

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *Scottish Bulletin of Evangelical Theology* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_sbct-01.php

Russophobia, Antisemitism and Christianity: Some Remarks on an Anti-Russian Idea*

ZOYA KRAKHMAL'NIKOVA

One More Apocalypse?

'I myself am a Christian and consequently not a Marxist'.¹ So the readers of *Moskovskiy novosti* were told by I. R. Shafarevich, author of the book *Rusofobiya*, published in 1989 by the journal *Nash sovremennik* and the Russian National Union in Munich. In this book, whether he intends to or not, the Christian Shafarevich expresses the anti-Christian ideology of antisemitism and Russian chauvinism.

Shafarevich, who belongs to the 'scientific establishment' (he is a corresponding member of the Academy of Sciences and a winner of the Lenin Prize), has undoubtedly rendered a considerable service to those who share his views: members of the *Pamyat'* organisation and writers who belong to the so-called 'right-wing bloc' and consider themselves 'true sons of Russia'.² Everyone knows how important ideology is for establishing a programme of activities.

This service has proved particularly valuable to Shafarevich's fellow-thinkers, as it has been almost impossible to revive the ideology of antisemitism, on which German Nazism was based, after the latter's defeat in the Second World War. Shafarevich himself admits this in setting out the 'distinct concept' that he was convinced he could discern, after 'fate', as he writes, 'seemed to lift the lid of the cauldron in which our future was coming to the boil', and thus allowed the author to glance into it.³

The prophecy that Shafarevich derived from the cauldron informs us that our motherland, now on the brink of catastrophe, has been ruined and is still being ruined by the Jews, who form the core of a 'Little Nation'. The Little Nation has attached itself, like a leech, to the 'Great Nation', is constantly trying, with all its might, to defeat it – by forcing its own conception of history upon the Great Nation, thus bringing the latter to the point of cataclysm – and is now trying to force upon it a form of democracy that will eventually destroy it. The Great Nation is seen by our prophet as weak and pitiful, hypnotised by the evil will of the Little Nation, which now permits itself the effrontery of boiling up the future of the Great Nation in a cauldron! Not only has this Gulliver been tied up by the malicious Lilliputians, like Swift's hero; in Shafarevich's presentation there is hardly anything left of him.

How could this empty concept arise in the mind of a man trying to defend his own people from slander? Where did it come from? Obviously the author finds it simpler to proclaim his mission as the defender of Russia in this godless void, this desert where the defeated Gulliver lies. Where the people are silent and inactive prophets find it easier to proclaim their own truth.

*This article first appeared in Russian under the title 'Rusofobiya, khristianstvo, antisemitizm: zametki ob antirussoi ideye' in the Leningrad journal *Neva* no. 8 (1990), pp. 163–78.

At the end of his book, Shafarevich informs us that if he had not spoken the truth he could not have died in peace (p. 113). It was only in bygone days that Russians felt it unbecoming to speak well of themselves, when they did not venture to assume that they had a right to die in peace, as they knew by faith that only God, who is in charge of both the living and the dead, has the right to grant the possibility of a 'peaceful death'. This phrase at the end of the book 'fires its shot' like a rifle hanging on the wall at the time it is supposed to fire. At the beginning of his work, the author is already telling his readers that they will unavoidably 'come up against a question that has been absolutely banned among the whole of mankind today' (p. 10). Shafarevich tackles this task, naturally that of a prophet, for how could any ordinary person think of eliminating an *absolute* ban, imposed on 'the whole of mankind today'? We are further informed, probably in order that we should understand more clearly the greatness of this aim, that the ban is not recorded in any laws, but that *everybody* knows of it. And all of them 'obediently leave their thoughts at the forbidden boundary' (*ibid.*).

All of them do – but not the author of *Rusofobiya*. Without false modesty, he states that he intends to cross 'the forbidden boundary'. 'Why?', the reader might risk asking. And he will receive the reply: 'mankind cannot walk for ever spiritually muzzled' (so he says!). How Shafarevich intends to remove humanity's 'spiritual muzzle', the reader will have to discover as events unfold.

Forgetting Details

One would think that in mathematics, which is Shafarevich's speciality, he would find it impossible to be a dilettante, but academics devoted to the 'exact sciences' are sometimes of the opinion that the philosophy of culture, religious or historical philosophy, is 'second class' and that what is not permitted in mathematics is allowable in that sphere. Shafarevich allows himself to be arbitrarily imprecise about facts, but not only because he is merely dabbling in the sphere of thought and knowledge that he has now taken up, and obviously not because his mathematical mind wants to have a rest from strict logic and find distraction in the fields of philosophy, history or culture. Every time his mind romps in these pastures, he not only violates investigative logic, but deliberately resorts to distorting realities, which he clearly feels will boost the success of his book.

Let us turn to the facts. In order to demonstrate the truth of his prophecies, the author of *Rusofobiya* gives a selection of quotations from the works of literary figures, philosophers and journalists who make up the so-called 'core of the Little Nation' and whose villainous intention is to bring the Great Nation to 'the brink of catastrophe, after which nothing is likely to remain of our people' (p. 108).

In order to acquaint his readers with the biographical particulars of the authors of these hostile theories, Shafarevich uses footnotes in which he gives information about his opponents. However, here we notice something strange: the author gives various biographical data concerning the authors of these quotations, but when the people concerned are already dead he conceals the fact. Thus, in quoting from the works of Andrei Amal'rik, Aleksandr Galich and Nadezhda Mandel'shtam, Shafarevich fails to mention in the biographical footnotes about them that these people died several years ago. Why did he find it necessary to hide the fact that his opponents were dead? Why quote from works that were written 15 or 20 years ago, sometimes under pseudonyms? After all, *Rusofobiya* is presented to readers as a prophecy in 1989.

This is characteristic of the method used by our prophet. Dead opponents, like out-

dated quotations from works signed with pseudonyms, are necessary to Shafarevich for the same reason that Chichikov needed the 'dead souls'. The Little Nation has to have a certain number of *members*. The dead must be represented as living. However, we shall discuss that later on. For the present, we ought to continue our conversation about the discipline of mathematics and the 'mathematical mind'. So we must turn to a favourite theme of Shafarevich's, which he recently outlined in an article entitled 'Fenomen emigratsii' ('The phenomenon of emigration').

Both *Rusofobiya* and 'Fenomen emigratsii' contain similar ideas about emigration – and there is nothing surprising in that, as the author is free to repeat his ideas in various different publications, free to repeat them or not to repeat them. So, for example, both *Rusofobiya*, which was published in 1989 in Munich by the Russian National Union, and 'Fenomen emigratsii', published in *Literaturnaya Rossiya* in the same year (5 September), mention that Shafarevich spoke of the essential nature of the emigration of the 1970s at one of his press conferences. This refers to the press conference at the time of publication in 1974 of the essay collection *Iz-pod glyb (From under the Rubble)*, one of whose authors was Shafarevich. It was at this press conference that he first expressed his main concept of emigration as a defeat. Leading figures of Russian culture had

simply not withstood the pressure. . . as it turned out, they did not have enough spiritual values, which might have outweighed ordeals that were of course severe, but could certainly have been overcome by human forces. And if that is so, how can we say that they made any significant contribution?

In *Rusofobiya* this quotation is concealed by means of dotted lines, the author having deliberately broken it off at precisely the point where he denies that émigrés might possess 'spiritual values'. Why then does Shafarevich refuse to cite his 'fundamental principles' in the Munich edition? This is no mystery, as the quotation refers directly to his publishers: *Rusofobiya* was published by Russian émigrés. So it could hardly be stated, in their publication, that they were incapable, in Shafarevich's words, of making 'a significant contribution to culture'.

There is a more important aspect to this 'phenomenal theme'. In 'Fenomen emigratsii', the author not only goes in for 'self-quotation', he embarks on 'self-mythologisation'. In the same interview, given to mark the publication of the essay collection *Iz-pod glyb*, Shafarevich announced (as we discover in the same article in *Literaturnaya Rossiya*) that 'among those who bravely declared their views at the time when the first voices were heard protesting against the lies and cruelty of the 1960-70s' were some who had decided to emigrate. 'And I remember', the author of this article continues, 'our feeling of shock, when it became clear that our comrades, with whom we had imagined we would be standing together *to the last, bearing all persecutions*, all of a sudden were packing their suitcases and unexpectedly disappearing from our midst and from our country' (emphasis added).

Any reader of these lines who has lived in an information 'vacuum' for many years will naturally become indignant, together with Shafarevich, at those who packed their suitcases and disappeared, leaving Shafarevich to 'bear all persecutions. . . to the last'. However, openness (*glasnost*) also exists in order to expose myths. Regrettably, Shafarevich's words about 'all persecutions' belong to the same type of declaration as the hopes expressed by him concerning his right to 'die in peace' after removing mankind's 'spiritual muzzle'. Readers of the article 'Fenomen emigratsii' have been misled: Shafarevich has not succeeded as yet in fulfilling his hopes of being persecuted

'to the last', any more than he has succeeded in fulfilling his dream of saving Russia through self-sacrifice – for which he appealed in his article 'Yest'-li budushcheye u Rossii?' ('Does Russia have a future?'), published as part of *Iz-pod glyb*.

'So this is the conclusion we have reached' [wrote Shafarevich in this article]:

Russia's fate is in our hands, it depends on the personal efforts of each and every one of us – but the essential contributions to the cause can be made only through self-sacrifice. . . . Self-sacrifice offers the same sense of uplift and joy and gives a meaning to life. If more than just a few individuals can rise to the pitch where they are ready to sacrifice themselves, souls will be cleansed and the soil prepared for the growth of religion.⁴

In quoting these words by Shafarevich I feel somewhat embarrassed. It would be cruel to reproach the author of these lines for not having had the moral strength to follow in the footsteps of those who heeded his appeal for self-sacrifice and paid the price in prisons, camp sentences and exile, or to recall that Shafarevich did not even dare to speak out in their defence, as others did. So we shall not start to reproach the author – not under any circumstances. Let God be his judge – who knows, perhaps a time will come when Shafarevich too will fulfil his dream of sacrificing himself. However, it might be important for the author of *Rusofobiya* to remember the words of Christ: 'But go ye and learn what that meaneth: I will have mercy and not sacrifice' (Matthew 9: 13).

Let us now return to 'Fenomen emigratsii'. The author of this article carefully analyses the type of émigrés who, as I have already quoted, did not wish to bear 'all persecutions' with him and, having packed their suitcases, 'unexpectedly disappeared'; but I am convinced that the phenomenon of emigration cannot be fully studied, if the researcher ignores another very typical 'phenomenon'. I refer to the opportunity that has arisen in our land of packing a suitcase and then not carrying it away but *sitting on it*, of remaining where you are, of sitting there *as if you did not exist*.

Surely sitting on suitcases, in case they might be taken away, is less dignified than getting ready to carry them away. However, there is also a third way. It came to an end in the December dusk of 1990, when Academician A. D. Sakharov was escorted on his last journey by a penitent and humble Moscow. For almost a whole day the city said its farewell to the man who had been a constant and tireless defender of the persecuted. He had no time to pack a suitcase, when he was sent to suffer exile in Gor'ky because he had spoken up in defence of the men being sent to their deaths in Afghanistan. His life was a model of penitence and expiation, he knew that mercy was greater than sacrifice, and therefore the countless bouquets of flowers that millions of people brought him bore the phrase 'Forgive us'. For the same reason, in many churches in our homeland, the funeral service was read on his behalf and he was mourned by those who knew the price of his compassion. He did not preach self-sacrifice, nor did he preach hatred. And the peoples of Russia, weary of hatred – like millions throughout the world – mourned his departure.

When prisoners of conscience were returning from prisons, camps and exile in 1987, *Rusofobiya* was already being disseminated in *samizdat*. It could well be that the author had decided to present this particular work to our homeland as a saving sacrifice. This also comes into 'Fenomen emigratsii': an intense feeling of guilt towards the abandoned homeland gives rise to daring plans for its salvation and to a thirst for prophecy – especially when one's fellow-countrymen are in deadly danger.

It is possible that this book was written during precisely those years of dark and

gloomy 'stagnation', when the power of Brezhnev and Andropov, ruining the country and enslaving its nationalities with ever-increasing speed, was being established on the foundations of hatred, fear and treachery. The young men for whom Shafarevich showed such concern in *Rusofobiya* were being driven to their deaths in Afghanistan, while the prisons, camps and psychiatric hospitals were filling up with individuals who had not called for sacrifice but did not want to sacrifice their consciences. Perhaps it was then, when people were afraid to name those who were really responsible for the approaching catastrophe and wanted to suppress their own feelings of guilt, that a guilty party was named. This topic – criminal guilt – is very popular in gaol.

When I returned from exile, I did not succeed in 'fishing out' of *samizdat* the already 'fashionable' work *Rusofobiya*. It was only when I ended up in the West that I easily obtained this book, with the author's portrait on the cover. My acquaintances felt relieved to get rid of it – they are among the Russian Orthodox believers who feel squeamish about antisemitism.

Surely Pomerants is not the Only One?

It is now time for us to return to Gulliver. We left him in the desert, laid low in the dust. The dreadful Lilliputians, who form part of the despicable Little Nation, had been tormenting the helpless, bound Gulliver and the author of *Rusofobiya* had decided the time had come to set him free.

We have returned to the origin of this tragedy and have begun to follow carefully the manoeuvres of the Little Nation, as described in Shafarevich's book. And now a fantastic picture is revealed to us: it turns out that Gulliver – the Great Nation, abandoned in the desert – is not only helpless, according to his chronicler, but also inactive, although he has long been forced – by the Jews, to be precise – to carry out revolutions, organise the Terror, the *gulag* and so on. In this historical crime novel, the enslaved Great Nation not only seems to have had no defenders, but it could not, of course, defend itself (without the author's help!). However, it also turned out that the Little Nation itself did not exist.

All the enslavers, all the ideologues and leaders against whom the author directs his fury, are now inaccessible far from us and strong border posts and mighty border guards stand between them and us. All of them have long since packed their suitcases and left us, not to mention those who have died long since, but they are necessary to Shafarevich, just as Chichikov's 'dead souls' were necessary to him: to make up the numbers.

It turns out, however, that the numbers do not exist and neither does the Little Nation. Out of 18 literary figures, philosophers and journalists who, in Shafarevich's book, represent not only the core of the Little Nation but even, so to speak, its 'brains', the 'creators of its concepts' and the 'generators of its ideas' (those who, as Shafarevich assures us, are busy destroying all that contributes to the existence of the Great Nation), *only* Grigori Pomerants is still with us, on this side of the border. Is Shafarevich really assigning to him alone the most evil role in his science-fiction narrative: that of cooking up our future in his cauldron?

It could be said that this is not a matter of numbers but of truth. However, Shafarevich needs numbers as such, or he would not have included so many similar quotations, but would have reduced them by a third and concentrated on the truth. Unfortunately, his concepts are as unreliable as the numbers of his imaginary nation.

Their essential nature is revealed in the methods used by Shafarevich, for his methods lay bare their lack of substance. All the examples, quotations, surnames and

biographical footnotes, the whole so-called 'style' of Shafarevich's work, are recognisably typical of the Soviet denunciatory document, which does not touch on the truth, because the authors of such documents were and are uninterested in the truth. The whole factual side of Shafarevich's work is reminiscent not only of the Stalinist and Zhdanovite works that laid the foundation for such party 'documentation', but also of the 'examination records of the material evidence of crime' that used to be compiled by KGB and MVD investigators, when sentences had to be passed because of quotations in books, articles and manuscripts. This police method was worked out long ago and has been essentially summed up in the melancholy witticism, 'I give him a quotation and he gives me a term of exile'. Convicting people for quotations taken out of context and defined as 'means of subversion' is a practice typical of those who rewarded such subversion with Article 70, camps, exile and death.

The beauty of mathematics lies in its faithfulness to its own laws. However, there is another sphere of life, which has a beauty greater than that of all the exact sciences. It is the life of conscience, the life of the human spirit. It has the strictest rules and, according to them, feelings of hatred and revenge are destructive to this sphere of existence. A single thought can land a man in hell – that was the teaching of the Holy Fathers of the Orthodox Church.

Of course, before us lies the phenomenon of religion, which is so much more significant than 'the phenomenon of emigration' that so occupies the mathematical mind of our researcher. In reading the book *Rusofobiya* and the article 'Fenomen emigratsii', we find ourselves in the 'fiery course of nature', in the words of the Apostle St James (James 3: 5–6). In the fiery course of nature created by Shafarevich, the fire of hatred burns, awakening a desire for reprisals. Even when he is dealing only with Andrei Sinyavsky, author of the book *Progulki s Pushkinym (Walks with Pushkin)*, which shocked lovers of our country's literature by its free and easy tone and opinions, Shafarevich threatens him ('We shall give him our answer one day!') but first falls into ecstasies at the power of the Muslim world, which has condemned to death a writer who offended religious feelings. And this is what we read in the work of a man who calls himself a Christian!

Christianity and Shafarevich's Antisemitism

I must ask the reader to forgive me for such a long preamble to the main theme of my remarks, that is my analysis of Shafarevich's ideas from the point of view of Christian teaching. If the author of *Rusofobiya* had not declared so loudly that he is a Christian, if the anonymous author of the foreword to *Rusofobiya* had not been so obviously rapturous at Shafarevich's confession that he was a Christian, it would hardly have been worthwhile to analyse yet another variation of ideological antisemitism, even one that proclaimed itself to be a prophecy.

Human history has known various kinds of antisemitism, from the vulgar, ordinary sort to the 'higher' racist variety that thrust representatives of the Little Nation into the gas chambers. However, human history has not known Christian antisemitism, if Christianity is considered to be profession of faith in Christ – that faith whose basis is revealed to mankind in the Gospels. True Christianity and antisemitism are irreconcilable.

Nevertheless, humanity has known cases of antisemitism among those who call themselves Christians: the ideological conception of pogroms, the dissemination of the *Protocols of the Elders of Zion*, theories of 'racial nonentity', of Jewish

Lilliputians and their crimes against Great Nations, which often are not a dispute between representatives of various denominations and world-views but ideological reprisals. The Jewish pogroms, like the mass extermination of Jews by the Nazis, are historical realities planned with the aid of doctrines, conceptions, theories and prophecies that people who called themselves Christians helped to invent.

However, Antichrist also makes himself out to be Christ, and Satan 'is transformed into an angel of light', as the Apostle Paul informs us. Christ warns us more than once against false Christs and false prophets – 'Many will come in My name', He tells us (Matthew 24: 5), 'And many false prophets shall arise and deceive many, and because iniquity shall abound, the love of many shall wax cold' (Matthew 24: 11–12). Why then should Satan take on the appearance of 'an angel of light' and Antichrist pretend to be Christ? Christ answers this question. Satan is a murderer, 'he is a liar and the father of lies' (John 8: 44). In order to profane Christianity – the Good News of hope, of victory over death through the great act of love – and to turn mankind away from it, he makes use of those who call themselves Christians while not knowing what Christianity is. It is through them that Satan sows the seeds of falsehood and hatred.

Christianity is not an ideology, but life in Christ, unity with the Uncreated and inextinguishable Light of life, the eternal God. Unlike other religions, which allow for the possibility of despising and hating your enemy or killing him, the Revelation of God to man, as it appears in the Gospels, not only rules out the possibility of taking vengeance on your enemy, of condemning him to death, but even rules out *thinking* about taking vengeance on your enemy or desiring vengeance.

Christians are called on to denounce 'the unfruitful works of darkness' (Ephesians 5: 11), satanic lies and violence, heresies and treachery to God, but only in order to *return* souls to God. Christians are called on not to curse, but to bless those who hate them. 'Dearly beloved, avenge not yourselves, but rather give place to the wrath of God' (Romans 12: 14–21). A Christian believes that *noone* can harm him or the nation to which he belongs contrary to the will of God.

The first Christian martyr, Stephen, prophesying to the Jews and trying to bring them to the saving faith, said to them: 'Ye stiff-necked and uncircumcised in hearts and ears, you do always resist the Holy Ghost, as your fathers did, so do ye.' And when they were killing him, he 'knelt down and cried with a loud voice: Lord lay not this sin to their charge' (Acts 7: 51–60). That is how faith behaves in the life that has no beginning and no end, in which our deeds will be judged by the Creator of all things.

Such a life is ruined when the human mind, yielding to the satanic temptations of hatred, condemnation of others and vengeance, allows itself to act in such a way. The soul tears itself away from Christ, falls into the 'fiery course of nature' where Christianity – as service to the God of love – becomes impossible.

'The Party is Always Right'

So said yet another active supporter of the 'patriotic front' – the artist Il'ya Glazunov.⁵ He could be considered 'the Father of Russophobia'. As long ago as 1978, when his fellow-thinker Shafarevich (whose portrait Glazunov was painting at the time) was only beginning to develop the idea of 'removing humanity's spiritual muzzle', Glazunov was already trying to touch that hateful muzzle with his brush.

It was Il'ya Glazunov's first exhibition at the Manezh Gallery – in 1978, at the height of the period of stagnation. According to the estimates of well-wishers, 5000 people came to see Glazunov's canvases. Their queues made Manezh Square look

untidy and the police guarded these living chains, so that there should be no disorder or quarrelling among the art-lovers; in the galleries, it was impossible to get near the canvases; cameras and cine-cameras were constantly clicking in one's ears, while the artist, who was given to describing himself as persecuted by everyone at all times, was now exchanging kisses in front of the flashing cameras and cine-cameras with important state officials, whose business was ideology.

A. Sofronov, who was the editor of *Ogonek* at the time and was a personality noted for his zeal in unmasking Christianity, was greeted affectionately by the hero of the opening day and walked quickly round the artist's works. The crowd standing along the walls pressed in on the editor and news photographers were trying to take his picture but could not quite manage it. Their lenses were blocked by other lenses wielded by ordinary owners of cameras and cine-cameras, all trying hurriedly to capture the artist's works. A few days later, Fr Dmitri Dudko, a priest who was in fashion at the time, produced an article proclaiming the triumph of Christianity at the Manezh Gallery. 'Art for the masses, pop art' – thus the art critics tried to explain Glazunov's success. 'The hunger for religion', asserted some religious believers, but others disagreed: it was 'commercial profiteering using Christ's name'. The neo-Slavophiles insisted that it was 'Ancient Russia'.

Il'ya Glazunov, who has come to be known as the 'king of kitsch', was famous in those years as a salon artist. He courted fame in diverse circles with his portraits of diplomats and members of their families, of well-known party leaders and statesmen. Glazunov paints people's eyes in a pseudo-icon style, which naturally impresses his models. In his portraits a church tends to be visible in the background, which also impresses his models; sometimes the artist decks his canvases with trinkets and adorns the headdresses of his Russian beauties with fake jewels and precious stones.

The pictures exhibited by Glazunov at that opening day in the Manezh had well-defined subjects: Russian history and modern life in Russia; Russian religious feeling; the murdered Tsarevich; princes, knights, Russian beauties (in tears) and churches; his self-portrait and those of his family in the pseudo-icon style (not faces – icons!). However, the most important picture in the exhibition was 'The Return' – an illustration of the Gospel parable of the return of the prodigal son, using Russian subject matter.

Here we have the lot: a table dripping with blood, at which the prodigal son had been feasting, a severed head on a platter (apparently St John the Baptist) and a fallen woman, as well as Satan, who has – as Fr Dmitri Dudko commented ecstatically – 'an un-Russian face'. Could he be a Jew, the spectators whisper to each other, gazing at the un-Russian face, who is offering the prodigal son a goblet filled with blood, obviously drained from the corpse stretched out on the blood-stained table (Glazunov loves depicting corpses, dripping blood from flat surfaces). Then there are some loathsome fat swine, and a piece of barbed wire on the bloody table. In addition there is the prodigal son, with his father, 'a Russian peasant' (as stated in the notes to the picture, written of course with the author's consent), who is blessing the son or perhaps just greeting him. And behind the father stand the saints and great men of Russian culture: Tolstoy is not there, but Dostoyevsky is; Mussorgsky is present, Borodin is not. Was there an agreed list? The notes to the picture state that its subject is a legend (thus the Gospel story of the prodigal son is described) concerning a son who left his father and later returned to him, and that here, in Glazunov's picture, he is returning to 'the bosom of national culture'! These notes are obviously intended to explain the meaning of the national religiosity in Glazunov's art. When I use the phrase 'national religiosity', it is with purpose – it has its own meaning and I shall

return to analyse it a little later.

It is not mere chance that I keep going back to that first exhibition at the Manezh Gallery, for it was there that we first recognised clearly the same shoots of Russian religious pseudo-patriotism (also called National Bolshevism) that are now scaring the world with their new fascism – enriched by the ‘prophetic’ theories of I. R. Shafarevich.

Five thousand came to gaze at the crosses desecrated in Russia and the idea of Russia coming back to life – an idea that was allowed to coexist with the Soviet idea on Glazunov’s canvases! It was worth wearing oneself out in the queues for five or six hours, just to see in the end this miracle, this festive occasion: at the gates of the Kremlin, near the closed cathedrals that had been turned into museums, crosses and churches were being permitted on canvas! The ‘miracle at the Manezh’ took place over ten years ago; today, this kind of miracle has become a daily occurrence – television, newspapers and the other mass media are eager to demonstrate that Christianity is allowed: crosses, churches, priests, *et al.*

What is the point of this Christianity, which is permitted by the atheist authorities, and what do the powers of this world get out of it? The devil, as we know, does not change. In one of his letters, St John of Kronstadt observed that sin was monotonous. Unchanging and monotonous, the devil’s ‘signature’ is always the same. God has not given him the gift of creation, so all his temptations are unchanging and monotonous. If we remember this, we shall be able to see this reiteration and monotony.

We can also see that the idea of ‘permitted Christianity’ is as old as the world is, if we remember Ivan Karamazov’s legend of the Grand Inquisitor, which described a similar miracle. The basic meaning of Karamazov’s legend is the lie about Christ and Christianity. That is why it was invented by the parricide Ivan, in order to justify himself. In order to justify parricide, Christianity must be ‘purged’ of the original principle of the Good News; the Gospel must be revised, by ‘abolishing’ repentance and proposing a Christianity ‘of one’s own’, convenient for rulers, which will allow the ‘alien’ to be called guilty and the guilty to justify themselves. In this ‘new Christianity’ the glory will belong to those who have permitted it. This will happen, I repeat, so that an inquisition can be carried out on the human soul.

‘Man is vile and weak’, argues the Grand Inquisitor.

What does it matter that now man is rebelling everywhere against our power and is proud of himself for rebelling? . . . Like small children, rebelling in class and driving out their teacher. But the children’s raptures will come to an end and will cost them dear. They will destroy the churches and soak the earth with blood. But will those stupid children finally guess that, although they are rebels, they are weak rebels, unable to sustain their rebellion?

What then can save the pitiful flock of ‘weak rebels’? Lies and the substitution of the false for the real. In order to ‘save’ the flock, the devil must be substituted for God. ‘We have corrected your great work’, the Inquisitor tells Christ, ‘We are not with you, but with him – that is our secret!’ ‘We are with him’ – that is the secret of every Inquisitor, in whatever aspect or disguise he appears, a secret that will inevitably be exposed and discredited by the Creator of all.

‘We will convince them’, the Inquisitor continues to reveal his secret, ‘that only then will they become free when they have resigned their freedom to us and have submitted to us.’ Later comes a description of the satanic idyll:

They will grow timid and begin looking up to us and cling to us in fear as chicks to the hen. . . . They will be helpless and in constant fear of our

wrath, their minds will grow timid, their eyes will always be shedding tears like women and children, but at the slightest sign from us they will be just as ready to turn to mirth and laughter, to bright-eyed gladness and happy childish song.

This idyll always ends, as we know, in the same way – with the murder of God. ‘You will behold the obedient flock which, at a mere sign from me, will rush to heap up hot coals against the stake at which I shall burn you, because you have come to meddle with us.’ This banal lie about God and man, terrible in its banality, could have arisen only in the mind of a parricide and fratricide. And of course it did not come into that mind of its own volition, for a lie is not independent and has no substance. It is the handiwork of ‘the spirit of self-destruction and non-existence’, as the Inquisitor describes the devil.

The lie is anti-truth, anti-right – it replaces truth and therefore it has no substance or independent existence, despite its monotony and repetitiveness. However, discovering the monotony and repetitiveness of lies is not simple – in order to do so, you need to know about Truth. Strictly speaking, the Grand Inquisitor’s whole series of lies is based on this – on his calculation that the flock does not know of the existence of Truth. So the Inquisitor’s main aim is to keep the flock away from the Truth, away from Christ, to substitute something else for Christ, to ‘correct His great work’, to pass Him off as someone else, to permit a Christianity of one’s own.

Church history has known various kinds of inquisition, set up by enemies of the Church who sometimes acted in its name. The stake has been replaced by spiritual violence, the result of lies, heresies and treachery. ‘We are with him.’ Satan is not only unchanging, he is vulgar and cynical – none of the inquisitors has been able to hide this fact. However, for a victory over lies, the Truth must be proclaimed; if false substitutes are to be exposed, we must know the reason for such substitution and the cause of the violence done to the truth.

‘The world is returning to paganism,’⁶ remarked S. I. Fudel, a church writer of our time, in his notes ‘U sten tserkvi’ (‘At the gates of the Church’). Of course, in leaving Christianity, the world is returning to paganism, while pretending that paganism is Christianity. Russia too is returning to paganism. The Revolution and all it brought with it was a rebellion against Christ, a rejection of Orthodoxy and a return to the pagan form of existence.

It is not enough to say that our homeland was plunged into a catastrophe of biblical proportions, a catastrophe linked with retribution for its rejection of the faith of our Fathers and betrayal of God. This might seem a superficial analogy, despite the obvious connection, between the Russia of today and the biblical prophecies uttered by God through His prophets. What God warned would happen to the people who betrayed Him has happened to us. A once fertile land was transformed before our eyes into a desert. Mankind did not believe the words of the prophets and the prophecies of God, and God showed mankind what the consequences were. Through Russia’s experiences, the Will of God is leading human history along a new path; towards the end of time, as we know from God’s Revelation to man, the alternatives offered to the individual and to mankind become more sharp and clear and the choice of heaven or hell acquires a unique immediacy.

In the very first years of our homeland’s post-October history, it swiftly developed into a new state, whose ideology proclaimed that it was the only doctrine in human history that could give individuals and nations the happiness they needed, thus establishing paradise on earth. This was not a new doctrine. Mankind has always wanted

to reestablish the lost Eden – to attain this aim on earth first of all and then, if possible, in heaven too, of course. But above all on earth – it is close and heaven is far away. However, the Soviet ‘paradise doctrine’ had to be fundamentally distinguished from all the possible ways known to man of building a ‘paradise’ on earth and also from the more common ‘earthly paradises’ that exist ‘in practice’ among the nations of the world, which are linked with a democratic way of life and a flourishing economy. The Soviet ‘paradise doctrine’ is above all a religious doctrine, as it declares that mankind will gain paradise only through faith in the ideals proclaimed by the doctrine’s founders – its founders and their successors.

It must be understood that the ideologists of the new world, the new paradise, which had to arise in the midst of millions of crosses and in an ocean of blood, would not be satisfied by success in the struggle for land and property. They understood that their booty, their appropriation and redistribution of material goods, was closely dependent on the process of ‘gaining souls’. Denying the existence of the soul but admitting the existence of consciousness (both social and individual), the founders of the paradise doctrine – and then their successors – fought to absorb the consciousness by ‘winning it over’ (a Leninist term).

A time comes when violent methods of ‘winning over the consciousness’ become the main ones. The won-over consciousness inevitably becomes that of a slave, who in order to remain among the living must love the gods and idols offered to his soul instead of the crucified God. For the human soul cannot exist in a void, cut off from the roots and essence of its being, and demands that its mind should create surrogate gods.

Thus the most aggressive atheism in the history of mankind was reborn as a misanthropic religion, whose priests – in order to win over the human soul – offered it idols to bow down to, and not only in the image of the party. This new paganism created political idols, verbal idols, before whom the whole system was called to bow, as part of its education, from the kindergarten to the concentration camp.

Gods and idols become old and boring and leaders die, but the inquisition defends just as zealously the new idols that replace the old ones, even if the new ones contradict the old. Neopaganism turns fairly quickly into pseudo-paganism – into lies. Turning unreal gods into ideology becomes a game, a theatrical, cynical masquerade. The human being has to take part in this masquerade, if he wants to survive, for he is being constantly watched by those who take an interest in his lies; he has to walk along a hellish road, up a fearful staircase, awaiting new, more real gods and idols, until in the end he loses the most precious characteristic of the soul: its thirst for God. With that, his soul dies too.

A special role in this totalitarian religious culture is allotted to culture: literature, art and science. Culture, particularly literature and art, has created a special type of consciousness, a special type of personality, over the decades. With the aid of the representative arts – style, symbols, images, etc. – it maintains the unique religious ideals, faith in them and behaviour dictated by them. It became possible (after the ‘builders of the earthly paradise’ succeeded in ‘winning over the consciousness’) to introduce gradually into this system of ideals even some elements of the Christian cult – symbols, crosses, names etc. – representing them as part of national consciousness or of ‘ancient Russia’. In the Inquisitor’s ideology, even this part of the programme is worked out in detail: ‘In the hours they have left over from work, we shall create for them a life like a childish game, with childish songs, choirs and innocent games.’

This will happen with the help of Glazunov’s pictures and of a culture that encourages us to believe that, as the Inquisitor explains, ‘they will only become free

when they renounce their own freedom for our sake and in obedience to us.' To this end, 'permitted Christianity' could also be quite useful.

The new socialist culture has to become a cultural justification of an anti-Christian, neopagan existence, an existence supposedly under attack by the hostile 'external circumstances' of the world outside, which make it necessary to build the earthly paradise at whatever cost, according to the given model. Spiritual aggression, as part of the Satanic plan to destroy the human soul, has to wipe out the plan of existence that is most effective in bringing man into creative communion with God's love, the cause of all creation.

The basic reason for the persecution of Christianity and the spiritual hostility shown towards it by inquisitors of all shades, throughout the Christian history of mankind, has always been the same: to destroy the human soul's thirst for close communion with God's love, by inciting rebellion against God and hatred for His creation. However, the Inquisitor cannot have his way with man against the will of man himself. So all human activity, above all human culture as the natural home of ideas in all their variety, is constantly under the control of forces that hate Christianity. In this sphere, the strict rule of what is permitted is always in force.

Always, at all times in Christian history, the Satanic plan begins its activity by killing off the Church through betrayal, treachery and the violence of lies – and then substituting something else. In this process, culture always plays a decisive role: in the plan, it is intended to be a substitute for religion. This is the plan of the Inquisitor, who knows that the path to destruction begins with the introduction into consciousness of faith in *nothing*, which inevitably turns an individual into nothing. That 'nothing', which now reigns over the wreckage of Christian culture and the remains of Christian humanism, is establishing its pseudo-humanism in the ruins of desecrated churches and showing it off in all its cultural forms: in literary works, philosophy and party documents.

Who, then, is behind this 'nothing'? What fills its godless emptiness? Camp zones, psychiatric hospitals and prisons created their own culture, their own language, morality and code of honour. This culture of the 'small zone' formed the culture of the 'big zone' in a paradoxical way: the more joyless the culture of the small zones, the more life-affirming was the culture of the big zone, and the more refined its 'artistic arsenal' became, including various kinds of hidden meanings, illusions and allusions, every type of 'Aesopian' language. The techniques of this half-dead half-culture have been developed in order to serve the Inquisitor's ideas better: 'we will create for them a life like a childish game.'

It is probable that in one in every five families – or perhaps even every three families – of our homeland (apart from the corrupt associations of various elites – those of the party, culture, science etc.), someone has at some time been thrown into prison darkness; this was the living flesh and blood of society, part of its soul, wounded all over and plunged into mortal sorrow. Did they really not know, the 'rulers of our thoughts', the party's helpers, the engineers of human souls, those who are now fighters for democracy and modern patriots and supporters of Russia – did they not know that every reader of their books, each person who watched their films and theatrical spectacles, who visited their exhibitions, was a potential criminal? For so it was: anyone was guilty if the law (reigning over lawlessness) wished it!

Of course, it is so much easier and less dangerous to fight 'the Russophobia of a little nation', rather than a misanthropy directed against all nations. 'The party is always right.'

The Inquisitor's Masks

The anti-Christian culture is a culture of masks. Having made a contract with the Inquisitor, its founders have to observe the rules of their own permitted themes, problems and means of expression. It suffocates inside the masks imposed on it but is always trying on new ones to keep a hold on its 'consumer'. These days, having been permitted openness (*glasnost*), we have the opportunity to see the result of a devalued culture, enslaved by lies, and of the wholesale devaluation of the word, which has been forced to express the opposite of the truth; we have become eye-witnesses to the truth of the dialectical law hammered into us in educational institutions: the quantity of lies in our life has led to a qualitative change and has affected the *quality* of life. Lies have poisoned the essence of life and weakened our culture.

Let us now return to the Manezh exhibition and to Glazunov's Christianity. 'Christian exoticism' is expressed not only in his artistic treatment of the Cross as an exotic and forbidden 'subject', which appears as a decoration or detail of a Russian theme. Glazunov offered visitors to his exhibition his own psychological ideas, which appear with particular clarity in his portraits. Glazunov depicts himself and members of his family almost as if they were already in glory – only their haloes are missing. This stylisation 'in the guise of sanctity' has nothing in common with Christianity, of course. I have already referred to Shafarevich's 'self-mythologisation'. The Christian consciousness excludes the possibility of glorifying oneself, whatever aims that might serve. This is a matter of basic principle and perhaps it would not be worth catching out the artist (and his fellow-thinker in the battle against Russophobia) on such petty weaknesses, if these did not demonstrate their fundamental attitude to mankind in general – and to Christianity.

Glazunov is clearly not as concerned with throwing down the gauntlet to his 'persecutors' as with glorifying the Russian man in his own image. It is not by chance that his self-portrait has a specific background – the artist's thoughtful gaze is directed at a Russian landscape; the birch trees so dear to our hearts help to ennoble the artist's face even more. 'Poster psychologism' almost always looks vulgar, because it exploits 'a change of sign' or a 'linguistic communication', doing violence to a symbol by subtly altering it. The artist's journalistic, poster-type canvases have nothing to do with the biblical understanding of man or with Christian anthropology.

'Poster psychologism', which as a rule serves the aims of political journalism, is unable to express the tragic complexity of the main idea of human life – the choice between good and evil, between the Truth and the Lie. The reproductions of Glazunov's pictures recently published in *Ogonek*, along with an interview with him (no. 51, 1989), show the artist's increasing tendency towards politicisation and poster-type art. A 'synthesis of politics and Christianity' was characteristic of Glazunov's pictures even earlier, but in his illustrations of Gospel parables or symbols, he nowhere expressed his utilitarian attitude towards Christianity as clearly as he did in the work which he named 'The Raising of Lazarus'. We see Gorbachev, his face brighter than all the other faces that make up the crowd watching the raising of Lazarus (and both the sugary face of Christ and the mad face of Lazarus are masks – which show contempt for the original images). We see the slogans '*Glasnost*' and '*Perestroika!*' and 'Peaceful Dialogue', as well as the face of the same 'alien', behind whose back churches are painted against a background of flaming tongues of fire and so on.

This is the monotonous, wordy, empty one-sidedness of political placards, in which the artist has decided to flatter Gorbachev, as resurrecting Russia by means of *glasnost*' and *perestroika*.

The 'Russian Idea', or Who Is to Blame?

The active supporters of the so-called 'patriotic bloc', armed with Shafarevich's prophecy, have their own idea of Russia.

'What can one do?', asked one of the ideologues of the new idea of Russia, back in the days of the Brezhnev-Andropov stagnation, 'if antisemitism is the only possible means of uniting Russians?' At that time, the little phrase *zayedino* ('united as one') had not yet appeared, but the need for it was growing. The ideologist's complaint that antisemitism is the only possible means of uniting people as one expressed not so much his conviction that it was necessary to hate the Jews, as a certain melancholy quality: if there is nothing left that can unite us, let us be united at least in this. Nowadays, the situation is different: *glasnost* and *perestroika* have given the patriots the opportunity to unite, demanding that the RSFSR should have all that other republics have – 'its own Communist Party, its own KGB, everything of its own'.

We can unite, as we know, by means of love or of hatred. Love is always with us and leads to immortality, while hatred unites executioners in a mutual thirst for violence and for profit. After finishing off their victims, the executioners will inevitably be divided into new victims and new executioners. This division is inevitable, as all that is born of hatred is destined for destruction. Hatred gives people an illusion of unity. Hate and you will be saved. Kill and you will succeed. Betray others and you will be justified. Thus once again someone has found it necessary to build a Russian national idea of blood and hatred, an idea that is already steeped in fratricidal blood. This means growing the bread of hatred and slavery in graveyards – and spitting once more in the suffering face of Russia.

Take a look at the 'bloody aesthetics' of the picture 'The Return', where the ruling figure, although he is sitting to one side, is Satan, with 'an un-Russian face' – the same sort of face as a certain someone who is depicted in the picture 'The Raising of Lazarus'. Obviously this 'murderer at his post', this Cain (Glazunov has a picture called 'Cain and Abel', which was exhibited at the opening day in the Manezh Gallery), who migrates from one Glazunov canvas to another, is either trying to prevent the raising of Lazarus (that is, the resurrection of Russia) or waiting for him to be raised so that he can kill him.

These two pictures were painted at different times in the life of our society but are variations on the same theme, expressed in the same banal poster style: a Gospel text is profaned for the sake of a pseudo-patriotic idea. In 'The Return', we see a church shooting up into the sky, as if sliced off by a rocket; in 'The Raising of Lazarus', tongues of fire are burning behind the church. One and the same image of Orthodox Russia, part of the 'background', turns out to be merely a decorative detail in the national 'environment'. It is the same thing with the Fund for the Restoration of the Church of Christ the Saviour, which was set up by the activists of the 'patriotic bloc' to bear witness to their piety. What such 'religious funds' are worth was made clear when the weekly *Literaturnaya Rossiya*, closely linked with this fund and using the name of Christ the Saviour as a cover, tried in a series of articles to defend the warriors of the *Pamyat'* organisation, who had been shouting anti-semitic slogans and threatening to incite pogroms on Forgiveness Sunday. On that day, the Orthodox Church performs the rite of forgiveness and calls on everyone to repent before Lent. The Church of Christ the Saviour is not a pagan shrine. 'Beware of false prophets', Christ warns us, 'which come to you in sheep's clothing, but inwardly they are ravaging wolves.' 'By their fruits shall ye know them' (Matthew 7: 5–16). The fruits, alas, are obvious.

So what about Glazunov's 'prodigal' son? Was it not he who shed blood, who danced with the whore, who stretched out the barbed wire? Where has he come from, the one who is now returning to the 'bosom of national culture'? And who was it who arranged all this *for him*?

The answer to this fateful question is given, as we know, by Shafarevich in *Rusofobiya*. It is clear that the state of mind recorded in Shafarevich's works not only does not belong to the Christian perception of the world, but explicitly contradicts it. This state of mind is closer to that of the Old Testament, to the Judaic consciousness, brought up according to the ancient law 'Thou shalt love thy neighbour and hate thine enemy' (Matthew 5: 43).

One cannot fail to notice [wrote Lev Tikhomirov] the striking resemblance between the national narrow-mindedness of our patriots and the Hebrew national psychology denounced by the prophets. The concept of faith becomes confused with that of the national group, and the Russian nation is represented as living by faith for itself alone, in egoistic exclusiveness.⁷

Shafarevich, in his tendentious denunciations and wrathful prophecies, has not renounced the mentality of those whom he accuses of 'undermining the foundations of the Great Nation's existence'. He also tries to insult and humiliate his opponents, comparing them to the Lilliputians, disparagingly calling them the Little Nation, who falsely consider themselves 'the chosen'. We observe an interesting phenomenon: in despising the Gospel commandment, Shafarevich has found himself unprotected by the principles of the Christian perception of the world, in which the fear of God is the beginning of wisdom and the basis of existence. In spiritually renouncing Christianity, our author has adopted the thinking of representatives of anti-Christian ideology, which is understood not by thought but by feeling, not by knowledge, but by the emotions. I must say, by the way, that I cannot agree with a single one of the statements quoted by Shafarevich in *Rusofobiya*, as I find unacceptable the deliberate hostility towards Russia and its peoples that was characteristic of certain aspects of émigré culture. However, I do not see any difference between the anti-Christian attitude of those who blame the Russian nation for their misfortunes and that of Shafarevich, who blames Russia's misfortunes on 'persons of Jewish origin'. The blood shed in the twentieth century by people of various kinds on our planet cannot be measured in any way or by anyone, except God. After all, in Christianity there is no concept of *another's* guilt, there is only the concept of one's own guilt. This fateful biblical theme began in Eden, for it was there that man, only just created, disobeyed his Creator, but did not want to admit his *own* guilt, blaming *someone else* for it. For this, he and mankind paid with death.

More than once, Shafarevich uses the concept of 'religious roots' with reference to the life of the nation, but not once does he give any idea of what these 'roots' are. We can only make a guess that, as applied to the Russian nation, this might refer either to paganism, which was fairly widespread among the peoples of Russia until their conversion, or to the Orthodox faith.

According to the teaching of the Orthodox Church, Christianity and nationalism are as incompatible as Christianity and antisemitism. In the part of the New Testament that gives a revelation about the Church – in the Acts of the Apostles and their letters to the church community, as well as in the prophecies about the Church granted to St John the Theologian in the Book of Revelation – there are no indications that the Church is a 'national collective'. In contrast to Christianity, paganism is closer to the national consciousness: polytheism, which gives rise to 'replacement of

gods' and 'treachery to the gods', has a characteristically dynamic religious symbolism, which is often borrowed from folklore and in its turn saturates folklore and other aspects of culture with pagan symbolism. Orthodoxy, however, in professing the true faith in One God, also professes its faith in the Church, whose unity does not depend on national community. 'In Christ there is neither Jew nor Greek' (Galatians 3: 28) – so the Apostle Paul explains the non-national aspect of the Church, or rather the supra-national unity of its members.

We know from the Acts of the Apostles that at Pentecost, when the Holy Spirit descended on those who were awaiting Him – the founders of the Church – there were at the same time in Jerusalem 'Jews, devout men, out of every nation under heaven' (Acts 2: 5–11). All of them, who spoke various mutually incomprehensible languages, began to understand one another – as the Holy Spirit descended. Thus was the Church founded out of Christians from various nations, both Jews and proselytes, who became capable of understanding languages unknown to them after receiving the gift of church consciousness. It is important to stress that this consciousness has nothing in common with international consciousness.

Christianity is a new humanity, a new creation of God, and thus in the Church it receives a different kind of life, not a national life but that of an organism which is both God and man. This does not mean at all that national consciousness is levelled down by the Church; on the contrary, it acquires a depth that no sphere of human existence can give. This is linked with the spiritual experiences of the personality, enriched not only by unity with Christ, but also by unity through Christ with unique personalities who devote their love and their lives to God and their neighbours.

Without doubt, the national aspect of human existence is fully realised within the Church – but only if national feeling does not try to make use of the Church and Christianity as a fragment of its national culture. It is easier to create national life than church life and so national consciousness often becomes dominant in cultural and social life. What is national belongs to visible earthly existence, while church life is trying to reach what is heavenly – it is a life on the 'fault-line' between two worlds. National and earthly existence seeks to augment what is earthly and visible, and is linked with the building of an 'earthly paradise' for the nation, while church existence is connected with the unavoidable loss of earthly interests and aspirations for the sake of union with higher spiritual realities.

Because these are different ways of living, individuals and nations find them difficult and contradictory to master. Many Russian religious thinkers of the Slavophile type have tried to solve this contradiction. Konstantin Leont'ev expressed his feelings on the subject thus: 'faith in Christ does not necessarily mean faith in Russia'.⁸ I think that faith in Russia without faith in Christ is impossible. 'Russia's mission', wrote Lev Tikhomirov in the article mentioned above, 'is Orthodoxy. . . . If Russia gives up working for the general good (which is Orthodoxy), It loses all its rights as a world nation.'

However, nationalism always tries to *use* religion for its own ends, to 'take over' religion and make use of it as a special element in national consciousness, as a sort of national ornament. Thus the members of *Pamyat'*, who threaten pogroms and shout misanthropic slogans, pinning to their shirts reproductions of the image of St George, the Martyr and Hero, are indulging in blasphemy. According to the teaching of the Orthodox Church, God is present in His saints and the Church sings in its services: 'The Lord, the God of Israel, shows His wonders in His saints'. Those who wear the image of a Holy Martyr upon their clothes and incite others to murder are desecrating this image. It is sad that our clergy, forgetting their pastoral duty, have not taken the

trouble to explain that hate-filled slogans and threats insult the memory of St George the Martyr, who was victorious over his torturers because of his *meekness*: before his death as a martyr he prayed for his executioners 'Do not hold this sin against those who sinned against me out of ignorance, but grant them forgiveness and love.'

National consciousness that is not enriched by the Church's experience and by communication with a spiritual, higher form of existence, inevitably becomes degraded and is reborn as nationalism or Nazism. Its ideologists try to 'unify the nation' and enrich the national culture, not through the experience of Christian universal responsiveness but in isolation from the essential Gospel principles that lie at the basis of world culture – and Russian culture, of course. Modern Russian chauvinists treat Christianity in a utilitarian manner, sometimes giving it a pagan interpretation. But Christ is not a Russian national idol, and Orthodoxy and paganism have nothing in common and cannot be united in any way.

The national existence of the Russian people, its culture and moral foundations, are built on the Orthodox faith. The treasury of Orthodox spirituality formed the national consciousness – the particular form of Russian sainthood, the unique, wonderful image of Holy Russia. Since the time of the conversion of Russia, the idea of Russia has been a purely Orthodox idea and was wisely developed further over a hundred years ago by the Slavophiles: Khomyakov, Kireyevsky, Aksakov and Dostoyevsky. The Slavophiles saw the salvation of Russia in the Church alone. Thus they realised that Russia and the Russian idea could find a full and natural life only by continuously working for repentance and expiation. Their quarrel with the Westernisers was a dispute over the Church's role in the life and fate of Russia.

The 'homeless wanderer' searching for world harmony, of which Pushkin wrote and whose fate expresses the idea of Russia, has departed from the stage of Russian culture. Others have appeared instead: the Soviet bourgeois member of the '*nomenklatura*' whoever he might be – scientist, writer, bishop, artist or party functionary – and the Soviet prisoner. The Russian 'sense of community', to which N. Berdyayev referred to in his book *Russkaya ideya*, has broken apart: there is the community of the *nomenklatura*, the party organisation and its supporters, and the community of prisoners and those who are willing to become prisoners, fighting for the Truth against lies. At the same time the wandering life, which was linked with the eschatological Russian consciousness, has changed – now the wanderer is a prodigal son (though not Glazunov's), blind in the country of the blind, deaf in the land of the deaf, who will – it is hoped – regain his memory, sight and hearing. However, the Russian sufferer can become a universal man, as Dostoyevsky put it, only when he stops putting the blame for his sorrows on *someone else*; that is, when he admits himself to be a prodigal son returning to the Father.

G. Fedotov was right when he said that 'our century has rendered naive all that the 19th century wrote about Russia'. The idea of Russia has been tragically simplified and clarified. But what is the reason for the spiritual ignorance of today's patriots? Why is it that, in defending Russia and fighting for the revival of our desecrated homeland, they distort the meaning of its thousand-year journey? Has the time really not come to end this rebellion against Christ and Christianity, which they want to adapt to their own ends, to an ideology that supported Stalinism, in the hope of retaining the benefits to which they are accustomed? Has the time still not come to reject 'obedience to the Inquisitor'?

Nationalism, as an ideology, develops with particular intensity at times of historical confusion, when Christianity, enslaved by a power hostile to God, wearies of long years of religious conflict and of physical and spiritual persecution. The tragic course

taken by the Russian Orthodox Church in the twentieth century and the consequences of its most severe persecution are undoubtedly the reasons for the anti-Christian, neopagan patriotism of today's Slavophiles.

The founders of the religious-ideological 'paradise doctrine' did not realise immediately that the Orthodox Church would be indispensable to their victory. At first they decided to abolish it. The Church was plunged into a merciless war, which continues to this day in various forms. Many active Orthodox believers, holy men and ascetics, foresaw this bloody struggle and deplored the inertia and weakness of Christianity. Spiritual seers testified that there would be crosses stained with blood, but none of them could foresee the full extent of the disaster.

The insane plan to abolish the Church could have arisen only in a demonic mind that hated God. Was Satan mocking the founders of the 'paradise doctrine', the arrogance for which he himself was responsible, by inculcating the thirst for deicide in those whom he was determined to ruin? Be that as it may, today many people already know – and tomorrow and the day after almost everyone will know – how Russia, and later the whole world, have been changed by this first offensive, this first religious battle, that has continued until our whole earth was soaked in the blood of martyrs and confessors of the faith. This battle was stopped when the builders of paradise decided it was time to change their strategy. They decided that in all respects it was more advantageous to disable rather than kill. Certainly this strategy has often been expressed in the following formula: the party must train clergymen of a new kind (to say nothing of archbishops, of course).

The 1927 declaration by Metropolitan Sergi (Stragorodsky), who later – on Stalin's orders – became the first Patriarch of all Russia who belonged to the *nomenklatura*, opened up a new era in the history of the Russian Orthodox Church. Since then, the bishops and patriarchs, followed by the clergy, have had to receive the sanction of the atheist authorities for their ordination and consecration. Soviets had influence over church life even in the pre-revolutionary period of Russian history, but the 'selective choice' of the bishops and clergy by antireligious authorities was a form of compulsion that the Russian Church had not known!

Sergi's declaration legitimised the possibility of an alliance with an anti-religious power, an alliance with Stalinism. However, in order to justify the alliance, it was necessary to begin on 'theological work', subjecting the Gospels to revision and laying the foundations of heresy: Sergi's 'theology of revolution', Nikodim's 'peaceology', Pitirim's 'super-ecumenism' and so on.

What we call common sense, based as it is on logic, might regard as a fabrication the assertion that a human mind could invent such a crazy idea as enslaving God and His servants, while allowing the enslaved and thus non-existent god to be worshipped in churches permitted for that purpose, by means of permitted rituals, calling these 'performances of a religious cult'. We might think it senseless to agree to this, consciously to accept regulations that force us not only to 'cut' our services but also to agree deliberately that the God who suffers with us would henceforth allow us to change His will because of new circumstances, which He himself sent us – we cannot think otherwise, if we truly believe in Him! Of course, such an absurd idea might be considered, but cannot be accepted in reality. However, it could become the plaything of the spiritual corpses who, with the permission of the authorities, have declared themselves patriarchs and metropolitans; it could become a captive force, driven back to barracks in the midst of the battle that has just begun, a force that loudly shouts 'Hurrah, your joys are ours!' to the benefactors who enslaved it.

We are told that Sergi's policies saved the Church. When people want to save a relic,

they cover it up and hide it from people: an ancient house is put under a special dome; a special fence is put round a surviving old tree. Metropolitan Sergi and his comrades decided to save our Church by dressing it up in Sergi's cowl. But the Church is not a relic, nor an old house, and so the cowl began to destroy it instead of preserving it. We are told that they preserved the Church by means of this alliance with an anti-religious power and thereby made it possible for the people to attend the remaining churches. However, attending church and praying there does not comprise the whole of Orthodox life. We are neither savages nor pagans, that we should come to church to bow to an unknown God; we do not believe in magic or magic rites.

Orthodoxy means consciously living in the Spirit and in Truth. There are not two Orthodoxies – the Orthodoxy of the Fathers and that of Sergi, which preserves the Church for us through the loss of that Church. It is the threat of losing the Russian Church as a spiritual force for Russia and the world (which would have led to a world catastrophe!) that explains the rapidly growing non-acceptance of Sergi's policies in our homeland – as a heresy, a distortion of the spirit of Orthodoxy and a split away from it.

If this very obvious danger did not exist, if the Church's people, brought up in the spirit of ritual observance, had not been deprived for so many years of sermons, teaching, charity and love on the part of its pastors, if the archbishops themselves had not been examples of cowardice, hypocrisy and false witness, our homeland would have been delivered from such a long 'dark stagnation' and would not be on the brink of catastrophe! And the idea of Russia – in the form it takes today, in the ideology of antisemitism and the slogans and threats of its heralds – would not appear to be anti-Christian and anti-Russian.

Hardening of the Heart

The new history of humanity begins with the hope of overcoming death, with the Resurrection, and therefore it begins with a call to repentance. However, the Old Testament faith refuses to repent. Christ is crucified by the arrogance of the human mind, which does not wish to see the Saviour of the world in the quiet Man of Sorrows.

Long before His Incarnation, God – through His prophets – foretold the antagonism that His people would experience through human history, if they renounced their God and His commandments:

If thou wilt not hearken unto the voice of the Lord thy God, to observe to do all His commandments and His statutes, which I command thee this day, all these curses shall come upon thee and overtake thee. . . . The Lord shall cause thee to be smitten before thine enemies: thou shalt go out one way against them and flee seven ways before them and shalt be removed into all the kingdoms of the earth. . . . The Lord shall smite thee with madness, and blindness and hardening of the heart: And thou shalt grope at noonday, as the blind gropeth in darkness and thou shalt not prosper in thy ways. . . . And thou shalt become an astonishment, a proverb and a byword among all nations whither the Lord shall lead thee. (Deuteronomy 28: 15–37)

At this point I must interrupt my reading of these terrible curses, which are to strike the nation that renounces God.

Shafarevich, interfering in the divine building plan, expresses dissatisfaction with God's commandments to mankind – both Old and New style – which are part of the

Bible and are a divinely inspired, sacred text for Christians (2 Timothy 3: 16). Our prophet is dissatisfied with God: in the chapter 'The past and the present', where the author tries to examine the reasons why 'persons of Jewish origin' played 'a fateful role at a critical time in our history', he asks 'What other nation has been brought up from one generation to another on such commandments?' Tearing quotations out of Holy Scripture in order to show that God was at fault in bringing up the Jewish nation so badly that they brought Russia to the point of catastrophe, Shafarevich distorts the meaning of these quotations. Even here, our author uses the device of 'selecting quotations' necessary for his accusations – a device that is reminiscent once again of those examination records of the material evidence of crime. This time the author of *Rusofobiya* is determined to demonstrate God's guilt. What is this? 'Christian nihilism', abuse of Holy Scripture, or the lack of respect shown by a dilettante who dares to criticise sacred texts that concern God's Providence?

At this point we must once again refer our author and our readers to the beginning of *Rusofobiya*. As we recall, the author had decided to cross the boundary at which everybody obediently abandoned their thoughts and to violate the absolute ban, in order to remove humanity's 'spiritual muzzle'. However, it is a pity that the author, before deciding to take this step, did not try to discover the reason for the absolute ban on antisemitism, imposed on humanity by God Himself. If our prophet had carefully studied the Gospels and the letters of the Church's Apostles to Christians throughout the world, perhaps he would have been freed from the desire to cross at any price a boundary that is very dangerous to cross.

It was in fact Christianity and the principles of the Gospel, laid down at the beginning of Christian civilisation, that also imposed the absolute ban that Shafarevich finds so unwelcome – a ban that has not and will not allow mankind as a whole, having already lived through fascism, to cross the boundary that the author of *Rusofobiya* has crossed. Christians in particular are called on by God to join Him in freeing *every* nation from 'madness, blindness and hardening of the heart', from all the horrors the Lord sends to those who betray Him. Therefore the Orthodox Church, through its true pastors, who are convinced that Christianity is 'the light of the world' and 'the salt of the earth' that saves humanity from disintegration and corruption, has always demonstrated its non-acceptance of antisemitism in any of its manifestations. The participation of people calling themselves Christians in the 1903 Kishinev pogrom was described as follows by the prominent churchman Metropolitan Antoni (Khrapovitsky) of Kiev and Galich, who after the 1917 revolution became the leading bishop of the Russian Orthodox Church in Exile:

Beware, Christians, of doing harm even to a rejected race. The terrible punishment of God will overtake those murderers who are shedding the blood of people related to God Incarnate, to His Immaculate Mother and to the apostles and prophets. Do not say that blood was sacred only in the past; know that even in the future they will be partakers of the Divine nature (2 Peter 1: 4). . . Believers in God and in His Christ! Fear the vengeance of God for His people, beware of injuring the heirs of the promise, even if rejected. Their lack of faith will be judged by God, not by us.

History has preserved many facts showing the support given to the Gospel vision of the world by Orthodox Christians, both laymen and clergy, who regarded antisemitism as shameful for Christians. While God still preserves our earthly home, while the Orthodox Church still journeys through this world, true Christians will remain uncompromisingly faithful in refusing to accept any national hatreds, whether

Russophobia or Judaeophobia. So that we may not be downcast or plunged into grief, seeing how Christianity is being profaned by those who call themselves Christians, history has preserved for us an example of the greatest courage and dignity in two representatives of different nations: the holy martyr Metropolitan Venyamin of Petrograd and the defence counsel at his trial, the barrister Ya. S. Gurovich.

In his book *Novyye mucheniki rossiiskiye (The New Russian Martyrs)*, senior presbyter M. Pol'sky describes the trial of the martyr Metropolitan Venyamin, who was sentenced to be shot in 1922. The Metropolitan appealed to Gurovich from imprisonment, asking him to take on his defence. Gurovich was doubtful that his participation in the trial was necessary, fearing that he might become 'a target for attacks by antisemitic groups and individuals'. In 1922 it was, of course, impossible to conduct a successful defence at this trial, as the defence counsel realised: 'In such circumstances, blunders and failures by the defence are possible... but if true Russians understand them, no one will reproach him for them', wrote Pol'sky. However, Metropolitan Venyamin, having listened to these fears, said that he trusted Gurovich 'unconditionally'.

Gurovich came to the defence not just of the holy martyr Metropolitan Venyamin, but also of the Russian Orthodox clergy, when there was an attempt during the trial to accuse them of being involved in the 'Beilis affair'. Only a courageous defence of the Truth by representatives of the Orthodox Church saved Russia from shame, so that she did not disgrace herself by finding Beilis guilty at the trial – as Pol'sky states, quoting Gurovich's defence speech:

I am happy, at this historic, deeply sorrowful moment for the Russian clergy, that I, as a Jew, can express before the whole world the sincere gratitude that I am sure the whole Jewish people feel towards the Russian Orthodox clergy for their attitude on the Beilis case at that time.

The ideology of pogroms, and pogroms themselves, racist theories and gas chambers come into being when church influence wanes under totalitarian regimes and becomes 'salt that has lost its savour', while the church hierarchy is weakened spiritually through treachery and heresy. Then the pulpits are silent and false prophets sow lies and hatred. As we have seen in Shafarevich's book, hatred distorts reality. Then mankind falls into the hands of phantoms, devils and turncoats.

See how humiliated and pitiful the Great Nation appears in Shafarevich's book! Why did the author feel it necessary to distort in this way the character and fate of a nation that has given the world its saints, the treasures of its spirituality and its great works of culture? In order to present himself as the defender of Russia, the prophet and ideologue of Russian chauvinism, did he really have to distort Russia's tragic experiences and reject the redemptive meaning of the mistakes made and the sufferings undergone? Could it not have been the self-mythologisation of our prophet that produced this anti-Russian idea – a strange form of Russophobia that could be taken for love, a Russophobia that has despised the heights of the Russian spirit, a spirit that showed its holiness in its sufferings for Christ and its love of Christ, giving the world such a throng of new martyrs and confessors in the twentieth century?

Was the author of *Rusofobiya* really incapable of recognising the provocative nature of the hatred he was inciting? And can love allow itself to call down wrath and curses on the head of one's own nation and fatherland at this terrible hour, when 'the whole of modern mankind' is involved in that nation's fate and naturally is not going to permit Shafarevich to remove its 'spiritual muzzle'? In concluding this topic with the Christianity and antisemitism of Shafarevich and his fellow-thinkers, we can only

remark bitterly that we have become spectators at a religious drama that does not arouse our sympathy.

Notes and References

¹ *Moskovskiye novosti*, no. 24 (12 June 1988).

² *Ogonek*, no. 48 (1989).

³ I. R. Shafarevich, *Rusofobiya* (Munich, 1989), p. 9.

⁴ *Iz-pod glyb* (YMCA Press, Paris), pp. 273–4.

⁵ V. Osipov, 'Glazunov i TsAL', *Russkoye vozrozhdeniye*, no. 1, 45 (1989), p. 174.

⁶ *Nadezhda*, no. 2, p. 287.

⁷ Lev Tikhomirov, 'Chto znachit zhit' i dumat' po-russki', *Moskovskiye vedomosti*, no. 178 (1911).

⁸ Yuri Davydov, *Solomennaya storozhka* (Sovetsky pisatel', Moscow, 1986).