally re-educating the residents of the village who practised religion, while, as she confirmed in her narration, secretly went to the church when in Daugavpils or Riga. During an interview in the early 2000s she told about the secret side of her life:

– [..] I still had that faith in me, yes. It has a great significance.

**– However, then you just had to keep it secret.**

– Yes, I had to keep it secret, but I could secretly pray.

**– Yes, but confession evidently…**

– Well, I could do it. When going to Riga, I went to confession in Riga.

**– Yes!**

– I went to Riga via Daugavpils. I went to Mukāns to that church and went to confession. It was possible if one wished, it was!

**– Only where you could not be caught.**

– Of course. Moreover, then you go with such fear.. thinking, well, maybe someone recognizes me. Because, one way or another, but it would be a pity to lose the job.

Such conduct by the narrator in the past may be classified in the broadest range from hypocrisy and cynical adaptation to a traumatic sense of loss and spiritual resistance (though unaware) to the totalitarian regime. In the post-Soviet period, according to the narrator, she experienced the most profound redemption and open reproaches of priest and believers: "[..] sometimes I drop my head but very many communists, former party members go to the church in our place."

Hence, though the motivation for participation in anti-religious propaganda and denouncing religion was sufficiently high (enforced on the part of authorities; fear of being 'other', not complying with the image of the 'builder of communism'; career interests), still it was not easy to reject the values imbibed in childhood.

## Evasion to participate in anti-religious activities and Church attendance

Among the interviewed teachers there were those who had tried to preserve a bond with religion disregarding the repressive policy of the authorities, and instead of straight participation in anti-religious activities, they participated in other spheres (culture, sports, etc.). In order not to

attract attention and avoid persecution, such teachers visited the church and performed religious rites discretely. Besides, the degree of a conspiracy of their religious life was steadily growing.

The example of Olga S[31] (born in 1921, teacher 1944-1976) shows that this process can be reconstructed with chronological precision. Hence, in 1946, when she got married, she never thought of hiding the fact of having had a church wedding. Moreover, the couple limited themselves to a church wedding only as in the pre-war Latvia this form of the wedding was not only recognized as official but in fact dominated in the society.

> [..] I worked at the school and yet had a church wedding in Eglaine. Everybody told me, what are you doing now. However, I do not know why… I have a document that we were married in Eglaine Catholic parish. Then I thought it is all and did not go to the civil parish registry. Well, after half a year I was told: I am not married; my surname is the same G-e and not S-e. However, I say, 'Why so?' No, it is not counted as official, church registry is not recognized. However, here I have a document that I am married. Well, I must have gone to the civil registry afterwards. So we went to civil registry, I had to pay a fine for having led, so to say, an immoral life, without registering [*laughs*].

Hence, the teacher, though having received punishment in the form of a fine and reprimand for immoral conduct, was not subjected to severe repressions; moreover, the officials had a discussion with her on the topic of the unlawfulness of church wedding. It is hard to imagine a similar situation after some years or decades.

The 'lesson' was not lost on Olga, in the course of time, the young teacher's conduct grew more and more secretive. She recalls the time of the early 1950s:

> My children were also baptized, they were born in 1952 and 1954. Well, then that was how Luberts was. He brought me a priest from

[31] Interview undertaken by Gints Kokins, in Eglaine parish of Daugavpils district, 10 April, 2003, 120 minutes, in Latvian. DU MV 28.

> Ilūkste in the middle of the night on a motorcycle. The windows were closed, and so my kids were baptized. Anyway, I just asked the priest not to record this in the parish register, that I am a teacher, that such things are not allowed.

There were moments when the teacher refused to participate in religious ceremonies, though afterwards, she reproached herself for this: "one must not refuse the cross, I refused". For instance, in the 1970s there happened such an occasion:

> The neighbour [..] gave birth to a daughter; the wife was a Catholic. She came to me and asked me to become a god-mother. I say, 'Well, what will Ilya say?' He was a real Soviet man. She says, 'Well, you will take her at night.' I say, 'And where will Ilya be then?' 'Well, on the occasion when he leaves home, then.' I say, 'But everybody in Eglaine will know how I will take that child.' 'I will give you a different coat and all; I just want you to be the god-mother.' I say, 'If you bring the priest home and Ilya will be out, maybe I will come, but I will not take the child to the church.' I refused and did not go, but only because I wanted to work at school.

In the situation described the narrator mentions the reason for her choice against religion – fear of losing a job. Another essential argument appears in the story – the probability of the child's father learning about the baptism (according to the narrator, he was 'a real soviet man', i.e. alien among the local people who secretly violated the norms of the Soviet lifestyle); she did not trust him and expected him informing on her.

Olga took into consideration the possibility of being exposed during the whole of the Soviet period, yet she continued her secret religious life. Only at the end of the 1980s, she learned how the surrounding people perceived it.

> By chance, when the awakening period began, people would tell me: 'We know where you go to church. [..] You go to Grendze. You had a different coat and scarf, and you went to the Grendze Church on a bicycle. They all said that S-e was in church.' I asked, 'Why didn't you tell the school that I was in the Church?'

The narrator emphasizes her loyalty to the Catholic tradition, for which during the Soviet period she would have paid dearly if the regime had known – that is if the surrounding community had revealed her secret. However, she was not reported to the school. As a result, this helped the teacher to maintain her ties with the church.

### Refusing to obey the requirements of the authorities

In cases when teachers who were believers did not keep secret their devotion to religion, did not take any opportunities of compromise, and did not engage in atheistic propaganda, they were not allowed to work in school. Janīna T.[32] (born in 1932, teacher 1956-1958) faced such a situation. She grew up in a mixed Polish-Latgalian peasant family with rich religious traditions. The family upbringing in the pre-war period, according to the narrator, "gives very [much] to a person for spiritual and moral growth".

For this reason, she refused to join the pioneer and Komsomol organizations, despite ardent persuasion on behalf of teachers as the girl learned with honours. "My daddy considered that I must not, that those ideas are different from how I had been brought up [..]. He knows that if I join Komsomol, it is against religion. There is a totally different idea, another teaching and, yes, the main is a religious conviction." Besides there was the conviction that, as much as possible, one must avoid collaboration with the communist regime: "seeing all those atrocities, what the Soviet regime did to these farms, collective, all that deportation. Seeing that atrocity, cruelty how priests were tortured here in Krāslava.[33] Just because they were priests. So, to a certain extent, there was such a protest, which I do not want to submit to you, your regime, and I did not join."

---

[32] Interview undertaken by Iveta Bogdanovicha, in Krāslava, 14-15 July, 2009, 109 minutes, in Latvian. DU MV 670.

[33] In 1941 in Krāslava Catholic priests V. Paškevičs, S. Tabore, A. Vilmanis were killed http://latgalesdati.du.lv/persona/619

Entering the teacher training institute, Janīna intentionally chose the specialization of a teacher of physics and mathematics, because "there are concrete things: 2x2=4, [..] whatever the ruling power." She also chose extramural studies not to live in the students' halls of residence – "on Sundays I want to go to the church or, for instance, the month of rosary, or services in May, I want to go to the church, but in the halls I won't be able to do it." During the study sessions, she regularly went to the church without being caught, unlike her friend who was exposed by other students who saw her entering the church. To the interviewer's question how the narrator's conviction conformed to the official ideology, the narrator replied:

> When I studied in the institute, I got the highest grade [for subjects rooted in communist ideology] [*laughs*]. Of course, it did contradict [religion], but I did it just to be able to exist. [..] I needed grant and more significant grant [..] historical, dialectical materialism reading, reading... After that I was thinking – maybe really there is no higher power, but everything happens so: nature rules and it goes according to nature rules [..] Well, if nature rules, there must be a legislator, for the rules to exist.

Before Janīna's eyes, her Latin language teacher was expelled from school when it turned out that he had studied in a religious seminary. Possibly she could have had to abandon school for ideological reasons because she lived with the conviction that "never even doubt that there is a supreme power ruling us; there is life beyond death, the soul exists, it continues living". However, having worked at the school for some years, she fell seriously ill and started working in the library. There she worked with success for long years, but her calling was still school and teacher's work. She just could not fulfil it during the communist regime. In the late 1980s, she took the first opportunity to return to school: "I applied to schools asking to let me take free classes, talk to pupils about religious faith. I went to Kombuļi, Skaista and here in Krāslava I went to school."

Janīna participated in Latvian Popular Front movement, took part in the Baltic Way, rallies and manifestations, all the time praying for the

independence of Latvia. She recalled her sensations on the eve of the time of barricades when after participation in people's manifestation in Riga they returned to Krāslava with heavy premonitions as to the possible attacks of the regime on the partisans of independence:

> [..] sitting on the bus, very sad that we had to leave Riga, had to return home to Krāslava. We were sitting unfortunate and singing religious songs, asking for God's help. Moreover, we saw the heavy trucks driving to Riga. We rejoiced that tractors and bulldozers were driving to defend Riga, construct barricades. Moreover, I rejoiced that there would be resistance to that attack.

Owing to the effort of Janīna and hundreds of thousands of such reliable people, the independence of Latvian state was restored, granting democratic rights to Latvian people including the freedom of faith. Janīna perceives it as a just solution and is glad about it. All her life she apparently knew the priority, and always could keep on the side of God. During the interview she demonstrated her hierarchy of values once again by sharing her joy with the interviewer:

> Now I will show you a more important, a more important photo. [..] when the awakening started, I actively participated in church life, and for this active work, I was granted such honour that I was allowed, when the holy father John Paul II came to Aglona, accept the holy communion from his hands. Moreover, I took Holy Communion in Aglona from the hands of a saint, Pope John Paul II!

It seems that God had heard Janīna's hot and persistent prayers and rewarded her true and self-denying faith.

## The consequences of choices made

Remembering their religious behaviour in the Soviet time, today the narrators experience a whole range of feelings and emotions, from joy and satisfaction to bitterness and regret. The joy is caused by a religious 'rehabilitation' in the post-Soviet period and the fact that the narrators today

are not ashamed of their past behaviour. On the other hand, one hears more and more often bitterness about that spiritual retreat committed many years ago and discomfort because of others' reproaches for atheistic activities:

> [..] but then when the [19] 90's years started, it was the worst moment for us [teachers], when you had to go to church if you want to go. Moreover, women standing in the doorway would ask: 'Now, are you allowed?' 'Yes, we can!' Just answer it for yourself, and go. Until they all come became used to it. Oh! [..] you go to church as if they were immediately going to douse you in hot water.[34]

Individuals are still looking for healing from their trauma through a variety of means:

- turning to priests for advice

> [When] the Soviet power arrived – occupants – then the church was neglected, you could not go there [..]. I had been reprimanded for participating in the funeral, going to the church with others [*sighing*]. However, now in [19]91 when our free Latvia regained its independence again I decided to go on procession anew. Dean Zeile then was serving in our church. The reconstruction was done, he made flags and me – 16 costumes. Moreover, now I have a procession twice a year going around the church. I am glad that I have done something for the benefit of my local church.[35]

- starting to visit church worship services and partaking of the sacraments

> He [the narrator's husband] was a believer, but at that time there were other ideologies, he worked as a teacher. You know, a teacher could not even look in the direction of a church, let alone go there.

---

[34] Interview undertaken by Irēna Saleniece, in Krāslava, 13 July, 2009, 340 minutes, in Latvian. DU MV 656.

[35] Interview undertaken by Ligita Strode, in Malta of Rēzekne district, 16 August, 2003, 75 minutes, in Latvian. DU MV 131.

> The secretary of the party organization [..] and when he retired, then he no longer had anything to do with the school, and then we could attend church freely. He began to go to church himself, and then it was an entirely different life. We got married. We just jumped on a moving train ten days before his death. We managed it.[36]

- attempting to find other opportunities to redeem their past resignation, such as donations to the church

> How grateful I am that I did this in the autumn [..] I did this for fifty-four lats. I made two beautiful table covers for the altar, I sewed them myself [..] now I think that it is right, it is over, there is no money left. I did this because every one of my great- grandfathers and parents married there and we were baptized there... For our church something was ... needed.[37]

Many former teachers blame themselves for not persevering with their faith, nor being able to transmit religious beliefs, values and thought acquired earlier in the pre-war society to their children, which got replaced by Marxist dogmas under the pressure of Communist propaganda. The children's and grandchildren's generations do not have the same adherence to religious beliefs, and children were kept away from the topic of religion, bearing in mind their future. This is partly a result of the efforts of atheist activity, but parents also take partial responsibility.

## Conclusions

On the whole, the analysis of evidence of contemporaries reveals that in the Soviet period in Latvia teachers brought up in the pre-war Latvia faced in the sphere of religious life a choice between rejecting traditional values including faith in God and abandoning their profession. It was not

[36] Interview undertaken by Inese Ruļuka, Demene parish of Daugavpils district, 28 June, 2006, 56 minutes, in Latvian. DU MV 357.

[37] DU MV 656.

a natural choice; the majority of teachers were forced to comply with double standards trying to preserve the bond with religion without revealing it publicly. They tried to save their children and pupils from this tormenting situation, protect them from the danger of repressions and make their life more comfortable in the atheistic Soviet state. Overwhelming anti-religious propaganda on a state level, atheistic system of education, and the example of the majority of teachers who publicly ignored, accused and even persecuted religion, created an atmosphere for the formation of the views of young people. The opposition to this state of matters of families of believers and religious institutions discredited by the regime was unequal. Therefore the following generations of Latvian society grew less and less religious, whereas the life of the society in Latvian SSR got secularised not only on the surface.

*Irēna Saleniece is Dr. hist., a professor of Daugavpils University.*

Nadezhda Pazukhina

# ECUMENISM MOVEMENT IN SOVIET LATVIA: A SKETCH OF THE HISTORY

The history of the ecumenism movement in Latvia under the soviet regime should be reviewed in the wider perspective taking into account the Soviet government policy in the field of religion overall, as well as relations between the secular power and the Christian churches including the Russian Orthodox Church.

## "Controlled" ecumenism

Interest in the ecumenism movement in the context of Soviet foreign policy appeared immediately following the Second World War. The participation of the Russian Orthodox Church in the World Council of Churches was planned by the Soviet government as a tool in the political game against the Vatican, thereby strengthening the stance of the "Eastern bloc "against the West. According to the policy, a plan was drawn with the consent of Stalin in March 1945 that foresaw the subjection of the Greek Uniate (Orthodox) Church under the Moscow Patriarchate thereby liquidating the Vatican 's jurisdiction on the Ukrainian Catholic Church and merging its priests (those who were free after the mass arrests) with the

Russian Orthodox Church.[1] The plan was implemented mainly in spring of 1946, and the goal was achieved overall during a two-year period.[2] Supporting the contact between the Russian Orthodox and Anglican churches the Soviet government hoped to counter the influence of the USA in the World Council of Churches. However, the Russian Orthodox Church did not become a member of the Council until 1947 partly due to the ultimatum of the Moscow Patriarchate representatives. The World Council of Churches did not accept the participatory conditions proposed by the Russian Orthodox Church with the approval of the Soviet government – reject participation in the ecumenical movement for the representatives of the St. Sergius Orthodox Theological Institute of Paris as well as American, Polish and Finnish Orthodox churches. The further official government attitude towards accession to the World Council of Churches was highly negative.[3]The issue of participation in the World Council of Churches became topical during Nikita Khrushchev's atheistic propaganda and the persecution of the church during the campaign. The church community perceived the international organization's authority as an opportunity to soften the Soviet government's repressive policy directed against the Orthodox Church, as well as religion in general.

---

[1] These political aims were clearly described in Georgy Karpov's (1898–1967), Chairperson of Council for Russian Orthodox Church case (1943 – 1960), report to Stalin (dated 15.03.1945.): Dokladnaia zapiska G.G. Karpova I.V. Stalinu o meropriiatiiakh po prisoedineniiu greko-katolicheskikh prikhodov SSSR k RPTs, ukrepleniiu vliianiia Moskovskoi patriarkhii za rubezhom, razvertyvaniiu bor'by protiv Vatikana. dr. GARF. F. 6991. Op. 1. D. 29. L. 101–109. Accessible at: https://rusoir.ru/03print/03print-02/03print-02-223/ [3.03.2017.]

[2] Unmerging Western Greek Catholic congregations with Moscow Patriarchate and the complete liquidation of Greek Catholic Church subjected to Vatican mentioned in the report of Georgy Karpovto the Soviet government at the beginning of 1948. GARF. F. 6991. Op. 1. D. 153. L. 6–7. Refer. Commentary on archive documents: https://rusoir.ru/03print/03print-02/03print-02-223/ [3.03.2017.]

[3] Vasil'eva, Olga Iu. *Gosudarstvo, Russkaia Pravoslavnaia Tserkov' i ekumenizm: istoricheskie aspekty problemy*. Accessible at: http://krotov.info/history/20/1940/vasil_o.html [3.03.2017.]

The Moscow Patriarch Alexius (Alexij, 1877–1970, patriarch 1945–1970) participated in the Soviet society conference on disarmament (*konferentsiia sovetskoi obshchestvennosti za razoruzhenie*) that was held in Moscow on 16th February 1960. His speech was later termed historic by believers in recognition of the Orthodox Church thus daring publicly to comment on the tragic situation of the church during ongoing repression by the Soviet authorities. The speech of the Patriarch authored by the metropolitan Nikolaj (Jaruševič, 1891/92–1961), stressed the role of the Russian Orthodox Church during pivotal movements in Russian history – the formation of centralised Grand Duchy of Moscow (Rus), spiritual well-being of believers during the Tatar-Mongol yoke, the "Time of Troubles" (*Smutnoe vremia*) in the 17th century, Napoleon war in 1812 and the 2nd World War, as well as the significance of religious tradition in the Russian cultural heritage and the society as a whole.[4] This report led to sharp criticism by the party functionaries and dissatisfaction of the Committee for State security. The metropolitan Nikolaj was removed from office in the editorial committee of the official Russian Orthodox Church magazine *Zhurnal Moskovskoi Patriarkhii* under pressure from the patriarch he resigned from the office of metropolitan and died in December 1961 in Moscow's Botkin hospital under unexplained circumstances. Patriarch Alexius was forced to support the changes proposed by the authorities for regulating church life (restricting the authority of the priests in favour of a church council that was controlled by the party committee at the local and regional level)[5]. These changes, as well as the issue of accession of the Russian Orthodox Church into the World Council of Churches, were discussed at the Council of Bishops summoned by the patriarch on 8th July 1961.[6] The Council approved the invitation of the metropolitan Nikodim (Rotov, 1929–1978) for the Russian Orthodox

[4] Speech publications: *Zhurnal Moskovskoi Patriarkhii*. 1960, № 3, 33–35.

[5] Pospelovskii, Dmitrii. (1995). *Russkaia Pravoslavnaia Tserkov' v XX veke*. Moskva: Respublika, 289.

[6] Ibid.

Church to join the World Council of Churches.[7] The Russian Orthodox Church was accepted as a member of the III World Council of Churches assembly in New Delhi (November–December 1961).[8] This event opened new opportunities for other churches in the Soviet republics including Latvia to join this organisation. The Evangelical Lutheran Church of Latvia became a member of the Council in 1962.[9]

However, the activities of the Christian churches from the USSR in this international organisation were strictly controlled by not just the Committee for State Security but also the Soviet authorities. The present critical attitude to the Soviet representation of religious life at the international level is directly related to the circumstances mentioned above.[10] The participation of church representatives of Soviet Union's largest Christian churches in the international ecumenical movement was an opportunity to attract the attention of the wider International community to the government's repressive policy towards the traditional churches of the USSR, especially during the period of the Khrushchev government (1958–1964). On the other hand, the activities in the international arena represented the state of the church during the Soviet regime. The Soviet regime used the representation as an opportunity demanding that the authorized representatives conceal the real situation.

---

[7] Mitropolit Nikodim i Vsepravoslavnoe edinstvo. *K 30-letiiu konchiny mitropolita Leningradskogo i Novgorodskogo Nikodima (Rotova).* Sost. prof.-protoierei Vladimir Sorokin. Sankt-Peterburg: Izdatel'stvo Kniaz'-Vladimirskogo sobora, 2008. Accessible at: http://www.vladimirskysobor.ru/_mod_files/PDF_files/mnivpe.pdf) [4.03.2017.]

[8] *The Moscow Patriarchate in the register of World Council of Churches*: https://www.oikoumene.org/en/member-churches/russian-orthodox-church [3.04.2017.]

[9] *News on this religious organisation in the register of World Council of Churches*: https://www.oikoumene.org/de/member-churches/evangelical-lutheran-church-of-latvia [3.04.2017.] *On ecumenical activity refer to the section Ekumene on the official webpage of the Evangelical Lutheran Church of Latvia*: http://www.lelb.lv/lv/?ct=ekurmene [3.04.2017.]

[10] Priede, Andris. Forced Ecumenism under Soviet regime in Latvia and its impact on the collective memory. *Scholarly papers University of Latvia. Vol. 793. Oriental Studies between East and West: Cultural and religious dialogue before, during and after the totalitarian rule*. Riga: University of Latvia, 2013, p. 53–68.

Although the various church representatives hoped to use the international authority of the World Council of Churches to lessen the ideological pressure exerted by the authorities on the religious organisations and achieve freedom of conscience in the Soviet society, in reality, they were themselves often used as a tool in political games. The remark of the Russian Orthodox priest Vsevolod Špiller (1902–1984) on the specifics of the Church during the Soviet regime in this context is very interesting. The Russian Orthodox Church as well other religious denominations in the USSR had no legal status. Consequently, according to Špiller, the Church, especially the Russian Orthodox Church, in 1960 fell into the hands of the generation born during the Stalin period (the 1940s), who did not have any experience or the confidence that the church could have cannon laws and institutions regulating Church life independent from the secular power. Church priests of that time did not perceive the church as a social institution but rather in the narrower perspective of a religious community. Therefore, in their further activities, they succumbed to the demands of the secular authorities not only from the fear of reprisals but also under the conviction that there could only be one authority and one law in the country.[11] The situation in the Evangelical Lutheran Church of Latvia was a bit different from that of the Russian Orthodox Church of the Moscow patriarchate, at least in the fact that the anti-religious propaganda in Latvia and the Baltic States did not have a profound impact on the society. Although the society overall was altogether secular even during the interwar period,[12] priests still remembered the religious life during the pre-war Latvia, and Catholic, as well as Lutheran priests, had "underground" contacts with the Latvian religious communities in exile. The

[11] Pospelovskii, Dmitrii. *Russkaia Pravoslavnaia Tserkov' v XX veke*. Moskva: Respublika, 1995, s. 292.

[12] Description of religious situation between wars in Latvia regarding the Evangelical Lutheran Church of Latvia refer: Misāne, Agita. Latvijas Evaņģēliski luteriskās baznīcas revitalizācijas projekti 20. gadsimta 20.–30. gados: Jāņa Sandera un Alfreda Indriksona teoloģiskie uzskati un darbība. *Reliģiski-filozofiski raksti*, XX, 2016, 181.–216. lpp.

Russian Orthodox Church in Soviet Latvia also had priests who had not been broken by the Soviet authorities. Paradoxically, it is the cruel *GULAG* system that promoted the "spontaneous" ecumenical relations between the representatives of various churches and their priests. The accidental meetings between the Christian labour camp prisoners with brothers of faith irrespective of their religious affiliation were important. There were cases where communion sacrament was received in custody together by Catholics and Orthodox prisoners. The story is similar also with the Shepherd Archimandrite Tavrion (Batozskij, 1898–1978, in the Valgunde cloister: 1968 – 1978) of the Valgunde Orthodox cloister (*Spaso-Preobrazhenskaia Pustyn'*) who was open to dialogue with Christians of all affiliations. The archimandrite suffered two arrests and forced labour in the construction of the Belomorkanal (White Sea Canal) and the Turinsk camp and exile in Kazakhstan. He ignored the distinctions between the various Christian churches and offered help to people in their search for God.[13] This inter-Christian unity, willingness to help Christian brothers in faith because they were all equally and cruelly persecuted, was transferred from the camps to live in "freedom", which one could easily lose again for openly expressing religious beliefs and views that did not coincide with the official ideology.

## "Non-formal" ecumenism: Sandrs Rīga

It is also important today not to forget the experience,[14]related to the non-formal ecumenical movement which did not have any direct links to any particular Christian church. The *Ecumen group* phenomenon can be

[13] Natalia Bolshakova, founder of Alexander Men fund (1990, Riga) and chairperson and active participant of non-formal ecumenist movement memoirs. Interview recorded by the author of the paper on 2nd May 2017, Riga. For archimandrite Tavrion refer to detailed memoirs of his spiritual follower priest Vladimir Vilgert: Vil'gert, Vladimir, sviashchennik. (2001). Vsiazhizn' – Paskha Khristova. Arkhimandrit Tavrion (Batozskii). Moskva: Otchii Dom.

[14] Latvian ecumenical publication "Kas mūs vieno?" (published 2005–2014) homepage: http://www.kasmusvieno.lv/par-zjurnalu.html [4.04.2017.]

linked to the philosophical-religious search atmosphere of the 70's and 80's of the 20th century that was formed by a new generation who had been brought up in the cities, had fairly good education but tried to avoid any kind of deep involvement in the ideological, political system of the USSR. Often this dissent also had a romantic dimension – the tendency to go beyond censorship and accepted norms, escape into a parallel reality where there was less contact with the official ideology and forced collectivism. Aleksej Jurčak describes this period from the social anthropological perspective as standardisation of authoritative discourse, inflexibility expressed in the media and official language and visual images (posters, films, art) and the daily life of organizations and social ritual structures. However, it is this standardization of norms and significance that marked a *performative shift* that provided people with the opportunity to create an alternative zone and space that was not in direct opposition to the official rule, but also not under its direct authority.[15] This theoretical notion is appended from the religious perspective by the words of the Orthodox priest and theologian Alexander Men (1935 – 1990): "We need not indulge in a political struggle. The evangelic gospel is in itself an anti-Soviet book. If people read the gospel, they would become different, and the totalitarian regime will collapse by itself".[16]In this respect, Sandrs Rīga's ecumenical group (Aleksandrs Rotbergs, b. 1939) idea organically blended with the late-socialist context. He tried to form an alternative community within the existing Soviet system which was ideologically based on Christian unity but institutionally independent from any specific Christian church. Irina Jazikova, art scholar and member of Sandrs Rīga's group since the end of the 70's remembers that the eve of 70's and 80's were a

[15] Iurchak, Aleksei. (2014). Eto bylo navsegda, poka nekonchilosj. Poslednee sovetskoe pokolenie. Moskva: Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie, 77–78. English: Yurchak, Alexei. Everything was forever, untill it was no more: the last Soviet generation. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2005.

[16] Refer to Irina Jazikova's memoirs: Iazykova, Irina, Golovko, Ol'ga. Irina Iazykova: Religioznoe podpol'e vos'midesiatykh. *Pravoslavie i mir.* 30.07.2013. http://www.pravmir.ru/religioznoe-podpole-vosmidesyatyx/ [4.04.2017.]

time when it became clear there is no point in reforming anything, and people started their internal emigration – search for the meaning of spiritual and intellectual life, having understood that one should live their lives regardless of the *political climate*.[17] Sandrs Rīga himself mentions the search for the meaning of life as one of the important turning points. In 1964, he moved from Riga to Moscow in an attempt to break the ties with his "bohemian" lifestyle in Riga. He mentions the director Māra Ķimele (1943), composer Imants Kalniņš (1941), author Juris Zvirgzdiņš (1942) as friends from those times. Sandrs Rīga studied at the Janis Rozentāls applied art secondary school in Riga, which during those days (and even today) was an educational institution with a good reputation. Very many talented artists such as the future rectors of the Latvian Academy of Art – artists Indulis Zariņš and Aleksejs Naumovs studied there, and excellent teachers worked at the school. He did not complete the school but gained the necessary skills, which provided the opportunity to find a place for himself in Moscow in the artists' park "Sokolniki".[18]

Referring back to this period, Sandrs Rīga remembers the 1968 events in Paris, student demonstrations, events in Czechoslovakia, overall sceptical attitude towards the official ideology although not considering himself as a political activist. Disillusion, apathy, indolence are the words with which he refers to the general mood of Brezhnev's reign. This background promoted the desire to get away, give one's life at least some meaning so that it is not lost in the general aimlessness. Sandrs Rīga formulates the notion very emotionally in his video interview (2010): "I guess everyone has a crisis in life. After some time. You live, live, live ... and then you realize that the foundation is not there. There is no foundation. It does not make any sense. Then you start to be afraid not so much of death but the

[17] Refer to Irina Jazikova's memoirs: Iazykova, Irina, Golovko, Ol'ga. Irina Iazykova: Religioznoe podpol'e vos'midesiatykh. *Pravoslavie i mir.* 30.07.2013. http://www.pravmir.ru/religioznoe-podpole-vosmidesyatyx/ [4.04.2017.]

[18] TV programme "Vertikāle" (2010). Author and interviewer Inta Zēgnere. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=lJNmvAXpwqQ [4.04.2017.]

senseless life. Then I started to look for ... "[19] This book helped him in his search. Sandrs Rīga considers Mahatma Gandhi's autobiography, which in 1969 was published in Russian by the title of "My Life" ("Moia zhizn'"[20]) as an important text. This book gave an understanding of fighting senselessness, moreover in a non-violent way. Sandrs Rīga considers this fight from today's perspective as the need to oppose the totalitarian regime.[21]

In those years, the Bible was not available freely in the Soviet Union. People looked for quotes from the Holy Scriptures in fiction and some even in atheist literature where texts from the Bible were quoted for anti-religious propaganda purposes. Some enthusiasts rewrote the Gospel by hand, and it could become a compromising evidence in "random" searches. Sandrs Rīga went to the "black" (illegal) market in Moscow, bought the New Testament for 9 roubles.[22] In interviews, he stressed that this book impressed him as a primary source, without belonging to any particular church or any interpretations.[23] Perhaps it is this deep personal experience,

---

[19] TV programme "Vertikāle" (2010). Author and interviewer Inta Zēgnere. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=lJNmvAXpwqQ [4.04.2017.]

[20] Mahatma Gandhi's biography "*The Story of My Experiments with Truth*" (1925–1929). The book not only describes India's struggle for independence but also Gandhi's search for his personal spiritual path. It first appeared in Russian as an abridged version (with political censorship) in 1934. The full text translation was published in 1959 and 1969 testifying the renewal of friendly relations between the Soviet Union and India. Refer: Gandi, Makhatma. (1959, 1969). Moia zhizn'. Moskva: Glavnaia redaktsiia vostochnoi literatury izdatel'stva"Nauka".

[21] Burve-Rozīte, Andra. Brīvais kristietis. Intervija ar Sandri Rīgu. *Ir*. 22.12.2010. Accessible at: http://www.irlv.lv/2010/12/22/brivais-kristietis [4.04.2017.]

[22] TV programme "Vertikāle" (2010). Author and interviewer Inta Zēgnere. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=lJNmvAXpwqQ [4.04.2017.] Average salary in USSR in 1964 was 87, 60 roubles. Refer: Srednie zarplaty v tsarskoi Rossii, SSSRiRF s 1853 po 2015 gody. http://opoccuu.com/wages.htm[4.04.2017.]

[23] Radio programme "Dzīveslīnijas". Lidija Čera's interview with Sandrs Rīga. 22.11.2016. http://lr4.lsm.lv/lv/lr/arhivs/?__uri=lv/lr/arhivs/&channel=4&d=22&m=11&y=2016&page=1 [4.04.2017.] In another interview Sandrs Rīga mentions an interesting detail about the book he bought with torn pages, he wanted to read the Apocalypse from the beginning... and just these pages were missing. TV programme "Vertikāle" (2010). Author and interviewer Inta Zēgnere. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=lJNmvAXpwqQ [4.04.2017.]

based on first-hand, direct contact with the Scriptures as a text personally addressed to each reader that affected the key practices of the ecumenical group: Bible reading and discussion. Natalia Bolshakova, who moved around in Sandrs Rīga circle, remembers that during meetings all participants read the Gospel as a letter that was addressed to each one personally.[24]In Sandrs Rīga's experience, the ecumenical idea beyond any particular Christian church was primarily related to the desire to overcome Christian differences and close the distance between the various churches. Anyway, talking about himself he remembered that he was baptized in childhood but started attending various Christian churches at a later age when he discovered the Gospel and his interest in Christianity grew to become the basis of his view of the world. He heard the same message in all the various churches – the message of love; however, representatives of each particular church distanced themselves from love referring to dogmatism and ritualistic differences.[25] His thoughts and search were directed by the desire towards something real, true. Perhaps that is why he perceived the contact with hippies, another group viewed as outcasts and existing rather illegally in the Soviet Union as an opportunity to talk to people who tried to escape the Soviet life and strove towards freedom. He was around 30 at that time, and his group read the Gospel and exchanged thoughts with the hippies. A lot of them accepted Christianity at that time. However, Sandrs Rīga did not practice the hippie lifestyle and appearance. On the contrary, he lived ascetically, did not remarry after his divorce and devoted himself to Christianity and preaching. It is the contact with the hippies that for the first time brought Sandrs Rīga to the attention of the Soviet state security service. In 1972, Sandrs Rīga with

[24] Interview with Natalia Bolshakova, recorded by the author on 2nd May 2017, Riga.

[25] These differences still exist, e.g. between Catholics and Russian orthodox, especially among the church hierarchy. Sandrs Rīga regrets the fact while talking about his friends: radio programme "Dzīves līnijas". Lidija Čera's interview with Sandrs Rīga. 22.11.2016. http://lr4.lsm.lv/lv/lr/arhivs/?__uri=lv/lr/arhivs/&channel=4&d=22&m=11&y=2016&page=1 [4.04.2017.]

his group members went to Tallinn to preach, where many hippies gathered. The group had copies of the Gospel that they wanted to distribute and talk to young people, but were detained by the security on the platform and then released. The same year in fall, when the group travelled to Tallinn for the second time, to preach the Gospel in a Baptist Church, KGB officers arrested them again. Since then it became clear that ecumenists were being followed. [26] Talking about the monitoring Sandrs Rīga acknowledges that is was visible, as the KGB officers followed them in cars and though the officers did not have any special equipment, the officers did not take any special efforts to hide themselves.[27]

The 1970s was a time when interest in the origins of Christianity and the Western society was the topic discussed at the pop culture level also. The rock opera *Jesus Christ Superstar* (1970) by Andrew Lloyd Webber (1948) and Tim Rice (1944) was performed at Broadway in 1971. The recording of rock opera album appeared in 1970 and immediately gained fantastic popularity. Although the album, as well as the film – screen version of the musical (1973, director Norman Jewison), was banned in the Soviet Union, the melodies from the rock opera were popular and performed secretly. Sandrs Rīga in the interview revealed that the musical became a sort of hymn of the ecumenist group and the melody still rings in his ears.[28]There was a string of films in the 1970s depicting the life of Christ as a real biographical tale from the historical context of early Christianity. Addressing the "historical" Christ meant a certain distancing

[26] These differences still exist, e.g. between Catholics and Russian orthodox, especially among the church hierarchy. Sandrs Rīga regrets the fact while talking about his friends: radio programme "Dzīves līnijas". Lidija Čera's interview with Sandrs Rīga. 22.11.2016. http://lr4.lsm.lv/lv/lr/arhivs/?__uri=lv/lr/arhivs/&channel=4&d=22&m=11&y=2016&page=1 [4.04.2017.]

[27] TV programme "Vertikāle" (2010). Author and interviewer Inta Zēgnere. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=lJNmvAXpwqQ [4.04.2017.]

[28] Radio program "Dzīves līnijas". Lidija Čera's interview with Sandrs Rīga. 22.11.2016.http://lr4.lsm.lv/lv/lr/arhivs/?__uri=lv/lr/arhivs/&channel=4&d=22&m=11&y=2016&page=1 [4.04.2017.]

from the "denominational attitude" to Christ.[29] Many viewers of films such as "Matthew's Gospel" (directed by Pier Paolo Pasolini, 1964), "The Greatest Story Ever Told" (directed by George Stevens, 1965), and later "Messiah" (directed by Roberto Rossellini, 1975) and "Jesus" (directed by Peter Sykes, John Krish, 1979) discovered Christianity in real life. These films indirectly introduced a wide audience to the Biblical studies and Biblical archaeology. Paradoxically, these films equally impressed secularised western audiences targeted by the films 'authors, as well as Soviet audiences with had been brought up under the official atheist ideology a lot later at the end of the 1980s. In both cases, these bright visual texts turned to "history" as truth and proof of the viability of Christianity. "Jesus Christ Superstar", for instance, was filmed in Israel in areas related to the geographical localization of events described in the New Testament. Film critics highly appreciated it as an aesthetical art achievement, but the representatives of various churches critically received it. Later during the period of Gorbachev's *perestroika*, such films appeared in video cassettes in the USSR and could be watched by a group of people who gathered at residences of a handful of owners of videocassette recorders. Regardless of the fact that the ideological atmosphere was more free during the second half of the 1980s, such gatherings were conducted mainly within one's circle. Natalia Bolshakova remembers such an experience in Riga. In her own words, if the message was disseminated over the telephone, it was referred to as "someone's birthday" that promised to be interesting; an address and password was provided that allowed entry also to strangers into the flat where the film was screened. This was usually

[29] Sandrs Rīga mentions in an interview, he delivered the sacrament for ecumenists in the pond on Sokolniki Park in Moscow, as according to Christian traditions under extraordinary circumstances any Christian not just a priest could perform the rites. Such a return to early Christian nonhierarchical cohesion was associated with not only the lack of confidence in hierarchs of Christian denominations and fewer opportunities to participate Church life, but also a romanticized picture of a free community with neither internal borders, nor hierarchy. Ibid.

followed by discussions with joint tea drinking. "In a small flat in Vecmīlgrāvis, we were so many that we sat on the floor. We could hear Russian, Latvian and even English because there was a young black gentleman; no one enquired to which church or nationality you belonged, and nobody asked you any questions about your personal life. We talked about everything that interested us – faith and everything connected to it, books, films and art, and prayed together. There was no freedom but we searched for ourselves in one another in the Christian sense, and that was genuine".[30]

On 13th October 1971, Sandrs Rīga gathered a small group of like-minded people in his communal flat in Riga to read the Gospel and pray. The aim of the group activities was not related to politics, but rather an attempt to unite the youth belonging to the various churches (or belonging to no particular church) who were interested in religious issues, religious literature and religious, philosophical conversations. Sandrs Rīga himself emphasised during the interview that he did not wish to form any institutionally organised union, did not wish to build any fences or barriers between the various churches.[31]Similar groups were formed in Moscow, Novosibirsk, Zhitomir, and Dushanbe. Members of the parish of priest Alexander Men also attended the ecumenical group in Moscow, moreover according to Sandrs Rīga Alexander Men approved his churchgoers attending such meetings.[32] He even attended the ecumenical group discussion himself.[33]He was acquainted with Sandrs Rīga and even prayed

[30] The author learned later from remembrances of Natalia Bolshakova that a young Lutheran pastor whom VCR apparently, brought "the West lived in this apartment." However, at the time, no one, of course asked such questions. Interview with Natalia Bolshakova, recorded by the author on 2nd May 2017, Riga.

[31] Krotov, Iakov. S khristianskoi tochki zreniia. Interv'iu s Sandrom Rigoi. 19.09.2009. http://krotov.info/library/17_r/radio_svoboda/20090919.htm [4.04.2017.]

[32] Burve-Rozīte, Andra. Brīvais kristietis. Interview with Sandrs Rīga. *Ir*. 22.12.2010. Accessible at: http://www.irlv.lv/2010/12/22/brivais-kristietis [4.04.2017.]

[33] Lidija Čera's interview with Sandrs Rīga 22.11.2016. http://lr4.lsm.lv/lv/lr/arhivs/?__uri=lv/lr/arhivs/&channel=4&d=22&m=11&y=2016&page=1 [4.04.2017.]

for Sandrs, even if Sandrs was not a member of his church.[34]After the fall of the Soviet Union with religious freedom, many ecumenical group members continued working in their communities or even joined some Christian church without losing the mutual contact and friendship.[35]Sandrs Rīga mentions Zbigņevs Stankevičs, the then Metropolitan of the Roman Catholic Church as a bright example who still considered participation in the ecumenical group as an important stage in his life. Having lost faith in his youth, he returned to Christianity through his interest in Oriental religions and during the ecumenical group meetings, he learnt mutual respect, to listen to differences in opinion and to strive to live by the gospel.[36] Then the Lutheran archbishop Jānis Vanags, dissident Lidija Lasmane-Doroņina, poet Vladimir Frenkel, artists and hippies also attended the group meetings.[37]The ecumenist group published a journal *Priziv* [Call], which was published from 1971 until 1984.[38]

Sandrs Rīga was arrested on 8th February 1984. He remembers seeing the flag at half-mast on his way to the prosecutor's office the next day marking the death of Yuri Andropov but did not understand its significance at that time. During the search, they found writings of Saint Francis of Assisi and a Bible published in Brussels that was deemed a "criminal" offence.[39] Sandrs Rīga maintained links with Alexander Men, but was not

---

[34] Interview with Natalia Bolshakova, recorded by the author on 2ndMay 2017, Riga.

[35] Krotov, Iakov. S khristianskoi tochki zreniia. Interv'iu s Sandrom Rigoi. 19.09.2009. http://krotov.info/library/17_r/radio_svoboda/20090919.htm [4.04.2017.]

[36] Lidija Čera's interview with Sandrs Rīga. 22.11.2016. http://lr4.lsm.lv/lv/lr/arhivs/?__uri=lv/lr/arhivs/&channel=4&d=22&m=11&y=2016&page=1 [4.04.2017.]

[37] Burve-Rozīte, Andra. Brīvais kristietis. Interview with Sandrs Rīga. *Ir*. 22.12.2010. Accessible at: http://www.irlv.lv/2010/12/22/brivais-kristietis [4.04.2017.] See also: Sandr Riga. Non-fiction. (2011). Rīga: Sacramento.

[38] Sandrs Rīga's materials – journals, articles on ecumenism etc.– stored in library of University of Stanford USA: https://searchworks.stanford.edu/?q=%22Riga%2C+-Sandr%2C+1939-%22&search_field=search_author [4.04.2017.] Since 2016 his private archives is available in the Academic Library of the University of Latvia.

[39] TV programme "Vertikāle" (2010). Author and interviewer Inta Zēgnere. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=lJNmvAXpwqQ [4.04.2017.]

a member of his parish in Novaya Derevnya. Sandrs Rīga was detained at *Butyrka* (Butyrka prison or Moscow detention centre No. 2) until his court trial. On 31st August 1984, he was sentenced in absence to indefinite arrest in a psychiatric hospital, after being "prescribed" a diagnosis typical for individuals suspected of anti-Soviet activities: latent schizophrenia. He endured the interrogation without admitting anything apart from the fact that he was a believer and published a journal; he did not betray any of his friends. He was sent six times for expert evaluation to Serbsky psychiatric institute, which was known among dissidents as a repressive institution.[40]No less distressing were his conversations in the Butyrka prison cell with a provocateur, who argued that a confession will ensure freedom, otherwise a lobotomy[41] by which usually a person loses his mental capacity will be performed. Psychologically, it was an ordeal. However, the fear of becoming a traitor was stronger than fear itself. Sandrs Rīga was sent to a special psychiatric department in Blagoveshchensk prison in the Amur region (the prisoners called it Groboveshchensk–play on words: *Grob* in Russian means coffin), where neuroleptic injections were given causing severe complications.[42] As church historian, Sergey Bychkov (1946) remembers other Christians were also imprisoned along with Sandrs Rīga because of the arrest of Vladimir Nikiforov, a former member of the Alexander Men's parish in fall 1983. Ņikiforov's defence tactics was to give a new name each time he was interrogated in order to demonstrate that the Christian movement was so widespread that it could not possibly be controlled. Sandrs Rīga

[40] For documents and evidence fabricated by experts, refer: Topografiia terrora. Moskva. Institut im. Serbskogo (Prechistenskaia psikhiatricheskaia bol'nitsa dlia zakliuchennykh). http://topos.memo.ru/institut-im-serbskogo-prechistenskaya-psihiatricheskaya-bolnica-dlya-zaklyuchennyh

[41] Lobotomy (surgical intervention into nerve centres in the frontal lobe) were officially prohibited in the Soviet Union in 1950.

[42] Krotov, Iakov. S khristianskoitochkizreniia. Interv'iu s Sandrom Rigoi. 19.09.2009. http://krotov.info/library/17_r/radio_svoboda/20090919.htm [4.04.2017.] Riga, Sandr. (1999). Prizyv. Riga: Daugava. II. Delo. 95–164.

and Sergey Markus were also among those named.[43] Four people from the ecumenist group were arrested following the arrest of Sandrs Rīga and search was conducted in almost thirty flats and workplaces in several cities where the ecumenist group existed – Riga, Tallinn, Vilnius, Zhitomir, Novosibirsk, Dushanbe, and Moscow. However, none of the ecumenist group members betrayed their fellow men.[44] Natalia Bolshakova remembers that people in the Sandrs' group had a huge sense of responsibility and understanding that one cannot disappoint and betray the trust as it could lead to tragic consequences.[45]

Sandrs Rīga was transferred from Blagoveshchensk prison to the capital city of Latvian SSR where he spent a further four months in a psychiatric clinic on Tvaika street. He remembered the flight all the way from Siberia to Riga through Moscow as a special event as it was his first flight by plane. Enthusiastically and with a smile he described how they flew up to the sun, how he saw the snow on the ground and roads as veins. He was released in 1987.[46]The International human rights organization, as well as Pope John Paul II, the British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher and the US President Ronald Regan demanded the release of Sandrs Rīga. It was already after the 14 June 1987 events in Riga, that the Liepāja organization members of the non-formal human rights group Helsinki-86 laid flowers at the Freedom Monument, commemorating the deportations of 1941.

It became clear that the times have changed. The awakening had started, followed by the collapse of the Soviet Union and the restoration of Latvian independence. During this time, there were high hopes for democratic values, freedom of conscience and religion, freedom of choice;

---

[43] Bychkov, Sergei. Ognevye vos'midesiatye. (Glava iz Knigi vospominanii) https://www.portal-credo.ru/site/?act=lib&id=1518 [4.04.2017.]

[44] TV programme "Vertikāle" (2010). Author and interviewer Inta Zēgnere. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=lJNmvAXpwqQ [4.04.2017.]

[45] Interview with Natalia Bolshakova, recorded by the author on 2nd May 2017, Riga.

[46] Riga, Sandr. (1999). Prizyv. Riga: Daugava. 234–238.

because it seemed that, nothing could be worse than totalitarian systems. The subsequent decades have shown that freedom can also be a serious test of faith and confidence of the lively spirit of Christianity.

*The article was prepared in the grant of the Latvian Council of Science No. 101-2012 "Thematization of Religious Experience in the Situation of Post-Liberal Spirituality: Latvian Case."*

*Nadezhda Pazuhina is a Doctor of Arts. She is a leading researcher at the Institute of Philosophy and Sociology of the University of Latvia and assistant professor at the Baltic International Academy.*

Guntis Kalme

# THE CHURCH IN AN OCCUPIED COUNTRY: BETWEEN SURVIVAL, COLLABORATIONISM, AND A MILITARY-PATRIOTIC ETHOS – THEOLOGICAL ASPECTS

## Introduction

Following Latvia's military occupation in 1940 by the Soviet Union, the destruction of the Latvian State and Army, the nation's last remaining resistance structure was the National Partisan movement, that waged a guerrilla warfare against the Soviet regime in 1941 and 1944–1956, along with non-violent dissidents and the Church, the latter two groups being active up until the demise of the occupation regime. The Communist regime's attitude towards the Church during the occupation of Latvia is precisely characterised by the words of the Latvian Soviet Socialist Republic's chief atheist ideologist Zigmunds Balevics (1933–1987): "in a developed socialist society, religion is the only legal and yet, still rather influential form of ideological opposition".[1]

Right after the Latvia's re-occupation in 1945 (in its Eastern region since 1944) by the Red Army, the Christian Church was forced to shape

[1] Balevics, Z. Ateisms – kompleksi saistībā ar dzīvi [Atheism – in complex connection with life]. Grāmatā: Vējš, J. (atb. red.). *Ateistiskās audzināšanas efektivitāte*, Rīga, 1980, 37.

its attitude towards the Communist regime. There was not a great deal of options to choose from – 1) survival, along with outward submission, yet safeguarding the Church's sovereignty in matters of doctrine and, as far as possible, practice; 2) total submission and collaboration with the Communist regime; or 3) resistance.

In discussing the Latvian Church's choice between resistance and collaboration, it is mandatory also to mention those who were spared this gruesome choice, because in 1944, they were either no longer in Latvia, or no longer among the living. Namely, upon invading Latvia, the Soviet regime swiftly executed considerable numbers of the Latvian clergymen, only to follow up with vast deportations to the GULAG camps. Furthermore, a large portion of the Latvian clergy was in effect forced to flee their beloved homeland to save their bare lives and their freedom, as they rightly foresaw the morally impossible choice that would be laid in front of them by the Soviet totalitarian regime.

This paper is dedicated to the theological analysis of the stance that Latvia's Church took towards the Communist regime.

## Christian Anthropology on Man's fundamental Duties

Due to the carnal nature of man, leading tenets of a Christian anthropology are related to a physical place, concrete territory. Christian anthropology defines man's fundamental duties towards it as:

– *Working and taking care* (Gen. 2, 15 NIV) or *protecting* the concrete part of the world entrusted to him by God. By doing so, each man partakes in God's plan for the sustenance of the world (*We are co-workers in God's service,* 1 Cor. 3, 9) and to *seek God* (Acts 17, 26–27) as fulfilling His will in this territory by:

  • *Working* (*cultivating* – NASB) it. As Scripture witnesses, in the beginning God created the world *very good* (Gen 1, 31 NIV) and entrusted it to man to rule over it (*rule ..over all the crea-*

*tures* Gen 1, 26). This denotes the task of sustaining, cultivating, creating, and developing, entrusted to man, materialising in the achievements of human civilisation and culture.

- *Taking care* or *protecting* means safeguarding the goods entrusted to man. The tasks of *tending* and *protecting* are inextricably linked to each other. In a world that is home not only to good, but also to evil, one must be able of protecting or defending oneself and the fruits of his labour. The native population's continuity of presence over an extended period results in its strong attachment to this land. People inherit a territory from their ancestors and take care of it, and passes it on more cultivated and enriched to the next generation. Only a native population, living in its own land, is vitally interested in caring for it. Only the indigenous people will safeguard a territory's long-term sustenance, for only they are accountable to God for it. For the occupiers, the annexed territory is but a resource to be exploited.
- *Searching God* (Acts 17, 27) is to fulfil God's will in one's life, within the time and space that we have been entrusted. People continue to exist if the values grounded in their religion – the metaphysical invariable of their existence – are upheld, manifested in their system of moral values, culture etc. As soon as a religion as a denominator of man's identity is lost, civilisation will likewise start to dissipate.

## The Christian Thought on Metaphysics of Evil

The Devil, evil personified, has a chief aim to destroy the works of God – man, the territory which is his dwelling place, the world, and the works of Christ.

– Destroying man, the pride of God's creation (for man is created with a living soul, in God's own image Gen 1, 26–7), that is, the idea of humanity as such (*who killed both the Lord Jesus and the*

*prophets, and drove us out, and displease God and oppose all mankind* 1 Thess. 2, 15 ESV).[2]

– Destroying the territory occupied by a totalitarian regime, a meaningful part of God's creation.

– Destroying the work of Christ (the Gospel message) and the value system derived from it – Christian culture in all its manifestations.

Christian doctrine declares that evil is not necessary to the world, as it is not primordial, but somewhat ontologically accidental fact. It is catastrophic, as it is caused by an ontological catastrophe, the original sin. Therefore, evil is not, and can never be creative. It is not self-supporting; it is an ontological parasite, and hence, aggressively expansionistic.

Evil is expansionist not only in a physical sense but also regarding values. An upheaval of its spiritual identity follows the territory's physical occupation. The existing system of values is revamped and immediately destroyed. Its artefacts and culture are being degraded, destroyed, and blasphemed. Values are debased publicly and systematically rendering them by jeering, mocking and disdaining. In this way, the impunity and supremacy of evil over good is demonstrated – good is shown to be unable to defend itself and its adherents. In a metaphysical sense, this kind of blasphemy as contrary to worship is the triumph of evil and its self-ascertainment towards the divine creation and its derivations in culture. Therefore, it is essential to demonstrate the power of good and impose limits on evil (to demonstrate that evil is not almighty) and to show that good can be victorious. As long as good is defended, evil is not almighty, as it has no power at least over the defenders of good. Thus, the armed struggle against a totalitarian regime is a manifestation of Christians' metaphysical belonging to God by way of a physical battle.

---

[2] Other translations: *enemies of the whole human race* – God's Word Translation; *enemies of all mankind* – Weymouth New Testament; *agains tall humanity* – New Living Translation.

On a pragmatic level, the occupiers migrate to the annexed territory to scrounge its resources (once that territory will be ravaged, they and their next generation will migrate further). The territory and its culture are unable to develop under the occupation regime – there is only militarisation, degradation of the environment and depletion of its resources. Political annexation, military and demographic occupation, however, cannot change a territory's principal ownership. Both annexation and occupation can be legalised and politically legitimised, but they will never be legitimate before God, who has entrusted the territory to a particular people as their only dwelling ([God] *marked out ..boundaries of* [nations'] *lands*. Acts, 17, 26 NIV).

## The metaphysical Genesis of the Conflict between the Church and the Totalitarian Regime

Our belonging to the Christian faith implies that our human identity is rooted in a metaphysical reality that is fundamentally different from the secular one. This belonging to a different metaphysical reality has its ramifications in a socio-political sense as well.

The Christian Church by its mere existence and the fulfilment of its primary tasks – the proclamation of God's word, the distribution of the Sacraments and another ministry – represents a reality that is not subject to the totalitarian ideology. The Church functions as God's 'embassy' to the world. It not only proclaims but also carries a new, divine reality into the regime-controlled society. That is why the Church and the totalitarian regime necessarily confronts each other and conflicts.

Totalitarianism manifests itself by the expectation of total submission of the secular sphere to political power. Totalitarian atheistic secularity is not just godless – instead, it stands in evident enmity against God. Atheist totalitarianism idolises and ideologizes secularity. The regime separates the world from God. Belligerent atheism is the logical, necessary component of the totalitarian Soviet state. This is what made the Soviet Union as the *Empire of Evil* in a metaphysical sense.

Since God is supernatural, the moral values rooted in Him are beyond the range of socio-political manipulation. The total submission of a person is possible only by locking God out of the discourse on the nature of his being (as Karl Marx's definition of man unintentionally suggests in his 6th Thesis on Ludwig Feuerbach – as merely social being – *the essence of man .. is the ensemble of the social relations*[3]). This is exactly what the totalitarian regime aimed to achieve by implementing the ideological maxim of a *new Soviet man, Soviet people.*

By political instinct, every dictatorship perceives the Church's divine authority (*We must obey God rather than human beings!* Acts 5:29) as an ideological competitor and a threat to its totalitarian ambition. The mere existence of the Church ran contrary to the state's mono-ideology, Communism, and its official religion, atheism.

Thus, the conflict between the Church and the totalitarian regime is inevitable, and the fight against it in any form is Christian man's spiritual duty.

## The Tasks of the Church under Occupation

The Church must fulfil its fundamental tasks – to *tend* and *keep* and to *search God* – regarding an individual, people, State, and Church.

Under occupation, when the previous State's structures that usually carry out these tasks have been destroyed by the totalitarian regime, every citizen is called upon to take responsibility for them (e.g., when the Armed forces have been destroyed, the citizen is called upon to step up to the defence of his country).

If the Army's task is the defence of the country's physical territory than the Church must protect territory's attachment to the divine values. This is done by:

- standing by the truth and consequently proclaiming it;
- guiding and protecting the nation's moral and religious life.

---

[3] Marx, K., *Theses On Feuerbach*, Read on January 19, 2017, in electronic format: *https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1845/theses/*

## The Military - Patriotic Consequence of the Christian Faith

Because the Church asks the truth to be proclaimed consistently, conflict with the Communist regime as the representation of the metaphysical evil and the Church's involvement in the struggle (most of the time, taking the form of spiritual, moral, and humanitarian support) against it is logical and inevitable.

This uncompromising struggle is rooted in the Christian tenet of man's inherent craving for freedom. Christian anthropology holds that man is created free and destined to be such (*You, my brothers and sisters, were called to be free*. Gal. 5, 13). Life in the territory of truth testifies to the uncompromising nature of truth and demonstrates the fundamental possibility of freedom. Under a totalitarian regime, freedom can only be maintained and achieved in the fight.

Under Soviet Communism, one's involvement in the actual struggle against the regime necessitated his total devotion to the cause of truth. Therefore, the freedom fighter ceded his right to private life and often to the life as such[4]. Dedication to the cause of truth is the essence of ministry, which is precisely why the uncompromising proclamation of truth, including one's involvement in the partisan struggle, was not an extraordinary, but rather a logical course of action for believers.

---

[4] E.g., Broņislava Martuževa (1924–2012), a Latvian poetess during the Soviet occupation, said: *To the cause of truth / I pledge my life* or literally, *For my convictions / I sign my life.* Martuževa, B., *Kopotas dzejas* [Collected Poetry], Rīga: Zvaigzne, 2014, 201. Latvian historian ZigmārsTurčinskis, researcher of the Latvian Partisan movement, said about Rev. Paulis Birzulis who joined Latvian Guerrillas: *From this moment on, he dedicated his entire time and strength to the partisan movement.* Turčinskis, Z., *Ziemeļvidzemes mežabrāļi. Latvijas nacionālo partizānu cīņas Valkas apriņķī un Alūksnes apriņķī rietumu daļā. 1944.–1953.* [Forest Bretheren of North Vidzeme. Battles of Latvian national partisans in Valka district and in the western part of Alūksne district, 1944–1953], Rīga: Latvijas vēstures institūta apgāds, 2011, 80.

## The Church's Support to the National Partisan Movement

The partisan war was the single most consequential, utterly uncompromising way of Latvian citizens to face the Communist evil. The most significant partisan organisations were the *LNPA* (*Latvijas Nacionālo partizānu apvienība* / Latvian National Partisan Union, active in the Vidzeme region, 1944–1953), under the command of Colonel of the Latvian Partisan Army Pēteris Supe (1920–1946), the *LNPO* (*Latviešu nacionālo partizānu organizācija* / Latvian National Partisan Organisation, active in Northern Kurzeme, 1945–1947) organized by Freds Launags (1919–1991) and the *LTS(p)A* (*Latvijas Tēvijas sargu (partizānu) apvienība* / Union of Guards (partisans) of the Latvian Fatherland, active in the Latgale Region, 1945–1946, political leadership by Chairman of the Board, Catholic priest Antons Juhņēvičs (1905–1947). Later partisans, nicknamed *forest brothers,* fought on in smaller units. According to KGB reports 400–500 partisan groups operated in Latvian in 1945, comprising around 20 000 – armed guerrilla fighters[5] and a similar number of supporters (there were 82 000 partisans in the Baltic States in 1944).

Ministers of several Christian denominations represented their respective Churches by offering spiritual, moral, logistical and humanitarian aid to their plight. Due to limitations article will focus merely on a few exemplary Catholic and Lutheran clergymen.

In one of the 28 bunkers of the partisan camp (altogether approx. 350 people) at Stampaku swamp (located in Northeast part of Latvia), a chapel was installed. Every day, the Dean of the Rekova Catholic parish, LNPA Chairman of the Board, priest Ludvigs Štagars (1905–1973) held mass there. Liturgical things and sacramental tools were supplied by the Capuchin monk Kārlis fon Gumpenbergs (1904–1984). Upon

[5] Statistics from Strods, H., *Latvijas nacionālo partizānu karš 1944–1956,* [Latvian national partisan war 1944–1956] Rīga: LU Akadēmiskais apgāds, 2012, 41.

monk's arrest, he was charged with *inspiring and leading a nationalist organisation*.[6] This verdict demonstrates the regime's fear of Christian values.

Priest Antons Juhņevičs in his sermons bravely confronted the German and the Communist occupation regimes. He hid young men from conscription to the Nazi and Communist armed forces. On 24 August 1945, he was elected Chairman of the Board of LTS(p)A.

The Lutheran pastor of Zeltiņi, Eduards Grāvītis (1913–1973) went into hiding as early as February 1945. He operated as a partisan signalman, organised the ten-day truce of Alsviķi (29.09.–09.10.1945) that held for the entire district of Valka between the LNPA and the local KGB and distributed partisan leaflets.

The Lutheran pastor of Palsmane, Pauls Birzulis (1913–1990) was the LNPA North Eastern staff's main signalman and coordinator of partisan units. He also organised partisan attacks on district centres.

Finnish historian Jouko Talonen characterises the Lutheran pastors' stance towards the Soviet regime:

> *The vast majority of Lutheran pastors were staunch opponents of Communism. They unmistakably rejected Communism and the Soviet system. The term 'godless' was commonly used in sermons to denote Communism. On 18 November 1945, the anniversary of Latvia's Declaration of Independence, pastor Pauls Birzulis encouraged his congregation at Palsmane church to sing the Latvian national anthem. On the same day at Ventspils, during a Church service conducted by pastor Hugo Grīvāns, the congregation did not even require any encouragement (for a similar demonstration of patriotism). These spontaneous manifestations*

---

[6] Dreimane, I., *Kapucīnu mūki – nacionālās pretošanās kustības atbalstītāji Bauskas apriņķī un citur Latvijā* [Capuchin monks – the supporters of the national resistance movement in Bauska district and else where in Latvia]. Read on January 19, 2017, in electronic format: http://www.kbvestnesis.lv/index.php/sakums - jaunumi/latvija/453 - kapucinu - muki - nacionalas - pretosanas - kustibas - atbalstitaji - bauskas - aprinki - un - citur - latvija

> *of national pride were regarded as extremely dangerous by the State authorities.*[7]

In the eyes of the partisans, the Church's patriotic and non-conforming attitude was represented by local pastors, rather than by the leadership of the respective denomination. Due to its position, the latter was mainly concerned with keeping and safeguarding the institutions of the Church. The regime forced denominational leaders to compromise, even to the brink of collaborationism. Yet, to the partisans, what mattered was the remnant of clergymen who represented the Church's values onto their utterly consequential end, the military - patriotic ethos.

The support or in some cases participation of clergymen in the guerrilla movement offered moral encouragement and elevation of the plight of the partisans. It qualified their cause as a struggle for the values of Western civilisation and independent Latvian statehood:

1) The presence of clergymen offered moral encouragement to the partisans by confirming that the truth as a value of divine origin will eventually win, even if the military victory is not yet in sight or cannot be achieved. To fight for the truth means to fight for the ultimately victorious side. Such were the convictions that spurred on the Baltic partisans to fight for 12 years without any support from the West.
2) The presence of clergymen elevated the partisan struggle and boosted public support for their cause.
3) The support of the clergymen confirmed that the plight of the partisans was bolstered by the defence of Christian values and the defence of Western civilisation. As professor Heinrihs Strods has pointed out:

---

[7] Talonens, J., Baznīca staļinisma žņaugos. Latvijas evaņģēliski luteriskā baznīca padomju okupācijas laikā no 1944.–1950. gadam [*Church under the Pressure of Stalinism. The Latvian Evangelical Lutheran Church in 1944–1950*], Rīga: Luterisma mantojuma fonds, 2009, 48.

*The struggle of the Latvian national partisans was a struggle for Western European values, Western European civilisation against the Byzantine Eastern civilisation on the Eastern brink of European civilisation, (a territory) occupied by the totalitarian empire of the USSR.*[8]

4) The clergy's presence and support also served to reinforce the perception of the partisan struggle as representing the values of independent Latvian statehood.

The encouragement between clergymen and partisans worked both ways. The ministers' presence and support boosted the morale of the fighters, whereas the partisan struggle spurred the clergymen on to greater courage in affirming patriotic values among their laymen. This boosted the people's spirit of resistance, thus triggering further moral and material support for the partisan cause.

Christian values were extensively referred to in partisan documents, partisan folklore and manifested in their everyday life:

– In official documents of the partisan movement, e.g. the solemn oath of the LTS(p)A: *I pledge allegiance to God and our Fatherland .. I promise to be brave and conduct myself never to be ashamed of giving account for my deeds before God, my conscience, and the Latvian people.*[9] The Board of the LTS(p)A charged the partisan units to hold solemn worship services on 11 (Freedom fighter's Day) and 18 November (Independence Day), offering prayers *to God for the fallen heroes, and entreating Him for help and for His blessing in the partisan plight to regain Latvia's freedom.*[10]

---

[8] Strods, H., *Latvijas Nacionālo partizānu karš. Dokumenti un Materiāli 1944– 1956.* [National Partisan war of Latvia. Documents and materials 1944–1956], Rīga: Preses Nams, 1999, 559.

[9] From: *Instrukcija Latvijas Tēvzemes sargu (partizānu) organizēšanai un darbībai* [Instruction to the organization and action of Union of Guards (partisans) of the Latvian Fatherland]. Read on January 19, 2017, in electronic format: http://www.old.historia.lv/alfabets/N/na/nac_partiz/dok/1945.07.00.01.htm

[10] Protocol Nr. 9., 01.12.1945. LTS(p)A quoted in: Strods, H., *Latvijas Nacionālo Partizānu Karš. Dokumenti un Materiāli 1944–1956.* (Rīga: Preses Nams, 1999), 284.

– In partisan folklore, e.g. the *Partisan's Song: To guard our Latvia's freedom / Forever has charged us, God.*[11]
– In everyday life, LNPA partisan, Catholic laywoman Mihalīna Supe (1923–) used to carry her rosary in one pocket and a pistol in the other.

## Criteria and Consequences of the Strategy for Survival

### The Situation of the Church under the Occupation

The totalitarian regime forced the Church to choose between a speedy, foreseeable death (by liquidating its leadership and its infrastructure) on the one hand, or a slow destruction and moral decay because of compromises with it (e.g. praising the Soviet regime, participating in its propaganda activities, e.g.,*Soviet Peace Committee* etc.). This choice was dramatic – either a fast, heroic death awaited the Church or slow and degrading demise. A glimmer of hope remained that the regime's socio-economic troubles and the confrontation on the international stage (the *Cold War*) would eventually lead to a collapse of the USSR (which is precisely what happened). Strategically, one had to ask, which of the two processes of degradation would prove to be faster – the regime's or the Church's?

To preserve the Church as an institution was outstanding with a view to:

1) Make sure that the people retained regular access to the Gospel message.
2) Symbolically keep the territory within God's spiritual realm (Rev. Dr Roberts Feldmanis (1910–2002) said: It is important to pre-

[11] Author of the lyrics: the commander of the LNPA Central Vidzeme region, Kārlis Rusovs (1916–2005).

serve even empty churches – they are like divine guard posts, testifying to the fact that this territory belongs to God.[12]

3) Sustain the Latvian people's identity along with its moral and cultural values. Owing to the Church's separation from the State, the latter's russification policies, penetrating nearly all spheres of society, did not affect the Church. By sustaining the people's Christian faith, the Church preserved an essential dimension of the national identity as well.

Historians hold that the USSR's *policies towards the Christian Church – in particular, towards the Evangelical - Lutheran Church – were predetermined by the active support of the Church's Governing Board for independent Latvian statehood and its warnings of Communist ideology and its practice, as professed during the years of Latvian national independence, as well as during the wartime years.*[13]

By proclaiming a worldview contrary to that of the Communist party, the Church also revealed its different viewpoint of the sociopolitical reality of the Soviet Latvia. From the perspective of secular Latvians, the regime was illegitimate, because it had usurped power in a Russian coup of 1917. It took power in Latvia by way of annexation in 1940 only to use it in a very brutal way against the Latvia's people[14]. In the eyes of Christians, the regime's illegitimacy was further engraved by its specific atheistic character[15]. The crude introduction of aggressive atheism demonstrated not only that the country was occupied, but furthermore, that its

[12] In his private conversations, ca 1987–1990.

[13] Gintere, S. un Zālīte, I. Ieskats Latvijas evaņģēliski luteriskās Baznīcas vēsturē pēc Otrā pasaules kara. *Ceļš*, Nr. 1, 1992, 105.

[14] "During the 1941 at least 35,828 persons were deported o rmurdered." Berkis, A., *Soviet Russia's Persecution of Latvia, 1918 to the Present*. Read on January 19, 2017, in electronic format: http://www.ihr.org/jhr/v08/v08p - 25_berkis.htmlIn03.24.1949, about 43,000 people,mainly farmers and overwhelmingly ethnic Latvians, were deported to Siberia.

[15] The clergymen were also among the deported and executed for they represented the leading element of the Latvian society.

fundamental values were subject to aggressive attacks by the regime, forcibly eroding and substituting anti-values for them.

## Compromise between the Church and the Totalitarian Regime

Pastor and lawyer Arnolds Rautenšilds (1906–2007) holds that:

> *The totalitarian State and the Christian Church are irreconcilable adversaries. If they manage to reconcile with each other, either the State is no longer totalitarian, or the Church is no longer Christian.*[16]

Any compromise with the totalitarian regime is thus impossible, because:

1) The totalitarian regime's claim to absolute power, fundamentally, constitutes the essence of evil in its aggressive expansionistic form. Evil claims to take God's place. According to the First Commandment, God is unwilling to cede His monopoly on truth to anyone; He is unwilling to let anyone partake of the attributes of His divinity, or else He would no longer be omnipotent, i.e., by definition, He would cease to be God.

2) The regime is a notorious liar – its promises cannot be trusted, for it does not even endeavour to fulfil them (*he is a liar and the father of lies*, John 8:44); therefore, to enter an agreement with the regime is impossible in principle. From the viewpoint of the regime, any agreement constitutes but a unilateral commitment of the other party towards the regime. The regime aims to ensure a gradual, yet incessant expansion of the realm of evil.

Hence, by any compromise of the Church with the regime, truth is compromised, thus giving the impression that:

---

[16] Rautenšilds, A. Baznīca un valsts. [Church and State], Grām.: *Baznīca un draudze,* Lincoln: Sējējs, 1966, 33.

– Truth is not self - sufficient or sovereign; it exists only as far as the regime permits it to exist.

– Truth is contextual (the context here being the pressure of the regime). Thus, the truth is shown to be relative and subject to the demands of the political situation. It is changing and interchangeable (degraded to the level of a secular viewpoint).

– Truth is incapable of defending itself; it is only capable of resigning.

The regime aims to debase truth's absolute claim. Brutal force is exercised to push the agents of truth to concede. As soon as they have done so at least once, a precedent is set for others.

From the viewpoint of the Latvian national ethos the patriotic clergy's consistent resistance, although small in numbers, was more essential to the testimony of the truth than the Church Government's efforts to co-exist with the totalitarian regime.

This consistent testimony for the truth helped to upheld the resistance of the Latvian people, which manifested in the national Awakening (1987–1990) and regaining of the independence of the Latvian state (1991).

## Conclusions

- The conflict between the Church and the Soviet totalitarian regime is rooted in the metaphysical incompatibility of their respective natures and the impossibility of coexistence resulting thereof.
- Armed struggle is the most logical and consequential form of resistance against the totalitarian occupation regime.
- The Church's participation and support of the armed resistance plight are rooted in its values and are also necessary as a consequential form of proclamation of the Church's professed faith.

- The Church's support to the partisan movement is necessary to uphold the morale, the national identity, and the dignity of the armed resistance's movement.
- This consistent testimony for the truth helped to upheld the resistance of the Latvian people throughout the 50 years of the Soviet occupation.
- This spiritual force of the national resistance manifested in the National Revival and the regaining of the independence of the Latvian state.

*Guntis Kalme is a Doctor of Theology and a Professor of Luther's Academy.*

Archpriest Alexander Bertash

# THE TEMPLE CONSTRUCTION IN GERMANY IN THE INTERWAR PERIOD, ITS STYLE AND SIGNIFICANCE

Abstract. The article presents poorly studied theme of the temple construction in Germany in the interwar period mainly on the basis of German sources. Church architecture of this period did not occupy a leading position in architectural practice and was distinguished with professionalism and style variety or its creators. The intensity of temple construction decreased only in the height of the Second world war. The main directions in temple construction was the "brick expressionism" (the unique world phenomenon in the scale of construction), functionalism and combined in the second half of the 1930s with each other archaizing Neo-Romanesque and national style. It is wrong to speak about "Nazis" temple architecture because during the rule of the Nazis the temple construction has maintained its "independence" and the old stylistic forms. In this sphere continued to work the architects of a previous age, it was not subjected to special restrictions and regulation, and only the functionalism was changed with the "national architecture". The article briefly discusses the theoretical views and projects of the largest temple constructors: Otto Bartning, Dominikus Böhm, Rudolf Schwarz, and others. It marks such major trends as the convergence of the style of the Protestant and Catholic temples and the theoretical views of architects (mainly on the basis of Protestant theology), the tendency towards simplification of form, to minimalism, to the revival of "pre-form", the temple construction as

complex construction of the temples and not separated from the temple parish centers. The unique building of the German temple construction is the Berlin Orthodox cathedral in Russian style.

The temple construction in Germany in the interwar period is relatively little studied because it did not occupy a dominant position in architecture in comparison with the public, residential, and industrial buildings. However, there are numerous examples of buildings both of Catholic and Lutheran churches, quite clearly reflecting the main stylistic trends of the era. In the field of temple construction in the first place proved themselves such prominent German architects as O. Bartning, G. Bestelmeyer, C. Steinberg (Evangelical temples), D. Böhm, A. Boßlet, R. Schwarz, M. Weber (Catholic temples). D. Böhm, O. Bartning, and R. Schwarz were called "trio of the great German temple constructors in the 20th century".

It is significant that a number of them showed themselves not only as practical but also as academic specialists in temple architecture. R. Schwarz was not only architecturally, but also theologically educated, O. Bartning also studied theology and was married to the daughter of a famous Protestant theologian. For many architects temple building was not the main topic, but, for example, Fritz Höger (1877–1949), author of the famous Chilehaus in Hamburg was also the constructor of the Church in Berlin on Hohenzollernplatz. It became one of the highest achievements and latest representative construction for his activity. The design of the temples had a complex character, in the prewar years particularly relevant was the question of the creation of parachurch buildings (*kirchliche Gruppenbau*): parish centers – Gemeindezentrum, including the church, clergy house or rectory – Pfarrhaus and halls – Saalbau, and also incorporated children gardens and nursing houses for the elderly. The leading advocate of houses for the community was the Berlin architect Otto March[1].

[1] Kahle B. Deutsche Kirchenbaukunst des 20. Jahrhunderts. Darmstadt, 1990, S. 26–27.

The temples changed themselves also, especially in the principles of their internal organization. There was a tendency for renewal of Church life in young-Catholic circles after the World War I. It was headed by a philosopher from Breslau Romano Guardini and the priest from Gladbeck J. van Acken, who in 1923 proposed the idea of a Christ-centered church art. The altar as the mystical Christ had to be its starting point.[2] New spatial forms contacted the reform of the Liturgy: the destruction of the separation between the presbytery and the laity, the central position of the altar, the nearness of priest to the people. All that predicted the decisions of the Second Vatican Council. Dominikus Böhm (1880–1955)[3], who built about 55 churches, perhaps, was the first, who expressed the new liturgical and architectural ideas (not a coincidence, that van Acken was his admirer). To him belongs the aphorism "Ich baue, was ich glaube". During eight years he worked with untimely deceased Frankfurt architect Martin Weber (1890–1941) (Sts. Peter and Paul Church in Dettingen). In the Holy Spirit Church in Riederwald (1931) Weber for the first time in a Catholic temple building in Germany set up an altar near the centre of the church.[4]

For the concept of temple construction by Rudolf Schwarz (1897–1961)[5] is particularly important the idea of a neutral and empty space, that is combined with the aesthetics of "poverty", "purity", especially in his

---

[2] Acken Johannes van. Christocentrische Kirchenkunst. Ein Entwurf zum liturgischen Gesamtkunstwerk. Gladbeck, 1923.

[3] Voigt W., Flagge I. Dominikus Böhm 1880–1955. Tübingen, Berlin, 2005; Hoff A., Muck H., Thoma R. Dominikus Böhm. München, Zürich, 1962; Zukowsky J., Laney-Lipton K.A., Lesnikowski W. Architektur in Deutschland 1919–1939. München, N.-Y., 1994. S. 76–79.

[4] Stock W.J. Europaischer Kirchenbau / European Church Architecture 1900–1950: Aufbruch Zur Moderne / Towards Modernity. München, B., L., N.-Y., 2006. S. 16, 78.

[5] Pehnt W., Strohl H. Rudolf Schwarz 1897–1961. Bewohnte Bilder – Architekt einer anderen Moderne. Ostfildern-Ruit, 2000; Zahner W. Rudolf Schwarz, Baumeister der neuen Gemeinde: ein Beitrag zum Gespräch zwischen Liturgietheologie und Architektur in der Liturgischen Bewegung. Altenberge, 1992.

works of the 1920-30s.[6] With the using of the simplest tools, it is appeared "a work created by light and life, ...fluctuating and constantly created anew"[7]. According to Schwarz, the technical development must go together with the spiritual one, so that "the technique has shown its spirituality".[8] "It is great that our new spaces are so "empty", that the personality of man explains them". "It is great when sacred space is completely determined by the community and its actions when the Liturgy releases it and again sinking together it. ...At first, there's nothing here but space of the cosmos and after there is nothing but the space of the cosmos: God has disappeared".[9] Schwarz thought that the building is a shell of the vital functions, and relevant for modern architecture also. Both R. Schwarz and D. Böhm offered to take temple building (Bauschaffen) based on "preform". Rudolf Schwarz was not a supporter of modernism as an ideology, rather, he was guided by "fanatical Puritanism", close to Protestantism: his "liturgical functionalism" clearly illustrates the tendency of the contact of temple architecture of two Christian traditions.

One should not overestimate the reformist mood of the figures of the Catholic Church. Although new ideas were declared (but rarely implemented) at the decision of the internal space, concerning the style of the temple was emphasized the need to separate the sacred and the profane forms (statement by cardinal Bertran, 1929; opinion of the bishops conference in Fulda, 1932). Hence the discrepancy of the internal design of the liturgical space and the external style of the building arose: new wine poured into old wineskins.

Similar trends described as a liturgical movement ("liturgische Bewegung") can be traced in the Evangelical Church also. For Otto Bartning

---

[6] Zhemchugova V. A. Arkhitektura katolicheskikh khramov Zapadnoi Evropy XX v.: Tendentsii razvitiia i osnovnye voprosy organizatsii prostranstva. Avtoreferat … kandidata arkhitektury. M., 2001.

[7] Schwarz R. Über Baukunst // Die Schildgenossen. 1923/24. S. 277.

[8] Stock. 2006. S. 127.

[9] Schwarz R. Kirchenbau. Welt vor der Schwelle. Heidelberg: Kerle, 1960. S. 41.

(1883–1959)[10] (as for R. Schwarz) the most important theme is people and space. Architect, closely associated with the ideas of the liturgical movement, said the aphorism "The Liturgy is the manager of construction". In his works, he tended to the centred compositions, which allow reaching spatial nearness of the preacher and the community – first of all, Auferstehungskirche in Essen. Otto Bartning replied critics that accused him of modernism, that "the temple construction should reflect its pre-purposes, to put latent spirituality in every material and every technique at the service of religion, to free the form from matter". The temple construction is "the visible shape and image of the society"[11]. "Emptiness, silence and dimensions – spatial attributes of the sacred". As spaces guide to contemplation, but not the liturgical state, was noted in Böhm's architecture by Holger Brülls. He thought, that unfriendly monumentality by D. Böhm – a prerequisite for the transparency of the sacred in a secular environment.[12]

The World war I (unlike the World war II) fundamentally changed the style of temple construction. The defeat caused in Germany disappointment in the national idea. The historicist forms of the 19th century (Gothic revival, neo-Romanesque and neo-Baroque) has exhausted themselves, their heritage in the temple construction of the 1920s was a peripheral subject, refracted through the prism of Art-Nouveau and national romanticism. However, later, in the 1930s, the national theme is developed in the framework of the style "Heimatschutzarchitektur" – "the architecture of the protection of the Fatherland").

---

[10] Lerch H., Bredow J. Otto Bartning. Materialien zum Werk des Architekten. Darmstadt, 1983; Gerbing C. Otto Bartning (1883–1959). Kirchenbauer, Architekt und Pädagoge zwischen Tradition und Moderne // Gerhard Schwinge (Hrsg.): Lebensbilder aus der badischen evangelischen Kirche. Band V: Kultur und Bildung. Heidelberg, 2007. S. 245–273.

[11] Stock. 2006. S. 121, 123.

[12] Brülls H. *Architektur, Macht und Übermacht. Beobachtungen und Thesen zur Architektur Dominikus Böhms in den 1930er Jahren.* Das Münster. 2005, 58, S. 45–52; Stock. 2006, S. 84.

The primary style of the time in Germany was Backsteinexpressionismus (brick expressionism). The above-mentioned Evangelical church at Hohenzollernplatz with the clergy house (Gemeindehaus) in Berlin-Wilmersdorf (1930–1933, F. Höger)[13]. The Kreuzkirche in Berlin-Schmargendorf (1928–1929), built by Ernst Paulus (1868–1935) and his son Günther is a classic work of the German expressionism. The unusual complex includes a high rectangular tower with three pinnacles, an adjoining the clergy house and gallery, leading to the main rotundly building of the church. It has a unique ceramic portal in the "Asian spirit". The architect considered his building as "protection from the madding crowd". One should also mention Heinrichkirche (St. Heinrich church) in Hannover (1928-1929, architect. Eduard Endler) with powerful prismatic volume, and two Berlin churches built into the red line of the street: Bekenntniskirche (1930-1931, architect Curt Steinberg) with two cubic towers, and lapidary St. Adalbert church[14] with cylindrical volume in the center of the facade (1933, architect Clemens Holzmeister).

St. Engelbert church in Köln (1930–1931) – a bold construction by D. Böhm, teetering on the brink of expressionism and functionalism. The round-planned petal-shaped structure with high concrete parabolic arches height of 21 meters is complemented with free-standing campanile. Its style foretells "organic architecture" of the 1950s.[15]

However, in most cases, the architects kept most widespread since the age of historicism the tripartite composition of the basilica with a tower over the entrance, which is sometimes replaced by a wall, which served as a belfry. It is interesting; this scheme is usually present in the German church architecture of reinforced concrete in the forms of functionalism, which is a short time (just five years) from the end of the 1920s, developed

---

[13] Stock. 2006, S. 142–147.

[14] Stock. 2006, S. 172–177.

[15] Stock. 2006, S. 136–140; Dohmen H., Sons E. *Kirchen, Kapellen, Synagogen in Essen.* Essen, 1998. One can see the influence of the architecture of the temple in Cologne in the style of the famous La Chapelle Notre Dame du Haut, Ronchamp Le Corbusier, 1950–1955.

St. Engelbert Roman Catholic Church. Cologne-Riehl. 1930–1932. Architect: Dominicus Böhm. Photo: Alexander Bertash, 2014.

as an alternative for a national style. Functionalism (Neues Bauen, Moderne) continued the ideas of Deutschen Werkbund, based on the achievements of the Bauhaus-school and had more sharp space solution. Starting from functionalism, began to form "international style" with elements of "plastic style", foretelling "organic architecture" of the postwar age and Christian symbolism (Böhm).

The first church building by Schwarz was Catholic Lord's Body Church (Christ Church) in Aachen (1929–1930). He worked long and carefully on the project. Large church building square of 47x13 meters with bell tower height of 40 meters was designed as a complex and became, in fact, the first church building in the functionalism. Schwarz

St. Lord's Body Roman Catholic Church. Aachen. 1929–1930. Architect: Rudolf Schwarz. Photo: Alexander Bertash, 2013.

avoided the demonstration of construction design, characteristic of modern civil architecture. He interpreted the Lord's Body Church in Aachen as "the melody of the rectangular body, as a Romanesque cathedral" and made internal space in enough traditional way. He is a supporter of the way, of the "open circle" in the planning. In Schwarz's opinion geometric content as presymbol of power, and holiness were essential elements of the Romanesque building art, and they had not lost their value for the modern man and could take a new life. This understanding goes back to the idea of presymbolism by Gottfried Semper, who stressed the style-formed significance of materials and techniques.

D. Böhm adapted Italian Romanesque and justified it in a historical-theological way. In the early Romanesque he saw architectonic preform: large rectangular squares, cubes, cylinders in equilibrium. Such beliefs allowed to connect Neo-Romanesque and functionalism. To the

most significant extent his views emerged in the design of St. Engelbert Church in Essen with a monumental two-tower facade (St. Engelbert Pfarrkirche, Essen, 1934–1937, 1953–1955).[16]

Key construction by Otto Bartning became Resurrection Church in Essen also (Auferstehungskirche, Südostviertel von Essen), built as a four-tier rotunda (1930, beginning of work on a project "Sternkirche" – 1922)[17]. It should be noted that the active use of new forms in the Ruhr industrial region may be partly explained with the influence of the advanced industrial and transport architecture. The revolutionary nature had Pressa-Kirche of steel and concrete, built by Bartning for the exhibition in Cologne in 1928 (later Melanchthon Kirche, was destroyed in the war years). An example of a functional architecture was Gustav-Adolf-Kirche in Berlin-Charlottenburg (1929, 1932–1934, Otto Bartning) with the majestic bell tower height of 47 meters.[18] Location of the church between two diverging at an acute angle streets determined its complex planning. The whole silhouette of the bell tower inspired by Notre-Dame Church in Le Raincy (1922–1923, Auguste Perret) – the first church in France, built entirely of reinforced concrete. However, the main hall of Gustav-Adolf-Kirche planned by Schwarz in the form of an amphitheatre. After the war, in 1951, the church was rebuilt by the architect himself (together Otto Dörzbach).

Types of temples in the interwar period in southern Germany, especially in Bayern, are often more conservative. Temple construction in this region had the same professional quality of projects, but conducted more intensively, especially in the second half of the 1930s. Connecting the "native motives", advocated by local cardinal M. von Faulhaber, emerged in the forms of neo-Baroque St. Theresa Church in Münich (1922–1924, von Bömmel), and in projects by O. O. Kurz and Ed. Herbert: "the modern basilica" St. Gabriel Church with a 45-meter tower (1925–1926) and

[16] Voigt W., Flagge I. 2005. S. 149–150.

[17] Dohmen H., Sons E. 1998; Stock. 2006. S. 148–150.

[18] Die Gustav-Adolf-Kirche in Berlin-Charlottenburg und ihr Architekt Otto Bartning. *Festschrift zum 75. Jahrestag der Einweihung*. Gifhorn, 2009.

a bolder three-nave St. Sebastian Church (1928–1929)[19]. "The Münich way" in the temple construction of the 1920s can be described as a middle way between Bauhaus and historicism, but rather one can see here the most widespread in the Western temple construction type of the basilica with a bell tower over the porch, decorated in the spirit of Neo-Romanesque and "brick expressionism"[20].

The connection between redesigned national motives and functional architecture can be seen by one in the tower-like Bethanienkirche (1931–1933, W. Zweck and H. Voigt) in Leipzig. The tower symbolized Luther's words about the Lord as our unwavering strength, but was reminiscent of the industrial structure despite the originality of the solution.

Significantly, it is entirely illegal to talk about Nazis temple architecture in the period of the Nazis regime in Germany, and the reason of it, of course, is not the lack of temple construction in this period.[21] The style trends of temple construction had an origin in the previous age, and there was only a slight shift of emphasis and priorities in the 1930s in the absence of any "Nazis style" and a small decrease in the intensity of temple construction (it fades away only to 1942). There were built about 100 churches to the beginning of the World war II, especially in Bayern, Rheinland and Westfalen. Only in Hamburg in the years of national socialism was constructed eight Lutheran churches and clergy houses.[22] However, there isn't the selection of temple construction as typology in publications of the proper time. Even in today's most complete set of buildings of the Nazis time[23] among the 14 types of buildings – the party-state, residential, service, industrial, military, exhibition, theatre and buildings of culture, memorial, etc., up to the concentration camps – the

[19] Katholische Kirchen in München. München, 1984. S. 96–97, 216, 226–227.

[20] Dreesbach M., Stölzl C. (Hrsg.). Die Zwanziger Jahre in München. Katalog zur Ausstellung im Münchner Stadtmuseum. München, 1979.

[21] Stock. 2006. S. 20.

[22] Donath M. Hamburg. 1933-1945. «Führerstadt» an der Elbe. Petersberg, 2011. S. 112.

[23] Weihsmann H. *Bauen unterm Hakenkreuz. Architektur des Untergangs*. Wien, 1998, 1168 S.

temple construction is not highlighted. It is logical because of 1) churches of this period didn't usually carry any specific features of the "Nazis style"; 2) temple construction hadn't a representative role at this period, so not to compete with the "new values" NSDAP; 3) temple construction was no longer perceived as an experimental field and was not particularly attractive to the ruling regime due to its conservatism.

Sacralization of the profane has become the main trend of the Nazis architecture. "Cathedrals of the new age" were called, for example, bridges and road structures.[24] The most typical for architecture of the public buildings of the Third Reich neo-Classicism didn't touch temple construction, and the largest masters of that style P. Troost, A. Speer, E. Sagebiel didn't build temples, dedicating themselves to another cult. A. Speer made a project of the most spacious in the world neo-classical Assembly hall in Berlin for 150-180 thousand spectators on order of Hitler. The architect pointed out "in fact, with all the negative attitude of Hitler to the mystical quirks of Himmler and Rosenberg – here we were dealing with a cult space, which was on the basis of tradition and their authority in the course of centuries to gain the same value as St. Peter Cathedral in Rome for the Catholic Christianity. Without this implicitly religious idea, all the costs for the Hitler's leading construction would look pointless and incomprehensible".[25] Another system of values, both not Christian and absolutely not Nazis, presented in the ideology by W. Gropius and founded by his Bauhaus-school, which the Nazis described as the "Church of Marxism". There was practically not monumental, important for the whole German church projects during the Nazis era, although some architects were involved in the Nazis party (Bestelmeyer, Höger, Steinberg). According to the memoirs by A. Speer, Hitler felt passion only for the monumental public buildings. In "My struggle", he writes about his admiration for state buildings "of huge dimensions", which could be considered "symbols of

[24] Schuder K. Granit und Herz. *Die Straßen Adolf Hitlers - ein Dombau unserer Zeit.* Braunschweig, 1940.

[25] Speer A. *Vospominaniia*. M., 2010, Ch. 1, s. 11.

the era", emphasizing "the greatness of society". "Gothic churches" were similar in the Middle Ages. Hitler was not a doctrinaire and controlled only "the construction of public buildings in the state, which aims to create an empire".[26]

The functionalism styling, closed to the modernist search of Bauhaus-school, quickly "dissolved" and disappeared after 1933, in contrast to the "brick expressionism" and, first and foremost, a national style that combined Heimatschutzarchitektur and elements of Backsteinexpressionismus. The time for "experiments" came to an end. The most widespread type of temple architecture, based on neo-Romanesque, one would like to describe the concept of "harsh style". It reflected "Christian universalism of the Middle Ages" and also fit in the Heimatschutzarchitektur context, but could be interpreted through expressionism and functionalism. One could capture the influence of the functionalist method also in the ascetic plasticity and strict spatial composition of the temples in this time.

Temple construction found itself on the political and architectural periphery during the Nazis period, and thus it preserved considerable freedom, "pluralism in a choice of style".[27] Even functionalism in the church architecture did not deserve the rating of "degenerate architecture". However, in 1936 it was recommended to architects to follow the ideas of "bodenständigen Bauen" (compare "Blut-und-Boden-Architektur"). A certain turn in architectural styling can be seen in the creativity of the most productive temple constructor Dominikus Böhm, who applied in the years of Nazism to the "harsh style". Brülls sees him as a brilliant eclectic, like P. Behrens and H. Pölzig, who could use all styles: expressionism, Heimatstil or functionalism. By the spirit of the time, Böhm more specifically refers to medieval forms in the spirit Heimatschutzarchitektur and

---

[26] Speer A. *Vospominaniia*. M., 2010, Ch. 1, s. 10.

[27] Brülls H. «Deutsche Gotteshäuser»: Kirchenbau im Nationalsozialismus: ein unterschlagenes Kapitel der deutschen Architekturgeschichte. In: Stefanie Endlich, Monika Geyler-von Bernus, Beate Rossie (Hrsg.). *Christenkreuz und Hakenkreuz Kirchenbau und sakrale Kunst im Nationalsozialismus*. Berlin, 2008, S. 93.

brutal interprets them (Herz Jesu Kirche, Bremen-Neustadt, 1935–1936; Heilig-Kreuz-Kirche, Billerbeck, 1936–1939; Benediktinerabtei St. Josef, Billerbeck-Gerleve (Westfalen), 1937–1938; St. Wolfgang Kirche, Regensburg, 1940). His St. Elisabet hospital in Köln-Hohenlind (1932) interpreted as an expression of "German lines of fate". St. Engelbert church in Essen (1936) has a metal frame; its cubist angularity makes it the most "expressionist" of the later temples by Böhm. The proportions of his temples differ from the "classical" variants by Bestelmeyer and Boßlet.

Albert Boßlet (1880-1957)[28] has built more than 100 churches, which personified "immersion in the German imperial glory and strength of culture". He worked primarily in Franken and Pfalz, and there was a "trendsetter" there in 1920–30s. His creation is characterized by a new interpretation of Romanesque. Along with the archaic, "village" component in the spirit of Heimatschutzarchitektur, Boßlet's projects retained elements of expressionism. Giant Benedictine basilica in Münsterschwarzach (1938) became the largest church building of the Nazis time. Even anti-Church-minded Nazis functionaries spoke about it as about monument to the "great past". Temple construction in this interpretation had to express "the positive traits of the German people": life force and emotional depth, the unity of the folk and devotion to the motherland, nearness to nature, but, above all, distinct political and cultural potential. The concept of "German" became the ideological conjunction between the conservative architectural ideology and national socialism.[29]

According to Dauner, the constructor of Reformations-Gedächtnis-Kirche in Nürnberg (1935–1938), neo-Romanesque in his building, on the one hand, was the massive and bold memorial to Reformation, on the other – reflected "today's art, militant and heroic time".[30] The tender

[28] Jöckle C. Albert Boßlet (1880–1957). Ein Kirchenbaumeister zwischen Historismus und Moderne. *Jahrbuch des Vereins für Christliche Kunst in München*, 19. Bd. (1993). S. 542–617.

[29] Brülls H. *Neue Dome. Wiederaufnahme romanischer Bauformen und antimoderne Kulturkritik im Kirchenbau der Weimarer Republik und der NS-Zeit*. Berlin, 1994, S. 177.

[30] Brülls. 2008, S. 86.

for the construction of the temple was initiated by the Nazis mayor of Nürnberg in 1933 with the purpose to express "the new Reich and a new time within the Evangelical Church" under the leadership of Hitler. Three-tower stone-lined temple symbolized a fortress as well as a spiritual struggle.

Example of archaism with Italian Romanesque orientation (which was extensively used in the German church architecture of the middle of 19th century, in turn,) is Frohbotschaftskirche in Hamburg (1937–1938, F. Dyrrsen, P. Averhoff) with a 52-metre campanila.[31] It is known as the isolated case of neo-Baroque designs of the temples.[32]

The neo-classical trend in temple construction in fascist Italy developed in the forms of imitation of the Pantheon (Sts. Peter and Paul Basilica in Rome, EUR, 1938-1939), while in Germany only in civil pompous Nazis buildings – dome palace, or a congress hall (Albert Speer, 1937). Memorial buildings and monuments of war as a fortress of the dead (Totenburgen, the idea of Wilhelm Kreis) during national socialism period was designed in the archaic-classical styling. They are united by the use of simple geometric shapes. Brülls notes that it intersects with the aspiration for monumentality in the Romanesque forms, which in the time of Nazism is manifested to a greater extent than previously (protestant Bestelmeyer, Catholics Boßlet and Böhm). Bestelmeyer was named by his contemporaries "the greatest builder of temples" of his time because he built eight churches that bore "the imprint of eternity". His majestic Oratorienkirche in Nürnberg (Gustav-Adolf-Gedächtniskirche, project 1930) was "the verily German Protestant House of God", combined in its design hall-space and construction with reliance on the walls, coming from Baroque, and Romanesque basilica of the 11th–12th centuries. Development of this theme can be seen in one of the projects for Savior church (Erlöserkirche) in Bamberg (1933–1934) and Jakobuskirche in

[31] Donath M. 2011. S. 111–115.

[32] Christuskirche, Altenholm, Schlesien, 1936, архитектор G. Langmaak (Langmaak G. Evangelischer Kirchenbau im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert. Kassel, 1971. S. 335).

Oberkonzau (1938). Bestelmeyer criticized the architecture of the "competitors" "die neue Sachlichkeit", as well as of expressionism, as soulless and formalistic, destroying "tradition". He called to deepen the study of the monuments, which appeared on German soil in those days, when "our people felt in their originality racial and national"[33], he saw in the Romanesque "monumental powerful Germanism". Sacred art, as at Wilhelm II years, became in part the art of war, and the formation of a totalitarian state was conceived similar to the construction of the Church.

On the other hand, the fact that the churches were not the priority objects for construction, as well as lack of funds, explain the construction of small churches in the forms of Heimatschutzarchitektur, modest in scale and decoration, especially in the North. As already mentioned, most of the memorials had the ideological character of the "new cult". In 1938, in Bremen,at the initiative of the head of the Pro-Nazis Protestant movement "German Christians" (Deutschen Christen) "bishop of the land" H. Weidemann, built three modest in their architecture "churches of thanksgiving" (Dankeskirche) in the style of Heimatschutzarchitektur "in gratitude to God for the miraculous escape of our people from the abyss of Jewish-materialistic Bolshevism by deeds of the Fuhrer".[34]

In general, church projects, reflecting the reality of national socialism to some extent, were extremely few, and this connection was expressed only in fragmentary "narrative" elements as, for example, "speaking" decoration: Martin-Luther-Gedächtniskirche in Berlin-Mariendorf, 1933–1935 – church in memory of Martin Luther in Berlin; Lutherkirche, architects B. Hopp, R. Jäger, Hamburg-Wellingsbüttel, 1937. The union of Christian, state and military history symbols is fairly typical for the memorial temples of different periods, and it can be seen in the interior of the Martin-Luther-Gedächtniskirche. The altar of the church of "German Christians" Lutherkirche in Hamburg is oriented the nearby ancient

[33] Brülls. 2008. S. 88.

[34] Heitmann C. *Von Abraham bis Zion. Die Ortsgemeinden der Bremischen Evangelischen Kirche*. Bremen, 1985, S. 87. All these temples were destroyed in the postwar years.

"German graves". Its facades are decorated with ancient Germanic symbols, including the swastika, and the wood-panelled interior is reminiscent of the rural medieval churches.

The memorial project of the dual Protestant-Catholic church (1942) was emphasized the lack of religious preferences of the customer. One of the rare attempts to create the ideology of temple construction in the Nazis period as antiromantic "style of power" and based on the technical achievements was made by the architect professor F. Seeßelberg[35].

Post-war temple construction continued previous trends, especially functionalism ("Neues Bauen"), starting with a minimalist Notkirchen ("churches of needs"), built in 1947–1953 in destroyed Germany on five projects by Otto Bartning which included elements of Heimatschutzarchitektur[36].

The particular place has the Russian Orthodox church – the Resurrection Cathedral in Berlin (Christi-Auferstehungs-Kathedrale, 1936–1938[37], architect-immigrant S. Shostovskii, constructor Carl Chellberg), the only one built in the interwar period in Germany with the support of the Ministry of church affairs. One of the most significant projects of temple construction of the interwar Russian emigration bears in its architectural features of the neo-Russian style. Concise interpretation of the details in the spirit of the architecture of ancient Novgorod and Pskov and centric "Moscow" composition and the material (concrete) correspond to the time of construction. Some drawbacks (five helmet-shaped domes overscale and "buried" in the primary volume, expressionless image solutions of the eastern part with the service annex and bell tower and interior) don't violate the traditional image of the Russian church.

Except for Germany, impressive monuments of the interwar temple construction are to be met, although not in such numbers, in Italy,

---

[35] Brülls H. 1994. S. 198–201.

[36] Stock. 2006. S. 164.

[37] Shkarovskii M.V. *Natsistskaia Germaniia i Pravoslavnaia Tserkov'*. M., 2002, S. 92–96; *Russkie khramy i obiteli v Evrope*. Sost. Antonov V.V., Kobak A.V. SPb., 2005, S. 45–48.

The Russian Orthodox Cathedral of the Resurrection of Jesus Christ. Berlin-Wilmersdorf. 1936–1938. Architect: Sergei Shostovskii. Photo: Alexander Bertash, 2013.

Czech Republic, Switzerland, Finland, France, and several other European countries. If the national style and especially functionalism was distributed in various countries, so pronounced "brick expressionism" (Backsteinexpressionismus) is unique and specific to German architecture. German architecture confirmed the high level of design and construction even in these highly controversial and difficult years. As already has been mentioned, Church architecture did not occupy a dominant position in architectural practice. It was due to the secularization of the post-war Weimar Republic, and during the Nazis regime – to the formation of the cult, as an alternative to Christianity and reflected primarily in the neo-classical architecture of public buildings. However, it miraculously showed its independence from political authority, even in the period of national socialism. The externally imposed aspiration to archaism and

brutality of the forms, often based on Romanesque and German folk architecture may be noted. The formal inclusion of the small "narrative" elements does not allow talking about the "Nazis church architecture" as about unique phenomenon. In Church architecture of the interwar period attended and developed such major trends as the convergence of the style of the Protestant and Catholic churches, the desire for simplification of forms and minimalism on the basis of the revival of "pre-form", complex church design that included the construction of parish centers not separated from the temple.

The article was translated by *Diana Keypen-Warditz (Moscow)*.

*Archpriest Alexander Bertash is a researcher at St. Petersburg State University.*

Liudmila Artamoshkina

# SACRALIZATION OF TOPOI IN LANDSCAPE WORLDS OF BIOGRAPHY

The author considers the process of sacralization of topoi in the individual memory and translation of images from the individual memory into the cultural memory, introduces the concept of "landscape worlds of biography". The content of this concept is related to the concepts of the *topoi*, "image", "landscape". Sacralization of topoi in individual memory is most overtly manifested on the historical and/or cultural "border", in situations of "reconsidering/processing of the past".

The process of sacralization of topoi in the individual memory and translation of images from the individual memory into the cultural memory is predictably found, for example, in preservation and sharing of religious experience in the Soviet period of history (the period of aggressive atheism). As we consider the formation principle of narrative practices, we can research sacralization of topoi. This process is reflected in biography writing: memoirs, diaries, letters, autobiographic novels, thus reproducing individual experience. Individual experience stipulates the character of cultural memory formation, which, in its turn, makes us consider the role of individual memory in a group`s memory formation and retention of this memory in the culture`s memory.

Historical/cultural oblivion initiated by social and political institutions may, on the contrary, enhance the process of individual remembrance and the desire to preserve it. The bearer of such autobiographic/individual

memory acts as a scriptor, preparing the process of retention of an individual memory in the generation`s memory and incorporation of the generation`s memory into the culture`s memory. Mnemotopos of memory that become an axis for memories have become sacral places for this individual memory. They initiate the process of remembering and, at the same time, serve as an origin for the image that the individual memory forms to subsequently incorporate it into the space of the culture`s memory, thus inducing topology of the generation`s memory. Talking about the topology of memory, we link the topologic nature of memory to the nature of the image that is embodied in the process of remembering and that serves, in its turn, as a mnemotop that becomes the memory`s "sacred place" and ensures the integrity of the processes of forgetting and remembering, forming the "landscape`s world of biography" and preserving the culture`s memory.

A landscape expresses a human`s accommodation of the world as an effort in life creation; landscape worlds of our biography are forms of emerged selfness.

The notion "a landscape world of biography" can be compared to several well-established notions and concepts used in philosophy of geography, cultural geography, and topology reflection[1]. All the research areas and tendencies mentioned above are united by space as a research object and as a concept on its own.

Talking about space as a subject matter for thinking, we often connect notions lying on various levels: geographical space, space of geographic images, and landscape. D.Zamyatin gives an extensive account of space thematization in philosophy in his article *Phenomenology of Geographic Images*[2]. "Space" is viewed as a condition for thought and the biography itself: Nietzsche`s geographical biography, Heidegger `s landscape orientation of thought – themes and definitions that mean a turn towards spatial and geographical forms of philosophical thinking that were especially

[1] Savchuk V. V. *Topological reflection*. M.: Kanon, 2012, p. 416.

[2] Zamyatin D. N. Phenomenology of Geographic Images. *New Literary Review*, 2000, 46.

well expressed, for example, in V.Podoroga`s analytical writing : "All the efforts of thought are nothing but paving a way in a certain landscape; the landscape`s image is generated by the velocity of the thought itself"[3]. This is the concept that we claim to be crucially important for the notion "landscape worlds of biography": we are talking about the space`s *image*. In most studies, a conceptual shift from the space to the space`s image is not overtly expressed; the grounds and opportunities for such a shift are not discussed either, which, in fact, turns "space" and "landscape" into synonyms. The insensibility of such transition is characteristic for various kinds of research, where the landscape is perceived as a "cultured" space domesticated by a "glance" and "extended into the body"[4].

The landscape is often used as an operational notion necessary for the elaboration of analytical procedures in interdisciplinary studies.

However, the very process of transition in studies from the natural space to the geographical space and, eventually, to the landscape is usually not considered because there is still no notion that could help in the search for unified methodology for such studies. To elaborate the direction of the search, we suggest researching the nature of the image. In case of landscape worlds of biography, we can discover "penetration" of space into an individual world. This can be done with the help of the research into "transition" from humans` natural conditions for their biography (we do not choose our place of birth). Such penetration is stipulated by the space`s image that we receive from our culture.

However, the image of space is being created by us during all our lives. In our further discussion, we also make an emphasis on the reverse direction of images: from each one of us into the world of culture. The notion that we are introducing – landscape world of biography – refers us to the bidirectional nature of such images and can provide applied research with necessary verification procedures.

---

[3] Podoroga V.A. *Vyrazhenie i smysl. Landshaftnye miry filosofii*. Moscow, 1995, p. 275.

[4] Domnikov S. D. Landshaft prakticheskoi deyatelnosti i fenomenologiya "videniya" v traditsionnoi culture. *Dukhovnye osnovania deyatelnosti* [Tekst]. The Russian Academy of Science; Philosophy Institute; ed. By S.A.Nikol`sky. Москва.: IFRAN, 2007, 207 p.

People "insert" images into the cultural landscape, simultaneously assimilating the existing ones and building up their own landscape, because they remain authors of their own *biography* that is inseparable from the overall "text".

The nature of the notion we are introducing – landscape worlds of biography – can be clarified as we consider the connection between topoi, image, and landscape.

J.Assman highlights the importance of topoi in the formation of a social group`s identity. "This tendency for localization is evident in all types of community. Any group of people that come together tends to create and secure places that will not only be sites for their joint activity but will also symbolize their identity and will become key points for memories."[5]

Assman`s concept refers us to the social memory concept by Maurice Halbwachs and his works – The Social Frameworks of Memory and The Legendary Topography of the Gospels in the Holy Land. Using the Holy Land as an example, Halbwachs has shown that a social group creates its own symbolic unity owing to the sacralization of space and to retaining the collective memory of this sacred place, which serves as a principle for the preservation of a group`s identity. According to Halbwachs, the past is structured by social memory, while our present, in its turn, is defined by this past retained by our memory. The concepts of social and collective memories are comparable. Their pivot point is that an individual and his life is determined by the community world, which is comprised of the social world and the cultural world.

However, it is essential to consider one more correlation: perception of the world develops from the location point of ego. This direction of the "glance" is connected with the moments of "my own" self-constitutive and constitutive activity in this world-embracing glance of this very world, "the world for me". The manner in which individual topoi that have be-

---

[5] Assman, J. *Kulturnaya pamyat`: pis`mo, pamyat` o proshlom and politicheskaya identichnost` v vysokikh kulturakh drevnosti*. Transl. from German by M. M. Sokolskaya. M.: Yazyki slavyanskoi kultury, 2004, p. 40.

come part of one`s biography and are, therefore, retained by individual memory are included into the cultural memory is stipulated by the notion "landscape world of biography". Our assumptions are close to the version put forward by T.Breyer, a German researcher. He includes topoi of individual memory, which occupy a certain place in the overall topoi hierarchy, into the topoi of cultural memory. This approach is based on the phenomenological theory of perception. While working on the concept of cultural memory`s topology, the author defines topoi incorporated into cultural memory as images and texts, body and landscape, and memory of emotions. The topoi is integrated "into a wider framework. In this topological framework, there is a hierarchical order of modalities indicating that it is impossible to determine once and for all which media and processes of encoding and retrieval constitute cultural memory. Since there is often the interplay of different modes, each should be recognized in its contribution to the transmission of cultural knowledge"[6]. Therefore, correlation of topoi and the landscape has a dual meaning: the topoi of spaces that we explore in the continuity of our life (as places pertaining to our biography and everyday experiences) and the topoi of our individual memory. This correlation is stipulated by the formation of a landscape, that is, the image of the space that is created owing to such dual meaning of the topoi. As we connect a topos and landscape, it is important to mention that the very process of bringing the topoi together to form a landscape turns into the process of certain sacralization of a place. A space that turns into a landscape loses its neutrality for me. It is "my" space now. A landscape is retained by a perceiving consciousness as an image plunging into the memory`s depths. However, forgetting is a function of memory, just as memorizing; it can be so radical that the image shifts into the subconscious. What are the conditions and mechanisms that allow this image to become actual both in the individual and collective memory and, eventually, in the memory of culture?

---

[6] Breyer, T. *On the topology of cultural memory: different modalities of inscription and transmission.* Würzburg: Königshausen & Neumann, 2007, p. 106.

While in the space of biography, we can link this moment of actualization to the necessity /need for self-understanding and understanding as an opportunity to remain a person who acts and makes decisions. Understanding/description always have a mood and are emotionally coloured. Emotionality of our understanding provides adequate access to the contents of our memory and lets us "fish out" our memory images of the past that are the most adequate to this perception "here and now".

Specific events are retrieved from the memory more readily if there is an emotional correlation between instants of coding an emotional experience into an image suitable for retrieval and future search/finding of this image as a memory.

As Heidegger has demonstrated, both understanding and mood constitute the existential nature of Dasein in general. No understanding is possible without mood or emotional colouring. This has another aspect: each emotional situation paves ways to (self-)understanding. Individual memory is also emotional. We cannot treat ourselves neutrally because the very fact of our "thinking" about ourselves is never neutral. On the other hand, each act of a thinking process leads to the mood. Our memories discover a memory`s attachment to a particular place. The topological nature of memory is stipulated by the spatial nature of this image. Images that retain our memories transform topoi into a landscape. A landscape presupposes an effort of gathering; retaining the landscape inside a culture, in a culture`s memory, becomes possible through the effort of its retention/preservation in the landscape worlds of individual biographies.

A prospective approach to research into interaction between individual and collective memories, and into constituting principles of cultural memory, is referring to the knowledge accumulated by anthropology and cognitive psychology, research into cognitive religious studies (for example, works by Harper Whitehouse[7] *Inside the Cult* (1995), *Rites of Terror* (1996)). His theory links memory to religious transmission. Transmission of religious knowledge in the "imagistic mode of religiosity" is connected to the episodic memory and, therefore, to an individual`s specific image.

[7] Qtd. In T. Breyer, p. 86.

Interesting research was also conducted by M.Bloch[8] (*How We Think They Think: Anthropological Approaches to Cognition, Memory, and Literacy* (1998)). He studies the interaction between the body, landscape, and a particular kind of narrative that is also perceived as a topos in a group`s memory.

Bloch researches a transfer of historical knowledge (memory of a historical event) among the Zafimaniri people in Madagascar. He talks about nonverbal characteristics of a cultural topos and claims that "culture in general, and especially cultural knowledge, is a highly complex phenomenon; it is more complex than something that can be explained in words and cannot be equal to something clearly evident". According to Bloch, knowledge is non-linguistic; most elements of cultural memory are transferred not verbally, but through practice, imitation, and "experimental" participation in the events acted out as a memory/reminder.

The Zafimaniri are a small people who practise slash-and-burn agriculture and live in the forest in the high mountains of Madagascar. One of the most dramatic events in the Zafimaniri`s history took place during the colonial war when the village where Bloch was working was burned down by French soldiers in 1947. The villagers fled to the forest, where they lived during two years hiding from the French, without any reliable shelter or habitation. The French army undertook such actions after the anti-colonial riot in 1947. During the war, the army killed about 80,000 people. The Zafimaniri suffered the worst from the riot, not due to their active participation in the anti-colonial movement, but because of the geographical location of their villages. Most of the rebels` army was marching through the Zafimaniri land, which made the colonial authorities believe that the Zafimaniri themselves were rebels or supported the rebels. When the French restored control over the territory where the Zafimaniri village was located, the authorities decreed that the village (i.e. the houses) was to be destroyed, and the villagers had to be locked up into a concentration camp. This event is retained in the villagers` memory in

[8] Qtd. In T.Breyer, pp. 86–89.

well-structured and formalized narratives, which allows them to keep the essence of the historical event under control of the elders. Bloch remembers the case when he was having a rest with the village`s elder in a hut due to the pouring rain that lasted for several hours. The hut had a view of the peace where the dramatic events of 1947 had taken place. A villager who had survived those events reconstructed the scenario in that hut; however, his story was very different from that of the official narrative, because it was based on his autobiographic memory. Bloch writes that we should not, therefore, mix up one narrative version of the events with the events retained in the survivors' memories. It is especially true in cases when the individual memory refers to a certain topos. Consequently, the individual and the cultural memory may become competing sources of knowledge. We are confident that this consideration, expressed in T. Breyer`s comments to anthropologists` research, is especially valuable for the analysis of processes that are active in the cultural memory today. Bodily practices in memory places is a mnemonic process.

Topoi and bodies interact actively in such commemorative practices and are aligned through the corresponding narrative. As Bloch describes it, inhabitants of the Zafimaniri villages occasionally return to the places where they used to hide in forests as hunter-gatherers for two years after the riot. There they restore physical and emotional experiences of the past, taking typical postures and making certain movements (they move in duck fashion and imitate hiding and hunting for French soldiers) and thus tell the young generation what they used to do to survive. When Bloch attended such a memorial place in 1995 with a family he was staying with; he was amazed by the fact that all the family members including children demonstrated what they did there, where they were, and what it was like, although, of course, they did not line in 1947. When they talked about the historical events, they used the pronoun "we", thus proving that the events of their historical memory were not abstract decorative facts but vivid experiences. Similarly, when an old man told Bloch in the hut about the 1947 events, elements of the landscape helped him to recall the facts from his memory. Bloch argues that bodily imitation helps to remember the

past not as knowledge placed into a semantic memory, but as vivid experiences; this way, the past lives in the active memory.

These examples demonstrate that the boundaries between individual memory and cultural memory are penetrable.

In case of children who acquire historical knowledge through imitation and listening to their parents` and grandparents` stories, memories have a different emotional quality.

According to Bloch, while relating or acting out experiences from the past, people might be remembering not real events but the last time when they were told about or acted out. Basing on anthropologists` works, Breyer highlights the connection between the topoi of individual and collective memory. However, we would like to explore further outcomes of the discovered connection: mnemotops of individual memory acquire their meaning because our "participation": in the related events is connected to the process of these topoi`s sacralization and retention in our memory. The event experienced through a told story becomes sacred and turns into a sacred place in our memory. Sacralization of topoi that stipulates their transfiguration into the landscape world of biography defines the character of a deed as an event of our biography.

Sacralization of topoi in individual memory is most overtly manifested on the historical and/or cultural "border", in situations of "reconsidering/processing of the past". The process of sacralization of topoi in the individual memory and translation of images from the individual memory into the cultural memory is predictably found, for example, in the preservation and sharing religious experience in the Soviet period of history (the period of aggressive atheism). This link is evident in interviews with those who have survived and incorporated this experience into their own biographies.

Research into memory problems leads us to the necessity to find ways to understand how a culture`s memory is preserved when certain traditions that used to warrant its preservation are broken or eradicated (the existence of totalitarian societies, as well as their demise, aggravate the problem of both preservation and translation of traditions in the culture`s memory).

We believe that the problem of memory is becoming more and more challenging for the following reasons: the generation of those who witnessed important events and periods in history that were pivotal points for memory policies in certain institutions, for memory`s preservation and transmission, is passing away. The generation of witnesses had the "authenticity" of a culture`s memories. It was experience imprinted in the body itself.

The new generations do not have their own experience of living through these milestone events; they regard the experience of "witnesses` generation" through the lens of their own experience and narrative practices. As we consider the formation principle of narrative practices, we can research the sacralization of topoi. This process is reflected in biography writing: memoirs, diaries, letters, autobiographic novels, thus reproducing individual experience. Individual experience stipulates the character of cultural memory formation, which, in its turn, makes us consider the role of individual memory in a group`s memory formation and retention of this memory in the culture`s memory.

Collective memory and individual memory are different in the quality of their subject`s representation; individual memory is always brightly coloured and is coded in narratives offered to relatives and the inner circle. There are no intermediaries between the individual and The Other (be it a person or a group of close people). The content of the collective memory is coded symbolically and needs intermediaries; it is connected with the tradition of cultural knowledge`s canonization. Canonization of cultural knowledge stipulates the character of formation and preservation of cultural memory; however, oblivion zones appear when, for example, a document is irretrievably lost (destroyed) or when people who used to be guardians of cultural memory pass away. Aleida Assmann uses the term "pole of forgetting" in this case. However, historical/cultural oblivion initiated by social and political institutions may, on the contrary, enhance the process of individual remembrance and the desire to preserve it. The bearer of such autobiographic/individual memory acts as a scriptor, preparing the process of retention of an individual memory in the generation`s memory and incorporation of the generation`s memory into the culture`s memory.

The modern culture has the material that naturally embodies these processes. These are various types of biographical writing: diaries, memoirs, notebooks, or an autobiographic novel. The analysis of literary texts that have gained considerable attention from readers or of media that have become a matter of heated discussions may confirm the processes we are considering and, at the same time, may encourage scientists to research the character of the link between autobiographical memory, a generation`s memory, and their retention by a culture`s memory: "Memories of the War" by Nikolai Nikulin (the memoirs were written in 1975 and published in 2007); memoirs by Yelena Tselma ("The Time and My Fate" (2012); by Valentina Freimane (in collaboration with Gunta Strautmane); "Farewell to Atlántida" (2012); by Pyotr Krupnikov "What I Lived Through and Survived" (2015); autobiographical novels by Tamara Petkevich ("Life is an Unpaired Boot", 2015), and Alexander Chudakov ("Mist Falls onto the Old Steps", 2016). Mnemotopos of memory that become an axis for memories have become sacral places for this individual memory. They initiate the process of remembering and, at the same time, serve as an origin for the image that the individual memory forms to subsequently incorporate it into the space of the culture`s memory, thus inducing topology of the generation`s memory. Talking about the topology of memory, we link the topologic nature of memory to the nature of the image that is embodied in the process of remembering. It serves, in its turn, as a mnemotop that becomes the memory`s "sacred place" and ensures the integrity of the processes of forgetting and remembering, forming the "landscape`s world of biography" and preserving the culture`s memory.

*Liudmila Artamoshkina has PhD. She is a researcher at the Saint-Petersburg State University.*

*The publication was prepared with the support of the grant of Russian Science Foundation № 16-03-00566.*

Izdevējs **LU Filozofijas un socioloģijas institūts**
Kalpaka bulvāris 4, Rīga, LV-1940
Tālr. 67034861, e-pasts fsi@lza.lv
www.fsi.lv
Izdevējdarbības reģistrācijas apliecība Nr. 2-0521