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PREFACE

In thinking of religion in Russia, we immediately think of organized religion in the form of Greek Orthodoxy. Also, we think of the Russian people as being atheists because for the last thirty years the government has believed in atheism. One day I read a statement that said the Russian people were very religious. Through research, I wanted to find out if this were possibly so.

With world affairs as they are today, I think we need to do our best to understand the Russian people, if it is at all possible through the meager means we have of studying them. To understand them, it is necessary to understand their religious character, for religion in the form of Orthodoxy has played an important part in the history of Russia. To try to understand why the Communists have wanted to destroy religion, it is necessary to know something of the history of Church and State relationship before 1917. Was it organized religion they wanted to destroy, or religion in general?

In this work I have given a brief historical survey of the Church and State relationship from the introduction of Christianity into Russia in the tenth century until the beginning of the Russo-German War in 1941. At times the Church has had a lot
of influence in matters of State. At other times, it has been completely subservient to the will of the State, being a tool for the fostering of autocratic ideas. Since the Communist regime started, it has been persecuted very much. In spite of its persecution, the Church still exists today. I do not believe the Communists will ever be able to destroy the Church. But I believe the persecution has purified the Church in many ways, and there is a possibility that it will emerge the victor in the future, stronger in spiritual essence than ever before.
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PREFACE</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iii</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chapter

| I. THE EARLY RUSSIAN CHURCH AND STATE | 1 |
| II. THE CHURCH AS A STATE INSTITUTION | 37 |
| III. THE CHURCH AND THE COMMUNISTS   | 90 |
| CONCLUSION                         | 125 |
| BIBLIOGRAPHY                       | 133 |
CHAPTER I

THE EARLY RUSSIAN CHURCH AND STATE

The average man of Russia has always considered himself a part of some unit, be it some tribe or village community, State or Church. From the Middle Ages until the Revolution of 1917, the fundamental principle of social life for the Russian Nation was represented by the Church. After the centralization of the Russian government, the Tsar was considered the protector of the faith and the Church. Consequently, the idea of autocracy and religion were blended into one single faith, and the people believed the preservation of this faith would save the nation. This faith, however, was shaken by the Revolution of 1917; and since then, Marxism has become the guiding principle of the State. Submission of the whole nation to a common faith is still required, and the Communist Party considers itself as the protector of this faith, the same as the Tsar did under the old regime. The same spirit of obedience is apparently required from the nation by both the old and new regimes.

The Christian religion, in the form of Orthodoxy,

---

1George Vernadsky, Political and Diplomatic History of Russia, p. 15.

2Ibid., p. 15.
predominated in the cultural advancement of the early Russian State. Its influence was felt in the political realm of the State as well. There is a widespread prevailing opinion that the influence of the Church was a specific peculiarity of the Russian people. There have been two views in Russia concerning this peculiarity. The Slavophiles believed it to be all the virtues of Russian life. They believed the devotion to God, humility, the spiritual contemplation, and the love of neighbor constituted the very essence of Christian ethics and were natural to the character of the Russian. The other view held that the influence of the Church was responsible for all the shortcomings of Russia; that it had caused the State to lag behind Western Europe in the advancement of civilization. This group believed the corruptness of the Byzantine Church was responsible for the backwardness of the people and State.  

In the development of Western European civilization, there had been a close relationship between Church and State. But the close union between the two in Russia was very different from that in the West. Russia imported the Orthodox Christian faith from Constantinople, and for many centuries, the supreme ecclesiastical authority for the Church remained with the Patriarch of Constantinople. The administrative structure of the Russian Church was determined by the Greek

---

Nomocanon and by the precedents of Byzantine Canon law; and in many cases, its administrative policies and decisions came from the East. 4

The Russian people belong to the Slavic race, especially the Eastern Slavs. The beginnings of the Russian State centered around the waterways of the Dnieper and Desna, with the chief centers being Novgorod and Kiev. It was along this water route that trade was carried on with Constantinople. In 862 the Slavs of the town of Novgorod invited Rurik, the Viking from Sweden, to rule; so the Vikings established themselves as the ruling class. In the tenth century, Kiev became a rising principality supported by commerce. Kiev was also along the water route,

Oleg became the ruling prince of Kiev in 882, and in 907 he made an expedition to Constantinople. The purpose of the expedition was to establish trade relations with Constantinople. Igor, successor to Oleg, made some military expeditions against the Greeks. Because these expeditions alarmed the Greeks, trade treaties were made between the Greeks and Russians. It was through contact with Byzantine traders and the conversion of some of the peoples of the Western Slavs that the people of Russia began to accept the Orthodox religion of Byzantium. Princess Olga, widow of Igor, realized

---

4Robert Casey, Religion in Russia, p. 4.
the emptiness of the heathenism of her people and went to Constantinople in 957. Here she was baptized into the Christian faith, the first of the family of Rurik to become a Christian. Although there were Christian people in Kiev in the early part of the tenth century, it remained for Vladimír I to take on the Christian religion as a national one.

Vladimír I became the ruler of Kiev in 980. He was a zealous heathen and began his reign in an orgy of paganism. He had many people sacrificed to the heathen gods that had been placed around his palace. One of the victims was the son of a Boyar who had become a Christian. The father refused to give up his son and told Vladimír that his gods were only pieces of wood. Both the father and son were killed, but this seems to have been Vladimír's last outburst of paganism. It seems that he became convinced that it was necessary for the people to choose a new faith. Perhaps he had remembered some of the teachings of his Christian grandmother, Olga.

Kiev was a stopping place on the highway for travellers of many nations. The legend goes that Vladimír discussed the various religions with the peoples who passed through Kiev. There were many Jews in Kiev. Also the people came in contact with Catholicism of the Western Slavs and peoples of the Mohammedan faith. Vladimír is reported to have discussed the

---

5Sir Bernard Pares, _A History of Russia_, p. 28.
question with various strangers.

He asked the Jews the home question of a statesman; why they are scattered over the face of the earth; and they reply "for their sins," so that Judaism is discarded. Islam is also rejected because, as Vladimir explains, it is quite impossible to be happy in Russia without strong drink. Papal Christianity was hardly likely to appeal to Vladimir; with Rome the spiritual chief is above all secular rulers. Much stronger and also much nearer was the attraction of the Orthodox confession.6

The representatives that were sent to investigate the religion of Byzantium were very much impressed by the dazzling Orthodox churches in Constantinople. They are said to have reported to him,

"When we stood in the temple, we did not know where we were, for there is nothing else like it upon the earth; there, in truth, God has his dwelling with man, and we can never forget the glory we saw there. No one who once tasted what is sweet, will afterwards take that which is bitter; therefore, we can no longer remain pagans."7

After Vladimir had decided upon the belief, he set out to conquer it. He conquered the Greeks at Kherson and marched on toward Constantinople. He notified the Greek emperors that if they would give him their sister, Anne, in marriage, he would refrain from attacking the Empire any more. There had been, however, a principle laid down that no Greek princess was to marry a foreign potentate unless he were baptized.8 When he further threatened Constantinople, the Greek

6Ibid., p. 29.
7Dorsey D. Jones, Under the Russian Canopy, p. 9.
8Samuel H. Cross, Slavic Civilization Through the Ages, p. 69.
princes decided to let him have Anne, providing he would accept Christianity. This he did in about 989, and later he married Anne.

After he had embraced Christianity, he felt that his spiritual status was secure; so he ordered the wholesale baptism of his subjects. The adoption of Christianity by Vladimir as a national faith was an important move, as it was influential in determining the political and cultural history of Russia until the Revolution of 1917. The conversion of Russia was an act of statesmanship, but the acceptance of Christianity by his subjects was an act of obedience.\(^9\) Many of the people objected to the baptism and fled, but mainly the people were willing to accept Christianity. For his zeal in spreading the religion, Vladimir was later canonized by the Church.\(^10\)

The conversion of the masses was helped by the fact of the assimilation of the figures of Christian beliefs with those of the chief deities of the pagan Slavic cult. Perun, the god of thunder, was identified with the Prophet Elijah in his chariot of fire. It was also an easy step from the belief in Svarog, the god of fire, and in his son, Dazhzhog, the life-giving solar orb, to an elementary conception of the Almighty God the Father and the Son, the light of the world and of truth. The supernatural version of the pagan religion was

\(^9\)Pares, op. cit., p. 29.

superimposed by the Christian notion of the Virgin, the Saints, and the devils.  

At first the Christian faith seriously affected only the upper layer of society. A duality of faith existed for a long time among the masses of the people. Maurice Hindus, in his book *Humanity Unrooted*, seemed to think the masses of people are still pagan in belief in spite of the fact that Christianity has been in Russia several centuries. Still the introduction of Christianity into Russia was a turning point in the development of the country. Greek priests came and with them the alphabet, an adaptation of Greek letters for Slavic ones. In other ways, the religious ties linked the Russians with an older civilization, that of Byzantium.  

The responsibility for the lack of religious instruction rests upon the Byzantine hierarchy whose leaders were called upon to rule the Russian Church.  

The genius of the early Christians had decided that the Church to achieve the widest possible influence must be modelled upon the organization of the secular state. The cities and towns had bishops and hierarchs according to civil

---

importance.\textsuperscript{14} The Church was made an eparchy, or a metropolitan, of the Byzantine patriarchate. From the beginning, the appointment of the metropolitan for Kiev and All-Russia was in the hands of the Patriarch of Constantinople. The Patriarch was more interested in appointing Greeks whom he could trust than to find men in Russia who were able to speak Russian and were conversant in Slavic affairs.\textsuperscript{15}

The organization of the Russian Church in the latter part of the tenth century was a problem not only of purely ecclesiastical considerations, but also of international policies. Probably the Byzantine rulers required complete canonical subordination of the young Russian Church to the Patriarch of Constantinople. There was even a question about establishing a bishopric of Russia. At first, Constantinople was inclined toward establishing only a number of parishes in Russia, with a Greek governing bishop outside of the country. Vladimir did not like this solution, since subservience to the Church at Constantinople presupposed political dependence as well. At this time there was no complete break between the Greek Orthodox Church and the Roman Catholic Church in the West, and there was an attempt to consolidate the Russian Church with that of Rome. This happened in 991. A few years later the Church was organized along Greek Canonic lines. It seems that

\textsuperscript{14}Steven Runciman, Byzantine Civilization, p. 109.

\textsuperscript{15}Casey, op. cit., p. 4.
Vladimir did not want to depend entirely on Rome or Constantinople; so he turned to the Bulgarian Church for both clergy and ecclesiastical books.\textsuperscript{16}

The Church in Russia was organized according to the Church Constitution that had been laid down by the Council in Trullo in 681. The patriarch was over the metropolitans and archbishops of the big cities and the provinces. The bishops were under the control of the metropolitans and archbishops, and they in turn controlled their local clergy down to the humble village priest or pope. During the early times, three sees were established in Russia, one at Kiev, Belgorod (near Kiev), and Novgorod, respectively.\textsuperscript{17} There were two classes of clergy, the white or secular, and the black or monastic. Clergymen that ranked below the bishop, including the village priest, made up the white clergy. These were married before their ordination and lived with their families in the parishes where they served. The priest was to be married "so as to keep him from sexual temptation and housekeeping worries."\textsuperscript{18} He could not, however, marry the second time, and when his wife died, he was obliged to enter a monastery or be shorn into a monk. (The white clergy wore their hair long.) Clergymen that were bishops or higher were taken from the black clergy, or the monks. These monks were to be unmarried. The whole

\textsuperscript{16}Vernadsky, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 48. \textsuperscript{17}Ibid. \textsuperscript{18}Runciman, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 111.
organization was controlled strictly from the patriarchal court. In Greece, the patriarch was nominally appointed by a body of bishops, but actually he was appointed by the Emperor and could be deposed by him by packing the synod that was subservient to his will.

There was little distinction made between temporal and spiritual authority in the Byzantine Empire. The Emperor expected to extend his temporal influence over the Kiev state, but the Kiev rulers fought for a native clergy. After Greece had conquered Bulgaria, it was necessary for Yaroslav to conclude a concordat with either Rome or Constantinople. Traditional interests were with Constantinople, but there were conflicts between Kiev and Constantinople, and in 1051 there was an attempt to make the Russian Church autonomous. A council of bishops chose Illarion, a Russian, as metropolitan but the Patriarch at Constantinople refused to sanction the move; so he did not serve after the concordat was completed. It was probably the Russian Church conflict which led to the final schism between the Roman and Greek Churches for Byzantine ecclesiastical leaders were eager to cut the possibilities of Russian relations with Rome by proclaiming schismatic.19

As a result, the Patriarch of Constantinople controlled the Russian Church until the thirteenth century. Even as late as 1389 the Greeks expressed indignation officially over the fact

19Vernadsky, op. cit., p. 53.
that the Russians accepted the Church but not the power of the Emperor. The highest power of the Church remained abroad, but the plans of Byzantium to extend political influence through religious channels did not materialize; thus the Church became a unifying force in the loosely held territory of Kiev.  

Vladimir attempted to lay the foundation for Russian culture by having some of the younger generation educated in the ability to read the Psalms, the Gospels, and such Byzantine religious and historical writings as had been translated into Old Bulgarian. The clergy, especially the bishops and higher, early assumed a place among the ruling class. New judicial procedures were introduced which were derived from the Greek Nomocanon. Also the clergy undertook to advise Vladimir on affairs of state and local policy. The bishops were well educated and knew the methods of government, especially the Byzantine methods. They advised the adoption of corporal punishment for fines in order to suppress brigandage. Also they suggested that the proceeds from the fines be used for military equipment to be used in the defense against the menacing nomads. The Church courts assumed jurisdiction over many social problems and offenses which took new significance in the light of the Christian moral code:  

bigamy.

divorce, heresy, witchcraft, and adultery. Thus Vladimir tolerated the fusion of the Church and State on the basis of contemporary Byzantine usage. Yaroslav, Vladmir's son, consulted with the Church dignitaries on matters of general policy. The duties of the Church were set up in the Church Ordinance of Vladimir and Yaroslav. It had to aid the temporal power in building up the social organization of the community. It exercised jurisdiction over the whole body of Christians in the State. In short, it was charged with the organization and supervision of the family order, the religious and moral order of the period. It had charge of all spiritual and benevolent establishments in which church folks found shelter, such as monasteries, hospitals, hostels for foreigners, homes for the aged and destitute.

Christianity had triumphed in Greece during a disillusioned age because it promised a better world. The right to this eternal bliss, the right ecstasies could only be won by treading the path of perfect orthodoxy. Consequently, tiny points of theological questions were more important than grand questions of secular policy, for the latter only concerned this world, while the former had eternity at stake. The mysticism of

---

21 Cross, op. cit., p. 73.

22 V. O. Kluchevsky, History of Russia, translated by C. J. Hogarth, p. 166.

23 Runciman, op. cit., p. 108.
the Greek Orthodox Church was transplanted on Russian soil among the Russian pagans.

The Byzantine relationship between the Emperor and the patriarch paved the way for the close relationship between the Church and State in Russia. Early in the development of the Orthodox Church, the Emperor was entrusted with the protection of the Church and was to be the representative of God. Of course, there were conflicts between the Emperor and the patriarchs. The Greek metropolitan of Russia was to hold the same relationship to the Grand Prince of Russia. He was to support the Grand Prince against rival princes, and he was to help the Grand Prince in strengthening his authority within the nation. The conflict that raged between Church and State in the West never occurred in Russia until the Revolution of 1917.24

From the beginning, the Orthodox Church was dependent upon the prince. Theoretically the bishops were elected in conformity with the will of the people, but actually the Prince recommended them, and, if the bishop were not what the Prince expected, he could dispose of him.25 With the approval of the secular authorities, the bishops had legal jurisdiction over the clergy and other church officials, including the people employed on church lands as well as the personnel of the monasteries.

24Minns, op. cit., p. 868.

Charges of heresy against the laity, breaches of ecclesiastical discipline, and theft of church property, cases involving the legality of marriages, the rights of parents over the children and the laws of inheritance, and disputes over correct weights and measures in trade—all these were heard in the episcopal courts with rights of appeal in certain cases to the metropolitans. Disputes between bishops were decided by the metropolitan or in case of need, by the Patriarch. The metropolitans consulted in matters of grave disputes with other bishops called in council for the purpose.²⁶

In the eleventh century, monasticism established itself in Russia, centering around Kiev. The prince would establish the monasteries, where prayers were made for himself and his kin, and where he was master just as much as on his own estate.²⁷ The early Russian monks strove to give nationalism to the character of the Church and attempted to make the Church an autonomous church of Greek Orthodoxy. The monasteries possessed land estates, supported almshouses, were a refuge for book learning, and possessed charitable objects. The lettered men who wrote the chronicles, the histories, tales and lives of the saints would retire to the monasteries to write them. They established schools and had a great part in changing the old heathen society through education. The monasteries, in early times, would be located in the hinterland of Russia, and the people would settle around them. In this manner they were instrumental in colonizing Russia.

The faithful would give donations to the monasteries,

²⁶Casey, op. cit., pp. 4-5.
²⁷Pokrosky, op. cit., p. 54.
while other members of the laity would deposit their goods with the monasteries for safekeeping. The Russians that made donations to the monasteries wished to propitiate the spirits, and they believed the Christian clergy were the only ones who were able to do it. The Church was given land and movables for saying rites for a dead man. In this way the Church was able to become very wealthy. Also the monasteries would use their money to buy land, or lend it out to the landlords at a high rate of interest. Because of their great wealth, the monasteries were really the first commercial storehouses and bankers for Russia. The Church, through these monasteries, was among the most ruthless exploiters of the peasantry. Serfdom makes its first appearance on the estates of the Troitsa Monastery, which obtained charters to this effect as early as the fifteenth century. 28 During the Time of Troubles, the local priests as well as the local police were active in returning fugitive peasants. The Trinity Monastery was the first to secure the right to have about eleven years in which to find their runaway peasants. The essential thing to remember is that the people, in their imagination, thought the priests and monks were the only persons who knew how to propitiate the world of saints and demons. They believed that the welfare of the people depended upon the propitiation of the

28 Ibid., p. 91.
saints and demons. Consequently, the priests as well as the monks were able to do things that would have been condemned in others.

There was a great deal of jealousy between the princes of the different principalities when Russian culture and government was centered around Kiev. The different princes would be moved up in governmental control to the coveted position of Grand Prince of Kiev, according to their seniority rank. Because of the civil strife caused by the jealousy between the princes, the Tartars, a Mongolian race, were able to subdue Kiev and bring a large number of Russians under their control. They made their first invasion in 1228, but they retreated. The Church begged the Princes to unite in order to stave off the Tartars, but the feuds between them continued. By about 1245 the Tartars had established their rule over the Russians and were able to continue this rule for nearly two hundred years. Prior to this invasion, the Orthodox Church was very dependent upon the princes, but the Tartars helped the Church to rid itself of this dependence. The archbishops would obtain charters from the Tartar Khan which granted the Church all kinds of privileges. Also the Khans would promise not to levy taxes on the clergy, would make the archbishops judge over all the Church people, entirely independent of the prince's jurisdiction, all on the single condition that the Church would

29 Ibid., p. 93.
offer prayers for the Khan and his kin. Of course, the Khans were unbelievers, but the Church did not mind. Because the Church was considerate of the Khans' wishes, it was able to bring order out of chaos. The firmness and intelligence of the metropolitan was helpful in bringing about this order. Most of the metropolitan had been sent from Constantinople, and the Tartars supported the spiritual power of Constantinople and would give civil rights to them when the appointees arrived in Russia.\textsuperscript{30}

At the break-up of Kiev, Metropolitan Cyril left the devastated area of Kiev with all his clergy and went to Vladimir. The Metropolitan dwelt at Vladimir for a time, but, because the Prince of Tver became jealous of the power of the Church under the Tartars, the Metropolitan was forced to find another ally. The Prince of Tver had tried to bring the Church under his control by rising up against the Tartars. The Metropolitan moved to Moscow under the protection of John I and since that time the ecclesiastical capital of Russia has been Moscow.\textsuperscript{31} The Tartars were afraid the Grand Prince of Vladimir would get too much power so they helped the Prince of Moscow. Consequently, Moscow began to rise in the fourteenth century under John I, called Kalita, the Moneybag. The Church also

\textsuperscript{30}\textit{Casey, op. cit.}, p. 4.

\textsuperscript{31}\textit{Pokrosky, op. cit.}, p. 56.
supported John,* blessed his deeds, and even used the threat of expulsion from the Church against those who opposed him, or refused to surrender his enemies to him or the Tartars. In John's hand the Church and the Tartars became tools for the aiding in the growth of Moscow. The Church was instrumental in getting the people to unite behind those Moscow leaders following John I and throw off the Tartar yoke.

There was a change in the political situation in Russia toward a more centralized government after the Tartar yoke had been thrown off. The Church had grown wealthy and had increased its prestige during the Tartar period, and it realized that if it were to keep this wealth and prestige, it would be necessary to cooperate with the Prince of Moscow. When the prelates of Moscow, with the consent of the Grand Prince of Moscow, attempted to put their nominee in the office of Metropolitan, they met with some opposition of Constantinople. A Greek by the name of Isidore was appointed to be Metropolitan of Moscow. At first he was accepted in Russia, but after he had shown that he was a staunch supporter of the Union between the Catholic and Orthodox Churches, the people began to dislike him. Isidore promised Basil II that he would remain true to Orthodoxy when he attended the Council of Florence (1439).

---

*John is sometimes called Ivan, the Russian name for John.

32Simmons, op. cit., p. 45.
But, upon returning to Moscow as a papal legate, he substituted the Pope's name in the liturgy of the Church instead of the Patriarch of Constantinople. This proposed union between the Churches was an attempt to save Constantinople from the Turks. The Russians had been taught to hate the Western Church; so Isidore was arrested and condemned by a council of Russian bishops.

After Isidore had been condemned, there was a move by the Grand Prince of Moscow to have the metropolitans consecrated at Moscow. He wrote to the Emperor of Constantinople asking for this permission. The reason that he wrote to the Emperor was that he did not know whether the Patriarch was still at Constantinople because of the threat of the Turks. The Grand Prince did not receive an answer to his letter to the Emperor because Constantinople fell to the Turks in 1453. The Russians believing that Constantinople had fallen as a punishment for their backsliding toward Latinism felt that they were the true representatives of Orthodoxy and advanced the theory of Moscow being the "Third Rome."

John III became the heir to the "Caesaropapism" of the Byzantine Emperors, and the Church declared itself independent of the Patriarch of Constantinople. An Abbott of the Pskov Monastery wrote John III,

\footnote{Ključkov, op. cit., p. 19.}
The Church at Rome fell because of Apollinarian heresy. As to the second Rome—Constantinople—it has been hewn by the axes of Ishmaelites, but this third new Rome—the Holy Apostolic Church, under thy mighty rule, shines throughout the entire world more brightly than the sun. All the Orthodox Christian realms have converged in thine own. Thou art the sole Autocrat of the Universe, the only Tsar of the Christians... Observe and hearken, O Pious Tsar, two Romes have fallen but the third stands, and the fourth can never be. Thy Christian Empire shall fall to no one’s lot.\(^{34}\)

Thus the Russian Tsar had to uphold the fragment of true Orthodoxy until the second advent of Christ. This idea of the Third Rome helped to nationalize the Russian people, and, through the assistance of the Grand Prince, the Russian Church was freed from the control of Constantinople. Thus a patriarchate at Moscow was set up in 1589. In Byzantium, the Emperor was the protector of the Church; so the Russian Tsar became the protector of the national Church. The close union between the Church and State was to be a detriment to the Church in later years.\(^{35}\) The Tsar, through the Church, kept a strong hold on the masses of the people. It was during the time of Peter the Great that the Tsardom process was complete—one Tsar, one faith, one law, one nation, one administration, one church—and the Church was very influential in developing it.\(^{36}\)

In the fifteenth century there arose a religious sect

\(^{34}\)Ibid., pp. 15-16.\(^{35}\)Ibid., pp. 16-17.\(^{36}\)Victor Berard, The Russian Empire and Czardom, translated by G. Fox-Davies and G. O. Pope, p. 240.
known as the Judaisers. There had been another sect prior to this known as the Strigolniki who believed "that priests were unnecessary, that laymen might preach and that prayers for the dead were to no avail." This sect did not last long, but the advent of the Judaisers threatened the realm of the Church, even going so far as gaining the metropolitan as a convert. They challenged the deity of Jesus Christ, the doctrine of the Incarnation and the Trinity, the worship of the saints, the use of icons and the practice of monasticism. This sect also challenged the power of the Church; so Joseph, Abbott of Volokolamsk, together with the help of Grand Princess Sophia, succeeded in condemning and burning the leaders.

Joseph of Volokolamsk was one of the most notable Churchmen of this time. He and his followers preached a close union between the Church and State. They supported the State authority, hoping in return to obtain its protection. By allowing the State to interfere with Church matters, Joseph and his followers got the State's support in the question of monastic property. He regarded the Monastery of Volokolamsk as a State institution whose aim it was to prepare hierarchs for the State Church. Joseph was very careful in selecting men for his monastery, preferring to have men who were rich and influential so they would make great donations of lands and money. Joseph

37 Pares, op. cit., p. 92.  
38 Ibid., p. 93.  
39 Miliukov, op. cit., p. 20.
believed that if the monastery were rich, it would attract men who were prominent; thus they would be better fitted to fill the high Church offices. Joseph declared that it was the duty of the State to defend the property of the Church, and in turn the Church could render the State great support.

An opposite view was taken by Nil Sorsky, one of the saintliest of the Russian ascetics. He lived in an hermitage among the monks who knew poverty. These monks were known as the Transvolga Elders, and they emphasized the spiritual element of the Church. Nil Sorsky contradicted Joseph on every point. He asserted that

...the Church had to do with the souls of men and their salvation through humility and penitence. It was not the business of the Church to Council the State on matters of politics, or on war and peace, but only to give spiritual guidance for the salvation of the soul, whether a prince or a peasant. The Church should have no wealth, nothing to attract or display authority, yet within its own realm, the realm of the spirit, it was supreme, even over the prince. It should ask no favor of the State and should give none to the Prince.40

Naturally the State could find attractive elements in both views. At this time the Prince of Moscow was only a little higher than a feudal lord, and if the monasteries were so wealthy, the Abbott would be in a position to have power equal to the prince. Because of the rivalry, it would be best to side with Nil Sorsky, giving preference to a free but

40 Paul B. Anderson, *People, Church and State in Modern Russia*, p. 25.
poor Church. On the other hand, if the State supported Joseph, it would be able to have control over ecclesiastical persons and property. In this manner, the State would stand a chance to profit by the wealth and influence of the monasteries. Joseph was able to place many of his followers in influential positions in the Church; so his idea prevailed. His ideas helped to strengthen the belief of the people in Moscow, that as the Third Rome, it was the possessor of the only true and unpolluted Christianity. The Josephites attempted to make the Church a State and national one.

John IV, known as John the Dread, was crowned Tsar in the year 1547, when he was only sixteen years old. In 1551 he called a Church Council, or Sobor, at the advice of the metropolitan. The idea that the Tsar, upon recommendation of the Church officials, should be the one to call the Church Council was inherited from Byzantium. The council that John IV called is known as the Hundred Chapters, or Stoglav Sobor, and it was composed of both church officials and laymen. It received its name from the fact that its decisions were arranged in a hundred sections. Some of the measures that were adopted tended toward the improvement of the education of the clergy and the morals of the congregation. The details of the Church rituals were also fixed at this Sobor. Because the details of the rituals had been blessed by the authority of the Fathers at the Stoglav, they assumed an importance which made their exact
observance obligatory to the Great Russian. The Schism within the Church was the result of Patriarch Nikon's attempt to change some of the Stoglay's decisions.\textsuperscript{41}

John IV showed great esteem and reverence for the Church, but he intervened in the matters of morality. However, when he attempted to deal with the great and increasing land holdings of the monasteries, he met with so much opposition that he did not do more than forbid further bequests or sales of lands to the monasteries without imperial consent.\textsuperscript{42} It remained for Catherine the Great in the eighteenth century to settle the question of large land holdings of the monasteries and Church.

It was under Feodor, son of John IV, that the Russian Church became completely independent of the patriarchate of Constantinople. Feodor was a weakling, so he left the affairs of State in the hands of his father-in-law, Boris Godunov. Boris gave his support to the Tsar in transforming the metropolitanate of Moscow into a patriarchate. The Patriarch of Constantinople was in no position to oppose this move because he was in exile, so he finally gave his consent. The Tsar called a Council of Russian bishops to ratify this step, and when the Patriarch of Constantinople visited Moscow in 1589, Metropolitan Job was enthroned as the first patriarch of

\textsuperscript{41}Vermadsky, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 161.

\textsuperscript{42}J. S. Curtiss, \textit{Church and State in Russia, 1900-1917}, p. 15.
Moscow, or all Russia. It is significant that the patriarchate of Moscow was established by the Tsar and Boris Godunov rather than the Church.\textsuperscript{43}

Upon the death of Feodor, the Patriarch of Moscow intervened in the affairs of State, the Church claiming to be the highest authority in the land. The Patriarch was instrumental in placing Boris on the throne as Tsar of Russia, but Boris did not welcome any rival to his autocratic power. Boris addressed the Patriarch as being supreme in spiritual matters, and the Patriarch replied that he, the Tsar, was the "true defender and administrator of the Christian faith."\textsuperscript{44} Because the patriarchate was instituted in Russia on the eve of the convulsions that were to leave the country without a Tsar, the Church proved to be a valuable instrument in carrying the nation through the Time of Troubles.

There were Polish pretenders to the throne of Moscow during the Time of Troubles. In 1610 the Russian Boyars were ready to swear allegiance to Wladyslaw, son of Sigismund of Poland, on the condition that he should accept the Orthodox faith at once. In an agreement signed by Sigismund and the Russian envoys sent to deal with him, Wladyslaw was to keep intact the Greek Orthodox Church and govern with the assistance of both the Boyar Duma and the Zemsky Sobor.\textsuperscript{45} When the Polish

\textsuperscript{43}Ibid., p. 15.  \textsuperscript{44}Casey, op. cit., pp. 9-10.  
\textsuperscript{45}Vernadsky, op. cit., p. 189.
garrison occupied Moscow, Sigismund changed his mind and decided to occupy the throne himself. The Moscow leaders became alarmed at this decision because they were afraid the Russian Church would be compelled to acknowledge the authority of the Pope and the Russian State incorporated into the Polish State. A nationalistic reaction set up, and Patriarch Hermogen of Moscow sent out circular letters to different Russian cities, asking the people to unite against the Poles. The Poles found out about the letters and arrested Patriarch Hermogen, but it was too late. The nation had heard the call and succeeded in ousting the Poles.

After the Poles had been ousted from Moscow, a representative Sobor was called for the purpose of electing a new Tsar. This Sobor was made up of townspeople, clergy, service nobility, boyars, and Cossacks. It was decided that no foreigner would be selected, so Michael Romanov was chosen. Politically, he was unknown. However, he was related to John IV, and his father had been forced by Boris Godunov to become a monk, taking the name of Filaret. Michael became Tsar in 1613, and he was the first of the house of Romanov, which was to rule Russia until the Revolution of 1917. Upon his return from captivity in Poland, Filaret was chosen Patriarch of the Russian Church. Thus spiritual and temporal power were held by father and son respectively.\[^{46}\] The relationship between

\[^{46}\text{Simmons, op. cit., p. 55.}\]
Church and State became equal. It had never attained this equality before nor since in the history of Russia.

The title Great Lord (Veliki Gosudor) was given to Filaret by the Moscow government. Prior to this, the title had only been applied to the Tsar. The inference was that the Patriarch should be looked upon as the head not only of the Church, but also of the State as well.47 A diarchy—two Great Lords, the Tsar and the Patriarch—was established and continued until the death of Filaret in 1633. As it was an application of Byzantine theories to the life of the Russian Church and State, it served as a precedent for the future claims of Patriarch Nikon.48 Because of the weakness of Michael, it turned out to be a dictatorship of Filaret.

Filaret was well along in years when he returned from Poland. He was a man of ambition and strong will. He showed a great contempt for the courtiers, and he possessed marked abilities as a statesman. He showed initiative in both the affairs of state and the affairs of the Church, as well as on matters pertaining to the domestic and international policies. Together the Tsar Michael and Patriarch Filaret would receive ambassadors and perform other important acts of State. Together they set about the difficult task of restoring the Church and State to their former strength and well-being.49

47Vernadsky, op. cit., p. 195.  
48Ibid., p. 195.  
49Curtiss, op. cit., p. 17.
Both the Church and State were in a very bad condition when Michael Romanov came to the throne. Education and morality had sunk to a very low level. Some of the people believed that the troubous times had been a punishment from God. Many of the churches and monasteries had been leveled; in some cases the superiors had been taken into captivity. The government had burdened the remaining monasteries with levies of money in order to support the fighting men. The civil and criminal jurisdiction over the clergy had been taken out of the hands of the bishops and placed under a civil department, called the Monastery Office. While Filaret was Patriarch, he obtained a charter from the Tsar granting him jurisdiction over his dioceses, monasteries and churches, together with their servants and peasants.  

The Patriarchs immediately succeeding Filaret were not very strong. Ioasaf, who succeeded Filaret, when he was consulted about important matters of state, declared it was his duty to pray for the Tsar, not to advise him, as the Tsar was autocrat over all. There was a conflict, however, between Church and State during the reign of Alexis from 1645 to 1676. Also there was a schism within the Church that continued down to the Revolution of 1917.

The ecclesiastical policy under Alexis was closely

50Hastings, op. cit., p. 871.
51Curtiss, op. cit., p. 17.
connected with Russia's international situation. Alexis considered himself not only the Tsar of Russia, but also the Tsar of the whole Greek Orthodox world. Consequently, he tended to coordinate both the habits and rituals of the Russian Church with those of the Greek Near East. In these matters he was supported by Patriarch Nikon. Nikon was permeated by the Byzantine idea of a close union between the Church and State, and he believed the Tsar was not able to rule the country in due Christian fashion unless he was assisted by the Patriarch.  

Nikon, a remarkable Russian leader, was born into a peasant family in the Novgorod district. He became a village priest; but after the death of all his children, he persuaded his wife to become a nun so that he could enter the monastery and become a monk. In 1646 he met the young Tsar Alexis. Nikon made a great impression on the Tsar, so he was appointed Abbott of a Moscow monastery and invited to the palace weekly. In 1648 he was consecrated Archbishop of Novgorod. When he was being considered for the office of the Patriarch, he was not willing to accept it unless his views were shared by the Tsar. It was only after the Tsar and prominent clergymen promised to recognize Nikon as their "Chief, Shepherd, and Father" that he accepted the office. He was installed as Patriarch on


*According to Greek Canon Law, a priest could not become a monk unless his wife died, or he persuaded her to take the veil.
August 4, 1652 and was given the title "Great Lord" just as Patriarch Filaret had had during the time of Michael.

Nikon claimed to share equally with Alexis in the control of the government. When the Tsar went to the West during the Polish War in 1654, Nikon was entrusted with the care of the Tsar's family. Also he was made regent. He had a despotic character and made many enemies among the clergy and boyars. The boyars had submitted to the dictatorship of Filaret because he was the father of the Tsar, but they resented Nikon because he was a commoner. It was only Tsar Alexis' favor that supported him at court. Upon the return of Alexis to Moscow, he began to show that he was not ready to listen to Nikon's dictatorial habits. The boyars and courtiers noticed that Nikon was losing favor with the Tsar, and they set about to cause his downfall. When Nikon saw that he was losing favor with Alexis, he laid down his office insignia and retired to the Resurrection Monastery, hoping that Alexis would take him back into his good graces. This Alexis refused to do; so he took over the de facto control of the Church.\footnote{Vernadsky, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 212.}

Just before the Time of Troubles, printing was introduced into Russia, and the first presses belonged to the Church. This, together with Greek criticisms, suggested a revision of the Church books, as any errors would become more harmful
from the moment they were widely circulated in print. After the fall of Constantinople, the Greek patriarchs and prelates who had visited Russia had kept an eye on the mistakes that had crept into the Russian service books through centuries of recopying. The task of correcting the books was first taken up in the early part of the seventeenth century, but ignorance prevailed among the clergy and the persons attempting to correct the books were accused of heresy. Consequently, many books were printed with loose corrections, and these only served to stereotype the mistranslations and other errors.

It remained for Patriarch Nikon to take up the correction on the books with great vigor. It was these corrections that brought about the schism within the Russian Orthodox Church. In 1551 the Stoglay had confirmed the two-finger crossing, had sanctioned the two-fold "alleluia," and had condemned some Greek usages. In translating the Greek to Russian, the translators had written Иисус instead of Иисус, and when there was a move to correct the books, many people refused to change.

A Church assembly was held in 1654 for the purpose of correcting the books. The Council established the three-fingered crossing in giving the blessing, the three-fold "alleluia," and the spelling of the Savior's name as Иисус instead of Иисус. At once there arose great opposition to the

---

54 Pares, op. cit., p. 157.
measures. Even though Nikon was supported by the Tsar and the
corrected books were retained, the struggle within the Church
was the beginning of Nikon's ruin. Since the downfall of Con-
stantinople, many people in Russia did not respect the Greeks
and considered them incapable of teaching the Russians.
Another thing, the strong supporters of Nikon were the Ukranian
scholars of Kiev. When the Ecclesiastical Academy was estab-
lished in Kiev in 1631, Kiev became the intellectual center
of the Russian Church as a whole. The Muscovite clergy were
suspicious of the Ukrainians because they believed them to be
in too close contact with the Polish Catholics. Furthermore,
the time-hallowed practices had taken on an air of traditional
holiness, and many feared the proposed changes marked a first
weakening of the faith which would proceed the coming of the
Anti-Christ.55

After Alexis came to the throne, there was a rise of pro-
Greek sentiment. Thus, there was a change in the attitude of
the government toward the Greeks. This change in attitude had
been brought about by an attempt of some Greeks to get Alexis
to help in securing Greek independence from the Turks. If
this could be accomplished, Alexis was to be the Tsar of Con-
stantinople as well as Tsar of Russia. The reform within the
Church had been suggested by the Greeks and Greek sympathizers.

Alexis was conscious of the fact that, if he were to put over his idea of reform within the Church and the idea of helping the Greeks, it would be necessary to win the Church to his ideas. The Tsar won Patriarch Nikon over to his ideas, but Nikon had another motive for wanting to side with the Tsar. He had ambitions to become stronger than the Tsar; so he thought he could accomplish this by bringing about the reforms within the Church. These reforms caused the great schism within the Russian Orthodox Church.

The schismatics were called Raskolniki, or Old Ritualists, and they believed more strongly in Moscow's authority than in Byzantine authority. The most conservative classes made up the Old Ritualist movement. They believed they were defending the orthodoxy of the Church as well as the stability of the throne. They desired to save their metropolis from the fate of Rome and Constantinople and avert the terrors of the Last Judgment. Their differences were matters of dogma. According to them, the service books must stand as they were before the time of Nikon; the Church procession must go with the sun, not against it; the name of Jesus must be written Iesus, not Iisus; "alleluia" must be said twice and not thrice; the sign of the Cross must be made with two fingers, not three;

---

56Vernadsky, op. cit., p. 207.

the liturgy must be celebrated with seven prosphoras instead of five; and the only cross to be honored was the eight-pointed one (that is, the Russian Cross in which the title and foot slanting rest had become extra pieces).58 Their opposition to the reform resulted in religious and political persecution. This persecution was carried out by the State at the insistence of the Church. Many were exiled to Siberia; their children were declared bastards and torn from their parents; their clergy were forbidden to perform the duties of their offices; and they were declared a menace to the State and placed outside the law. The strict Old Ritualist, in latter years, refused to touch tea or sugar, for they were unknown before Nikon's time. They would not cut off their beards because they believed "the beardless could not enter Heaven."59

The conflict that raged between Alexis and Nikon paved the way for the complete subjection of the Church to the State. The Great Sobor that was called by Alexis in 1666 to try Nikon included the Patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch and legates from Constantinople and Jerusalem. The Council deposed Nikon to a monk of low degree and sent him to a monastery in northern Russia. In spite of the fact that Nikon was deposed, the Great Sobor upheld the corrections made by him in the service books.

58 Minns, op. cit., p. 871.
It also excommunicated the Old Ritualists, hence bringing about their great persecution.60

Some of the Russian bishops in the Sobor were willing for Nikon to be deposed because he had been very harsh and had taken over some of the lands and added them to the Patriarchal holdings. They were, however, unwilling for the Tsar to be given control of the Church. Only after the Greek Patriarchs threatened them with anathema* did they accept the formula saying the Tsar was supreme in the State and the Patriarch was supreme in the Church. The Tsar agreed to return the jurisdiction of the clergy to the Church. This had previously been put under the control of the Monastery Office, a civil department of the government. The office was not abolished, and until 1675 the State retained control of the lands of the Church.61

Many people flocked to the side of the Old Ritualists because they believed the official Church was the Church of the Anti-Christ, and they also believed the State was an agency of the devil because it supported the Church. Thus the opposition soon developed into a rallying point for all dissenters, political as well as religious.62 The Cossacks were afraid the government would take away their old liberties; the

60Vornadsky, op. cit., p. 212.
62Joshua Kunitz, Russia, The Giant That Came Last, p. 70.

*Anathema is a solemn ban or curse pronounced by ecclesiastical authority, and accompanied by excommunication; hence denunciation of anything accursed.
peasants were disgusted with serfdom; and the merchants did not like the taxes that were imposed upon them.

A wave of fanatical hysteria rolled over the land. In many districts fields were not sown and crops were not gathered. In an apocalyptic mood people prayed, confessed, and waited for the end. They gathered in wooden structures, chanted old hymns, and, on hearing the approach of the Tsar's troops, set the structure on fire, and perished in the flames. By the time Peter ascended the throne twenty-thousand people are known to have burned themselves to death.63

Because of the break within the Church, and the Church's inability to heal the break, Peter the Great was able to completely subdue the Church. He abolished the Patriarchate at the death of Patriarch Adrian in 1700, and later set up the Holy Synod that was to make the Church a state institution. As a state institution, it was able to keep the people submissive to the will of the Tsar. During the Revolution of 1917, it nearly collapsed, and has not completely regained its strength.

63 Ibid., p. 70.
CHAPTER II

THE CHURCH AS A STATE INSTITUTION

The foremost and dominant faith in the Russian Empire is the Christian Orthodox Catholic Eastern
Confession.

The Emperor possessing the throne of All Russia may not profess any faith but Orthodoxy.

The Emperor, as Christian Sovereign, is supreme
defender and preserver of the dogmas of the ruling
faith, and protector of the orthodoxy of belief and
the decorum of the holy church.¹

These words, embodied in the Svod Zakonov or Code of Laws
in 1833, definitely defined the Imperial policy with regards
to the religious affiliation of the Russian ruler. Also it
favored Orthodoxy as the most important religion. These were
not empty words; the Orthodox Church was definitely favored as
the only religion recognized by the State until the October
Revolution in 1917.

The complete independence of the Russian Church from the
Patriarch of Constantinople had not been accomplished until
1589. Under Patriarch Filaret, the power of the patriarch was
on a level with that of the Tsar. Under Alexis, Patriarch
Nikon had tried to make the patriarch's authority greater than
that of the Tsar. The struggle between the two brought about

¹Curtiss, op. cit., p. 35.
Nikon's downfall, and it paved the way for the complete subordination of the Church to the will of the Tsar during the reign of Peter the Great. The Church was made a State institution; and, because of its role in keeping the people in submission to the will of the Tsar, the Bolsheviks, later the Communists, were to persecute the Church intensively and try to rid the country of its religious beliefs.

Peter I came to the throne of Russia in 1682 as co-ruler with his half-brother, John. Upon the death of John in 1693, he became the sole ruler. By training, Peter did not seem to have a personal attachment to religion. As a child, he was brought up in the practice of Orthodoxy, the forms of which he observed throughout his life. He became isolated from ecclesiastical influence when his mother moved from the court. He appreciated religion as a moral and social force, and he wanted to keep it alive among his people. However, he wanted to direct this religion along the lines that would be most beneficial to him.

Early in his reign, Peter became convinced that it was necessary for Russia to take on Western ways if she were to make any advancement in civilization. In order to study the ways of Europe, he traveled in England, Prussia, Holland, and Austria. As a result of these travels, he saw the need of

---

2Casey, op. cit., p. 11.
reform in the matters of State, customs, and the Church. With regards to the Church, he saw the advantages of the State controlling the Church in England and in Germany. It seems that he even considered an alliance with the Pope in Rome. But he soon realized that the Pope would probably want to exercise too much influence in the affairs of State. In the need for reform within the Church, he became convinced that it would be necessary to direct the religious policy in the same way that he directed his civil policies—the centralization of power in the Tsar and the subjection of all branches of government and national life to his sovereign will. He saw that he would practically have to change the whole Russian way of life, if he were to succeed in his reforms. He also saw that the Church, as the main bulwark of national tradition, would have to be considered. The Church had been influential in keeping the men bearded and in medieval dress, and it kept the women in oriental seclusion. It kept the old calendar and the archaic alphabet. It pretended to dispose of men's immortal souls and held promises of divine mercy and forgiveness against worldly punishment and disgrace. It affrighted the secular arm by visions and prophecies. The Patriarch, being nearer to God than the sovereign, was assumed to know more, and to be wiser in judgment. Spiritual power and mystical paradoxes had greater authority than materialism and logic.  

Peter ruled in Russia at the time when the idea of the divine right of kings was prevalent in Western Europe. He held

---

3Ibid., p. 14.

4Stephen Graham, Peter the Great, p. 309.
to this belief because it suited his purpose. He did not recognize the divine right of the Patriarch because this was a hindrance to his plan. He considered himself as being the closest to God, and his will must be God's will. Therefore, his conscience raised no obstacle to his becoming the head of the Church.5

When Peter started reforming the customs of the land, such as the shaving of the beards and the changing of the old calendar to the new one, the people believed that Patriarch Adrian was only half-heartedly opposing Peter. They accused him of allowing too much power to pass into Peter's hands, and that he was not upholding the sacred traditions of Russia. This caused Adrian to lose much of the respect of the people. Adrian died in 1700. Peter seemed to be relieved and resolved that no patriarch would be selected soon.* Without a patriarch to oppose him, Peter thought he would probably be able to carry out more of his reforms. Also, he hoped to divert some of the Church money into his war fund. Peter appointed Stephen Yavorsky as Exarch, and he was to carry on the administration of the Church and to deal with the heretics within the Church. Yavorsky was an humble, pious man with Western ideas. He was

---

*As an inheritance from Byzantium, the Tsar was supposed to appoint the patriarch and the bishops were to confirm the appointment.

*In the Eastern Church an Exarch was a deputy of the Patriarch, usually with the rank of bishop.

5 Ibid., p. 109.
not eligible for the office of patriarch, but he occupied the patriarchal throne.⁶

Even before the establishment of the Synod, reforms were started within the Church. A census was taken of the monks and nuns, and all residents and dependents of the monasteries. All parasites of the Church were turned out and made to work for a living. Yavorsky was completely under the control of Peter, and he raised no objection when Peter raided the Church treasury for war expenses and conscripted priests' sons for military service. Peter took away some of the property of the monasteries and used some of the bells in making his war supplies. Bishops, priests, monks, and nuns were flogged at the order of the civil power. The knout instead of the Cross ruled the Church.⁷ Twenty-one years lapsed between the time of the death of Adrian and the establishment of the Synod as the governing body of the Russian Church. During this time, Peter began to realize that he was strong enough to do what he wished without the support of the Church; so he established the Synod in order to make it more difficult for his successors to undo his ecclesiastical reforms.⁸

In 1721 Peter issued an ordinance which put the government of the Church into a commission. In civil matters of

---

government, he had established colleges, or ministeries, to administer the governmental policies. He set up the Most Holy Synod as the college for the administration and control of the Church. This synodical idea had come from the Protestant churches of the West. The Synod, however, was not to be a congregational union; rather it was to be an ecclesiastical governmental committee, formed like the Senate, not to find out the will of the nation and then to carry out that will, but to do the will of the Tsar. 9 Peter cared nothing for the Church as a vessel of dogma, but only used it as it was adaptable to his purposes. 10

Theophan Prokopovitch, a learned man with Western tastes, was most important in bringing about Peter's reforms within the Church. He had a satirical mind and shared none of the common superstitions of the Russian clergy and the peasant mass. At Peter's suggestion, he had published in 1719 and 1720 a series of regulations of ecclesiastical procedure and behavior. These regulations probably prepared the way for the establishment of the Most Holy Synod. The government could control the bishops, priests, the seminaries, monasteries, and ecclesiastical revenues; but it could not completely control the customs, traditions, and legends that had been built up during the centuries. The people believed that the Anti-Christ

9 Ibid., p. 310.
10 Cross, op. cit., p. 109.
in the form of Peter had come to rule the land. He did not try to get cooperation through the good will of the people in carrying out his reforms; he did not ask, he imposed. Those that obeyed him were those who feared him.

The Synod was established by a ukaz of Peter in 1721, and the framework of it was taken from the Spiritual Regulations issued by him. Some of the reasons given in the ukaz for the establishment of this body were that a Synod, made up of bishops, abbots, and other clergy appointed by the Tsar, would be an impartial body and that its collective wisdom would be needed in the control and administration of the government of the Church. The real reason given in the ukaz establishing the Synod stated that "the existence of a patriarch might cause disaffection among the people, as there might conceivably develop a conflict between the civil and spiritual authorities." Peter did not want another conflict like the one that had raged between Nikon and Alexis. In order to make sure that the members of the Synod were not opposed to the interests of the State, they were required to swear: "I recognize and confirm with my oath that the supreme judge of this Holy Synod is the Emperor of All Russia." Also they had to promise that they "would in all matters attempt to further everything which may bring true benefit and service to His Imperial Highness." This oath

12Ibid., p. 11.
was used until 1901, and it did much to make the Synod an organ of the civil government.

The chief motive which guided Peter in his reform within the Church was candidly stated in the Regulations.

The fatherland need not fear from the synodical administration the same mutiny and disorder as occur under a single ecclesiastical ruler. For the common people, not knowing the difference between the spiritual and autocratic power, and being impressed by the greatness and fame of the Supreme Pastor, think him a second sovereign, possessing a power equal or even above that of the autocrat, and believe the Church to be another and higher State. And if the people continue to think this, then what will occur when the sermons of ambitious clergymen add fuel to the flame? Those of simple heart will be so perverted by this idea that they will respect the Supreme Pastor more than the autocrat, and if there is discord between the two, more sympathy will be shown the spiritual ruler than the secular. They will venture to fight or mutiny for his sake, and deceive themselves into believing that they are fighting for God Himself and that their hands are not stained but blessed by the blood they may shed. Such popular beliefs are of profit to those who are hostile to the sovereign, and they incite the people to unlawfulness under the guise of religious fervor. And what if the Pastor himself through self-pride grasped the opportunity?  

The original Regulations setting up the Synod provided for a council of twelve, consisting of both clerical and lay members. An official called the Ober-Procuror, a layman, was attached to the Synod. At first, he did not dominate the Church policy. He was, as described by Peter the Great, the "eye of the Tsar." He had no definite rights and powers over

---


the Synod. If he disapproved of the Synod's decisions, he could only protest to the sovereign. His protest could be nullified by the bishops taking their side of the case to the court. The other lay officials were subject to the clerical members, not to the Ober-Procuror; likewise the churchmen could bring the Ober-Procuror to heel by withholding his salary. Much depended upon the clique at the court.\textsuperscript{15} By custom all the lay members, with the exception of the Ober-Procuror, were excluded. He was to be the Tsar's direct representative; and through a course of time, he virtually became a dictator, as in the case of Constantine P. Pobedonostsev, a dictator of policy within the Church and in many matters of the civil government.

Because he was the "Tsar's eye," it was very necessary for the Ober-Procuror to be a carefully-selected man, one whose loyalty to the Tsar was unquestionable. Another qualification was that he be willing to be subservient to the policy of making the Church the mainstay of the autocratic State.\textsuperscript{16} The Ober-Procuror virtually had the power of choosing the members of the Synod because the Tsar selected them from a list which he had made. The influence of the Ober-Procuror depended upon the character of the man and that of the Tsar. Casey says that this office was charged with dynamite which exploded on more than one occasion. The combination of a weak Tsar

and a strong procurator could and did produce situations in which the Church was completely dominated by a lay pope devoid even of the sanctity traditionally associated with the imperial office. At best the man was a high-ranking imperial spy having under him a corps of agents composed of inspectors and employees of the Holy Synod, all of whom were under his charge. At worst he became a flagrant usurper of the Church's natural rights, whose position could be justified on the grounds of cynical statecraft.17

The primary business of the Synod was to see that all the Tsar's subjects remained in that state of life to which they were called and that they faithfully fulfilled its responsibilities. It was to receive and pass upon all suggestions for ecclesiastical reforms, exercise a rigorous censorship on all theological publications, which could not be printed without a license, pass on claims of special revelations and experiences of miracles, and was to adjust charges of heresy and schism within the Church. The Synod was to investigate all candidates for the episcopacy, and any appeals from the episcopal decisions were to be made to the Synod in cases of dubious marriages, divorce, or any wrongs done by a bishop to his clergy, to the monasteries in his diocese, or to another bishop. The Synod was to take over the jurisdiction that was formerly held by the patriarch and oversee the administration of all church property; and in cases of wrong suffered by the ecclesiastics at the hands of the landlords, the cases were to be tried in civil courts, but a report was to be submitted to the Synod. In case of rank, the case was to be settled jointly by the Synod and the

17Casey, op. cit., pp. 18-19.
Ministry of Justice. The Synod was to issue instructions on
the soliciting of alms and pious gifts of individuals, was re-
sponsible for the abolition of simony, and was to make provision
for the parish clergy so that they would not traffic in fees
for baptisms, marriages, and burials. The priests, however,
were to be able to accept gifts, if that was the manner in
which the people wanted to pay the fees.18

The clergy within the parishes were to keep records of
vital statistics, and if they found schismatic teachers, monks,
"holy men," or the like within the parishes, the priests were
to have them seized and sent to the diocesan authorities.19

The government's view of the Church was most clearly shown by
the rule that priests were to inform against persons confessing,
but not repenting, that they had evil intent against the State
or sovereign. The sanctity of the confession was not infringed
on by this disclosure, for the admission of any lawlessness
which the confessing person was not ready to renounce and which
he did not include in his sins was not a confession or a part
of confession, but a cunning trick to seduce his conscience.
Indeed the pastors were required to report not only specific
evil intent among their flocks, but also general disaffection
in the popular mind.20

The faithful were to be instructed in Christian doctrine,

18 Ibid., p. 16. 19 Curtiss, op. cit., p. 25.
20 Ibid.
and if there were any interference with this, the act was to be punished by the Synod. It was obligatory of the faithful that they partake of the Communion once a year. Those who were absent were to be considered in schism and were to be reported to the Synod. The Synod was to keep a record of all such persons within the dioceses. If landlords secretly harbored schismatics, they were to be punished. No schismatic was to be able to hold any ecclesiastical or civil office for fear he would indulge in treasonous activities. Any attempt to conceal unorthodox attachments or cases were to be reported to the Synod. No private chapels were to be allowed. In electing the parish priests, the landlords, or his dependents if he were not in residence, were to guarantee the priest's character and were to report his salary. The priest that was to be selected was to attach a statement to this report that he was satisfied with the remuneration and that he would not leave. The landlord could not use an itinerant priest for his confessor; he had to confess to the parish priest and had to take his children to him for baptism. The landlord was required to respect the judgment of the bishop in whose bishopric he lived. He could not appeal his case to another bishop. The Synod was to be the final authority in doubtful cases involving the prohibited degrees of marriages. All marriages were to be blessed by the priest having local jurisdiction.21

21 Casey, op. cit., p. 17.
The Most Holy Synod was opened on February 14, 1721, with Stephen Yavorsky as the nominal president, and Theophan Prokopovich the guiding spirit. The first Ober-Procuror was a colonel in the army. The Patriarchal library was given to the Synod, but for a long time the books and manuscripts remained in Moscow. (The capital had been moved to St. Petersburg.) The Synod did its work in St. Petersburg. One of its first acts was to substitute the name of "The Most Holy Synod" for the name of the Patriarch in the liturgy of the Church. The Synod was recognized by the Patriarch of Constantinople and other Eastern patriarchs.22

Perhaps the main defect of the organization of the Church government under the Synod was that Peter saw his whole reform for Russia through rose-colored spectacles. The setting up of the Synod bound the Church hand and foot; signed, sealed, and delivered it to the State, with emphasis being put on its obedience to the supreme will of the Tsar. Because its autonomy was lost, it lost much of its spiritual essence. Peter did not stop to think that this control over the Church could work well or badly, according to the character of the Tsar.

The Regulations set up a program of education. It proclaimed that

An enlightened, not an ignorant and superstitious religious sentiment is to be fostered and the responsibility for encouraging and refining it is placed on

22 Graham, op. cit., p. 310.
the clergy. The reform must be implemented by improvements in clerical education, a tightening of standards for admission to Holy Orders, and by broader education for the laity. New schools must be founded and maintained at ecclesiastical expense, properly qualified teachers trained and employed, and brief popular manuals of instructions on the essentials of faith and morals, such as were in use among Protestants, should be composed and used at the Divine Liturgy and in the Schools.23

The money to carry on this program of education was to be levied by the bishop upon the monasteries, and, if necessary, the money was to come from the bishop's own diocesan fund. To make sure that the money was available, the bishops were to present a financial report of their revenues and the revenues of the monasteries to the Synod. If the funds were inadequate, the bishops and the monasteries were supposed to practice a more rigid economy. Through the financial reports to the Synod, the government hoped to be able to know the wealth of the Church. In spite of the fact that the education program was set up, the government showed no eagerness to follow it up. On the contrary, superstition and ignorance were tolerated and even encouraged because the blind were more easily led.

With the introduction of Western ways into Russia, it was only natural that Western ideas would seep into the country. When Catherine II was the ruler, she introduced the ideas of Voltaire, Diderot, and Rousseau into the country. She tried to be an enlightened despot, but before her death she became a

23Casey, op. cit., p. 16.
strong reactionary. The Tsars following her attempted to stamp out the liberal ideas and instill in the people the idea of Autocracy, Orthodoxy, and Nationalism, blended as one faith. The Orthodox Church, through the control of the Synod, was one of the main instruments used by the government in keeping this faith before the people.

The universities and the seminaries were the places where most of the liberal ideas and revolutionary ideas were studied. Alexander I had Radishchev to write out a document which he wanted to read to the people on his coronation day. This document contained great prospects of real freedom for the Russian people—freedom of religion, freedom of speech and press, and freedom of movement. Alexander set up a committee to review this document. This committee found that the document was entirely too liberal, and it was afraid too much trouble would be stirred up among the people if the document were read. The government and the nobility were afraid; so Alexander never read the document that Radishchev had written. Another thing, the young people that had taken part in the Napoleonic wars had come back to Russia imbued with liberal ideas and no desire to return to their old way of life. Philosophical groups were formed within the universities. Because the liberal ideas were discussed in these groups, the government became afraid and tried to stamp them out. The government was afraid that subversive activities to overthrow the existing government would be made.
In order to try to stamp out the subversive activities of these philosophical groups, Alexander I appointed the head of the Holy Synod, Prince Golitsyn, as Minister of Education. In 1817 Alexander had created a new Ministry, Religious Affairs and Public Education. As a result, the Synod lost all the independence that it might have had. The Ministry was abolished in 1824 because of its unpopularity. Then the Ober-Procuror was raised to the status of a minister, and he was responsible only to the Tsar. The Synod then was only a tool in the hands of the Ober-Procuror and the Tsar. Under Alexander I religion was made the cornerstone of all learning. "Ruinous materialism" was extirpated from the schools. Professors of natural science were ordered to adhere strictly to the Biblical account of the creation; human skeletons were taken out of anatomy classes and given Christian burials. Institutes of Jurisprudence were confined to teaching Byzantine Law. Mathematics had to be given a religious interpretation. German idealism was officially denounced as intellectual license and corruption "hateful to God." Professors were dismissed for Kantianism and, in some cases, actually placed under police surveillance.  

Of course, this religious education was to be along Orthodox beliefs because no other religion was officially recognized, and the dissidents were persecuted for their beliefs. Nicholas I used the Church, the schools, and the press to foster his own idea of Autocracy, Orthodoxy, and Nationalism. The government, however, could not completely stamp out the liberal ideas. The youth would absorb these ideas through other means than

education. A new intelligentsia was built up: a ferment of spiritual unrest, philosophical search, and artistic and literary activity. 25

The government allowed the Church full freedom in proselyting and gave it wide powers and encouragement in the field of education during the nineteenth century. In the days of Alexander III, it was safe to give the people only that knowledge that harmonized with the accepted principles of Autocracy, Orthodoxy, and Nationalism.

Constantine P. Pobedonostsev, who was the Ober-Procuror of the Holy Synod from 1881 until 1905, was the power behind the throne in Church affairs, as well as in many matters of State. He was a firm believer in the trinity formula—Autocracy, Orthodoxy, and Nationalism—and he did more to stifle the initiative and free will of the people than any one man. He stood for sheer reaction and hostility to every kind of intellectual initiative. 26 It is in his lack of feeling and compassion for humanity, in his utter contempt for the ignorant masses, that is found his emphatic opposition to popular instruction. 27 He believed that inertia, like the ballast of a ship, sustained humanity in the crises of its history, and

25 ibid., p. 165.
26 Sir Bernard Pares, Fall of the Russian Monarch, p. 64.
27 A. S. Rapporport, "Apostle of Absolutism and Orthodoxy," Fortnightly, LXXXVII (May 1, 1907), 873.
so indispensable had it become that without it all measure of progress would be impossible. 28

Pobedonostsev insisted that it was necessary to hand over all primary education to the Ecclesiastical Department, or the Holy Synod. The idea behind this potential move was that so many times the Church had proven its loyalty to the State, and in this manner he hoped to crush all revolutionary ideas. The rising zemstvos were urged to turn over their schools to the ecclesiastical administration; funds were solicited from rich and poor alike to build up the Church schools; and appropriations from the treasury were added to the resources of these institutions. 29 The zemstvos were unwilling to give up their control of education. The State did not want to force them to hand over the schools to the Synod because it did not have the funds to take over and support the schools. The lowest type of schools, the so-called reading and writing schools, which were established by the peasants themselves, were given over to the Synod by a law in June, 1884. Pobedonostsev helped to make the Church elementary schools an important factor in the educational system by 1900.

The parish schools, however, were not too good because the salaries were small and the teaching staff was poorly trained. These schools had to depend upon various sources for

28 Ibid., p. 874. 
29 Curtiss, op. cit., p. 182.
their support: local taxes, local sources, such as contributions of the Church, monasteries, and peasant communes; and the government furnished some of the money. The attempt to instill orthodoxy in the minds of the school children was not limited to the parish schools. All public schools, elementary as well as secondary, were required by law to give the proper number of hours to religious instruction. This instruction was to be given by the Orthodox priest, or someone approved by the diocesan authorities. In non-Orthodox areas, confessional schools were permitted to be established for other faiths of non-Russian nationality. In some Russian areas where there were enough Jews to warrant a school, it was allowed. In the schools in the cities, Orthodox religious instruction was to be given only to the Orthodox children, and to others if requested. For the non-Orthodox children the teaching of their own form of religion was permitted in the Russian language, but only for those pupils whose parents requested it.\textsuperscript{30} In rural areas of the Russian provinces only Orthodox religious instruction was given, to be under the supervision of the bishop. The Orthodox clergymen were able to exert a great deal of influence upon the school children and, through them, on their parents. This instruction was beneficial to the State because loyalty to the Tsar was inculcated into the catechism.\textsuperscript{31}

\textsuperscript{30}Ibid., p. 186. (This was allowed after 1906.)

\textsuperscript{31}Curtiss, op. cit., pp. 182-187.
This was an effective way of instilling loyalty to the government because the Synod had complete jurisdiction on all matters of instruction in the Church schools. It had to pass judgment on all matter used in the instruction. The Church also had special schools in which people were trained to serve the Church in one capacity or another.

Pobedonostsev was instrumental also in stifling higher schools and universities. By a statute, they were denied any amount of academic freedom. The rectors and deans were appointed by the government. Previously they had been elected. Moreover, the State appointed inspectors, independent of the university authorities, who possessed very extensive disciplinary powers. Professors were appointed by the government, and their activity spied upon and reported; the same was true of the life of the students, whose number was lowered, the stipend formerly granted to poor students being taken away, in order to prevent the proletariat elements from entering the governmental service and the learned professions. The curriculum was also thoroughly "expurgated": all scientific and especially philosophical and political studies were reduced to a minimum, if not altogether excluded. All professors and students of even moderate progressive tendencies were promptly dismissed.32

Not only did the government favor the Church in the field of education, but also in the field of missionary work. The Synod possessed the right of religious censorship—that is, checking the anti-religious propaganda and other materials that might win converts to the other denominations.

Within the borders of the state only the official Orthodox Church has the right to convert the followers of other Christian religions and other believers (non-Christians) to receive its teachings concerning belief. The laymen and the clergy of other religions, Christian and non-Christian, were most strictly enjoined "not to try to convince the minds of persons not belonging to their religions," and if they contravened this rule, they were to be "subject to the penalty provided in the criminal law." No penalties, however, were provided in the Code of Laws for laymen who converted non-Orthodox persons to non-Orthodox Christian faiths; but the non-Orthodox clergy, "for receiving into their faith, without special permission in each case, any of the other-believing Russian subjects" were to be subject to penalties ranging from a severe reprimand for the first offense to suspension from or deprivation of ecclesiastical rank for repeated offenses. On the other hand, "if professed adherents of other faiths wish to join the Orthodox belief, no one may in any way prevent the fulfillment of this wish." While even the tolerated religions like the Catholic and Lutheran Churches were forbidden to win converts, even from the heathen tribes of Siberia, the Orthodox missionaries were encouraged to go up and down the land, winning converts from the ranks of Catholic Poles and Protestant Latins as well as from Old Believers and the secretarians and from the heathens of the East. This was no small mark of favor.

The secretarians within Russia were persecuted by the government at the insistence of the Church. Especially were the Old Believers persecuted by the government. Anyone who deviated from the Orthodox belief was considered a heretic. Heresy was considered a political offense as well as a religious offense because many times it was connected with a revolt against the existing political order. Such was the case of the Old Believers under Peter the Great. Naturally

---

33Curtiss, op. cit., pp. 181-182.
anyone leaving the Orthodox faith to join some other faith would be considered a heretic. The provincial governors as well as the police were to help the Church in trying to keep the people within the Orthodox fold. The provincial governors were instructed

in all cases and with all the powers given to them, to aid the Orthodox spiritual authorities in protecting the rights of the Church and the soundness of its belief, by watching carefully so that heresy, schism, and other errors born of prejudice and ignorance may not be spread among the inhabitants of the province entrusted to them, and so that (in order to avert this evil and the disaffection caused by it) at the proper moment all those measures enumerated in the general regulation and in the special Imperial commands may be used.

Furthermore,

the governors, acting through the city and the county police shall ensure that during the conduct of divine service and all other church ceremonies the proper quiet and decorum are not disturbed by anyone, and that for all actions violating this decorum, even though unintentional, the guilty shall be required to answer according to law. The governors shall in this connection provide the necessary protection and assistance for the other religious faiths practiced freely within the Empire, making sure, however, that no one shall be led astray into these faiths from Orthodoxy; and in general they are not to allow anyone belonging to the sects forbidden by law to attract converts to the said faiths.  

The government knew that if it gave so much support to the Orthodox Church, it would be necessary for the Church to support it in turn. Thus, the two were able to keep the people in submission until the revolutions of 1917.

Through the centuries, the Church and the monasteries were able to build up great wealth in lands. This cannot be

34bid., p. 38.
attributed to the Tsar or to the government, but to the people. For various reasons the people would donate, or will, their land to the Church. Naturally, when the Russian State began to get so powerful, it was jealous of this great wealth. The wealth of the Church did not change like the wealth of the State; and, too, the State did not like for anything to challenge its power.

During the Time of Troubles a Monastery Office, a civil department of the government, was set up to take care of the monastic lands. Under Peter, the metropolitans were to administer the affairs of the Church, and the Monastery Office was to take care of the monastic lands. This caused some friction between the Clergy and department because they thought the department infringed upon the rights of the clergy, and because the department had diverted some of the Church funds for purposes of the State. In 1724 Peter gave the control of the monastic lands to the Synod. The ordinary monks were also jealous of the wealth of the monasteries because they believed the abbots and bishops lived too lavishly off the wealth. To begin with, the abbots and bishops were taken from the monks, and they were supposed to take the vow of poverty upon entering the order.

Peter the Great had taken some of the property from the Church, but it was not until the time of Catherine II that the question of the jealousy between the State and Church over the landed wealth was partially settled. Catherine was a foreigner, but she had been able to take control of the government from her.
husband, Peter III, with the help of some of the guardsmen. The Metropolitan of Moscow welcomed her by saying, "God hath placed the crown on Thy head. He knoweth how to save the righteous from destruction; He hath seen before Him Thy pure heart; He hath known thy sinless ways." Catherine had been baptized into the Orthodox faith after coming to Russia, and she had won the favor of the ecclesiastics because of her enthusiasm toward her adopted faith. She was very respectful toward the clergy; she fasted regularly; and she took Communion once a year. She would listen very attentively to the sermons and rewarded the churchmen liberally. On the other hand, she finally solved the problem of the Church lands in the best interest of the State. This wealth had been a source of trouble between the Church and State from the days of Ivan III.

Vast areas with their serf populations were taken over by the State—in all 991,761 souls (males) and approximately the same number of females, or 13.8 percent of all the peasants of Great Russia and Siberia. Thus in spite of the small lands left to the individual monasteries and the larger amount of comparatively worthless land in the north retained by the Church, it ceased to be a great landholding institution. This secularization which was primarily intended to place great resources at the disposal of the state had also the indirect effect of making the Church even more dependent upon the state than before. The lands left in the possession of the churches and monasteries were so unproductive that the monasteries and the bishops were largely dependent upon the small incomes paid them from the treasury in compensation for their lost land.

Catherine confiscated the Church lands in the interest of the

---

35 Ibid., p. 27.  
36 Curtiss, op. cit., p. 27.
State, but the piety of the people continued to be expressed in gifts to the Church and monasteries in the form of lands, buildings, so that by the time of the Revolution of 1917 monasteries had regained their former position.

As a State institution, the Church received economic privileges as well as educational and religious privileges. The State subsidies, however, were not the only economic means of the Church. The higher clergy consisted of the bishops, archbishops, and metropolitans, and only a monk could become one of the three. In entering the monastic order, it was necessary for a candidate to take a vow of poverty. They had no family ties; so they were furnished free quarters in the monasteries or diocesan homes. Likewise, their meals were furnished. Consequently, they did not need an income for the necessities of life.

As chief clerics of the Russian Church, they received their income from various sources. One source was in the form of a State salary. In many instances, the heads of the dioceses received certain amounts to take care of the maintenance of the diocesan home. Also many of the hierarchs received an income from their positions as heads of the monasteries within their dioceses. According to a ukaz of 1897, one-third of the "fraternal income" that was subject to division among the monks of the monastery was to go to the bishop if he were the head of
the monastery.\textsuperscript{37} Besides, the bishops of the dioceses were to have full control of the income from podvoryes, or hotels or inns maintained for the accommodation of travelers, located in their diocese, provided the podvoryes had not been donated by the State. Famous shrines were often found in these podvoryes; so an income was collected from the pilgrims who visited the shrines.

A greater percentage of the wealth of the Church was centered in the monastic institutions. In spite of the confiscation of the lands by Catherine II, the monasteries had accumulated lands, substantial sums of capital, and held famous treasures of vestments and utensils of precious metals adorned with gems by the twentieth century. Curtiss, in his book \textit{Church and State in Russia}, says the bishops, as well as the monasteries, derived little of their income from the State. The subsidies of the government were to recompense the property confiscated by Catherine II; consequently, those institutions that were established after Catherine did not receive any subsidy from the State. In 1905, there were about three hundred and thirty-seven monasteries and diocesan homes and about two hundred and eight convents that were so favored by the government. That was only about two-thirds of the total of such institutions that received help from the State.\textsuperscript{38} Most of the income and wealth of the monasteries were derived from other sources.

\textsuperscript{37}\textit{Ibid.}, p. 90. \hspace{1cm} \textsuperscript{38}\textit{Ibid.}, p. 94.
The lands of the monasteries in many instances would be rented out to peasants for a small fee. Besides possessing land, the monasteries held utilities in the form of mills, fishing lakes, and the like. They also held some urban territory which they used for themselves. They would set up printing presses, shops of different types, factories to make tapers and images. At times they might even rent out these shops to people. Although most of the monasteries enjoyed the commercial advantage of freedom from the guild taxation paid by private establishments, their industrial and commercial activity was not great, and what there was, for the most part, was linked with their function of attending to the needs of the pilgrims.\(^{39}\)

The greatest source of income for the monasteries was derived from the Russian pilgrims. The prayers and rituals that were said, or performed, in the monasteries were considered to be more effective than those said by the parish priests. Famous ikons were in the monasteries, and, because they were so revered by the people, the people would flock to the monasteries to pay honor to these ikons at Christmas and Easter, especially. These pilgrims would contribute quite a bit of money to the monastery coffers.

All the income derived from these pilgrims was not pure

\(^{39}\)Tbid., p. 99.
profit to the monasteries. By custom and tradition, the monastery was to furnish the pilgrims with free meals during their stay in the monastery. But, many times the monks would pass a bag around to collect a few kopecks* to take care of the expenses of the meals. The most important form of devotion of the Russian was the placing of a candle, or taper, before an ikon in the monastery or church. The monks would sell these tapers. Besides the selling of the tapers, the monks would sell Communion loaves to the pilgrims, and the pilgrims in turn would have them blessed at the altar. Many times one person would buy several loaves for friends and relatives who were not able to make the trip to the monastery. Small fees had to be paid to the monks who wrote on them the names of the destined recipients, and larger amounts to the ones who consecrated them.\textsuperscript{40}

Another type of revenue was that of performing special masses and saying special prayers for people. It seemed that the people thought it more fitting to have the ceremonies said in the monastery. If a person were poor, many would go together and have a joint service for the commemoration of all their lost ones. The wealthy would pay for elaborate rituals. However, the total income received from these sources were not great.\textsuperscript{41}

Some of the wealthy people preferred to have their loved ones buried in the monasterial burying grounds rather than in

\*A kopeck is a small Russian coin.
\textsuperscript{40}Curtiss, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 102. \textsuperscript{41}\textit{Tbid.}, p. 101.
the parish burial grounds. The monks charged fees for these plots of ground, for putting up markers, and the like. If the monastery hearse were used, that entailed a higher fee. If there were to be a covering for the coffin, or special lighting in the church for the service, additional charges were made. If a solemn requiem were held in the church with a large choir, another fee was added. After interment, the monastery continued to receive money from the family of the deceased for requiems, for commemorations, and the like. Also, wealthy men occasionally donated large sums for eternal remembrance of their dead.42

In early times, the people were critical of the immense wealth of the Church. People charged that the monasteries would construct buildings which were not needed for worship service, or inmates, or pilgrims. Before the days of securities, the monasteries and churches would turn their surplus wealth into ceremonial articles of precious metals and jewels, and into buildings. Most of the churches of the monastic establishments would have gilded domes, crosses, arches, and pillars, and frescoes and mosaics, making them very costly. Ikons were framed in gold; precious utensils of the altars were gilded with silver and gold. Altars would be covered with gold cloth, and many times, the ikons would be studded with precious stones. In addition, the monasteries supported almshouses, hospitals, educational and charitable institutions. Because the critics

42 Ibid., p. 104.
of the monasteries felt they had too much wealth, the monks felt they needed the protection of the State.

The economic position of the white, or married, clergy was very different from that of the black, or monastic, clergy. The white hierarchy consisted of the Protopresbyters, Super-deans, Deans, Presbyters, Protodeacons, Deacons, Subdeacons, and the common priest. The fact that the monastic clergy had so much wealth was a source of irritation to this group. It was not so much the possession of the wealth that irritated this group as it was the arbitrary use of the wealth by the bishops. The priests did not like it because only the bishops or higher clergy could be appointed to the higher offices. The white clergy was held back in social life, in educational opportunities, and in economic advancement. Since many people realized that this situation had developed as a product of many historical factors, the Tsar's government was not blamed for creating the situation; but the Tsar's government was blamed for the failure to permit reform to be instituted.43

The parish clergy were endowed with land. By law it was established that each parish was to possess at least thirty-three desiatines (one desiatina equaled 2.7 acres) of land. Originally this land might have come from the State, or from a private landowner. The priest worked the land, or sometimes he rented it out. He did not have time to work the land properly.

43 Paul B. Anderson, People, Church and State in Modern Russia, p. 37.
If he did so, he did not have time to contribute to his religious and civil duties. If land were not available, the members of the parish had to contribute to the upkeep of the parish priest. This was not a satisfactory arrangement because of the slowness in paying in bad years, and because there were disputes over the size of the donations.

The most universal economic means of the local priest was that of receiving payment for ministrations to the members. The priest received payment for saying rites of the Church for families or individuals, such as marriages, funerals, Te Deums (an ancient Latin hymn of praise to God, or a religious service in which this hymn formed the principal part), requiems (a Mass for the repose of a departed soul, or souls), baptisms, the blessing of homes and fields. The Canon Law forbade the charging for confessions, for Holy Communion, for the optional services such as marriages, baptism, and burial, but contributions might be accepted. Thus, the priest did not receive a fixed amount for these services. Many times there was much friction between the priest and the parishioners because they felt he charged too much for the services. The Synod contributed monthly grants to some priests, but the amount was very small. The average income from all sources had been variously estimated at about 600 to 800 rubles a year.44 In theory the

44 Ibid., p. 35.
payments for memorial masses, ceremonal processions to bless the homes of the parishioners, their fields, their ikons, and other small ministrations was to be voluntary, but many times it was obligatory in that the priest might refuse to officiate until the money was in his hand. If the priest set his rates low, there was not much chance for friction, unless it came from some unreasonable peasant. If the peasant thought the priest was charging too much for his ministrations, he could complain to the consistory, and sometimes that meant trouble for the priest.

A practice somewhat akin to that of paying for ministrations was that of making donations periodically. These donations were in kind or in money. Sometimes the donations were delivered to the priest's home by the peasant in the form of pieces of linen, cabbages, butter, eggs, chickens, or geese. In other cases the priest made the rounds of their parishes in order to collect their dues—a practice which consumed much time.45

Both methods of payment, that of fees for ministrations and donations, were at a disadvantage. There was too much friction between the priest and the parishioners because the parishioners thought the priests were charging too much. In many cases, this friction led to lawsuits in the consistorial

---

45 Curtiss, op. cit., p. 122.
courts and causing disaffection among the people. Another thing, the receipts from both were uncertain and the amounts varied greatly. The priest had to wait for the harvests and depend upon the attitude of his parishioners. Some of the priests supplemented their income by teaching in the *zemstvo* or city schools, or as official administrators of the oaths required in courts of justice. This added only a small amount to their income and did not provide a substitute for it. All church members from the parishioners to the *Ober-Procuror* wished to make some change in these methods of paying the priests. There was a need for State salaries to the priest.

There was a movement for State salaries back in 1893, when Pobedonostsev appealed to Alexander III. The desirability of State support for all the Orthodox clergy was formally recognized by the Tsar. To be sure, there had been some salaries paid to the clergy from the treasury before this date, but only in exceptional cases.\(^{46}\) The amount increased some after this. Many times the city parishes paid their priests more than in the village parishes.

The Church parish also had an income independent from the income of the priest. This income was collected through the sale of tapers; and sometimes its lands were rented and interest on investments brought in some money. Bequests and other miscellaneous sources produced a little income. This income

\(^{46}\)Ibid., p. 123.
was usually used for repairing the churches, heating the churches, the buying of tapers at wholesale prices, and to the needs of the diocesan authorities. There was a little left for charitable or educational work. The elders and the priest were to administer the Church funds, not the parishioners. The priests and elders were not responsible to the members for the funds, but they were not free agents because the diocesan authorities required certain amounts to take care of the work within the diocese. There were obligatory imposts for the benefit of the diocesan schools, to help the sick of ecclesiastical families, for office expenses of the district priest, to increase the pay of the consistories, for the Imperial Palestine Society, and many others.\textsuperscript{47}

The support of the Church by the State was not too great, but it could ill afford to lose it. State funds made up nearly a fifth part of the Church's income,\textsuperscript{48} and the rest was raised by the Church itself. The Church did not feel secure in the enjoyment of its wealth; so it valued the protection of the State. Furthermore, the eagerness with which the bishops and the leading Church periodicals sought for greater aid from the State argues that most of the leading Churchmen were not averse to closer financial relations with the civil power. These circumstances undoubtedly helped to explain the fact that when the first test came in the Revolution of 1905, the greater part of the clergy were found among the supporters of the government.\textsuperscript{49}

\textsuperscript{47}Ibid., p. 127. \textsuperscript{48}Ibid., p. 130. \textsuperscript{49}Ibid.
The bureaucratic scheme set up for the civil government by Peter the Great was extended to the Church. The Synod was created, and this centralized form of Church government allowed the Tsar to be all-powerful in Church matters as well as civil matters. This bureaucratic scheme made it easier for him to carry out his autocratic ideas. The Synod made episcopal appointments upon the recommendations of the Ober-Procuror. However, because the Ober-Procuror was the "Tsar's eye" it was only natural that the Tsar was influential in the appointments. Also the bishops appointed would have to favor the government.

When the bishop was elevated to a high office, he had to please the government and the Ober-Procuror, or he could not hope to advance. It did not matter whether the bishop had the best intentions in the world of doing his best in the diocese; he could not do so if he opposed the will of the Ober-Procuror. If a bishop displeased the Ober-Procuror, he could be removed, or sent to a diocese of less importance. The long arm of bureaucracy reached far. Even if a bishop knew of an instructor in a religious seminary that was a radical or a liberal, he could not remove him unless he had the permission of the central government. The bishops were further hampered in their work because the Synod appointed a special committee to check the work of the bishop. Also much red tape was involved because all decisions of the bishops had to be referred to the Synod; and before the decisions were carried out, they had to be approved by the Synod.
Also, if churches were to be built in far-off provinces, it was necessary to get the official architects from the capital to pass upon the work and supervise it a few days. Needed repairs in provincial churches could not be done without the approval of the Synod. If the printer of the Diocesan News was to be changed, the diocesan authorities had to obtain the approval and confirmation of the Synod. No religious brotherhood or trusteeship might be formed; no harsh abbot might be removed until after correspondence with the Synod and until the bureaucratic machine had ground out its answer. Curtiss says that when calamities occurred because of physical forces, it seemed that the people might say, "In everything is the will of God"; but in things concerning the spiritual and moral, the people might say, "In everything is the will of the Ober-Procuror of the Most Holy Synod."  

Especially in the nineteenth century and until the Revolution of 1917, the Church was overrun by the bureaucracy of the government. The bishop, in theory, was supposed to be supreme in his diocese. But in actual practice he had to depend upon a religious consistory which was composed of four or five priests. This consistory was dominated by the lay officials of the consistorial chancery. Hence, it follows that the real power in the consistory lay with the bureaucrats, and above all their chiefs, the secretary.

---

50 Curtiss, op. cit., p. 53.  
51 Ibid., p. 53.
The secretary of the consistorial chancery was a layman, appointed by the Synod at the request of the Ober-Procuror. He could also be removed at the suggestion of the latter. This secretary was supposed to be under the control of the bishop, but at the same time he was under the direct orders of the Ober-Procuror and was to fulfill his commands. Furthermore, he was to send in periodical reports concerning matters within the diocese. If the bishop were too independent, these reports might cost him his job. Other officers, such as the bureau heads, archivist, the registrar, were generally appointed at the suggestion of the secretary of the chancery and were responsible to him. It is no wonder that they sided with the secretary and the Ober-Procuror in case the ideas of the bishop conflicted with those of the secretary.\(^{52}\)

The bishop was further handicapped in his religious work because he had to confirm journals, reports, and requests of various kinds. Most of these papers could have been taken care of in the consistories, office of the district priest, or other institutions within the diocese. Most of the time the bishop was not able to know what was in the various reports and journals that he was to confirm. The religious consistory that was appointed to help the bishops in their work did not have the time because they were priests that had other duties. They were supposed to have met in a body to consider the proposals,

\(^{52}\)Ibid., p. 54.
but the time was limited so that they could not do a thorough job. Many times the chanceries would write out the decisions and get the priests of the religious consistory to sign them separately. This was in opposition to the procedures set down in the Code of Religious Consistories. Under this system, most of the power of the Church lay with the lay officials rather than with the priesthood. It would seem that perhaps this organization of the consistory chancery was set up for the express purpose of having more power in the hands of the government.

Perhaps the greatest failing of the chanceries was the amount of red tape involved. All of its work had to be transacted through a medium of papers. These papers were much too numerous, and in many cases they could have been taken care of by the lower officials. Everything that was done within the diocese was done by a "diocesan ukaz." Any repairs of the Church had to be done by a ukaz. Each performance of the marriage service had to be done by a ukaz; the bells for a vespers service or a liturgy could be rung only by a ukaz; the baker of Communion bread could not bake except by a ukaz. These ukazes were usually sent in official packets by persons going to the particular parishes, or by special messenger. As a result, the ukaz was very slow in reaching its destination.
"In some churches they keep on praying for the good health of some member of the Ruling House long after his death is everywhere known"—because no ukaz was received ordering a change.54

The religious consistories also had judicial functions as well as executive functions. It was the religious court for the diocese. The parish priest would usually start proceedings for trials by making an investigation near the scene of the dispute. Usually the priest possessed no judicial training and was not too well educated, but he had to collect the data concerning the trial and get the interested parties to sign the sheets of evidence. Should the persons involved refuse to sign the sheets of evidence, they had to indicate their reasons in writing as to why they would not sign them. The papers were then given to the consistory courts for consideration and decisions. No witnesses were called, and the accused or the accusor had no opportunity to plead their case before the judges who decided their fate. Everything was decided in formal fashion on the basis of the writings sent in by the investigator.55 These courts had jurisdiction over all clergy. It judged them in all crimes committed by them or "offenses against their calling, or violations of propriety and good conduct." If a quarrel arose between two clerics regarding church property or money, the local consistory decided the case. Finally, all Orthodox laymen were subject to the consistorial court in all cases involving marriage and divorce.56

54 Curtiss, op. cit., p. 60. 55 Ibid., p. 61. 56 Ibid., p. 62.
The village priest had more reason to fear the consistory courts than anyone else because if any person had a grudge against him, that person could start an investigation by writing the complaint to the bishop. Sometimes these investigations could have been started by a mere rumor. All cases went to the consistory no matter how insignificant they were. It was necessary for the priest to carry out the wishes of the diocesan authorities to the letter, for there was no way of telling when some of his actions would be misinterpreted and reported to the consistory and the lay official that dominated it. 57

Besides taking care of his flock, the clergymen was required to declare all imperial manifestes, ukazes, and the like in the churches. Also he was to do everything possible to weaken or silence any opposition to the government. The priest through the Church was to support the Tsar in secret. This was required by law in 1722 when Peter the Great issued the law in a supplement to his Religious Instructions. The priests were to disclose to the secret police any information concerning plots or attempts against the emperor or his government, even when the knowledge had been obtained under the seal of the confessional. 58

The clergy were not so opposed to the Tsar's authority or the necessity of performing political actions at the government's

57 Ibid., p. 62.  
58 Ibid., p. 74.
behest. Their main difficulties and worries were caused by the fact that the Church was charged with keeping the "metric," that is, the record of births, deaths, marriages, etc., and all vital statistics. These statistics were not only kept on members of the Orthodox faith, but also on the entire community, including the dissidents and other religious sects. This involved the making of the original record, reporting to the next instance and the issuing of rescripts, birth certificates, etc. Considering the modest education of the village priest, this must have been a heavy chore, and many were the reprimands and punishments for errors which he did not know he had committed, and when explained, he could scarcely understand. This task was greatly complicated by the laws on dissenters, particularly the Old Believers and the evangelical sects, whose position varied with the degree of tolerance granted by the ruling Tsar, and by the degree of either bigotry or hypocrisy practiced by the dissenter. Thus marriages were valid only when performed by the priest of a legalized religious body, but when the bride and groom were adherents of a forbidden sect, they could not be married by the Orthodox priest, nor could the local priest register a marriage performed by an illegally operating priest or sectarian minister. Having in mind the fluctuation in policy between toleration and persecution, how could the local priest know when a sect was completely illegal, somewhat tolerated, or legal? The situation was the more confused when children of such parents had to be registered—were they legitimate or illegitimate? Later, when the young man's military service began, what sort of birth certificate and religious adherence record should be given him? And always the secular officials were demanding accuracy, when accuracy was impossible. 59

The Ober-Procurator of the Synod was a member of the Committee of Ministers, and, like the other ministers, was a member of the Senate. The Senate was the highest court in the land. He could attend the meetings of the Senate if it were dealing

59 Anderson, op. cit., pp. 33-34.
in matters concerning the Church. Another way in which the clergymen were represented in political institutions was that the bishop had the power to appoint a member of the clergy to attend the meetings of the local assembly, the zemstvo. The zemstvo was a local assembly, mainly elective, which had the power to promote education, public health, agriculture, and other local interests. Likewise, the clergy were allowed representatives in the county zemstvos. Also they were allowed the privilege of attending the town councils to see that the interests of the church were carried out. These representatives were appointed by the bishop.60

The Svod Zakonov proclaimed the "Christian Orthodox Catholic Eastern Confession" as the foremost and dominant faith in the Russian Empire. The government supported the Church in its attempt to make the people conform to this faith. Anyone who deviated from it was considered a dissenter. Since the time of Peter the Great, various religious sects had come into being, and the government helped the Church to persecute them. According to Rappoport,61 a religious sect was to a great extent formed because of political rather than religious causes; for in Russia religion is often a pretext for a revolt against a new order of things. The Raskolniki, or Old Believers, were political and social dissenters rather than religious ones.62

60Curtiss, op. cit., p. 37.
61A. J. Rappoport, Home Life in Russia, p. 133.
62Ibid., p. 134.
The Church not only persecuted the religious sects, but also helped the State in its attempt to stamp out liberal ideas. Since the Tsars were desirous of having all the people adhere to the blended faith of Autocracy, Orthodoxy, and Nationalism, it is only natural that they tried to rid the country of any idea or person who was opposed to this faith.

Pobedonostsev, the Ober-Procuror of the Holy Synod from 1881 to 1905, was very influential in matters of State as well as religious matters. His attempt to suppress all liberal ideas helped to bring about the Revolution of 1905. In 1883 he was influential in getting a law passed that dealt with the legal position of the Old Believers. The sectarians, as well as the Old Believers, were entitled to hold minor offices, to receive passports, and to engage in productive enterprise and trade. The law further stated that the Old Believers could hold group religious services in their homes, or houses of prayer. These houses of prayer were not, however, to resemble Orthodox Christian Churches in any way. Nor were they to have bells that were visible from the outside. No new houses of prayer could be built, and old houses could be remodelled only with the permission of the Minister of Internal Affairs after he had consulted with the Ober-Procuror of the Synod. Old Believers were allowed to bury their dead with their own religious ceremonies. They were allowed processions, but they were not permitted to wear vestments of any kind.63

63Curtiss, op. cit., p. 135.
No phase of Church life was free from State control. Restrictions had been placed on all theological development. Particularly, restrictions had been placed on the attempts to connect Christian doctrines with the movements for social, economic, and political reforms in the nineteenth century. The Tsars did not desire a change; yet by the twentieth century religion was demanding a change in the State ideology and the Church establishment to meet the high ideals of the intelligentsia and professional classes. There was a need for reform within the theological schools. The sons of priests wanted to attend secular schools, or to have the curriculum within the Church schools changed so that they could go on to the university if they did not want to enter the priesthood. They wanted to have freedom of discussion within the schools. There was quite a bit of dissatisfaction among the students in the seminaries, and nearly all went on strike when the final upsurge came to force the Tsar to abdicate. The dissatisfaction of the students in the seminaries caused them to be potential leaders of the revolutionary movement rather than "tools of the Tsar." 64

The State and Church were able to keep the Russian masses in superstition and ignorance, but the intelligentsia absorbed many of the Western ideas in spite of the hardships encountered. In trying to work out a Russian philosophy, the intelligentsia divided into two important classes: the Slavophils and the

---

64 Anderson, op. cit., p. 39.
Westerners. The Slavophils thought that the European civilization was in a state of decay and that the Russians should develop their way of life from their own native elements rather than accept the ideas from the West. Slavophilism united an ardent emotional patriotism or nationalism with an equally zealous, somewhat uncritical valuation of the Russian Orthodox Church, even though tempered by a certain amount of criticism of the excesses of official ecclesiasticism. 65 This was the religious party, and it influenced the religious thinking of modern Russia.

The other class, the Westerners, was not concerned particularly with religion. They regarded it as something mystical and irrational. They rejected most of the things Russian and wanted to develop Russian civilization along Western European lines. They were exponents of the policy of Peter the Great; while the Slavophils idealized pre-Peterine Russia. 66 These two lines of thought influenced the revolutionary movement in Russia.

There were liberals among both the white and black clergy, and they were persecuted by the Church and State the same as the other liberals. The Church suspended the liberal clergy from office, required them to do penance for a certain period of time in the monasteries, moved them to poor parishes, or excommunicated them. Many went to prison and were even exiled to Siberia.

The defeats of the Russian army in the Russo-Japanese war revealed the depth of governmental mismanagement and corruption, in spite of the attempt to keep it secret, and caused a great demand for reforms. It resulted in the Revolution of 1905. Certain concessions had to be made by the government. The first important attempt at religious freedom was made in 1904. In the early part of 1904, a secret movement started in St. Petersburg to demand freedom of conscience. The government in December of that year attempted to appease the people by issuing a ukaz which promised a certain amount of religious toleration. The "Bloody Sunday" massacre of the working masses in January, 1905 helped to increase the dissatisfaction of the people.

On April 17, 1905, the Tsar issued a ukaz, establishing a degree of freedom of conscience that had not been enjoyed before. However, this did not include religious tolerance to all peoples. According to this ukaz, the priesthood of the Old Believers was recognized and given the permission to celebrate marriage. The sectarianists and Old Believers were allowed to erect houses of prayer without restrictions. A transfer of membership from one religious communion to another was permitted. However, non-confessionalism was not allowed; the people had to belong to one of the existing religious bodies. The Jews did not receive any freedom. The government and many members of the Orthodox clergy had been responsible for the
great pogroms carried on against the Jews in the latter part of the nineteenth century and early part of the twentieth century. The Orthodox Church retained its privileged position, and it was to retain the monopoly in the marriage rite.\textsuperscript{67}

The Church was involved in the action of the reactionaries in trying to regain control after the Revolution of 1905. Because of the close relationship between the Synod and the State it was almost necessary that the Church take a stand against liberalism in general. There were many clergymen, however, who wanted to overthrow the bureaucratic control of the Synod and substitute a more democratic form of government within the Church. The center of this movement was in St. Petersburg, and its leaders stressed the need for separation of Church and State. They demanded a local Russian Sobor to decide the matter.

In October, 1905, the Tsar issued a Manifesto granting a limited monarchical form of government. A legislative body called the Duma was established. The clergy were permitted to be members of this body. A number of liberal clergy was elected to the First Duma. This Duma recommended that a National Sobor be convened in order to work out the problems of the Church. The Tsar instructed the Synod to call a Sobor, and a committee was set up to study the matters to be considered. But not long after the granting of the Manifesto,

\textsuperscript{67}\textit{Ibid.}, p. 50.
the reactionaries began work to try to curb the liberties that had been granted. The pre-sobor committee was conservative to a large extent. There were those who wanted a democratically representative government within the Church and those who wanted to re-establish the patriarchate. Those within the committee who favored the patriarchate won.

Because the clergy members of the Second Duma were so outspoken in their opposition to the governmental policies, the State and Church did everything to try to see that the majority of members were of the conservative party. The conservative clergy in the Second Duma attempted to get laws passed restricting the freedom granted the people by the ukaz in 1905. The Synod attempted to place more restrictions on the theological seminaries, but even the conservative members of the Duma opposed the move. The liberals within the Duma wanted to take the control of the church schools away from the Church and place it in the hands of the Minister of Education.

V. K. Sadler was appointed Ober-Procuror of the Synod in 1911. He was a man of strong reactionary and intolerant tendencies. He did everything in his power to try to stamp out liberalism within the Church schools. He required the professors within the schools to belong only to the monarchical party; he took away the freedom exercised within the parish; and he placed the clergy on state pay rolls so as to make them
completely independent of the parish and more dependent upon the State. In this way the clergy were expected to be more pliable tools of the State. The *Duma* would not uphold Sadler's ideas. He promised a *Sobor* for 1912, but he did not carry out his promise.

Before the March Revolution of 1917, there was a distinct distaste for religion on the part of the educated class because of the influence of the illiterate and immoral mushik, Gregory E. Rasputin, upon the Imperial family. Because of his influence, Rasputin, who considered himself a "saint," was able to bring about appointments and removals of the Church officials and State officials. He was practically supreme in power when Nicholas II took over the personal control of the Army and the Tsarina took over the control of the government. His policies and scandals so inflamed the people at court that he was murdered in 1916.

The disastrous defeats of the Russian Army at the front in 1917 and the terrible internal conditions brought about the March Revolution of 1917. The Tsarist regime was overthrown and a provisional government established. Under the provisional government the Synod was still tightly bound to the government, but a more liberal-minded *Ober-Procuror*, Prince Vladimir Lvov, was appointed. He still had the authority that had been given under the Tsar, but he substituted the more
liberal clergy for the reactionary clergy. There was no fundamental change in the government of the Church. The Ober-Procuror of the Synod was appointed by the provisional head; but the Synod did not have to submit its decisions to the government for approval. The Church took on an air of reform, but the government did not attempt to make any important changes in the Church until the property elected bodies had been assembled: the Sobor within the Church and the Constituent Assembly within the State.

On April 23, 1917, the Holy Synod issued a proclamation which stated that with "the change of regime the established Church could not preserve the old order, which had outlived its time."66 The Church, however, was not ready to realize that it would never hold the position that it had held under the Tsars. Consequently, there was friction between the Church and Provisional Government. In July, 1917 the Provisional Government established a Ministry of Religion, and a minister took over the duties of the Ober-Procuror. Preparations were being made for the All Russian Sobor to be held in August of the same year.

An All Russian Conference of clergy and laymen was called in July to discuss the reforms to be made within the Church. Some of the resolutions of this Conference were: I. Orthodoxy

66Anderson, op. cit., p. 45.
was to hold its place of priority among the religions; 2. the Church was to be autonomous in all matters; 3. the decisions of the Church were to be legal norms for all people of the Orthodox faith; 4. the Orthodox marriage law was to be the legal one; 5. the registration of births by the Church was to be legal if kept within the law of the government; 6. the Church holidays and Sundays were to be recognized by the government as the days of rest; 7. both the head of the government and the minister of confessions were to be Orthodox; 8. the Church was to be given preference in actions of State that required religious functions; 9. the Church was to be allowed freedom in establishing schools, and these schools were to be granted all the rights of the secular schools; 10. the teaching of the Orthodox catechism was to be compulsory within the schools and the instructors were to be paid from the State treasury; 11. the Church was to be a juridical person and retain all property; moreover, this property was not to be confiscated unless with the consent of the ecclesiastics; 12. the Church properties not yielding a net income were to be free from taxation; and 13. "the Orthodox Church shall receive out of the State treasury annual appropriation to the limit of its actual needs, for which it shall be responsible in accordance with general principles."69

The conservativeness of these resolutions showed that the Church expected to still hold its favored position, but the

69Spinka, op. cit., pp. 73-76.
Provisional Government was not willing to grant them. A law of June 20 took all state-supported schools and placed them under a Ministry of Education. This law affected the parochial schools and all ecclesiastical educational institutions. At this time, the Church-controlled schools amounted to thirty-seven thousand, or one-third of all schools in Russia.\textsuperscript{70} The schools had been supported by the State, but they were carried on mostly in the interest of the Church. The Church objected to this move, but the law went into effect. Furthermore, the Minister of Education planned to take off the required list of subjects all "catechism." The Church objected to this move also.

A law granting full religious liberty was issued July 17, 1917. By this law, all civil limitations based upon religious grounds were abolished, and the right to pass from one religious communion to another was granted. Also, the right to sever one's connection with all religions was granted. However, the government allowed the Church to retain some civil functions, such as the registration of births, the solemnization of marriages, and the granting of divorces. Also the people were to be compelled to resort to the Church for a legal performance of such acts.\textsuperscript{71}

The National Church \textbf{Sobor} assembled on August 15, 1917, and had 564 delegates, including 278 laymen, representing 66 dioceses of the Church.\textsuperscript{72} The \textbf{Sobor} was conservative to a

\textsuperscript{70}bid., p. 76. \textsuperscript{71}bid., pp. 69-70. 
\textsuperscript{72}Anderson, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 45.
large extent, and it established the patriarchate again. It stayed in session into the year 1918, but the Sobor was not able to make definite decisions because it did not know what position the new government that came into power in the October Revolution would take. After the Bolsheviks came into power, the Church was to see a drastic change in the relationship between the Church and State.
CHAPTER III

THE CHURCH AND THE COMMUNISTS

By the twentieth century many people in Russia had begun to realize that it would be necessary to make some changes in the Church setup. Since the time of Peter the Great, it had been only a tool in the hands of the State, and, as a result, had lost much of its spiritual essence and the respect of many people. Because it was a State institution, it had been used by the State in trying to stamp out liberal ideas and to foster the autocratic form of government. After the Revolution of 1905, the liberal thinkers demanded the assembling of an All Russian Sobor to consider the problem of the Church. Feeble attempts were made, but it was not until 1917 that the Sobor was actually convened.

The Tsarist regime had been overthrown in the March Revolution in 1917, and a Provisional Government had been established. This government showed a great amount of toleration toward the Church, in spite of the fact that the Church had been such a pliable tool of the Tsar. It also showed a great amount of toleration toward other religious bodies, but it recognized Russian Orthodoxy as the mother Church of Russia.¹

¹Sir Bernard Pares, Russia and the Peace, p. 37.
The government insisted that a national Church sobor be called to consider the problem of the Church. No definite legislation concerning the Church was passed at first because the government was waiting for the convening of the Constituent Assembly.

A Conference was called in July, 1917 to consider the matters to be taken up by the Sobor. The Conference wanted the Church to be completely independent of the State, but it showed a great amount of conservatism by hoping to retain a lot of its privileges. The Provisional Government was not able to do anything definite about the Church because the Soviets took over the control of the government in October, 1917.

To the Russian people, this was more than a change in rulers; it was a change in their whole way of life. It marked the beginning of a new era in the life of the Russian Church. Orthodox Christianity had existed for several centuries, and this orthodoxy had become a fundamental principle in the life of most of the Russian people. It was known by many that the Soviets were atheists who rejected God and who considered religion as an enemy of the people. Thus, it was to be a war between national tradition and international utopia, and in regard to religion, a clash of two faiths.²

The All-Russian Church Sobor convened in August, 1917. A few days after the Soviets had taken over the government in October, the Sobor re-established the patriarchate and elected

²N. S. Timasheff, Religion in Soviet Russia, p. 1.
Tikhon, metropolitan of Moscow, as Patriarch. On November 5, Tikhon was installed as Patriarch. There was a hesitancy on the part of the Sobor at first to make definite plans for the Church because the leaders, knowing that the Soviets were atheists, did not know just how the new leaders of the government would react toward the Church.

The new government did not dismiss the Sobor, and it allowed the Sobor to continue until August of the next year. However, in December, 1917, a number of decrees were issued that made the Church realize that a new way of life would have to be worked out. The nationalization of all land had been advocated by the Soviets before taking over the government. So, on December 4, 1917, the government issued a decree declaring all land to be national property, to be controlled by special land committees. It was explicitly stated that the lands owned by the ecclesiastical or monastic institutions were also included in the scope of the law. As a result, the Church lost most of its means of support almost overnight.

A few days later another decree was issued which struck another blow at the Church. The Commissariat of National Education ordered all schools turned over to that department. The law of June 20, issued by the Provisional Government, had demanded that only the parochial schools and ecclesiastical

---

3Spinka, op. cit., p. 102.
institutions for teachers which had been supported by state funds be handed over to the Ministry of Education. This new law demanded that all schools, irrespective of their support, be turned over to the control of the Commissariat of Education. Thus, the Church was to be deprived of all means of educating the young, as well as training its priests.

The influence of the Church was weakened further on December 18, 1917, when a decree was issued regarding marriages and the registration of births. The decree stated that the "Russian Republic henceforth recognizes only civil marriages." Church marriages were to be considered a private affair but all civil marriages were to be obligatory. With regard to the keeping of vital statistics,

All religious and administrative institutions alike, which have hitherto had charge of the registration of marriages, births, and deaths according to the customs of any religious cult, are ordered to transfer immediately all their registration books to the respective municipal, district, rural and zemstvo administrations.4

With regard to divorce, the decree declared:

1. Marriage is annulled by the petition of both parties, or even one of them.

11. The operation of this law extends to all citizens of the Russian Republic irrespective of their adherence to this or that religious cult.

12. All suits for annulment of marriage which are now tried in ecclesiastical consistories of the department of Greek Catholic and other denominations, in the governing Synod, and all other institutions of the Christian and non-Christian religions, and by officials

4"Russian Documents," Nation, CVII (December 26, 1918), 824.
in charge of ecclesiastical affairs of all denominations, and in which no decisions have been rendered or the decisions already rendered have not become legally effective are declared by reason of this law null and void, and are subject to immediate transfer to the local district courts for safe-keeping, with all archives in the possession of the above enumerated institutions and persons having jurisdiction in divorce suits.\(^5\)

In the early part of January, 1918, a decree was issued that stopped all financial aid for the purpose of religious worship, but the priests and catechists were to receive their salaries until March 1.\(^6\) On January 23, 1918, the most historic document of all was issued, that of the separation of Church and State and the separation of the schools from the Church. It was embodied in the Collected Laws. The full text of the decree is as follows:

1. The church is separated from the state.
2. Within the confines of the Republic it is prohibited to issue any local laws or regulations restricting or limiting freedom of conscience, or establishing privileges or preferential rights of any kind based upon the religious confession of the citizens.
3. Every citizen may profess any religion or none. All restrictions of rights connected with the profession of any belief whatsoever, or with the non-profession of any belief, are annulled.

Note: All reference to citizens' membership in religious groups, or their non-membership, shall be removed from all official documents.
4. The governmental functions, or those of other public-juridical institutions, shall not be accompanied by religious rites or ceremonies.
5. A free performance of religious rites is guaranteed as long as it does not interfere with public order, and is not accompanied by interference with the rights of citizens of the Soviet Republic. Local authorities possess the right in such cases to adopt all necessary measures to preserve public order and safety.

\(^{5}\text{Ibid.}, 825.\) \(^{6}\text{Spinka, op. cit., p. 104.}\)
6. No one may refuse to perform his civil duties on account of his religious views.

Exception to this rule, on condition that one civil duty be exchanged for another, may be granted in each individual case by decision of the People's Court.

7. Religious vows and oaths are abrogated.

8. Acts of civil nature are registered solely by the civil authorities: the departments for the registration of marriages and births.

9. The school is separated from the church.

Instruction in religious doctrines is not permitted in any governmental and common schools, nor in private teaching institutions where general subjects are taught. Citizens may give or receive religious instruction in a private manner.

10. All ecclesiastical or religious associations are subject to the general regulations regarding private associations and unions, and shall enjoy no privileges or subsidies, whether from the government, or from local autonomous or self-governing institutions.

11. Compulsory demand of collections or dues for the support of ecclesiastical or religious associations, as well as measures of compulsion or punishment adopted by such associations in respect to their members, are not permitted.

12. No ecclesiastical or religious association has the right to possess property.

13. All properties of the existing ecclesiastical and religious associations in Russia are declared to form national wealth. Buildings and objects specifically appointed for purposes of worship shall be delivered, in accordance with the regulations of the local or the central governmental authorities, to responsible religious associations for their use, free of charge.

This decree brought about a drastic change in the position of the Church. Since the days of Vladimir I, the Russian State had been a religious confessional state; and the Orthodox religion had been the national religion. The Orthodox Church had been the national religious institution. It had had special privileges conferred upon it by the State, had had State support,

7Ibid., pp. 105-106.
and had had an opportunity to indoctrinate the youth with the Russian principles of Autocracy, Orthodoxy, and Nationalism. The Tsar had been considered the temporal head of the Church. The Church had protested some of the actions of the Provisional Government, but the decrees of the new government were even worse.

The new government was to organize Russia on a secular basis, severing all connections with religion and reducing all religious institutions to the status of a private association which possessed no official standing whatsoever. All religious oaths were abolished. In case an oath was necessary, only a solemn promise was to be given. No religious society was to be considered a juridical person.

The publication of the January decree was practically a declaration of war upon the Church. The new government had every reason to fear the Church because it was the only institution that was capable of offering any resistance to the new masters. However, the Revolution took the Church unawares. The immobility of the dogma, the prevalence of administrative activities over the spiritual, the ritualism of the masses and their indifference towards the spiritual contents of religion, placed the Russian Church in a totally different relation to revolutionary ideas from that which existed in seventeenth century England, where the revolution of religious ideas preceded and was closely connected with the political revolution.8

8Miliukov, op. cit., p. 151.
For the past two centuries, it had been a tool of the State, and naturally its connection with the State would make it an opponent of the revolution. The masses of people had a passive attitude toward Church affairs and did not question the part it played in affairs of State.

According to Article 3 of the decree, there was to be freedom of conscience for all people, and anyone could profess a creed or none at all. There was to be freedom of both religious and anti-religious confession and propaganda. Under this Article, the sectarians were allowed freedom of confession, and the discriminations against them in their rights as citizens were taken away. Under the Tsars, they had been persecuted for their religion and denied civil rights.

Under the old regime, "holy Russia" had connected all State functions with religious ceremonies and symbols. According to Article 4, all ikons were to be removed from all public buildings and no religious processions were to be held without the consent of the Soviets. The Church, however, was to be free to carry on its own proper work undisturbed, provided it confined it to the buildings intended for worship.\footnote{Spinka, op. cit., p. 110.}

With reference to the marriage law, only civil marriage, registered before the proper governmental authorities, was to be regarded as binding upon the parties to it and conferred
legal protection guaranteed by the laws. If anyone wanted to cohabit without either a civil or ecclesiastical ceremony, they were free to do so without any penalties being inflicted upon them. However, to make a marriage legal, it had to be registered.

Article 9 separated the school from the Church, and no religious doctrines were to be taught in any schools. The persons were to receive their religious instruction in a private manner. This Article failed to specify the conditions under which religious instruction was to be given to children or adults. This Article was further defined in a ruling handed down June 13, 1922, and it specified:

Instruction in matters of faith of persons who have not reached their eighteenth year of age is not permitted. Persons above eighteen years of age may be instructed in special theological courses with the aim of preparing them for the priesthood, but on the condition that the curriculum of such courses be limited to specifically theological subjects. It is likewise permitted to hold separate lectures, discussions, or reading courses dealing with confessional matters for persons above eighteen years of age, provided that such meetings do not acquire the character of a systematic scholastic method of instruction.

The purpose of this legislation was to see that the growing generation would not receive any systematic religious instruction. The government wanted to train the growing generation to think in terms of secular ideas rather than religious ideas.

The January decree stripped the Church of all its former

---

10 Ibid., p. 112.  
11 Ibid., p. 152.
privileges and support. The Church was thrown entirely on its own resources. To make it even worse, the Church was not permitted to levy any compulsory payments or church tax upon its members. It could employ no compulsory means of enforcing support upon the members. The Church was to depend entirely upon voluntary gifts. The land and property of the Church had been nationalized, but the buildings and articles of cult needed for the service could be loaned out to the parishioners. Before the building and articles of cult could be secured, the parish had to consist of at least twenty faithful members. These members were to draw up an agreement with the Soviets, promising to keep up the repairs on the buildings and pay the taxes, before they could get the buildings and articles of cult. The parishioners could procure a priest, but he had to comply with all the duties of an ordinary citizen.

In addition to the "groups of the faithful," authority was granted for the forming of religious societies with no less than fifty members. If these religious societies were duly registered with the government, they could spread their activities over several provinces, and with special permission they could form all-Russian conventions and publish periodicals. Of course, all of this was subject to Russian censorship. Unlike private societies, however, they had not the right of property and were not recognized as juridical persons.\[12\]

\[12\] Miliukov, op. cit., p. 161.
The January decree was very harsh, but the Church had been an institution for so long that it did not intend to go down without a fight. There was open conflict even before the decree. All property had been nationalized in 1917. The first attempt to take over ecclesiastical property occurred when the government sent an official to take over the Alexandro-Nevsky Monastery in Petrograd.\textsuperscript{13} When the official demanded the surrender of all cash money and other assets, the head of the Monastery refused to hand over the property. The whole monastic community backed the head of the monastery in his stand and voted to surrender no property and to oppose any attempt on the part of the government to disperse them. The Sobor was in recess in the Christmas holidays; so Patriarch Tikhon took it upon himself to issue a proclamation anathematizing all persons who attempted to confiscate the Church property and all those who surrendered the property. The proclamation was an open declaration of war against the Soviets. When the Sobor re-convened, it confirmed the Patriarch's proclamation.

The Sobor drew up some instructions that were to be followed in case the government attempted to take over the ecclesiastical property. The main points were as follows:

1. Not to surrender anything whatsoever voluntarily to the plunderers of the sacred possessions of the church, but to guard it according to the example of our pious ancestors.

\textsuperscript{13}Spinka, op. cit., p. 116.
2. In case of a forcible demand by anyone whatsoever of any part of the ecclesiastical or monastic property, the superior of the church or the monastery should refuse, turning upon the violators with appropriate words of exhortation.

3. The plunderers and robbers of ecclesiastical and monastic property whose names are known should be reported to the eparchial superior, in order that in cases especially revolting they may be excommunicated from ecclesiastical fellowship. (The Neo-canon of St. Gregory, rule 3.)

4. In case a whole village proves to be guilty of sacrilege and acts of scoffing at sacred things, the eparchial superior shall order all divine ministrations stopped (with the exception of the sacrament of baptism and of the administration to the sick of the body and blood of Christ), and the churches closed until the guilty shall manifest signs of a true penitence which must be accompanied by the restitution to the church or monastery of everything that has been seized.

5. In case of violence done to priests, the same measures as those described in the previous article shall be adopted.

6. Orthodox brotherhoods should be organized without delay in parish churches and monasteries for the protection of ecclesiastical and monastic property.

7. It shall become the duty of the parochial and monastic clergy to exhort the people, in their sermons in the church, to penitence and prayer, giving the explanation of the current events from the Christian point of view.\footnote{Ibid., pp. 123-124.}

These instructions were carried out to a large extent, resulting in many uprisings and riots of the people who mobbed the officials and soldiers who were detailed for the duty of confiscating the Church property.

The Sobor refused to recognize a divorce that had been granted by civil authorities to persons who had been married by Orthodox Church rites. It was said that the whole law was
in conflict with the sacrament of marriage. If anyone married again after receiving such a divorce, the Church considered that person as living in adultery. The Church insisted that the solemnization of the marriage rite by the Church was very necessary.

The new rulers seemed to have in mind the extermination of religion, especially organized religion in the form of orthodoxy because it had been the cornerstone of the Tsarist regime. Some of the leaders believed that if the State and bourgeois economic support were taken away from the Church, it would crumble away of its own accord. They thought the people would turn away from the religious superstitions when they had been liberated from the bonds of capitalism. This group thought that any direct attack on religion might revive the Church and make it an enemy of the government.

Another group of the leaders thought that the victory of Communism in 1917 was not complete. It was afraid that the capitalists, even though beaten, would be able to avenge themselves through religion. This group wanted to make violent attacks on religion, but they realized that a certain amount of caution would be necessary because the effects of a direct attack were unpredictable.

In his book *The Soviets* Albert Williams\(^\text{15}\) says that the

\[^{15}\text{Albert Rhys Williams, *The Soviets*, pp. 322-326.}\]
revolutionists were antagonistic toward the Russian Orthodox Church because of the following three points:

1. Autocracy found the church its most faithful servant and ally, always ready to use its tremendous powers against every movement for the liberation of the masses. It was an abettor of ignorance and superstition and was an obstacle to social and moral progress. As an indictment of the church, the revolutionists pointed to the old village. The church took the peasant's money to build magnificent temples and allowed the peasants to live in straw-thatched huts—miserable, overcrowded, and unsanitary. It hypnotized them with mystic rites, with bells and incense, while seventy percent were unable to read and write. It gave them icons to pray to in misfortune—a saint for every sickness from toothache to tuberculosis—and left them to the ravages of plagues and disasters, a third of the children dying before one year. It began the great church festivals with imposing pomp and ceremony and let the people continue in them, wallowing in drunkenness for days, and often the priest with them.

2. Not only did the church do little or nothing to deliver the peasant from his miseries, darkness, and ignorance, but the effect of his teachings—submission, passive resignation, and contentment with one's lot—was to paralyze his will, to leave him without desire to deliver himself. His inbred fatalism and conservatism further strengthened by religion was especially disastrous for agriculture.

3. They believe that the church was in league with the capitalists for the purpose of exploitation of the masses of the people. To them most of the evils would disappear with the coming of the classless society of Communism. With the abolition of exploitation and the crasser forms of injustice, one would no longer be bounded by sense of guilt and sin. In solidarity with his fellows in a community of equals he would no longer be stricken by loneliness and isolation. With freedom and means to live out life to the fullest, the peasant would no longer feel thwarted and frustrated. Depending upon science and himself rather than on prayer and propitiations of the supernatural, one would for the first time realize the tremendous potentialities in himself. Under these conditions, they asserted that there would be little or no necessity for the antidotes, compensations, and escapes offered by religion. They regarded religion, in any of
its organised forms at any rate, as in impediment to the onward march of humanity. Therefore, they are seeking to prevent it from resuming its ascendancy over the minds of the people.

In drafting the constitution for the new government, the Constitutional Committee issued the formula "religion is a private affair of the citizens." However, Lenin declared it to be unacceptable and ordered it to be replaced by another clause which guaranteed the freedom of religious and anti-religious propaganda. Thus, Article 13 of the Constitution of the Russian Socialist Federal Soviet Republic of July 10, 1918, read: "In order to secure for the toiling masses a real freedom of conscience, the church is being separated from the State, the schools from the Church, and freedom of religious and anti-religious propaganda is recognized for all citizens." This Article was a prototype for all articles concerning religion in the later Soviet constitutions.

This Article seemed to be a fairly moderate clause, giving equal freedom to both religious and anti-religious propaganda, but actually the difference was that religious propaganda was left to a weak Church, severely afflicted by the sudden destruction of its privileges, and the anti-religious propaganda was to be furthered by the new State with the Communist Party as its backbone. Actually the formula in the new constitution was a declaration of war on religion.  

16 Miliukov, op. cit., p. 160.  17 Timasheff, op. cit., pp. 21-23
According to Article 65 of the Constitution of 1918, ministers of religion, priests and monks, neither enjoyed the right to vote nor the right to be voted for. They were declared to be non-workers and servants of the bourgeoisie. Both were deprived of their franchise. No one, however, cared to take part in the Soviet elections because it could go only one way. But disfranchisement was a symbol of being deprived of essential rights. Instead of forming a classless society, the Soviets had formed one that was as bad as that under the old regime. As a rule, the members of the lowest category of the system did not receive ration cards when they were distributed. They were not allowed to belong to trade unions. Since everything had been nationalized and the clergy had been classed as non-workers, they did not have a means of supplementing the meager donations of the parishioners. They had to pay higher rents for living quarters, and their children were forbidden to attend secondary schools and universities. They also had to pay higher income taxes as well as an agricultural tax.18

A virtual state of civil war existed between the State and Church almost from the very beginning of the new regime. There were riots and conflicts between the officials and the people over the confiscation of Church property. The relations

18 Ibid., p. 27.
between the State and Church reached a crisis during the famine that struck the Volga region in 1921. The peasants had objected to the government taking their crops with the exception of just enough needed for their families. They had just planted enough to satisfy the needs of the family, resulting in a shortage of food in the region. Then, too, there was a drought during the year, and what had been planted was destroyed. The emergency called for all the energies of the government and the various professional and private societies.

The Church had made its appeal for help to the Eastern churches, the Pope at Rome, and other religious congregations as early as August, 1921. It organized a committee to take care of distributing the funds collected by the various churches. The trouble between the State and Church resulted when the government decided the relief administration should be in the hands of a central committee controlled by the government. The committee of the Church was pronounced as superfluous. The government demanded that the money that had been collected by the Church be turned over to the State committee. The demand was complied with.\(^\text{19}\) The government gave the Church quite a bit of freedom in collecting the money, but it began to think the Church was withholding some of the aid in the hopes that this might paralyze the government's power. To make matters worse for the Church, a Sobor was held in Karlovtsi in 1921 and many of the émigré clergy that had left Russia during the Revolution

\(^{19}\)Spinka, op. cit., p. 164.
were among the members. The Sobor was hostile toward the Soviet government and wanted to restore the monarchy. Patriarch Tikhon was accused of secretly conspiring with the members of the Sobor.

The famine grew worse in 1922, and many people began to think the Church could supply more funds if the Church treasures were turned into silver. In February, 1922, the Patriarch issued a proclamation saying that all unconsecrated articles that were not being used in worship service could be sacrificed to help the famine-stricken areas. Still the people and the press accused the Church of refusing to save the lives of the people by refusing to give up all the treasures. Possibly realizing that this was an opportunity to break the power of the Church, the State on February 23, 1922, ordered all treasures not used in worship service to be turned over to the famine fund. Patriarch Tikhon said it was impossible to surrender the consecrated articles of the Church treasures. He issued a proclamation saying that anyone surrendering the sacred articles would be excommunicated if a layman, and if a clergyman, he would be degraded from his sacerdotal rank. The issuing of this proclamation caused the breaking point in the relations between the Church and State. Also it caused many churchmen and laymen to offer resistance to the confiscation of the articles and riots ensued. To break this resistance, many churchmen and laymen as well were tried and some were executed.

20 Ibid., p. 177. 21 Miliukov, op. cit., p. 170.
The trial of a number of the high clergy of the Greek Orthodox and Roman Catholic Churches climaxed the struggle between the Church and State. During this trial, Patriarch Tikhon was called as a witness. He declared that he had been brought up in the traditions of the Tsarist regime, but he considered it his duty to be loyal to the government under which he served. The Church's duty lay with the established, or de facto government. However, two conditions should always be considered:

First, when a country is in revolution and the outcome of the revolutionary conflict is in doubt, a leader of the people is at liberty to oppose any apparently successful revolutionary movement until at least a de facto government has been established. Life and liberty may be sacrificed by this course, but surely the loyalty of an individual or a church is not involved. The plea for such liberty of action is enhanced when the revolutionary government is antireligious. In the second place, it should be remembered that even under an established, or de facto government, a prelate of the Church is bound to protect against any act that seems to him to be immoral, irreligious, or illegal.22

Because of his declaration, the Soviet government ordered Tikhon's arrest and trial.

After the arrest of Tikhon, the government added another instrument for breaking the power of the Church, that of fostering a schism within the Church. A group of progressive priests did not like the policy of Patriarch Tikhon, so they met in council in May, 1922. At this council they declared him unfit for the office of patriarch and organized a church known as "The Living Church."

Throughout the years, a certain amount of jealousy had existed between the priests and the bishops and other higher clergy. The priests were jealous because only the monks could be appointed to the higher offices of the Church. In the Revolution of 1905, a group of ambitious priests in St. Petersburg advocated the setting up of a Church government that was democratic. Some of these same priests were influential in establishing the Living Church. There were progressive priests in the Sobor of 1917, but they were in a minority; so the patriarchate was re-established. The progressive priests were in close accord with the policy of the government when it suggested that the Church change its policy with regard to the giving of the articles of the Church for famine relief. In a meeting of the People's Commissars in April, 1922, Trotsky made a motion to the effect that the policy of the State toward the Church should take on a more aggressive character. At this time the government was aware of the discord among the clergy, and it hoped to profit by this discord. Consequently, it supported the Living Church movement for awhile.

Using revolutionary tactics, three priests were able to secure from Patriarch Tikhon permission in writing to open the patriarchal chancery and carry on the administration of the Church until Tikhon's successor could be named. Tikhon at this time was in prison awaiting trial. Instead of seeing to it
that the designated successor of Tikhon be allowed in Moscow, the three priests took over the control of the Church administration. They established a Supreme Church Administration to take care of the affairs of the Church.

To justify their actions and appeal to the people for support, the group had an article published in the Izvestia and Pravda, which stated that

by the "will of God" Russia had a Workmen's and Peasants' Government, whose aim it was to save the country from the ghastly after effects of the war, and that the Church was assisting it in its struggle for justice and the welfare of humanity. It accused the higher hierarchs of having gone over to the enemies of the people and to have become engaged in counter-revolutionary activities. They had refused to help those stricken by famine and they strove to bring about the downfall of the Soviet State. 23

The group in charge of the Church affairs thought it was necessary to convocate a local Sobor to solve the Church problem and establish "normal relations between the Church and Soviet government."

A Sobor was called. In its opening resolution, it stated that the "world was divided into two camps, the existing capitalists and the proletariat," and the Soviet government was the only one in the world that had originated a struggle against the social evil. It proclaimed capitalism to be a deadly sin, and that it was the duty of every Christian to struggle against it. The Sobor appealed to every Christian in Russia to join

with the government in its war against the universal social evil. The Sobor adopted the Georgian calendar, declared married priests eligible for the episcopate, and said they could re-marry. The bishops, however, were not to contract a second marriage. They voted to discontinue the monasteries and replace them with communistic fraternities. A conciliar system of Church government was also adopted. The Living Church group advocated the separation of Church and State and hoped to make the Church a living, dynamic, and progressive one instead of one of inertia. It demanded the cessation of the civil strife between the Church and State. It also demanded the abolition of "soulless formalism" in the performance of the divine service.

Not long after the movement started, it became evident that the Commissariat of Justice was in charge of all Church legislation. Also, the government resorted to the use of the secret police in its struggle against the Church. The government assisted the Living Church group in getting rid of the bishops and priests who were opposed to the movement.

To give the Living Church legal standing, on April 7, 1923, the government gave the joint Commissariats of Justice and Interior permission to allow all religious organizations

---

to call provincial and central conventions to elect executive boards, but only by special permission of the Soviet authorities. This permission was to be given only to the sects which had been persecuted under the old regime and the Living Church. The decision of the government to interfere in the schism permitted the Living Church to be an official church of the atheist state for awhile.

The government and the promoters of the Living Church were in for a disappointment because they had not taken into consideration the laity. The Living Church had the power, the churches, and the clergy, but it did not have the members. Most of the orthodox members remained true to the Patriarch. The people of the patriarchal Church showed open hostility toward the Living Church. The government could keep the people from going to church, but it could not make them go to a church in which they did not believe. Consequently, the government withdrew its support from the Living Church because it had to deal with the masses of the people.

There was a great clamor among the people for Tikhon's release. The outside governments denounced the government's religious policy; so Patriarch Tikhon was released without trial on June 27, 1923. A lot of the people that had gone over to the Living Church went back to the Patriarchal Church after his release. He remained the Patriarch until his death in 1925.

---

25 Timasheff, op. cit., p. 31.
There was a let-up in the persecution of the Church after his release, but after his death the government would not allow the Church to appoint and install a new Patriarch.

In 1927, Metropolitan Sergius was able to negotiate a compromise with the Soviet government and retain the acting office of Patriarch. He said, "I have taken upon myself, in the name of the whole Orthodox Church, hierarchy and flock, to register before the Soviet authorities our sincere readiness to be fully law abiding citizens of the Soviet Union, loyal to its government, and definitely to hold ourselves aloof from all political parties or enterprises seeking to harm the Union." Sergius made this statement to keep the government from accusing the Church of counter-revolutionary activities.

In separating the Church from the State the government did not intend to maintain complete neutrality. On the contrary, it openly sided with the antagonists of religion by trying to fulfill the demands of the Communist party. The government was completely identified with the Party. Marx had declared religion to be "an opium of the people." Lenin argued that


26 Ibid., p. 34.
existence and selling tickets to a heavenly happiness at a reduced price. 27

The Communist Party was determined to fight religion and religious prejudices because the Church and religion had been connected with the bourgeoisie. In their attack on the bourgeoisie, they were determined to get rid of all implements which the class had used to enslave the people. Article 13 of the rules of the Communist Party says,

With regard to religion, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union does not confine itself to the already decreed separation of church and state and school and church, i.e., measures advocated in the programs of bourgeois democracy, which the latter has nowhere consistently carried out to the end, owing to the diverse and actual ties which bind capital with religious propaganda. The Communist Party of the Soviet Union is guided by the conviction that only conscious and deliberate planning of all the social and economic activities of the masses will cause religious prejudices to die out. The Party strives for the complete dissolution of the ties between the exploiting classes and the organizations of religious propaganda, facilitates the real emancipation of the working masses from religious prejudices and organizes the widest possible scientific educational and anti-religious propaganda. At the same time it is necessary carefully to avoid giving offense to the religious sentiments of believers, which only leads to strengthening of religious fanaticism. 28

Besides the direct attack on the Church and the clergy, the government sponsored an anti-religious propaganda group first called the "Atheist" and later the "League of Militant Atheists." In 1922 the Atheist was a non-party publishing company which was used to distribute anti-religious propaganda.

---


28 Paul B. Anderson, People, Church and State in Modern Russia, p. 60.
The right to circulate anti-religious propaganda had been given in the Constitution of 1918. In 1925 the Atheist body was renamed the "League of Militant Atheists." The purpose of the League was to organize a system of macerries and insults to religion based upon materialistic atheism and give it to the people. The League wanted to show up the superstitions of the people and expose the relics of the Church. The members of the League were trained to tell the people about the worthlessness of the religion they followed.

The League pressed into service everything for the disseminating of the knowledge to the people—the theaters, the movies, literature, etc. Three lines of attack were chosen: first, the demonstrations telling the people that the religion they followed was, in all of its forms, an enemy of the people; second, there was no room for religion because material science explained everything; and third, it said that religion was incompatible with socialism; therefore, a religious belief was a species of disloyalty to the Soviet State. To the Communists, socialism and the revolution were the be-all and end-all of their lives. Feeling no need for religion within themselves, they saw no need for it in the lives of others. Give the man the vision of a new world without poverty or oppression; let him lose himself completely in the wonders of science and the beauty of art; let him understand that in humanity his

29 Timasheff, op. cit., p. 35.
noblest deeds and thoughts and aspirations go on forever, thus may one find the true meaning of life, the fulfillment and satisfaction of his deepest desires.  

At the beginning of its regime, the Soviet government attempted to destroy the influence of the Church by depriving it of legal existence and material means of subsistence, reduced the clergy to a status of social inferiority, and deprived it of a chance to influence various phases of life, such as education and family life. It allowed the League to distribute its propaganda. In 1923, the official Church holidays were changed from the old calendar to correspond with the new one. On July 16, 1924, the teaching of religion was forbidden in the churches; and on September 1, 1924, the teaching of religion privately to a group of more than three children was prohibited.

After 1924 the government relaxed somewhat its persecution of the Church and religion, but in 1928 the second great wave of persecution came about. The atheists complained that more people went to Church on workmen's holidays than went to the clubs that had been established for the people. In 1927 Stalin made a statement showing the policy of the government in conducting a propaganda campaign against religious prejudices. He declared:

---

30Williams, The Soviets, p. 332.
The laws of the country are such that each citizen has the right to confess any religion. This is a matter of conscience for each one. Exactly for this reason we carried through the separation of church and state and, proclaiming freedom of confession, we also preserved for each citizen the right to struggle against any religion by means of persuasion, propaganda and agitation. The Party cannot be neutral with regard to religion, and it conducts anti-religious propaganda against any and all religious prejudices because it stands for science, while religious prejudices go against science, since every religion is something contrary to science. ... anti-religious propaganda is the means which must carry through to, the end the work of liquidating the reactionary clergy. 31

On April 8, 1929, the basic law on religion was codified.

The law further tightened the instructions concerning religion.

Article 17 of the law contained prohibitions which had not been previously enforced on an all-union scale. Article 17 says,

Religious associations are forbidden: (a) to establish mutual aid funds, co-operative and productive associations, and in general to use the property at their disposal for any other purpose than the satisfying of religious needs; (b) to give material aid to their members; to organize either special meetings for children, youth, women, for prayer and other purposes, or general meetings, group circles, departments biblical, literary, handworking, labour, religious study, and so on, and also to organize excursions and children's playgrounds, to open libraries or reading rooms, to organize sanatoria and medical aid. Only such books as are necessary for the performance of services are permitted to be kept in the Church buildings and houses of prayer. 32

The Fourteenth Congress of the Soviets was held in Moscow in April, 1929. Because the government had not been successful in breaking completely the power of the Church, the Congress proposed a revision of the article in the Constitution of 1918

---

regarding religion. Article 13 of this Constitution had recognized the free distribution of religious and anti-religious propaganda. The proposed amendment, which was later adopted, said: "In order to provide the workers' actual freedom of conscience, the Church is separated from the State and the school from the Church, while freedom for religious confession and anti-religious propaganda is recognized for all citizens." An interpretation of religious freedom was given by the People's Commissariat of Justice in 1926. The following was the Soviet idea of justice:

Our jurisprudence provides the fullest measure of conscience; however, not in an objective but in a subjective sense; that is the Soviet government does not hinder any individual from believing in anything whatsoever, or from believing in nothing whatsoever so long as his actions are not contrary to law and to the interests of other citizens.33

According to the new law, religion was to consist only of rites and confession. Only printed anti-religious propaganda was to be distributed. The League of Militant Atheists attempted to show the youth of the land the falseness of religion and instill in them a contempt for anything religious.

In 1929 the first Five Year Plan was ready, and mass collectivism was started. The renewed persecution of the Church came with this movement because the Church had been a vital element in village life and was known to be hostile to

33 Paul B. Anderson, "Russia Creates a New Law on Religion," The Christian Century, XL (October 9, 1929), 1246.
collectivism. Churches were closed, turned into granaries, movie houses, or clubs. The closing of the churches was carried on in connection with the collectivizing of the village. In mass meetings there would be a show of hands to see whether the Church was closed or not. In this manner, the government could say that the people were the ones who had closed the churches. It was usually the young pioneers of collectivism that decided whether the churches would be closed or not. It was no longer a question of whether some wanted to attend Church, but whether the community as a whole would decide to convert the building to some other use—for instance, a club or reading room.34

There was a linking of the priest and the kulak, or wealthy peasant, in their rebellion against the government. Both were threatened with destruction by the trend at this time, the one through forcible absorption in an agrarian scheme which leaves no place for the middle class virtues of profit-seeking enterprise; the other through atheistic teachings of communism. The collective farms at this time formed the pivot of the Soviet socialization policy and was used as a spearhead in the assault against organized religion. Religious activity of any kind was not permitted with the collectives; and since coercive measures were employed to bring the

34Sir Bernard Pares, Russia, p. 175.
peasantry within the new agrarian organization, this meant
the gradual encroachment upon the domain of the Church in the
village, its former stronghold which could not but arouse the
opposition of the priests.\textsuperscript{35} Many times the villagers opposed
the closing of the churches, and the government had to send
troops into the village to quell the riots. Also, the villagers
in 1930 refused to work and plant crops because of collectivism.
The government feared that there would be no harvest; so it had
to issue a decree separating collectivism and the de-Christian-
ization of the countryside. The decree said that the closing
of the churches was against the will of the people.

Besides the closing of the churches, the clergy were ar-
rested, exiled, and imprisoned. In many instances they were
executed. Sometimes the priest would be arrested because the
government thought he was inciting a rebellion. The priest
may have been guilty, or he may not have been guilty—the main
idea of the government was to crush religion, to crush it at
its source. Sometimes the priests were taken when a Soviet
official was murdered, whether he had anything to do with the
murder or not.

More successful than the direct attack on religion was
the indirect attack of establishing the six-day work week.
This decree was issued on September 24, 1929. The workers

\textsuperscript{35}Edgar S. Furniss, "Class War Linked with Anti-Religion
were to work five days and rest one. Of course, the rest day would come on Sunday only once in a great while. This caused a tremendous falling off of church attendance, because there was a threat of loss of work and loss of food if one missed a work-day. Also another indirect method was the introduction of anti-religious propaganda into the schools. Textbooks were used to teach the class roots of religion and to show its incompatibility with science.

On December 27, 1932, a decree was passed that said priests were forbidden to live in towns. This made it necessary for them to go back and forth from the country to the city in order to carry on their work. Sometimes the peasant would harbor a priest, but if it were found out, he would likely be taxed more heavily for showing consideration for the priest. Because the priest was cut off from his parish, he would in many instances become a travelling missionary. He would go from parish to parish conducting christenings, weddings, and other religious ceremonies.

The decree separating the collectivism movement and de-Christianization, the severe condemnation of the government's policy toward religion by Pope Pius XI and various Protestant countries caused the government to relax its wave of persecution. These condemnations threatened Russia with withdrawal

36Sir Bernard Pares, Russia and the Peace, p. 42.
37Timasheff, op. cit., p. 44.
of recognition, and she needed economic help of the foreign nations to accomplish her first Five Year Plan.\textsuperscript{38}

There was a let-up in religious persecution between 1934 and 1937. The government made many concessions: anti-Easter and anti-Christmas literature was taken out of the stores; stores were allowed to sell the special ingredients needed for the traditional Easter and Christmas cakes; anti-Easter and anti-Christmas festivals were discontinued. Christmas trees were allowed to be lighted up and wedding rings were manufactured. There was a great increase in church weddings. Also there was greater difficulty in getting divorces and re-marrying. The indoctrination of the official dogma was taken out of the grammar schools, and it was restricted in high schools. However, it was left intact in the institutions of higher learning.\textsuperscript{39}

The Soviets established another constitution in 1936. The Russians claimed it to be the most democratic constitution in the world. It still excluded the freedom of distributing religious propaganda, but it abolished some of the civil disabilities of the clergy. Article 135 said, "Election of deputies are universal: all citizens of the U.S.S.R. who have reached the age of eighteen, irrespective of race or nationality, religion...social origin, property status or past activities, have the right to vote in the election of deputies and to be

\textsuperscript{38}Ibid., p. 45. \textsuperscript{39}Ibid., p. 48.
elected, with the exception of insane persons who have been convicted by a court of law and whose sentences were deprivation of electoral rights."\textsuperscript{40}

The third great wave of direct persecution of the Church followed this constitutional enactment. The attack came in 1937 and 1938, and the purpose was to prevent the religious organizations from having too much influence in electing friendly Soviet deputies. The Church was accused of organizing espionage and sabotage in the interests of Japan and Germany. The government hoped to finally destroy the prestige of the Church by trying to brand it as an enemy of the people. Many clergymen were arrested, tried, exiled, and executed. This period of religious persecution was carried on when there was a great purge in political affairs.

In 1939 the atheists were instructed to be careful in offending the religious sentiments of the people. Soviet agencies were instructed to stop all attempts to liquidate religion. Trials against the clergy were stopped. Anti-religious propaganda was to be milder and more respectful. Christianity was to be tolerated with veneration due to its historical rule, and propagandists were no longer to show contempt for the word "Church."\textsuperscript{41}

In 1940 the \textit{Godless}, the official paper of the League of

\textsuperscript{40}Frederick L. Schuman, \textit{Soviet Politics}, Appendix I, p. 640.  
\textsuperscript{41}Timasheff, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 123.
Militant Atheists, printed a decree issued by Stalin that Sunday was to be restored because it was the wish of the majority of the people. The Central Committee of the Communist Party, however, reminded its party members that they were forbidden to practice religion.\textsuperscript{42}

The outbreak of the German-Russian war brought relief in the persecution of the religious believers. The principal reason for the new reforms lay in the religious sentiments of the population, particularly in the villages. It was possible to ignore them when the government had to deal with collectives and purges, but when the peasants were mobilized for a life and death struggle, it was necessary for the government to take a step backward and adopt a policy of the needs of the peoples. The government granted many concessions, but the Church usually had to pay for the concessions with political moves.\textsuperscript{43} The Church from the first co-operated in calling for sacrifices for the services of the country. Metropolitan Sergius declared his support of the war in the name of the Church and prayed for the success of the Russian Army in 1941.


\textsuperscript{43} David J. Dallin, \textit{The Real Soviet Russia}, translated by Joseph Shaplen, p. 61.
CONCLUSION

During the time of national crises, such as the attack of the Poles in the sixteenth century and the attack of Napoleon in the nineteenth century, the Orthodox Church in Russia has been very influential in rallying the people behind the government to repulse the attackers. Together, the people and the army have been able to repulse these attacks. Such a national crisis arose in 1941, when Hitler started his invasion into Russia.

Since the beginning of its regime, the Soviet government has attacked the Orthodox Church and religion in general. A question comes to mind as to why the Communists did not realize the religious fervor of the people and try to use it to foster their ideas. It seems the Communists saw how the Church had helped to keep the people in ignorance and superstition in order to foster the autocratic ideas of the Tsarist State. Through a process of education, they hoped to make the people realize the falseness of the Orthodox religion. If they were to succeed in making the people think the Orthodox religion was false, the Communists hoped to replace it with the Communist Faith. Also, it seems the Communists realized that through the years the traditions of the Church and its dogmas
were so imbedded in the officials of the Church and in the minds of the people that the Soviet State did not see how it could possibly use the Church. Realizing this, the State decided to break the power of the Church by doing away with its leaders. Without leaders, it was hoped that the people would turn to the State for leadership to a better Russian way of life.

The Communists got off to a wrong start with the Church because of the fact that they advocated the nationalization of all property and said there was no God. Both of these facts were in opposition to the beliefs of the Church. The opposition of the Church to the new regime eventually brought on the first direct attack on the Church in 1922-1923. This attack was aimed specifically at the Orthodox Church because of its association with the Tsarist regime. Under the Tsar, the Church was used as an organization in carrying out the will of the Tsar; but many of the clergy as individuals were liberals and opposed the methods of the Tsarist State. Despite the presence of liberalism among the Clergy, the Communist State saw that they would have too much opposition in trying to use the Church for the fostering of its ideas. Probably another reason for not using the Church was that they considered religion in direct opposition to science. In the Constitution of 1918, freedom of conscience was to be permitted for all.
The Soviets rather encouraged the other religions in the hope of breaking the power of the Church more quickly. However, they realized that religion in general was dangerous to their regime; so the next two direct attacks—in 1929-1930 and 1937-1938—were aimed at all religions, with special emphasis being put on breaking the power of the Orthodox Church.

After about twenty years of persecution, the State realized the Church still existed, if not in organized form, at least in spirit and in the minds of the people. When the German invasion started, Metropolitan Sergius, the acting Patriarch, during high Mass offered up prayers for the victory of the Soviet troops. He sent out a message to all the Orthodox Churches of Russia, encouraging the people to use every effort and to offer prayers for the defeat of the enemy of the people. He wrote:

The Orthodox Church always has shared the nation's fate. It always has carried its burdens and cherished its successes. We will not desert the nation now, Christ's Church blesses all Orthodox members defending the Fatherland's sacred borders. God will grant victory.¹

It was impossible for the Soviet government to ignore the message because it needed the support of all the peoples in successfully repulsing the German attack. Not long after the invasion, the government called on all the "God-loving Russians" to rise up and defend their religion. In this manner the Soviet government showed that it had changed its religious policy, for

¹Timasheff, op. cit., p. 136.
the time being at least. It probably realized that religion would have to be tolerated.

The government permitted churches to re-open, and in October, 1945, the Council of People’s Commissars established a Soviet Council on Orthodox affairs to work with the Soviet Commission of Religious Cults.² The Council was headed by G. G. Karpov, and he insisted that the basic purpose of the Council was to maintain contact between the Church and State. In 1945 the Council permitted the re-opening of a number of theological seminaries. In its attack on the Church, the State hoped to break the power of the Church by striking at its source, that of allowing no men to train for the priesthood. The State knew that some of the men were trained for the priesthood in foreign training centers, and probably it realized that some of these men might enter Russia and take up their duties as priests. Because of their training abroad, the priests would be more apt to be enemies of the State. Thus, after the government decided to tolerate religion, it decided that it must regulate it also. Inside Russia the patriarchal Church had shown a desire to integrate Christianity with Soviet patriotism. It was obviously better, if the Church had come to stay, to see that its hierarchs were reared in this atmosphere and stood behind these principles.³

In September, 1945, two decrees were declared that showed

²Casey, op. cit., p. 183. ³Ibid., p. 185.
the State's new attitude toward the Church. First, approximately one half of the property of the Church that was confiscated in 1923 was restored. Second, the ancient shrines were restored. Another thing, a Sobor was called to consider the problems of the Church and a new patriarch was elected to take the place of Sergius who had died. Alexei, Metropolitan of Leningrad and Novgorod, was elected and installed.

Thus, it seems that a new phase of Church and State relationship has been entered. Whether the Church will be allowed freedom in its sphere, or whether it will be controlled by the State to the best advantage of the State remains for the future to decide. It would seem that the Church is emerging because the State has found out that there is a place for it, both at home and abroad, in the Soviet scheme of things. The Communists have considered themselves the promoters of a new way of life. The Church has considered Moscow as the "Third Rome," and from it the salvation of the world would come about. Can it be that the Soviets hope to use the Church in its effort to dominate the world? Within the last two years there has been a movement to unite all Russian Orthodox Churches at home and abroad.

\[4\text{Ibid., p. 186.}\]

\[5\text{Harrison Salisbury, Russia on the Way, p. 282.}\]
Father George\(^6\) in his book *God's Underground* thinks that the Church of Alexei in Russia now is only a puppet of the State. He also says there is an underground religious movement in Russia and that many of the people within its borders are rather skeptical of the Soviet's "religious toleration." The people seem to think that it is just a prelude to another attack on religion. Father George thinks that the supposed toleration is an important scheme in trying to win the support of the peoples within the Soviet sphere of influence. Can the trial of Cardinal Mindszenty in Hungary and the trial of the Protestant leaders in Bulgaria be an indication of the future policy of launching another attack on religion in the Communist attempt to stamp it out? Is the Russian government attempting to put Orthodoxy in the place of other religions with the hopes of controlling all?

"Will Christianity survive in Russia?" is another question that arises in the minds of the people. Writing in 1929, Matthew Spinka said that the survival of Christianity in Russia was linked with the survival of Christianity in other parts of the world. However, the problem of survival is different in Russia because the religious level of Christianity has been lower than in some of the other countries. Consequently,

---

\(^6\)Father George is not the author's name. His name cannot be publicly disclosed because of his association with the Christian Underground in countries under USSR control. He is a Greek Catholic priest that was attached to the Red Army incognito for eighteen months. He spent six of those months travelling inside Russia itself. His connection with the Christian underground movement in Europe naturally made him very much interested in the religious situation in Russia today.
atheism has been able to find greater support than in the other countries. The greatest problem of Christianity in the world today is what to do in a materialistic world. Spinka goes on to say,

If the question of whether Russian Christianity shall be able to survive implies whether its present ecclesiastical organization with its ancient doctrinal formulation and cults can preserve its exact identity unchanged, the answer is not difficult; as long as the general ignorance hitherto so characteristic of the Russian peasant prevails, no great modification in his religious habits may be expected. If, however, the government succeeds in organizing its educational system in a thorough going manner, and if the younger generation quite generally shares the educational privileges thus provided, there is no doubt that this will imply a considerable change in the religious thinking of the nation.

It is said of the Russian that he is very religious. If the Communistic idealism is unable to give the people some assurance and security, and if through a process of education the people turn to religion, there is a great possibility that Orthodoxy and all forms of Christianity will have a greater spiritual essence in the future than in the past. Father George says that there exists quite a bit of confusion in the minds of many people that have been educated along Communistic lines of thought. So, it may be that if the Church can alter its methods and give the people a great amount of spiritual satisfaction, it will be able to grow much stronger. If the State were to modify its atheistic teachings and work out a compromise with

---

the teachings of the Church, it is possible that there might be a better co-operation between Church and State in developing the future way of life for Russia. It remains, however, for the future to decide the type of relationship that will exist between the Church and State. Will it be one of complete sub-

jection as in the latter days of Tsardom? Or will it be one of equal power with the State? Or will the Church of the future prove to be greater and more influential upon the people than the State?
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