

INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

**Bell & Howell Information and Learning
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA
800-521-0600**

UMI[®]

**THE "THIRD WAY":
RUSSIA'S RELIGIOUS PHILOSOPHERS IN THE WEST,
1917-1996.**

Catherine Baird

Department of History

McGill University, Montreal

May, 1997

**" A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research
in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor in History"**

• **Catherine Baird, 1997.**



**National Library
of Canada**

**Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services**

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

**Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada**

**Acquisitions et
services bibliographiques**

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Your file Votre référence

Our file Notre référence

The author has granted a non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of this thesis in microform, paper or electronic formats.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de cette thèse sous la forme de microfiche/film, de reproduction sur papier ou sur format électronique.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

0-612-44354-X

Canada

ABSTRACT

In 1922, the Bolshevik government expelled some 160 prominent intellectuals from Russia. Numbered among these were many of the leaders of the Religious Renaissance which had flourished since the turn of the century. They advocated a "third way": neither for the Tsarist regime nor the Bolsheviks; neither for Capitalism nor Communism; neither for Materialism nor Idealism; rather, they promoted personalist, spiritual development (*Godmanhood*), Christian economic ethics (*Sobornost'*), and a path to knowledge informed by reason, but guided by faith (*Religious-Philosophy*). Forced to join the Russian diaspora, these religious philosophers continued to advance their movement with the help of the Young Men's Christian Association. Largely at the initiative of Nikolai Berdyaev (1874-1948), they also began to interact with the French intellectual milieu in Paris in order to develop inter-confessional and cultural understandings. Although Russian religious-philosophy suffered a certain decline following World War Two, many of their writings had returned to the USSR. As Soviet intellectuals discovered these works, they gradually began to revolt against dialectical materialism, and aspire to recover the religious-philosophical tradition. In 1988, this *Return* was at last made possible, and religious-philosophy has been enjoying a second renaissance which continues unabated today.

RÉSUMÉ

En 1922, le gouvernement bolchévique a expulsé quelque 160 intellectuels éminents à l'extérieur de Russie. Parmi ceux-ci nombraient beaucoup de chefs de la renaissance religieuse qui a prospéré en Russie depuis le début du siècle. Ils appuyaient une "troisième voie": en faveur ni du régime tsariste, ni des bolcheviques; ni du capitalisme, ni du communisme; ni du matérialisme, ni de l'idéalisme; au lieu de cela, ils promouvaient plutôt le développement spirituel et personneliste (*vers le Dieu-homme*), l'économie chrétienne (*sobornost'*) et la connaissance motivée par la raison mais dirigée par la foi (*la philosophie-religieuse*). Obligé de faire partie de l'émigration russe, ces philosophes religieux continuaient leurs efforts d'avancer le mouvement avec l'aide de l'Association des jeunes chrétiens. À l'initiative de Nicolas Berdiaeff (1874-1948), ils commençaient à communiquer avec le milieu intellectuel français à Paris pour développer les connaissances inter-confessionnelles et culturelles. La philosophie-religieuse souffrait d'un certain déclin après la deuxième guerre mondiale, beaucoup de ses oeuvres est retournés à l' Union Soviétique. Quand les intellectuels soviétiques a découvert ces oeuvres, peu à peu, ils ont commencé une révolte contre le matérialisme dialectique, et ils aspiraient au rétablissement de la tradition russe philosophique-religieuse. En 1988, fût enfin possible, d'effectuer ça *retour*; une deuxième renaissance de la philosophie-religieuse continue à cet jour.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract	i.
Résumé	ii.
Table of Contents	iii.
Author's Note	vi.
INTRODUCTION	1.
 1. RUSSIA'S RELIGIOUS RENAISSANCE	 15.
Early Religious-Philosophical Meetings	19.
From Marxism to Idealism	25.
Religious-Philosophical Antecedents	34.
Some Political Engagements	42.
The Vladimir Soloviev Society	50.
<u>Vekhi</u> (Landmarks)	57.
The Russian Revolution	64.
<i>Bratstvo sviatogo Sofii</i>	70.
 2. THE DIASPORA	 75.
Emigration and the Civil War	77.
Surviving in Russia	80.
The Famine	93.
The Expulsions and Persecutions of 1922	128.
 3. THE YMCA AND THE RUSSIAN EMIGRATION	 151.
Getting Back to Russia	152.
Immediate Needs of the Emigration	169.
Education Programs	172.
YMCA Press	177.
The Russian Religious Philosophical Academy	198.
The Russian Christian Students Movement (RSCM)	205.
The Move from Berlin to Paris	215.
St. Sergius Theological Institute	227.
The Orthodox Church Schism	238.
<u>Put'</u>	251.

4.	ENGAGING THE FRENCH INTELLECTUAL MILIEU	266.
	Reasons for <i>Engagement</i>	271.
	The Emergence of Berdyaev as Leader	282.
	The Religious Renaissance in France	287.
	The <i>Oecumenical Circle</i>	296.
	The <i>Studio Franco-Russe</i>	311.
	Clamart Tuesdays	314.
	Marcel's Christian Philosophical Society	329.
	Russian Encounters at Meudon Sundays	339.
	Clamart Sundays	343.
	Social Studies Meetings at Meudon	350.
	<i>Esprit</i>	356.
	The Non-Conformist Movements of the 1930s	360.
	Oecumenical Outcomes	367.
5.	FACING THE TRIAL OF WAR	376.
	Withdrawal of the YMCA Russian Division	380.
	A New Emigration	386.
	Issues of Collaboration	396.
	Status of the "Third Way" on the Eve of War	399.
	Nazi Occupation	413.
	Resistance	425.
	Collaboration	429.
6.	DISPERSAL AND DECLINE	444.
	Secularization	448.
	A Changing Mood in France	459.
	The Cold War in America	466.
	Scholarly Utilization of Religious Philosophy	481.
7.	THE RETURN OF RELIGIOUS PHILOSOPHY	493.
	The <i>Return</i>	504.
	The Policy of <i>Glasnost'</i> and the <i>Return</i>	508.
	CONCLUSION	521.

Appendix A	531.
Appendix B	551.
Appendix C	556.
Selected Bibliography	561.

Author's Note

This thesis employs a modified version of the Library of Congress system of transliteration: the customary English spelling of names for all the principal personages is applied throughout except in quotations where a French or archaic form was used in the original. However, the names of Russian and Soviet scholars today are spelled in accordance with the system. Unless specified, all translations into English are mine.

I would like to thank the McGill Department of History and the Max E. Binz Fellowship foundation for providing the grants which made this work possible. I also express my gratitude to Dr. Maynard Brichford, Archivist of the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, for his invaluable assistance with the Paul B. Anderson Papers, to Father Sable of Scranton University who unearthed the papers of Helene Iswolsky for me, and to Dr. John Hellman for giving me access to the unpublished diaries of Emmanuel Mounier. Finally I thank my husband and my family for their unending patience and support, without which this thesis would never have been written.

Introduction

In 1922, Lenin engineered the expulsion from Russia of some 160 intellectuals he deemed anti-materialist and "counter-revolutionary". Little could he have imagined that seventy years later, as the Communist regime crumbled, the ideas developed by these unwilling émigrés would return to the former Soviet Union to enjoy a new currency and vogue. Amazing indeed as many of the expelled formed the backbone of the church-related "religious-philosophical movement", something the Communists, thereafter, spent two generations trying to exterminate. The expulsion of this group coincided with the execution or deportation to labour camps of the Orthodox clergy, the seizure of sacral items, and the confiscation of religious/non-materialist literature.¹ For all intents and purposes, these acts seemed to mean the death of the Orthodox Church in Russia. Yet, the transformational policies of *Perestroika* and *Glasnost*, combined with the Orthodox Church's celebration of its millennium in 1988, aroused a wave of religious fervour that caused the people to express their desire for free, pluralistic worship. Since this time, many of the works written by the 160 in emigration have been republished through a wholesale project sponsored by the Academy of Sciences, and initiated by the Politburo in the last years of the Soviet Union to promote the dissemination of religious thought.

¹ As the writer Solzhenitsyn described: "...the root destruction of religion in the country, which throughout the twenties and thirties was one of the most important goals of the GPU-NKVD, could be realized only by mass arrests of Orthodox believers. Monks and nuns, whose black habits had been a distinctive feature of Old Russian life, were intensively rounded up on every hand, placed under arrest, and sent into exile. They arrested and sentenced active laymen. The circles kept getting bigger, as they raked in ordinary believers as well, old people, and particularly women, who were the most stubborn believers of all and who, for many long years to come, would be called "nuns" in transit prisons and in camps." Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn, The Gulag Archipelago (New York: Harper & Row, 1973) 37.

How could this written treasury of ideas ever have been created, preserved, and then transported from the emigration back to the USSR? The religious philosophers and their colleagues were expelled with nothing more than their immediate families and one suitcase apiece. They arrived in the West with few connections aside from the already existing émigrés of the substantial post-revolutionary diaspora. During their lifetime, these intellectuals continually had to carve out a niche in an increasingly materialist world. Moving from country to country, interest group to interest group, most died in relative obscurity on foreign soil. Nevertheless, today, thanks to two generations of preservation and consensus on the part of these émigrés and those who came into contact with them, the contribution they made to Russian philosophy is becoming fully evident. Moreover, the grandchildren of the Revolution are now the vanguard of their literature's *Return*.² This thesis traces the history of the religious philosophers in the twentieth century and the events that made it possible for the current *Return* to occur.

The interest in these ideas which the post-Communist intellectuals are evincing may be explained by the religious philosophers' vision of Russia and its destiny. They had suggested a "third way" which equally opposed the Tsarist regime and materialist socialism (especially Marxism). Thus, they had proposed an alternative for change in Russia which had competed with the Bolshevik and all other Socialist and Liberal programs. Moreover, theirs was a world-view which evolved from balancing the dominant

² The *Return* (or *Vozvrashchenie*) is the term that Russians employ today to characterize the republication of pre-revolutionary and émigré religious-philosophical materials. In a broad sense it is applied to all materials now published that were censured under Soviet authority. However, in the intellectual milieu it is usually strictly reserved for those previously forbidden works relating in some form to religion and spirituality.

schools of Russian thought (Westernizer and Slavophile), rather than one dominated by either Western or Eastern conceptions.³

The nineteenth-century philosopher, Vladimir Soloviev, is most frequently attributed with being the founder of religious-philosophy. He was able to reunite "the religious orientation of the [Slavophiles] with the Western outlook of the [Westernizers]" thereby embodying in thought, Russia's geographical reality of being both East and West.⁴ During Russia's Silver Age at the dawn of the twentieth century, religious-philosophy served to inspire novel approaches in artistic expression. It also attracted a growing contingent of thinkers who were to develop the principles of this native Slavic world-view into a coherent and decisive body of thought. At its basis was a recognition of the human paradox: people are matter but also spirit; knowledge is discovered through reason but also through faith; spiritual (i.e. *dukhovnye*) principles underlie all material preoccupations. The religious philosophers, therefore, did not deny the need for social justice and an end to Tsarist repression, but they opposed the monism of materialist socialism. When the Revolutions broke out, most religious philosophers were supportive of the Tsar's demise, and most chose not to emigrate nor to join the Whites during the Civil War. They stayed

³ Both the Marxists and the Populists out of which the major revolutionary parties (Menshevik, Bolshevik, and Socialist Revolutionary) derived were largely founded upon the theories espoused by the Westernizers and by Western thinkers. Russia's latent Liberal tradition which found a consolidated voice through the Kadet Party was also dominated by Western ideas. On the other hand, groups like the Eurasianists and some selected nationalist Pan-Slavics adhered to a more eastward-looking view which eschewed Western concepts.

⁴ James Edie, James Scanlan & Mary-Barbara Zeldin, Russian Philosophy Vol III (Knoxville, TE: University of Tennessee Press, 1994), 55.

in Russia committed to assisting a spiritual change among their own people which would transform the revolution from within.⁵

In so doing, they became a persistent thorn in the side of the new Bolshevik regime. It would perhaps not be incorrect to consider these intellectuals to be Communist Russia's early dissidents. Always working within the parameters of the latest decrees and never directly countermanning Bolshevik rule, they nevertheless pursued an educational task designed to evoke questions and dissent from the Russian people. The religious philosophers constantly challenged the regime on matters of ethics, morality, human rights and dignity, and pluralism. As will be explained below, these actions, combined with the still formidable influence of the Orthodox Church, aroused the highest echelons of Bolshevik officialdom to develop a complex plan designed to root out all these remnants of religion.⁶

In expelling the religious philosophers along with other undesirable intellectuals out to the West, the Bolsheviks seem to have expected that they would be marginalized on account of their foreignness, their advocacy of active (not spectator) spiritualism, and their repudiation of rational materialism. As this story will show, the Bolshevik leaders

⁵ G. Fedotov, "Rossiia, Evropa i my," Novyi grad 2 (1932): 3-15; F. Stepun, "Zadachi emigratsii," Novyi grad 2 (1932): 15-28; F. Stepun, "Porevolutsionnoe soznanie i zadacha emigrantskoi literatury," Novyi grad 10 (1935): 12-29; N. Berdiaev, "O profeticheskoi missii slova i mysli," Novyi grad 10 (1935): 56-66; F. Stepun, "Ideia Rossii i formy eia raskrytiia," Novyi grad 8 (1934): 15-28; Ot Redaktsii, "Dukhovnaya zadachi russkoi emigratsii," Put' 1 (September 1925): 9-14.

⁶ See Chapter 2 below. One part of the plan, drafted by Lenin, which spelled out exactly how the Orthodox Church might be destroyed was released through dissident sources in the 1960s, but was disparaged as a fake by both Soviet and Western scholars. In 1994, however, James Billington led an investigation team from the Library of Congress into the Soviet Archives where they discovered the original, translated it, and disseminated it on the Internet. Although Richard Pipes has just released the English edition containing it and other explosive sources in The Unknown Lenin: From the Secret Archive (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1996), it is still unfamiliar enough to deserve full exposition in this thesis. See Appendix B.

were not wrong in this assumption. However, in hindsight they did not take into account three exceptional conditions. First, there existed a substantial but divided émigré community into which these thinkers were being thrust, and upon which they would impact to promote a greater degree of unity and purpose. Second, the flourishing Western organizations committed to Christian oecumenism and to spreading the Social Gospel would be most receptive to the ideas of the expelled. Third, a movement for spiritual *engagement* was just awakening among certain European intellectuals with whom the religious philosophers would discover an immense rapport. Hence, as this study explores the connections developed by the religious philosophers once compelled to join the emigration, it discovers not simply marginalization, but also the flowering of many inter-cultural and inter-denominational initiatives. These served to aid the emigration as a whole, to preserve and continue Russian Orthodox culture, and to further develop religious-philosophy for both the Russian and Western peoples.

Study of the Russian emigration, prior to the current Russian transformation, by and large remained a fringe interest in Western historiography until the late eighties. After all, who would want to devote much attention to the clear "losers" of the Russian Revolutions and resulting Civil War? A testimony of its obscurity may be illustrated by its undetermined demographic proportions. Numbers for the emigration range from 800,000 to three million, and the statistical dispute shows no signs of being resolved in the near future.⁷ Some scholars have examined the emigration issue because it had some direct relevance to their own interests. Three Frenchmen during the inter-war years, for

⁷ For a discussion of the demographic debate, please see Appendix C.

example, paid considerable attention to these foreigners in their midst.⁸ The vast and supposedly novel problem of refugees also interested those involved with the new League of Nations, and prompted studies intended to inform policy decisions.⁹ After World War Two, the sporadic trend continued. There were a few biographies of the more famous Russian émigrés, a few studies of specifically émigré institutions,¹⁰ and one or two explorations per decade on singular émigré movements like the *smenavekhovtsy*,¹¹ the *Eurasianists*,¹² or the Russian Fascists.¹³

⁸ Charles Ledré, Les émigrés russe en France: ce qu'ils font, ce qu'ils pensent (Paris, L'illustration, 1930); Jean Delage, La Russie en exile (Paris: Librairie Delagrave, 1930); J. Campcommunal, La condition des Russes à l'étranger et spécialement en France (Paris: Recueil Sirey, 1925).

⁹ W.C. Huntington, The Homesick Million. Russia-out-of-Russia (Boston: Stratford, 1933); Sir John Hope Simpson, The Refugee Problem: Report of a Survey (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1939).

¹⁰ Regarding religious institutions, an example is Donald Lowrie, Saint Sergius in Paris. The Orthodox Theological Institute (London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1954). A book which did appear in the 1970s about St. Sergius, but should not be paid attention is Alexis Kniazeff, L'institut St. Serge - De l'académie d'autrefois au rayonnement d'aujourd'hui (Paris: Beauchesne, 1974). The reason for this caution lies in the fact that Kniazeff appears to have plagiarised Lowrie's work on St. Sergius for the first three chapters, merely translating his description from English into French.

¹¹ The first systematic study of this movement only occurred in 1994 as part of the "Return" phenomenon, although the movement did get brief mention in many studies of the early Soviet Union. See Hilde Hardeman, Coming to Terms with the Soviet Regime: The "Changing Signpost" Movement among Russian Émigrés in the Early 1920s (DeKalb: Northern Illinois University Press, 1994).

¹² Charles Halperin, "Russia and the Steppe: George Vernadsky and Eurasianism," Forschungen zur osteuropäische Geschichte 36 (1985): 55-194; Nicholas Riasanovsky, "The Emergence of Eurasianism," California Slavic Studies 4 (1967): 39-72. Another such "movement" which might be mentioned here is L. Hamilton Rineland, "Exiled Russian Scholars in Prague, the Kondiakov Seminar and Institute," Canadian Slavonic Papers 16.3 (1974): 331-352.

¹³ John J. Stephan, The Russian Fascists: Tragedy and Farce in Exile, 1925-45 (New York: Harper & Row, 1978). Related works are Catherine Andreyev, Vlasov and the Russian Liberation Movement - Soviet Reality and Empire Theories (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987); A. P. Stolypin, Na sluzhbe Rossii (Frankfurt: Possev Verlag, 1986); B. Prianishnikoff, Novopokolentsy (Silver Spring, Md.: Multilingual Typesetting, 1986). Also deserving of mention in this category is a study of just the White Russians with little reference to the fascists within their

One exception to these specific-interest examinations was the 1963 study by a Russian émigré teaching at Oxford, Nicholas Zernov, who told the story of his people and his mentors in The Russian Religious Renaissance of the Twentieth Century.¹⁴ This work, close in aim to the present thesis, provided an illuminating view of the Orthodox influence on the emigration, and especially upon the ideas generated within. As a participant in the major religious movements of the émigrés, Zernov was able to augment his detailed knowledge of Orthodox theology with reminiscences of his personal development. His focus was the Russian Student Christian Movement in the emigration in which he played a long and leading role. This penetrating testimony to the faith and strength of the émigrés is truthful and moving.¹⁵ He made no attempt, however, to place religious-philosophy within the historical context of the emigration.

The first systematic historical studies were undertaken only in the 1970s.¹⁶ Michèle Beyssac wrote a useful study of the phenomenon in France, La vie culturelle de

midst: Leonid K. Shkarenkov, Agoniia beloi emigratsii, 2nd ed. (Moscow: Mysl', 1986).

¹⁴ Nicholas Zernov, The Russian Religious Renaissance of the Twentieth Century (New York: Harper & Row Pub., 1963). Some mention of philosophical developments made by Russians in the emigration was given in the final chapters of Vasily V. Zenkovsky, A History of Russian Philosophy, trans. George Kline, 5th ed., Vol 2., 5th ed. (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1953). See also Nicholas O. Lossky, History of Russian Philosophy (New York: International University Press, 1951), and in James M. Edie, James P. Scanlan & Mary-Barbara Zeldin eds., Russian Philosophy Vol 3. (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1987).

¹⁵ For more information on this movement see especially Chapter 3 in which archival material has been added to Zernov's analysis.

¹⁶ About émigré literature, specific studies are too numerous to be cited here, but see particularly: N.P. Poltoratsky, ed., Russkaia literatura v emigratsii: sbornik statei (Pittsburgh: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1972); Alfred Appel and Simon Karlinsky, The Bitter Air of Exile: Russian Writers in the West, 1922-1972 (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1973), and Gleb Struve, Russkaia literatura v izgnanii: Opyt istoricheskogo obzora zarubezhnoi literatury (Paris: YMCA-Press, 1984). Also deserving of attention is the unique archival material presented in Vladimir Gessen, V bor'be za zhizn': zapiski emigranta : Peterburg--Berlin--Parizh--N'iu Iork (New York: Rausen Pub., 1974).

l'émigration russe en France: Chronique 1920-1930,¹⁷ and Robert C. Williams at Harvard completed an even more encompassing work, Culture in Exile - Russian Émigrés in Germany 1881-1941.¹⁸ Beyssac's theme has since been revisited by Robert Johnson in New Mecca, New Babylon. Paris and the Russian Exiles¹⁹ which takes a more sociological approach in so far as it situates the Russians within the broader context of refugee history in the twentieth century. Like Williams, Johnston still holds to the prevailing view - clearly indicated by the use of the term "exile" in their titles - that the émigrés were first and foremost the "vanquished", and hence all of their activities must be viewed as desperate attempts to cope with "despair and ultimate defeat".²⁰

Until 1990, a study which might bring the diverse centres of the emigration and the full spectrum of their activities together in some coherent form was still lacking in Western historiography. An attempt to do this was undertaken by the respected Russian historian at Columbia University, Marc Raeff. With his book Russia Abroad, he provided a valuable introduction to the entire emigration which immediately places in perspective

¹⁷ Michèle Beyssac, La vie culturelle de l'émigration russe en France: Chronique (1920-1930) (Paris: P.U.F., 1971). His work was expanded upon in Catherine Gousseff and Nicholas Saddier, "L'émigration Russe en France, 1920-1930," Mémoire de Maitresse d'Histoire, Department d'histoire des slaves, University of Paris, 1983.

¹⁸ Robert C. Williams, Culture in Exile - Russian Emigres in Germany 1881-1941 (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1972). Some other related studies which largely focus on a specific element of the emigration in Germany are L. Hughes Feishman and O. Raevskaya-Hughes, eds., Russkii Berlin, 1921-1923: po materialam arkhiva B.I. Nikolaevskogo v Guverovskom Institute (Paris: YMCA-Press, 1983); Thomas R. Beyer, G. Kratz, and X. Werner, Russische Autoren und Verlage nach dem ersten Weltkriege (Berlin: Arno Spitz, 1987).

¹⁹ Robert Johnston, New Mecca, New Babylon: Paris and the Russian Exiles, 1920-1945 (Kingston, Ont.: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1988).

²⁰ Robert C. Williams, Culture in Exile 242.

most movements or events that future historians might wish to explore at greater length.²¹ Raeff himself defined what he tried to do and what he thought should be done in these words:

The aim of this book is quite modest; for a comprehensive history of Russia Abroad much monographic spadework is still necessary. As noted, such work has been and will be carried out by a number of scholars in the fields of literature and the arts, but more historical and sociological study is still needed, so that Russia Abroad ceases to be somehow suspended in mid-air, independent of the existential circumstances and the host environment of Russian émigrés in the 1920s and 1930s.²²

In retrospect, his timing could not have been better. By 1990, the extraordinary transformation in Russia was more than apparent. Along with the need to reappraise the "sovietology" approach to Russian politics, came a complementary resurgence of Western interest in émigré studies, which was fuelled by the aspirations of Russian intellectuals today.²³ Finally, the *Return* has not only brought back the original works of the religious

²¹ Marc Raeff, Russia Abroad: A Cultural History of the Russian Emigration, 1919-1939 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990). He has written other works on the subject: see Marc Raeff, "L'émigration et la cité nouvelle," Cahiers du monde Russe et Soviétique 29.3-4 (1988): 543-552; Marc Raeff, "Novyi Grad and Germany: A Chapter in the Intellectual History of the Russian Emigration of the 1930s," Felder und vorfelder russischer Geschichte, eds. I. Auerbach, A. Hillgruber, and G. Schramm (Freiburg, Breisgau: Rombach, 1985) 255-265; Marc Raeff, "V pomoshch' issledovaniu zarubezhnoi rossii," Novyi zhurnal 196 (1995) 348-358; Marc Raeff, "Institutions of a Society in Exile: Russia Abroad 1919-1939," Rossia/Russia 6 (1988): 95-117.

²² Marc Raeff, Russia Abroad 14.

²³ For example: Catherine Evtuhov, "Sergei Bulgakov: A Study in Modernism and Society in Russia, 1900-1918," diss., University of California at Berkeley, 1992; Kenneth Clarke Wenzel, "The Transmigration of Anarchocommunism," diss., The Catholic University of America, 1985; J. E. Hassell, Russian Refugees in France and the US between the World Wars (Philadelphia: Transactions of the American Philosophical Society, 1991); Temira Pachmuss, D.S. Merezhkovsky in Exile: The Master of the Genre of Biographie Romancée (New York: P. Lang, 1990); Temira Pachmuss, A Moving River of Tears: Russia's Experience in Finland (New York: P. Lang, 1992); Temira Pachmuss, Russian Literature in the Baltics Between the World Wars (Columbus, Ohio: Slavica Publishers, 1988); George Kline, "Variations on the Theme of Exile," Brodsky's Poetics and Aesthetics, eds. Lev Loseff, and V.A. Polukhin (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1990) 56-88; Aleksey Gibson, Russian poetry and criticism in Paris from 1920 to 1940 (The Hague: Leuvenhoff Publishing, 1990); John Glad, Conversations in Exile (Durham: Duke University Press, 1993); Inna Broude, Ot Khodasevicha do Nabokova: nostalgicheskaiia tema v poezii pervoi russkoi emigratsii (Tenafly, N.J.: Ermitazh, 1990); Arnold McMillin, ed., Under Eastern Eyes: The West as Reflected in Recent Russian Emigré Writing (London: MacMillan, 1991); Lawrence Senelick, ed., Wandering Stars: Russian Emigré Theatre, 1905-1940 (Iowa City: University of Iowa Press, 1992); Bernice

philosophers, but has also prompted Russian scholars to embark upon their own assessments of the emigration.²⁴

The prevailing theme in most émigré studies prior to Raeff's was that of the material hardship, defeat, and frustration from which these dispersed people suffered. Even Russia Abroad largely focused upon the unrelenting isolation and alienation of the émigré communities. It is undeniable that the difficulties faced by the emigrants in both reconciling themselves to their fate and in adjusting to their new foreign milieu often seemed to be insurmountable. Nevertheless, material circumstances and external conditions are not the only things which determine how people live and act. Will, spirit, and ideas may flourish despite outside forces, and may even turn a difficult situation into one of unexpected advantages.

The religious philosophers were forced from their homeland carrying an undiminished intent to assist an internal, spiritual transformation of the revolutionary impulse in Russia. Upon arriving in the West, therefore, they immediately sought the means by which their aspirations could be attained. However, as it is almost impossible

Glatzer Rosenthal and Martha Bohachevsky-Chomiak, eds., and Marian Schwartz, trans., A Revolution of the Spirit: Crisis of Value in Russia (New York: Fordham University Press, 1990); Judith D. Kornblatt and Richard Gustafson, eds. Russian Religious Thought (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1996).

²⁴ See the recent collection which traces the dimensions of the *Return* with regards to philosophy, and describes which émigré authors are enjoying the most attention in their homeland today: James P. Scanlan, Russian Thought After Communism: The Recovery of a Philosophical Heritage (Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe, 1994). Russian scholars have already produced works dealing with the emigration as a whole. See, Viacheslav Kostikov, Ne budem proklinat' izgnan'e... Puti i sud'by russkoi emigratsii (Moscow: Mezhdunarodnye otnosheniia, 1994). Additionally the Russian Academy of Sciences has prepared a two volume collection which contains many articles from scholars in Russia and throughout the world: Academician E. P. Chelyshi & Professor D.M. Shakhovskii eds., Kul'turnoe nasledie rossiiskoi emigratsii, 1917-1940 2 Vols. (Moscow: Nasledie, 1994).

for one group to enter into association with others without themselves being transformed and drawn into the preoccupations of their new colleagues, they soon found themselves augmenting their goals.

Although the religious philosophers began their involvements with such, perhaps unlikely, organizations as the Young Men's Christian Association in order to further what they called the "Post-Revolutionary" movement - the dissemination of ideas intended to transform the revolutionary impulse in Russia away from Communism and towards a more religious and spiritual vision - they could not remain untouched by the concerns of the Association's leaders. These émigrés, in fact, found the aspirations of the YMCA to assist in the development of a world wide oecumenical movement absolutely vital to their quest for Russia. If they wanted to prove to their people that Christianity was more worthy than what they called the "dead end" of Communism, then a unified Church would be a much more valuable means of persuasion than one which was divided and torn by parochial disputes.

When both fate and practical considerations conspired to cause most of these émigrés to congregate in Paris by 1924, the demands of their *Post-Revolutionary* and their adopted oecumenical efforts motivated the religious philosophers to seek close ties with French intellectuals. They were fortunate in their timing because a certain religious revival was occurring in France which made the atmosphere congenial to Russian religious-philosophy. As they forged intense and enduring friendships with both Protestant and Catholic intellectuals, they did indeed expand the means for disseminating their ideas, and thus contributed to the growth of oecumenism and their *Post-Revolutionary* movement. However, they also became involved in the concerns of their new French

colleagues: literature and the arts; the development of a religious existentialism; the French Personalist movement.

By becoming involved with Personalism which also maintained a "third way", refusing both the options of the status quo and of the rising ideologies (both Communism and Fascism), the religious-philosophers became fully immersed in all the political quarrels of that time. Once World War Two broke out, the "third way" became a dangerous association due to the increasing spirit of polarization: If one was not a Communist then one must be a Fascist and Nazi collaborator. The reverse was even more perilous as the Nazi Occupation in France ruthlessly executed suspected Communists. In refusing both Fascism and Communism yet espousing a world-view which embodied certain elements of both ideologies, the Personalists and the Russian religious philosophers found themselves repeatedly misunderstood. This unenviable situation essentially put a halt to their activities, and its taint scarred their efforts for decades after the war ceased. Nevertheless, the Russian religious philosophers had already created a vast body of literature expressing their ideas. As the phenomenon of the present-day *Return* suggests, these writings were transferred back into Communist Russia where they began to work their way into the minds and hearts of intellectuals who themselves became a new generation of *Post-Revolutionaries*.

The Russian religious philosophers were not a unified group that can be assessed as a faceless collective. Diffuse and driven to frequent quarrels, each was a distinct and eccentric personality in his or her own right. The central figure of this thesis is Nikolai Berdyaev because it was he who played the major role of creating connections and involvements with the YMCA and the French intellectuals. At his salons in Moscow, then

Berlin, and finally at Clamart in the outskirts of Paris, he provided a dynamic environment in which to promote discussion, ideas, and action. Berdyaev also possessed the ability to connect his own ideas with the most immediate dilemmas faced by human beings. In so doing, he rapidly became the most popular Russian philosopher in the emigration and, today, his works are central in the *Return*.

Berdyaev, however, did not work alone. His close friend Sergei Bulgakov was a major force in these activities, and arguably did much more to promote the oecumenical movement. Bulgakov, perhaps, deserves more attention than Berdyaev for it was he who originally brought the tempestuous philosopher back into the Church, and, therefore, to religious-philosophy. To Russian scholars the names Berdyaev and Bulgakov bring to mind two others: Peter Struve and Semen Frank. As will shortly be discussed, these four shared a unique relationship which shook the Russian intelligentsia at its very foundations in the years prior to the Revolution. Struve, unfortunately, was a rather reticent member of the emigration, and he soon broke his former ties with religious-philosophy in favour of more political involvements. Frank, however, was a vital participant in the activities discussed herein, and his advances in philosophy made their own impact.

In addition to these four, this thesis refers to the singular, self-proclaimed disciple of Nietzsche, Lev Shestov, who was to define his own brand of religious, and irrational, existentialism. The intuitivist philosopher Nikolai Lossky also made his contribution to these activities, as did Berdyaev's loyal friend and colleague (and an active philosopher in his own right), Boris Vysheslavitsev. The leading expert on Orthodox history and doctrine, Georges Florovsky, greatly assisted Franco-Russian and international oecumenical initiatives and, furthermore, did a tremendous amount to preserve the religious-philosophical message during the unsympathetic years of the Cold-War. Many

others are involved in this story. Each contributed to preserving religious-philosophy while it was forbidden in their homeland and, for this reason, all are being reclaimed to a greater or lesser extent by Russians today.

For they did not merely maintain their culture and their ideas, they also expanded them in the seemingly less-than-favourable situation of emigration. In fact, as this thesis will demonstrate, emigration brought many opportunities which would probably not have been available had these people been allowed to remain in Russia. Therefore, this is not a story of defeat and despair, but one of indomitable spirits who refused to be quelled and always found some way to begin again.

1. Russia's Religious Renaissance

At the turn of the twentieth century, the hegemony of positivist thought came under attack in Russia, and this revolt encompassed every field of intellectual activity. Positivism had been the central tenet by which the intelligentsia rationalized their role in Russian society ever since the emancipation of the serfs in 1861. Its fundamental precept relied upon the conception that humanity was first, wholly material - "man is nothing more than a composite of atoms"¹ - and second, wholly rational - "man would always act in his own best interests".² These beliefs had allowed the intelligentsia to explain every human problem as a consequence of poor environment which prevented man from acting in accordance with natural law; fix the social inequalities, so their theory went, and all the ills of the human condition would immediately cease. All one needed was a plan which created total equality in all areas of life. Once people saw that they were playing on a level field and that no one through birth had any advantage over them, and they would immediately cease all self-destructive behaviour.

It had not taken long for the Marxist blueprint to become widely accepted as the most appropriate way to fix that which was wrong in Russia. The end-result of

¹ "It is that man must be regarded as a single being having only one nature...that this organism is the material which produces the phenomena under examination, that the qualities of the phenomena are conditioned by the properties of the material, and that the laws by which the phenomena arise are only special cases of the operation of the laws of nature." Nicholas Chernyshevsky, "The Anthropological Principle in Philosophy," Russian Philosophy, eds. James M. Edie, James P. Scanlan & Mary-Barbara Zeldin, vol. 2 (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1994) 60. "But we others, who do not believe in God or in the immortality of the soul or in the innate freedom of the will...We others, materialists in theory..." Michael Bakunin, "The Paris Commune and the Idea of the State," Russian Philosophy vol. 1 413.

² "A careful examination of the motives that prompt men's actions shows that all deeds, good and bad, noble and base, heroic and craven, are prompted by one cause: a man acts in the way that gives him the most pleasure. He is guided by self-interest..." Nicholas Chernyshevsky, "The Anthropological Principle in Philosophy," Russian Philosophy vol. 2 52.

Communism seemed to match the already existing conditions of collective peasant life in Russia to such a degree that many Russian intellectuals thought they could almost entirely omit Marx's stage of "bourgeois capitalism".³ More cautious thinkers, such as Lenin, came to believe that the Russian situation might at least allow a more rapid transition from the "bourgeois" to the "socialist" revolution than Marx had proposed for Europe.⁴ Thus, despite certain divergences, most of Russia's intelligentsia all agreed that socialism was the cure for Russia, and this *Cause* dominated all of their activities. They judged each other in accordance with what contribution their individual works made to the *Cause*, and they derided and condemned as decadent and self-indulgent any intellectual who dared to create for any other reason.⁵

The entire premise of the *Cause* only came under widespread attack in the last years of the nineteenth century. In 1898, the dilettante artist Serge Diaghilev⁶ launched a new gathering for select members of the intelligentsia who were interested in artistic pursuits outside of the *Cause*. Personally, Diaghilev was tired of visiting Europe and hearing the people there describe Russia as culturally backwards; he was convinced that

³ This was first proposed by Chernyshevsky, and is more fully described in Franco Venturi, The Roots of Revolution: A History of the Populist and Socialist Movement in Nineteenth Century Russia (London: William Clowes & Sons Ltd., 1960) 147-150.

⁴ Vladimir I. Lenin, April Theses, 20 April 1917, as cited in William H. Chamberlin, The Russian Revolution, 1917-1921, Vol. 1 (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1987) 441-443.

⁵ The best explanations of this particular facet of the Russian intelligentsia has been given by Isaiah Berlin. Please see his collection of essays, Russian Thinkers (New York: The Viking Press, 1978).

⁶ Alexander Benois remembers: "He painted no pictures, created no productions, ballets or operas; he hardly ever appeared as a critic on questions of art...but the inspiration and fire which we professional artists expressed in our work was displayed by Diaghilev in the organizing of everything in which we were associated....The sphere of advertising and publicity was alien to us, whereas Diaghilev was marvellous at it - he was a born master of the art." Cited in Suzanne Massie, Land of the Firebird (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1980) 420.

there existed enough native talent in his country to shock the Europeans out of their complacency.

What did he want? Three definite things: to reveal Russia to Russia, to reveal Russia to the world, to reveal the world - new - to itself.⁷

His "Wednesdays" inaugurated a new quest solely for the advancement of the Arts, and he unabashedly forbade the inclusion of any socially-relevant issues.

At first the traditional intelligentsia ignored him. However, in 1899, Diaghilev's group began to publish its own journal, Mir iskusstva (The World as Art): Russian newsstands were transformed by its brilliant colours, witty commentary, and symbolist poetry which directly contradicted the usual grey turgidity of political and economic tracts.⁸ By now, Diaghilev's "Wednesdays" had the highest reputation in St. Petersburg society.⁹ Between 1899 and 1904, while Mir iskusstva was published, the traditional intelligentsia sniped from the sidelines condemning the effort as "sheer decadence";¹⁰ yet, they faithfully bought their copies every fortnight. Diaghilev's audacity in promoting

⁷ Robert Brussel as cited in Massie, Land of the Firebird 420.

⁸ "It was lavishly printed on beautiful paper, with excellent reproductions. Diaghilev and Filosofov dug out of the Academy of Art old type characters dating from the time of Empress Elizabeth. Bakst worked all night with the printers, setting type and working on layouts." Massie, Land of the Firebird 424-425.

⁹ The Mir iskusstva group included - the painters and stage illustrators Leon Bakst, Konstantin Somov, Alexander Benois, Eugene Lanceray, Alexander Golovin, Ivan Bilibin; the writers Dmitrii Merezhkovsky, Zinaida Gippius, Dmitrii Filosofov; the musicians and composers Alexander Scriabin, Nikolai Rimsky-Korsakov, Sergei Rachmaninov, Serge Koussevitzky, Mikhail Glinka, Modest Mussorgsky, Alexander Borodin, Igor Stravinsky; the dancers Anna Pavlova, Tamara Karsavina, Vaslav Nijinsky; the choreographer Mikhail Fokine; and the singer Fyodor Chaliapin.

¹⁰ However, more innovative members of the intelligentsia were inspired by Diaghilev to begin their own solely artistic initiatives: from 1900-1914 a host of art journals were started, including The Scales, The Treasures of Art, The Golden Fleece, The Flame, Appollon. "Violent literary debates took place in the pages of the journals Grif and Scorpion. Inspired by the activities of The World of Art, Walter Nouvel and his friends formed a society which presented evenings of contemporary music and introduced St. Petersburg to the new music of Debussy, Franck, Ravel, Schoenberg and Prokofiev." Massie, Land of the Firebird 427.

intellectual activity which had completely no relevance to the *Cause* reached astronomic proportions when he was able to fuse the diverse talents within his circle toward one all-consuming and awesome production: The European grand tours of the now-famous *Ballets russes*. Through this endeavour he and the creative artists achieved a world-renowned reputation.¹¹

The rebellion among the Russian intelligentsia took hold with the first release of Mir iskusstva. Writers, poets, political thinkers, philosophers all began to question what had been inviolate before. Although Diaghilev's salon generally attracted adherents to the performing arts, it also included the most adventurous intellectuals from the literary milieu. Two of the most prominent were the curious husband-and-wife team of Dmitri Merezhkovsky (1865-1941) and Zinaida Gippius (1869-1945). Merezhkovsky had actually begun his move away from positivism as early as 1892 with his essay "On the Causes of the Decline in Russian Literature" in which he adroitly attacked the "censorship" which was levied by intellectuals in the name of the *Cause*; he declared that their obsession with social justice was causing them to undermine all creative efforts which tried to introduce new ideas or raise the level of language and literary expression.¹²

¹¹ For each successive year until the outbreak of World War One, the Russian troupe played to packed houses in city after city, garnering rave reviews in major European paper: Some of their famous performances included Boris Godunov (1908); Le Pavillon d'Armide, Cleopatra, and Les Sylphides (1909); Schéhérazade, The Firebird and Giselle (1910); Swan Lake, Petrushka, and Le Spectre de la Rose (1911); Daphnis and Chloé and Prélude à l'Après-midi d'un Faune where Nijinsky made his infamous gesture (1912); and the crowning triumph, The Rite of Spring, caused a riot at its premier in Paris (1913). See Massie, Land of the Firebird 440-449.

¹² An exploration of Merezhkovsky's life and thought may be found in Bernice Rosenthal, D.S. Merezhkovsky and the Silver Age: The Development of a Revolutionary Mentality (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1975). See also, Temira Pachmuss, D.S. Merezhkovsky in Exile: The Master of the Genre of Biographic Romancée (New York: P. Lang, 1990); Zinaida Gippius, Dmitrii Merezhkovskii (Paris: YMCA Press, 1951).

Both he and Gippius had become fascinated with the writings of Nietzsche¹³ during this time, and in their own work they galvanized the pursuit of a new form of literature which was broadly identified as Symbolism. It, in turn, spawned a host of literary experiments - into Dionysian imagery and ethics, acmeism, and futurism - gradually replacing the *Cause* with Art. Merezhkovsky and Gippius were to nurture a host of writers, the foremost of whom - Alexander Blok (1880-1921), Andrei Bely (1880-1934), and Viacheslav Ivanov (1866-1949) - came to embrace Art as a "means to higher truths".¹⁴ Thus, the very premise of the *Cause* and its entire philosophical foundations were to be scrutinized and then, by a substantial number of Russian intellectuals, discarded as flawed.

Early Religious-Philosophical Meetings

Merezhkovsky and Gippius seized upon Diaghilev's inspiration and methods to create their own society. Yet, Merezhkovsky was not satisfied with fighting against the *Cause*. He felt that some new underlying principal should be introduced into Russian consciousness to replace the old positivist, socialist paradigm. Further influenced by Dostoevsky, Tolstoy, and the religious philosopher Vladimir Soloviev (1853-1900), he devoted more and more of his work to specifically religious themes in search of the

¹³ The Bolshevik writers Bogdanov, Gorky, and Lunacharsky, for example, all began to use certain Nietzschean concepts in their work. For more information on the influence of Nietzsche on the Russian intelligentsia, see Bernice Rosenthal, ed., Nietzsche in Russia (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1986).

¹⁴ Bernice Rosenthal & Martha Bohachevsky-Chomiak, eds., A Revolution of the Spirit: Crisis of Value in Russia, 1890-1924 (New York: Fordham University Press, 1990) 27.

unknowable "moments where one enters the half-opened door to eternity".¹⁵ He had decided that the *Cause* did not appeal sufficiently to him because it lacked any spiritual or religious dimension.

Merezhkovsky launched his defence of spirituality with a challenging essay in Mir iskusstva in 1900. He analyzed Dostoevsky and Tolstoy, not as commentators of social ills in Russia, but as predominantly religious writers. In so doing, he insisted that the unified atheism (or at least complete neglect of religion) on the part of the intelligentsia was misguided, and had caused much of the sterility which he attributed to the *Cause*. If Diaghilev had been perceived as a decadent, Merezhkovsky was clearly toying with the label of "heretic". Nevertheless, he had tapped into a mood for change, and was read and followed by an ever-growing number of the intelligentsia. As his wife commented about those times:

Something was breaking down in Russia. Something had been left behind; something was just being born or brought back to life. We had started moving forward. Where? This was not known to anyone, but even then, on the threshold of a new century, one could feel tragedy in the air of Russia.¹⁶

For Merezhkovsky the answer seemed to lie in some spiritual or religious rebirth, and he championed Symbolism because he saw it as a means for bringing religious and mythical metaphors into literature. However, he also realized that the prevalent ignorance about religion and the Russian Orthodox Church must be mitigated if Russian intellectuals were truly to incorporate such themes in their future work.

At this time, Merezhkovsky was presented with dramatic evidence about the enormous gap between the Church and the intelligentsia: the Orthodox hierarchy

¹⁵ Merezhkovsky, as cited in Pierre Pascal, Les grands courants de la pensée russe contemporaine (Paris: Librairie Fischbacher, 1971) 20.

¹⁶ Zinaida Gippius, Dmitrii Merezhkovskii 80.

decided to excommunicate Leo Tolstoy. Upon hearing of this act, Merezhkovsky hotly proclaimed: "if you [the Church] have excommunicated him [Tolstoy], then also excommunicate us, because we are with him and not with you".¹⁷ Clearly more communication was essential, and changes were required among the clergy as well as the intelligentsia if they were ever to become reconciled.

In both the creation of new styles and the call for a reformed religion, Merezhkovsky was not alone. The mercurial Vasily Rozanov (1756-1919), who had taken on the mantle of Dostoevsky (as well as his wife¹⁸), was putting his own stamp upon the new approach. He devoted his writings to the question of religion and the expression of religious symbolism. After completing a series of articles assessing the meaning of Dostoevsky's "The Legend of the Grand Inquisitor" (1899), Rozanov concentrated on the relationship between religion and culture; this led him to his ensuing preoccupation of the spiritual element in sexual relations and marriage.

In 1902, Rozanov shocked Russian society with his bold assertions against traditional Church interpretations of Christ the man. He insisted that God did not want weak or insipid characters in the play of life, but joyous, virile, and impulsive men; the Church had castrated Christ, and then all of the Saints who followed. At the heart of his polemic was a complete revolt against asceticism, celibacy, and especially, the chaste marriage. Rather, he argued that God knowingly created man as animal, and fully expected him to gain as much physical pleasure as that state afforded: man was not doomed to burn; he should be encouraged to feel a spiritual satisfaction along with the

¹⁷ Merezhkovsky, as cited in Pascal, Les grands courants 20.

¹⁸ Dostoevsky's long-time mistress and second wife, Polina Suslova, remarried Rozanov a few years after his death.

physical fulfilment.¹⁹ Like Merezhkovsky, Rozanov augmented the logical force of his arguments with a new literary style. His, however, was not mystical or dreamy symbolism, but rather scintillating, paradoxical, and brutal. In sharp, abrupt terms spiced with aphorisms he illustrated the gap between the Church and everyday life.

Rozanov was not only short in his writings. He was also notoriously impatient and curt with all people he encountered.²⁰ Although his literary compositions were compelling, his personality tended to repulse others. Merezhkovsky, on the other hand, was born gregarious, and, although he was intransigent in his opinions, his charm and open nature attracted seeking personalities in droves. This facet of his character complemented his own personal needs: Merezhkovsky was a teacher, and he needed to test his ideas, compare them with others, and pass them on. He said once that "I must inflame others or I lose myself".²¹ Consequently, it was at Merezhkovsky's initiative that the Religio-philosophic meetings in St. Petersburg were established in 1901: Bringing together clergy and intellectuals, he hoped to educate young members of the intelligentsia about the Church, and simultaneously make the Church hierarchy more aware of intellectual concerns. Rozanov's similar interests compelled him to attend and take an active part in the proceedings, but he was incapable of providing the organizational force.

The first "seance" was held on November 29, 1901. Both sides in the now public debate were equally represented with theologians and priests in comparable numbers to

¹⁹ Pascal, Les grands courants 19.

²⁰ See Andrei Belyi, Mezhdu dvukh revoliutsii, 2nd ed. (Chicago: Russian Language Specialities, 1966); Nachalo veka, 2nd ed. (Moskva: Gos' izd-vo Khodozh. lit-ry, 1966) for a description of the new religious intelligentsia.

²¹ Merezhkovsky, as cited in Pascal, Les grands courants 19.

"heretical" (to the *Cause*) philosophers and writers. The gatherings were also officially sanctioned by the High Procurator, Constantine Pobedonostsev, of the Holy Synod. In order to maximize the potential for acrimonious debate, Merezhkovsky combined the most reactionary clerics with the most revolutionary artists. The most conservative of the Church members was Bishop Serge, auxiliary of the Metropolitan of St. Petersburg.²² Yet, controversial clerics were also invited such as Archimandrite Antonin, who would later found "the Living Church",²³ and Archimandrite Michael.²⁴

The laic representatives were, on the other hand, mostly independent thinkers and personalities. In addition to Rozanov, there were several experts on religion such as Anton Kartashev (1875-1960) who was to become the Minister for Religion during Russia's brief Provisional Government. At that time he was teaching theology at St. Petersburg Theological Academy, but had resisted formally joining the clergy because he perceived it to be in dire need of reform especially regarding autonomy from the State.²⁵ The symbolist protégés, Blok, Bely, and Ivanov, were included as was the more traditional, symbolist poet Vasily Briusov: He did not share the others' fascination with religion, but was concerned with illustrating issues of the "inner man".²⁶ In addition to a collection of other avant-garde artists and intellectuals, the gatherings even included Marxists -

²² He would later go on to become Metropolitan of Russia under the Soviet Regime, and play a very controversial part in the State-Church loyalty dispute, forcing all Orthodox believers to take an oath of loyalty to the Soviet State in 1927, or face excommunication.

²³ This dubious body represented itself as a reformation of the Orthodox Church, but was well known to have been a paid ploy of the Bolshevik Party designed to discredit religion in Russia.

²⁴ An eloquent writer who went on to convert to the Old Believers before his untimely death in one of the popular uprisings in the twilight of the Tsarist Regime.

²⁵ Nicholas Zernov, The Russian Religious Renaissance of the Twentieth Century (New York: Harper & Row, 1963) 90.

²⁶ Rosenthal and Bohachevsky-Chomiak, eds., A Revolution of the Spirit 27.

Maxim Gorky, and Anton Lunacharsky - and the two former Social Democrats Nikolai Berdyaev and Sergei Bulgakov.

The meetings lasted until 1903, and totalled twenty-eight in all. Merezhkovsky succeeded admirably in provoking acrimonious and controversial debate (the first subject was Count Tolstoy's excommunication by the Orthodox Church), and the hall where the meetings were held was always filled past its capacity of 200 people.²⁷ In order to disseminate the discussions to a wider, public audience, Merezhkovsky and Rozanov edited a new journal Novyi put' (this task was soon taken over by a young poet, George Chulkov) which tended to emphasize the reform tendencies, and criticized conservative Orthodox views. Despite this certain editorial agreement that the Church must change to a state where it had some veritable meaning and value in the lives of its laity, there was still a large divergence over what methods would be most appropriate and over what course these changes should take. Finally, the High Procurator decided that the meetings were becoming too popular and much too outspoken in their criticism of the Church; after the last meeting on April 5, 1903, he suspended the gatherings permanently.

While most clerical representatives still retained a degree of resistance to any laically-directed change, the meetings began to spur a radical transformation in world-view among the secular component. The young poets and writers, especially Alexandr Blok and Andrei Bely cemented their commitment to Symbolism with an understanding that a spiritual or religious theme might underlay all their advanced forms. They found security and a sense of purpose in the idea that art could be religious. This was not

²⁷ Other topics included *liberty of conscience, spirit and body, marriage, dogmatic development*. Pierre Pascal, Les grands courants 21.

merely a superficial merging of spiritual symbols with the narrative of everyday life, but a complete transformation of the meaning of art; a divine impulse gave more validity to the unexplained desire of the artist to create; symbolic and non-verbal forms characterized the "unknowable" dimensions of faith and grace in a more dramatic manner than dry theological tracts. In short, the change involved conceptualizing human artistic creations as a dialogue between the artist and all forces in his life. A dialogue between man and the world, man and man, but also between man and God.

From Marxism to Idealism

The impetus for change discussed at the Religio-philosophic meetings intersected with an outright revolt against Marxism from some of its most prominent adherents within Russia. At the turn of the century, Lenin began to condemn the so-called "Legal Marxists" whom he felt were revising and perverting the "truths" of Orthodox Marxism. Foremost of these was the stipulative founder of the Social Democratic Party in Russia, Peter Struve (1870-1941). The others were Nikolai Berdyaev (1874-1948), Sergei Bulgakov (1871-1944), and Semen Frank (1877-1950). The four had begun to write in a similar vein to German and French revisionist Marxists such as Eduard Bernstein, Rosa Luxembourgh and Jean Jaurès. They saw that the world situation of the proletariat had changed from the time of Marx in so far as unions and social reforms enacted by most governments in Europe were swiftly undermining any need for a violent and complete socialist revolution. The Marxist plan, they felt, needed to be reformed to suit the new conditions.²⁸

²⁸ See Richard Kindersley, The First Revisionists: A Study of "Legal Marxism" in Russia (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1962)

Lenin's outright refusal to countenance any change in Marxist theory was largely supported by his fellow Social Democrats in exile in Switzerland. However, their intransigence made the four intellectuals in Russia feel more and more alienated. While the four "Legal Marxists" each arrived at an irreconcilable opposition to Marxism independently, they did share a similarity of method in that each man was a competent philosopher in his own right, and each was compelled to examine the fundamental premises of any theory which he espoused. It was this drive to rigorous analysis which caused them to first suggest reforms of Marxism, and then to unearth critical flaws which precluded their continued involvement in the movement.

Struve was the most established Marxist. He had participated in the founding of the Russian Social Democratic Party in Minsk in 1898, published a central Marxist tract, Critical Observations on the Problem of Russia's Economic Development (1894) at the age of twenty-four, and edited the two predominant Marxist journals in Russia until 1901. That year, just ahead of the Tsarist police, he emigrated to Germany where he established an anti-government review Osvobozhdenie (Liberation). A more committed soldier for the Cause could not be found, and Struve was held a hero by the intelligentsia.²⁹

It was this very reputation which made the "betrayal" of Struve so calamitous to the Marxists specifically and to the intelligentsia in general. Struve declared his disavowal of Marxism after his move to Germany in a preface, "On Various Themes" to the first published work by Nikolai Berdyaev, Sub'ektivizm i individualizm v obshchestvenoi filosofii

²⁹ Adriana Tyrkova, Na putiakh k svobode (New York: Chekhov Press, 1952). The most comprehensive biography of Struve in English is the two volume work written by Richard Pipes, Struve: Liberal on the Left, 1870 - 1905 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1970) and Struve: Liberal on the Right, 1905-1944 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1980).

(1901).³⁰ Both Struve's introduction and the work which it accompanied created a scandal among the intelligentsia: the two men argued that socialist theory in Russia - both Marxist and Populist - was logically flawed, and could not stand in the face of rigorous philosophical testing. It accused the Russian socialist theoreticians of adhering not to objective, scientific truths as they proclaimed, but rather to subjective, opinionated proselytizing.

No greater condemnation could be made of the social materialists. The entire foundation of their ideas rested upon the premise of objective absolutes: Scientific investigation, historical determinism, natural law, and rational materialism. To say that Marxist or Populist theory was nothing more than flawed opinion, was to undermine its very reason for being. Moreover, if social materialism was actually based upon the subjective method, as both Berdyaev and Struve argued, then its claim to offering the one, true solution to all of mankind's problems was invalidated.

We say that this double foundation for the ideal [Socialism] is absolutely inadequate; a third foundation is necessary, one which we would call *objectively ethical*. It is necessary to show that our social ideal is not only objectively necessary (the logical category), not only subjectively desirable (the psychological category), but also that it is objectively moral and objectively just, that its actualization will be progress in the sense of improvement; in a word, that it is binding on all, has unconditional value, is something *obligatory* (the ethical category).³¹

The former Marxists thereby insisted that social materialism could not be applied universally nor could it fulfil its aspirations for world revolution unless it was fundamentally revised at its ontological basis. In this one publication, they pierced the *Cause* of the

³⁰ This has been translated into English as Nicholas Berdyaev, "Subjectivism and Objectivism," Russian Philosophy, Vol. 3, eds. James M. Edie, James P. Scanlan and Mary-Barbara Zeldin (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1994).

³¹ Nicholas Berdyaev, "Subjectivism and Objectivism," Russian Philosophy Vol. 3 150.

Russian intelligentsia by raising the spectre of doubt: Could the Materialist program for social justice have any "objective moral sanction"?³²

The publication was a scandal. Struve's preface made it impossible to ignore, and the carefully crafted argument by Berdyaev attracted considerable attention. As a debate began in the Socialist press, the intelligentsia demanded, who was Nikolai Berdyaev? And why would Struve have supported him? As the first reports came out, proponents of socialism took heart from the revelation that Nikolai Berdyaev was the youngest son of a minor noble.³³ Further information, however, proved most disquieting. Berdyaev had joined the Marxists while a student at the University of Kiev (1894-1898), and he had conducted his Party tasks with dexterity. Moreover, he had written the heinous article while in exile in Vologda. Berdyaev and his fellow Marxist students had been arrested in a police raid in 1898. Instead of using his family connections to mitigate his sentence he had insisted that he share the fate of his comrades. Not only had he drawn the attention and commendation of the Kiev Social Democratic chief, Anton Lunacharsky, he had willingly suffered persecution for the *Cause*.³⁴ While Berdyaev did not have the stature of Struve, he had clearly been an asset to the Marxists and a loyal revolutionary.

The truth could, therefore, no longer be denied. Two committed Marxists had left the *Cause* because they had found on close examination its philosophical basis was

³² Nicholas Berdyaev, "Subjectivism and Objectivism," Russian Philosophy Vol. 3 151.

³³ Biographies of Berdyaev have been written in Russian, French and English. The most authentic English version was written by Donald Lowrie, Rebellious Prophet: A Life of Nikolai Berdyaev (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1960). Two recent biographies written by Russians have brought some new archival material to light: N.K. Dmitrieva and A.P. Moiseeva, Nikolai Berdiaev: zhizn' i tvorchestvo (Moskva: Vysshaia shkola, 1993); Aleksandr Vadimov, Zhizn' Berdiaeva: Rossiia (Oakland, CA: Berkeley Slavic Specialities, 1993).

³⁴ Nicholas Berdyaev, Dream and Reality: An Essay in Autobiography, trans. Katharine Lampert (New York: MacMillan, 1951) 117-123.

flawed, subjective, and opinionated. As a fellow revolutionary and compatriot in exile in Germany described him, Struve was a man,

for whom there existed none of the stereotyped forms. He checked everything and turned everything upside down....He was the first to find justification, explanation and proper expression for still unformulated changes in public opinion.³⁵

Like Struve, Berdyaev was also an intensely questioning individual. He had enjoyed a degree of philosophical self-training as a youth, and had augmented his knowledge while at university. It was in the intense, Marxist-dominated community in Vologda that he began to see flaws in the theories expressed by his colleagues and, as he held Marx up against Kant but also other great philosophers, he found that he could no longer accept the materialist position. Separated by hundreds of miles, the two Marxists both travelled the road away from materialism; for a time they found solace and answers in the diametrically opposed philosophy of idealism.

The revolt of Struve and Berdyaev was followed by a new intellectual movement and the publication of a review critical of Marxism, social materialism, and the *Cause*. Problemy idealizma (Problems of Idealism) made its debut in 1902 as a forum for renewing the viability of idealist philosophy in direct repudiation of dialectical materialism. Struve edited the journal from abroad. The first collection explained the contributors' disillusionment under the heading "From Marxism to Idealism," and it included essays from the two other formerly staunch Marxists: Sergei Bulgakov and Semen Frank.

Sergei Bulgakov had been raised in a religious environment and was destined for the seminary to follow his family's tradition in the priesthood.³⁶ However, as an

³⁵ Adriana Tyrkova, Na putiakh k svobode 198.

³⁶ While Zernov does devote several pages to Bulgakov, describing his intellectual development (see Zernov, The Russian Religious Renaissance 137-150, 265-269, 335), and a

adolescent he became increasingly troubled by the obvious inequalities in Russian society, and soon revolted against this: "Orthodox piety only irritated me, for its mystical side had ceased to exist for me. ...I became the victim of a gloomy revolutionary nihilism".³⁷ As he shifted out of the theological school to study law at the University of Kiev, he soon became involved with the Marxists and wrote several important economic tracts.³⁸ Nevertheless, he continued to have religious experiences (one in 1895 and another in Dresden in 1898)³⁹ which sowed the first seeds of doubt in his chosen path of Marxism; when his friend Berdyaev turned away from the *Cause* in 1901, Bulgakov agreed with his argument and joined the new revolt. Like Struve and Berdyaev, he turned now to Kant and idealism which he found temporarily more satisfying than materialist philosophy.

Semen Frank had also been educated in a religious environment. He was raised by his maternal grandfather who was an Orthodox Jew and one of the leading elders of the Moscow synagogue.⁴⁰ His stepfather, however, harboured Populist sympathies, and

recent dissertation has been written concerning Bulgakov's philosophy (see Catherine Evtuhov, "Sergei Bulgakov: A Study in Modernism and Society in Russia, 1900-1918," diss., University of California at Berkeley, 1992), there exists no biography of him in English, French, or German. However, a biography has been written in Russian by a fellow Russian émigré Lev Zander, Bog i mir, 2 vols. (Paris: YMCA-Press, 1948). Bulgakov also wrote a short autobiography: Sergei Bulgakov, Avtobiograficheskie zametki (Paris: YMCA-Press, 1991). For a list of Bulgakov's writings see Kliment Naumov, Bibliographie des oeuvres de Serge Boulgakov (Paris: Institut d'études slaves, 1984).

³⁷ Sergei Bulgakov, Avtobiograficheskie zametki 26-29.

³⁸ Some of these include Sergei Bulgakov, "O zakonornosti sotsial'nykh iavlenii," Voprosy filosofii i psikhologii (Moscow, 1896); O ryinkakh pri kapitalisticheskome proizvodstve (Moscow, 1897).

³⁹ Sergei Bulgakov, Avtobiograficheskie zametki 61-62.

⁴⁰ Frank has been even less studied by Western scholars than Bulgakov. As he had done for Bulgakov, Zernov devoted a few pages to describe his background, writings and philosophy. See Zernov, The Russian Religious Renaissance 158-163, 338. However, the only complete elucidation of his life and his development is his own autobiography, Semen L. Frank, S.L. Frank (Munich: s.n., 1954). See also Philip James Swoboda,

introduced the young Frank to the leading socialist and Marxist Russian writers. Frank became a member of the Social Democratic Party while at the University of Moscow in 1894, and worked closely with Peter Struve.

Marxism attracted me by its scientific form. I was impressed by the thought that human society can be understood through the study of the laws that govern it, in the same way as nature can be studied in science. I accepted also the ethical principles of the revolutionaries, but I never liked them.⁴¹

Despite his continual doubts about the methods espoused by the Marxists, he still wrote socialist pamphlets, and was eventually expelled from Moscow University in 1899. Going abroad, he directed his studies increasingly towards philosophy at the University in Berlin and, upon his return to Russia in 1901, he decided to devote all his energies to a career as a philosopher. The shift of his former mentor Struve and the appeal of Berdyaev's treatise coincided perfectly with Frank's personal transformation, and he gladly offered his services in outlining the new idealist programme.

Struve's writers also included other Russian philosophers who had never been attracted to Marxism, yet found the idealist trend attractive. The foremost of these, the jurist and philosopher, Pavel Novgorodtsev (1866-1924), became Struve's co-editor. He had always embraced the liberal politics of Constitutional Democracy, and cherished the British model as an example for Russia: his most compelling attachment was, therefore,

"The Philosophical Thought of S.L. Frank, 1902-15: A Study of the Metaphysical Impulse in Early Twentieth Century Russia," (PhD. diss, Columbia University, 1992); Philip Boobbyer, S.L. Frank: The Life and Work of a Russian Philosopher. (Athens, OH, 1995). His works have been consistently (if infrequently) republished: Natalie Duddington, trans., God With Us: Three Meditations (London: J. Cape, 1926); The Vladimir Soloviev Anthology, ed. Semen L. Frank, trans. Natalie Duddington (London: S.C.M. Press, 1950); Iz istorii russkoi filosofskoi mysli kontsa 19: nachala 20 veka (Washington: Inter-Language Literature Association, 1965); The Unknowable: An Ontological Introduction to the Philosophy of Religion, trans. Boris Jakim (Athens, Ohio: Ohio University Press, 1983); The Light Shined in Darkness: An Essay in Christian Ethics and Social Philosophy, trans. Boris Jakim (Athens, Ohio: Ohio University Press, 1989).

⁴¹ Semen L. Frank, Biografiia, P.B. Struve (New York: Chekhov Press, 1956) 5.

to the rule of law, and he continually bemoaned the intelligentsia's naïveté and puerile appreciation of the law's intricacies and importance. Soon Novgorodtsev would rise to prominence as the Chairman of the Kadet Party in Russia.⁴² Sergei Askoldov, a notorious metaphysician and "pan-psychist", was also attracted to the idealist movement as were the Princes Evgeny (1863-1920) and Sergei (1862-1905) Trubetskoy.⁴³

Problems of Idealism made a sensation and scandal not only among the Marxists, but among the mass of the intelligentsia: idealism, nietzscheanism, natural law, absolute principles, morals on a metaphysical base, instead of just materialism and the social cause, these were heresies. But a great deal of attention would be paid to their call by the coming political events.⁴⁴

The elaboration of idealist principles in Problemy idealizma coincided with the rise of neo-Kantian and neo-Platonic philosophy in the Russian universities, as well as with a similar resurgence of Idealism occurring at that time in Europe, especially in Germany.⁴⁵

The growing popularity of such investigation in Russia may have had as much to do with its novelty as with the intrinsic merit of idealist philosophy. Materialism and

⁴² Novgorodtsev remains an elusive figure. There are fragments about him in Rosenthal and Bohachevsky-Chomiak, eds., A Revolution of the Spirit 247-264; and in Zernov, The Russian Religious Renaissance 332-333. At least one of Novgorodtsev's works has been republished: Ob obshchestvennom ideale (Moscow: Pressa, 1991). Some of his ideas may be found in Russian Schools and Universities in the World War (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1929); G.F. Putman, Russian Alternatives to Marxism: Christian Socialism and Idealistic Liberalism in Twentieth Century Russia, (Knoxville, TN, 1977).

⁴³ The Trubetskoy family had repeatedly converged with alternative intellectual movements in Russia, especially those based upon some spiritual foundation. An ancestor of these two princes had been a notorious free-mason at the turn of the nineteenth century, and had suffered exile for his participation in the Decembrist revolt of 1825. One of his daughters had then married the Slavophile philosopher Ivan Kireevsky, and she purportedly was instrumental in bringing him into the Orthodox revival movement led by the monks of Optina Pustin. See Henry Lanz, "The Philosophy of Ivan Kireevsky," The Slavonic and East European Review (March 1926): 594-604. Evgeny Trubetskoy continued to be a central figure in the religious renaissance until his death, and afterwards, his children contributed greatly to the movement within the emigration. For a biography of Sergei, see Martha Bohachevsky-Chomiak, S.N. Trubetskoi: An Intellectual Among the Intelligentsia (Belmont, Mass.: Nordland, 1976).

⁴⁴ Pascal, Les grands courants 18.

⁴⁵ For more information, see Frederick Copleston, A History of Philosophy, Vol. 7 (New York: Doubleday, 1985) 361-389.

Positivism had dominated Russian self-consciousness for almost fifty years, but despite the seemingly unquestionable solutions and assurances which they put forth, these concepts suffered from sterility and a certain inhumanity. Idealism was, moreover, a comfortable transition for previous Materialists because it too asserted certain absolutes, accepted determinism, and provided a guiding plan. Yet it also was more complex and speculative, for it allowed consideration of metaphysical truths as well as the over-popularized material and physical realities.

For the four former Marxists and their new colleagues at Problemy idealizma, however, idealist philosophy became only a temporary stopping-ground in their search for "truths" which would explain man's role in the world and Russia's particular characteristics. Once open to a greater plurality of world-conceptions they began to study intently the specifically Russian contributions to philosophy. The four were aided in this by the Princes Trubetskoy who were self-avowed disciples of Russia's predominant religious philosopher, Vladimir Soloviev. As they began to appraise Soloviev's works and gradually to trace the development of this train of thought through its Russian origins, the writers of Problemy idealizma found themselves increasingly confronted with the issue of religion. It was decided that more information was needed, and this was part of the reason why Berdyaev and Bulgakov chose to become regular attendants of the Religio-philosophic meetings held by Merezhkovsky.

In 1904, this entire group of idealists moved beyond their allegiance to Kant and Plato with the intent of creating a true religious-philosophy for Russia. The first expression of their ideas was recorded in Novyi put' (the journal which Berdyaev and Bulgakov had taken over from Merezhkovsky after the forced closure of his Religio-philosophic forum in 1903. Chulkov continued his editorship of the review. The move from Idealism to

religious-philosophy was prompted by some of the same motivations which had caused the four to originally leave Marxism. They found the abstract speculations and rationalizations of the great Greek and German Idealists rather sterile and too absolute. Moreover, all four men were still very concerned with the social problems in Russia and the world, and they felt that pure Idealism was too other-worldly and too impractical. Possibly, they desired to personalize the ideal: To bring God from the un-reachable absolute of the ideal into some living connectedness with human life and aspirations. In 1905, when Novyi put' again was censored by the office of the Holy Synod, the group reopened their discussion in a new journal Voprosy zhizni (Questions of Life).

For these intellectuals the religious-philosophical tradition had the benefit of being a native one quite distinct from Western developments, and they became increasingly convinced that it was the only appropriate path for their country. They continued to rail against the illogic of Marxism, the idolatry of Positivism, and the sterility of Idealism as they performed the invaluable task of recovering their own Russian philosophy. In so doing they began to see a unique destiny for Russia in the world.

Religious-Philosophical Antecedents

Launched by the Slavophiles in the 1840s, the religious-philosophical school of thought held that the crucial element for any true advancements in philosophy, theology, or social theory was an East-West Christian reconciliation. The ontological basis for their theory was the conception that knowledge derived from two sources: reason and faith. In the earliest history of man, these two ways to knowledge had been used together, but as civilization evolved, they had split along geographical lines. The West had developed rational thought to its highest level, but at the expense of faith. The East had

concentrated on learning the best methods to arrive at revealed knowledge while neglecting reason. In Russia, concern over this division led to the genesis of a philosophy of unity. *Logos* (Western rational knowledge) must again be combined with *Sophia* (wisdom, or Eastern revealed knowledge) in order that both could benefit from the advances made along their divergent paths, and a renewed, unified approach to knowledge be achieved.

This theory had been first proposed by the Slavophiles. They had gone to the West to study and learned of the great advances made by Hegel and Schelling in philosophy. Upon returning to Russia, they were torn between their allegiance to the Greek Patristic tradition which lay at the basis of Russian Orthodoxy - it was currently undergoing a promising revival in the hands of the monks at *Optina Pustin* - and the new ideas they had learned in the West. Unwilling to disregard either their national traditions or the Western ideas they had learned, the Slavophiles struggled for a way to integrate the two.

Initially, several of the Slavophiles were threatened and repulsed by some of the consequences of rational thought which they had seen in the West: The erosion of religious spirit, the autocratic determinism of Hegel, and the developments of industry and the proletariat. They feared that any acceptance of Western reason would bring these blemishes to Russia. Constantine Aksakov (1817-1860) was one of the most ardent anti-Western Slavophiles. Dressed in the traditional garb of the Russian peasant, he shunned modernity, Hegelian thought, and all aspects of Western civilization with a passion; for Aksakov, the salvation of Russia lay in a return to its mythical past.⁴⁶ Alexis

⁴⁶ Nicholas Riasanovsky, Russia and the West in the Teaching of the Slavophiles. (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1956) 49-50.

Khomyakov (1804-1860) was, at first, also a proponent of Russian isolation from the West. He had spent a year at the universities in Germany and Austria, and had come back to Russia revolted by the political and social situation he had seen in the West. Russia, he insisted, must be protected from "the rationalism, the machinism, the juridicism, and the democratic 'impersonalism' which were causing the West to lose its soul."⁴⁷

It was left to the Slavophiles' leading philosopher, Ivan Kireevsky (1806-1856), who also held serious doubts about Western development, to propose a solution by which Russia could help the West and not simply cut itself off from the changes which were enveloping the world. He believed that Russians, emotionally open and capable of love, should aid the faithless, divided Europeans.⁴⁸ Kireevsky envisioned a universal brotherhood of men in which Russia,

would serve as the bridge between East and West; Russia would offer a cure to both the "grabbing individualism" of the West and the despotic anti-individualism of the East.⁴⁹

His last essay, O neobkhodimosti i vosmozhnosti novykh nachal d'lia filosofii,⁵⁰ suggested that the World should use Europe's superior capacity of reason as a starting point for a new unity in which Russia would provide the communality and faith to bind humanity together.⁵¹

Kireevsky established the historical and philosophical foundations which

⁴⁷ Edie, Scanlan, and Zeldin, Russian Philosophy Vol. 1 161.

⁴⁸ Edie, Scanlan, and Zeldin, Russian Philosophy Vol. 1 161.

⁴⁹ Janko Lavrin, "Kireevsky and the Problem of Culture," The Russian Review 20.2 (1961): 119.

⁵⁰ Translated as Ivan Kireevsky, "On the Necessity and Possibility of New Principles in Philosophy," Russian Philosophy, Vol. 1, eds. James M. Edie, James P. Scanlan and Mary-Barbara Zeldin (Knoxville: University of Tennessee, 1994) 171-213.

⁵¹ Kireevsky, "On the Necessity and Possibility of New Principles in Philosophy" 213.

predicated the need for a religious philosophy. He first explained the limitations which had led Western rational thought to its finite end:

...when man rejects every authority except his abstract thinking, can he advance beyond the view which presents the whole existence of the world as the transparent dialectic of his own reason, and his reason as the self-consciousness of universal being? It is obvious that in this case the ultimate goal which can be conceived by an abstract reason separated from other cognitive powers is the goal which he has been approaching for centuries, which he has now attained [in Hegel], and beyond which there is nothing further for him to seek.⁵²

In Kireevsky's view there were no more advancements to be made in Western rational philosophy, or indeed in Western social and religious life. In its entire reliance on individual reason, Western philosophy could now only "expand in breadth, developing details and giving all individual disciplines a common sense".⁵³

Western religions faced an even bleaker future. Division began from the first moment that the Roman Catholic Church decided to admit individual opinion into the realm of divine revelation (by creating a Roman hierarchy with the Pope as the "Vicar of St. Peter", later the "Vicar of Christ" and God's physical representative on earth, and changing the unchangeable, eternal Christian dogmas).⁵⁴ In Kireevsky's opinion, this first schism began a chain reaction which was causing the Christian Church in the West to splinter again and again. Protestantism might be the most dramatic of the ensuing schisms, but it was not the last. Once individual reason could command dogma, every individual would eventually insist upon creating his own religion.⁵⁵

⁵² Kireevsky, "On the Necessity and Possibility of New Principles in Philosophy" 172.

⁵³ Kireevsky, "On the Necessity and Possibility of New Principles in Philosophy," 173.

⁵⁴ Kireevsky, "On the Necessity and Possibility of New Principles in Philosophy" 174-175.

⁵⁵ "Natural reason, upon which the [Protestant] Church was to be affirmed, outgrew the faith of the people. Philosophical concepts more and more replaced, and are still replacing, religious concepts." Kireevsky, "On the Necessity and Possibility of New Principles in Philosophy" 194.

For Kireevsky, the fragmentation did not stop here. The endless game of abstract thinking caused human beings to criticize and doubt every tradition, eternal value and truth. Eventually, even man's conception of himself became unattached to any foundations, and he saw himself as a spectator to the grand parade of life around him: "...not only was faith lost in the West, but also poetry, which in the absence of living convictions became transformed into a barren amusement; and the more exclusively poetry sought imagined pleasure alone, the more tedious it became."⁵⁶ Finally, the only remaining serious interest left to Western man was industry.

Industry rules the world without faith or poetry. In our time it unites and divides people. It determines one's fatherland; it delineates classes; it lies at the base of state structures; it moves nations; it declares war, makes peace, changes mores, gives direction to science, and determines the character of culture. Men bow down before it and erect temples to it. It is the real deity in which people sincerely believe and to which they submit...Incidentally we have not witnessed everything yet. One may say that we are seeing only the beginning of the unlimited domination of industry and of the recent phase of philosophy. Proceeding hand in hand, they have yet to run the full course of the modern development of European life. It is hard to see what European culture may come to if some sort of inner change does not occur among the European peoples.⁵⁷

The Western world had reached a terrible impasse and, Kireevsky asserted, if Russia did not show the West a way in which they could stop this destructive spiral they would all perish. He, thus, persuaded many of his fellow Slavophiles to abandon their isolationism and, instead, attempt to work with the West to the betterment of both parties. It became their quest to remind the West that in true Christianity,

...[t]he sum total of all Christians, of all ages, past and present, comprises one indivisible, eternal, living assembly of the faithful, held together just as much by

⁵⁶ Kireevsky, "On the Necessity and Possibility of New Principles in Philosophy" 194-195. It is interesting to note the amazing similarity between Kireevsky's observation and that of the contemporary Danish philosopher Søren Kierkegaard who accused his fellow Protestants of being merely "spectators" of the religious "show" instead of true believers and creatures of God.

⁵⁷ Kireevsky, "On the Necessity and Possibility of New Principles in Philosophy" 195.

the unity of consciousness as through the communion of prayer.⁵⁸

Only if Western rational thought was again reunited with Eastern faith would Christianity be saved, and a new age of man begun. Without such a union, Kireevsky was very pessimistic about the future of the world. Kireevsky's arguments were so persuasive that even the isolationist Slavophile, Khomyakov, abandoned his former stance in his final years, and embraced oecumenism.⁵⁹ After 1860, however, most of the original Slavophiles had died, and the pursuit of religious-philosophy fell into some obscurity.

Feodor Dostoevsky tried to continue to develop certain elements of religious-philosophy. So too, it may be said, did Leo Tolstoy. However, Dostoevsky was so intransigent in his attitude to the Catholic Church, and became such an ardent nationalist and isolationist that he could not embrace the mingling of reason and faith. Instead he devoted most of his writings to attacking the developments of rational philosophy, especially in its new, popular form: materialism. Tolstoy, as well, diverged from the central religious-philosophical path. He was first all rational, then all religious. With the creation of a new religion, his Tolstoyan sect, he actively worked against Orthodoxy and, indeed, all established churches. In the end, he too embraced anti-rationality and came to believe only in the "strong faith of the simple peasant". Thus, it was only through the work of Vladimir Soloviev, that the quest for a true religious-philosophy was rejoined.

Soloviev largely agreed with Kireevsky's appraisal of philosophy and world development. Yet, he found the Slavophile's elucidation of unified knowledge to be incomplete. Kireevsky was too entrenched in the patristic tradition, and still too unfamiliar

⁵⁸ Kireevsky, "On the Necessity and Possibility of New Principles in Philosophy" 197.

⁵⁹ This is discussed in Serge Bolshakov, The Doctrine of the Unity of the Church in the Works of Khomyakov and Moehler (London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1946).

with the intricacies of rational thought to achieve a comprehensive integration. Soloviev, on the other hand, had begun his career as a student in Western philosophy and, while he remained loyal to Orthodoxy, he asserted that:

The task which stands before us is: to introduce the ancient content of Christianity into a new form that corresponds to it, i.e., one that is rational and unconditional...Now it is as clear to me as 2×2 equals 4 that the great development of Western Philosophy and science, apparently indifferent and often hostile to Christianity, in actuality has only formulated for Christianity a new and worthy form for it.⁶⁰

He, therefore, advocated a modernization of Orthodox theology which would maintain its patristic foundation, but also assimilate the new rational developments from the West.

Perhaps Soloviev's most important insight into the relationship between reason and faith was in his concept of *Godmanhood*.⁶¹ Soloviev saw man as acting as the link between God and created matter, exhibiting the characteristics of both. From created matter, man derived the capability of *logos* (reason or "God as an active force and productive unity"⁶²): "'Reason', is a *formal principle*, it has no independent access to reality. It is, as it were, *essentially abstract*, i.e., precisely *detached* from reality, i.e., from the being."⁶³ From God, man carries the element of *Sophia* (faith or "the very essence of God and the very purpose of God"⁶⁴): "On the contrary, 'faith' is precisely an insight

⁶⁰ Vladimir Soloviev, letter to his fifteen-year old cousin, E.K. Romanova, 2 August 1873, translated in Samuel D. Cioran, Vladimir Solov'ev and the Knighthood of the Divine Sophia (Waterloo, Ont.: Wilfred Laurier University Press, 1977) 12-13.

⁶¹ Vladimir Soloviev, The Justification of the Good: An Essay on Moral Philosophy, trans. Nathalie Duddington (London: Constable & Co., Ltd., 1918) 135-193; "Lectures on Godmanhood," Russian Philosophy, ed. James M. Edie, James P. Scanlan, and Mary-Barbara Zeldin, Vol. 3 (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1992) 62-84.

⁶² Andriy Chirovsky, Pray for God's Wisdom: The Mystical Sophiology of Metropolitan Andrey Sheptytsky (Chicago: Metropolitan Andrey Sheptytsky Institute of Christian Studies, 1992) 154.

⁶³ Soloviev, "Lectures on Godmanhood" 73.

⁶⁴ Chirovsky, Pray for God's Wisdom 154.

into existence. It touches reality even if it cannot, by itself, give an account of what it possesses."⁶⁵ For Soloviev, *Sophia* was both faith or holy wisdom, and "ideal or perfect humanity, eternally contained in the integral divine being or Christ".⁶⁶ In other words, Christ - the "Godman" - was the perfect creation of God in that he completely integrated *logos* and *Sophia*. Christ, as the inspiration and example for all Christians, therefore, showed man the way to attain full and complete knowledge. Reason must be used to inform us of the truths which can only be known through faith.

With this strong theological bent, it should not be surprising that Soloviev did not simply reiterate Kireevsky's appeal for the integration of Eastern and Western philosophy through a new religious philosophy. He also stated that a reunification of the Christian Churches was essential for man's evolution to *Godmanhood*. For him, *Sophia* was God's ultimate goal of uniting humanity with itself and with God.⁶⁷ Only once the Orthodox reaffirmed this truth to their Catholic and Protestant counterparts, once the Christian Church again became one, could it inspire the rest of humanity to finally follow their ultimate destiny in God.

These foundations came to inspire those fin-de-siècle members of the intelligentsia who were dissatisfied with Materialist Positivism. Merezhkovsky and his group of religious-seeking intellectuals quickly proclaimed Soloviev as their leading example. Gradually, the four "heretics" from Marxism and their new colleagues also turned to Soloviev and the quest for a religious-philosophy. Soloviev never personally knew any members of the generation who was to proclaim him their leader: he died in 1900 just as

⁶⁵ Soloviev, "Lectures on Godmanhood" 75.

⁶⁶ Soloviev, "Lectures on Godmanhood" 74.

⁶⁷ Chirovsky, Pray for God's Wisdom 156.

the new spirit of revolt was coming into its full force. The new brand of intellectual saw his death on the eve of the new century as a portent of the change in which they intended to assist. As the poet Alexandr Blok said,

Soloviev died in July 1900, i.e. six months before the coming of the new century, which at once revealed a countenance unlike that of the preceding century. As a witness not altogether incapable of hearing and seeing I dare state today that even January 1901 stood under a sign altogether different from December 1900, that the beginning of the century was accompanied by new signs and portents.⁶⁸

Some Political Engagements

The full expression of religious-philosophy was somewhat delayed by the 1905 revolution in Russia, and the enormous constitutional changes which accompanied it. For the first time in the country's history, the Tsar granted a representational body, the Duma, which would finally limit the autocracy. The riots and massacres appeared to have succeeded in forcing a guarantee of civil rights, and even the notorious censorship office had its operations severely curtailed. While the new laws seemed to vindicate the long-avowed promises of the Socialist revolutionaries, much of the intelligentsia had been shocked and disgusted with their first real taste of revolutionary violence. They had seen the masses aroused, and found that it was not as simple and glorious as all the multitude of positivist tracts had made out. Thus, while cautiously jubilant about the new rights and freedoms, the mainstream intelligentsia was now uneasy about the face of a fully-realized socialist upheaval.

The Orthodox Church was also affected by the Revolution of 1905. Since the turn of the century, the rising ferment for change had caused a growing openness and opposition to Orthodox isolation (seen as early as 1901 with the participation of clergy at

⁶⁸ Aleksandr Blok, as cited in Nicholas Zernov, The Russian Religious Renaissance 88.

the Merezhkovsky meetings). With the revolution of 1905, this pressure increased, and certain established lay theologians and clerics began to demand serious church reforms intended to modernize and make it more relevant. The first step out of obscurity required that the Church free itself from the strong governmental control which had imprisoned it since the time of Peter the Great. The government office of the Holy Synod was considered, by modernists, as the greatest barrier to reform because of its conservatism and adherence to bolstering Tsarist authority. Consequently, many of the leading figures in the Church hierarchy began to demand that the Tsar convene a Great Sobor in order that the Church could discuss the possibility of reform; there they could freely elect a Patriarch and take control of their own governance, dispensing forever with the compromised Synod office.⁶⁹ There was enough support in the Church that the badly besieged Tsar Nicholas II finally signed a mandate to convene the Sobor. However, he refused to call it at that time, and set no date for its eventual convocation:

I feel that during the troubled time through which we are passing it is impossible to accomplish so great a work as the convocation of a Council. This task demands quiet and consideration. I propose therefore, when a favourable season comes, to set this great plan in motion after the example of the Orthodox Emperors of old, and to call a Council of the whole Russian Church in accordance with canons, for consideration of questions of ecclesiastical administration.⁷⁰

Although the Church reform movement had not been able to force an immediate calling of the Great Sobor, they did gain official recognition for their aspirations through the Tsar's statement. They were also granted the privilege of striking a commission designed to recommend exactly what issues should be raised at the future Sobor.⁷¹

⁶⁹ Nicholas II as cited in Zernov, The Russian Religious Renaissance 62.

⁷⁰ Tserkovnyy vedomosti 2 April 1905: 99.

⁷¹ Its first meeting occurred on 8 March 1906, and the members included six prominent lay reformers: General A.A. Kireev, Paul Mansurov, Nikolay Kuznetsev, Prince Evgeny Trubetskoy,

At the end of 1906, the Sobor Commission released its findings. It concluded that, in addition to a series of clerical reforms, the Orthodox Church should work towards four major goals: it should revive the principles of *Sobornost'*, restore the Patriarchate, arrange the convocation of the Great Sobor, and establish a closer relationship between clerical and lay representatives.⁷² The religious-philosophical agenda, therefore, had attained official recognition within Church circles, and reformers were actively encouraged to communicate with interested secular intellectuals.

As the country reorganized itself, the religious-philosophical movement sporadically continued its investigations. The most organized forum was a series of new "at-homes" initiated by Merezhkovsky and Gippius. Their discussions, however, became more and more mystical to a point where the couple abandoned any pretence of working with established Orthodoxy. By 1907, Merezhkovsky was openly talking of starting his own religion based upon the "resurrection of Christ". This tendency repelled Sergei Bulgakov, and he derided it as a "fad" comparable to the "Tolstoyan", "Theosophic", and other cults. Throughout 1906 and 1907, Berdyaev appeared to give it much more serious consideration as he continued to attend the newly-directed meetings at the house of Merezhkovsky and Gippius. However, even his patience and desire for originality finally wore out, and he found that the relationship had become irritating for all concerned.⁷³

Many of the other leading intellectual proponents of religious-philosophy also became involved in politics during this period. Peter Struve found in himself a surprising

Dmitry Khomyakov, and A.D. Samarin. The last two were descendants of the Slavophiles Alexis Khomyakov and Yuri Samarin. Thus a link was established between the current reform movement and the old Slavophile aspirations.

⁷² Zernov, The Russian Religious Renaissance 82.

⁷³ Nicholas Berdyaev, Dream and Reality 162.

sympathy for order and more conservative positions. He returned to Russia in 1905 after the granting of the constitution, and transformed his "League of Liberation" into a branch of the Kadet Party. While Struve persuaded Bulgakov and Berdyaev to participate in the foundation of the new League, he soon lost both men's support due to differences over methodology and political opinion: Berdyaev attended the congresses at the Black Forest and at Schaffhausen, but found the "semi-liberal, semi-radical" group even more strange and abhorrent to him than the Social Democrats had been; Bulgakov was simply alienated by the members' lack of social programs, and likewise extricated himself.⁷⁴ In 1907, Struve was elected to serve in the Second Duma.

Disappointed with the directions which Struve was taking, Bulgakov decided to form his own party which he intended to be more truly representative of religious-philosophical aspirations. He called it the Christian Socialist Party and, running on this platform he was elected, like Struve, to the Second Duma. Bulgakov's political preoccupations during and after the 1905 Revolution brought him into contact with a new Moscow-based religious-philosophical movement. His Christian Socialist Party shared similar aspirations to "The Christian Brotherhood of Combat,"⁷⁵ founded in 1905 by two philosophers from Tiflis, Vladimir Ern and Valentin Sventitsky. Both men had come back to the Church under the influence of Prince Evgeny Trubetskoy, and they found the message of Christ more revolutionary and fulfilling than Marxist materialism. Like Bulgakov, they had viewed the liberation brought about by the Revolution of 1905 as a crucial time to present alternatives to the traditional socialist parties. Coming to St. Petersburg to solicit supporters for their Moscow initiative, they found Bulgakov and his

⁷⁴ Pascal, Les grands courants 22.

⁷⁵ "Confrérie chrétienne de combat," Pascal, Les grands courants 23.

Christian Socialist Party much in sympathy with their own aspirations.

The phenomenon of Christian Socialism was an entirely new one in the Russian political sphere. However, now that the Church was actively working to liberate itself from the bounds of the tsarist government, the general fin-de-siècle revolt against Positivism made possible such a religious political movement. Those members of the intelligentsia who were unfulfilled by atheist socialism still harboured a desire to promote social justice and new political realities in Russia. They found in Christianity, a more sympathetic vision of equality and fairness. Literally interpreted, the gospel decried every abuse afflicting Russians at that time.

As the revolt against social materialism proceeded and the intelligentsia began to rediscover its own religious-philosophical heritage, they also found concrete political principals advocated in the writings of the early Slavophiles and in the works of Soloviev. The central concept of *sobornost'* - an organic organization of freely united individuals - provided a religious alternative which seemed, in its pure form, more appropriate for the Russian situation than the foreign importation of Marxism. In *sobornost'* there was no messianic proletarian class, no question of top-down social engineering, no rigid historical determinism, nor any stultifying scientific-rational method. Rather, the Slavophiles had envisioned a simple expansion of the Orthodox Church ideal of *sobornost'* to every facet of society. *Sobornost'* outwardly extolled the superiority of the Orthodox synodal system and inwardly defined the Church, "not as a centre of teaching or authority, but as a congregation of lovers in Christ".⁷⁶ Stemming from early Christian history, *sobornost'* promoted the idea of equal individuals coming together through love for mutual growth

⁷⁶ Edie, Scanlan and Zeldin, eds., Russian Philosophy Vol. 1 161.

and protection while never losing their freedom or uniqueness as they pursued their spiritual development. This ideal was maintained in the early Russian Orthodox Church through the Sobor - a "council of equals" - the guiding and inspirational body of the Church.

When the Slavophile movement began in the 1840s, the Church Sobors and the Patriarchate had been in abeyance for much longer than a century. Such time and distance caused the Slavophiles to romanticize highly the ideal of *sobornost'*, so that it became an almost mystical symbol of the potentially perfect communion of brotherhood which men might achieve. They idealized not only the pre-Petrine Orthodox Church, but also the free peasants before serfdom and their communal organization, the *mir*. However, this very transformation of reality allowed the Slavophiles to conceptualize *sobornost'* as a uniquely Russian version of utopian or religious socialism.

Sobornost' creates a dialectical tension between the welfare of the community and the welfare of the individual, ensuring the sanctity of both. This situation is realized in the *obshchina* [*mir*] which the Slavophiles considered, "...the highest form of social, moral, and political organization because it emphasises the primacy of the social over the individual and yet guarantees the freedom of the individual, as a part of, not apart from, the community."⁷⁷

In the 1840s, the Slavophiles proposed that the serfs be emancipated, allowed to form naturally organic communities, and to manage all of their affairs at the local level. They envisioned a loose federation of autonomous *mirs* organized by a greatly reduced central government which would control only specifically national issues such as defense, the postal system, and external trade. All matters of law, economics, education, and religion would be handled at the most local level, the *mir*, and the political power of the nobility and bureaucracy would be obliterated.

⁷⁷ James M. Edie, James P. Scanlan and Mary-Barbara Zeldin, eds., Russian Philosophy, Vol. 1 (Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1969) 163.

The guiding principal for all future human relations would be *sobornost'*, not democracy, communism, or any other purely rationalist system. Instead of subsuming the individual to society or allowing individuals to abuse others through means of private ownership of land or means of production, *sobornost'* proposed a means of reconciling the two polarities by maintaining them in continual tension. The Slavophiles had not believed that natural man, divorced from God's guiding principles and governed only by the meagre power of his own reason, was capable of forming just societies; nor did they accept any man-made plan for the wholesale reorganization of human communities. Rather, Christian ethics must presuppose each act of an individual or a group.

They espoused an extraordinary degree of personal responsibility, and encouraged each person to undergo intense spiritual training as the starting point for *sobornost'*. Communities would then naturally form, they asserted, as similar seekers gathered together to assist each other's development. Reason would be tempered and guided by faith at each stage in this new evolution. Soloviev later explained this process as a gradual growth toward *Godmanhood*. As more and more human beings engaged in this spiritual endeavour, the immediacy of material concerns would increasingly fade as a preoccupation: money and profit would have no value to people involved in finding their own divine qualities; the urge to dominate others would subside as people realized that one must come to seek God freely. Finally a veritable brotherhood of mankind as envisioned by Christ and the first apostles would actually come into being on Earth.

The message of the Slavophiles was not particularly complex nor really that novel. It had all been said before in the Bible and by Christian believers throughout the centuries. Similar evocations were made again and again by the prophets of every faith. The Slavophiles were certainly not the only writers who suggested that human beings

actually had to work towards the creation of the "City of God", and that this, not material, earthly preoccupations was, in fact, their divine purpose in life. What was unusual about the Russian situation, however, was that this belief became transformed into a concrete political and philosophical programme which was repeatedly resurrected and attempted. *Sobornost'* had been in the shadows for over fifty years, but with the revolt against Positivism and the "religious renaissance", it again became a living aspiration for a growing section of the intelligentsia.

Sergei Bulgakov won his seat on the Second Duma running on the platform of *sobornost'*. Sventitsky and Ern simultaneously merged their "Christian Brotherhood of Combat" with his party and brought the religious-philosophical initiatives in Moscow together with those in St. Petersburg. They were not passive in their efforts: Sventitsky openly advocated the use of violence in the Christian terms of fighting for righteous causes:

It is impossible to bring people to Christ by using force, but one can apply it in order to stop their covetousness which corrupts mankind. A Christian can fight against economic exploitation by using force.⁷⁸

Once the collaboration between Bulgakov's group and Sventitsky's had been arranged, Sventitsky and Ern returned to Moscow to begin a corresponding publication to Bulgakov and Berdyaev's Voprosy zhizni. They called it Voprosy religii (Problems of Religion), and it ran from 1906-1908.

Unfortunately the political careers of both Bulgakov and Struve were fairly short-lived. A reactionary turn in 1907 caused the Second Duma to be swiftly disbanded, and new electoral laws restricting the suffrage prevented their inclusion in the conservative

⁷⁸ Voprosy Zhizni 1 (1906): 37.

Third Duma. Both men accepted that they had more success in the publishing world than in politics: Struve went on immediately to take over the editorship of the popular monthly Russkaya mysl', and began preparations for completing a doctorate in Economics; for Bulgakov, St. Petersburg with its intrigues and bizarre cults had lost its allure, and he decided to move to Moscow and work more closely with the religious-philosophical group there.

The Vladimir Soloviev Society

Sventitsky and Ern had dissolved the political "Christian Brotherhood of Combat" with the disbanding of the Second Duma, but their publishing initiative proceeded apace. They began another regular review called In Search of the City. They had even formally organized the movement into the Moscow Society for the Study of Religion and Philosophy dedicated to the memory of Vladimir Soloviev. Through this, they maintained close contact with the Princes Trubetskoy and with another disciple of Soloviev, Lev Lopatin. They had also attracted Father Egorov and two other intellectuals - Paul Florensky and Alexander Elchaninov - into their midst.

Alexander Elchaninov was a promising historian and philologist who had given up his academic career to join the religious-philosophical movement. He was now secretary to the Moscow Society. Florensky (1882-1952) was a brilliant mathematician who possessed an unusually encyclopedic range of abilities and interests; he was also adept at philosophy, theology, philology, medicine, and an advanced student of Russian folklore. When he met Bulgakov, Florensky was lecturing in philosophy at the Ecclesiastical Academy in Moscow, and in 1908, would be appointed a full Professor. Having decided to devote his eclectic talents to enhancing the appeal of Orthodoxy,

Florensky began to experiment with a series of devices which would make religion seem more relevant in the lives of the secular intelligentsia. He suggested that icons, Russian folklore and religious art be used as a teaching tool to spread the message of Orthodoxy. Bringing the latest developments of European thought to bear upon his theological eruditions, he transformed the face of religious publications.

Instead of a dull cover, prosaic print and dry language, which was considered to be the appropriate expression of solid learning, he presented his profound speculations on the nature of our knowledge of God in the form of twelve intimate letters addressed to a friend. His theological affirmations were accompanied by lyrical comments, personal allusions and poetic descriptions of Russian scenery.⁷⁹

Using the techniques of Symbolist literature and the new styles of painting and drawing, Florensky admirably merged the full spectrum of the ensuing artistic revolution with a deep commitment to religion.

With the addition of Bulgakov in 1908, the Moscow Society quickly expanded its operations. It began two separate publications: brochures for the *narod*⁸⁰ and an entirely different set for the intelligentsia. The former tended to discuss policies in terms of familiar Church parables and sermons, or popular concerns, myths and legends: The Apostolic Church, St. Francis of Assisi, God or Mammon, The Day of the Eighth Hour, The Earth, The Workers Syndicates. The intellectual organ was phrased in more technical and abstract terms in order to appeal to highly-educated readers who were familiar with the latest political-economic jargon and theories: The Question of Property, Christian Socialism in England, The Autocracy and the Liberation Movement from the Christian

⁷⁹ Zernov, The Russian Religious Renaissance 102.

⁸⁰ Loosely translated as the "people," this word possesses the symbolic metaphor of spiritual and national collectivity somewhat comparable to that of the German "volk" or the French "peuple".

Point of View, The Fundamental Traits of the Capitalist Regime.⁸¹ For believers and loyal members of the Orthodox Church it must have been a novel experience to finally see their faith given credence in social, political and economic tracts; after almost sixty years of hearing about the Cause and finding, if not outright condemnation of religion then a complete vacuum regarding the spiritual, there was suddenly an outpouring of spiritual alternatives.

The central core of the movement remained the same until 1909. Externally, however, they continued to receive contributions and support from Bulgakov's former colleagues at Novyi put' and Voprosy zhizni in St. Petersburg, and from Struve and Frank. Even Merezhkovsky, Chulkov, Filosofov, and the poet Viacheslav Ivanov sent in their opinions. Bulgakov had never ceased in trying to persuade his friend Berdyaev to make the move to Moscow, and, in 1909, he finally succeeded. When Berdyaev announced his intention to come, the Moscow Society decided that the time was right to finally organize all the religious-philosophical initiatives, meetings and "at-homes" around the country in a central forum. Formally changing their name to the Vladimir Soloviev Society, they began to negotiate a public place for regular meetings, and asked diverse groups throughout the city to unite with them.

The judge, Pavel Astrov, agreed to bring the regulars from his salon. At this time, these included many prominent symbolist writers like Andrei Bely (who had also decided to abandon St. Petersburg society), Sergey Solovyev, and Lev Kobylnsky. Astrov had also become the mentor of a young philosopher, Feodor Stepun (1882-1969), who had completed his studies in Germany. Stepun was interested in exploring a possible convergence between the Neo-Kantian schools and Russian religious-philosophy. Astrov's

⁸¹ Pascal, Les grands courants 52.

eclectic salon further boasted, "priests like Grigory Petrov, theosophists like K.P. Khristoforova, liberal politicians, and other representatives of the Moscow intelligentsia."⁸² Berdyaev's arrival also encouraged the participation of his former colleague from the Merezhkovsky circle, Viacheslav Ivanov, and of Ivanov's new friend, the literary critic and historian Mikhail Gerzhenson (1869-1925). Semen Frank relocated to Moscow to join the new society, and Peter Struve kept in close contact from St. Petersburg. G.A. Rachinsky was elected as their President.

As the time for the first meeting approached, the supporters were able to gain the assistance of Marguerite Morozova: The grand dame of Moscow Society and the wealthy widow of the industrial magnate and art collector Mikhail Morozov. She agreed to put the lobby of her hotel on Smolensky Boulevard at the disposal of the Vladimir Soloviev Society. There, in a spacious, public place surrounded by icons, the tableaux of Vrubel and the Empire bronzes, the orators could be assured of the largest possible audiences. The printer A.S. Yashenko prepared invitations for the first meeting which was to take place at eight o'clock in the evening on January 19, 1909. The key-note speaker was Berdyaev, and the title of his speech was, "Philosophical Verity and Intelligentsia Truth."⁸³ In order to enhance the popular appeal of religious-philosophy, the Vladimir Soloviev Society offered pleasing entertainment in addition to the key-note addresses of a given meeting. Hence a speech by one of the intellectuals was frequently interspersed by a performance by Rachmaninov or Stravinsky of their latest compositions, by a reading from Blok or Bely, or by the latest artistic forms of Benois or Kandinsky.

⁸² For descriptions of the diverse societies and meetings prior to the unification under the umbrella of the Vladimir Soloviev Society see Andrei Belyi, Nachalo veka and Nikolai I. Astrov, Vospominanie (Paris: YMCA-Press, 1940).

⁸³ Vadimov, Zhizn' Berdiaeva 101.

Forays into publishing spread interest in religious and philosophical themes to the outer limits of the intelligentsia and Moscow society. Audiences flocked from as far away as Kiev, Minsk, and Kazan to attend the meetings at the Morozova hotel, and related publications were easily able to find sustaining markets. Struve placed Russkaya mysl' largely at the disposal of the new religious-philosophical writings, and the revenues of his journal increased to such an extent that they were able to open a corresponding publishing house "Russkaya mysl'" in 1910. It tried to meet the massive demand for religious and philosophical literature by specializing in the translations of foreign authors writing on related subjects: Bergson Essay on the Immediate Givens of the Conscience (1910); William James, Varieties of Religious Experience (1910); Schleiermacher, Discourse on Religion (1911), and Eduard Zeller, History of Greek Philosophy (1912).⁸⁴ In 1909 Russkaya mysl' defended Gogol against the condemnation of the Westernizers and Populists, reassessing him as a "predictor of an effective Christian socialism".

Emil Karlovich Medtner's publishing house in St. Petersburg had been doing a thriving trade in religious-philosophical works since 1905. Now most of his collaborators - Bely, Blok, Kobylinsky, Sadovsky, Stepun, S. Solovyev, Briusov - had moved to Moscow to join the Vladimir Soloviev Society. To make the most of the rising trend, Medtner divided his publishing efforts into three distinct series, expanding from "Musaget" (Literature - mostly of the symbolist and other new styles) to include two new branches of publishing: "Orpheus" (Mysticism) and "Logos" (Philosophy). Under the "Orpheus" series in 1912, he brought a number of Western mystical writings to the Russian reading

⁸⁴ Pascal, Les grands courants 33.

public.⁸⁵ "Logos", was responsible for producing a new philosophical journal Logos after 1910: It was edited by Nikolai Lossky (1870-1965) who was making great strides in elucidating a Russian form of intuitive philosophy which Bergson was so successfully popularizing in France.⁸⁶

The burgeoning market and the vast audiences at the Vladimir Soloviev Society persuaded Madame Morozova to become involved in publishing. She opened the related house "Put'" in 1910, assisted in editorial decisions by Berdyaev, Bulgakov, Rachinsky, Prince Evgeny Trubetskoy, and Ern. In addition to specifically publishing the new books produced by the members of the Vladimir Soloviev Society,⁸⁷ her house concentrated on resurrecting the writings of Russia's native religious philosophers of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries in their entirety. Soloviev's Collected Works, first published in 1902-1907 by Radlov, were reprinted between 1911-1914 in ten volumes augmenting the three volumes of his letters (1908-1911). Mikhail Gerzhenson edited two volumes of the Works and Letters of Chaadaev in 1913 and 1914.

In 1912 the first publication of the famous Slavophile, Ivan Kireevsky's Collected Works was released in Moscow. Kireevsky had been consistently banned in Russia and, until this date, scholars knew of his views only through the interpretations of his friend and colleague Alexis Khomyakov. However, as Kireevsky was the preeminent philosopher for

⁸⁵ For example: Hymns of Orpheus; Heraclius, Fragments, Eckhart, Sermons; Ruysbroek, Ornaments of the Mystical Marriage; Jacob Boehme, Aurora, others by Novalis, Swedenborg, and Wagner, and even Fioretti by St. Francis of Assisi.

⁸⁶ "Logos" also published Boris Vysheslavtsev's thesis on Fichte (1914), the Intuitivist Nicolai Lossky, The World as All Organic (1915) and Novgorodtsev, The Social Ideal (1917). See Pascal, Les grands courants 33.

⁸⁷ For example: Florensky, The Pillar and Ground of the Truth (1914), Bulgakov, Two Cities (1911) and Philosophy of Economics (1912), Berdyaev, Philosophy of Freedom (1913), Ern, The Struggle for Logos (1911), Frank, The Object of Knowledge (1915) and The Soul of Man (1917). See Pascal, Les grands courants 33.

the Slavophiles, his original writings were a goldmine to the current religious philosophers. At last they had the exact words and phrasing of the man who was largely responsible for originating their singular world-view in the first place.⁸⁸

For the layman, the change was almost inconceivable. Instead of focusing all of their attention upon a bill, a reform, or an entire revolutionary blueprint that would solve the social, economic and political problems in Russia, the intelligentsia began looking for integration and deeper causes. The jargon terms "class", "proletariat", "bourgeois", slowly fell aside for lengthy discourses on human nature, on the divine principle in man, on man's relationship with his maker. Division was being supplanted by union, brotherhood, humanity. Politics shifted from being a priority and an absolute, to a subfield or a descriptive category. The renaissance of religious-philosophy changed the framework for future debates about the *Cause*. Instead of one class versus another, there were suddenly only human beings before God. Could one judge the "bourgeoisie" as being wholly bad if individuals in this class was each the child of God? In the reverse, how could the proletariat be all good and all right if they were only human like the rest of the population? A question began to resound in the halls of St. Petersburg and Moscow: Should we not consider a man's soul as our yardstick rather than the amount in his wallet?

Moreover, as spiritual issues came to preoccupy the intelligentsia, then material problems slid to the side. A good Christian, wholly aware of his relationship with God and

⁸⁸ Accompanying these re-releases were biographies of Russia's foremost thinkers. Gerzhenson published his biography of Chaadaev in 1908. Berdyaev's biography Khomiakov was released by "Put" in 1912 bringing a fuller picture of the Slavophile legacy to light. Ern added his contribution with Skovoroda, an appraisal of the eighteenth-century Ukrainian mystic. Serge Askoldov wrote a book on his father, A. Kozlov, the metaphysician and Soloviev's contemporary who had been so preoccupied with delimiting the relationship between God and the world.

with the entire humanity could not be true to this and still violate others. If people began to accept that every single person was divine, God-created, and possessing of a unique spiritual value, then they could not objectify others on the material basis of profit. A shift in priorities and in attitude was demanded by religious-philosophy. It condemned much of the status quo. Capitalism, absolutism, police brutality, censorship, the death penalty, conscription, and imperialist war came to be characterized as sins of idolatry in so far as one man (or group of men) thought he could put himself in the place of God and judge or control other men. Yet on exactly the same premise it refused the revolutionary alternative promised by various socialist parties who idolized a certain class, a thing, and were prepared to kill others in order to institute their ideology, which was also a thing. Taking this atypical stand, religious-philosophy placed itself along a completely new path. Neither for the status quo, nor for any of the proposed alternatives, its adherents began to orient themselves around a new founding principle: That the spiritual was primary and must first be considered before the implementation of any material system.

Vekhi (Landmarks)

Part of the amazing popularity of the Vladimir Soloviev Society must be attributed to the single-most scandalous publication of these years. Vekhi,⁸⁹ released in 1909, was a collection of essays written by seven members of the Vladimir Soloviev Society. It presented a resounding and devastating critique of the entire Russian intelligentsia from

⁸⁹ The English equivalent to Vekhi would be Signposts, Landmarks, or Milestones. The authors of this work were Nikolai Berdyaev, Sergei Bulgakov, Mikhail Gershenzon, A.S. Izgoev, Bogdan Kistiakovsky, Peter Struve, and Semen Frank. All except Gershenzon were at one time marxists. See Marshall S. Shatz & Judith E. Zimmerman, trans. and eds., Vekhi (Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe, 1994).

a perspective grounded in spirituality while admitting the full gamut of political opinion. The most important task, as the writers saw it, was to formulate an authentic approach to man's dilemma in the world. It may therefore be asserted that with the publication of Vekhi, Religious-Philosophy came into its full maturity.

Vekhi was the most important publication of that year: it quickly ran to five editions and elicited more than two hundred letters in response; numerous societies debated it,⁹⁰ and five retaliative collections of essays were produced by the main left-wing and centrist parties.⁹¹ These responses were almost all defamatory and few actually addressed the issues raised in Vekhi. As Andrei Bely commented, "The tendency was less to analyze the book than to sentence it to a summary execution".⁹²

Although each of the contributors held quite different beliefs, they all agreed with the central message of Vekhi as stated in the foreword:

Their common platform is a recognition of the theoretical and practical primacy of spiritual life over the external forms of community. They mean by this that the inner life of the personality is the sole creative force of human existence and that this inner life, and not the self-sufficient principles of the political sphere, is the only solid basis on which society can be built.⁹³

⁹⁰ Some of the societies that held meetings in 1909 to specifically discuss issues raised in Vekhi included the Society for the Dissemination of Technical Knowledge (met on April 14), the Religious-Philosophical Society (met on April 21), the Women's Club (met on April 22 and November 1), the Literary Society (met on May 22), and the Société Savantes (met in Paris on November 13), where Lenin read a paper. See N.P. Poltoratzky, "The Vekhi dispute and the Significance of Vekhi," Canadian Slavic Review 9 (1967): 90-91.

⁹¹ This included "V zashchitu intelligentsii," a collaboration between leftist liberals other radicals (including two Mensheviks), "Vekhi kak znamenie vremeni," written by a collection of Social Revolutionaries and Populists, "Intelligentsiia v. Rossii," published by the Kadets, "Po Vekham," including twenty-one writers from various political camps, and finally "Iz istorii noveishei russkoi literatury," produced by the Bolshevik party. See Poltoratzky, "The Vekhi dispute and the Significance of Vekhi 93.

⁹² A. Belyi, "Pravda o russkoi intelligentsii. Po povodu sbornika 'Vekhi'," Vesy (May, 1909) 65.

⁹³ Mikhail Gershenzon, "Preface to the First Edition," Vekhi xxvii.

Nikolai Berdyaev, repeating his premier speech at the Vladimir Soloviev Society, insisted that the intelligentsia had to approach Russian and European philosophy in its entirety. Instead of fully understanding any one philosophical idea, or searching for the "Truth", the intelligentsia simply turned theory into dogma. This absolutism undermined their ability to provide responsible leadership. It also left them bereft of any concrete future vision to apply after they overturned the autocracy.⁹⁴ Sergei Bulgakov attributed their dogmatism to an "heroic" self-image. Persecuted by the government and convinced of the legitimacy of their Cause, the intelligentsia abandoned reality: As heroes they were super-human and therefore unaccountable. He blamed the excesses of the 1905 Revolution on this lack of self-discipline and responsibility.⁹⁵

As responsible citizens, the intelligentsia had to respect the rule of law; they had to "make the law work" in Russia. Such true leadership would immediately benefit them by putting an end to the aberrant political judgments of Russian Courts and eventually render the Siberian exile of political "criminals" a thing of the past. Moreover, a firm grounding in legal principles would enable a more peaceful transition to a new political system. Acting as the foundation for Russia's new government, it could prevent despotism and the abuse of individuals. Kistiakovsky insisted that only with formal, respected laws are individual rights protected from random violation.⁹⁶ Pursuing this

⁹⁴ Nikolai Berdyaev, "Philosophical Verity and Intelligentsia Truth," Vekhi 12-16.

⁹⁵ Sergei Bulgakov, "Heroism and Asceticism: Reflections on the Religious Nature of the Russian Intelligentsia," Vekhi 17-48. "The concepts of *personal* morality, *personal* self-improvement, development of the *personality*, are extremely unpopular with the intelligentsia...the intelligentsia must be corrected, not from without but from within..." (33-34).

⁹⁶ Bogdan Kistiakovskii, "In Defense of Law: The Intelligentsia and Legal Consciousness," Vekhi 91-112. "Even the most outstanding leaders of the intelligentsia are ready to renounce the immutable principles of legal procedure for the sake of temporary advantages" (102).

attack, Struve condemned the intelligentsia's anarchist bent. In idolizing the peasants, the intelligentsia had become alienated from the State. They were convinced that the existing order was completely corrupt and entirely opposed to reform. Hence, all of the intelligentsia's revolutionary programs called for total change, for the dismantling of autocratic government. However, none provided a concrete replacement program.⁹⁷ Struve recalled the violence of the "Days of Freedom" (1905) to demonstrate the consequences of creating a political vacuum.

Even the life-style of the intelligentsia had to change. Izgoev pointed to the decadence and ignorance of the *intelligent* youth. Given no direction from their parents, these students wasted their time drinking, masturbating, and visiting prostitutes.⁹⁸ They never learned the basic works like Plato and the Bible, and thus were prone to manipulation by demagogues. Izgoev attributed their decadence to a fear of death and self-hatred:

It goes without saying that a man who acknowledged that he "had no right to live" and felt a continual divergence between his words, ideas and deeds could not create worthy forms of human life or be a true leader of his people.⁹⁹

Therefore, the intelligentsia had to learn how to "love life". And one can only love life if one believes in God; then improving oneself on earth becomes essential. Thus in divine retribution exists the "purpose" which makes man's life worth living.

Vekhi saw in the problem of religion, the intelligentsia's greatest weakness. Having subscribed to atheism, they had alienated the very group, the *narod*, which they

⁹⁷ Pëtr Struve, "The Intelligentsia and Revolution," Vekhi 115-129. "No one has ever called for massive political and social changes with such unbounded frivolity as our revolutionary parties and their organizations during the 'days of freedom'" (123).

⁹⁸ A.S. Izgoev, "On Educated Youth: Notes on Its Life and Sentiments," Vekhi 73-74.

⁹⁹ A.S. Izgoev, "On Educated Youth: Notes on Its Life and Sentiments," Vekhi 86.

were trying to help. The *narod* regarded the intelligentsia as strange beings, probably mad, and in some cases dangerous. In 1874 when the intelligentsia "went to the people" the *narod* ignored them or summoned the local constable to arrest the "foreigners".¹⁰⁰ The *vekhovtsy* asserted that this mistrust was caused by religion, not by differences in language or perception. Berdyaev saw its origins in Peter the Great's reforms which had secularized "society", but ignored the masses, leaving the *narod* with their "old religious beliefs and feelings."¹⁰¹ Gershenzon concurred:

The people fail to understand us and hate us, but this is not the whole story. Can it be that they do not understand us because we are more educated than they are, and hate us because we do no physical labour and live in luxury? No, the main thing is that they do not regard us as human beings; to them we are man-like monsters, people without God in our souls.¹⁰²

If the intelligentsia were going to successfully lead the people, they had to regain God.¹⁰³

The *Vekhi* authors perceived the intelligentsia as hanging over a dangerous abyss. Dissociated from the State, they had no practical knowledge of how to govern, of the rule of law, and of the many controversies existing in their huge country. How could they be responsible leaders without training and experience? They could only destroy, not build anew. Alienated from their constituency, the *narod*, they further endangered the continued existence of Russia. It was possible for them to prod the peasants into action

¹⁰⁰ Abbott Gleason, Young Russia: The Genesis of Russian Radicalism in the 1860s (New York: Viking Press, 1980) 5.

¹⁰¹ Nikolai Berdyaev, The Origins of Russian Communism, trans. R.M. French (London: Geoffrey Bles, 1937) 14.

¹⁰² Mikhail Gershenzon, "Creative Self-Consciousness," *Vekhi* 61.

¹⁰³ "All are equal before God, and everyone has absolute importance if he fulfils his individual destiny, occupies his own place in the world, and becomes an individual whose image abides eternally in the mind of God." Berdyaev, "Socialism as Religion," Revolution of the Spirit 130.

through propaganda, but they could neither control nor direct this action. The *narod* generally were contemptuous of the intelligentsia's impractical and confusing ideas, and the intelligentsia had no clear understanding of their needs and desires.¹⁰⁴ Responsibility, education, and religion therefore had to be adopted by the intelligentsia if they were ever to abandon this road to anarchy.

Vekhi was not the first platform from which the religious-philosophical intellectuals engaged political matters directly, but it was undoubtedly their most dramatic foray, and it popularized religious-philosophical concerns in an unprecedented manner. Even the tenor of responses aided the public dissemination of their message: the uniform criticisms, delivered in outraged diatribes, demonstrated a reaction of anxiety on the part of established revolutionaries and political thinkers; their meetings, collections of essays and articles served to bring Vekhi to the attention of many more people than those who would normally have purchased it. The massive response then provoked a sensation through incongruity. As Russians flocked to buy and read the new editions of Vekhi in order to find confirmation for the claims made by one or another political figure, they would be confronted by the realization that the attacks did not address the specific issues raised therein. What became increasingly revealed was not weakness or prejudice on the part of the Vekhi authors, but rather the inadequacy of established viewpoints. The inability of leading political figures to transcend their rigid and often repeated party lines

¹⁰⁴ Aleksandr Blok was simultaneously elaborating upon this theme. He gave an address "Rossiia i intelligentsiia" before two literary societies in November 1908 and published it in Zolotoe runo 1 (1909). Blok's criticism of the intelligentsia grew throughout the years preceding the Revolution of 1917, leading him finally to publish a pro-Bolshevik essay "Intelligentsiia i revoliutsiia" in Znamia truda on 19 January 1918, in which he proposed that the sufferings of and attacks on the intelligentsia were no more than what that "class" deserved. See Aleksandr Blok, "The Intelligentsia and the Revolution," Russian Intellectual History: An Anthology, ed. Marc Raeff (1909; New Jersey: Humanities Press, 1978) 364-371.

in order to address concretely the assertions of the *vekhovtsy*, signalled the possible bankruptcy of their leadership.

From the "Left" came long, but similar declarations that the Vekhi writers were "bourgeoisie" trying to stifle the just claims of the peasants and the working man. They saw the collection as proof that "liberals" had completely joined the "reactionaries". Lenin called them "Kadets" (although the Kadet Party had already disavowed and harshly criticized the collection), labelled them the "encyclopedia of liberal desertion", and accused them of being opposed to democracy all in an attempt to drive further the wedge between the working and bourgeois classes.¹⁰⁵ Victor Chernov, leading a coalition of Socialist Revolutionaries and Populists, condemned Vekhi for tarnishing the glorious Cause, and vilifying the tremendous advances made by the intelligentsia.¹⁰⁶ Those representing the "Centre", or the position of constitutional democratic liberalism also resented the attack in Vekhi of the activities of the intelligentsia, and felt constrained to make clear the distance between their platform and that of the religious-philosophers. The leading Duma member, Paul Miliukov was particularly outraged by Vekhi's subtle criticism of the ignorance of Russian liberals.¹⁰⁷ Even the aged Tolstoy added his censure to the whole debate, condemning Vekhi for being "over-intellectual," and he

¹⁰⁵ Vladimir I. Lenin, "O 'Vekhakh'," address given at the *Sociétés Savantes* conference, Paris France, 27 November 1909. A transcript was published in his Collected Works, trans. Yuri Sdobnikov, Vol. 16 (Moscow: Progress Publishers 1973) 106-114.

¹⁰⁶ Vekhi kak znamenie vremeni [Vekhi as a Sign of the Times] (Moscow: Izdanie Zveno, 1910). The authors included N. Avksent'ev, I. Brusilovskii, Ia. Vechev (a.k.a Viktor Chernov), Iu. Gardenin (a.k.a Viktor Chernov), N. Rakitnikov, N. Ratner, L. Shishko, and B. Iur'ev. Another publication put forward a similar anarchist platform: V zashchitu intelligentsii [In defense of the Intelligentsia] (Moscow: Izdatel'stvo Zaria, 1909). Writers of this work included K. Arseniev, I. Bikerman, Boborykin, Vl. Botsianovskii, N. Valentinov, N. Gekker, I. Ignatov, Nik. Iordanskii, D. Levin, F. Muskatblit, and Grig. Petrov.

¹⁰⁷ Paul Miliukov, "Intelligentsiia i istoricheskaiia traditsiia," Intelligentsiia v Rossii (St. Petersburg: Zemlia, 1910) 89-192.

insisted that he gained more insight from a peasant friend's letter than from the whole series of essays.¹⁰⁸

Yet Vekhi had tapped into a growing worry on the part of moderate political figures and intellectuals. The events of 1905-1906 demonstrated the volatility of the Russian populace, and the inability of revolutionaries to control the masses aroused by their polemics. Few citizens living in St. Petersburg or Moscow wished to see any similar demonstration again in their lifetimes. For several years there was only a general sense of uneasiness, but Vekhi changed all that. It brought the problem out in the open, and made clear the irresponsibility and lack of foresight pervading not only the radical intelligentsia, but, by in large, all of Russia's political and intellectual classes. Quite naturally the various leaders were stung by the attack, and felt it necessary to defend themselves. However, by failing to accept any responsibility or to answer the charges, they added to the feeling that both reform and revolutionary alternatives were out of control. After the Vekhi scandal, religious-philosophy was propelled into the forefront of popular awareness, and had successfully shown itself to be a completely new approach. It could no longer be mistaken for just another socialist or liberal initiative.

The Russian Revolution

While Populist, Marxist and other social materialist, positivist works had dominated the Russian literary scene prior to the turn of the century, religious-philosophy was increasingly coming to the fore in the Empire's last twenty years. The Vladimir Soloviev Society and all the associated publishing houses thrived through World War One. With

¹⁰⁸ L.N. Tolstoy, "O Vekhakh," Polnoe sobranie sochinenii, Vol. 38 (Moscow: Iobilineoe izdanie, 1928-1958) 285-290.

the coming of the war, a certain neo-slavophilism began to enter the writings of the religious philosophers as their personal expression of patriotic sentiment. Rozanov, after years of abusing the Tsar and the Orthodox Church, suddenly turned volte-face to write The War of 1914 and the Russian Renaissance (1915) which justified both the Autocracy and official Orthodox doctrine.

Florensky and Bulgakov had made great strides with their expression of a new theological concept - *Sophiology* - first introduced by Vladimir Soloviev. During the war, St. Sophia came to symbolize Russia's particular world destiny. S. Durylin wrote The City of Sophia (1915) to resurrect the idea of Moscow as the "Third Rome". He explained again that after Rome and Constantinople, Moscow now held true Christianity; the Russian mission was to bring its beliefs and concepts, especially *sobornost'*, into dominance throughout the world. Prince Evgeny Trubetskoy added his fervent patriotic expressions in: The National Question, Constantinople and St. Sophia, The War and the Universal Mission of Russia, The Patriotic War and its Spiritual Significance.

Hence the religious-philosophical movement was able to seize upon World War One as a crucial moment for Russia to reassert its place in the world. Bulgakov openly advocated that Russia "had a responsibility for the spiritual destiny of humanity" if only its intelligentsia could finally transcend their limited materialist preconceptions. Berdyaev was more cautious: in The Destiny of Russia (1918), he clearly elucidated the split mentality within his people whereby they avowed high spiritual principles and a new approach to social relations, but also tended to embrace quick solutions, messianic crusades, and sheer barbarity. He suggested methods for re-orientating these negative energies in his capstone treatise A Sense of Creation: Essay of Justification of Man (1915) which appealed for man to recognize his link with God in the area of creativity: God had

created man so that man too could create; man was closest to God at the moment of creative inspiration. Berdyaev also wondered if many social problems could not be corrected by a change in man's perceptions towards work. Occupations involving creativity would presumably be more fulfilling than drudgery performed for the sake of money. Therefore, he championed the "creator", not the "taker" or destroyer.

Since issuing their emphatic warning in Vekhi, most members of the religious-philosophical movement had concentrated upon developing elements of this body of thought, and elaborating new concepts. Berdyaev was one of the few who continued to focus upon the critical flaw in the intelligentsia and among the Russian people. In 1917, however, Vekhi came rushing back to the forefront when its very predictions actually occurred: failures to reform, the immense pressure of war, and the insidious messages of "heaven on earth" put forth by social materialists finally raised the emotions of workers in St. Petersburg to a fevered pitch. One spark set off the whole cataclysm, and the city was swept into a spontaneous revolt.

The events of February 1917 took every intellectual by surprise. As the people rioted, soldiers mutinied, and the Tsar abdicated in quick succession, the intelligentsia struggled to find their place in the melee. The writers of Vekhi had been absolutely correct: The intelligentsia had lost control of the movement which they had fostered and encouraged. In the midst of this chaos, the religious-philosophical movement found itself split along political lines. Some decried the absence of authority and the loss of their Tsar while others applauded the end of the autocracy, but worried about what form of government would replace it. Only the Symbolist poet Alexandr Blok openly embraced the Revolution as an exhibition of the raw power held within the glorious Russian *narod*.

Gradually, most of the religious-philosophical movement reoriented itself to the new conditions, and they were distracted by church affairs. The new Provisional Government, in its haste to address all the complaints of Tsarist times swiftly granted the Orthodox Church full right to complete the reforms which it had requested back in 1905. It appointed Kartashev as new Procurator of the Holy Synod and, in an edict on April 29, 1917, told him to convene the Great Sobor with all possible speed. By August 5, 1917 the Orthodox Church was at last liberated from the government as the Office of the Holy Synod, created by Peter the Great, was permanently dissolved. The Sobor began ten days later.

For those involved in the religious-philosophical movement, the calling of the Sobor suggested that their fondest aspirations might soon be realized. The Orthodox Church was preparing to redefine itself and its role in the country, and it should soon be able to take its place as a significant social institution. *Sobornost'* seemed potentially within their grasp. The Sobor was a substantial event including 432 representatives from the laity and the clergy: 80 bishops, 149 priests, 9 deacons and 15 cantors from the clergy met with 299 laymen.¹⁰⁹ Most of the latter had been involved to some degree with the religious-philosophical movement, and many of the clergy were newly ordained, former members of the intelligentsia, fully committed to the cause of reform. The Vladimir Soloviev Society personally fielded Sventitsky, Florensky, and Elchaninov for the clergy, and Bulgakov, Kartashev, and Prince Evgeny Trubetskoy for the laity.

Although the cause for reform along the lines promoted by the religious-philosophical movement had by far the largest representation at the Sobor, it did not go uncontested. Included also was a strong contingent of conservatives who saw only

¹⁰⁹ Zernov, The Russian Religious Renaissance 193.

danger in a Church which became highly involved in secular affairs. There were also priests who had been influenced by the social materialists and wished the reforms to somehow take a Communist direction; this contingent was led by Alexander Vedensky. Most divisive were the clergy from the different national republics of the Empire who felt that nationalist aspirations and freedom from Moscow was more important than any genuine changes in the Church organization; these sentiments were so powerful that the entire Georgian delegation decided to boycott the Sobor, declaring unilaterally that their Church was now independent.

After the Eucharist was celebrated at Uspensky Cathedral in the Kremlin, the delegates convened at the largest church in Moscow, the Cathedral of St. Saviour. The appeal of the reformist movement was immediately demonstrated with the almost unanimous election of Archbishop Tikhon, a known reforming cleric, as Chairman for the event: 407 of the 432 present voted for him.¹¹⁰ The first issue on the agenda was the election of a Patriarch, and here the conservatives were able to put forth two very strong candidates: Antony Khrapovitsky and Arseny of Novgorod. However, the reformers were strong enough to push forward the election of Tikhon, and he was formally enthroned as Patriarch on November 21, 1917.

The Bolshevik seizure of power in November did not halt the proceedings of the Sobor. They continued their work until many of the old repressions were eradicated and a new programme to express the principles of *sobornost'* in all Church activities was developed; the Sobor only ended in September 1918. Despite the completion of their reforms, the Sobor representatives were not able to ignore the new government. Just as they were redirecting their Church so that it could play a much more important role in the

¹¹⁰ Zernov, The Russian Religious Renaissance 197.

everyday lives of the Russian people, the Bolsheviks were passing laws designed to obliterate its function. They stopped short of forbidding public expression of religion, however, they seized all the Church lands, closed the theological schools and confiscated their libraries, dissolved Church marriage in favour of civil, and formally separated Church from State: "No Church or religious society has the right either to own private property or to enjoy the rights of a juridical person."¹¹¹

The religious-philosophical movement among the intelligentsia was also suffering under the rule of the Bolsheviks. Medtner's and Morozova's publishing houses were closed down. When the decree against "counter-revolutionary" organizations was made, the Vladimir Soloviev Society had to cease its formal operations. The Bolshevik attack was not uniform at first: in March 1918 the former members of the Society began to hold conferences at the Polytechnic Museum in Moscow where Orthodox, Tolstoyans, Anarchists, and Idealists could express their ideas, and members of the Bolshevik Party would come and debate with them; Anton Lunacharsky and Maxim Gorky were frequent participants. However, with the burgeoning of the Civil War during the summer of 1918 and the creation of the Cheka (secret police) such public meetings were swiftly disbanded as treasonous.

The religious-philosophical movement was forced underground to personal meetings held in their own homes, and to disseminating their ideas by word of mouth or from hand to hand. Many of the less committed proponents of the religious revival began to join the exodus out of Russia, and away from the Bolsheviks and their policies. The start of violent hostilities in 1918 only increased the emigration. However, the central core

¹¹¹ "Separation of Church and State, Church and Schools, and Religious Rights and Freedoms," 20 January (2 February) 1918, Documents of Soviet History, ed. Rex A. Wade, Vol. 1 (Gulf Breeze, FL: Academic International Press, 1991) 96.

of the old Vladimir Soloviev Society remained in Russia, hoping that they could reform the Revolution from within. In 1918 they issued their condemnation of Bolshevik policy in a collection Iz glubiny clearly indicated as a sequel to Vekhi. The book was published, but not initially released.

Bratstvo sviatogo Sofii

Under such arduous conditions, the most committed adherents to the religious-philosophical movement in Russia decided to form a religious brotherhood in order to strengthen their resolve and faith, and to bring them comfort in their trials. A holy brotherhood - *bratstvo* - bound its members by a vow taken in Church before God, and was a living realization of the principles of *sobornost'*. Once avowed with full Orthodox Church recognition, the members of the *bratstvo* would consider each other truly as brothers (albeit linked by God and faith, not by blood): they would use the familiar *ty* (you) form of address with each other instead of the formal *vy*; they would pray together and assist each other's spiritual development; most of all they would protect and shelter each other. As betrayal and infiltrators of the Bolshevik Cheka became more and more prevalent in Russian society, it must have seemed that such a commitment was a necessary protection. It also complemented the central tenet of *sobornost'* for individual spiritual development within a loving community.

Due to the intensely secretive nature of such a union, the actual members are difficult to determine, let alone the details of their communion. All that even suggested the existence of such an organization were a few obscure references made in the mid-1920s to a *Bratstvo sviatogo Sofii* (Brotherhood of Saint Sophia). This could then be connected to the former Vladimir Soloviev Society because of their often-stated allegiance

to that Saint and to the concepts of Sophiology. Moreover, most references always listed Sergei Bulgakov as a member of the *Bratstvo sviatogo Sofii*. However, until recently, its date of origin, vows, and almost all specific details were untraceable.¹¹²

In 1994, more information was unearthed and has been presented by M. A. Kolerov.¹¹³ He discovered a draft of "The Provisional Charter of the Brotherhood of St. Sophia-Divine Wisdom" written in 1918 by A.V. Kartashev and confirmed by Patriarch Tikhon.

The Brotherhood....sees as its aim the uniting of Orthodox Church people, predominantly people active in education and culture (intellectuals) in their striving for depth and fullness in their church life and in their efforts toward the beneficial comprehension, discovery, and practical implementation of the great universal principles and promises of the Church of Christ.¹¹⁴

The official sanction from none other than the newly-installed Patriarch indicates the prestige of the *Bratstvo*, and its close ties with the reform movement within the Russian

¹¹² Marc Raeff speculates about this *bratstvo* in *Russia Abroad* 91-92, 139-140. He suggests that it was formed by Sergei Bulgakov in 1919 (he does not list any other original members except Anton Kartashev) and says that it was later joined (in about 1922 or 1923) by Peter Struve, Semen Frank, G.B. Vernadskii, Peter Savitskii, and an undetermined number of other Russian émigrés. He also assumes that this *bratstvo* was continuous with the "Priiutinskii Brotherhood," an association that had been established between 1885-1908 (Raeff, 91, 139). New evidence in Russia implies that making such a connection based upon anecdotal evidence has resulted in error: one scholar chastises Raeff, "supposedly thanks to the membership of Struve and G.V. Vernadskii (!) in it." Modest A. Kolerov, "Bratstvo sv. Sofii: vekhovtsy i evrazitsy (1921-1925)," *Voprosy filosofii* 10 (1994): 143-66.

To explain Kolerov's indignation: this *priiutinskii bratstvo* was also inspired by Vladimir Soloviev's idea of "*kollektivnoi lichnosti*" (collective personality) which perhaps explains why Raeff makes the connection. However, here all similarity ends: the *priiutinskii bratstvo* was composed of some of the original members of the Kadets and it included D.I. Shakhovskiy, V.I. Vernadsky, F.F. and S.F. Oldenburg, I.M. Greys, A.A. Kornilov [See, D.I. Shakhovskoi, "Pis'ma o bratstve," *Zven'ia: Istoricheskii al'manakh* 2 (1992): 176-177]. It was the only highly public *bratstvo*, but it certainly had no visible links with this much more secretive organization of religious-philosophers. Struve was never a member, nor was the Vernadsky whom Raeff identified. There is no common ground between Russian "liberals" and Russian "religious-philosophers".

¹¹³ Kolerov's article has been translated into English as "The Brotherhood of St. Sophia: The 'Landmarks People' and the Eurasians (1921-1925)," *Russian Studies in Philosophy* 34.3 (Winter 1995-96): 26-61.

¹¹⁴ Kolerov, "The Brotherhood of St. Sophia" 27.

Orthodox Church. Its draft Charter elucidates the full burgeoning of the purpose of the religious-philosophical movement: Namely to bring together an elite group of intellectual laymen, an apostolic brotherhood of the intelligentsia, who would lead, maintain and further the synthesis of religious and philosophical principles for "practical implementation" in the world.¹¹⁵ In other words, the primary exponents of the religious-philosophical movement in Russia - incited by the Church reforms and the threat presented by Bolshevism - decided to transform their ideas into action.

The *Bratstvo* was an ecclesiastical organization and, "In the spirit of the Church, the Brotherhood is hierarchical. Its members were divided into three levels: (1) brothers-novices; (2) brothers-disciples; and (3) brothers-elders."¹¹⁶ In its fully-developed form the *Bratstvo* had twelve members at the elder level. One of these would be chosen Chairman by the members to organize, preside over meetings, and presumably to maintain records (although these have never been unearthed). It is not yet known how the Chairman was chosen nor what, if any, electoral method was used.

Kolerov was unable to determine exactly whom the original members of the *Bratstvo* were during the Civil War years in Russia. However, frequent reference in personal letters indicates that Sergei Bulgakov was a member. It has also been suggested recently that Nicolai Lossky and Lev Karsavin were among the founding participants.¹¹⁷ Later, in the emigration, membership was revealed by references in

¹¹⁵ Kolerov, "The Brotherhood of St. Sophia" 27.

¹¹⁶ Kolerov, "The Brotherhood of St. Sophia" 27.

¹¹⁷ Kolerov obtained this information from A. Klement'ev who is now engaged in studying the life of Lev Karsavin (1882-1952). Karsavin was a relative latecomer to religious-philosophy (1918) and may have become involved with the movement while a Professor of Medieval History at St. Petersburg University. See A. Klement'ev, "Dela i dni L.P. Karsavina," Vestnik RKhD 167 (1993) 97.

personal letters and memoirs: Semen Frank, for instance, admits his inclusion in the *Bratstvo* in his biography of Peter Struve.¹¹⁸ Vasily Zenkovsky (1881-1962) named as original members (or at least members in Russia), himself, Bulgakov, Paul Novgorodtsev, Nikolai Berdyaev, and Kartashev.¹¹⁹

Until more is known, the membership of the *Bratstvo* between 1918-1922 (while it was able to operate within Russia), cannot be ascertained. However, it seems to have contained the four former Marxists (Struve, Berdyaev, Bulgakov, and Frank), and quite possibly two of their fellow collaborators in *Vekhi* (Izgoev, and Kistiakovsky). The other original members of *Problemy idealizma* (Novgorodtsev, Prince Evgeny Trubetskoy, and Kartashev), were clearly included, if not the propelling founders. It seems most likely that the last three elders were Nikolai Lossky and Feodor Stepun considering their relatively lengthy involvement with the Vladimir Soloviev Society, and a late addition, Georges Florovsky.

At the lower ranks, certain candidates may be included either because of their own admission or because of close association. Lev Karsavin and Vasily Zenkovsky asserted that they were members. The printer for the Soloviev Society, A.S. Yashenko, and the former editor of *Novyi put'*, George Chulkov, may be included because of their organizational activities during the post-revolutionary period which will be discussed in chapter two. Novgorodtsev's student and protégé, Boris Vysheslavitsev (1877-1954) became engaged in religious-philosophical movement during the First World War, and

¹¹⁸ A possible explanation is that Bulgakov had continually been a primary organizer of religious-philosophical initiatives, and he may well have acted as the major recruiter for the *bratstvo*. Semen L. Frank, *Biografiia P.B. Struve* (New York: Chekhov Publishing House, 1956) 138.

¹¹⁹ V.V. Zenkovsky, "Zarozhdenie RSKhD v emigratsii," *Vestnik RKhD* 167 (1993): 21.

was closely involved in its semi-clandestine activities after 1917. Whether or not the Symbolist writers Bely, Blok, and Ivanov were inducted is, as yet, unknown. What may be said is that the *Bratstvo* seems to have superseded the Vladimir Soloviev Society after the Bolshevik takeover causing its transformation from a loosely-gathered, public association into a tightly-knit, formally-bound, and secret brotherhood.

Despite the many questions which remain about the *Bratstvo*, its purpose has become increasingly clear. With the *Bratstvo sviatogo Sofii* they created a singular intellectual and political movement determined to oppose all rationally-created ideologies including Communism, Liberalism, Democracy, and Capitalism in favour of *sobornost'*. The following chapter will examine the process which led to the abrupt expulsion of almost every potential member of the *Bratstvo* from Russia in 1922. Before this event, it may be asserted that the group worked to mitigate the worst offenses and persecutions of the Cheka against intellectuals and artists. It also subtly pursued a programme of resistance to the "Bolshevizing" of Russia. Its members wrote about, lectured on, and debated ways in which the revolution might be transformed from within in an effort to help the populace of Russia overturn the ideology which the Bolsheviks were trying to implement, and replace it with their genuine Russian alternative.

2. The Diaspora

By 1918, with the Bolsheviks firmly in power, a horrible irony must have struck the religious philosophers: Here, indeed, was the confirmation of their warnings issued in Vekhi. Frank had characterized the typical Russian radical as "*a militant monk of the nihilistic religion of earthly well-being*."¹ The Bolsheviks, with their drab uniforms, with their increasingly repressive rule, and with their ruthless pursuit of eradicating every old Russian societal tradition in the quest for "heaven on earth" became a parody of the fears which the *vekhovtsy* had expressed only nine years earlier. As the new government instituted the Cheka, disbanded the Constituent Assembly at gunpoint, outlawed opposition parties, and began to censor publications, Vekhi's prophecies were made real:

Translated into real life, the teaching of the Populists, not to mention that of the Marxists, turned into licence and demoralization. There are only two alternatives to the idea of education in politics: despotism or ochlocracy.²

...unproductive, anti-cultural *nihilistic moralism*.³

They [SDs during 1903 split into Mensheviks and Bolsheviks] violated the cardinal legal principle that a society's statutes, like a constitution, be ratified on a special basis by a qualified majority⁴...The idea proclaimed in this speech [Plekhanov] - that force and usurped power are supreme, and not the principles of law - is simply monstrous.⁵

¹ Semen Frank, "The Ethic of Nihilism: A Characterization of the Russian Intelligentsia's Moral Outlook," Vekhi, trans. and eds. Marshall S. Shatz and Judith E. Zimmerman (Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe, 1994) 150.

² Peter Struve, "The Intelligentsia and Revolution," Vekhi 125.

³ Semen Frank, "The Ethic of Nihilism: A Characterization of the Russian Intelligentsia's Moral Outlook," Vekhi 155.

⁴ Bogdan Kistiakovskii, "In Defense of Law: The Intelligentsia and Legal Consciousness," Vekhi 106.

⁵ Bogdan Kistiakovskii, "In Defense of Law" 102.

Maximalist goals lead to the maximalist means...I give myself the right not only to the property of others, but to their life and death, should this be needed for my idea. Inside each maximalist there is a little Napoleon of socialism or anarchism.⁶

Demagoguery of this sort is spiritually demoralizing and creates an oppressive atmosphere. Moral cowardice develops, while love of truth and intellectual daring are extinguished.⁷

Little comfort, however, must have come from such vindication. Rather, the religious-philosophers, like all other non-Bolshevik Russians, were faced with a new reality in which there were few available courses of action.

Simply put, the only possible responses to the new regime, short of changing one's entire world-view were, to leave, to fight, or to stay and oppose within the newly-imposed restrictions. Emigration was still a viable choice, and gained from the reality of outright war propagated by the "fighters". The latter was incoherently organized around loyal supporters of the Tsar, although many of quite divergent ideologies - i.e. Menshevik, Socialist-Revolutionary, Anarchist, Nationalist - soon joined the White forces once the Civil War became a reality in the summer of 1918. The third alternative was chosen by those who disliked military engagement, held an intransigent loyalty to their homeland, and/or could not stomach the prospect of a restoration. It required a degree of caution and ingenuity to be able to reconcile opposition to Bolshevism with empathy for the dynamism of the revolutionary impulse.

⁶ Sergei Bulgakov, "Heroism and Asceticism: Reflections on the Religious Nature of the Russian Intelligentsia," Vekhi 32.

⁷ Nikolai Berdyaev, "Philosophical Verity and Intelligentsia Truth," Vekhi 7.

Emigration and the Civil War

The emigration was initiated by the Bolsheviks' policies of class war and nationalization. Hoping to save their tattered fortunes and their lives, businessmen and nobles led the exodus from Russia. Soon they were joined by others fleeing repression, war, and economic deprivation. As the Civil War entered its second year, thousands slipped through the fluid borders of the separatist Ukraine, and the newly independent Poland and Baltic States. They forged passes and identity papers; some sewed jewels and valuables into their clothing or hid them in loaves of bread; a few pretended to be German prisoners-of-war or mentally-disturbed patients.⁸

The Russian diaspora became a flood in 1920 when the White Army fell before Bolshevik troops: First Denikin's forces at Novorossiisk that spring, and then Wrangel's army at Sevastapol in November. After the last defeat, some 150,000 White soldiers and their followers swamped Russian and Allied boats and warships on the Bosphorus in a massive exodus to Constantinople (Istanbul), the Gallipoli peninsula, and islands in the Aegean or Marmora Seas.⁹ There, they joined the survivors of Denikin's army, and remained in internment camps until they could be transferred to countries more willing to take them as refugees.

Most émigrés settled near Russia in hopes an imminent collapse of the Bolshevik government would permit their return. Those who had fought for the White Armies searched eagerly for signs of a new opposition in Russia which would necessitate their services. Thus, the emigration dispersed over Finland, the Baltic Republics, Poland,

⁸ Described in John Hellman, "Interviews with Alexander Marc," Cogne, Italy, 1985, cassette 7a-4. See also Denis de Rougemont, Journal d'une époque (Paris: Gallimard, 1968) 93-94.

⁹ T.F. Johnson, International Tramps: From Chaos to Permanent World Peace, 2nd ed. (London: Hutchinson, 1938) 230.

Bulgaria, the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes (Yugoslavia), and Germany. On Russia's eastern frontier, 50,000 settled in the Manchurian city of Harbin and another 70,000 moved to the various Far Eastern countries of China and Indonesia.¹⁰ As the emigration began to stabilize, Germany - and in particular Berlin - emerged as the initial centre of Russia Abroad.¹¹ Berlin already had an established Russian intellectual community and a vigorous Russian press which drew many of the fleeing émigrés. Germany also had the added benefit of being close to Russia should events allow the émigrés to return, and a low cost of living which the impoverished Russian refugees could afford.¹²

The diaspora included a disproportionately large number of Russia's most highly educated and skilled citizens.¹³ Two-thirds had attended secondary school; one-seventh held university diplomas; almost all the émigrés possessed an elementary education.¹⁴ Due to the large military component, men outnumbered women, most of the men were

¹⁰ Raeff, Russia Abroad 24.

¹¹ See Williams, Culture in Exile for the most complete analysis of the emigration in Germany. Also helpful is L. Feishman, R. Hughes, & O. Raevskaya-Hughes eds., Russkii Berlin, 1921-1923.

¹² In 1923, the State Department of America received a report from Warren D. Robbins, counsellor of the American embassy in Berlin quoting an estimate of 800,000 Russian émigrés in that country alone: "By far the most important colony of Russians is to be found in Berlin. There are in Berlin approximately 180,000 Russians." Warren D. Robbins, letter to the Secretary of State, 14 March 1923, National Archives, Document Division, Russian Section, Record Group 59, Department of State, Washington D.C., File 861.48/2189.

¹³ In M. Bredekin's study of 3,354 émigrés in Varna, Bulgaria, 50% of men over the age of 17 were manual labourers, 30% were skilled workers or semi-professionals, and 18% were skilled in purely intellectual pursuits. In Russia the common breakdown before World War I was: 80% manual, 5% skilled workers, less than 1% intellectuals. See Bredekin as cited in Simpson, The Refugee Problem 86.

¹⁴ Professor Ivantsov based his work on a survey of émigrés in Yugoslavia that had been conducted in 1921. See Recueil économique russe vol. 2. (Prague, 1925) as cited in Sir John Hope Simpson, The Refugee Problem: Report of a Survey (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1939).

unmarried, and the majority were between 19 and 45 years of age.¹⁵ On an economic scale, the émigrés included many of the top wage earners, tax-payers and landowners in Russia.¹⁶

Even after the Reds had won the Civil War (at least in the heartland of Russia),¹⁷ the exodus continued. Added to the earlier emigration were Russian prisoners-of-war (POWs) from World War One who had been interned in Germany and Austria-Hungary, and were now in the process of being repatriated. However, many of these POWs, upon hearing of the conditions in their former homeland, chose not to return. After 1920, moreover, the stream of Russian émigrés began to include larger numbers of peasants, workers, and even Red soldiers: In the aftermath of the Civil War, material devastation provoked an escalating famine and multiple epidemics.

Of the *Bratstvo sviatogo Sofii*, Peter Struve was the most vulnerable to Bolshevik persecution as a former ranking early Marxist, and his later participation in the Kadet Party. He was also the most militant. In December, 1917 he travelled south to join the Volunteer Army under General Alekseev. Throughout most of 1918 he operated underground in Moscow and Petrograd. At the end of that year, he went to Archangel to await the British Expeditionary Force, but failing to find the English, he and his family escaped into Finland.¹⁸ Struve continued to actively solicit international support for the

¹⁵ In Ivantsov's study in Yugoslavia, he found 69% of the émigrés to be men. Of these 66% were between 19-45 years of age and 70% were single. A similar study by Mme. Solonsky done in Belgrade in 1929 established a ratio of 60.48 men to 39.52 women. In M. Bredekin's study in Varna, 64.8% of the people surveyed were between 20-40 years of age. See Simpson, The Refugee Problem 85-86.

¹⁶ Simpson, The Refugee Problem 88.

¹⁷ Vladivostok would not capitulate to Bolshevik rule until 1923.

¹⁸ Richard Pipes, Struve: Liberal on the Right, 1905-1944 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1980) 246-268.

White Army, and even returned to Russia at the end of 1919 as part of Denikin's forces.¹⁹ In the spring of 1920, he somehow managed to escape the Red Army's seizure of Novorossiisk, and emigrated once again; this time he was never to return.

Prince Evgeny Trubetskoy, who followed much of Struve's torturous path was not as lucky. He succumbed to typhus in Novorossiisk just before the White Army fell.²⁰ Anton Kartashev, founder of the *Bratstvo*, had also joined Struve in the initial protest in 1917, and even accompanied him part of the way to Archangel. Rather than leave Russia at that time, however, Kartashev returned to Moscow. There he faced considerable peril because he had been the Minister of Religion under the Provisional Government and, furthermore, had directly joined the White initiative. Upon his return, he found himself an outlaw reduced to hiding in friends' homes. He was even arrested once by the Cheka, but somehow managed to escape from prison. Early in 1919 he managed to slip across the border to Finland.²¹ In the emigration, Kartashev was soon followed by Pavel Novgorodtsev who was also involved in the Civil War.

Surviving in Russia

The remainder of the *Bratstvo* stayed in Russia despite their opposition to Marxism and the perils of the Civil War. Unlike their "brothers" who had emigrated, they, to varying degrees, could not justify participating directly in the war, and generally found little sympathy for the White position. Much as they had carved out an alternate path between

¹⁹ Struve took charge of a daily newspaper *Great Russia (Velikaia Rossiia)* on Denikin's territory. See Pipes, *Struve: Liberal on the Right* 278.

²⁰ Rosenthal and Bohachevsky-Chomiak, eds., *A Revolution of the Spirit* 321.

²¹ Donald Lowrie, *Rebellious Prophet: A Life of Nicolai Berdyaev* (New York: Harper & Row, 1960) 50; Zernov, *Russia's Religious Renaissance* 337.

the tsarist status-quo and revolutionary socialist materialism during the pre-Revolutionary years, they now gravitated to a position outside and apart from the Red-White debacle. As Berdyaev would continually insist, they might not respect Bolshevism, but neither did they wish for a restoration. Moreover, the religious-philosophers had rarely engaged directly in politics under the Tsarist regime, and were not disposed to take such a stance at this time. The only one of the remainder who had any political experience was Sergei Bulgakov, and he was now a priest in the Orthodox Church subject to the authority of that body.

Furthermore, the members of the *bratstvo* who did join the Whites and emigrate were those who had always abhorred socialism, or, like Struve, grown increasingly disenchanted with socialist policies over time. On the contrary, those who stayed shared a greater openness to the appeal of social justice. They persisted in believing that the guiding spirit behind the changes in Russia was propitious. Only the instrument - Marxism and the Bolsheviks - was perverting this dynamism. The former editor of Vekhi, Gershenzon, even went so far as to embrace the Bolshevik cause because of the vitality he saw manifested in its movement. So too, did the poet Aleksandr Blok. Thus, the *Bratstvo* and a core of associated proponents of religious-philosophy remained in Russia to continue their work.

Caution, secrecy, and obfuscation. These had been the bywords of the intelligentsia during the repressive years of the nineteenth century when censorship, informants, and infiltration forced them to operate "underground". Weaned on Dostoevsky's intrigues, the religious philosophers adjusted their methods to the rules of the new Bolshevik government.

A decree banning all "hostile" newspapers was passed on November 9, 1917, and it was immediately followed by an order to confiscate all private printing presses and stocks of paper; all alternative parties beginning with the Kadets on December 17, 1917 were banned; widespread legitimate means of dissent were thus made unavailable. The creation of the Cheka on December 20, 1917 provided the Bolsheviks with a special army designed to root out any "counter-revolution" and arrest its propagators. People's Courts replaced the existing judicial system making it more likely that sentences rendered would be arbitrary and especially severe. The dangers of oppositional work were compounded after February 22, 1918 when the powers of the Cheka were broadened: "counter-revolutionaries, spies, speculators, ruffians, hooligans, saboteurs and other parasites...*will be mercilessly shot by the commission's detachments on the spot of the offence.*"²²

With these restrictions, the religious philosophers adapted their course of action. Those who held any allegiance to a political party, disavowed it as soon as it was officially outlawed. "Put" publishing house was shut down, Struve had to close Russkaya mysl' as well, and the other publishers of religious-philosophical writings quickly joined the diaspora. Thus, by the end of 1918 all the old means of disseminating their ideas were gone. However, Berdyaev had long been operating his select Tuesday "at-home" meetings at his apartment on Maly Vlas'evski Lane and, as a private gathering of friends, these remained fully within the boundaries of the new laws. He thus continued them during and after the turbulent years of the Civil War. Usually the guests were limited to the old stalwart supporters of religious-philosophy who happened to be in Moscow on any given Tuesday. Occasionally, however, a "safe" intellectual celebrity could be

²² Iz istorii Vserossiiskoi chrezvychainoi komissii, 1917-1921 gg.: sbornik dokumentov [From the History of the All-Russian Extraordinary Commission, 1917-1921: Collection of Documents] as cited in Jesse D. Clarkson, A History of Russia (New York: Random House, 1962) 492.

enjoined to participate. The philosopher A.V. Losev was one such guest in 1918. Extra protection was ironically provided by one of the frequent guests: Olga Kameneva (Trotsky's wife and the sister of Kamenev), found the discussions interesting. Her presence must have warned the Cheka away from efforts to infiltrate and arrest the participants.²³

Despite the convivial family atmosphere, discussions were not limited in anyway by the outside censorship. Members could elaborate on their frustrations, their fears, and even their hatred of "godless communism". While no record of the meetings exists (as far as is known), a hint of the tenor of conversations may be obtained from individual works which some of the participants wrote that year, and especially from the collection of essays, Iz glubiny (From out of the Depths).²⁴ This rather bleak and depressing tome was the inspiration of Struve who, in his last days in Moscow, wanted to revisit Vekhi in light of the events of 1917.

Gershenzon refused to have any involvement with the sequel when he discovered Struve's particularly anti-Bolshevik intent, and Kistiakovsky was unavailable.²⁵ The shift away from socialist sympathies was further illustrated by two of the six new contributors whom Struve included: Pavel Novgorodtsev and Viacheslav Ivanov. Novgorodtsev held a centrist political position, and Ivanov was moving increasingly to the radical right. Even Berdyaev's article was uncharacteristically rigid. In it, he made frequent reference to

²³ Donald Lowrie, Rebellious Prophet 151. At this time, Leon Trotsky was commander in chief of the Red Army, while Lev Kamenev was the Commissar of the Moscow Soviet. Both were members of the Bolshevik Politburo.

²⁴ Iz glubiny: Sbornik statei o russkoi revoliutsii, 2nd ed., (Paris: YMCA-Press, 1967). There is also an English translation by William F. Woehrlin, Out of the Depths: A Collection of Articles on the Russian Revolution. (Irvine, Calif.: Charles Schlacks Jr. Publisher, 1986).

²⁵ Marshall S. Shatz and Judith E. Zimmerman, "Introduction," Vekhi xxiv.

Joseph de Maistre, and the need for reaction against the "chaos of mob-rule." During the year he transformed these ideas into a book, The Philosophy of Inequality, which he later disavowed. He came to consider its sole worth lay in its reiteration of the important censure against inhibiting free creative endeavour, but he felt uncomfortable with the bitter tone and scathing attacks which he had employed.²⁶ Bulgakov and Frank dwelled more upon the tragedy of revolution, and their sadness that their warnings in Vekhi had not been heeded. Their articles lacked the pointed themes and energy exhibited in the earlier collection. By and large, Iz glubiny served as a personal catharsis for each of its authors. With a much heavier reliance on religious themes, it dwelt upon "the Christian cycle of sin, repentance, and redemption...not merely as a metaphor for the revolution but as an explanation and solace for it."²⁷

Berdyaev also led the move to continue the dissemination of religious-philosophical ideas in a more positive and judicious direction with the foundation of the Free Academy of Spiritual Culture. Unlike the negative purpose of Iz glubiny, the "school" was intended to spread the ideas of religious-philosophy to any person of any class, political affiliation, or occupation who wished to learn more. In beginning such a constructive undertaking, Berdyaev and the majority of the *Bratstvo* discarded their self-absorbed preoccupation with the tragedy of the Revolution, and moved on to pursue its transformation. This was declared clearly in their only condition for admittance: one must accept "the new age as an age of material destruction and spiritual creation."²⁸ In other

²⁶ Nicholas Berdyaev, Dream and Reality 225.

²⁷ Shatz and Zimmerman, "Introduction," Vekhi xxv.

²⁸ Berdyaev, Dream and Reality 234-235.

words, its mandate did not oppose the present regime, it simply opposed its central doctrine of dialectical materialism.

The Free Academy was also more carefully established with a view to the existing restrictions. Berdyaev registered the Academy with the Moscow Soviet, and obtained the appropriate permits and licences signed by Lev Kamenev²⁹ (Societies, organizations and private academies had not yet attracted the attention of Bolshevik ideologists). Premises for courses were obtained from the Women's University in Moscow, and lectures and seminars were held in other locations.

The faculty was essentially comprised of the old members of the Vladimir Soloviev Society and/or the remaining members of the *Bratstvo*. In the sense that the Free Academy promoted widespread education into religious-philosophical themes and encouraged its participants to apply these ideas in their writings and every-day lives, it was the descendant of the Vladimir Soloviev Society. Berdyaev taught courses in his two favourite subjects of the philosophy of history and the philosophy of religion. Boris Vysheslavtsev held a position in philosophy at the University of Moscow, but took the time to give instruction into the field of ethics at the Free Academy, and even took on the role of Dean. Viacheslav Ivanov put aside his increasingly radical political pursuits in order to teach Greek religion, and Feodor Stepun elaborated on themes of contemporary life and work.³⁰ Michael Gershenzon agreed to continue his association despite the dispute over *Iz glubiny*, and conducted courses in history.³¹ Semen Frank became the principal

²⁹ Lowrie, *Rebellious Prophet* 150.

³⁰ L.A. Kogan, "Vyslat' za granitsu bezzhlostno' (Novoe ob izgnanii dukhovnoi elity)," *Voprosy Filosofii* 9 (1993): 62.

³¹ Vadimov, *Zhizn' Berdiaeva* 185-187.

administrator of the Free Academy in Moscow, but also gave lectures on introductory philosophy.³²

The Academy also drew some new intellectuals who had not noticeably participated in the Vladimir Soloviev Society. Struve's student Yuri Bukshpan, entered full-time to teach economics after he had conducted his mentor to Archangel.³³ There was also the jurist Gold'stein, who became instructor of Law, Gritsov, and the writer Muratov who had entered into a business relationship with Berdyaev. By far the busiest member of the faculty, however was Andrei Bely. Not only did he give lectures in philosophy and spiritual culture at the Free Academy in Moscow, but also commuted between that city and St. Petersburg (during a Civil War) where he directed an associated society: The Free Philosophical Society or *Vol'fila*. Fortunately he was helped in this by the co-directorship of P.V. Ivanov-Razumnik.³⁴

The St. Petersburg *Vol'fila* complemented the Free Academy although its efforts were more directed towards furthering religious-philosophical knowledge than to teaching the basic ideas to the uninformed. Formally begun at the start of 1919, a few months after the Moscow Free Academy had opened its doors, it boasted the inclusion of many of Russia's most advanced non-materialist intellectuals. Bely's long-time friend and Russia's greatest symbolist poet, Aleksandr Blok, was a member until his early death from typhus in 1921. Nikolai Lossky, who by now had achieved a reputation in academic

³² L.A. Kogan, "Vyslat' za granitsu" 62.

³³ Pipes, Struve: Liberal on the Right 260.

³⁴ Lowrie, Rebellious Prophet 151; Berdyaev, Dream and Reality 234-235; Vadimov, Zhizn' Berdiaeva 185-187; Kogan, "Vyslat' za granitsu" 62.

circles as one of Russia's foremost philosophers, could not resist the call of the *Bratstvo* and continued religious-philosophical investigation.

Vol'fila also enjoyed the contributions of the rather challenging personality, Lev Shestov (1866-1938), who had already established a formidable name in Europe as one of the leading anti-rationalist thinkers of his time.³⁵ His works on Dostoevsky, Nietzsche, and Tolstoy had been widely published and translated, and he was beginning to define certain elements of an entirely new mode of thought which was to become called existentialism. Shestov had returned to Russia on the eve of World War One, after teaching and travelling in Europe for almost fifteen years. Already acquainted with Berdyaev and Bulgakov from their student days in Kiev, he found that he had most in common (and this was not that much, as Shestov was a notoriously original thinker) with the religious-philosophical intelligentsia.³⁶ He remained with *Vol'fila* until the end of 1919 when he decided to take his family into safety, and emigrated from Russia.

As many of the courses offered at the Free Academy and themes discussed at *Vol'fila* might be construed as counter-revolutionary by the authorities (or at least too overtly religious), the decision was made not to advertise the meetings. The general ration on paper and lack of substantial funds probably were also a factor. Students and interested listeners "discovered" the organizations by word of mouth.

By 1919, Berdyaev's reputation as a lecturer on religious themes had spread, and he was invited to an Anarchist club for a debate on Christ; the audience was largely

³⁵ Kogan, "Vyslat' za granitsu" 62.

³⁶ Bernard Martin, ed., A Shestov Anthology (Athens, Ohio: Ohio University Press, 1970). ix-xvii.

composed of Tolstoyans, Red Army men, sailors and workers.³⁷ His popularity and that of the subject spread, and Berdyaev and other professors at the Academy were increasingly invited to public lectures throughout the city.³⁸ The apparent appeal of such lectures prompted the faculty to undertake a new dimension to their programme in 1920. They began to give public lectures about once every two weeks on a theme of specific interest to the individual professor.³⁹ The benefits were two-fold: first, they could spread their religious-philosophical ideas to a much wider audience and potentially recruit new students through the public lecture format; second, they could test and refine themes that each was developing for future publications. Berdyaev applied this method in the creation of Dostoevsky and The Meaning of History.⁴⁰

The resulting notoriety, however, was not without its dangers. In the spring of 1920, Berdyaev gave a series of courses at the Central Distillery. Not only were the

³⁷ Berdyaev recollected that he was rather shocked upon hearing the first few speakers. He soon discovered that the point was to vilify and mock religion, not to engage in serious discussion about it. "having listened to all the speakers I felt completely paralysed, not knowing what to say or how to extricate myself from the frightful predicament. But I made an intense spiritual effort, concentrated all my powers, and got up to speak when asked to do so. With the very first words I felt as if I was seized by some power inspiring me and giving me strength and all the words appropriate for the occasion...At first the audience was extremely hostile and drowned my words in hisses, cries and derisive ejaculations. But gradually I gained control over it, and ended my speech in a roar of applause." The speech was entitled "On the Worth of Christianity and the Unworthiness of Christians." Berdyaev, Dream and Reality 233-234.

³⁸ Berdyaev gave a public lecture on "Science and Religion" in the hall of the Polytechnic Museum to a crowd of approximately two thousand people. Berdyaev, Dream and Reality 234.

³⁹ Topics on which the professors delivered lectures in that year included: "The Crisis of Culture," "The Crisis of Philosophy," "About Christian Freedom," "About the Substance of Christianity," "Idealist Greece," "About full Messianism," "East, Russia and Europe," "Hindu Mysticism," "About overcoming Platitudes," "K. Leontiev," "Vl. Soloviev and Universal Christianity." Vadimov, Zhizn' Berdiaeva 208.

⁴⁰ Berdyaev, Dream and Reality 235. Neither book could be published in Russia owing to Bolshevik censorship. Berdyaev kept the manuscripts, and was only able to publish them after his expulsion in Berlin.

premises "official" (i.e. government owned), but also the number of students was quite large. A Bolshevik journalist wrote stridently about the situation in Pravda, and Berdyaev was arrested along with the chairman of the distillery. In this case, Berdyaev was able to gain his release the same day after several hours of questioning by simply showing the permits for the Free Academy signed by Kamenev; the Cheka seemed most interested in having him define "Spiritual Culture" but, as his rapid release indicates, could not find anything counter-revolutionary in the subject.⁴¹ After this incident, the Free Academy moved its lecture series to a "neutral" location, the auditorium of the Polytechnic Museum.⁴²

Later that same month, on February 20, Berdyaev was again arrested by the Cheka and transported to Lubianka Prison. This time, the charge involved an apparent link to the counter-revolutionary "Tactical Front" which was sending information to the White Army General Yudenich in Poland.⁴³ After several days confinement and questioning, Berdyaev was taken to an interview with Dzerzhinsky himself; Kamenev and Menzhinsky (second in command of the Cheka) were also present. According to his autobiography, Berdyaev decided to take the offensive, and delivered a half-hour speech on his philosophical beliefs and his moral objection to communism while clearly asserting his total lack of interest in political life.⁴⁴ The Cheka leader seemed to accept his honesty; he said, "It is possible to be a materialist in theory and an idealist in life or, on

⁴¹ Berdyaev, Dream and Reality 235; Lowrie, Rebellious Prophet 151.

⁴² Kogan, "Vyslat' za granitsu" 62.

⁴³ Berdyaev, Dream and Reality 237; Lowrie, Rebellious Prophet 151.

⁴⁴ Berdyaev, Dream and Reality 237.

the contrary, an idealist in theory and a materialist in life".⁴⁵ He then asked Berdyaev several questions about his connections to several people implicated in the case to which the philosopher, experienced in the methods of police interrogations from Tsarist times, politely refused answer. After the interview, Dzerzhinsky asked one of his policemen to drive Berdyaev home because it was late at night and he did not want him to be harassed by ruffians on the street. No charges were laid; Berdyaev was simply requested not to leave Moscow without permission.⁴⁶

Despite this unwanted police attention, the growing success of the Free Academy also had its personal benefits. Berdyaev had established a reputation as an excellent professor and lecturer which attracted the attention of the faculty at the University of Moscow. After his arrests and releases without any further complications, the Dean of Philosophy G.G. Shpet, asked him to take up a chair of philosophy at the University, and become a regular member of the faculty.⁴⁷ This was not only a great honour for a man who did not even hold an official Baccalaureate degree, but also augmented his meagre income. Involvement with the University aided the Free Academy in that students who found the curriculum insufficient for their needs began to take additional classes at the Academy. Interest in the Free Academy blossomed to such an extent that Bely opened a second branch of his Petrograd *Vol'fila* in Moscow in September, 1921, which was directed by Gershenzon and Vysheslavtsev.⁴⁸ Furthermore, Lossky and the philosopher,

⁴⁵ Vadimov, Zhizn' Berdiaeva 216.

⁴⁶ Berdyaev, Dream and Reality 237; Vadimov, Zhizn' Berdiaeva 216-218.

⁴⁷ Berdyaev, Dream and Reality 235; Vadimov, Zhizn' Berdiaeva 209.

⁴⁸ Vadimov, Zhizn' Berdiaeva 222.

E.P. Radlov, became the editors of a new journal Mysl' in Petrograd which published articles from the members of the philosophical society.

The continued autonomy of "societies," "academies," and "associations" despite myriad Bolshevik restrictions, caused the so-called "bourgeois" intelligentsia to gravitate to this type of forum in their desire to disseminate and develop their ideas. In addition to the Free Academy and *Vol'fila*, other similar organizations of prominence included: The Russian Technical Society (1921) in which Pitirim Sorokin played a major role; The Sociology Society (1919)⁴⁹ led by N.I. Kareev; The History, Philosophy and Social Science Societies (1917) of Perm University; The Philosophical Society of Donsk University (1921); The Pedagogical Institute in Kostroma (1922); and the Institute of Educated People in Chita (1922).⁵⁰

Through the Free Academy of Spiritual Culture, its associated organizations, and the multitude of similar initiatives, the religious philosophers pursued an educational task which they felt the Bolsheviks had neglected to their peril. They attempted to spread their ideas not only to intellectuals, but also to the workers of the Revolution in the hope of broadening their perspectives and igniting an interest in spiritual, ethical, and moral issues. Judging by the steady expansion, they did enjoy a degree of success. Bolshevik policies might provide for changing material conditions, but the Free Academy professors were engaging minds and hearts. In so doing, they hoped to gently push the Russian people towards a stance where they naturally began to demand change in basic policy from their own leaders: were they not attempting a spiritual transformation of the Revolution from within?

⁴⁹ Sorokin also contributed to this group.

⁵⁰ Kogan, "Vyslat' za granitsu" 62.

Despite Berdyaev's frequent assertions that he had no interest in engaging in politics, he was not immune to the campaign for human rights especially where it concerned people within his own profession. Along with creating the Free Academy of Spiritual Culture in 1918, he joined an initiative with the former Socialist Revolutionary, Michael Osorgin, to begin the Writers' Union.⁵¹ This body tried to provide shelter and food to writers who were displaced and starving as a result of the new censorship and residence laws. By the new constitution of the R.S.F.S.R. delivered in the summer of 1918, the bourgeois were now considered a class, and were disenfranchised. They were refused ration cards for fuel, and given only part rations or none at all for food; their houses were seized, and only the fortunate few were allowed to remain in residence while sharing the remainder of their rooms with other people in the city. Compounded by the closure of newspapers and publishing houses, this left most artists bereft of the basic necessities of life, let alone work.

An additional facet of the Writers' Union was to protest the arrest and imprisonment of writers, and to work for their release. The counter-revolutionary laws and the exuberant efficiency of the Cheka meant that the lowliest writer could easily be seized for one injudicious phrase in print. In fact, aside from the few Bolshevik writers, the safest course for artists was to simply end their careers.⁵² The Writers' Union, duly registered

⁵¹ Berdyaev, Dream and Reality 231.

⁵² Maxim Gorky was the most obvious exception. Only his affiliation with the Bolsheviks saved him repeatedly from arrest and imprisonment. After the disbanding of the constituent assembly, and the massacres which followed, Gorky equated the actions of his comrades to those of the Tsar's soldiers on "Bloody Sunday" in an editorial. He continued to lambaste his own Party throughout 1919-1921 for every act of despotism and restriction of free speech. While these editorials in Novaia zhizn' provoked several harsh personal letters from Lenin, Gorky was never silenced. See Maxim Gorky, Untimely Thoughts: Essays on Revolution, Culture and the Bolsheviks, 1917-1918, trans. and ed. Herman Ermolaev (London: Garnstone Press, 1968).

and licensed, was housed in Herzen's home on Tverskiim Boulevard in Moscow.⁵³ In addition to Berdyaev and Osorgin, the administration included the writers Muratov, Zaitsev, and Khodasevich. An offshoot to the Union also provided the means of subsistence for its directors: they established a book store - the Lavka Writers' Shop - from which they sold their own and other authors' works (mostly pre-revolutionary) at relatively high cost.⁵⁴ While not providing a vast source of income, the shop did keep its owners and their families fed throughout these grim years.

The Famine

Life in Russia, indeed, was not pleasant during these years. The turmoil of Civil War constantly restricted supplies to the major cities, and those which did arrive were largely directed to the factory workers. The so-called "Bourgeois" scrounged for their basic needs, selling mementoes from their past, and breaking up furniture for fuel. They also had to perform heavy labour tasks because, by virtue of their class, they were considered unemployed; Berdyaev took his turn shovelling frozen garbage in the depths of winter. However, despite these hardships, city life was by no means as desperate as that in the countryside. Marauding White and Red troops marched through villages indiscriminately requisitioning food stocks for their armies, torturing peasants, and killing all who were tainted with the hint of collaboration. These terrors were augmented by the Bolshevik policy of War Communism implemented in 1918: simply stated, the policy demanded the fostering of class war in all peasant villages; Bolsheviks endeavoured to

⁵³ Vadimov, Zhizn' Berdiaeva 191; Berdyaev, Dream and Reality 231.

⁵⁴ Vadimov, Zhizn' Berdiaeva 196. It is entirely possible that much of the stock sold by the Writers' Shop came from Berdyaev's old house "Put" which he had directed as editor-in-chief for Mme. Morozova.

turn "true" peasants against the "kulaks" (rich peasants) who were supposedly forces of counter-revolution and White sympathizers. However, when whole villages refused to act against one of their own deemed unacceptable by the authorities, then the entire population was often exterminated.

Mass deaths, the theft and slaughter of more than seventy percent of all labour animals,⁵⁵ and the persistent requisitioning left village after village destroyed. By 1920, most peasants were operating at a subsistence level, and refused to plant more food than was required for their own needs; the rest, they now knew, would be "stolen". A drought that year in the Volga and Central Asian districts made these harvests insufficient even for the existing population, and yet the Bolsheviks still demanded their requisitions, often slaughtering those peasants who had nothing to give. By 1921, when the Regime sincerely hoped that, "The tortured country now [had] the chance to begin to heal the wounds inflicted by the imperialist and civil wars,"⁵⁶ it instead faced the most devastating famine since 1891.

At the start of the year, Petrograd had insufficient food to feed even its workers, let alone the bourgeois; Central Asia, the Tambov province, and the Northern areas were starving. As hunger took its toll, revolts began to spring up all over the countryside. The Antonov rising in Tambov was quelled only with several divisions of the Red Army, and not until early summer. However, by far the most ominous warning to the Bolshevik leaders was the revolt which began in the naval base at Kronstadt. There, the most loyal and stalwart fighters, the sailors who had been the first to side with the Bolsheviks in

⁵⁵ Reported in "Failure of Soviet-Russian 'Land Reform,'" Rigasche Rundschau 152 (11 July 1921), National Archives, Document Division, Russian Section, Record Group 59, Department of State, Washington D.C., file 861.48/1490.

⁵⁶ Red Army General Frunze as cited in Pravda, 250 (7 November 1920): 1.

October, 1917, mutinied against their officers and Communist rule.⁵⁷ They demanded freedom of speech, the creation of opposition parties, the reinstatement of a democratic constituent assembly, and economic reforms. Even worse, they found support among the Bolsheviks' own Central Committee as diverse factions were hastily created to challenge the Politburo. Angry printers at the Kushnerev typography in Moscow seized the opportunity to reprint anti-Bolshevik writings, most prominently Iz glubiny, in the hope of spreading the spontaneous revolt even further.⁵⁸

The Bolshevik leaders did not hesitate to put down this revolt violently, but its magnitude forced them to reconsider their policies and face the coming famine for the first time. The Kronstadt revolt lasted from March 1-17, 1921. During this time, the situation in Russia attracted international attention. White Russian émigrés were eagerly awaiting just such a sign of popular dissent which might lead to the downfall of Communism and permit their return. Of course, humanitarian concerns were awakened as well. The European powers and international aid bureaus further found their attention drawn to Russia because of a new influx of refugees; this time it was not Whites, nobility, or bourgeois fleeing the war, but peasants, proletariat, and even some Red soldiers and sailors trying to escape the famine.

While Lenin and the Politburo were immersed in military action against the Kronstadt mutiny during these two weeks and trying to control their own unruly Party,⁵⁹

⁵⁷ See Paul Avrich, Kronstadt, 1921 (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1971) for a description of this event.

⁵⁸ Pipes, Struve: Liberal on the Right 258. The distribution was quickly stopped and only the publication date, 1918, saved the remaining authors in Russia from arrest.

⁵⁹ The Ban on Factions which made Party expulsion the penalty for opposing the will of the Politburo was instituted between 8-16 March 1921, and the first Communist Party purge was begun.

a flurry of telegrams were passing to the political representatives of every major Western nation. The American Government and the League of Nations were the recipient of most of these. Both had played the major role in the reconstruction of Europe after World War One: the League of Nations ran a relief-refugee-POW programme under the direction of the famous Norwegian explorer Fridtjof Nansen; America instituted the extremely well-funded American Relief Association (ARA) which was directed by President Harding's close friend and the negotiator for the United States at the Versailles Peace Talks, Herbert Hoover.

An appeal was made by the émigré Russian Parliamentary Committee in Paris to President Harding to supply Petrograd on March 7, 1921.⁶⁰ A day later, the philanthropist Dr. D. H. Dubrowsky consigned 4000 bales of clothing and 600 cases of food to help Petrograd; these materials were handled by a sub-division of the Nansen commission of the League of Nations for refugee aid.⁶¹ On March 10, President Davydoff of the Russian Industrial Commercial Corporation again appealed to President Harding to aid the starving people in Russia.⁶² It was then reported on March 14 that not only Petrograd, but also the garrison of Kronstadt was threatened; the base had sufficient supplies for only two weeks; American agent Magruder asserted that 75,000 people

⁶⁰ President Goutcheff of the Russian Parliamentary Committee, letter to President Warren Harding, 7 March 1921, National Archives, Document Division, Russian Section, Record Group 59, Department of State, Washington D.C., file 861.48/1391.

⁶¹ Dr. D.H. Dubrowsky, letter to Albrecht, 8 March 1921, National Archives, Document Division, Russian Section, Record Group 59, Department of State, Washington D.C., file 861.48/1392.

⁶² President Davydoff of the Russian Industrial Commercial Corporation, letter to President Warren Harding, 10 March 1921, National Archives, Document Division, Russian Section, Record Group 59, Department of State, Washington D.C., file 861.48/1397.

(45,000 of them soldiers) were in imminent threat of starvation.⁶³ The next day State Department representative Hughes denied any relief on the grounds that it would violate neutrality: the Bolsheviks must first *officially* request assistance before the Americans could render their aid.⁶⁴

Publicly, the Bolsheviks were doing their best to ignore the coming crisis. Privately, however, a series of ciphers indicated just how serious the situation really was. As early as February 19, 1921 Lenin acknowledged this in a letter to G. M. Krzhizhanovsky, head of the State Planning Commission: "we are beggars. Hungry, ruined beggars."⁶⁵ In April, the Politburo was appraised of the fact that the previous year's poor harvest was consumed in the Transcaucasian region, and the entire Volga region was almost in the same state. On March 31, Lenin instructed the Commissar of Trade and Commerce, L.B. Krasin, to immediately obtain a stock of consumer goods from abroad which could be exchanged for grain.⁶⁶ On April 9, Lenin sent a telegram to G.K. Orjonikidze, Chairman of the Caucasus Bureau of the Central Committee which demonstrated his government's impotence in the face of the coming disaster.

I have received your cipher message about the desperate food situation in Transcaucasia. We have taken a number of steps, given a little gold to Armenia, confirmed all kinds of instructions to the Commissariat of Food. But I must warn you that we are in great need here, and will not be able to help. I urgently require that you should set up a regional economic body for the whole of Transcaucasia,

⁶³ National Archives, Document Division, Russian Section, Record Group 59, Department of State, Washington D.C., file 861.48/1400.

⁶⁴ National Archives, Document Division, Russian Section, Record Group 59, Department of State, Washington D.C., file 861.48/1400. There is some indication that Hoover was already indirectly supplying the Society of Friends (the Quakers) who had begun a religious relief initiative in Western Russia.

⁶⁵ V.I. Lenin, Collected Works, trans. Yuri Sdobnikov, vol. 35 (Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1970) 475.

⁶⁶ Lenin, Collected Works vol. 45 111.

make the utmost effort with concessions, especially in Georgia; try and buy seed, even if it be from abroad...⁶⁷

As the situation worsened and imperative work projects were slowed or halted through lack of food, the Bolsheviks began a propaganda campaign blaming the White Army, foreign intervention, bourgeois counter-revolutionaries, Kulaks, and finally drought for the agricultural devastation. Nevertheless, in replacing their own policy of forced requisitioning with a new tax-in-kind, by reducing the 1921 tax target to almost half of the previous year's requisition target,⁶⁸ and by allowing a measure of free market exchange for surplus production, the Bolsheviks tacitly recognized their own culpability in the economic devastation.

The Bolshevik government continued to put a brave face on the situation and avoided the unpleasant alternative of international relief until the middle of June. On June 16, Lenin even gave a speech, "The Success of the New Food Policy" to the Third All-Russian Food Congress.⁶⁹ His words were shown to be a lie two days later at the Pan-Russian Congress of Agriculturalists.⁷⁰ There, the leading academic and civil agronomists - mostly bourgeois - reported their findings on the true extent of the famine: the drought that summer, which had also reduced yields in 1920, extended over 800 miles from Viatka in the north to Astrakhan in the south and over 350 miles from Ufa in

⁶⁷ Lenin, Collected Works vol. 35 483.

⁶⁸ The delivery quota for grain for 1920-21 had been 423 million poods. In 1921-22 this was slashed to a tax-in-kind target of 240 million poods. For potatoes, the government demand was reduced from 110 to 60 million poods. The target for meat was lowered from 25.4 to 6.5 million poods. Alexander Nove, An Economic History of the USSR (Markham, Ontario: Penguin Books, 1982) 84.

⁶⁹ Lenin, Collected Works vol. 32 455, 458.

⁷⁰ A translation and copy of this report was made available to the State Department on July 14, 1921. See National Archives, Document Division, Russian Section, Record Group 59, Department of State, Washington D.C., file 861.48/1480.

the east to Penza in the west;⁷¹ 88 million poods of grain would be needed if the Russians were to be saved from starvation, although Professor Rybnikov personally estimated 100 million. The Congress made no attempt to hide their contempt for Bolshevik economic policies, "The Government was blamed for playing at Communist International and world revolution while the people were dying of hunger".⁷² Quite startling was the fact that a minister of the Communist Party, Bogdanov, attended this meeting and, at its closure, asserted that,

a decree was to be issued shortly, according to which up to 50% of the Government estates (so-called soviet estates) which are in worse condition than ever, would be leased to private persons.⁷³

As a result of this forecast and the eyewitness accounts of the Cooperative specialist M.I. Kuhovarenko and the Agronomy professor Rybinkov who had just returned from the most afflicted area of Saratov, the Moscow Society of Agriculture called for the formation of an aid society to immediately begin relief measures. Out of this meeting on June 22, 1921, *Vserossiiskii Obshchestvennyi Komitet pomoshchi golodaiushchim* (the All-Russian Social Committee to Aid the Starving), or VOKPG, was formed.⁷⁴ Composed

⁷¹ Harold H. Fisher, The Famine in Soviet Russia, 1919-1923: The Operations of the American Relief Administration (Freeport, NY: Books for Libraries Press, 1971) 51.

⁷² "Failure of Soviet-Russian 'Land Reform,'" 152 (11 July 1921), National Archives, Document Division, Russian Section, Record Group 59, Department of State, Washington D.C., file 861.48/1490: 1.

⁷³ "Failure of Soviet-Russian 'Land Reform'" 2.

⁷⁴ No consistent acronym for the group has yet been established. Most Western scholars call it simply the "bourgeois committee" [E.H. Carr, Michel Heller] which would be rather unwieldy and potentially lead to confusion in this exposition. Russian scholars refer to it diversely as VSERPOMGOLa [Leont'ev], VKPG [Vadimova], and even erroneously as POMGOLOM [Maksimov] which was another relief organization formed by the Central Executive Committee of the Communist Party after this committee was sanctioned. Therefore, for the sake of clarity and brevity, I have chosen to apply the usual rules of acronyms, and labelled it by the first letters of each word in its formal name - hence VOKPG.

mostly of university professors, Tolstoyans, and other intellectuals, the Committee was led by three former Kadets who had held portfolios in Kerensky's short-lived Provisional Government. The Economist, Sergei N. Prokopovich, had been the Minister of Food and Provisions and, with such expertise, he was elected leader of the Committee. The other two principal members were his wife, the agronomist Ekaterina Kuskova, and the former leader of Zemgor, Nikolai M. Kishkin.⁷⁵

Although the Committee had formed in reaction to the Bolshevik government's inability to provide famine relief, they realized that official sanction of their activities was essential for their success. Hence they sent a delegation to the Kremlin to obtain such approval. Neither Lenin nor the Commissar of Agriculture, Teodorovich, would admit them.⁷⁶ Kuskova then sought the assistance of her old friend Maxim Gorky who agreed to use his connections with the Bolshevik Party to arrange a meeting. Almost one month later, Gorky prevailed upon Politburo member and Commissar of the Moscow Soviet, Lev

For the first rendition of this story see Michel Heller, "Premier Avertissement: Un Coup de Fouet," *Cahiers du monde russe et soviétique* 20.2 (1979) 131-172. Recently more information about the expulsions in 1922 has been presented in L.A. Kogan, "Vyslat' za granitsu bezzhlostno'." 9 (1993) 61-84. See also for VOKPG: Yuri Maksimov, "1922 god: Bol'sheviki, zapad i intelligentsiia (Vospominaniia ochevidt'sa)." *Diplomaticheskii Ezhegodnik* (Moscow, Mezhdunarodnye otnosheniia, 1992) 385-405; Ia. V. Leont'ev, "Likvidatsiia VSERPOMGOLa: Pis'ma E.D. Kuskovoi k V.N Figner 1921-1922," *Russkoe Proshloe* 4 (1993): 330-342.

⁷⁵ See Appendix A for a table of the VOKPG members.

⁷⁶ Michel Heller, "Premier Avertissement" 132. This was not the first time that Lenin had refused Prokopovich and Kuskova: on March 27 of that same year, the couple had suggested a plan to help restore the Ruble by issuing bonds secured by their Co-operative Society (an institution which they had formed in 1918 after revoking their membership in the Kadet Party in reconciliation with the new Bolshevik government) seemingly in accordance with the government's roll-back of nationalized institutions as put forth in NEP. However, Lenin rejected their plan on the grounds that it was blatant capitalism. This decision did not prevent Lenin from seizing upon the idea himself and, on April 8, ordering one of the Secretaries of the Central Executive Committee (VTsIK), Preobrazhensky, to issue these bonds on the security of the Communist Party and the commodity stocks of the R.S.F.S.R. thus effecting a certain revitalization of the currency through State means. See Lenin, *Collected Works* vol. 45 106.

Kamenev, to receive the delegation from VOKPG. At the meeting, Kamenev admitted that Russia did not possess the internal means to prevent or significantly mitigate the famine.⁷⁷ Then suddenly, on July 12, VOKPG was granted official sanction from the Politburo to organize relief efforts, and the Commissar of Public Health, N.A. Semashko, and Lev Kamenev were inducted into the Committee.

This reversal on the part of the Bolsheviks may not be explained as a policy evolution by the Party. It was a sudden turn-around. Lenin had received another submission from Nansen offering aid to the starving in Petrograd two days before, on July 10, which he had urged the Politburo to accept; they had done so unanimously on July 11.⁷⁸ Yet such proposals had been proffered by Nansen and by the ARA repeatedly since 1919, and had been rejected.⁷⁹ The Bolsheviks had begun to initiate crucial changes in domestic policy in 1921 with the obliteration of "War Communism", but these did not involve a mitigation of tax obligations (grain) or total Party control even at the height of the famine.⁸⁰

What seems to have occurred - and this cannot yet, if ever, be known due to the secretiveness regarding motivations - was a machiavellian decision to change direction on the part of Lenin. This is evinced in a secret telegram which Lenin sent to Semashko on the day VOKPG was sanctioned by the Politburo:

Semashko, my darling!

Don't fret, sweetheart! We shall leave the Quakers to you, to you *alone*.
You mustn't be jealous of Kuskova.

⁷⁷ Heller, "Premier Avertissement" 134.

⁷⁸ Lenin, Collected Works vol. 45 207.

⁷⁹ Fisher, The Famine in Soviet Russia, 1919-1923 14-33.

⁸⁰ Lenin, Collected Works vol. 45 238.

Today's directive to the Politbureau: Kuskova must be strictly rendered harmless. You are in the "communist cell" and will have to be on your toes, *keeping a strict watch over this.*

We shall get Kuskova to give us her name, her signature and a *couple of carloads* from those who sympathize with her (and **others of her stripe**). **Not a thing more.**

It is really not very hard to do this.⁸¹

He had determined that the VOKPG might be a greater asset than a threat; that the Committee might be able to solicit enormous sums in famine relief which they would then be able to freely distribute throughout the country. It cannot yet be said that he hoped that some of these funds could be diverted for the purpose of spreading Communism worldwide, or that the bourgeois VOKPG-led relief negotiations were intended to pave the way for diplomatic discussion. Nevertheless, Lenin appears to have decided to accept VOKPG for no other reason than that they could be seen to be taking direct action to elicit world support, that they justified Bolshevik inaction on the basis of lack of means,⁸² and that they might just bring in a substantial reservoir of monies. Moreover, VOKPG offered the Bolshevik government a way of handling negotiations with the distasteful capitalists at arm's length as it were, and could easily be used as a scapegoat should the initiative fail. Either way, the Bolsheviks had nothing to lose.⁸³

⁸¹ Lenin, "Letter to N.A. Semashko," 12 July 1921, letter 245 of Collected Works vol. 45, 208-9. This was the only time in the history of Soviet Russia that a private organization was given the right to make such arrangements with other countries and foreign organizations which seems to indicate the immense proportions of the crisis. Heller, "Premier Avertissement" 143.

⁸² This may well not be true. It may be possible that they did not have the *will* to invest their money in their own people. The New York Herald, for example, reported that the Bolsheviks had already sequestered some 4,247,665,520 rubles from the Orthodox Church as well as some 327,340 destinas of land. See the New York Herald 19 June 1921: 3.

⁸³ E.L. Packer, the Russian advisor for the American secretary of state concluded that VOKPG was probably created for "a) efficiency, b) confidence, and c) lack of official responsibility in case of failure which is probable." See E.L. Packer (Division of Russian Affairs), letter to Secretary of State, 5 August 1921, National Archives, Document Division, Russian Section, Record Group 59, Department of State, Washington D.C., file 861.48/1506.

The process by which international relief was engaged for this disastrous famine in Russia took almost two months, and involved intricate manoeuvrings on the part of all interested bodies. The political machinations and secret agendas quickly obscured and sullied initial humanitarian intentions.

Despite his obvious lack of faith in the potential gains an international appeal might bring, on July 12, Lenin either directed Gorky or acceded to Gorky's plan to solicit help from the Orthodox Church.⁸⁴ The next day, Gorky sent a telegram to Nansen at the League of Nations enclosing an appeal by him directed to "All Honest People" and by Patriarch Tikhon directed to "the Archbishops of Canterbury and New York".⁸⁵ Later the Patriarch, in an interview with an American official, avowed that he had offered to make such an appeal much earlier, but that the Politburo refused.⁸⁶ Neither appeal was made public in the Russian press until several weeks had passed. On July 14, Nansen sent his reply to Gorky stating that a relief endeavour of these proportions would require American assistance, and that they would not be likely to help unless their citizens who were detained in Bolshevik prisons were released. He also forwarded the Gorky-Tikhon appeal and his reply to the American consulate in Riga.⁸⁷ The State Department in Washington received this on July 15, and forwarded a copy to Herbert Hoover in London;

⁸⁴ James J. Zatko, Descent into Darkness: The Destruction of the Roman Catholic Church in Russia, 1917-1923 (Notre Dame, Ind: Notre Dame UP, 1965) 102.

⁸⁵ Maxim Gorky, telegram to Fridjof Nansen, 13 July 1921, National Archives, Document Division, Russian Section, Record Group 59, Department of State, Washington D.C., file 861.48/1501.

⁸⁶ Office of the Commissioner of the United States, Riga, Memorandum of Conversation with Mr. Colton of American Y.M.C.A., 20 April 1922, National Archives, Document Division, Russian Section, Record Group 59, Department of State, Washington D.C., file 861.404/30: 1.

⁸⁷ Maxim Gorky, telegram to Fridjof Nansen, 13 July 1921, National Archives, Document Division, Russian Section, Record Group 59, Department of State, Washington D.C., file 861.48/1501.

for some reason, they labelled Gorky as an "official from the Commissariat for Foreign Affairs".⁸⁸

In Russia, VOKPG could not begin its activities until it was sanctioned by the Central Executive Commission (VTsIK). This permission was given on July 21 after "three stormy sessions".⁸⁹ The Party only agreed when it was assured that a Communist Cell of ten loyal officials would oversee the "bourgeois committee", and when their President, Kalinin, revealed his plans to begin a separate, VTsIK relief committee called POMGOLOM.⁹⁰ That same day, the Information Messenger in Russia reported upon the formation of VOKPG, sympathized with the mandate of the Committee to autonomously administer all sums and products received internally and from abroad, and emphasized its restriction to refrain from all political activities. It did not mention that an appeal to the outside world had already been sent.⁹¹

This last bit of crucial information, however, was emerging in the international press that day, and commentary about Gorky's appeal was prevalent until July 23. Immediately it was championed by such illuminaries as Anatole France, Gerhard Hauptmann, Blasco Ibanez, Bernard Shaw and H.G. Wells. However, it was also vilified:

⁸⁸ Office of the Commissioner of the United States, Christiania, Norway, introductory letter to the Secretary of State explaining the telegram from Maxim Gorky to Fridjof Nansen, 15 July 1921, National Archives, Document Division, Russian Section, Record Group 59, Department of State, Washington D.C., file 861.48/1501.

⁸⁹ Maksimov, "1922 god: Bolsheviki, zapad, i, intelligentsia" 386.

⁹⁰ Kalinin was clearly instructed to do this by Lenin. See V.I. Lenin, "Telegram to the Simbirsk Uyezd Congress of Soviets, July 18 or 19, 1921," and "Telephone Message to M.I. Kalinin and L.B. Kamenev, July 19, 1921," letter 259, Collected Works vol. 45 215. The Appeal was issued on August 1.

⁹¹ Information Messenger 27 July 1921: 1-2. Translation in National Archives, Document Division, Russian Section, Record Group 59, Department of State, Washington D.C., file 861.48/1549.

In one particularly emotional outburst published on the front-page of Le Figaro, the Leader of the Association of Veterans of France, Binet-Valmar, reminded Gorky that because of the Bolshevik's cruelty, thousands of Russians had been made into refugees. He further accused the Bolsheviks of being culpable for his son's death at the Front during the summer of 1918 because of their "treachery" at Brest-Litovsk. Binet-Valmar concluded, as many others in Europe were to during the next month, that Russia should only receive aid if it was accompanied by changes to the current regime.⁹²

At the height of this controversy, on July 22, Hoover sent a copy of his intended reply to Gorky to the American State Department for their approval.⁹³ The State Department was further pressured by the return of Senator France from a trip to Russia who was now graphically describing the horrible conditions which he had witnessed, and demanding that immediate aid should be sent with no conditions.⁹⁴ Reports, albeit minimizing the extent of the disaster, began to appear in Russian papers. The bourgeois leader of VOKPG, Prokopovich, gave an interview in Izvestia that day stating that more than 1 million people were dying of starvation, that Russia did not have the money to assist them, and that aid must be solicited from abroad.⁹⁵ Finally, on July 23, Pravda

⁹² Gustav Binet-Valmar, Le Figaro 22 July 1921: 1.

⁹³ Herbert Hoover, letter to the Secretary of State, 22 July 1921, National Archives, Document Division, Russian Section, Record Group 59, Department of State, Washington D.C., file 861.48/1476.

⁹⁴ National Archives, Document Division, Russian Section, Record Group 59, Department of State, Washington D.C., file 861.48/1476.

⁹⁵ This was received from agent Quarton by the State Department on August 9. See National Archives, Document Division, Russian Section, Record Group 59, Department of State, Washington D.C., file 861.48/1507.

published news of Gorky's appeal (Patriarch Tikhon's was not mentioned), and revealed the full membership and constitution of VOKPG.⁹⁶

Hoover's reply reached Gorky on July 23. As Nansen had warned, Hoover's first condition was the release of American prisoners.⁹⁷ His second was an official request for aid delivered specifically by the governing Communist Party in order that the ARA could be assured that these appeals were genuine.⁹⁸ In return, he made a direct offer to the Bolshevik government of 1.2 to 1.5 million dollars per month for relief.⁹⁹ His demands were backed by Nansen a day later on July 24 who sent a telegram to the *actual* Commissar of Foreign Affairs, Nikolai Chicherin, stating:

Would a general international organisation for relief of famine in Russia on the same basis as International Committee of Relief Paris for Central Europe be welcome to Soviet government? If so could you give official statement of actual food situation in Russia.

He further reiterated, "As American cooperation absolutely essential it would be greatest importance to know whether all Americans in Russia will be immediately released and

⁹⁶ A translation of the decree of the All-Russian Central Executive Committee regarding the All-Russian Hunger Relief Committee published in Pravda 160 (23 July 1921) was received by the American Department of State on 28 July 1921 from the Riga Bureau. See the National Archives, Document Division, Russian Section, Record Group 59, Department of State, Washington D.C., file 861.48/1550.

⁹⁷ Some sixty-six Americans were being held at this time for acts against the Soviet people; most had been arrested during the Civil War for "interventionism". Le Figaro 28 July 1921: 3.

⁹⁸ Herbert Hoover, "Response to Maxim Gorky's Appeal," 23 July 1921, Documents of Soviet History, ed. Rex A. Wade, Vol. 2 (Gulf Breeze, FL: Academic International Press, 1993) 277-278.

⁹⁹ The total amount given by the A.R.A. between 1921-23 was 60 million dollars of which 24 million was provided by the Government of the United States and substantial sums were donated from the Red Cross, the Jewish Joint Distribution Committee, and various church organizations. Kuskova estimated that this aid would result in only 35% mortality in the Volga region (the centre of the famine) compared with the 50-70% which had been expected. See Heller, "Premier Avertissement" 148.

sent at once to Russian frontier."¹⁰⁰

Before Gorky had a chance to reply to Hoover, the Communist organ Novyi put' obtained a copy of Hoover's telegram and proceeded to lambaste it on July 27 in an editorial entitled "Help...On Certain Conditions."¹⁰¹ It caustically berated Hoover for restricting aid on political grounds: first, it noted the incongruence of Hoover discussing such matters of State with Gorky and not an appropriate Communist official; second, it gave several examples where European countries had been offended by the ARA's methods.¹⁰² The editorial concluded by hinting that Russia would be better off dealing with the famine on its own rather than being subjected to such insults, and it warned Hoover that he should simply rely on the existing distribution committees in Russia (i.e. VOKPG) and not try to set up independent ARA bodies.

The next day, as Hoover was receiving Gorky's reply from a representative of the Commissariat for Foreign Affairs in Latvia, his own telegram to Gorky began to receive

¹⁰⁰ Nansen sent the telegram on 24 July 1921, and it was received by the American Department of State on 25 July 1921 [see Schneideman for the Office of the Commissioner of the United States, Christiana, Norway, telegram to the Secretary of State, 25 July 1921, National Archives, Document Division, Russian Section, Record Group 59, Department of State, Washington D.C., file 861.48/1502]. It was then sent on to Hoover. See Charles E. Hughes, letter to Herbert Hoover, 30 July 1921, National Archives, Document Division, Russian Section, Record Group 59, Department of State, Washington D.C., file 861.48/1502.

¹⁰¹ It is not known if it was intentional that the Communists applied the name from Merezhkovsky's and then Berdyaev and Bulgakov's original religious-philosophical journal to this newly established paper. The coincidence, however, is rather interesting. "Help...On Certain Conditions," Novyi put' 143 (27 July 1921): 1-3. The Department of State received a copy of this article from agent Quarton on 9 August 1921 and translated it into English. See National Archives, Document Division, Russian Section, Record Group 59, Department of State, Washington D.C., file 861.48/1548.

¹⁰² Russian relief became a political "football" for all Europeans who had resented the high-handed approach of the ARA. On July 26, Richard of the ARA reported to Herter at the Department of Commerce that Gorky's appeal had been answered by the German millionaire Stinnes who had been very antagonistic towards ARA methods employed in Germany. See National Archives, Document Division, Russian Section, Record Group 59, Department of State, Washington D.C., file 861.48/1540.

considerable attention in the international press. Most articles disparaged Hoover for either reducing humanitarian concerns to politics, or for being insufficiently harsh and rigorous with his demands.¹⁰³ Gorky's reply was clearly tailored for media dissemination: it began by sardonically assuring Hoover that his proposal had been transmitted to the Communist government "seeing that they *alone* can discuss the conditions therein" (emphasis added); the telegram then stated that the condition regarding American prisoners was acceptable. It concluded by saying,

The Russian Government considers it desirable as soon as possible to fix the precise conditions on which this association will begin immediate relations of its humane intentions to guarantee the feeding, medical treatment and clothing of a million children and invalids. For that purpose the Russian Government would consider it useful that Director Brown [ARA] or another person invested with full powers should carry out negotiations and should immediately come to Moscow, Riga or Reval.¹⁰⁴

The affixed signatures intended to give an official air to this reply, but they were still incorrect. The telegram was signed Maxim Gorky and Kamenev as "Chairman of the All-Russian Central Executive Committee for Helping the Famine Stricken Population". Kamenev, however, was Chairman of the autonomous VOKPG, not of the government POMGOLOM, as the signature asserted.

Regardless of these diplomatic manoeuvrings, VOKPG was rapidly trying to fulfil its mandate, and was one of the only bodies taking concrete action by the beginning of August. Working under the insignia of the Red Cross, VOKPG moved rapidly to co-opt assistance from all Russians who could help. On August 1 it augmented its numbers by an additional ten bringing the total to seventy-three. A Student Branch was formed when

¹⁰³ Le Figaro 28 July 1921: 3.

¹⁰⁴ Received by the American Department of State, 1 August 1921. See Maxim Gorky, telegram to Herbert Hoover, 28 July 1921, National Archives, Document Division, Russian Section, Record Group 59, Department of State, Washington D.C., file 861.48/1503.

the Moscow All-city Student Bureau offered its services to VOKPG and, by August 3, eleven universities had joined; more than forty state universities were involved before the end of the month.¹⁰⁵

Both the parent VOKPG and the student branch were divided into three sections: Organization, Literature and Agitation, and Collection of Donations. Kiskhin (with stipulatory control by Kamenev) and Kuskova headed the first and third sections. For the second, VOKPG solicited help from the Writers' Union and Lavka Writers' Shop. Michael Osorgin was one of the ten later additions to VOKPG, brought in specifically to run their publication organ Pomoshch'.¹⁰⁶ Nikolai Berdyaev, was deliberately excluded from work at VOKPG by his own partners. They needed someone to direct both the shop and the Writers' Union and, as Berdyaev still had his commitments at the Free Academy, he was chosen. Moreover, as there was a degree of risk in being involved in VOKPG - its participants did acknowledge the potential danger that the authorities would turn on them because of their class affiliation and/or as scapegoats - Berdyaev's responsibilities and previous debacles with the Cheka made him too valuable and vulnerable to risk.¹⁰⁷ In the student branch, the leaders of the three sections respectively were V.D. Golovachev, G.L. Levin, Iu. N. Maksimov.¹⁰⁸

While the Literature and Agitation sections of VOKPG and the Student branch were urging all possible internal support and disseminating news about the full ramifications

¹⁰⁵ Maksimov, "1922 god: Bol'sheviki, zapad i intelligentsiia" 390.

¹⁰⁶ He was assisted in this by Boris Zaitsev who had been one of the original members of VOKPG, and was one of his partners at Lavka. See Vadimov, Zhizn' Berdiaeva 219.

¹⁰⁷ Vadimov, Zhizn' Berdiaeva 219-220.

¹⁰⁸ Maksimov, "1922 god: Bol'sheviki, zapad i intelligentsiia" 385-406.

of the famine, the Collection sections managed to raise over 60 million rubles and 300 million articles of clothing, produce and medical supplies before August 13.¹⁰⁹ The significance of monetary contributions was diminished by the wildly fluctuating price of rye flour which inflated from 100 to 200,000 rubles in the affected regions during the month of August.¹¹⁰ Nevertheless, by August 25, the Committees had secured the sacrifice of 100,113,678 rubles¹¹¹ from the already terribly impoverished Russian population.

The success of VOKPG's appeal was such that they even reached the struggling émigré population which created social committees under the umbrella of VOKPG in Berlin, Paris, London, and other major émigré centres. The London branch had collected 79,000 pounds sterling for famine relief before the end of August.¹¹² Kuskova and the VOKPG delegates for foreign collection contacted government representatives in Germany, France, Sweden, Great Britain, the United States, and Italy in order to arrange the negotiation of foreign aid through either direct charity or credits and loans. The two most prominent figures in VOKPG - Gorky and the daughter of Tolstoy, Alexandra Tolstoya - headed the appeal delegation which left Russia on August 4.¹¹³

¹⁰⁹ Izvestia 14 August 1921: 3.

¹¹⁰ Prodovol'stvennaia gazeta 18 August 1921. Such inflation only affected Moscow for a few months, reaching the level of 120,000 rubles for a ration of bread by April 1922. In this diary, Iury Got'e listed the price of bread from September 1921 until April 9, 1922. see Terence Emmons, ed. and trans., Time of Troubles: The Diary of Iury Vladimirovich Got'e (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1988).

¹¹¹ Pomoshch' 29 August 1921. 1.

¹¹² Novgorodsky proletarii 22 September 1921.

¹¹³ National Archives, Document Division, Russian Section, Record Group 59, Department of State, Washington D.C., file 861.48/1493.

Despite such industry on the part of the independent VOKPG, the Bolshevik Government acted as though the famine was a minor concern. On August 1, Lenin ordered military units into the countryside to enforce the rapid collection of the tax in kind - grain - for his government's coffers, not for redistribution to the starving areas.¹¹⁴ POMGOLOM, however, did finally issue its appeal to the Russian people that day and, on August 2, Lenin sent off the politically-safe "Appeal to the International Proletariat" which called for funds from foreign workers; it brought in one million marks from the Second Internationale.¹¹⁵ He also made an "Appeal to the Peasants of the Ukraine" to give up some of their grain for the famine victims.¹¹⁶ In fact, the general line disseminated by the Bolshevik authorities was that the famine was not a very serious affair, and actually quite limited in scope. To emphasize its minuteness, the Commissar for Foreign Affairs, Chicherin, issued a blistering reprimand to the Western nations on August 2. He accused them of exaggerating the scale of the famine and the gravity of conditions in Russia. Although admitting that some migration of people out of famine areas was occurring, Chicherin insisted that "independent famine relief committees composed of people outside of Soviet governmental spheres" had the situation under control.¹¹⁷

Beside VOKPG, the only other "independent" relief was being established by various religious bodies. The Society of Friends (Quakers) and the Mennonites were

¹¹⁴ Lenin, "To M.I. Frumkin," 4 August 1921, letter 296 of Collected Works vol. 45 238-239.

¹¹⁵ T.F. Johnson, International Tramps 225.

¹¹⁶ Lenin, Collected Works vol. 32 502.

¹¹⁷ G.V. Chicherin, message to the Secretary of State, 9 August 1921, National Archives, Document Division, Russian Section, Record Group 59, Department of State, Washington D.C., file 861.48/1506.

already distributing food in limited areas of the Volga Region. The Orthodox Church, after Patriarch Tikhon issued his appeal with Gorky, had created the Church Committee to aid the famine victims.¹¹⁸ However, these bodies never received any official notice or sanction. In fact, Tikhon's appeal was kept secret from the Russian population until August 6 when it was reported in an article in Izvestia entitled "It Should Have Happened Long Ago!"¹¹⁹

The Catholic Church hierarchy in Rome also responded to the situation in Russia. They were never contacted by the Patriarch because of continued tension between the two denominations; the Orthodox had reason to suspect secret negotiations between the Papacy and Lenin with regards to a massive Catholic missionary move into Russia.¹²⁰ Nevertheless, Pope Benedict XV sent his Secretary of State, Cardinal Gasparri, to approach the heads of state about the issue of aid to Russia, and he appealed to the people of the world for personal charity on August 8, 9, and 10.¹²¹ He personally sent one million lire for relief to the Orthodox Church Famine Committee that Autumn.¹²²

¹¹⁸ Pomoshch' 22 August 1921. Sergei Bulgakov directed the Ukraine branch of this committee.

¹¹⁹ Izvestia 6 August 1921. Translated by the American Department of State. See National Archives, Document Division, Russian Section, Record Group 59, Department of State, Washington D.C., file 861.48/1584.

¹²⁰ On May 20, 1921 the State Department received information that the Holy See in Rome was in contact with Lenin concerning Church reform questions. Some Jesuit fathers had recently been sent to Moscow. It was suggested that Lenin was ready to advocate certain religious reforms to favour a Catholic revival of religious forces among the peasant population in return for diplomatic assistance from Rome. See Walter Smith (*chargé d'affaires ad interim*, Riga), letter to Charles E. Hughes, 20 May 1921, National Archives, Document Division, Russian Section, Record Group 59, Department of State, Washington D.C., file 861.404/14.

¹²¹ Zatko, Descent into Darkness 108.

¹²² Johnson, International Tramps 225.

The ARA chose Riga to be the site of their negotiations with the Russians. Lev Kamenev, as Chairman of VOKPG, met with Hoover on August 5 to launch the proceedings, and to bring proof that the incarcerated Americans had been released outside of Russia.¹²³ Hoover then turned the details over to his second-in-command Walter Lyman Brown, and to C.J.C. Quinn, P.H. Carroll, and J.C. Miller;¹²⁴ Kamenev was replaced by the vice-Commissar for Foreign Affairs and a member of VOKPG, Maxim Litvinov. Official talks began on August 10. Although neither had the resources of the ARA, Nansen's organization and the International Red Cross hoped to be involved in the Russian relief programme as well. Nansen indicated his willingness to comply with whatever terms were achieved by the ARA, but Ador of the Red Cross wanted to engage in separate, less-conditional, negotiations; he was granted Papal support for his intention on August 11.¹²⁵ On August 15, both Nansen and Ador arrived in Riga to take part in the negotiations.

At Riga, the ARA demanded their usual conditions: First the Bolshevik government had to publicly admit that they had sought and needed assistance from the ARA. Representatives of the ARA, while guaranteeing not to engage in any political activities, were to have the freedom to come and go, and move about in Russia, without impediment. The ARA was to be given free transportation, storage, communications and handling of imported supplies, and priority over all other traffic. Earmarking children as the most essential victims to be relieved, they demanded access to the aid sites in order

¹²³ Other Americans in the country were now being processed for exit visas. Le Figaro 6 August 1921: 3; The Globe and Mail 6 August 1921: 1. See National Archives, Document Division, Russian Section, Record Group 59, Department of State, Washington D.C., file 861.48/1494.

¹²⁴ Fisher, The Famine in Soviet Russia 59-60.

¹²⁵ Zatko, Descent into Darkness 108.

to enforce proper delivery. In return, the ARA would give aid to all who needed it regardless of age, sex, religion, race, or political affiliation.¹²⁶ Finally, the ARA demanded collateral to secure American Government loans.

If the plight of starving Russian people could not arouse much response from their Bolshevik leaders, these demands certainly did. On August 11, when these demands were transferred to Lenin through Gorky from Litvinov, he exploded:

Comrade Molotov:

It is absolutely necessary to appoint a special commission from the Politbureau:

Kamenev, Trotsky

Molotov (with the right of his substitution by Chicherin) for the day-to-day handling of matters connected with aid to the starving from America and the league of Nations Council.

Hoover must be punished, he must be *slapped in the face publicly, for all the world* to see, and the League of Nations Council as well.

This is *very hard* to do, but it *must* be done.

I can't work. There is absolute need of help from Trotsky, who has a capacity for these things (both diplomatic experience and a military and political instinct).

Please have a vote taken in the Politbureau **at once** by telephone.

Show this note to *everyone* and get their votes.¹²⁷

For Lenin, the demands of Hoover smacked of interventionism, and he accused him of using the famine victims as leverage to dismember the Bolshevik government,¹²⁸

¹²⁶ Fisher, The Famine in Soviet Russia 52-53.

¹²⁷ V.I. Lenin, "To V.M. Molotov for the Politbureau of the R.C.P.(B.) C.C.," 11 August 1921, letter 310 Collected Works vol. 45 250-1. Lenin's view of the ARA becomes especially clear at the end of the letter, "The disguised interventionists must be *caught* (have Unschlicht [man who later helped round up the intellectuals for deportation] help out).

The Kompomoshch apparatus must be tightened up (if there is a shortage of men, *borrow* some from the *military* for two months)... P.S. Our moves must be subtle. A number of especially strict measures. Hoover and Brown are liars and brazen-faced fellows.

The conditions must be of *the strictest*: arrest and deportation for the slightest interference in our internal affairs."

¹²⁸ From the Bolshevik perspective such suspicion about Hoover's motivations was not unreasonable. Hoover had represented the United States at the Versailles Treaty Conferences which resulted in the loss of much of the former Russian lands. He was also implicated in the American intervention endeavors in the Far East. Moreover, according to Soviet history, Hoover

or at least as a devious method to inject foreign capital and private interest into their communist society.¹²⁹ He must have hoped that the ARA and other organizations would send their money directly to VOKPG, and allow them to distribute it as they saw fit without the involvement of hundreds of American workers. He certainly did not expect to have to deposit Bolshevik monies as collateral.

Lenin's concerns of intervention were reinforced by the rumours abounding in the West: that Germany and England were intending to use the famine to exploit Russian resources; that the French were demanding that aid be attached to intervention; and, most popular among émigré circles in France, and that the VOKPG was intended to become a new Provisional Government of Russia as Lenin and the other top Bolshevik leaders resigned their positions and fled abroad.¹³⁰ The former leader of the Provisional Government, Alexander Kerensky, even stated categorically that no aid should be given at all: the famine should be used to help eliminate the Bolsheviks.¹³¹

Litvinov was given his orders from the Politburo, and he repeatedly tried to dissuade the ARA from insisting upon handling their own distribution committees. He

had plundered the mineral resources in Siberia before World War One. See Lenin, Collected Works vol. 45 770.

¹²⁹ This fear is suggested in Maksimov, "1922 god: Bol'sheviki, zapad i intelligentsiia" 389.

¹³⁰ This last assertion received considerable attention in the international press. The Globe and Mail reported that "Observers say committee may extend influence to politics", and "SEE END OF SOVIETS". The paper did at least mention the codicil, "It would appear that its prospects of becoming the governing body would depend largely upon how much pressure Lenin and Trotsky would be able to exercise upon it, should it extend its endeavours into political fields" [12 August 1921: 1]. See also Le Figaro 2 August 1921: 3; 3 August 1921: 3; 6 August 1921: 3; 12 August 1921: 3; The Globe and Mail 6 August 1921: 1; Le Matin 6 August 1921: 1; Berliner Lokal Anzeiger 11 August 1921: 1; Copenhagener Lokal Anzeiger 1 August 1921: 1.

¹³¹ From a Department of State report of 13 August 1921, National Archives, Document Division, Russian Section, Record Group 59, Department of State, Washington D.C., file 861.48/1523.

argued that American-run organizations might upset "present governmental distributing machinery and [duplicate] newly formed relief committee [i.e. VOKPG]."¹³² As the dispute went on, Lenin decided to give in on the matter of collateral despite rising opposition within his own Party on the whole matter of international relief. On August 16, he instructed Chicherin and Kamenev to deposit in gold in New York City 120% of the amount the A.R.A. was to be supplying for one month (1.8 million dollars) for one million starving children and sick persons.¹³³

The same day, the State Department received a report from their agent Quarton that major disagreement was occurring among the Bolshevik leaders. Trotsky was apparently neutral in the matter, but "Radek and Boukarin are most bitter [and] may use their influence to impede activities [of the] foreign relief organization inside Russia".¹³⁴ Pressured in this way, Lenin instructed Litvinov to hold firm on the matter of distribution. Regarding on-the-spot checks, he would only allow parity commissions made up of A.R.A. men and Communist officials; Lenin completely reserved their right to choose where and when these checks would occur. Further protecting his government's stated reputation, Lenin insisted that the Bolsheviks had "never had rationing of any kind in the countryside,"

¹³² Walter L. Brown, report submitted to Herbert Hoover, 13 August 1921, National Archives, Document Division, Russian Section, Record Group 59, Department of State, Washington D.C., file 861.48/1528.

¹³³ Lenin, "Letter to G.V Chicherin and L.B. Kamenev," August 13, 1921, letter 317 of Collected Works vol. 45 253-254.

¹³⁴ Quarton, message to the Secretary of State, 16 August 1921, National Archives, Document Division, Russian Section, Record Group 59, Department of State, Washington D.C., file 861.48/1544.

and protested the "hucksters" assumption that the Bolsheviks might renege on their debts.¹³⁵

Internally, Lenin ordered another reform on August 17, demanding that Frumkin, Avanesov and Stalin prohibit bonuses in salt and ration it in the cities in order that there be enough stock to pay peasants in the Ukraine for their grain.¹³⁶ While Litvinov continued to refuse the conditions which jeopardized "Soviet dignity and sovereignty" as well as lambasting the West for exaggerating the scale of the famine,¹³⁷ the truth of its dimensions were becoming obvious to everyone. Potential mortalities of 25 million which had been reported through August were horrifying enough, but now more accurate reports suggested some 40 million Russians were in immediate danger. No longer was the problem isolated to starvation: epidemics were flaring throughout the afflicted regions; cholera, typhus, and anthrax demanded immediate medicines as well as sufficient food and clothing. Moreover, the first reports of cannibalism were beginning to filter through the still-fluid borders.¹³⁸

¹³⁵ Lenin, "Letter to G.V Chicherin and L.B. Kamenev," 13 August 1921, letter 317 of Collected Works vol. 45 253-254. In 1918 the Bolsheviks repudiated the so-called "Tsarist" war debt and refused to pay back the substantial loans from USA and especially Britain and France. It is perhaps not surprising that neither Britain nor France offered any aid to Russia during this crisis.

¹³⁶ Lenin, "Letter to M.I. Frumkin, V.A. Avanesov and J.V. Stalin," 17 August 1921, letter 322 of Collected Works vol. 45 257.

¹³⁷ Novyi put' 165 (18 August 1921): 1.

¹³⁸ The first reports of this kind came directly to the State Department from Quarton on August 20. He reported furthermore, that the Bolsheviks were actually starting to evacuate people from the worst regions. See National Archives, Document Division, Russian Section, Record Group 59, Department of State, Washington D.C., file 861.48/1568. The same day Birionkov, a member of VOKPG's Berlin branch said in an interview that Prokopovich concurred with the 40 million figure and that the deficit in grain was not 75 million poods but 120 million. See file 861.48/1637.

The ARA finally received acceptance of all of its conditions on August 21, 1921.¹³⁹ In choosing to retain their tried and true methods of independent distribution and autonomous selection of their own committees, however, they had completely undermined the need for VOKPG. If the ARA was going to recruit their own workers upon arrival in Russia, what need was there for a dubiously-composed committee to administer the relief? The truth of this was evinced the very next day when Lenin ordered that visas for VOKPG members be rescinded indefinitely.¹⁴⁰ Lenin also instructed Zinoviev to compile special press releases about the foreign aid. The agreement was to be kept secret for the time being while Zinoviev was to emphasize that the collection of donations for famine relief was *solely* the providence of the Bolshevik Government. He was told to prepare foreign press releases which did not *initially* attack the American government, but did tell all interested philanthropists to send their aid directly to the Kremlin and not to Hoover or VOKPG.¹⁴¹ From this time forward, VOKPG was living on borrowed time.

Why did Hoover, and then Nansen, refuse to accept the agency of VOKPG as a distribution body? According to the official ARA history of the relief initiative, the two leaders did not realize that the Committee even existed until the end of that month, August 27, when their representatives arrived in Moscow and heard about the fate of the VOKPG.¹⁴² This, unfortunately, is a blatant lie. Not only had the international press repeatedly reported that VOKPG existed and speculated about its chances of becoming

¹³⁹ Heller, "Premier Avertissement" 148. See Appendix B.

¹⁴⁰ Maksimov, "1922 god: Bol'sheviki, zapad i intelligentsiia" 388.

¹⁴¹ Lenin, "Telephone Message to G.Y. Zinoviev," 22 August 1921, letter 331 of Collected Works vol. 45 262-263.

¹⁴² Fisher, The Famine in Soviet Russia 78.

the replacement government in Russia,¹⁴³ but also the State Department had been compiling a formidable dossier on VOKPG since July 28 which even included an appraisal of its function.¹⁴⁴ The first proof of its existence (the July 21 article in Information Messenger) was, furthermore, forwarded directly to Hoover on July 29, 1921 as indicated by the official stamps.¹⁴⁵ Finally Litvinov had repeatedly referred to VOKPG during the negotiations as his reason why an ARA distribution-network would be unnecessary.

In Nansen's case, the charade goes further. On August 26, Nansen, now representing some sixty-seven private and public charities including the International Red Cross, requested that his relief measures be directed by a committee headed by two representatives: One from Russia and one from the League of Nations.¹⁴⁶ Nansen specifically requested that the Russian representative be one of the "neutral" (i.e. non-Bolshevik) members of the VOKPG.¹⁴⁷

It is highly possible that the ARA did not trust the power or autonomy of VOKPG enough to rely upon that body to safeguard what was to total sixty million dollars in aid during the next two years. Nansen and Hoover both knew that it was not VOKPG which controlled the government, armed forces, and transportation in Russia; official sanction was not the tangible guarantee that official involvement offered. Why the history of the

¹⁴³ See note 132.

¹⁴⁴ See National Archives, Document Division, Russian Section, Record Group 59, Department of State, Washington D.C., file 861.48/1550 (28 July 1921); file 851.48/1506 (5 August 1921); file 861.48/1493 (4 August 1921); file 861.48/1494 (5 August 1921).

¹⁴⁵ National Archives, Document Division, Russian Section, Record Group 59, Department of State, Washington D.C., file 861.48/1549.

¹⁴⁶ Fisher, The Famine in Soviet Russia 64-65; Johnson, International Tramps 219-220.

¹⁴⁷ Curiously, official histories of Nansen's endeavors say that the Russian representative was to be simply a member of the Soviet government. See Johnson, International Tramps 220.

VOKPG is obscured in the official ARA and Nansen renditions, however, remains a matter for conjecture.

Be that as it may, it was Nansen's final request which sealed the fate of the "Pro-Ku-Kish-i" (*Prokopovich, Kuskova, Kishkin*) VOKPG.¹⁴⁸ That same day, on August 26, Lenin addressed the Politburo:

"Comrade Stalin:

Nansen's most brazen proposal (to appoint a Cadet from the Relief Committee), the behaviour of these "Kukishi" and the enclosed telegram clearly reveal that we have made a mistake, or if we did not make one earlier, we are going to blunder badly unless we keep our eyes peeled.

You will recall that Rykov, shortly before he left, came and told me that someone called Runov, one of our men, had informed him about a meeting at which Prokopovich had held forth against the government. The meeting had been arranged by Prokopovich, who had used the Famine Relief Committee as a screen.

What else is there to wait for now? Are we going to tolerate their obvious preparations?

This is absolutely inconceivable.

I propose: this very day, Friday, 26/8, "Kukishi" should be dissolved by a decision of the All-Russia C.E.C. - motive: their refusal to work and their resolution. *Appoint one man from the All-Russia Cheka* to take over the money and to supervise the liquidation.

Prokopovich should be arrested this very day on a charge of anti-government speech-making (at a meeting attended by Runov) and detained for about three months, while we make a *thorough* investigation of the meeting.

The other members of the "Kukishi" should be expelled from Moscow at once, this very day, and settled singly in uyezd towns, preferably without railways, *under surveillance*.

Really and truly it would be a bad mistake to wait any longer. The whole thing will be done before Nansen leaves. Nansen will be faced with a clear "ultimatum". That will be an end to this playing (*with fire*)

Not later than tomorrow we shall publish five lines of a short dry "government communiqué": dissolved because of unwillingness to work.

¹⁴⁸ By late August this was the joke name by which VOKPG was known. In Russian, Kukishi, is the word for "fig". Most Russians considered VOKPG to be about as important. The general ridicule, especially on the part of intellectuals, for the efforts of VOKPG shows the degree to which most Russians were already cynical about "independent" organizations. The extent of disillusionment within Russia is evident within the Iury Got'e diary which characterizes the efforts of the VOKPG as "fools," "useless," and praises their arrest on August 27 as "the best and most honourable way out of a foolish situation." See T. Emmons, ed. and trans., Time of Troubles: The Diary of Iury Vladimirovich Got'e 418-421.

We shall issue an order to the newspapers: the same day, tomorrow, start ridiculing "Kukishi" in a hundred ways. These whiteguards and sons of the landed gentry wanted to take a trip abroad and refused to go and work in the localities. Kalinin has gone, but the Cadets find it "unbefitting". They should be ridiculed and harassed in every possible way at least once a week in the course of two months.

The sore tooth will be extracted right away, and with great benefit in every respect. There must be no wavering. I suggest that we get this thing over and done with at the Politbureau today.

Foreigners will start arriving, and Moscow should be "cleared" of the "Kukishi", and their playing (with fire) *should be stopped*. Show this to the members of the Politbureau.¹⁴⁹

On August 27, 1921, the day that the first contingent of the ARA representatives arrived in Moscow, Chicherin signed the last agreement for famine relief with Nansen in Riga which allowed his umbrella organization to begin their efforts which would feed over one million Russians by the summer of 1922.¹⁵⁰ That night, the VOKPG met at their usual location on Sobachia square. They themselves had not conducted one famine relief activity since August 22, 1921 in protest to the decree that had revoked their visas.¹⁵¹ They waited in vain for their president, Lev Kamenev, to come and take his usual place in their assembly. Prokopovich then telephoned Kamenev to question his delay, and received Kamenev's assurance that he would be there momentarily.¹⁵² Instead a squad of policemen from the Cheka led by T.P. Samsonovy arrived with orders to arrest everyone present except the Communist officials in the assembly.

Nearly all of the "actual" members of VOKPG were arrested and conducted to Lubianka prison as well as five people found at the premises of the Committee for Rural

¹⁴⁹ Lenin, "Letter to J.V. Stalin and All Members of the Politbureau of the R.C.P.(B.) C.C.," 26 August 1921, letter 338 of Collected Works vol. 45 268-270.

¹⁵⁰ Johnson, International Tramps 225.

¹⁵¹ Maksimov, "1922 god: Bol'sheviki, zapad i intelligentsiia" 388.

¹⁵² Record of Interview with Prof. S.N. Prokopovitch, Berlin, 3 October 1923, Paul B. Anderson Papers, University of Illinois at Urbana Champaign, Box 5: 2.

Cooperation, and another eleven people found at the President of Rural Cooperatives, A. Sadyrin's home. As Kuskova remembered it:

They acted quickly, all members of the committee were locked in the meeting hall. Guests and others were brought to another room. Then they started to summon.
 - Member Vera Nikolaevna Figner!
 They took her away.
 - Member Aleksandr Ivanovich Yuzhin-Sumbatov!
 They took him away.
 - Member Lev Aleksandrovich Tarasevich!
 They were designated for release. Also released was P. A. Sadyrin. Why those in power, separated them from mutual responsibility is unknown. And then the automobiles began to pull up at Sobachia square...¹⁵³

The arrest was carefully planned, even to the point of alerting the Cheka officers as to the particular physical ailments suffered by some of the victims. No reason was given for their arrest and they were held for days without any audience. Then, they were subjected to interrogations and asked to write statements about their work with the Committee, their ties to religion, and their views about the Communist government.¹⁵⁴ Soon, fifty-five of the accused were released, but had to leave Moscow, while the six foremost members were condemned to death: Sergei Prokopovich, Ekaterina Kuskova, N.M. Kishkin, Mikhail Osorgin, D.S. Korobov and I.A. Cherkasov.

The incident was reported in Pravda in an article entitled "The Truth About the Russian Committee" on August 30. The next day the American State Department was informed of the dissolution by their agent Quarton, and on September 1, Hoover was personally notified.¹⁵⁵ Berdyaev, immediately took action in Russia to try and ameliorate

¹⁵³ Ekaterina Kuskova, as cited in Ia.V. Leont'ev, "Likvidatsia VSERPOMGOLa" 330.

¹⁵⁴ Record of Interview with Prof. S.N. Prokopovitch, Berlin, 3 October 1923, Paul B. Anderson Papers, University of Illinois at Urbana Champaign, Box 5: 2-3.

¹⁵⁵ National Archives, Document Division, Russian Section, Record Group 59, Department of State, Washington D.C., file 861.48/1596.

the sentences on his friends, especially Osorgin, who had been sentenced to death. He gained admission to see the President of VTsIK, Kalinin, in early September, to plead Osorgin's case as a "leading cultural figure" while citing his own relationship with Commissar Lunacharsky. Kalinin purportedly responded with total disinterest stating: "Lunacharsky's recommendation has no significance whatsoever: it is as unimportant as any recommendation I might have given you. It would be a different matter had you been authorized to refer to Comrade Stalin."¹⁵⁶

Despite the fears of their friends and relations, the six leaders of VOKPG were not to meet their end in front of a firing squad. The case of the Committee was discussed in the British House of Lords on September 5, and examined at the American State Department.¹⁵⁷ On September 22, the Russian embassy in New York (which was still controlled by Tsarist, not Soviet, officials) informed the State Department that the Berlin branch of VOKPG had appealed to Nansen and Ador to prevail upon the Bolsheviks to commute the sentences to imprisonment. Moreover, Ambassador Bakhmeteff, strongly suggested that Hoover add his name to them noting that if the executions were carried out, he could give up any hope of receiving cooperation and assistance from other non-Communist Russians during his relief initiative. Russians would look at the case of VOKPG and conclude involvement was simply too dangerous.¹⁵⁸

Hoover took immediate action. On September 23 he cabled Brown in Moscow:

¹⁵⁶ Berdyaev, Dream and Reality 232. It should be noted that Berdyaev wrote this some twenty-odd years after the event, and may have been indulging in some selective memory process due to the prominence to which Stalin had by then achieved.

¹⁵⁷ National Archives, Document Division, Russian Section, Record Group 59, Department of State, Washington D.C., file 861.48/1612.

¹⁵⁸ National Archives, Document Division, Russian Section, Record Group 59, Department of State, Washington D.C., file 861.48/1609.

These reports may be purely anti-Bolshevik propaganda and in any event it is a political matter in which private relief organization can take no interest. On the other hand it seems to us that authorities should be informed that such action if contemplated will undermine confidence and greatly destroy the sympathetic attitude of the world toward Russian sufferings and thereby greatly limit the volume of food stuffs and supplies: if untrue should be promptly denied.¹⁵⁹

The warning messages from Nansen, Hoover and Ador had the desired effect. On September 25, Kamenev told the above organizations that the story that the VOKPG leaders were to be liquidated was a fabrication; they had merely been removed from Moscow.¹⁶⁰ Among Russians, the word went out that this intervention had forced Lenin to commute their sentences to exile in the northern provinces.¹⁶¹

While the issue of VOKPG was being resolved, American and international relief efforts in Russia were proceeding at optimum speed. The ARA brought in a substantial organization of American workers to take charge of transport and distribution at all points. In addition to their own team members from ARA assignments in Europe, they recruited personnel from the American Red Cross and from American religious societies. One group which was noticeably absent - at least officially - was the Young Men's Christian Association (YMCA) and its women's counterpart the YWCA: both of these groups had been performing considerable relief efforts in refugee and POW camps throughout Europe; their work was especially praised in Germany and Austria-Hungary.

¹⁵⁹ Herbert Hoover, telegram to Walter L. Brown, September 23, 1921, National Archives, Document Division, Russian Section, Record Group 59, Department of State, Washington D.C., file 861.48/1662a.

¹⁶⁰ Walter L. Brown, telegram to Herbert Hoover, 25 September 1921, National Archives, Document Division, Russian Section, Record Group 59, Department of State, Washington D.C., file 861.48/1685.

¹⁶¹ Michel Heller, "Premier Avertissement" 148-149; Record of Interview with Prof. S.N. Prokopovitch, Berlin, 3 October 1923, Paul B. Anderson Papers, University of Illinois at Urbana Champaign, Box 5: 1.

However, the YMCA and its affiliates had unforgivably insulted the Bolshevik regime at an earlier date due to their provision of "soldier's huts" and POW relief for both the Red and White armies during Russia's Civil War. At the end of 1918, the Bolsheviks determined that the YMCA was working for the cause of foreign intervention, and the Cheka arrested its leaders then deported all foreign YMCA workers out of Russia.¹⁶² Their reputation was further compromised by their decision to continue their relief and morale programmes among the White and Intervention Armies in the Far East, and by distributing increasing aid to Russian émigré refugees.¹⁶³ Finally, the YMCA could not escape the Bolsheviks' ultimate condemnation about the religious - specifically Christian - nature of their organization.

For these reasons, the YMCA was forbidden on Russian territory, and the ARA had no choice but to comply with this ban. A series of incidents, however, demonstrates that a significant number of YMCA representatives did manage to sneak back into Russia as part of the famine relief initiative. Donald Lowrie, a Secretary of the YMCA and a specialist in Russian issues, entered the country on September 5. He was almost immediately noticed by the security forces, and placed under close surveillance; Lenin even mentioned his activities in a letter to Chicherin that very day.¹⁶⁴ Within a week, evidence was compiled against Lowrie, indicating that he had held interviews with "dubious elements"

¹⁶² Paul B. Anderson, No East or West: The Memoirs of Paul B. Anderson (Paris: YMCA Press, 1985) 4-22.

¹⁶³ Anderson, No East or West 6, 23; Ethan T. Colton, Manuscript for Revised Forty Years with Russians, 1969, Paul B. Anderson Papers, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Box 25: 86-109.

¹⁶⁴ Lenin letter to G.V. Chicherin, 5 September 1921, letter 370 of Collected Works vol. 45 289.

(i.e. bourgeois intellectuals) and even the Patriarch. He was then summarily expelled from Russia.

Five other members of the YMCA accompanied the second transport of ARA workers classified as long-term ARA employees in order to elude the secret police. In fact, though, they comprised a separate cell within the ARA initiative, and were directed from Riga by the YMCA Overseas director E.T. Colton. Their mandate was to assess the situation of students and professors in Russia, and to provide material and moral relief. This arm of the relief plan began to act on September 24, and they distributed food, clothing and - perhaps most precious - books to Russia's destitute intellectual class. Gradually, they were even able to offer small vacations to the south of Russia for exhausted and sick professors. As the Student/Professor relief was started as a secret endeavour, it was able to continue its work long after the ARA mandate expired in 1923. The YMCA reports indicate that they supplied continued funds to this initiative as late as 1928.¹⁶⁵

The famine was, therefore, being admirably contained and ministered to by predominantly American assistance from abroad, and the "little incident" of VOKPG began to recede from everyone's attention. However, it has been asserted that these events were to have wider ramifications for Russian intellectuals in general and for the religious-

¹⁶⁵ In the late 1920s the YMCA was providing much less money to this relief because the improved economy and increased native support had reduced the need. Nevertheless they gave 9,780 roubles in 1927 and 4,890 roubles in 1928: most of this went to salaries for the now Russian secretaries of the programme - 8,320 roubles 1927 and 4,160 roubles 1928. This work was carried out in the five principal University centres and in some provinces. In 1928, leadership consisted of six secretaries and fifty-five leaders of Bible study, men's, women's, and mixed groups. Aside from Bible study, there were 260 students involved in various types of volunteer Christian service. "Fourth Report on the Fund. Exhibit XIII: Student Movement in Soviet Russia," August 1928, Paul B. Anderson Papers, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Box 3.

philosophical intelligentsia in particular.¹⁶⁶ Speculation suggests that the events of that summer produced a two-pronged motivation for a change in policy by the Bolshevik leaders. First, the famine had shown the Bolsheviks that they could not institute communism immediately; in October 1921, Lenin formalized the famous retreat of NEP (the New Economic Plan) which allowed for a degree of free market and privatization. Nevertheless, foreign assistance allowed the Bolsheviks to emerge from the experience relatively unscathed politically, and it released the leaders' attentions from total preoccupation with the food crisis. If communism could not be directly achieved through economic policy, could it not at least be advanced ideologically?

Second, as far as the VOKPG incident was concerned, it confirmed for Bolsheviks that the bourgeoisie would exploit the most minimal opportunity to assert their political will and undermine that of communism. The relative success of the short-lived committee, and of the continued Orthodox Church relief indicated that the "forces of reaction" still exerted considerable influence among the Russian populace. Therefore, the first battle of a new ideological front, so important for maintaining the morale of Communist proponents, must be waged against these enemies within. However, as the following examination of the events of 1922 will demonstrate, there was minimal direct connection between the VOKPG incident and these events aside from a broad "class" relationship (i.e. bourgeois), and the inclusion of several VOKPG members in the resulting expulsions.

¹⁶⁶ The foremost proponent of this theory is Michel Heller, but this line of argument is also taken by L.A. Kogan.

The Expulsions and Persecutions of 1922

The Bolsheviks determination to begin a new, non-military onslaught was manifested before the end of 1921: In November, they disapproved the Orthodox relief committee, and sequestered its funds for their official POMGOLOM.¹⁶⁷ A month later, they instructed the Church to again raise funds for the famine or face State seizure of Church property; the monies would be distributed by POMGOLOM. The Church complied despite fears that if they did not control the money, it would be diverted from the starving, and added to the coffers of the Communist Party. The Patriarch was also aware that the Church would receive no public recognition for its charity.¹⁶⁸ Nevertheless, faced with the threat of indiscriminate seizures, he prevailed upon parish committees to give up ornamental jewels and all non-sacral art objects.¹⁶⁹

The next Bolshevik offensive in the ideological war began in January 1922 with the creation of a new Party organ Pod znamenem Markizma. The first issue opened with an editorial by Leon Trotsky declaring that Russian Communists must now engage in "Militant Materialism". All other forms of philosophical investigation were deemed not simply useless, but dangerous, and Trotsky encouraged Bolsheviks to take a more open approach towards non-communist materialists in order that a "united front" of significantly greater power and influence could be established to counteract mystics, idealists, and

¹⁶⁷ National Archives, Document Division, Russian Section, Record Group 59, Department of State, Washington D.C., file 861.404/53.

¹⁶⁸ Office of the Commissioner of the United States, Riga, Memorandum of Conversation with Mr. Colton of American Y.M.C.A., 20 April 1922, National Archives, Document Division, Russian Section, Record Group 59, Department of State, Washington D.C., file 861.404/30.

¹⁶⁹ Memorandum - SOVIET RUSSIA (POLITICAL) Seizure of Church Property, 21 April 1922, National Archives, Document Division, Russian Section, Record Group 59, Department of State, Washington D.C., file 861.404/33.

other pseudo-religious thinkers.¹⁷⁰ That same month, the Commissariat of Enlightenment - Narkompros - began to attack the Academy of Humanist Sciences which directed the humanist faculties at Moscow and Petrograd University, and force a complete transformation of their curriculum.¹⁷¹ This political interference in their professional autonomy caused the professors to walk out in a brief strike.¹⁷² Their action was emulated by the professors at the Moscow Higher Technical College in February who added insufficient material resources to their list of demands.¹⁷³

Despite the fact that Berdyaev had been affected by the university events and had suspended his classes, he and the other religious-philosophers at the Free Academy of Spiritual Culture continued as if oblivious to the change in Bolshevik attitude. Feodor Stepun recruited a new professor, Olga A. Shor, a former student of his who had completed her studies in Germany and had just recently returned to Russia. She brought the Free Academy the precious gift of Oswald Spengler's The Decline of the West, which

¹⁷⁰ Pod znamenem Markizma 1 (January 1922): 1-3.

¹⁷¹ Its divisions included physical-psychology, sociology, philosophy, religion, and the classics; the President was P.S. Kogan, and the Deans of the first three programmes were V.V. Kandinsky, V.M. Friche, and G.G. Shpet respectively. Lenin's wife Krupskaya directed "Narkompros" contentiously with Lunacharsky.

¹⁷² Vadimov, Zhizn' Berdiaeva 227.

¹⁷³ This action, according to the official Bolshevik account, was supposedly influenced by a series of articles condemning Communism in the Paris review Poslednie novosti directed by Paul Miliukov. The review was largely directed toward liberal, democratic elements in the emigration and written mainly by Kadets. In retaliation, Lenin suggested that: "We should have Pravda and Izvestia carry a dozen articles on "Milyukov merely contemplates." Pravda of 21/II.

If this is confirmed, make sure to sack 20-40 professors.

They are fooling us.

This should be thought out, prepared and a *strong blow delivered*."

Vladimir I. Lenin, "To L.B. Kamenev and J.V. Stalin," 21 February 1922, letter 643 of Collected Works vol. 45 480. Not surprisingly, "on February 24, 1922, Izvestia VTsIK carried an article "Cadets at Work" (On the Lecturers' Strike at the Moscow Higher Technical College)." See Lenin, Collected Works vol. 45 721.

was causing tremendous debates among the intellectual community in Europe. The religious-philosophical intelligentsia were so excited by the book, that they decided to give an entire lecture series devoted to the subject, and Stepun conceived of the idea that he, Bukshpan, Berdyaev, and Frank should write a collective appraisal.¹⁷⁴

Berdyaev's lecture on Spengler, given at the end of January, 1922, was so well-attended that people were lined up outside the door, and filled the staircases. The directors of the Women's University approached him after his speech, and told him to either limit numbers in future or find a new location; they were afraid that the floor would collapse.¹⁷⁵ The collection of essays entitled Oswald Spengler and the Decline of Europe was finished in February and, remarkably, did not attract the notice of the censors. It went on sale at Lavka Writers' Shop in Moscow, an affiliated store in Petrograd, and several other outlets.

The book seemed to attract a great degree of attention. While it is not known what its initial sales were, it was circulated outside of Russia and to the highest government spheres within the country. Since the start of Russia's "Religious Renaissance," many Western works had been imported and translated to augment the intellectuals' understanding of other trends in philosophy, but the transfer had not been widely reciprocated. However, in making their first foray into the European philosophical debate with the book on Spengler, the religious-philosophical intellectuals prompted Western interest. The book was purchased by one of the secret YMCA men attached to the ARA and sent to the Russian Division headquarters in Berlin for assessment. There, the secretaries who were establishing their own Russian language publishing house - the

¹⁷⁴ Vadimov, Zhizn' Berdiaeva 223-224.

¹⁷⁵ Berdyaev, Dream and Reality 236; Lowrie, Rebellious Prophet 151.

YMCA Press - were so impressed that the quality of assessment indicated such a high degree of expertise in religious and philosophical ideas that they instructed their agents in Russia to pursue a contract for further books.

This process was directed from Berlin by the former publicist for the Vladimir Soloviev Society - A. Yashenko¹⁷⁶ - who had emigrated during the Civil War. Due to his knowledge of Russian writers and literature, Yashenko had soon found a position with the YMCA Russian Division helping to establish their new press. Now, he was also able to utilize his formidable connections with leading intellectuals within the country. On May 2, Yashenko wrote to Berdyaev in Moscow asking him to arrange among his professors the writing of a collection of essays to be purchased and published by the YMCA Press.¹⁷⁷ The subjects which were of most interest, he suggested, were: the state of religion in Russia at that time; more focused explorations on the state of Christianity; the Orthodox Church; new developments in Orthodox and other Christian thought; and, finally, what directions would be most fruitful for expanding the assistance and relevance of religion and Christianity throughout Russia.

Yashenko specifically requested contributions from the old leaders of the Vladimir Soloviev Society, and asked Berdyaev to recruit Bulgakov, Florensky, and Rachinsky in Moscow. This would prove difficult as Florensky was travelling all over the country at the direction of the Church, and Bulgakov was then stationed in the Crimea. Yashenko also made a preliminary offer on behalf of the YMCA to pay between 2,000 to 3,000 marks per page of 36,000 letters. Payment would be arranged through the ARA. Yashenko's

¹⁷⁶ See chapter 1.

¹⁷⁷ Prof. A.S. Yashenko, letter to Nikolai Berdyaev, 2 May 1922, Paul B. Anderson Papers, University of Illinois at Urbana Champaign, Box 3.

contact within the organization was none other than their old colleague George Chulkov to whom an advance would be sent.¹⁷⁸ On May 13, Yashenko contacted Lev Karsavin in Petrograd with a similar offer, asking him to also recruit Nikolai Lossky. The ARA contact in that city was V.P. Belkin.¹⁷⁹

Less beneficial for the religious-philosophers was another recipient of the collection on Spengler. Lenin collected every new publication possible, and the Cheka delivered Oswald Spengler and the Decline of Europe along with several other books to him at the start of March. Upon reading the book, Lenin became suspicious, and demanded to speak to Unsicht about it: "I think it looks like a 'literary screen for a whiteguard organization'."¹⁸⁰ He ordered that the book be recalled, and every copy seized from book store shelves.¹⁸¹ The immediate penalty for its authors, and especially Berdyaev, was the closure of Lavka Writers Shop and its affiliate in Petrograd on the charge of distributing counter-revolutionary materials.¹⁸²

Lenin was already busy engineering the destruction of religious opposition in Russia. On January 29, Krassnaya gazetta published an editorial accusing the Orthodox Church of contributing a "drop in the bucket" to famine relief with their forced fund raising

¹⁷⁸ Prof. A.S. Yashenko, letter to Nikolai Berdyaev, 2 May 1922, Paul B. Anderson Papers, University of Illinois at Urbana Champaign, Box 3: 2.

¹⁷⁹ Prof. A.S. Yashenko, letter to Lev Karsavin, 13 May 1922, Paul B. Anderson Papers, University of Illinois at Urbana Champaign, Box 3: 1-2.

¹⁸⁰ Lenin, "Secret Letter to N.P. Gorbunov," 5 March 1922, Collected Works vol. 45 500.

¹⁸¹ Kogan, "Vyslat' za granitsu" 64.

¹⁸² Vadimov, Zhizn' Berdiaeva 227.

since the previous December.¹⁸³ Lenin used this as an excuse to implement a decree in February 1922 seizing all Church valuables - sacral or not - as an emergency famine relief measure.¹⁸⁴ In March, Atheist advocated a much harsher application of the anti-religious laws proclaimed in 1918. It also called for a new law denying the freedom of religious demonstration, and retroactively punishing those who had to six months hard labour.¹⁸⁵ Since the seizure of Church valuables had been decreed there had been a rapidly increasing number of mass demonstrations protesting the law; Patriarch Tikhon issued an epistle in early March explaining why the Church could not give up sacral items.¹⁸⁶

¹⁸³ The journal further disparaged the Church by stating that all bread feeding the starving was coming from "Soviet power or other countries which are not religious such as America," and not from any religious bodies especially the Russian Orthodox Church. A copy of this journal was obtained by the State Department. See National Archives, Document Division, Russian Section, Record Group 59, Department of State, Washington D.C., file 861.48/1877.

¹⁸⁴ VTsIK decree was levied February 26, 1922. It ordered all valuables to be stripped from every Church; its also harshly warned the Church's spiritual leaders to make no attempts at opposition. National Archives, Document Division, Russian Section, Record Group 59, Department of State, Washington D.C., file 861.404/53.

¹⁸⁵ Atheist 2 (March 1922). See National Archives, Document Division, Russian Section, Record Group 59, Department of State, Washington D.C., file 861.404/31.

¹⁸⁶ A copy of Tikhon's epistle was kept by the State Department. See National Archives, Document Division, Russian Section, Record Group 59, Department of State, Washington D.C., file 861.404/53.

Behind the public scene, Tikhon had asked Colonel Haskell commanding the ARA to buy the sacral items so that they could be sold intact in America for the amount sought by the Bolshevik government. A sacral object - i.e. the eucharist chalice - was one which had been blessed and it would be a sin against God to dismantle, melt down, or otherwise pervert the now holy item. Many of these objects were also antiques which dated back to the 16th and 17th centuries, and were, in their intact state, invaluable. Haskell could not comply because of the ARA contract stating non-interference in domestic affairs, but he concurred with Tikhon's fears that such monies would not be used for famine relief: as he reported to the American State Department, "the ARA already had more food and supplies at all ports and on all lines leading into Russia than the Soviet transportation could handle." Both men believed the money would instead go to the Soviet "war-chest". Office of the Commissioner of the United States, Riga, Memorandum of Conversation with Mr. Colton of American Y.M.C.A., 20 April 1922, National Archives, Document Division, Russian Section, Record Group 59, Department of State, Washington D.C., file 861.404/30: 2.

The Cheka, ignored this appeal and proceeded to its task. The results, however, were not very pretty. Pogroms began in Smolensk on March 28-29 and spread to Vologda, Viatka, and Petrograd: Jews were blamed for the seizure laws because there were several high-ranking Bolsheviks who were Jewish - Kamenev, Zinoviev and Trotsky in the Politburo - and because Jewish temples were not initially subjected to seizure. The Patriarch received death threats from members of the congregation who wanted to force him to direct an outright opposition to the Bolsheviks.¹⁸⁷ In Shuia, the first church to be desecrated by the Cheka on March 18, mass crowds assembled before it and physically denied entrance to the Cheka agents, some of whom were wounded.¹⁸⁸ Znamensky church was closed after the seizure law was passed, and crowds again prevented the authorities from entering. By April 21, the official Soviet report on the seizure noted that only one quarter of scheduled valuables had been retrieved due to mass dissent.¹⁸⁹

Berdyaev and a good proportion of the religious-philosophical intelligentsia participated in the procession against persecution of the Church in Moscow. They were all given last rites before beginning their march because they had every reason, considering Bolshevik actions after the disbanding of the Constituent Assembly in 1918 and during the Civil War, to believe that they would be shot down by Red troops. In the

¹⁸⁷ Memorandum - SOVIET RUSSIA (POLITICAL) Seizure of Church Property, 21 April 1922, National Archives, Document Division, Russian Section, Record Group 59, Department of State, Washington D.C., file 861.404/33.

¹⁸⁸ Lenin, letter to V.M. Molotov, 19 March 1922, Library of Congress website, Documents from Soviet Archives, file ae1bkhun.bkg: 1.

¹⁸⁹ Memorandum - SOVIET RUSSIA (POLITICAL) Seizure of Church Property, 21 April 1922, National Archives, Document Division, Russian Section, Record Group 59, Department of State, Washington D.C., file 861.404/33.

end, however, the procession was so enormous that, although the Red cavalry was called out and fired volleys in the air, they did not dare to attack the crowd directly, and the seizure was called off for that day.¹⁹⁰

The Bolsheviks responded to this impediment with public and private approaches. For the public, they issued urgent instructions to make inventories of sacral items in all churches and especially Jewish temples in order to demonstrate that sacrifice was being demanded from all faiths, not just the Russian Orthodox.¹⁹¹ They also began to arrest leading members of the Orthodox hierarchy for inciting mass demonstration. Privately, however, Lenin sent a jubilant instruction immediately after the Shuia incident to the Politburo on March 19 outlining his desired approach to the Church incident: Namely that it could be used to destroy Orthodoxy in Russia.¹⁹²

Against the intellectuals specifically, Lenin wrote the editorial for the third edition of Pod znamenem Markizma in March.¹⁹³ In it, he reiterated Trotsky's call for a united front of all materialists, and elaborated upon the need for such a compromise in the "joint work of combatting philosophical reaction and the philosophical prejudices of so-called educated society."¹⁹⁴ Lenin then dismissed the entire work of advanced philosophy in

¹⁹⁰ Berdyaev, Dream and Reality 239; Memorandum - SOVIET RUSSIA (POLITICAL): Seizure of Church Property, 21 April 1922, National Archives, Document Division, Russian Section, Record Group 59, Department of State, Washington D.C., file 861.404/33: 1.

¹⁹¹ Memorandum - SOVIET RUSSIA (POLITICAL): Seizure of Church Property, 21 April 1922, National Archives, Document Division, Russian Section, Record Group 59, Department of State, Washington D.C., file 861.404/33.

¹⁹² See Appendix B. for the entire document.

¹⁹³ Lenin, Collected Works vol. 33 227-236.

¹⁹⁴ Lenin, Collected Works vol. 33 228.

the West and in Russia as nothing more than that of "graduated flunkies of clericalism."¹⁹⁵ In so doing he had just connected all non-materialist investigation directly to the Church which he was in the process of destroying.

For the remaining authors of Vekhi, Lenin's attack must have seemed rather ironic: in 1909 he had disparaged their collection for being anti-democratic; now he wrote,

But, on the other hand, it becomes all the clearer to us that so-called modern democracy (which the Mensheviks, the Socialist-Revolutionaries, partly also the anarchist etc., so unreasonably worship) is nothing but the freedom to preach whatever is to the advantage of the bourgeois, to preach..."¹⁹⁶

Lenin did not address the Spengler book in this attack, as he probably did not want to give it more attention than it had already aroused. However, he did take the opportunity to lambaste Pitirim Sorokin and the new journal Ekonomist, published by the 11th Department of the Russian Technical Society, which he called "an organ of modern feudalists"; "Sorokin must have lived in a monastery so divorced from society as to be unbelievable."¹⁹⁷ In his conclusion, Lenin intimated a plan of action which was actually to be carried out over the ensuing months. He stated,

The working class of Russia proved able to win power; but it has not yet learned to utilize it, for otherwise it would have long ago very politely dispatched such teachers and members of learned societies to countries with a bourgeois "democracy." That is the proper place for such feudalists. But it will learn, given the will to learn."¹⁹⁸

The decision to expel and not liquidate was an anomaly in light of the Bolshevik treatment of Orthodox clerics, Whites, and other oppositional parties. It is possible that Lenin,

¹⁹⁵ In this quotation Lenin paraphrases Josef Dietzgen Sr (1828-1888), "a German tannery worker, who independently arrived at dialectical materialism." Lenin, Collected Works vol. 33 228, 519.

¹⁹⁶ Lenin, Collected Works vol. 33 232.

¹⁹⁷ Lenin, Collected Works vol. 33 234.

¹⁹⁸ Lenin, Collected Works vol. 33 236.

having been once warned about the VOKPG, did not forget the lesson which Hoover had taught him: Certain executions at this time would undermine world sympathies for the plight of Russia, and irredeemably harm the relief effort. However, is it not possible that we should take Lenin at his word? If he executed the spiritual "feudalists" he would only create more martyrs in Russia. If he sent them to "bourgeois" countries then, according to the dictates of Marx, they would be ridiculed and quietly eradicated as all other feudal vestiges had been by bourgeois progress. Regardless, he saw no better time to get rid of these thorns in the side of Russian communism.

It has frequently been suggested that Lenin was less blood-thirsty than Stalin, especially towards intellectuals, because he was once a part of that milieu. A recent Russian appraisal of the events of 1922 by L.A. Kogan denies this. Kogan asserts, and demonstrates with considerable evidence from Lenin's own writings, that Lenin wanted to exterminate the way of thought descended from Vladimir Soloviev almost as much as he wanted to implement Communism.¹⁹⁹ As an intellectual, Lenin was actually much more involved in the trends, jealousies, and intricacies of that milieu than Stalin. Despite the frequent characterization of Lenin as the classical example of a completely dispassionate man, he had only the time and power to seek revenge upon those who had contradicted him in the last years of his life. In 1922, it seems, he made the most of this opportunity, and strove to rid Russia of every last trace of religious-philosophy.

This is not to say that Lenin did not have pressures upon him above and beyond the desire for vengeance. Since instituting NEP in 1921, he had faced harsh criticism within his own Party, and saw increasing signs that the Bolsheviks were losing their appeal to radical elements. Lenin's concerns were evinced in the Party Congress which

¹⁹⁹ Kogan, "Vyslat' za granitsu" 65.

took place from March 27 through to April 2, 1922 when he was required to give an accounting of NEP. Rather than emphasizing the success of the policy, Lenin instead focused on its commentators. He told the Party about a rather obscure émigré group - self-labelled the *Smenavekhovtsy* (after Vekhi) - who were trying to encourage other Russian refugees to support the Bolsheviks and return to Russia because they believed that NEP was not merely an exercise in practical tactics, but a natural and inescapable devolution from radical to moderate policies which all revolutions (they pointed especially to the "thermidor" of the French Revolution) eventually experienced.²⁰⁰ Lenin thanked them in his speech:

Smenavekhovtsy adherents express the sentiments of thousands and tens of thousands of bourgeois, or of soviet employees whose function it is to operate our new economic policy. This is the real and main danger. No direct onslaught is being made on us now...[some "war scare" warnings].... Nevertheless, the fight against capitalist society has become a hundred times more fierce and perilous, because we are not always able to tell enemies from friends.²⁰¹

He thus acknowledged that there were extreme dangers in pursuing a policy of retreat despite its economic necessity.

Lenin explained that NEP could not yet be abandoned because loyal Bolsheviks still had to learn methods of administration and economics from bourgeois specialists and other experienced public workers. The Russian economy, furthermore, had to recover from the multitude of blows brought on by World War One, the Revolutions, the Civil War, and the famine. While chastising his Party for being arrogant and resistant to learning necessary techniques from those they despised, he also recognized their frustration and

²⁰⁰ Lenin, Collected Works vol. 33 285. For more information on the *smenavekhovtsy* see Hilde Hardeman, Coming to Terms with the Soviet Regime: The "Changing Signposts" Movement among Russian émigrés in the Early 1920s (DeKalb: Northern Illinois University Press, 1994).

²⁰¹ Lenin, Collected Works vol. 33 287.

desire to move immediately towards full socialism. As a conciliation he affirmed that NEP was only a temporary stage which would be varied and adjusted to meet encroachments by capitalist and bourgeois elements. This stance was emphasized in his closing speech on April 2 when Lenin declared that the submissive phase of NEP (which had given rise to abuses by "NEP-men" and foreign interests), had produced the desired result of stabilizing peasant agricultural production. Therefore, he declared that the next phase of NEP should now begin: "Now we have decided to halt the retreat."²⁰² The easiest way to demonstrate a new hard-line Bolshevik approach without provoking economic dislocation was to attack religious, non-materialist "elements" within the country. This would show that the bourgeois were not to be tolerated even though entrepreneurial activities would continue to go unchecked.

On April 7, Lenin's secret plan against the Orthodox Church was put into action, and the Patriarch was called to the Kremlin for a sharp meeting. He was given one week to bring the entire Church in line with the seizure laws or face personal retribution; any of his priests who incited resistance would be arrested, tried, and shot. Lenin then asked Tikhon if he would personally travel to the United States in order to garner more publicity for famine relief. He also suggested that the Patriarch might have fruitful meetings with the American government, and perhaps later he would be asked to represent Soviet Russia with other foreign governments. The Genoa Talks were just beginning at this time, and the Bolsheviks were seeking, primarily, official recognition from any major power. Tikhon refused. While he was prepared to use his connections with other Christian prelates for the sake of the starving Russian people and hopeful that foreign powers would extend loans and credits, he was afraid the Bolsheviks would try to exploit his

²⁰² Lenin, Collected Works vol. 33 287.

contact with these governments as a means of gaining diplomatic recognition of their Party as the legitimate rulers of Russia.²⁰³ He also feared for his personal safety.²⁰⁴

The Patriarch's intransigence made no impact upon the Bolshevik offensive against the Church. Throughout April, the GPU (formerly the Cheka) arrested priests and bishops connected with the earlier and continuing demonstrations against seizure of Church valuables. On May 5, the first trials were held and eleven prelates, including Tikhon's second-in-command the Metropolitan of Petrograd Benjamin, were sentenced to death.²⁰⁵ Tikhon himself was presented with a warrant for his arrest, and held at his house pending trial. Despite the mass protests which met the verdict and the news of the Patriarch's arrest, Bolshevik pressure tactics against the Church continued. On May 12, the leaders of the break-away "Living Church"²⁰⁶ - Vvedensky, Krasnitzky, Kalinovsky, Belkov, and Stadnik - visited the Patriarch demanding that he resign from his position because of the verdict, the mass appeals, the violence, and countless other "political" acts

²⁰³ Zatko, Descent into Darkness 102-103.

²⁰⁴ Office of the Commissioner of the United States, Riga, Memorandum of Conversation with Mr. Colton of American Y.M.C.A., 20 April 1992, National Archives, Document Division, Russian Section, Record Group 59, Department of State, Washington D.C., file 861.404/30.

²⁰⁵ National Archives, Document Division, Russian Section, Record Group 59, Department of State, Washington D.C., file 861.404/21.

²⁰⁶ This so-called reformation group was unveiled as a Bolshevik-created body early in its existence. Its leaders were paid agents for the regime, and their mandate was not to reform the Church, but to undermine its influence over the people of Russia. During its existence, it was unable to entice any substantial number of the laity away from the Church; at its end, the Bolsheviks simply abolished it and sent its remaining leaders in Russia to exile on Solovki Island in the Arctic Sea. See William Emhardt, Religion in Soviet Russia: Anarchy. Together with an Essay on the Living Church by Sergius Troitsky (Milwaukee: Morehouse Pub., 1929).

which sullied the reputation of the Church. According to Izvestia, Tikhon tendered his resignation.²⁰⁷ His trial began on May 14, 1922.

One year after being besieged by appeals to help the starving in Russia, President Harding was again deluged by telegrams. They began to arrive one day after the trial of Patriarch Tikhon had begun. After official requests from Archbishop Alexander of Canada and Metropolitan Platon of the United States asking Harding to protest the trial and continued persecution of the Church in Russia,²⁰⁸ he received petitions from every Orthodox parish in the United States as well as many Episcopalian ones.²⁰⁹ Harding's response continued to remain the same: despite his sympathies for Patriarch Tikhon and the plight of the Church in Russia, there was nothing he could do officially because this was a domestic Russian problem. On June 15, the House of Lords in Britain debated the issue, and came to the same conclusion.²¹⁰

²⁰⁷ "Patriarch Tichon [sic] has of his own Accord Temporarily Resigned," Izvestia 108 (17 May 1922): 1-3 [Translated by the Department of State]. See National Archives, Document Division, Russian Section, Record Group 59, Department of State, Washington D.C., file 861.404/34.

²⁰⁸ National Archives, Document Division, Russian Section, Record Group 59, Department of State, Washington D.C., file 861.404/22.

²⁰⁹ Fifteen petitions came May 16 (file 861.404/26; file 861.404/27). Nine followed the next day (file 861.404/28). This was further followed by twelve on May 18 (file 861.404/29) along with a letter from the Episcopalian Church Conference (file 861.404/36), and three more on the 19th (file 861.404/32). After acknowledging the receipt of these (file 861.404/35), Harding received still more. Six on May 20 (file 861.404/38) followed on the 22nd by a telegram from the Russian Orthodox Greek Catholic Mission of Western Canada representing American- and Canadian-Russian subjects protesting the action that had been taken against Tikhon. It had even been signed by the Russian Ambassador to the United States, Boris Bakhmeteff and Archimandrites in Canada (file 861.404/37). Petitions still flowed into Harding's office: Five on May 23 (file 861.404/39), seven on May 24 (file 861.404/40; file 861.404/41) including one from the Diocese of Rhode Island Episcopalian Church (file 861.404/44), two on May 25 (file 861.404/42), and finally 4 more on May 26 (file 861.404/43) which include one from the Russian parish in Chicago with 14 pages of signatories attached (file 861.404/45).

²¹⁰ National Archives, Document Division, Russian Section, Record Group 59, Department of State, Washington D.C., file 861.404/80.

Patriarch Tikhon was not sentenced to death. Lenin had already instructed the Politburo that such an extreme action would endanger their control over the country and their attempts at international diplomacy. He was, however, found guilty of inciting dissent and confined to indefinite house arrest. Between June 15 and July 15, the third trial of the clergy ensued giving no such clemency at its outcome. Thirty-seven priests and bishops were sentenced to death.²¹¹ Between 1922 and 1923, these trials resulted in hundreds of priests being executed, and thousands being sent into exile to Solovki Island; there, they were systematically starved and frozen to death.

The clergy were not the only victims of this new policy of terror. In February 1922, the foremost leaders of the now-banned Socialist Revolutionaries were arrested, and forty-seven were slated for trial that summer. On July 3, Maxim Gorky wrote to Anatole France asking him to lead a protest against the trial of the SRs which was just beginning; Gorky asserted that it would merely be a sham leading to "the murder of people who had sincerely served the cause of the Russian people's emancipation."²¹² He also sent a copy of his letter to Comrade Rykov with a warning that a death sentence for the SRs would result "in a moral blockade of Russia by socialist Europe."²¹³

Russia's intelligentsia, especially the religious-philosophers, were about to face their own assault. Nevertheless, that Spring found the professors at the Free Academy of Spiritual Culture busier than ever before: the closure of the history and philosophy faculty and the dismissal of the professors (including Berdyaev), because of their strike

²¹¹ National Archives, Document Division, Russian Section, Record Group 59, Department of State, Washington D.C., file 861.404/80.

²¹² Lenin, Collected Works vol. 45 744.

²¹³ See Lenin, Collected Works vol. 45 745.

action, left hundreds of students without courses; they joined the Free Academy, and swelled classes there to overflowing.²¹⁴ The professors also participated in the May protests against Bolshevik persecution of the Church. On May 14, the Commissar of Public Health, Semashko, reported to Lenin that the dissent was spreading among the educated classes. He had received information about "anti-soviet speeches by 'top' doctors at the 2nd All Russian Congress of Medical Section" which took place from May 10-14, and he counselled his leader to deal carefully with these "dangerous trends."²¹⁵

Lenin quickly prepared the necessary weapons for the next onslaught. On May 17, he ordered the Commissar of Justice, D. I. Kursky, to add a supplementary article to the Criminal Code which,

...explains the *substance* of terror, its necessity and limits, and provides *justification* for it; one which is formulated in the broadest possible manner, for only revolutionary law and revolutionary conscience can more or less widely determine the limits within which it should be applied; an addition which made culpable those who participate, associate, encourage, or condone any organization whose purpose is to assist that section of the international bourgeoisie which refuses to recognize the rights of the communist system of ownership that is superseding capitalism.²¹⁶

Moreover, the new article, Paragraph 57, was to make such offenses punishable by death which might be commuted to either life imprisonment or expulsion abroad.

Two days later, on May 19, Lenin sent a directive to Dzerzhinsky at the GPU with explicit instructions as to the arrest and investigation into about 100 writers and professors; the ultimate aim as stated in this letter was their final deportation from Russia.

²¹⁴ Vadimov, Zhizn' Berdiaeva 228.

²¹⁵ Lenin, "To J.V Stalin," 22 May 1922, letter 744 of Collected Works vol. 45 743.

²¹⁶ Lenin, Collected Works vol. 33 358.

"Comrade Dzerzhinsky:

On the question of deporting the writers and professors helping the counter-revolution.

This needs more thorough preparation. Without it we shall make mistakes. Please discuss these measures of preparation.

Call a conference of Messing, Mantsev and some other persons in Moscow.

Put the duty on the Polibureau members to devote 2-3 hours a week to looking through a number of periodicals and books, *verifying* execution, *demanding reviews in writing*, and securing the dispatch to Moscow of all non-communist publications without delay.

Add to this the reviews by a number of Communist writers (Steklov, Olminsky, Skvortsov, Bukharin, etc.).

Collect *systematic* information about the political record, work and literary activity of the professors and writers.

Assign all this to an intelligent, educated and scrupulous man at the G. P. U....

...The Petrograd magazine *Economist*, published by the XIth Department of the Russian Technical Society, is another matter. I think this is clearly a whiteguard centre. Its No. 3 (*only* No. 3!!! this *nota bene!*) carries a list of its members on the cover. These, I think, are *almost all* the most legitimate candidates for deportation.

These are patent counter-revolutionaries, accomplices of the Entente, an organisation of its servitors and spies and corrupters of the student youth. We should make arrangements to have these "military spies" caught and once caught constantly and systematically deported.

Please show this confidentially, without making any copies, to the *Politburo* members, *returning it to you and to me*, and inform me of their opinion and your conclusion.²¹⁷

Then fate intervened. Before Lenin could oversee the rapid action against the intellectuals, he had a stroke on May 25. He was sent out of Moscow to Gorki to recover, and would remain there until October. In his absence, the special committee which Lenin had formed to oversee the case of the "bourgeois intellectuals" - Kamenev, Kursky, Unshlikht, Mantsev, and Reshetov²¹⁸ - hesitated to act definitively without his supervision of the lists which they were compiling. They, therefore, limited the attack to small manoeuverings instead of wholesale arrests. In June, Glavlit was created to replace the

²¹⁷ Lenin, "To F.E. Dzerzhinsky," 19 May 1922, letter 739 of Collected Works vol. 45 555.

²¹⁸ Kogan, "Vyslat' za granitsu" 69.

old Bolshevik censorship bureau with broad directives as to what type of literature was unacceptable, and a much more accountable chain-of-command.²¹⁹ The sixth of that month saw the arrest of the remaining professors at the Academy of Humanist Sciences for interrogation, and the GPU searched the premises for evidence of counter-revolutionary activity. Also in June, the Association of Artists of Revolutionary Russia (AKhRR) was created to espouse "socialist realism" as the only acceptable form of writing.²²⁰ This early precursor to RAPP harshly criticized even some of the proponents of Bolshevism like Mayakovsky and Essenin causing them to react with subtle criticism of the regime within their own poetry and prose.

Finally, in August, the purge of the intellectuals began. Lists had been compiled by the special sub-Politburo committee, sent to Gorki to be checked by Lenin, and they were now distributed by Dzerzhinsky to the necessary GPU agents. In total, 174 persons were targeted for arrest. August was a good month as most professors who had gone to the countryside for summer holidays were returning to the cities at that time to prepare for the next semester's classes.²²¹ On August 3, seventy-seven intellectuals were arrested in the Ukraine.²²² On August 10, new laws were passed regarding the registration of associations and societies rendering the statutes for the Free Academy of Spiritual Culture, *Vol'fila*, the Russian Technical Society, and countless other groupings

²¹⁹ "Statutes of the Main Administration for Literature and Publishing (Glavlit)," 6 June 1922, Documents of Soviet History, ed. Rex A. Wade, Vol. 2 389-391.

²²⁰ "Declaration of the Association of Artists of Revolutionary Russia (AKhRR)," June 1922, Documents of Soviet History 391-392.

²²¹ Berdyaev and his family managed to get away from Moscow for the first summer since the revolution. They stayed with Osorgin, who had just been released from the North, in Borvik. See Vadimov, Zhizn' Berdiaeva 230.

²²² Kogan, "Vyslat' za granitsu" 66.

which had been formed by the disenfranchised to be illegal.²²³ The next series of arrests were completed by August 23 with sixty-seven apprehended in Moscow and thirty in Petrograd.²²⁴ Berdyaev was caught in this wave of arrests as were the intellectuals who had contributed to the one fateful edition of Ekonomist, the professors who had gone on strike, and many of the former members of VOKPG.²²⁵

The arrests all took place in the middle of the night. Each person was designated by a secret numbered Order which listed their address and stated that they were part of the "Operation". It was signed by the Chairman of the GPU in charge of "Oper. section", although no name was given. Each arrest took about four hours as the agents also searched the houses for incriminating evidence. From Berdyaev they seized the notebooks in which he had written in, all his letters, and even papers which he had thrown out.²²⁶ The arrested were then taken off to prison where they were rarely held for more than three or four days. The interrogations were all the same. First they were asked to give their opinion of the "structure of Soviet power and the system of proletarian government." Berdyaev responded that he felt uncomfortable with basing everything upon class and upon one narrow opinion which depended on an ideological characterization of what it was to be peasant, proletarian or bourgeois; he would prefer to have a less "aristocratic" interpretation which took into consideration people's individual abilities, desires, and traits. Ivan Alexandrovich Ilyin said that he found Soviet power to

²²³ M. Kalinin [Chairman of VTsik], "Instructions for the Registration of Societies, Unions and Associations," 10 August 1922, Documents of Soviet History 392-393.

²²⁴ Kogan, "Vyslat' za granitsu" 67.

²²⁵ Berdyaev, Dream and Reality 239.;

²²⁶ Designated by Order # 1722, Berdyaev was one of the first arrested on August 16, 1922. The police arrived at one o'clock in the morning. See L.A. Kogan, "Vyslat' za granitsu" 71.

be an inevitable result of the past one hundred years trend in Russia's socio-spiritual evolution. Feodor Stepun declared that he was loyal to Soviet power as a citizen, but as an intellectual believed Bolshevism neglected the people's spirit and could not give them purpose and hope.²²⁷

Second they were asked about their view of "the intelligentsia's task" and "that of what are called 'societies'." Third, they were asked what their attitudes were "towards such methods of Soviet power towards the professor's strike." Fourth, came a request to explain their attitude toward the *smenavekhovtsy*, Savinkov, and toward the trial of the SRs." Fifth, they were asked to give their views on the "condition of Soviet power in regional, secondary schools and attitude toward the reforms of them." Sixth, they were asked to give their opinion of the perspective of the Russian emigration abroad. Finally, they were asked for their views on political parties in general and in Russia in particular.²²⁸

Replies to these questions seem to have generally been a uniform "no opinion," with the exception of the emigration question to which most of the accused responded that they disliked the "Whites" and the incestuous politics which pervaded that milieu. The day after their questioning, each was presented with a verdict which sentenced them to life in exile outside of Russia, and promised their death should they ever attempt to return. They were requested to sign the following statement:

On [date] the decree about my trial in the capacity delineated in article no. 57 of the Criminal code of the R.S.F.S.R. was read to me and I do not confess myself to be guilty of that, namely being engaged in anti-soviet work, and particularly, I do not believe myself to be guilty of that, namely causing external embarrassment for the R.S.F.S.R. by engaging in counter-revolutionary work.

²²⁷ Kogan, "Vyslat' za granitsu" 71-76.

²²⁸ Kogan, "Vyslat' za granitsu" 72.

They were then given a second form to sign which stated:

Pledge. Given by me, M. [name], to the Government political administration [GPU], that I pledge not to return to the territory of the R.S.F.S.R. without permission from the organs of Soviet power. I have been advised of Statute 71 of the Criminal code R.S.F.S.R. which states that I will face the greatest measure of punishment if I return of my own free will within the boundaries of the R.S.F.S.R....²²⁹

Therefore, while admitting to nothing and in some cases even protesting the accusation, each person was told s/he was to be exiled abroad and forced to sell their possessions and obtain visas.²³⁰ During the entire time of their incarceration, none were given a trial, told why they were accused, or given any chance to defend themselves against such charges. They were told instead to be grateful that their fate was exile and not death by firing squad. Upon their release and exile, each person was told she or he would be executed if they remained or if they tried to return at any time in the future.²³¹ Between September and December of 1922 the German ships Oberbürgermeister Hacken and Preissen conducted most of the exiles from Russia to Berlin.²³²

The "First Warning"²³³ against intellectual counter-revolution had been issued, and Lenin, in one move, had rid the R.S.F.S.R of many of Russia's most prominent and

²²⁹ Berdyaev signed these statements on August 19, 1922. Kogan, "Vyslat' za granitsu" 73.

²³⁰ Record of Conversation with Prof. S.L. Frank, Berlin, 4 October 1923, Paul B. Anderson Papers, University of Illinois at Urbana Champaign, Box 5: 2-3.

²³¹ Record of Conversation with Prof. S.L. Frank, Berlin, 4 October 1923, Paul B. Anderson Papers, University of Illinois at Urbana Champaign, Box 5; Record of Interview with Prof. S.N. Prokopovitch, Berlin, 3 October 1923, Paul B. Anderson Papers, University of Illinois at Urbana Champaign; Berdyaev, Dream and Reality 233.

²³² The Berdyaevs sailed upon the Oberbürgermeister Hacken in November from Petrograd to Stettin with some seventy other members of the expelled and their families. There they were provided with a train to Berlin. Berdyaev thanked the German government for their assistance in providing Visas for him and his family in his autobiography. See Lowrie, Rebellious Prophet 158.

²³³ Pravda, 31 August 1922: 1.

capable intellectuals. Of the 174 arrested, 160 were actually sent abroad. The Free Academy was thus destroyed. Only Bukshpan and Gershenzon evaded expulsion: Bukshpan was repressed within Russia finally ending up in the Gulag; Gershenzon died in 1925. In the Ukraine, the two remaining members of the *Bratstvo*, Bulgakov and Zenkovsky, were also arrested. After 1922, therefore, the *Bratstvo sviatogo Sofii* found its entire membership collected in Europe against the will of its foremost members. The other philosophers who were exiled were Ivan Ilyin, Ivan Lapshin, and Pitirim Sorokin. While not specifically related to religious-philosophy, they would carry some of its themes and images in their future work in exile.

Those who had been involved in VOKPG were also numerous. Three of the leaders, every Tolstoyan, all the writers, and many of the other politicals were included. The only exceptions were Academicians who worked within any scientific field who were obviously deemed too potentially useful to be disposed of despite their dubious political leanings. This applied, as well, to one noteworthy religious-philosopher and priest. Paul Florensky was not deported in 1922. He was allowed to remain in Russia, but constrained to his scientific explorations, and he managed to produce some important theories before his internment in the Gulag and his death in 1952. Therefore, the apparent rule was that scientists could stay, but philosophers, economists, political theorists, and other intellectual "parasites" must go.

In retrospect, the fate of the expulsees was amazingly lenient considering that which was to befall their clerical counterparts, not to mention millions of other Russians, in the ensuing years. An indication of relative proportion may be found in Solzhenitsyn's Gulag Archipelago in which he lightly dismisses the incident:

From the early twenties on, arrests were also made among groups of theosophists, mystics, spiritualists...Also, religious societies and philosophers of the Berdyayev circle. The so-called "Eastern-Catholics" - followers of Vladimir Solovyev - were arrested and destroyed in passing, as was the group of A.I. Abrikosova.²³⁴

However, in the emigration these intellectuals who so involuntarily had been propelled into its midst were to become its vanguard in Europe. They had stayed in Russia in order to continue their work begun before Bolshevism; once exiled they continued their pursuit of an alternate path - a "third way" - outside of Russia. Most of the hundred and sixty were the leading proponents of Russia's religious and philosophical renaissance. The expulsion denied the new Soviet Russia some of its most creative native intellectuals. In return, it gave the gift of their ideas, experience, and energy to Russia Abroad and to the West.

²³⁴ Aleksandr I. Solzhenitsyn, The Gulag Archipelago, 1918-1956, An Experiment in Literary Investigation, trans. Thomas P. Whitney (New York: Harper & Row, 1974) 37.

3. The YMCA and the Russian Emigration

Once the expelled intellectuals arrived in Berlin at the end of 1922, they discovered that an international organization, the Young Men's Christian Association (YMCA) was very active amid the emigration. Although the Russian religious-philosophers had a passing knowledge of the YMCA because of their relief efforts during World War One in Russia, and their latest, secretive, participation in the ARA famine relief, they appear to have been more or less ignorant about the full dimensions and mandate of the YMCA. However, upon their arrival they immediately realized that the YMCA shared their central aspiration: namely continued work among the people of Russia.

The 1920s marked a continued attempt on the part of the YMCA to overcome its annihilation in Russia during the Civil War years when the Bolsheviks had categorically banned all facets of the organization within their boundaries.¹ Despite repeated protestations about the neutrality of their work, the YMCA found itself and its activities in Russia linked inescapably to the cause of foreign intervention. By the end of 1918, the YMCA was declared an enemy organization by the Bolshevik government, and American Association Secretaries were ordered out of the Bolshevik-controlled areas of the country. They were more fortunate than the Russian members of the YMCA: when caught by the Reds, these associates were imprisoned and many were shot.

¹ The YMCA had started a native organization called "Mayak" ["the Lighthouse"] in tsarist Russia, but this had fallen into disuse largely because of pressure from the Office of the Holy Synod in the years immediately prior to the outbreak of war. Initially enthused by the new "openness" of the liberal, democratic Provisional Government in the February Revolution, the YMCA never had the chance to rebuild their infrastructure torn by the pressures of war once the Bolsheviks seized power.

It was the continuous waves of Russian emigrants to Europe between 1918 and 1922 that presented the new threads of opportunity and hope to the YMCA that they might be able to continue their Christian work and dialogue with Russians. Beginning with war-service activities limited to raising POW morale and related relief initiatives in the many camps throughout Europe, key YMCA leaders began to think that the émigrés might be their linchpins to re-entry. If the Bolsheviks were eventually overthrown, these émigrés would return with the YMCA; if the Bolsheviks stayed in power, those Russians that returned would still carry a grain of the YMCA message.

Getting Back to Russia

With unrepentant optimism that their expulsion from Russia was merely a temporary setback, most of the Overseas Division leadership of the YMCA in 1918 began to seek new and innovative ways to re-enter the country and continue their service. However, it soon became apparent to them that Bolshevik intransigence was just one of the obstacles they had to overcome. Their activities were met with resistance and apprehension by many of the high-ranking members of the central organization in New York. While the YMCA in America had been fully prepared to finance assistance in the immediate reconstruction and reorganization of Europe, they had no intention of making this a permanent arrangement. By 1920, YMCA leaders appeared to follow the trend for isolationism that had begun to permeate political and economic thought in America; they started to question why American money and citizens should be expended to aid the "the ungrateful and troublesome Europeans"² when they could be more effectively put to use

² As expressed by Ethan T. Colton in his 1969 manuscript for a revised version of his earlier *Forty Years with Russians* (New York: Association Press, 1940), "With the International Committee Foreign Work and Religious Work Departments and Overseas World War I Committee, 1904-1932,"

serving their own kind at home. They, therefore, strongly advocated the curtailing of the Overseas Division's activities for a more domestic policy.

In the ensuing "battle" within the Association to resolve whether it should continue expanding abroad or begin contracting and focusing exclusively on North America, personalities became the deciding factor. The most influential role was played by Dr. John R. Mott (1865-1955), the director of the international branch of the YMCA - the World Student's Christian Federation (WSCF).³ Having almost single-handedly engineered the expansion of the YMCA into India, China, Japan, and even in Russia before the outbreak of the war, he was not prepared to countenance the dissolution of his life's work simply because some of his countrymen had turned to selfishness and fear. The other central figure was Ethan T. Colton, the master conciliator who directed the Overseas Division office in Berlin.⁴ Like Mott, Colton believed that America, and especially the YMCA, had a calling to spread Christianity and its morals throughout the world, and he was convinced that their work had made a difference; YMCA foreign relief and morale programmes were making an immediate impact on POWs. Although Colton was more cautious about the extent to which YMCA service should be applied internationally - and more pragmatic about the funds which Americans would be willing to part with - he agreed with Mott that the Association must continue its work outside of America.

Paul B. Anderson Papers, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Box 25.

³ For more information on John Mott see Basil Mathews, John R. Mott, World Citizen (London: Student Christian Movement Press, 1934); John Mott, Lessons I Have Learned in over Fifty Years of Helping to Establish National and World-wide Movements. (Rochester, New York: Rochester YMCA, 1944).

⁴ No biography of Colton has, to my knowledge, yet been written. However much information about his life may be obtained in his autobiography, Forty Years with Russians (New York: Association Press, 1940).

The showdown to determine YMCA policy regarding future work to be directed by the International branch and the Overseas Division occurred at the YMCA General Assembly at Newark, New Jersey in February 1920.⁵ If consensus on continued efforts could be attained there, both Mott and Colton intended to focus the decision towards a new Russian initiative. Russia had long been a favourite project for Mott,⁶ and Colton had committed several years of his life to POW and relief work among both the Interventionist and White armies. Both men felt that the YMCA's expulsion from Communist Russia had been a frustrating insult, and they hoped to use this blow to American pride as a vehicle to convince their peers at the meeting that no Russian Communists were a match for the Yankee spirit. In a larger sense, however, Russia was for both men a critical Christian problem: over three million Russian POWs had been interned in German and Austrian POW camps, and were not yet repatriated; the country had been fighting a bloody civil war for two years leaving millions homeless, destitute, and in need of both moral and physical support; the massive emigration from that country had created a refugee problem which was quickly surpassing all national and international capabilities for aid.⁷ Finally, they believed that Russia was essentially a devoutly Christian country, being held hostage by an atheist dictatorship. If the rest of Christendom did not

⁵ Proposed Program of Y.M.C.A. Activities in Russia Revised from Newark Conference Report, June 1920, Paul B. Anderson Papers, University of Illinois at Urban-Champaign, Box 6: 1.

⁶ Mott had participated in the Elias Root Commission which President Wilson sent to Russian in 1917. During that stay, he also gained entrance to the Great Sobor where he saw, with great interest, new religious spirit.

⁷ The Red Cross was bogged down simply trying to feed the emigrants, let alone relocate them; countries to which the refugees fled were having problems absorbing them, and several had set up detention camps as a stop-gap measure. Disease was rampant, and typhus, typhoid, influenza, and cholera epidemics were being spread world-wide by the refugees. It was quite simply an international calamity which required any aid available to sort out the mess. See Sir John Hope Simpson, The Refugee Problem: Report of a Survey (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1938) 62-116.

act quickly to prevail against the intolerable conditions in Russia and the Bolshevik government's policies regarding religion, then some one hundred million Christians might be lost from the flock.

With these persuasive arguments, Colton and Mott arrived at Newark to begin changing minds. Each used the methods which most suited his character. Mott made inspirational speeches about the effect the YMCA had already had on Russians within the country, the emigration, and the POW camps. He called for a remembrance of the Christian duty and vocation. He transmitted messages of hope, need and purpose which inspired and overcame isolationist sentiments. Colton, alternately, met select, influential leaders one-on-one. He appealed to the spirit of generosity in some, to the Christian devotion of others, to national pride or fear of communism's spread. With each person he presented the case which would most appeal to their individual proclivities.⁸ On February 24, 1920 the delegates unanimously supported the continued work of the YMCA International Division, and especially its role in Russia.

In consequence of its seventy five years of successful experience in more than forty countries and more particularly in consequence of its experience within the past four years among the Russian people themselves, the Young Men's Christian Association believes that its work for the mental, moral and physical betterment of young men and boys will be of real value to Russia...⁹

Even the strong isolationist faction was silenced at that conference, as the need for YMCA work was made plainly obvious to all. However, on the issue of Russia, the isolationists

⁸ This is implied both in Colton's Forty Years with Russians (New York: Association Press, 1940) and his 1969 manuscript (see Paul B. Anderson Papers, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Box 25). However, it would have been incongruous for Colton to have stated exactly whom he talked to and how he persuaded that person; as a master of such one-on-one persuasion his reputation depended upon maintaining confidences.

⁹ Proposed Program of Y.M.C.A. Activities in Russia Revised from Newark Conference Report, June 1920, Paul B. Anderson Papers, University of Illinois at Urban-Champaign, Box 6: 1.

found some support from moderates and conservatives. They maintained that the YMCA should wait and let the situation settle before deciding on its future course of action. In their opinion, the Bolshevik government could be overturned at any point and hasty action might prejudice future efforts of the YMCA. They further suggested that if the Bolsheviks did indeed stand the test of leadership, any charity work with Russian émigrés on the part of the YMCA would just further exacerbate tensions between all Christian organizations and a paranoid Bolshevik Russia. Christian altruism and YMCA money were bound to be problematic in any future dealings, as both would inevitably offend the Soviet authorities and the Communist ideologues. For these reasons, the conservatives concluded that it might be better to ease off so they would no longer be seen as a threat.¹⁰

True to form whenever any aspect of the International Division was threatened, Mott responded vehemently. He asserted that enormous manpower and money had already been put into efforts to maintain any contact between Russia and the YMCA. To preserve this tenuous link and to achieve any potential for future alliances, he felt that it was of paramount necessity to keep the lines of communication open with any Russian peoples, be they indigenous or émigré. The end goal of such an approach, Mott reminded them, was to make sure that the people in Bolshevik Russia must never feel entirely abandoned by their Christian brothers and must never forget Christian ideas and life. With this persuasive argument and the sheer force of his personality, Mott was able to sway the majority of members, and the program was adopted. The Berlin Headquarters of the Overseas Division, which had become the axis of activities for the

¹⁰ This argument is outlined in "Newark Conference Notes," 23-24 February 1920, Paul B. Anderson Papers, University of Illinois at Urban-Champaign, Box 6: 1-3.

YMCA in Europe by 1920 due to its relief operations in Germany, was granted continued funding, personnel, and support for a renewed Russian initiative.

As was consistent with most YMCA programs, it was proposed that American personnel should initially direct the activities of the Russian program, with the intent of eventually establishing a Russian national organization, "modelled on lines best adapted to the needs and institutions of Russia, and supported and controlled by Russians."¹¹ For the renewed beginning, YMCA bureaus would be set up in three to six major cities in Russia under the initial direction of the Americans in Berlin (and in the near future by Russian nationals), as soon as they could obtain permission from the Bolsheviks. Believing the Soviet ban of the YMCA to be of little substance, the leaders of this division assumed that the necessary assurances could be obtained from the Soviet authorities with a few simple meetings between "reasonable people." The assurances the Y planners proposed were fairly standard:

1. Necessary papers of authorization regarding buildings and living accommodations, duty-free importation of supplies and equipment and right to control their use once in country. Precedence-rights for the travelling of Association secretaries, equipment and supplies. Privilege of securing locally whatever materials necessary predicated upon their availability.
2. Reasonable freedom of residence, travel and communication within and outside of Russia so that the program could be adequately developed. Ability for American workers to leave Russia without hindrance should the situation develop that they needed to for their personal safety. YMCA representatives must also be allowed to contact and work with any native Russian organizations - schools, athletic clubs, cooperative societies, and churches - to facilitate their work.
3. Finally the YMCA expected to get the right to hold meetings "for education and entertainment as well as those of a religious nature."

In their forthright and naïve manner, the YMCA resolved that this program would succeed as long as the spirit of good-will was made clear to the Soviets:

¹¹ Proposed Program of Y.M.C.A. Activities in Russia 1.

Those in authority in Russia must be convinced of the good faith and the sincerity of the Association and its secretaries. They must believe that these have no other purpose in Russia except that of service to the Russian people through an organization which is already serving people of many other countries, without regard to any antagonisms that may prevail between these countries or to political or social difficulties within the countries themselves. To this end the sponsors for the program herewith propose the wish to deal squarely and openly - to acquaint the proper authorities with every detail of a proposed program, to discuss it with them and come to an agreement as to its practical application, and to keep them informed regarding its operation, once it is put into effect.¹²

What followed was a concrete program, city by city, for the reestablishment of the YMCA in Russia - it took into consideration the conditions that they would face in the various areas, and relations they could rebuild with other religious organizations such as the older Y-inspired movement, *Mayak*, and the Orthodox Church.¹³

The new program for re-entry into Russia was implemented by the Berlin Headquarters, shortly after the Newark Conference ended. Mott returned immediately to Europe, and assigned his former personal Secretary and head of the YMCA in Moscow in 1918, Paul B Anderson (1894-1982) with the task of beginning negotiations with the Bolsheviks.¹⁴ Anderson brought much experience to the job: he had witnessed the Bolshevik Revolution in Russia, spoke the language fluently, and had personal experience with the government; in 1918 he had been arrested in Moscow, held for one week and interrogated, before the Cheka released him for deportation from Russia. He was now charged, in 1920, with arranging an interview with the Bolshevik Foreign Commissariat

¹² Proposed Program of Y.M.C.A. Activities in Russia 2-3.

¹³ Findings of the Russia Conference (Newark, N.J., February 21-23, 1920), Paul B. Anderson Papers, University of Illinois at Urban-Champaign, Box 6: 1-7.

¹⁴ In a multiple letter to Lowrie, Anderson, and Somerville, Dr. Mott stated that he had instructed Anderson and other members of YMCA to be prepared to wait until full political and organizational dynamics had worked themselves out before proceeding to implement the Newark Program. See Dr. John R. Mott, letter to Donald A. Lowrie, Paul B. Anderson, and James Somerville, Jr., from Warsaw, Poland, 16 June 1920, Paul B. Anderson Papers, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Box 6.

to discuss terms for the YMCA's return to Bolshevik Russia. While he pursued the long and frustrating task of setting up the meeting, Anderson remained at the YMCA headquarters in Berlin, where he also lent a hand to their on-going work of repatriating Russian POWs and camp work among Russian refugees.

Mott, himself, then went on to Poland where he supervised the transfer between German and Russian POWs, and then Polish and Russian veterans. He also tried to facilitate the new YMCA Russian program by returning personally to the country to reestablish contacts and gain supporters. However, his prominent reputation as a YMCA director caused the Soviets to refuse him an entry permit. Travelling between Warsaw, Berlin, and Vladivostok where the YMCA provided aid to the remaining Interventionists and White armies, Colton busily coordinated all the diverse activities. After Mott was denied entry to Russia, Colton arranged that Charles Hibbard, a much less prominent secretary from the Berlin Headquarters, should go. However, even he was unable to gain entry.¹⁵

These rejections made the work of Anderson even more important, and he repeatedly tried to arrange a meeting with the Foreign Affairs Commissariat. With the help of Donald Lowrie and James Somerville, he prepared for a meeting with the Commissar Chicherin, certain that it would be granted in the near future. At this juncture, however, he received new orders from Mott: he was still to meet with the Bolsheviks if it could be arranged, but was to approach the issue of the YMCA's return to Russia very delicately; Mott suggested that instead of stating their intentions directly, Anderson should

¹⁵ Mott continued to remain intransigent on this issue. In later discussions with Anderson, he continually reiterated that reentry into the Bolshevik controlled areas should be the main priority of the Russian division. Paul B. Anderson, No East or West: The Memoirs of Paul B. Anderson (Paris: YMCA Press, 1985) 30.

emphasize their work with Russian POWs in Germany in order to show the Bolsheviks their potential contribution. Moreover, he told Anderson that as the POW work was the more immediate concern, it should be regarded as being more important than returning the YMCA to Russia.¹⁶

Anderson did finally manage to arrange a meeting with the junior Commissar Maxim Litvinov in 1920, but found the actual encounter disappointing. Despite the terrible human need in Russia, where augury of an immense famine had begun to show, Litvinov was harshly denigrating to the YMCA. Anderson, Sommerville and Lowrie had presented their case by suggesting only that the YMCA return to Russia to provide relief to Russian, German and Czech POWs there not to begin a complete YMCA service throughout the land. They tried to establish their honourable intentions by demonstrating how the YMCA had supported the Nansenhilfe Committee in Berlin to the amount of 50,000\$ for POW relief. It would only be natural that the YMCA presence within this organization could be continued in the Nansen relief effort in Russia.¹⁷ Litvinov laughed at this: The Bolsheviks, he said, had no need for Christian proselytizers and bourgeois interventionists. This was later repeated at negotiations between the Nansenhilfe and the Bolsheviks, when the latter insisted that Nansenhilfe ensure that no YMCA men joined their operations. Not prepared to jeopardize their own relief operations for the cause of the YMCA, the Nansenhilfe relief duly complied with the Bolshevik demand, and gave the YMCA a categorical "no" to their request that YMCA men be placed in the relief

¹⁶ Notes on Conference, Jan. 21, 1921, Paul B. Anderson Papers, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Box 6: 5-6.

¹⁷ Notes on Conference, Jan. 21, 1921 1-2.

proceedings. The answer, at this point was clear: The Bolsheviks would not accept the YMCA on any terms.

At the start of 1921, the Berlin Headquarters underwent a shift in personnel. Francis Miller, the head Secretary, was transferred to Britain where his responsibility was to recruit other Russian-work associates who were being trained at Oxford. His departure meant a new director would have to be appointed and Anderson, with his experience and his free time now that the Russian negotiations had stalled, was the perfect choice.¹⁸ At first, he was assisted by Somerville and Conrad Hoffman which allowed him to do extensive travelling to assess the situation of the Russian emigration throughout Europe. Anderson's mandate, however, was not changed: the YMCA was still committed to going back to Russia. Immediately after his permanent appointment, he attended a follow-up conference to Newark in Berlin on January 21, 1921 to discuss, in more refined terms, what the aims and methods of re-entry might be.¹⁹

The meeting reinforced the premise, agreed upon at Newark, that future work in Soviet Russia should be upfront, not "backdoor."²⁰ This restatement, however was becoming more difficult to defend with urgency as support for this tactic was disintegrating even among members of the hitherto sympathetic International Committee of the YMCA. Colton attributed this change of heart on the part of Mott's division to one

¹⁸ Paul B. Anderson, Commentary on Donald Lowrie's Report of the Russian Division Office to the Central YMCA, 1929, Paul B. Anderson Papers, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Box 25.

¹⁹ Composed of such members as Ethan T. Colton, Charles V. Hibbard, Edgar MacNaughten, Banton, Julius Hecker, A.V. Yakhuntov, Paul Vinogradov, Ralph W. Hollinger, Paul B. Anderson, and Torell. See Notes on Conference, Jan. 21, 1921, Paul B. Anderson Papers, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Box 6.

²⁰ Notes on Conference, Jan. 21, 1921 1.

of political convenience: "They are hesitating not so much for themselves as to avoid being placed in the position where they will be liable to the charge of being a pro-Soviet organization."²¹ Colton further explained that many large business houses in the United States had begun to view communism with some paranoia. YMCA Committees' decisions tended to mirror this trend, and the Secretaries had no choice but to conform to their judgments. This was not an official American policy by any means. Colton described conversations between himself and Arthur Bullard of the State Department which made it clear that the government supported aid in the USSR, but could not force companies or organizations to adhere to this policy. On Colton's counsel, therefore, members of the conference decided that patience was required to wait until the tide of "red-scare" had passed over the USA.²²

The Russians at the meeting also counselled patience. However, they did so on the grounds that the situation in Russia had become completely unstable. No longer hoping for White victory (which was all but an impossibility since the Intervention had largely collapsed and Wrangel had been forced to yield in the south, fleeing to Constantinople), they still felt that the Bolsheviks were ripe for internal dissension. The Kronstadt revolt signalled to them that other elements might soon seize power from the Bolsheviks. Eventually, they hoped that these people would create a working coalition with the remaining liberals and non-communist socialists. Concerning the YMCA, they feared any rapprochement with the Bolsheviks could harm the YMCA's reputation after a new government came to power. They suggested, therefore, that the Overseas Division headquarters should only prepare the platform for essential educational work, and help

²¹ Notes on Conference, Jan. 21, 1921 2.

²² Notes on Conference, Jan. 21, 1921 3.

Nansenhilfe/ARA with necessary scouting expeditions in order to see which way things might turn.²³

Vinogradov supported this completely, noting that American policy would probably be influenced by the new group of influential émigrés in Paris who represent "more or less" the reactionary perspective. "My impression is that anyway some four or five months will pass before we can go to Russia. I do not know which group will be in control in Russia."²⁴ After discussing the past year's disenheartening encounters with the Bolsheviks, and the refusal of Nansenhilfe, all members of the meeting did agree that entry into Bolshevik Russia at the present time was going to be more troublesome than the YMCA had predicted.

This conclusion allowed Anderson to bring members back to the essential point of the meeting: What diplomatic approach must be taken in dealing with the Bolsheviks in the immediate future, especially after their most recent charges against the YMCA? Here, Anderson referred to the YMCA's work among the White and Intervention armies in general and, more specifically to the internationally embarrassing incident whereby Donald Lowrie had allegedly performed "spy-work" during a one week stay in Moscow.²⁵ With this politically delicate problem, the YMCA had only two courses open to them in Anderson's opinion. One would be to present the whole program of the Association to the Bolshevik officials, and say "Take it or leave it." The other would be to give them a

²³ This was expressed by Yakhuntov. See Notes on Conference, Jan. 21, 1921 3.

²⁴ Notes on Conference, Jan. 21, 1921 3.

²⁵ Notes on Conference, Jan. 21, 1921 4-5.

complete knowledge of the Association's program and then inquire what phases of this program might be undertaken.²⁶

While Hollinger immediately interjected that he was prepared to accept the second option only if contact between the YMCA and the Orthodox Church was permitted, Hecker now presented a moment of realism:

The YMCA is an alien element in Bolshevism. I believe we may have to have a different purpose in entering Soviet Russia. Our YMCA in America has as its purpose the building up of character for the support of our type of civilization.²⁷

Hollinger retorted that the YMCA, in its basic nature, was capitalistic - that could not be changed. However, he continued, "I cannot find any grounds anywhere in America for believing that there is democratic control of the YMCA... I have confidence in the central motive of the YMCA to do what Dr. Hecker has admitted, to create good citizens in any civilization." Colton went further and would not accept any proposal that denigrated the essentially *Christian* character of Y work. To this Hecker responded "We are not going into Russia to oppose their social order. We can build character that will stand in any civilization."²⁸ Vinogradov interrupted at this point, insisting that Colton was right and Christian work was needed more than any other form at the present time in Russia. Unsatisfied with their options, the committee decided to leave matters alone for the present and concentrate their attentions on other elements of the YMCA work, especially initiatives among the Russian refugees in Europe.

As the year progressed and news of the Russian famine became even more distressing, Anderson stayed in close contact with Nansenhilfe, and their efforts to

²⁶ Notes on Conference, Jan. 21, 1921 4.

²⁷ Notes on Conference, Jan. 21, 1921 4.

²⁸ Notes on Conference, Jan. 21, 1921 4-5.

dispense aid in Russia and Poland. At this time the Nansenhilfe was raising money mainly for prisoners still held in Siberia as general relief was not yet possible. Lowrie, the consummate chameleon, somehow managed to get himself reassigned to the Nansen Bureau and began helping their relief efforts in Siberia. Soon he would be accepted into the ranks of Herbert Hoover's ARA relief operations, and even make one more trip to Moscow. Anderson tried to aid the Nansenhilfe initiative by cabling Mott and Hibbard, and by asking the YMCA to contribute \$250,000, "to start first trainload supplies accompanied by five Nansen Relief representatives including two or more Association secretaries. Cable reply." He was troubled, however, when the reply came back negative: later he learned that the Central YMCA in New York was responding to a "general feeling in America that relief supplies were taken over by government [Bolsheviks] and used for propaganda purposes, with no supervision by the sending organization."²⁹ By the end of 1921 and throughout 1922, the YMCA actually did get back into Bolshevik-controlled Russia, but only by changing their "upfront" policy and entering through secret means.

While the Bolsheviks might have been completely opposed to the YMCA and any future work it could do in Russia, other powerful institutions threw complete support behind their plans. Patriarch Tikhon, in an interview with Lowrie before his first ignominious expulsion, clearly endorsed the YMCA and welcomed any help it could give. This was seconded in 1922 by the Greek Orthodox prelates out of Athens. On June 20, 1922, the Orthodox Church issued a formal appreciation and encouragement of continued YMCA endeavors in Russia. Hamilcar. S. Alivizatis D.D., foremost theologian of the

²⁹ Paul B. Anderson, Commentary on Donald Lowrie's Report of the Russian Division Office to the Central YMCA, 1929, Paul B. Anderson Papers, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Box 25: 29.

Patriarchate in Athens delineated their reasons for this support, and their suggestions about the most effective course of future action by the YMCA.

On the part of the new Russian Orthodox Church, and their reasons for supporting the YMCA, the Greek theologian argued:

1. It supported the fall of the Tsar because this released the Russian Orthodox Church from captivity and state subservience.
2. It is fully willing to work with other Christian organizations to promote greater unity and progress.
3. Its position is admirable within Christianity: "Persistence in the religious principles of Christianity as taught by Christ and the Apostles and developed by the Greek Church in a long Church tradition, liberal and philosophical (under the form of mysticism and symbolism) conformations of the Church life and the public worship, temporary and one-sided suspense or delay of the progress of both on account of the existing national circumstances [Bolsheviks], but, a persistent wish for progress and reconstruction..."

On the part of the YMCA and regarding its potential contributions to the Orthodox Church in Russia, he stated:

4. YMCA has helped Orthodox Churches variously in Greece, in the Constantinople refugee situation; it has the support and friendship of the Ecumenical Patriarch, and has done tremendous work in relief, Christian and moral improvement in Russia.
5. There are many needs that the YMCA can fulfil: Parish organization charity, philanthropy, and order; young peoples and boys work; education and preparation of men preparing for priesthood "Since a very long time, our best clergymen and our best professor at Theology [sic], after finishing their studies in Greece, have visited and finished their studies in Protestant institutions and universities; most of them (before the war) in Germany, and the younger ones during and after the war in England and America." The YMCA can, therefore, help support those in need both morally and financially; publication of religious books; encouragement of missionary activities stopped by lack of finance and international conflict; most of all work in Russia.
6. For work in Russia, the Orthodox Church sees two goals - preventing the Roman Catholic Church from using Bolsheviks to their benefit and taking Orthodox believers into their Church; combating Bolshevik proselytising of Atheism. "The Roman Catholic Church does not like to lose the such offered opportunity...and then the poverty and misery of the Russian people opens widely the door for the Roman Catholic Church, who knows perfectly how to help the

poor. The Pope, from every point of view has a very proper ground of work in Russia. The political conditions, the religious conditions, the present psychology of the Russians, the treaties of the Vatican with Bolshevism and the direct or indirect richness of the Roman Church, all these help and assist the propaganda work of the Roman Catholic Church in Russia....³⁰

In other words, he supported the intervention of the YMCA because it could help the Orthodox Church in its battle against both Romanism and Bolshevism.

The Roman Catholic Church was now offering unexpected opposition to the YMCA and its aspirations in Russia: Partially because it had its own agenda in that country, and partially because it increasingly mistrusted the motivations and growing popularity of the YMCA. Rome had viewed Russia as fertile territory for missionary work and conversions for centuries, but had continually been handicapped by the Tsar's national protection of Orthodoxy. With the Revolutions and especially with the Bolshevik take-over, the Roman hierarchy saw an opportunity. The Bolsheviks desperately needed some official State to offer them recognition; in return the Roman Catholic Church, denied of its statutory rights in Rome by the new Italian Republic (1871), and long desiring a voice in the Eastern Christian world (Russia) saw a chance for compromise.³¹ To this end, they arranged the Genoa Convention of 1922 which threatened to trample on the terms of the Versailles Treaty and the intentions of the Anglo-French alliance.³² As early as 1921, the Roman

³⁰ Hamilcar S. Alivizatis D.D., A Brief Statement upon the Relationship of the YMCA to the Orthodox Church, 20 June 1922, Paul B. Anderson Papers, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Box 3: 3-9.

³¹ At Genoa, the Vatican was somewhat betrayed by the Soviets' secret negotiation of the Rapallo Treaty with Germany thus mitigating their immediate need for foreign recognition. Nevertheless the plan to convert Russia remained a priority for Rome. Its dimensions are clearly outlined in "The Mission of the Catholic Church in Russia," Report of the Reverend Father August Maniglier, read in a Retreat of the Catholic Missionary Congregations in Louvain Belgium in September 12, 1923. Paul B. Anderson papers, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Box 6: 1-17.

³² For more information on the papacies of Pius XI and Pius XII, see Anthony Rhodes, The Vatican in the Age of Dictators, 1922-1945 (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1973).

Catholic Church had begun to prepare the way for its intended missionary onslaught on Russia by attacking any alternate denominational initiative which might threaten its work. As a consequence, the Pope issued a general ban against the YMCA in 1921.³³ Hence, the YMCA now faced a new opponent in their quest for return into Russia.

Despite the continual setbacks and their failure to gain any compromise from the Bolshevik government, the YMCA persisted in seeking re-entry and any means for directly helping the Russian people. By the end of 1921, Anderson was firmly established as chief of the Berlin Headquarters, and began coordinating the activities in Europe. That year the rest of the POWs were either repatriated or relocated, and the internment camps for Russian refugees were finally emptied. Now the individual countries were faced with getting to know and understand their new visitors. YMCA camp work among the other European nationalities had now come to an end and the Overseas Division moved increasingly to become the Russian division. As head of the Russian division, Anderson sought other ways to contribute to the Russian people until the YMCA managed to get back into their homeland. In discussions with Mott and Colton, and with prominent members of the emigration, he gradually came to the decision that the YMCA would serve best by helping the emigration. In that way, at least, some contact could be maintained with Russians. Although this alternative was much less attractive than a whole YMCA program in Russia, it was "Russian work."

Thus, from the headquarters in Berlin, Anderson continued several initiatives held over from the war years, and began many new ones, all geared to help the emigration. The tasks involved education for practical survival in new countries, the preservation of

³³ This was translated into English publications by February 4 of that year. "Papal Ban on 'Y' Reaches America in English Form," New York World 4 February 1921, Paul B. Anderson Papers, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Box 7.

the Russian culture and religion, and the continued development of Russian thought and way of life. Colton referred to the new perspective very positively:

This alternative represents a new dimension - instead of the physical entry into Russia of persons with passports, program and money for operations, one might think in terms of promoting ideas held in common by Orthodox Russians and Western Christians.³⁴

Ever adaptable, the YMCA found that it could serve Russians and Christianity in general through the avenue of the emigration. And from this, a surprising outcome occurred: the American YMCA became the central conduit between the Russian emigration and Europe; as chief protector of the émigrés, it brought their ideas, their religion, and their culture out of isolated émigré ghettos and into the general European and, to a lesser extent, American consciousness.

Immediate Needs of the Emigration

The end of World War One and the resulting treaties had created a new map of Eastern Europe, and the YMCA moved quickly to establish its organization in these new countries. To a large extent, the Association followed the path of the Russian emigration, which appeared to amass as close to the former homeland as possible. The refugee situation created by these displaced persons became the first crisis to deal with, and the aid of the YMCA gave them the ability for further development.

The most immediate gains were made in the Baltic states, especially Latvia and Estonia, where the largely Protestant population were in accordance with the aims of the Association. A delegation out of the Berlin Headquarters, composed of Sam Keeny,

³⁴ Paul B. Anderson, Commentary on Donald Lowrie's Report of the Russian Division Office to the Central YMCA, 1929, Paul B. Anderson Papers, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Box 25: 32.

Herbert S. Gott, Edwin Wright and headed by Colton, himself, managed to secure bureaux in Riga and Narva to serve both the Russian émigrés³⁵ and the native population. There, in Colton's opinion, the YMCA met with unqualified acceptance:

The religious leadership of these dominantly Protestant populations (Lutheran) gave full open support from the highest Church offices down through the parishes. High grade young men came forward for life service in the secretaryship.³⁶

Gyms, educational facilities, religious services, and bible study class initiated by American YMCA representatives were gradually taken over by their own nationals and soon became a normal part of life for the Baltic peoples.

Further south, in the new Eastern European countries, the YMCA faced more difficult situations. While they accepted the YMCA's temporary relief, the Catholic dominated countries of Poland and Hungary were far less in favour of the YMCA message from the very beginning. This dichotomy could be seen especially in Poland's tentative acceptance of YMCA involvement. Rather than encouraging any bureau to be opened for native use, the government limited YMCA involvement to helping with POW relief and repatriation. Dr. Mott took personal charge in this country during 1920 when the Poles were engaged in a fierce war with Bolshevik Russia, and his direction of the hastily-erected camps for Russian POWs and Russian refugees relieved the Polish Government of an extremely expensive and arduous task.³⁷ For this reason, the YMCA was given

³⁵ For a full history of the YMCA work with Emigrés in the Baltics see B. V. Pliukhanov, R.S.Kh.D. v latvii i estonii (Paris: YMCA-Press, 1993).

³⁶ He managed to establish a Baltic summer school, secure physical plants in the 3 main cities, and in Riga he got the city to build a spacious sports field. Colton's work was recognized by the Latvian government when they bestowed upon him the Order of the Three Stars Commander decoration in 1931. See the section "With the International Committee Foreign Work and Religious Work Departments and Overseas World War I Committee, 1904-1932," in Ethan T. Colton's 1969 manuscript for a revised version of his earlier Forty Years with Russians, Paul B. Anderson Papers, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Box 25: 106.

³⁷ Colton, Manuscript for Revised Forty Years with Russians 108.

official recognition and freedom to carry out their projects in Poland. By the end of the war in late 1920, the Poles closed all POW camps in operation in an attempt to discourage the masses of Russians fleeing across the border seeking asylum. Transferring the bulk of POWs (100,000 Russian soldiers) to Germany, the Polish government, with the help of the French, sealed their borders to any further refugees in an attempt to create the "Cordon Sanitaire."³⁸ In concurrence with this new Polish policy came the 1921 Papal condemnation of the YMCA, making the work of the Association untenable. Inevitably, the government of Poland asked Mott to cease his operations in the country, leaving the responsibility for aiding and ministering to the epidemic-carrying refugees to the Red Cross, Nansenhilfe, and Roman Catholic organizations. The work of the YMCA, curtailed in Poland, followed the Russian emigration back to Germany.

Disheartened, Mott returned with his men to the Berlin Headquarters where ongoing relief in the camps continued. He was immediately impressed with the German government's magnanimous support. Despite the tremendous chaos and disillusionment which the country was undergoing, the YMCA was still allowed to operate in almost complete freedom.

The German authorities dealt very liberally with us (YMCA) and with their Russian "guests", considering the state of their own finances and people. They allocated barracks to house the mass of strangers. For several years we had our large headquarters building centrally located on Koch Sousse - rent free.³⁹

Although the repatriation effort had begun as early as March 1918, the disorder in the governments of both Germany and Russia made organization of the transfer very

³⁸ Colton, Manuscript for Revised Forty Years with Russians 108.

³⁹ Colton, Manuscript for Revised Forty Years with Russians 108.

complex. Moreover, hearing about the Civil War in their homeland, many of the Russian POWs refused to be sent back.

By the end of 1920, the YMCA had helped with the exchange of almost all willing Russian and German veterans,

We [the YMCA] posted resourceful men at the frontier points of exchange. It was "Exchange" because the traffic moved both ways - the Russian homebound. Austrian, German and Hungarian war prisoners getting out of Russia. Through smiles and tears I saw in Riga the clearance of one echelon lord of the Entente survivors after five to seven years in Siberia.⁴⁰

However, by then the new influx arrived from Poland along with masses of refugees all of whom had to be detained in camps until they could be properly relocated. Where POWs were, especially Russian ones, so too was the YMCA. American secretaries helped with a variety of organizational matters and took charge of anything pertaining to morale. Classes, musical units, religious services and sports were all provided as the YMCA endeavoured to overcome the boredom and restrictions of confinement. The YMCA also contributed \$50,000 to the Nansen Bureau to aid the repatriation of those willing to return to Russia and to the Nansen Passport as a viable means of identification in any European country for those who did not. It was only by 1922 that the last camps were finally disbanded, the epidemics stopped, and the émigrés placed in temporary lodgings.

Education Programs

Even while millions were still detained in camps, the YMCA recognized a very pressing need of the emigration: few spoke the language of their new countries, and

⁴⁰ Colton, Manuscript for Revised Forty Years with Russians 108. The YMCA with the Nansen Bureau and the Red Cross tried to reunite broken families and even had to pass out new maps of Eastern Europe so that people from former Austria-Hungary could discover where their new homeland was.

even fewer were trained in technical or semi-skilled trades which were most likely to provide them with employment in Europe. A significant proportion of the Russian emigration - despite its generally educated character - was also functionally illiterate which did not augur well for employment, immigration, or easy adaption. The YMCA thus decided, in 1921, to spear-head an education program directly aimed at Russians with the goal of improving their chances for survival.

The nucleus of this program came from yet another war effort. In 1915, Julius Hecker had been captured by the Austria-Hungarians and interned in one of their POW camps. Hecker was by nationality a Russian, but had gone to Columbia University in New York as a student in order to obtain his doctorate in sociology. There, he had encountered the YMCA and, admiring the organization, joined it and soon became a certified secretary. When the war began, he returned to Russia to fight for his own country, only to be captured by the Austria-Hungarians and confined for the duration of the war. Although Hecker's military role was swiftly curtailed, he was not content to wait passively in the camp until peace arrived. Instead, he surveyed the fellow Russians in the camp, and began a small training course initially intended to teach illiterates how to read. Organizing a supply of books of different languages from YMCA men who serviced the camps, he encouraged inmates to continue studying and reading to stave off depression.⁴¹ Soon the demand for such instruction overwhelmed Hecker's *ad hoc* organization and he decided to set up structured classes to provide for the wave of interested students.

Politically, Hecker leaned to the "left" and he established contacts while in camp (and perhaps before) with the Socialist Revolutionary Party. His selection of reading and

⁴¹ Colton, Manuscript for Revised Forty Years with Russians 109.

teaching material was thus slanted in a progressive and socialist direction. Nevertheless, his success in setting up an educational service behind barbed wire was instructive for the YMCA, and they moved to help him expand it by funding correspondence courses following the cessation of hostilities. From this the YMCA Correspondence School was born. The YMCA logically concluded that Hecker, with his valuable experience and success during the war, should command the new educational initiative. He coordinated course materials, professors (gained mostly from the emigration), and students from a base in Prague and from the Berlin Headquarters. The subjects which Russian refugees could learn from the Correspondence School included technical training, basic schooling, preparation for University, and office skills.

The reason for the school being conducted by correspondence was wholly practical. Given the wide dispersion of the emigration, it would have required enormous organization and expense to set up formal schools in every major locale in which they settled. Moreover, a substantial number of the émigrés moved to rural districts and were employed in some form of farm labour. They would not be able to both feed themselves and travel to some city in order to obtain a formal education. Through the means of mail, these disparate peoples could be reached and given an opportunity for further learning. By 1923, the Correspondence School had 476 students registered from 41 different countries and was offering 225 subjects. The breakdown was: 32% primary school, 51% high school, 10 % general, 5.5% college.⁴² By the end of the decade, enrolment had increased to 7,091 students from 680 different localities. Courses mounted to over 1000, ranging from agriculture to engineering, commerce, foreign languages, high school, and religious education. By 1939 over 11,000 students were enrolled in the School, including

⁴² Colton, Manuscript for Revised Forty Years with Russians 110.

124 in the Soviet Union who found secret methods to pass their course work and tests back and forth across the strictly "closed borders". 28 countries in Europe, 17 in Africa, 16 in Asia, 9 in the Americas and Australia all provided registrants for the courses. Colton later weighed the benefits of the institute: "The School work advanced simple workmen to become technicians and foremen in power stations, mines and mills. Others started poultry farms and market gardens. The young gained entrance to higher educational institutions."⁴³

Although the YMCA could not afford to set up formal schools in every country where the emigration settled, it did establish two Technical Colleges: the first was created in Sofia, Bulgaria. As Bulgaria received a significant proportion of the emigration due to its proximity to the old homeland, the YMCA decided early on to establish operations in that country. Unlike other Eastern European countries with whom the YMCA worked, Bulgaria was quite amenable to educational programs the Y might set up. Technical education, which had been so sharply curtailed for former students from Russia, was seen as essential by both the émigrés and the Bulgarian government. If positions were going to be filled with capable professionals in their newly adopted country, they would have to be properly trained. Between 1922-1924, some 200 graduates of the school emerged with saleable skills in surveying house construction and electrotechnics, and each became self-supporting. Many expressed their gratitude by working on physical reconstruction programs at a less-than-average rate of pay.⁴⁴

⁴³ Colton, Manuscript for Revised Forty Years with Russians 109.

⁴⁴ Colton, Manuscript for Revised Forty Years with Russians 107. When Professor William F. Russell, President of the Teachers College, visited it, he proclaimed the school one of the best that he had seen.

With the success of the Sofia academy, the YMCA's predilection for practical education, and the need to offer training to young Russian POWs and emigrants in Germany, a trade school was established in Wünsdorf, outside of Berlin, in March 1921.⁴⁵ It served to enable graduates to find employment upon their release no matter what country they found themselves settled in. The school offered programs in expert electrical, mechanical engineering and draughtsmanship, agronomy and agriculture, typesetting, printing and bookbinding.⁴⁶ Between the years 1921 and 1923, the academy was able to award over 1,000 diplomas to students, most of whom went on to professional work. One student, who wrote a report on the Wünsdorf school in 1923, highly commended the YMCA for their work:

The Academy, the Student Hall, the Library, courses, seminaries, assistance to the self-supporting organizations - every one of them is important and it is difficult to make a distinction between these various activities. The Y.M.C.A. has so closely entered into our lives, that the true value of this work can be realized if for a moment we suppose that nothing of this existed...we see how desolate would be our lives, as well as to a certain extent, the lives of all the emigrants....I must frankly say that we were antagonistic towards it [YMCA]. The disinterestedness of the Association seemed too unusual and the war and the revolution had rendered our minds suspicious and we expected to find a hidden purpose in this activity. Two years spent with the Y.M.C.A. have completely dispersed this preconception. With the development of these enterprises the noble principles of Christian love towards our fellow-brothers were brought forth...The organization has melted the ice which ground our souls by its creative activity and the words fell deep into our hearts opened in full confidence, awakening and calling them to a new life.⁴⁷

⁴⁵ An Experiment and Demonstration: The Vocational School for Russian Refugee at Wünsdorf, Germany, 3 December 1923, Paul B. Anderson Papers, University of Illinois at Urbana Champaign, Box 7.

⁴⁶ Colton, Manuscript for Revised Forty Years with Russians 108.

⁴⁷ Extracts from Letter of Russian Student in Technical College, Berlin, 1923, Paul B. Anderson Papers, University of Illinois at Urbana Champaign, Box 5: 1-3.

These educational initiatives were mirrored by some governments' programs in the new Europe. Czechoslovakia was the most generous, at first, to the Russian diaspora. President Masaryk of the newly-constituted nation held considerable affection for Russians because of his tutelage under the Tsar's authority during his youth. He relaxed emigration rules to the point where almost any interested Russian émigré could settle in his country. There, he advocated and subsidized an intense program of higher education in the Russian language which became an immediate haven for the more academic Russian intellectuals. The first Russian-language university outside of Russia was established in Prague in 1922, which allowed the enrolment of Russian students from any country in Europe. The YMCA linked their organization to this effort by establishing within the university the *Studentsky Domov* (Student House), a "hut style clubhouse...with lounge, restaurant and activity rooms. An American Secretary in charge guided in the physical, cultural and religious program appropriate to the institution."⁴⁸ In 1922, Donald Lowrie was placed in control of the *Domov*.

The YMCA Press

With their commitment to education for the Russian émigrés in the Correspondence School and the two Technical Colleges, the YMCA soon discovered that they were lacking one of the most important elements: nowhere in Europe or the United States was there an available depository of up-to-date, effective textbooks from which to train their students. Hecker, in charge of the Correspondence School, had first drawn attention to this problem when the war ended. He had obtained some reading material in various languages for his POWs, but it was generally of poor quality, and the Russian

⁴⁸ Colton, Manuscript for Revised Forty Years with Russians 108.

language books were completely insufficient. The demand for Russian books expanded with the influx of refugees to Europe, and with the YMCA relief among the White forces in Siberia.

In 1920, more influential individuals added their voices to Hecker's in the call for the YMCA to provide Russian literature. Mott and the Overseas Division of the YMCA were contacted by the head office in New York City which had received a persuasive request from the former Russian Ambassador to the United States, Boris Bakhmeteff, to see what it could do for printing and distributing Russian language texts for the variety of impromptu and established schools throughout the world. Furthermore,

A small group of Russian professional men who had found themselves in New York during World War I, feeling this urge to help, approached the world-renowned leader of the American YMCA, Dr. John R. Mott, with the proposal that this organization lend its hand to helping Russia.⁴⁹

As the YMCA still had high hopes at this time of legitimately returning to Bolshevik Russia in the near future, they saw the publishing endeavour as having a very positive potential for expanding their circle of influence; if they could produce Russian translations of the latest scientific, humanist, utilitarian, and even religious publications from the United States and Europe, they could advance both education and their own cause in Soviet Russia. The YMCA, therefore, agreed to help Bakhmeteff who provided a grant of \$250,000 to begin the publishing initiative.⁵⁰

At first, it was a cooperative enterprise. Russian scholars in New York City, led by Bakhmeteff, chose and produced the publications, and then sent them to the Overseas Division headquarters in Berlin for distribution to Russia. The New York-based scholars,

⁴⁹ Paul B. Anderson, "A Brief History of YMCA Press," 1971, Paul B. Anderson Papers, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Box 4: 1.

⁵⁰ Anderson, "A Brief History of YMCA Press" 2.

mostly engineers and teachers, saw that the most immediate need was for textbooks such as Asbukha (written by Vakhterov) or a Khrestomatia (written by Ostrogorsky), and more specific books on more technical subjects such as electrotechnics, internal combustion engines, and agricultural methods. Wanting to appeal to Mott's and the YMCA's Christian orientation as well as the need in Russia, they also arranged for the reproduction of the New Testament (Holy Synod Edition) and for the translation of Mott's brochure "The Living Presence of Christ."⁵¹

Soon, however, it proved impractical to continue publication out of America. Distribution costs were prohibitive because the books had to be shipped first to Europe or to the Far East, and then transported to Russia. Moreover, the Russian readers were said, by the European distributors, to be unreceptive to mere translations of English works; they felt threatened by the Protestant overtones in some works, and could not comprehend the Anglo-Western mentality represented in others. As Anderson at the Berlin Headquarters concluded, future efforts in publication must be led primarily by Russian authors with only a few translations of the most advanced technical works. The centre of activity, was, therefore, to be transferred to Europe as there was an insufficient pool of experienced Russian writers in America.⁵²

In 1921, the first true Press (*YMCAtisk*) containing one lowly printing press was established in Prague. Not only was Czechoslovakia very accessible to Russia, it was also the home of the new Russian University and Schools which had attracted a host of Russia's finest intellectuals and scientists. The potential market from Prague could be immense: books could be easily shipped to Russia to supply universities and libraries in

⁵¹ Anderson, "A Brief History of YMCA Press" 2.

⁵² Anderson, "A Brief History of YMCA Press" 2.

that country; they could also be sold to the Prague Russian University and affiliated schools; the Russian emigration in Prague, Berlin and Paris (three of the largest centres) could individually buy these books as well. Finally, they could be used by Hecker's Correspondence School and, with minimal cost, shipped to the Technical Schools in Wünsdorf and Sofia.

The first director of the *YMCAtisk* was Julius Hecker, appointed to this post because of his experience with the Correspondence School, his academic qualifications, and his Russian background. He was assisted, at a distance, by Paul Anderson from the Overseas Division headquarters in Berlin. Within a few months, however, Hecker had embroiled the YMCA in one of the biggest scandals it had ever had to face in its history. Hecker had long been known to hold rather "left-wing tendencies", and was quite open about his connections with certain Russian Socialist Revolutionaries and other socialists in Europe. What the YMCA did not realize, however, was that Hecker was using the Press to publish material of a particular ideological bent: Not just progressive or new books, but outright communist and socialist literature.

The first indication of a problem came from a "group... operating more or less under cover" committed to "saving the country [USA] from radical [communist or socialist] penetration."⁵³ Using personal connections with certain prominent members of the YMCA they made unavoidable accusations about the type of literature that Hecker was trying to disseminate. When nothing was immediately done by the Overseas Division to remove Hecker they publicly charged that this particular YMCA division was actively pro-Soviet: "on about the level of where Communistic, Socialistic, and liberal views alike get

⁵³ Colton, Manuscript for Revised Forty Years with Russians 109.

posted in the same 'Red' category.⁵⁴ At some extreme risk to his own reputation, Colton defended Hecker's choice to publish the *Roubakine books*, a series of new religious and political tracts challenged by American groups as being suspect.

While in New York trying to defend Hecker and the *Roubakine books* against charges from his fellow YMCA secretaries, Colton delegated Paul Anderson with the responsibility of investigating Hecker's choice of publications in Prague. Anderson duly travelled to Czechoslovakia to look at the proofs, and then presented them to a Russian émigré religious scholar who was friendly to the YMCA. To his horror, the expert confirmed the charges that had been laid in America:

However, a friendly Russian member scored on the point that the writer's [Roubakine] position religiously was definitely unacceptable to the Russian Church. We awoke to the fact that fluent Russian-speaking Julius would take advantage of our illiteracy in that language to get by with what he had in mind to do. This led on to other discoveries that brought on his severance from our service.⁵⁵

Hecker was dismissed in a flurry of accusations and controversies. He went bitterly from the YMCA and turned increasingly towards the forces of radical communism. By the mid 1920s he had become a committed "fellow-traveller" stopping just short of full-Communist party membership on account of religion. The State Department became aware of his activities and put him under surveillance. At this point Hecker, his wife and four children made a permanent move back to Soviet Russia on a falsified passport. Colton tried to keep in touch by meeting him on the few periodic visits he made to Moscow. On

⁵⁴ Colton, Manuscript for Revised Forty Years with Russians 109.

⁵⁵ Colton, Manuscript for Revised Forty Years with Russians 110; Paul B. Anderson, "Roubakine Report," 1921, Paul B. Anderson Papers, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Box 3.

Colton's last sojourn to Russia in the early 1930s, however, Hecker's wife said he had been deported to Siberia. He was never heard from again.⁵⁶

After the Hecker affair, Paul Anderson's duties were simply expanded to include the Prague Press as well as the direction of the Berlin Headquarters. His first move, prompted by physical and practical constraints, was to cease buying any new manuscripts or publishing almost any new books until he sorted out all the "illicit" material brought in by Hecker, including Roubakine's 10 volume encyclopedia, contracted by Hecker for the sum of \$2,500 out of YMCA funds. Anderson's legal advisors saw no way for the YMCA to avoid this obligation; the *Roubakine* books were destroyed, and their copyright turned back to the author, but the YMCA still had to pay him the full amount. Upon further examination, Russians at the Prague University also urged Anderson to destroy eight other books which either contained outright communist propaganda or were misrepresentative of the YMCA mandate.⁵⁷ To this Anderson faithfully complied.

As he contended with this mess, Anderson tried to divest the Prague warehouse of the other stocks intended for Russia. He hoped that once Hecker's material was dispensed with, the taint of communism would evaporate as well, allowing him to start the project anew. Books were quickly transferred to Russia via the YMCA men attached to Hoover's ARA relief committee who randomly handed them out to students and professors along with other relief items.⁵⁸ Anderson also secured agreements from the

⁵⁶ Colton, Manuscript for Revised Forty Years with Russians 110.

⁵⁷ The books were: Khondiakov's Ancient Russia, Biriukov's International Significance of Tolstoy; Pavlotsky's Structure of the Human Body, Hecker's Organization of YMCA Educational Work; Under the Sign of the Red Triangle: Science and Faith, Biriukov's Agriculture, Louis Philippe, Mother and Child, Spir's Justice and Injustice. Report of the YMCA Press Ltd - Russian Editorial Section, 1924, Paul B. Anderson Papers, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Box 3.

⁵⁸ Anderson, "A Brief History of YMCA Press" 2.

Mennonites and the Society of Friends to distribute these materials free of charge while conducting relief operations in Western Russia.

Once Anderson had eradicated Hecker's errors and dismissed his contract writers, he finally began to consider the future publication policy for the Press. Now was the opportune time to direct the publications towards more traditional YMCA goals, and to enhance the dissemination of accepted religious materials. He presented this plan to the Plenary Meeting of the YMCA Overseas Committee of the Overseas Division in Copenhagen at the start of 1922. The YMCA men discussed the problem of the availability of Christian literature in the Russian language for young men. They agreed with Anderson that the press in Prague might provide needed and helpful reading material for boys, and they addressed the problem that Orthodox and Catholics require different material than Protestants.⁵⁹ The first list of suggested publications indicated the dire need for material in Russian to provide basic history, geography, and Russian culture to émigrés and to Russians in Bolshevik territory who increasingly found only propaganda available, if that. They decided to publish any acceptable book that would demonstrate the role of Christianity in Russia's history.⁶⁰

Anderson had already been able to test the possible success of such a policy. The previous year, he had made an exception to his hold on publishing out of Prague in order to release the Orthodox Prayer Service book and the Bible. Just before the Plenary Meeting, the YMCA had received a special commendation from Patriarch Tikhon himself on January 13, 1922.

⁵⁹ Report of the Plenary Meeting in Copenhagen, 1922. Paul B. Anderson Papers, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Box 3.

⁶⁰ Report on the YMCA Press Ltd., 1923. Paul B. Anderson Papers, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Box 3.

Grace to you and peace from God the Father and our Lord Jesus Christ

We have been deeply touched by your noble and truly Christian desire and decision to republish the valuable "Orthodox Service Book", fruit of many years labor by Miss Hapgood.

Prayerfully and with all our heart we invoke the all availing blessing of God upon this devout enterprise which proposes the spread of the faith of Christ upon the earth and a contribution to the living communion of the believers in Christ with our Lord and Saviour, marvellous in His saints - and we wish abundant success and joy in the Holy Spirit to all who labor in this great task.

We express our confidence that in the fulfilment of this purpose our esteemed Dr. Mott and his colleagues will include in their kind attention Miss. Hapgood and will invite her to a valuable and useful participation in the correction of inaccuracies, omissions and typographical errors which found place in the first edition, and which, as we understand she has already collected into a special summary, in case there should be a second edition of the book.

Thanks be to God for it all. Committing to His prescient will the completion of the work thus undertaken to His glory, we shall count ourselves happy if the Lord permit us to live to be gladdened by news of the publication of this book so needful for the comprehension of the teachings of the Holy Orthodox Apostolic Church and in witness of the zeal of the Young Men's Christian Association for the preaching of the truth of Christ.

Our Patriarchal blessing on our American flock ever dear to our heart, and to our never-to-be-forgotten American friends; to you all, Our Patriarchal blessing and prayerful greeting.⁶¹

Therefore, in October, 1922, Anderson became full Editor-in-Chief of the Press in Prague with the mandate to begin a large-scale publication of religious materials. The new aims were the publication of:

1. Vital ethical and religious books to meet the present spiritual needs of Russian students and youth wherever accessible.
2. Books for tools in our actual Association program: Correspondence School, Sofia, Athletics, etc.
3. Books of educational character for which sale in Russia is assumed or replacement in the same category.⁶²

⁶¹ Patriarch Tikhon, "To the American Young Men's Christian Association, Berlin," trans. Donald Lowrie, 13 January 1922, Paul B. Anderson Papers, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Box 3.

⁶² Report of the YMCA Press Ltd - Russian Editorial Section, 1924, Paul B. Anderson Papers, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Box 3.

The new direction of the Press begun in Prague in 1922 yielded product by 1923, most of which was intended to meet educational needs within Russia. Following these new goals, some 37 books were published by end of 1923, and 20 others were in progress.

Just as Anderson had almost completely dispersed the bulk of the Hecker material, he received the additional burden of distributing the remaining materials originally published in New York by the Russian literature Department (Bakhmeteff and Karpovich), the total consignment of which was valued at \$50,000.⁶³ This, in addition to the new books starting to be printed in Prague, presented enormous difficulties in storage and collation: He needed to dispose of them quickly. Overwhelmed with responsibilities and struggling with temporary storage negotiations of the books, Anderson was devastated when he received news, in 1923, that the Bolshevik government was about to place an embargo on all Russian literature published outside of the country. How was he to get rid of all these books, if he could not sell them in Russia? Ingenuity again prevailed. Those remaining books of the Prague Press were rushed through publication and shipped with the remnants from New York in a last package of relief to ARA/YMCA representatives in Moscow just ahead of the embargo deadline.⁶⁴

Then repatriation of the Czech Legionnaires and withdrawal of the Allied supporting troops from the territory brought an extension of Red power to the Pacific. The frontier closed to us before a book supply could reach any considerable distribution. The output served, however, to implement splendidly the Correspondence School's program outside, and the surplus found its mark. In 1923 our Student Relief Section, operating inside, accepted the offer of 69,603 books at a cost of 12,000\$, including distribution.⁶⁵

⁶³ A Report on the YMCA Press in Prague, 1921-22, Paul B. Anderson Papers, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Box 3: 1; 4.

⁶⁴ Anderson, "A Brief History of YMCA Press" 3.

⁶⁵ Colton, Manuscript for Revised Forty Years with Russians 112.

Thus eventually the Press found some way to get the books into Russia. In one year it supplied some 41 libraries by this circuitous path. Being a one-time deal, however, it forced Anderson to ponder the future purpose and intent of the Press. Less than a year after obtaining permission to orient the Prague Press towards Christian literature, he was now faced with a drastically reduced market. There were over 100 million potential readers in now-closed Russia, and the emigration could provide only about 1 million purchasers, most of whom were destitute and reliant on charity. Clearly a reappraisal of the YMCA role in publishing was demanded.

To this end, Anderson had already commanded some preliminary investigation of the situation in Berlin. As director of the YMCA Overseas Division Headquarters in that city, he found it illogical to have to spread his time between Prague and Berlin in order to fulfil his various duties. Hence, he investigated the feasibility of moving the Press from Prague to Berlin, and thus centralize the entire Russian operations. In 1922 he asked Kolesov, a Russian émigré associated with the YMCA and experienced in publishing, to compile a report on Russian-language publishing in Berlin.

Kolesov reported that only two major Russian houses were thriving in the German capital: *Ladishnikov*, and *Devrien*, which was being subsidized by the German capitalist Stinnes. This latter house, however, was phasing out the Russian section to replace it with other languages. Two other, small publishers did exist - *Znanie* directed by Mr. Sishklaver and *Rodina* by Mr. Morkovin - but they printed books chiefly concerned with science, technology, and old reprints.⁶⁶ The other news that Kolesov discovered was that these Russian publishers in Berlin were all on the verge of bankruptcy. Their prices

⁶⁶ "Kolesoff Report," 1922, Paul B. Anderson Papers, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Box 3: 1.

did not reflect inflation and the rise of labour and costs. Hoping to stop undercutting, the Russian publishers and booksellers had formed a union at the end of May 1922 to keep their prices high enough. However, the prices kept rising independently of the depreciation of the German Mark and so headway was either slow or non-existent. Cost of paper was the most apparent problem: with depreciation, its astronomically high price made publishing endeavors almost prohibitive.

Assessing the situation between 1919-1922, Kolesov further discovered conflicting views as to exactly how many books published abroad were actually sold and distributed in the USSR. In general, he reported, it seemed that "the Soviet authorities put no obstacles in the way of distribution of foreign books in Russia."⁶⁷ All that was needed was a special importing license from the *Vnestorg* (Ministry for Foreign trade) to export books into Russia; the demand for reading material within Russia itself seemed to have forced the officials to comply to soliciting outside publishing houses. The main distributor appeared to be *Zakoopsbyt* which maintained offices in London, New York, Shanghai and representatives in Vladivostok, Dairen (Japan), Constantinople, and Australia. In 1922, this company agreed to sell YMCA press books from Prague on a commission basis, guaranteeing the Eastern front until 1924.⁶⁸

With this information, Anderson tentatively concluded that moving the Press to Berlin might be a definite possibility. Although the financial situation in Germany was unstable, he had guaranteed financing from the United States. It would also be more convenient and less costly if he centralized all YMCA Russian operations. Most of all, there did appear to be a place in Berlin for a Christian-oriented, modern press. Certainly

⁶⁷ "Kolesoff Report" 4.

⁶⁸ "Kolesoff Report" 5.

it would have to compete with these houses and with others in Germany, Czechoslovakia, and even in Paris.⁶⁹ Yet, as "a modest and highly specialized (religious) enterprise at the start," Anderson felt that the YMCA could effectively exist beside "these more general publishers."⁷⁰

The decision to move more directly into Christian publications was influenced by more than just the YMCA's natural predilection, or by the strong inspiration in this direction provided by Dr. Mott. In the Autumn of 1922, the YMCA had discovered a unique source of future manuscripts: the expulsion of intellectuals from Soviet Russia in 1922 caused over 100 leading Russian professors, writers, and thinkers to settle in Berlin. The YMCA, in fact, had been negotiating with several of these members prior to their expulsion with the intent of creating a large anthology of Russian religious thought. When news of their arrival in Berlin reached Anderson, he counselled the Russian members of the Berlin Headquarters to approach the exiles in order to find out if the YMCA could be of any service to them. This quickly led to a formal meeting with Boris Vysheslavitsev who then introduced Anderson to Nikolai Berdyaev.

The recent exiles were pleased to discover the YMCA's commitment to the furthering of religious thought and literature. They also proposed a solution which Anderson himself had begun to conceptualize: regardless of the vicissitudes of the Russian market, could not the YMCA help the cause of Christianity among the emigration itself? Here was a possible bridge between the YMCA and the Russian people. If the Press helped win over the general emigration to the cause of the Orthodox Church, and acted as a liaison between Russian and Western culture, then these émigrés could be a

⁶⁹ "Vosrozhdenie" was the most active house in Paris.

⁷⁰ Anderson, "A Brief History of YMCA Press" 7.

vanguard for Christianity, and by extension the YMCA, when they finally returned to Russia.

Anderson's new alliance with the recent exiles tipped the scales in favour of the move to Berlin. There he had a repository of some of the finest minds from Russia who would publish only under the YMCA press. This monopoly would give the Press such a unique character that it could not fail to compete successfully with the more general, and often out of date, established houses in Berlin. After receiving permission from the central YMCA and a rousing endorsement from Dr. Mott, Anderson moved the Press to Berlin in 1923. The Prague Press was sold to the highest bidder to provide sufficient funds to cover the move and the start-up costs in Berlin. All its remaining stocks were then distributed to the Wünsdorf school, the Home Study school in Berlin and the Sofia Technical College. Their continued needs added a final motivation for continuing the publishing endeavour, albeit on different lines.⁷¹

The YMCA Press in Berlin was quite a different enterprise than the former YMCA publishing efforts had been. Previously, they had published some books in Russian, but these were almost exclusively renditions of Protestant and Western ideas simply translated into the Russian language. They had never made any attempt to preserve or further Russian literature. Nor had they held a unified position on promoting religious and spiritual works from people of all nationalities and denominations. Anderson saw this earlier purpose as being one of the causes of weakness among YMCA Russian work: because the Russians would not participate in such obviously Western perspectives, the YMCA had never been able to persuade large bodies of Russian Orthodox to become committed to its purpose; those Russians who actively espoused "The Russian Idea"

⁷¹ Anderson, "A Brief History of YMCA Press" 3.

could feel no common purpose or affinity with earlier YMCA tactics; in fact they felt threatened by them.⁷²

Now he intended to change all this. Having established a connection with Vysheslavtsev and Berdyaev, Anderson decided to use their considerable critique abilities and contacts among the emigration for his press.

Then the influx of the notable Christian scholars in Berlin, copiously productive, yielded precisely the talent as writers and editors to supply the dearth in religious cultural directions. The demands added up to dimensions calling for a publishing house.⁷³

Anderson also took pains to develop contact with Metropolitan Eulogius (the head prelate of the Russian Orthodox Church in the West), in order that the YMCA Press might receive official Orthodox sanction.⁷⁴ In this way he felt that the YMCA could serve the emigration, and he became converted to the view that the Russian diaspora represented a tremendous hope for future Christian work.

The unexpected and for many unintended arrival in the West of perhaps two millions of such Russians changed the situation. It formed a bridgehead for Russian Christian Culture in the west. This expansion of Christian culture is expressed in the Orthodox word "sobornost", which means joined together in love and Christian purpose. It is a national trait of the Russian people. It constitutes resistance to the suppression of free expression, and refers less to the activities of Soviet political dissidents than to the persistence of Orthodox faith and eucharistic worship in tens of millions of ordinary citizens in the USSR.⁷⁵

⁷² Paul B. Anderson, Commentary on Donald Lowrie's Report of the Russian Division Office to the Central YMCA, 1929, Paul B. Anderson Papers, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Box 25: 32.

⁷³ Colton, Manuscript for Revised Forty Years with Russians 112.

⁷⁴ Metropolitan Eulogius, Letter to Paul B. Anderson, 18 December 1924, Paul B. Anderson Papers, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Box 6.

⁷⁵ Anderson, Commentary on Donald Lowrie's Report of the Russian Division Office to the Central YMCA 32.

It was this post-revolutionary movement that the YMCA Press enjoined.⁷⁶ With this transformation in 1923, and the complete closure of the Russian market, the YMCA at last resolved to focus its attention upon the emigration.

That year Paul Anderson also wrote W.W. Bantam in order to discuss his intentions for the press and to seek advice. He proposed that the new Russian Press in Berlin should continue to choose "subject matter, method of presentation and authorship...specifically related to market in Russia" despite the fact that this market was currently closed to YMCA operations and their offshoots. He also maintained that he would carefully monitor the actual value of any proposed publication of a book, and if it was not high enough at that current time, it should be held for later publication.

This means that we must give special study to the development and maintenance of that full content and literary style in order that manuscripts shelved for one or two years may not become antiquated.⁷⁷

Anderson's experience with the Russians stood him in good stead in his position. As director of the new Press, he was able to solicit advice from appropriate Russian advisors as to the particular literary expectations of the market.

Russian is a large language with great pride in her uniqueness. This refers especially to the richness of meaning in her phrases and words, which all the people are accustomed to and which is quite distinct from our practical, specific language of modern English writings.

⁷⁶ By 1929 Anderson was prepared to back such a movement fully even if it did nothing to assist the reentry of the YMCA into Soviet Russia. "I would say, then, that the fourth alternative for the YMCA is to align itself with this spiritual, intellectual and social unity and to let the YMCA PRESS serve as its instrument, becoming a part of the indigenous Russian striving for Christian community throughout the world." Anderson, Commentary on Donald Lowrie's Report of the Russian Division Office to the Central YMCA 33.

⁷⁷ Paul B. Anderson, Letter to W.W. Bantam, c.1924, Paul B. Anderson Papers, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Box 3.

If the Press was to appeal to the emigration market, and in future, hopefully, to the market within Russia, then translations of English works had to be of a superior quality and format. Finally, Anderson appraised Bantam of the attempts he and his colleagues at the Press were making to solicit writings from Russia despite the international complexities and dangers to personal security that this action might entail.⁷⁸

In 1924, the YMCA Press was finally organized and centralized in Berlin upon acceptable YMCA standards. The current problems were comparatively mundane, such as clearing up copyright violations when translating books from the New York Russian literature section into Russian for publication. These were solved by the temporary relocation of their two Russian specialists from New York to Berlin: Prof S.F. Baldin and N.P. Makarov: The first was an expert in technical literature, the second in agricultural and economical literature. The new editorial board was composed of Paul B. Anderson as General overseer with total responsibility, Professor A.S. Yashenko (for General Literature), Professor B.P. Vysheslavitsev (for Religious literature), Baldin and Makarov. By the end of 1924, the staff was reduced with Baldin's return to the United States. Makarov became Senior editor for all technical and scientific literature, and the other two remained in their old positions. Mr. Koshkin was then added to the staff - he was an instructor of the Correspondence school - helping with editorial work and proof reading. Other instructors were commandeered when necessary.⁷⁹

The new aims of the YMCA Press were clearly delineated: First, it would increase emphasis on religious publications because achievements of 1923 were gaining the

⁷⁸ Anderson, Letter to W.W. Bantam 2.

⁷⁹ Report of the YMCA Press Ltd - Russian Editorial Section, 1924, Paul B. Anderson Papers, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Box 3.

respect and recognition of Russian religious leaders in the emigration, and they were found to be increasingly prepared to collaborate. Second, it would give attention to the special book needs of the Association's educational work and Student Relief in Russia. Third, it would limit general production to six titles which sales have proved to be in demand and which serve to maintain a balance and, fourth, it intended to maintain the high quality of authorship, translation and appearance.⁸⁰ A certain success in this may be evinced by Metropolitan Platon's (the Head of the Russian Orthodox Archdiocese of America) personal endorsement of the Press.⁸¹

In 1924 one important addendum was made to the YMCA Press in Berlin: In addition to publishing any of his manuscripts, and to funding and assisting in the re-organization of his Religious-Philosophical Academy, the YMCA appointed Nikolai Berdyaev as Editor-in-Chief of the YMCA Press, returning Makarov to overseeing only technical literature. This enabled the YMCA to provide materially for the Berdyaev family in order that the philosopher could continue his work without undo hardship. It also brought one of the foremost critical and intellectual minds to their enterprise, and under Berdyaev's leadership they were able to maintain the high quality of religious literature throughout the interwar years.

⁸⁰ The religious works published in 1923 included a translation of the New testament (50,000 copies), Lowrie's The Light of Russia (2,000), Berdyaev's Dostoevsky (5,000), Stankevitch's, Mendelieieff, Rosenberg's, Novikoff. Those in press: Berdyaev et al. Symposium on Russia's Religious Problem, Frank Downfall of the Idols, Zenkovsky Prayer, Hoover, American Individualism. Report of the YMCA Press Ltd - Russian Editorial Section, 1924, Paul B. Anderson Papers, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Box 3: 5-6.

⁸¹ C.V. Hibbard, Letter to Metropolitan Platon thanking him for his endorsement of the YMCA Press, 24 March 1924, Paul B. Anderson Papers, University of Illinois at Urbana Champaign, Box 3.

Despite the successful reestablishment of the YMCA Press in Berlin from Prague, Anderson did not forget his financial supporters, nor did he let triumph go to his head and stop seeking advice. In 1924, he travelled back to the United States for a dinner at the Yale Club on May 1 to consult with the primary sponsors of the new Press. The dinner was hosted by Roger Williams, a leader of the YMCA, and included the Russian historian, Michael Karpovich.⁸² Anderson was assisted in his presentation by C.V. Hibbard who had undertaken the liquidation of the Prague Press and dealt with most of the Hecker fiasco.⁸³

At the dinner, there was general agreement that Americans could and should continue to be involved in producing literature for Russians either within or outside of the Soviet Union. However, beyond this, each guest had quite a different conception of how that involvement should be handled: Dr. Geoffrey Montgomery proposed an emphasis on pragmatic literature - books of utilitarian value such as poultry raising, boot making and text books, not books aimed at building or defining moral or religious character - which were intended "to show the goodwill of American Christians towards Russia even at a time when religious literature is restricted in production and distribution in Russia."⁸⁴ The one exception that he put forth, and which all present agreed with, was the continued publication and distribution of the Bible. Montgomery added this because, when he had

⁸² Other YMCA leaders included, Mr. K.A. Wilson, Mr. Irving Squire, Dr. Geoffrey Montgomery, Mr. H. M Lydenberg, Mr. E.C. Carter, Mr. W.J. Colby, Dr. H.B. Grose, Mr. Kirby Page, and Mr. Charles M. Roe.

⁸³ Memorandum of Discussion at Dinner Gathering Called by Mr. Roger Williams on the Production of Literature for Russia (New Haven, Conn.: Yale Club, 1 May 1924) Paul B. Anderson Papers, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Box 3: 1.

⁸⁴ Memorandum of Discussion at Dinner Gathering... 1.

visited Russia in the winter of 1923, he was unable to find the Bible or any other religious material available.

H.M. Lydenberg supported this from his own experience. He left Russia in January, 1924 and, shortly before his departure, he talked with Mr. Schmidt - head of the State Publishing House ("Gosizdat") - and was told that the Soviet Government had banned publication and distribution of the Bible except by private religious societies.⁸⁵ E.C. Carter was more interested in the state of philosophical and ethical studies and their publication in the country so Anderson relayed to him the information that he had received from those expelled in 1922: Such non-materialist or non-communist philosophical endeavors were not allowed to be published, and their proponents were forced to pursue other lines of inquiry, and often other employment entirely if they wished to survive. Therefore, if alternate philosophies were to be pursued in the Russian language, they would have to be produced by Russian émigrés who were specifically supported in such work and published abroad.⁸⁶

At this juncture, Lydenberg proposed a very practical option: The Society of Friends (Quakers) had a certain freedom of movement and import in Russia and could be used as the distributors of Russian books published abroad if done with sufficient care. The pragmatic members, Irving Squire and Montgomery, again asserted that this would be a prudent course of action. Rather than publishing religious works which the Soviets did not want, the YMCA should only produce utilitarian books, establish a market

⁸⁵ At this time the Quakers and other Protestant groups were having some success in distributing their Bibles and religious materials in Russia. For the Orthodox, this was disturbing as they had not the freedom or the funding to compete with these "foreigners".

⁸⁶ Memorandum of Discussion at Dinner Gathering... 1.

gradually, and then see if it was possible to slowly infiltrate more religious subjects within these.

It will be better to let them be without religious literature than to let such literature stand in the way of humanitarian service through non-religious books in Russia.⁸⁷

After all, the two men argued, there was a much larger market in Soviet Russia who could at least be served by non-religious books if such a policy was followed.

The underlying rationale for this idea came from the Secretaries' knowledge of the publishing difficulties which were being experienced by Soviet officials. Although they had tried to continue to publish and distribute books, economic barriers made the market less than stable. Books cost an average of 11 kopecks to produce under Soviet regime as compared to 4 kopecks during the time of Tsarist Russia. Thus on all levels - advertising, marketing, competition, and cheap production - the Soviets were very far behind either Americans or Europeans. Other options which were suggested were the establishment of a utilitarian publishing house in the USSR separate from the current YMCA Press in Berlin which would permit wider production and distribution of necessary texts as well as giving the Soviets the benefit of an American injection of funds.

The meeting then turned to a critique of the YMCA Press, and the guests began asking Anderson if he had truly incorporated the Soviet book concern in his present mandate at the Press. Knowing he would be put on the spot here, Anderson responded

⁸⁷ In discussing how to evade censorship and earn the trust of the Soviets the question as to whether humanitarian literature might not be prepared and published in Russia while continuing the production and distribution of literature outside of Russia, Anderson stated in this connection: "that the Association had not up to the present attempted to establish its publication enterprise in Russia, although on one occasion the Soviet Consul in Berlin and had discussed this matter with one of Mr. Anderson's Russian colleagues in the YMCA and had suggested the desirability of investing American capital in this manner in Russia. However, the Soviet law, he understands prohibits the operation of a publishing firm in Russia if it undertakes also to publish outside of Russia. This would not be an insurmountable difficulty, however, as an entirely new firm might be established in Russia in addition to the YMCA Press operating outside of Russia, or vice versa." Irving Squire, Memorandum of Discussion at Dinner Gathering... 2.

that he had been in constant contact with agents of Gosizdat in Berlin, had given them a copy of each new book, and was doing his best to enlist cordial communication. As yet, however, the Soviets had not made a single purchase of YMCA stocks. Dissatisfied with his response, Lydenberg suggested a new policy of direct communication with Gosizdat in Moscow rather than going through possibly unreliable or incompetent agents abroad. To this Anderson retorted that the ban had been instituted directly by the Soviet government; if the YMCA wanted to appeal the ban on its activities, they must get cooperation from the Politburo and the Foreign Commissariat, not from a relatively powerless bureaucracy like Gosizdat.⁸⁸

Unwilling or unable to understand the sheer obstinacy and political intransigence of the Bolsheviks, Roger Williams now asked if YMCA published books were free or almost free would they not then be allowed? He hoped that the pragmatic monetary concerns might override political considerations. This fell on deaf ears as the YMCA was not readily in favour of an endeavour which had no chance to be even self-supporting let alone profitable. Finally, the resolution was at last agreed upon that American materials would not likely be acceptable in Russia regardless of their tone or intent. This was verified when Anderson's personal opinion was solicited. Anderson had lived this dilemma two years ago when he first started working with the Press: he had supported utilitarian over religious as such works did sell in the USSR; however, within a year even these books were banned as the "Soviet authorities were not ignoring of the fact that the YMCA Press publishing utilitarian literature was Christian in its basis and purpose." Thus, Anderson felt fully justified in withdrawing his support for such propositions of sidestepping Soviet laws as they were impractical and would not work. Therefore, they

⁸⁸ Memorandum of Discussion at Dinner Gathering... 2.

might as well publish religious material which at least the émigrés wanted. And with regards to the possible future market in Russia it would have to be all or nothing: Even "if the [Bolshevik] Government recognized the ultimate purpose of the YMCA Press, the Press would be failing in its duty if it failed to produce the religious literature which the Soviet Government recognized as within the province of the Press."⁸⁹ By the end of the dinner, the group finally accepted this reality and gave Anderson full honour for his work and encouraged him to continue upon the lines he had already begun.

Such acceptance came not only from American, but also from Russian sources. In 1924 the famous Sociologist Pitirim Sorokin who was currently the only Russian to be assigned a full faculty position at an American University, appealed to Anderson for the Russian publication of his latest books.⁹⁰ In the following year, Anderson received personal commendation from the top Russian Church leaders in Western Europe - Metropolitans Eulogius and Anthony, and Bishop Benjamin - for the publishing program of the Press.⁹¹ After so many setbacks, the Press was finally a success.

The Russian Religious Philosophical Academy

The appointment of Berdyaev and Vysheslavtsev to the YMCA Press was a tremendous coup for Paul Anderson. However, his relations with the members of the expulsion of 1922 also involved the creation of a new type of school in Western Europe, and the direct sponsorship of Russian religious thought abroad. In the YMCA's

⁸⁹ Memorandum of Discussion at Dinner Gathering... 3.

⁹⁰ Pitirim Sorokin, letter to Paul B. Anderson, 18 August 1924, Paul B. Anderson Papers, University of Illinois at Urbana Champaign, Box 6.

⁹¹ Paul B. Anderson, Russian Service in Europe: Annual Report for the Year 1925, Paul B. Anderson Papers, University of Illinois at Urban Champaign, Box 6: 7.

perception, the Bolsheviks had decided to expel these individuals because,

Of liberal mind and Orthodox tradition they had been meeting some success in reclaiming the intelligentsia for the Church. Communist educational policy prescribes entering the mind of a nation thus ruled of all ideas and interpretation of facts that do not comport with dialectical materialism. It follows that exponents of opposing systems must be silenced by destruction or exile.⁹²

However, for the YMCA it was this very success which endeared them to this small elite.

As the ships carrying the expelled began to arrive in Germany they produced a certain flurry of excitement among the general emigration. Prokopovich and Kuskova were known personally, or at least by reputation, by almost all the émigré intelligentsia in Berlin. They were, alternately, loved, envied, hated and, by some, viewed with outright suspicion as potential Bolshevik spies. All, however, were curious to see them again in person. The Countess Tolstoya augmented the publicity surrounding the expulsion: No one in Berlin émigré society would dare to say that they had not read the great works of her father, Lev Tolstoy, and she was a celebrity in her own right for her many charitable endeavors. Lastly, the professors, philosophers, writers, and applied scientists had sterling reputations among the old Russian nobility and intelligentsia now in emigration. While many might dispute their ideas, all were proud of the way they had enhanced Russia's standing in the world. Therefore, when the *Preissen* first docked at Stettin in September 1922, and then the *Oberbürgermeister Hacken* in November, the émigré press reported every detail of their arrival in celebrity terms. Once cleared through the German immigration, they arrived in Berlin by train to be met by their fellow countrymen. Not a single one of the exiles was left destitute or homeless: Kerensky arranged for lodgings

⁹² Colton, Manuscript for Revised Forty Years with Russians 110.

for most of them; friends and relatives provided for the rest. The house of Frau Dehme on 31/32 Ranke-Strasse was divided into apartments in which many were placed.

After the initial flurry had died down, Paul Anderson, Edgar MacNaughton and the Russian workers at the Berlin Headquarters went out to encounter the members of the expulsion in order to offer the assistance of the YMCA. They wanted to learn about the latest conditions in Russia, and see what advice these exiles might give about the YMCA's plans for return to service in that country. More importantly, they wanted to meet this group which was considered by Russians, and by some of the more knowledgeable Europeans, to be the finest Christian thinkers in Russia. When Anderson learned that Berdyaev carried completed manuscripts with him which he had not been able to publish in Moscow, he immediately offered the services of his Press in Prague. He also came to the conclusion that there should be some means by which they and their colleagues could continue teaching and formulating their ideas in Europe. As Berdyaev had directed the Free Academy of Spiritual Culture in Moscow, he felt confident that he could erect a similar institution in Berlin, especially as so many of his former Moscow instructors had either already emigrated or been deported with him. Berdyaev was delighted by the plan, and the Russian Religious Philosophical Academy was born.⁹³

First, the YMCA secured a property in which general lectures and courses could be held, and before the end of that year the Academy opened its doors to prospective students. Its immediate popularity was reported by Anderson in glowing terms:

⁹³ Paul B. Anderson, Russian Division Report, 1922/23, Paul B. Anderson Papers, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Box 7.

The great intellectual and spiritual assets of Berdiaeff, Bulgakoff, Arsenieff, Frank and others had authoritative weight at once among the Emigration, and shortly throughout Orthodoxy and the Western religious philosophical world.⁹⁴

However, other than these gestures, the YMCA leadership was not prepared to commit to any comprehensive initiative until a little time had proved the worthiness of the Academy and of these exiled intellectuals. They had cause for their suspicions, for this group of religious thinkers was not viewed with universal adoration by the general emigration. Immediately upon the formation of the Russian Philosophical Academy, the YMCA received complaints from émigrés in America and from other Russian groups in Berlin. One of the most virulent was launched by the paper *Nakanunye*, a Russian-language periodical in Berlin. When its contentions reached the ears of Colton, he demanded an explanation from the Berlin Headquarters. The Swiss-born Association Secretary, new second-in-command to Anderson, Gustave Kullman duly responded:

...the *Nakanunye* is, if not Bolshevistic, a positivistic, socialistic newspaper with strong anti-religious orientation. It was to be expected from the start that they would fight religious thinkers expelled from Russia by the actual government. If progress means the attempt to erect a rational life and a rational society without a godly foundation, the philosophy of our professors in the Academy is certainly very much antiquated.⁹⁵

Kullman further defended the Academy professors as being the direct descendants in the line of intellectual evolution from Plotinus, Griganos, and Augustine to Dostoevsky and Soloviev. He described his understanding of the main tenets of their religious philosophy,⁹⁶ and then the success which the Academy had been enjoying. Courses

⁹⁴ As cited in Colton, Manuscript for Revised Forty Years with Russians 110.

⁹⁵ Gustave Kullman, letter to Ethan T. Colton, 15 February 1923, Paul B. Anderson Papers, University of Illinois at Urbana Champaign, Box 7: 1.

⁹⁶ His explanation: "Such a Christian philosophy by its inherent nature must be hostile toward some of the big streams of Western thought. It will attack all rationalistic cognition which narrows down the chance of finding truth to its being conceived by rational concepts. It will be hostile to

in religious thought taught by Berdyaev, Karsavin, Frank, and Vysheslavtsev were full and the general lectures they offered bi-monthly to the general public drew crowds as large as 300-400 people. For example, Kullman explained, "Prof. Berjaieff's presentation last Sunday of Formal Democracy and Socialism as a problem of our spiritual life had an attendance of 400 people. The discussion lasted two hours and was maintained on a very high level."⁹⁷

In concluding his defense of the Academy, Kullman suggested that the YMCA should not join the disclaimers, but should in fact try to strengthen their ties with these intellectuals.

It may be that the individual traits of this movement are typically Russian but I am glad that its foundation is certainly deeply Christian. So much that some of us in the Y.M.C.A. begin to realize how much these men have to give us.

Moreover, he reminded Colton that Russians in general (not only the Bolsheviks) tended to view the YMCA with a certain degree of suspicion. The Professors at the Academy and their colleagues were among the few who were interested in working closer with the Association, and who were broad-minded enough to see it as a potential ally and not a threat. Therefore he asserted,

The big task, however, seems to me to be to avail ourselves of that unique chance to get some of the most potential men of today's Russia to think in terms of the

French and British positivism which declares the study of outside nature the only source of knowledge....Instead of being full of the naturalistic optimism of the Nineteenth Century, self-complacent, self-admiring, self-satisfied, it believes that history is a dialectic process toward the Kingdom of God, not in a straight line but in theses, antitheses and syntheses. For them historic consciousness means the consciousness to be called to serve the Kingdom of God in creative work, creative work being for them the only way to bear witness to God's reality....Such a philosophy places quite naturally Christ in the central place. He is for those Russian thinkers the living revelation of godly life. He is the reintegration of all that man separated, isolated and destroyed. The significant thing about the Academy is that it is increasingly a movement and less and less a mere institution....a community of thinkers who are fully aware of the mission they have to fulfil as spiritual leaders of Russia." Kullman, letter to Colton, 15 February 1923 1-2.

⁹⁷ Kullman, letter to Colton, 15 February 1923 2.

Y.M.C.A. as an organization capable of showing to the Russian youth that expression spiritual life which Russia is lacking today.⁹⁸

In Kullman's opinion, the Academy could be the most helpful leverage point for expanding YMCA work among the emigration.

His strong support for the Academy was seconded a week later by Anderson, currently wrapping up the Press operations in Prague. On February 21, 1923, Anderson wrote a letter to Colton indicating the hopes he had for the newly expelled of 1922:

You know we have quite a body of the elite, particularly in philosophy and certain schools of economics. Berdaieff, Frank, Lossky and Karsavin lead the former, and men like Struve, Novgorodtseff and Prokvice [Prokopovich (my correction)] in the latter. Then there are Lapshin and Kisewetter in literature, Sorokin, the only Russian occupying a University chair of sociology, Stratonow, an astronomer, and many of lesser prominence. The group is weak in modern Education, though Professor Hessen, University of Tomsk, is writing on the subject. I am not mentioning men in applied sciences but only those concerned with cultural life where the Association is specially concerned...Another group headed by Zenkowsky and supported by Florovsky, Trubetskoy and others is publishing collections of papers sustaining the Russian Orthodox Church as the only true successor of St. Peter's labours...quite a number of these men, principally among those first mentioned, are under expulsion... On the whole, however, they represent a culture whose basis and expressions are unwelcome in Russia at present. There are some, and these are the men I want you to think about, who are still growing and seeking the light which European and American thought can throw on the problem of Russia. All of them want to "help Russia" and to return, but naturally, these growing men are probably the ones who will be most useful in the long run...On the whole, and as compared with Soviet Russia these men will be found not only receptive but grateful for any real advancement in thought that Americans can bring.⁹⁹

Personally, Anderson had already appointed Vysheslavitsev to a prominent position in the new YMCA Press which was soon to open in Berlin, and he prepared to disseminate the ideas of the Religious Philosophical Academy professors by publishing all their latest works including the famous compilation of their views on religion in Russia at that time.

⁹⁸ Kullman, letter to Colton, 15 February 1923 2-3.

⁹⁹ Paul B. Anderson, letter to Ethan T. Colton, 21 February 1923, Paul B. Anderson Papers, University of Illinois at Urbana Champaign, Box 20: 1-2.

Now, he asked the leaders of the International Section of the YMCA for their concerted support of this group.

On September 29, 1923, the YMCA stabilized its methods for funding and paying salaries of the Professors at the Russian Philosophical Academy. They decided to offer a monthly remuneration for work done and a certain maintenance allowance so that total payment would cover their living expenses. For Berdyaev and Frank, this meant in addition to their Academy salary of \$25/month they would receive living allowances of \$30/month. As the 1924 budget had not yet been confirmed, this held good only until December 31, 1923. The circular letter to the Professors of the Academy explained: "Our motive in doing so is to enable you to [live] in Berlin...We believe that in assuring you thus a stable economic basis we will make this last important and significant work easier for you."¹⁰⁰ The leaders of the International division had finally come through with some concrete aid: with this additional funding, Berdyaev, Frank, Karsavin and Vysheslavtsev were able to continue their writing and teaching without the need to seek alternate employment in order to survive.

This bore significant fruit: by the end of 1923 Berdyaev had completed A New Middle Ages, The End of the Renaissance, and Leontiev; his The Meaning of History and Dostoevsky were already being printed by the YMCA Press in Berlin.¹⁰¹ Clearly these

¹⁰⁰ Gustave Kullman, letters to Nikolai Berdyaev and Semen Frank, 29 September 1923, Paul B. Anderson Papers, University of Illinois at Urbana Champaign, Box 7.

¹⁰¹ In the first few years of the Press, the following books by Russian religious philosophers were published: Semen Frank, The Fall of Idols, The Spiritual Basis of Human Society and The Meaning of Life; Vladimir Soloviev, Spiritual Basis of Life; P.K. Ivanov, Humility in Christ; Vladimir Ilyin, The Riddle of Life and Origin of Living Elements; Nikolai Berdyaev, Dostoevsky's World View, K.Leontieff, Russian Thinker and Philosophy of the Free Spirit (2 vols.); Ivan Ilyin, Religious Meaning of Philosophy; Nikolai Lossky, The Kingdom of God as Foundation of Values, The Freedom of Will; Vasily Zenkovsky, Russian Thinkers and Europe; Boris Vysheslavtsev, The Heart in Christian and Russian Mysticism, Faith, Unbelief and Fanaticism and Christianity and the Social Problem; Sergei Bulgakov, Marx as a Religious Type as well as many other books on specifically

thinkers, if adequately provided for, would be prolific producers of an entirely new wave of religious-philosophical literature.

The Russian Student's Christian Movement (RSCM)

As revitalized Christianity became the talk of Russian Orthodox émigré circles throughout Europe due to its new publicity from the YMCA Press and from the Religious Philosophical Academy, it found its most interested audience not from officially organized groups be they clerically, politically, or YMCA driven, but among spontaneously arising collectivities of young émigrés. These small groups, often of not more than four or five people, began meeting all over Europe. They met at homes, at cafes, in the national schools, and in the few solely Russian institutions abroad. They came together not to discuss politics nor even the difficulties of their new situation in foreign lands, but to share remembrances and knowledge in order that some spiritual life oriented towards their unique Orthodoxy might still continue.

When they gathered, they prayed, read the Bible, discussed the tenets of their religion, and began reading the new Russian religious literature published by the YMCA Press or any reports about the latest public lectures from the Religious-Philosophical Academy. If they lived in or near Berlin, they began attending these lectures, and afterwards would share their impressions. Slowly their aims and aspirations solidified: They wanted to find ways to live a true Orthodox Christian life, to learn more about their own religion and its culture, and to transmit this knowledge to succeeding generations.

religious topics. Complete List of Publications of the Y.M.C.A. Press, c. 1927 Paul B. Anderson Papers, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Box 3: 1-2.

The greatest concentration of such groups occurred as local circles in the university populations in Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Germany, the Baltic States and France. As the YMCA Russian-division became aware of these spontaneously erupting groups, it began to provide organization and synthesis through financial assistance and the counselling of staff. It was hoped, by this expanding diversification through all centres where émigrés comprised a substantial number, that Christian values could be fostered and extended. Colton called it the "circulatory system" of "vital spiritual experiences and expressions."¹⁰² From these circles, the YMCA saw the greatest potential for the creation of an autonomous student Christian movement among the Russian emigration.

The YMCA was the first, but not the only organization to see the possibilities these groups represented. The Orthodox Church in Europe also found in the spontaneous arising of religious study circles fertile ground for lay action and the expansion of their flock. However, it also had the potential to threaten their own authority and the rigorous understanding of their basic tenets. If these groups kept meeting to discuss Orthodox religious issues without the direction of trained clerics, they might evolve frankly heretical interpretations of the meaning of Russian Orthodox Christianity, and eventually be lost to the Church entirely. This situation was complicated by disagreements between the clergy in emigration as to what their Church really stood for. Some believed that the edicts of Peter the Great were still vital and that the Church must continue to be subsumed under the final authority of the Tsar. Others followed the decision of the Great Sobor of 1917-1918 which had reformed the Church and reinstated the Patriarch as the final authority.

The former group was most nationalistic, and thus very suspicious of the role of the *American* and *Protestant* YMCA in the lives of Orthodox Russian émigrés. The latter

¹⁰² Colton, Manuscript for Revised Forty Years with Russians 110.

tended to welcome all organizational and financial assistance that such associations could bring, and they fully supported any influence the YMCA might have in synthesizing these disparate groups because it would enhance religious-philosophical unity. In 1923, a certain cohesion was effected as the YMCA, the Professors from the Religious-Philosophical Academy, and priests following the reformed Orthodox Church contacted as many of the groups as possible, and had them send delegates to the first international conference in Prerow, Czechoslovakia. There, the delegates and these organizers would decide upon a name for all their groups, their organizational and membership rules, and their first tentative plan for action.

The conference at Prerow began on October 1, 1923 and ended on October 8. It was held under the auspices of Dr. Mott's World Student's Christian Federation (WSCF), and entirely funded by this organization. The YMCA was well-represented at Prerow by Hollinger, Kullman and Lowrie; the WSCF sent Miss Rouse, and the YWCA sent Miss Rule.¹⁰³ However, all three organizations protested that they were there only to guide and counsel; all decisions must be made by the Russians, and especially the delegates themselves. The Church sent Bishop Benjamin, the personal assistant to Metropolitan Eulogius, and Father Sergei Bulgakov. There was even a link between the old Russian YMCA - *Mayak* - as former member, A.I. Nikitin, attended.¹⁰⁴ Of the sixty delegates,

¹⁰³ Ralph W. Hollinger, Report on the Student Conference: Russian Christian Circles in Western Europe, Prerov, Czechoslovakia, 1-7 October 1923, Geneva, 18 October 1923, Paul B. Anderson Papers, University of Illinois at Urbana Champaign, Box 3: 4.

¹⁰⁴ Gustave Kullman, Report on the First General Conference of the Russian Christian Student Movement, outside Russia, held in Prerow, Czechoslovakia, from October 1, to October 8, 1923, Berlin, October 1923, Paul B. Anderson Papers, University of Illinois at Urbana Champaign, Box 3: 1.

representatives came from Paris, Lille, Belgrade Zagreb, Berlin, Sofia, Dorpat, and Kishinev.

The results were in accordance with the YMCA's preference for autonomous, independent development matching national character.¹⁰⁵ First, the delegates unanimously sanctioned the Russian Orthodox Church as their highest and final authority. The fears of priests were, therefore, curbed as they were guaranteed a continued position of influence over all matters relating to religion. Second, they chose the name for their new organization. They called themselves the Russian Students Christian Movement; this was both a tribute and an expression of gratitude to their American friends who had made the conference possible. Third, and perhaps most importantly, the conference provided the first occasion in which the delegates could all see a general unity of mission. It brought together the spontaneously created groups to common work, and showed the continued strength of Orthodoxy and its original meaningful contribution to Christianity.¹⁰⁶ The final decision of the conference was to keep the RSCM Orthodox and not begin forming interconfessional groups: These, they feared, would diminish Church life in favour of the group's own life.

This was not that unusual an experience for the YMCA and its affiliates. They encouraged their autonomous branches to develop their own character which could

¹⁰⁵ "The conference was Russian throughout. None of the foreigners participated in the executive management of the convergence nor had a place on the regular program, although we did sit in the general committee and occasionally took part in the discussions." Ralph W. Hollinger, Report on the Student Conference: Russian Christian Circles in Western Europe, Prerov, Czechoslovakia, 1-7 October 1923, Geneva, 18 October 1923, Paul B. Anderson Papers, University of Illinois at Urbana Champaign, Box 3: 2-3.

¹⁰⁶ Gustave Kullman, Report on the First General Conference of the Russian Christian Student Movement, outside Russia, held in Prerov, Czechoslovakia, from October 1, to October 8, 1923, Berlin, October 1923, Paul B. Anderson Papers, University of Illinois at Urbana Champaign, Box 3: 2.

involve separations along sex, religious lines, age and occupation. The only rule of the YMCA was that racial discrimination was not acceptable (although it did occur), and when the groups did work in society they must serve all regardless of any considerations. For their own constituency, however, they had almost complete freedom to associate with whom they wished.

The final question put to the Russians by the YMCA before the end of the conference was what their continued role should be?

Several of us had a long conference one afternoon with Father Bulgakoff, to find out from him what the place of Protestant workers, such as ourselves, might be in relation to student Christian work among the Orthodox. He was most cordial in insisting that we should continue to assist in organization, in the promotion of Bible Study, (which he feels that Protestants have wisely emphasized more than has been customary among the Orthodox), in training leaders, or in furnishing financial support for such enterprises as the Russian Student Movement or an Orthodox theological seminary.¹⁰⁷

On the universal council, the delegates appointed Professor Vasily Zenkovsky as President, and Liperovsky as Secretary-Treasurer. Other members were Nikitin, Miss Brechet, Hollinger, and eight students from diverse centres. The newly constituted RSCM also indicated an eagerness to continue and expand their relations with the other organizations - the YWCA, YMCA and the WSCF - and appointed their representatives there to the Presidium. The first budget of the RSCM was 450 pounds sterling, most of which was donated by the WSCF.¹⁰⁸

In all, the RSCM was quite a unique organization compared to the more traditional YMCAs in America. One major discrepancy was seen in their definition of the term

¹⁰⁷ Ralph W. Hollinger, Report on the Student Conference: Russian Christian Circles in Western Europe, Prerov, Czechoslovakia, 1-7 October 1923, Geneva, 18 October 1923, Paul B. Anderson Papers, University of Illinois at Urbana Champaign, Box 3: 2.

¹⁰⁸ Hollinger, Report on the Student Conference 4.

"student". In the Russian perspective the "student" was ageless and, hence, although the movement concentrated on providing some spiritual education to youth, its participants derived from any age group and was by no means exclusive to the young. The Russians also did not believe in the segregation of the sexes. Thus, there was no female and male RSCM as the YMCA, YWCA was divided. The RSCM was a fully co-educational, all-ages organization with distinction made only at the youngest levels with boys and girls camps in order to facilitate organization and family acceptance.¹⁰⁹

The RSCM gave impetus to the Press endeavour as it brought together so many young minds eager for readings about the Russian religious heritage and their spiritual traditions. Accordingly, the Press increasingly began to publish religious educational materials and books, "for the youth-element there as elsewhere that tended most to break away from family and Church discipline."¹¹⁰ The importance of emphasizing the Christian aspect of the newly formed RSCM grew as exponentially as the movement itself. The formal organization seemed to have inspired phenomenal growth as the original members found new purpose and unity to their work:

The Student Movement has probably been most prolific of spiritual results. The number of groups in Czechoslovakia increased to eleven, largely led by students themselves; in Jugoslavia, with no paid leader whatever, the first group attained a membership of over sixty, and stimulated the formation of several others; in Berlin and Paris the number of groups and members has continued to increase. Not only have young men been brought into richer spiritual life through study and

¹⁰⁹ "Finally, visualize program and activities appropriate to the spread in years, all intensively religious yet reaching out into the social service field without any theoretical limits. The program is what fully unified Student and City YM and YWCAs would be here without physical furnishings. In short, the non-equipment type serving both sexes jointly." Colton, Manuscript for Revised Forty Years with Russians 111.

¹¹⁰ Report on the YMCA Press Ltd - Russian Editorial Section 1921-23. Paul B. Anderson Papers, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Box 3: 2.

fellowship in these groups, but several have been led to undertake Christian callings, the ministry and service in the Christian Association.¹¹¹

Participants flocked to each circle gradually forcing the formation of national centres of the RSCM in Czechoslovakia, Germany, the three Baltic States, Bulgaria, England and France.

With their new ties with the International Students Movement, the RSCM began sending one or two delegates to each conference of National YMCAs; even in the first year of their existence, they managed to send two Russians to the Second World Conference for Boys work of the YMCA at Pörschach, Austria, in August 1923. In an article in the Austrian magazine *Neuwerk* Bob Jansen affirmed the Russians contribution:

The attitude which I have just tried to describe, namely, that all the consequences of political and social events of this world have their ultimate cause in the sinfulness - God-alooofness - dominant in humanity, I found myself sharing with very, very few men in the conference and yet...This experience I shared with 2 Russians, and this very close fellowship with them seems to me especially important and full of significance for the future.¹¹²

In other words, Russians were more susceptible than others to accept some blame in past events because they believed in "suffering" and in "sinfulness" of mankind; in fact, a prevalent view among the emigration was that their current dispossessed situation and the Bolshevik Revolution was the result of their own sins before Christ.

In 1924, the RSCM continued its vigorous growth. After the two preliminary conferences of 1923 which established the ground-rules for the movement, it held a third assembly in Falkenberg, Germany between June 6 and 12, 1924. Organized by a

¹¹¹ Paul B. Anderson, Russian Service in Europe: Annual Report for the Year 1925, Paul B. Anderson Papers, University of Illinois at Urban Champaign, Box 6: 8.

¹¹² Bob Jansen, The Second World Conference for Boys' Work of the Y.M.C.A. at Pörschach AM SEE, Austria, August 1923, Paul B. Anderson Papers, University of Illinois at Urbana Champaign, Box 6: 5.

committee of four students, four Professors (3 from the Religious-Philosophical Academy), and two YMCA Secretaries, the conference brought together 44 delegates (18 women and 26 men) from Hanover, Prague, Paris, and Sofia.¹¹³ Although it did not include delegates from each European RSCM, Falkenberg was a turning-point in the life and purpose of the movement.

The chosen theme was "Orthodox Life Comprehension," and for the first time the Religious-Philosophical Academy took a substantial role in the proceedings. Their contribution was both educational and inspirational. They injected a new premise to the entire work of the RSCM, namely that it should further Russian religious thought actively and openly. The meetings were divided into three sections: liturgical, with professors, and student-only meetings.¹¹⁴ Church services and prayers were officiated by Bishop Benjamin who was now declared first Prelate of the RSCM. He headed the liturgical gatherings, while the Professors Frank, Berdyaev, Karsavin and Zenkovsky lectured at the educational meetings. Each day, after these formal events were concluded, the students withdrew into general or small group meetings to discuss their own affairs and their impressions of what they had been told that day. The emphasis in lectures and services was *sobornost'*. The students heard for the first time a direct call to organize, work, prepare, and become more spiritually-guided for an eventual return to Russia. At both the lectures and the liturgical meetings the message was the same; the world was now

¹¹³ F.T. Pianoff, Report of the Russian Student Conference at Falkenberg, Germany from June 6-12, 1924, Paul B. Anderson Papers, University of Illinois at Urbana Champaign, Box 7.

¹¹⁴ Pianoff, Report of the Russian Student Conference at Falkenberg 2.

divided into two camps, Christian and anti-Christian, and while they were each free to choose their own course, they must live with that choice.¹¹⁵

The YMCA was especially honoured at that conference. The RSCM obtained an ikonostasy from Berlin Orthodox Church which was presented to the YMCA representatives as a gift of gratitude for their role in establishing the Orthodox Church at Falkenberg. Later, the students organized and decorated the Church so that it could be used for services during the conference.

The central liaison between the RSCM and the YMCA at Falkenberg was Pianoff, a Secretary at the Berlin Headquarters and a leader of the RSCM in Berlin. He characterized the gathering as such:

I cannot express in words the spirit of the conference which developed in the spirit of singularity and brotherly love. In reality it was a monastical mood of life. The heart of it was church services and prayers. The atmosphere was very light, joyful and free....In the evening of that day Vesper was officiated...It is impossible for me to frame this night in words. Here in the dark corner, Professors, students, men and girls prayed, kneeling before ikons, tears falling from their eyes.¹¹⁶

The spirit of cooperation allowed for three important decisions to be made. First, and most directionally important, the RSCM committed itself to fostering the spirit of *sobornost'* and preparing themselves for leading the eventual restoration of such Christian principles in Russia. Second, they agreed to unite the Berlin Movement by an elected committee and monthly meetings. With such coordination, the YMCA could operate more effectively among them, and truly serve their extant needs. Third, they decided to establish annual summer conferences in Czechoslovakia for all Russian students in order that they might

¹¹⁵ Pianoff, Report of the Russian Student Conference at Falkenberg 3.

¹¹⁶ This was noted by Pianoff in the section of the report where he expresses his personal reflections on the conference. See Pianoff, "Spirit of the Conference," Report of the Russian Student Conference at Falkenberg 4-5.

rest from their studies and flourish in the pure countryside atmosphere. There they would engage in strenuous physical activity, with only periodic mental exercises provided by Bible classes and religious meetings.¹¹⁷

This last resolution was so enthusiastically endorsed that the RSCM managed to establish the rest-camp that same summer at Moravska Trebova, a six hour ride from Prague. With forty students and ten professors, "The aim of the conference was the call to faith, the strengthening of faith among students, the summing up of the former work and making plans for the future".¹¹⁸ The motto chosen at Morasvski Trebova, however, was rather ominous: "he that is not with me is against me; and he that gathereth not with me scattereth" (Matthew 12:30).¹¹⁹ At this camp, the Religious-Philosophical Academy was noticeably absent as Zenkovsky (who proposed the motto) and the local émigré Professors from Prague jealously reasserted their influence over the students. Professor J.J.Lappo gave a lecture on "Missionary service as a moving force in the history of the Orthodox Church". Quite opposed to the Falkenberg message of unity and cooperation with other Christian denominations in the spirit of *sobornost'* Lappo used his speech to demonstrate the superiority of the Orthodox to the Roman Catholic Church, "...calling attention to the fact that the Orthodox Church had always peaceful means of promoting Christianity."¹²⁰ A note of tolerance and acceptance was given, however, by Father Sergei Bulgakov who, as a practising priest and Professor at Prague, was reluctantly

¹¹⁷ Donald Lowrie, Report of Russian Student Department Prague, July-August 1924, Paul B. Anderson Papers, University of Illinois at Urbana Champaign, Box 8: 1.

¹¹⁸ Lowrie, Report of Russian Student Department Prague 4.

¹¹⁹ Lowrie, Report of Russian Student Department Prague 1.

¹²⁰ Lowrie, Report of Russian Student Department Prague 2.

invited to the camp by Zenkovsky. His talks were much less defensive or militaristic, but still carried a vein which could be interpreted as a call to arms. His "address was calling the people to use the spiritual power given to them by Christ to transform the present life."¹²¹

The Move From Berlin to Paris

In 1924 a traumatic upheaval affected the YMCA Russian division. The continuing lack of stability in the German economy - massive inflation which caused the Deutsch Mark to become almost worthless - was putting an unbearable strain upon the already minimal resources of the Russian emigration. In such conditions, the émigrés (whose numbers in Germany may have exceeded 500,000¹²²), began a massive exodus from the country. The YMCA was less affected by the inflation crisis thanks to their reliance on the stable American currency. Nevertheless, the cost of operating the Press became prohibitive, and their employees were finding it difficult to cope. Moreover, they were rapidly losing the market, the Russian emigration, which they had sworn to serve. On April 23, 1924, Colton forwarded official orders to Anderson to prepare for the movement of the Berlin Headquarters out of Germany. The leaders of the International Committee of the YMCA had decided that it would be safer and more profitable if they moved all their operations to more stable countries.¹²³ Colton relayed their decision, for the time being, that the Headquarters would be moved to Geneva where Mott was situated with the

¹²¹ Lowrie, Report of Russian Student Department Prague 2.

¹²² Sir John Hope, The Refugee Problem: Report of a Survey (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1939) 82.

¹²³ Ethan T. Colton, letter to Paul B. Anderson, 23 April 1924, Paul B. Anderson Papers, University of Illinois at Urbana Champaign, Box 6.

control centre of the WSCF, and the other enterprises - the Press, the Correspondence School, the Technical College, and perhaps the Religious-Philosophical Academy - would be relocated to Paris.

Such an undertaking promised to be extremely complex. It required a large unexpected expenditure, tremendous organization and, most of all, delicate handling of the personnel. Obviously not all Russians associated with or employed by the YMCA Russian Headquarters would want to uproot their families so soon after they had settled in Germany. Those who were prepared to stay with the organization would have to find new lodgings in Paris, get to know completely different laws and way of life, and in most cases learn a new language. The YMCA itself, would have to start from the beginning in making contacts among the emigration already settled in France in order that they could continue and expand their work.

Fortunately, much of the groundwork had already been laid by Anderson who had made an extensive field-trip to France in December 1923, perhaps in preparation for exactly this eventuality, but stipulatively to discover the situation of Russian émigrés in that country.¹²⁴ In his report, he noted that France was fast becoming the new centre of the Russian emigration largely because of that country's involvement in and sympathy with White intervention in Soviet Russia. Moreover, of all countries in Europe, more Russians had longstanding connections with the French, and many of the aristocracy owned property there. Once they had to flee Russia, France became a natural retreat where they could create their new homes. Upon contacting the central organization for Russian émigrés in Paris, *Zemgor*, and the French Ministry of Labour, Anderson discovered that

¹²⁴ Paul B. Anderson, Report of Russians Immigrants Living in France, 16-24 December 1923, Paul B. Anderson Papers, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Box 3.

Russians were arriving from Poland, Germany, the Balkans and North Africa, and that some 30,000 male young Russians had obtained jobs in French factories in the last 8 months. In each French industrial region, more than 10,000 Russians were employed in factories, but only 500 Russian students were registered at various institutes of higher learning. The *Zemgor* produced evidence that more than 63,000 Russians were living in the Departement de la Seine (Paris) alone.¹²⁵ From this trip, Anderson was able to determine the basic composition of the emigration: most were young men between 20-35 years of age; most fought in World War One and/or with the White armies. Regarding education, they ranged from those who did not finish high-school to those just beginning their university degrees. The vast majority, however, had completed elementary education. Those most likely to find work had some technical training, not just intellectual or military experience. The greatest problems facing the émigrés in France were language difficulties and laws protecting the French labour force.

Of particular interest for Anderson on his scouting trip to France was the condition of students and education for the Russian emigration. This, after all, was his major preoccupation in Germany and the major aim of the YMCA world wide. In Paris, he found only one organization specifically devoted to the problem of students: The Comité de Patronage pour les universitaires russes under the direction of Michel Fedorov. It received 800,000F aid from the government in 1923: 300,000F paid the salaries of Russian professors lecturing at the Slavic Institute of the Sorbonne; 500,000F paid

¹²⁵ Outside Paris, most Russians were collected around big industrial plants: in Montargis, 600 Russians were working for the Hutchinson Rubber Works; in Maldeville (Calvados, Normandy), 5-6,000 Russians worked for Creuzot Steel; Decazeville (Lyons) had 4-500 Russians in their metal works and mines; Montebord listed a few hundred at the chemical factories in Rohan; in Roubaix-Lille-Tourcoing, there were more than 400 Russians in metal and textile plants. Anderson, Report of Russians Immigrants Living in France, 16-24 December 1923 4.

stipends and tuition fees of Russian students. In addition to this the Catholic Church in France was providing stipends to some 50 Russians.¹²⁶ However these were comparatively small sums: the 150-300F/ month did not cover all their costs, and these students had to find part-time work on the side or other private means in order to survive. There was a hostel which housed 50 students at a cheaper rent of only 275 F/month including food, but these were basic necessities with no organized activities, sports, or meetings.¹²⁷ The only student morale initiative was being directed by the Abbé Questnay who was assigned by the Vatican to conduct missionary work among the Russians. Not only was this a tiny endeavour - 20-25 Russian students met in the club room at rue Tournefort 2-4 times a month - but also his Société pour l'étude et affermissement de la culture slave was specifically proselytizing the Catholic faith to Orthodox believers. With the YMCA's stated commitment to respect alternate denominations and religions, it could clearly offer a more acceptable alternative.¹²⁸

The only institution at this time that was specifically devoted to the preservation and maintenance of the Russian culture was the Institute d'etudes Slavs founded by the French professor from the Université de Paris, Ernest Denis, in 1919, and funded by the governments of France, Czechoslovakia, Poland, and Yugoslavia.¹²⁹ Therefore, there was also room for a specifically Russian study centre, especially one conducted upon

¹²⁶ Anderson, Report of Russians Immigrants Living in France, 16-24 December 1923 6.

¹²⁷ Paul B. Anderson, Report of Russians Immigrants Living in France, 16-24 December 1923, Paul B. Anderson Papers, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Box 3.

¹²⁸ Anderson, Report of Russians Immigrants Living in France, 16-24 December 1923 6-10.

¹²⁹ By the 1930s, a Préfecture de Police report indicated that the institute included at least a dozen active members: G. Aucouterier, A Y Monin (Marcel), J. Asai, Bonachevitch, Beaulieu, Belloy, Bernard, Berne-Legard, Boissier, Collège Franciscain de Sinj, Jean Dayré, and perhaps most notably Etienne Gilson. see "Institut slaves, Université de Paris," Préfecture de Police, Paris, Carton # 1710.

Orthodox religious lines. Although it was never explicitly stated in the YMCA communications, Anderson's report probably influenced the leadership's decision to move their Russian operations to Paris. He had provided evidence that activities such as they had organized in Germany, Czechoslovakia, and Bulgaria, especially, were both needed and desired among the emigration in France.

As Anderson prepared for the move from Berlin, having already secured temporary lodgings at 9 rue Dupreyten in Paris, a major conflict arose regarding the Religious-Philosophical Academy. Some of the more practical-minded Secretaries, such as MacNaughton and Colton, felt that financial restraints could be eased if the YMCA ceased funding the Academy. It could remain in Berlin and survive as best as it was able. Then they would have ample funds for the move, and perhaps even additional monies which could extend the functions of the Correspondence and Technical schools. Even before the official decision reached Anderson about the move, such rumours abounded in the YMCA Berlin Headquarters and quickly reached the ears of the Russians employed there. As strong supporters of the Academy's mandate, they were outraged by this hint of betrayal, and began making personal protests to the Secretaries in Berlin, and even to the higher leadership of the International division. Pianoff, undertook to write a direct letter to Colton on April 9, 1924 defending the Academy and urging the YMCA not to withdraw its support. In his letter he gave not only a rousing endorsement for the Academy, but also a brief lesson in Russian history:

In order to define the spiritual state of the present generation, I am obliged to mention an irreligious movement of the past, existing in Russia which has a great influence upon the consequence which Russia survives now. Long ago, through very complicated causes, the intellectual class of Russia strived for revolutionary ideas, aiming at social reconstruction. These ideas have been based on rationalistic irreligious motives...After 1905 a small group of intellectuals came to the realization that this irreligious movement could not reorganize life without a religious justification. They perceived that otherwise the consequence to Russia

would be tragical. Among those men were a few Professors of the Academy. In 1917 all the said ideas came to consummation....The present generation was very slightly attached to the said movement. Young men of this generation had spent their early years in the trenches of the World War and Civil Wars. Their spiritual treasury was indeed empty, for the atmosphere in which they were educated was irreligious. When we came in contact with a number of young men in Berlin, we found that their very inner consciousness was in a state of demoralization. No question, there were individual souls who painfully sought the truth of their fate, who through great difficulties finally returned to God. All the rest remained in a static position, trying to fill up life with cheap trifles, insignificant, and external things.¹³⁰

The program of the Academy, Pianoff asserted, reached these disillusioned and threatened young people as no other organization could. It provided a systematic course of fundamental principals of Christianity, and a study of life and past thoughts from a Christian point of view. It reached masses of students through regular lectures at student centres in Berlin and in the provinces with the goal of awakening spiritual understanding. It called not only to students but to the general émigré population by its open meetings in Berlin held every two weeks for the entire Russian colony; these meetings included discussions and sometimes a lecture from representatives of other confessions. It was helping the reformed Orthodox Church under Metropolitan Eulogius by increasing awareness of the Church transformation which had occurred in the Great Synod of 1917/18. Finally, the Professors from the Academy gave above and beyond the call of duty to the RSCM with at-homes, discussions, and participating in conferences.¹³¹

In Pianoff's opinion, the success of these efforts could not be measured in any material terms:

¹³⁰ F.T. Pianoff, letter to Ethan T. Colton, Berlin, 9 April 1924, Paul B. Anderson Papers, University of Illinois at Urbana Champaign, Box 6: 1-2.

¹³¹ Pianoff, letter to Colton, Berlin, 9 April 1924 2-4.

The result of such work gave a tremendous awakening among the students who, in the past, very often did not see any justification in life...At the present time these young men and women gather around the Academy in groups for spiritual communion. These groups are based not on a light sentiment, but on concrete faith which was obtained by the individuals through the great sufferings and inner struggles.

Not only had it helped an immeasurable number of émigré students, but also, Pianoff argued, it had revitalized the Russian colony and was gradually counteracting their isolationism, xenophobia, and political disunity.

...the Academy has given a noticeable influence upon the social life of the Russian colony and many changed attitudes towards Russia. Before the activities of the Academy, the Berlin colony had political lectures which often fostered hatred. Since the Academy started its work political lectures have almost disappeared and often the members of the Academy in public speeches strongly emphasize the destructiveness in politicism.¹³²

In the final segment of his argument, Pianoff told Colton that the Academy, of all YMCA endeavors, had established the greatest international reputation: "The Academy is well known not only among Russians, but Germans, Italians and French religious thinkers..." Moreover, it was the one Russian organization which completely shunned any form of protectionism. While most Russian émigrés felt threatened by other confessions, religions, and nationalities, the Professors of the Academy actively sought out diverse contacts which might expand their own experience. "It was noticeable by all that the Academy never expressed a narrow attitude towards other confessions. It was always the tendency of bring an understanding between all confessions for spiritual communion." And last, but not least, the Academy was not only helping to keep Russian émigrés true to their Orthodox faith, it was bringing non-believers back to God.

It was not seldom that Archimandrite Tikhon remarked that since the Academy came into existence, the members of the church had increased greatly...In

¹³² Pianoff, letter to Colton, Berlin, 9 April 1924 3.

conclusion I may state that at this time when everywhere unheard of evil is prevailing, blindness and weakness, rooted to all forms of our life, the great sacrifice and spiritual power is required from each man...There is no place now for placidity and naivety in Christianity....The Academy...was the spiritual centre for living activities among the students and the Russian colony.¹³³

As far as Pianoff was concerned, the Religious-Philosophical Academy was the YMCA's best chance for furthering the cause of Christianity against the rising tide of atheism and ideology. It would abandon the institution only at the cost of losing any true influence over the emigration.

Pianoff and other individuals who contacted the YMCA leadership were swiftly given patronage by Dr. Mott. At the end of April, he came to Berlin to engage in a long conversation with Anderson's replacement, Bryant Ryall. As a result of this discussion, Ryall sent an urgent letter on May 3, 1924 to Anderson in order to prepare him for the new "edict from on high" that would be in effect upon his return to Berlin. Regarding the activity of the Press upon its relocation to Paris, Ryall informed Anderson that, "it is perfectly clear that neither Dr. Mott or Colton will consider for one moment anything other than Religious and Associational literature."¹³⁴ While this probably came as no surprise to Anderson, and was in accordance with his own beliefs, Ryall also offered more dramatic news about the fate of the Religious-Philosophical Academy:

I think it well to throw out this warning to you. He [Dr. Mott] said very positively last night just before I left him that he would far sooner see the Correspondence School closed rather than have the activities of the Religious Philosophical Academy cut off in any way.

Dr. Mott not only defended the Academy from the practical set, he even insisted that the scope of its operations should be expanded in Paris:

¹³³ Pianoff, letter to Colton, Berlin, 9 April 1924, 3-4.

¹³⁴ B.R. Ryall, letter to Paul B. Anderson, 3 May 1924, Paul B. Anderson Papers, University of Illinois at Urbana Champaign, Box 6: 1.

Dr. Mott again took the initiative in very strongly urging the need of a Journal of some kind which can serve as a source of spiritual inspiration to the scattered groups of Russians all over the world and also a source of communication and exchange. [He even agreed to the possibility of subsidizing such an endeavour.] Dr. Mott and the rest of us do not have in mind making this a specifically Association magazine, rather a general Religious magazine which could indirectly, of course, serve in spreading the knowledge of the Association.¹³⁵

Thus the Academy was to be saved. If the financial pressures of the move proved to be beyond the capability of the Headquarters budget, Anderson would have to cut other programs. Dr. Mott, however, also indicated that he would personally seek as much financial support as possible for the Russian work. The YMCA Secretaries should therefore think in terms of expansion, not reduction in their program.

The actual move was a feat of tremendous accomplishment for Anderson. It was also an extremely trying experience. In his annual report for 1924 he explained the intricacies which had been involved. First he had to move the Correspondence School from Berlin to Paris in advance of the general Headquarters and other operations. This was necessary to insure that ongoing courses did not suffer any loss of communication, and it provided the opportunity for a "complete reorganization of administration and finances, leaving the school now on a firm and known basis in both respects."¹³⁶ In Paris the Correspondence School and the on-site Technical School were brought together and incorporated under the name of the "Russian Superior Technical Institute"; this was soon given diploma-granting status by the French Ministry of Education. The move caused a certain drop in registration in 1925 from 476 down to 423 students, but more courses were bought: 1420 as compared to 930 in 1924. The total cost of operation had

¹³⁵ Ryall, letter to Anderson, 3 May 1924 1-2.

¹³⁶ Paul B. Anderson, Russian Service in Europe: Annual Report, June, 1924 - June, 1925, Paul B. Anderson Papers, University of Illinois at Urbana Champaign, Box 5: 7.

been brought down from \$13,052.03 to \$10,837.09 mainly by a reduction in salaries and the cost of preparation of lectures.¹³⁷

The moving of the Press was an even more complex endeavour. All ties to Prague had not yet been severed as the original corporation for the YMCA Press, the Y.M.C.A. Press Ltd., was still in existence. They had not dissolved the corporation because German commercial law allowed for a business to be operated in that country even though the parent corporation existed in another. Rather than bearing the cost of starting a new German corporation, they had simply worked under the auspices of the one in Prague. Now they were moving every program out of Central Europe and as the French law was significantly more protectionist, it was necessary and expedient to close down the Prague corporation and open a new one in France. In December, 1924 after the papers had been submitted to form the new French corporation, the one in Prague was placed on a liquidation basis. This also gave Anderson the opportunity of divesting the business of all of its remaining stock geared for practical and utilitarian purposes by secret channels to the U.S.S.R.; "the program and policy of the present Russian publication service (Y.M.C.A. PRESS) [Paris] has been defined as religious and character building service, along the line of which new books have been successfully produced and marketed."¹³⁸ The new Press was established in Paris with Anderson as director, Vysheslavtsev as assistant editor, and Nikolai Berdyaev as Editor-in-Chief.

Berdyaev moved quite happily to Paris as this gave him the chance to continue, what he considered, fruitful work within the auspices of the YMCA. The Association put

¹³⁷ Anderson, Russian Service in Europe, Paul B. Anderson Papers, University of Illinois at Urbana Champaign, Box 6: 13.

¹³⁸ Paul B. Anderson, Russian Service in Europe: Annual Report, June, 1924 - June, 1925, Paul B. Anderson Papers, University of Illinois at Urbana Champaign, Box 5: 7.

him and his family briefly in a local hotel in the city, but he soon moved to more cordial surroundings as a guest with his friends the Prince and Princess Trubetskoy in the Paris suburb of Clamart. By the end of the year, he had sufficient means to rent a small house on 14 avenue Marechal de Grandschamps there in Clamart. Together with Vysheslavitsev, he transferred the Religious-Philosophical Academy to Paris. However, they did not sever their old ties, and the Academy continued to function in Berlin, led now by Semen Frank. Karsavin joined them in Paris and continued his teaching activities. Other religious thinkers who had been settled in Eastern Europe were attracted to Paris by the move of the Academy, and by the end of the year Georges Florovsky, Georges Fedotov and Vasily Zenkovsky had joined the staff.

The RSCM also moved its central office to Paris in 1924. The Secretary-Treasurer Liperovsky headed the move with the support of Pianov. Once Zenkovsky had migrated to Paris from Prague by the end of the year, the central presidium was again united and complete. Initially it was established at the YMCA Press office on Rue Dupryten, but soon moved to more spacious accommodations at 10 Blvd Montparnasse where a forty room building housed the RSCM, its press *Vestnik* (the Messenger), the Boys and Girls Club, and the YMCA Press.¹³⁹ In the open basement refectory a low-cost meal service was provided. Religious education classes were taught in any available rooms twice every week. In the attic rooms, some of the very poor Russian émigrés found temporary lodgings; they even had a grammar school for the youngest children. In the summer, the young were herded out of doors and out of the city to summer camps at locations

¹³⁹ Colton, Manuscript for Revised Forty Years with Russians 111.

provided at minimal cost to the organization by charitable benefactors. Nearby in a garage, a new parish was established so regular religious services could be offered.¹⁴⁰

For Anderson, the entire move was a period of trial "among the most difficult I have ever lived through."¹⁴¹ He found heading the entire job of the Russian division too big for him alone, even with Kullman's help, and issued a call for assistance in that annual report:

Having no Russian on the staff to assign this work, it fell to me personally to prepare advertising, distribution lists, and conduct negotiations with book stores in various European countries. The result was that I gained a better knowledge of how this work should be done, but also a conviction that it could not be done by me alone so advantageously as by a Russian if put on the staff for this purpose. Book sales can be made only by real effort, and effort requires the time and attention of some individual more free than myself.¹⁴²

The central administration of the YMCA, however, was not willing to lend any more money or personnel to the trouble-fraught Russian division, and Anderson was left alone to cope with Kullman and MacNaughton and the two Russian editors. As a result, Vysheslavtsev was increasingly forced into marketing, recruiting literature, and sales, leaving Berdyaev in almost sole control of editorial decisions. Anderson coordinated all the various activities of the Russian division with Kullman acting as special liaison for religious matters and MacNaughton maintaining the financial sector. Out of sheer necessity, the American staff began to rely more and more on those Russians who might have little experience, but at

¹⁴⁰ "The Circles, seminars and conferences, conducted on the generally Western pattern by lay people, represented new forms to Orthodoxy. Early aloofness by a certain clerical element slowly gave way to collaboration. The Annual Conference of all the Circles functioned democratically." Colton, Manuscript for Revised Forty Years with Russians 111.

¹⁴¹ Paul B. Anderson, Russian Service in Europe: Annual Report, June, 1924 - June, 1925, Paul B. Anderson Papers, University of Illinois at Urbana Champaign, Box 5: 9.

¹⁴² Anderson, Russian Service in Europe: Annual Report, June, 1924 - June, 1925 9.

least exhibited great will; step by step, the emigration was being forced to become self-reliant and autonomous.

St. Sergius Theological Institute

The new responsibilities which were thrust upon the emigration with the move to Paris had, ironically, a positive effect upon their morale and self-confidence. Forced to make their own decisions about the development of programs for the émigré community with minimal YMCA direction, they began to do so with a vengeance often taking their American sponsors by surprise. In no case was this more obvious than in that of the new Theological Academy.

The concept was not a new one for either the émigrés or the YMCA. As early as 1918 when the YMCA was still functioning legally in Russia, Father Paul Florensky, acting as representative for all Church leaders who adhered to the authority of Patriarch Tikhon, proposed a joint initiative between the Orthodox Church and the YMCA to start a new theological academy in Moscow. The intent was to have a school which would accept both Russians and foreigners alike, and people of any Christian confession for the purpose of promoting "understanding, solidarity and cooperation between the Communion concerned, and particularly to share with Russian Christians the problems and values of modern learning in the experience of Western Christianity."¹⁴³

Plans for the undertaking were abruptly abandoned when the Bolshevik Cheka began rounding up the Y men in Russia for deportation that year. However, they were not forgotten. In February, 1924 Hibbard of the Berlin Headquarters finally completed the

¹⁴³ C.V. Hibbard, "Outline of a Plan in the Direction of Establishing a Theological Academy in Moscow under the Patronage of the Western Churches," 4 February 1924, Hibbard Overseas File, Paul B. Anderson Papers, University of Illinois at Urbana Champaign, Box 6: 1.

blueprint for a new interconfessional, Orthodox-run theological academy.¹⁴⁴ All that remained to be done was to reach a decision on where the school should be located. The YMCA was still strongly in favour of making the school in Russia, but Bolshevik repressions of the Orthodox Church and their closure of most theological academies in Russia made this suggestion less than practical. Moreover, the Association, as yet, had had no success in obtaining permission to return to that country.

It was at this point that the emigration itself stepped into the proceedings and began to force through their own agenda. In a plea spearheaded by the Orthodox Church in the West under Metropolitan Eulogius and seconded by the RSCM, they asked the YMCA to help them establish a theological academy outside of Russia. Their arguments were persuasive. Demographically, the Orthodox priesthood in the emigration was undermanned and swiftly facing extinction with over 50% of clergy aged more than fifty years and only 5% in their twenties;¹⁴⁵ the rapid growth of the RSCM demanded both more ecclesiastical service and the opportunity for those who felt a calling to receive advanced theological training. At their three conferences in 1924, at Falkenberg, Moravska Szebova (Czech) and Chateau d'Argaronne (France), the RSCM repeatedly endorsed the need for an academy.¹⁴⁶

Dr. Mott acceded to their request, and he personally guaranteed to donate \$5,000 to the future establishment of an academy.¹⁴⁷ He then dispatched Bryant Ryall on a

¹⁴⁴ Hibbard, "Outline of a Plan..." 1-3.

¹⁴⁵ Colton, Manuscript for Revised Forty Years with Russians 114.

¹⁴⁶ L.N. Liperovsky [Chateau Argaronne, France], letter to John R. Mott [Geneva], 28 July 1924, Paul B. Anderson Papers, University of Illinois at Urbana Champaign, Box 8: 1.

¹⁴⁷ Liperovsky, letter to John R. Mott, 28 July 1924 1-2.

scouting expedition in order that the YMCA might determine the best location for the proposed school. Ryall submitted his complete report on March 17, 1924. He had surveyed most of the promising locations in Europe with the major exceptions of Germany and France. Germany was discarded because the YMCA was currently endeavouring to move all of its assets and programs out of that country. France, about to become the new centre for YMCA operations in Europe, had already been well-examined in the previous year by Paul Anderson, and the YMCA was fully informed about the pros and cons of the situation there. Supposedly, this data would be taken under consideration when the YMCA leadership made its final decision about the Academy.

In his report, Ryall presented the following conclusions about the most likely alternative locations for the theological school:

Constantinople: sympathetic Archbishop Anastasii and School of Religion already there is pro. However, that school is Protestant and does not prepare men for priesthood. Moreover, Nikitin reports that students in Constantinople fear losing their Orthodoxy; the city is expensive, difficult to get in and out of, bad geographic location, and hostile to White Russians; there is no Russian Church in Constantinople.

Sofia, Bulgaria: Has Russian Church, is an Orthodox country, most sympathetic to White Russians and can get government financial support. However, economic and political situation uncertain, geographical position non-central, YMCA regarded with most hostility of all countries in Europe, Karlovci Synod there is reactionary, "Too much Petkoff," Protestants and Orthodox fighting, Orthodox suspicious of any Protestant organization and its aid; "Scene of conflict centering around YMCA and Student Federation from which we ought to protect our Russian friends."

Belgrade, Serbia/Yugoslavia: Orthodox country, has good Academy with 35 Russians studying theology, friendly to Russians, fairly central, reasonable cost, and available monasteries. However, Serbian Church and Theology Academy would resent rival Russian school, Acute political situation with reactionaries, Prussians, and remnants of Wrangel Army; strong clergy support for Bolshevik "Living Church", and Metropolitan Antonii there is leader of Monarchical movement.

Czechoslovakia: Generally friendly to Russians, some material there for faculty, a lot of students, central. However, increasing antagonism to such a large percentage of White Russians, government and people non-supportive of Russian

religious movement, will soon recognize Bolshevik government, expensive, no easy residence, no Orthodox background, student attitude bad - "too much help."

Palestine: Stable, has building facilities, has Russian traditions, is the Holy land. However, "most unfortunate conflict between the confessions," bad geographical location, expensive, no faculty there, hard to transport there.

England: Stable government, "real religious freedom." Church of England most sympathetic of all Protestant churches to Orthodoxy; good YMCA; government and private funding possible; reasonable cost of living; free from Russian political atmosphere; closer to Europe than USA. "Usable supplementing English talent available;" "no temptation to stay." However, no Russian Orthodox background or faculty, and some Russians dislike England.

USA: Stable with political and religious freedom, sympathetic Episcopalian church, easiest for YMCA, already established connection between Orthodox leaders there and American Churches, have existing institution at Tenaflly, Russian friendly to idea of America, most money available, "some Orthodox background and an existing Church," and auxiliary faculty there. However distance and expense of getting Russians there and most expensive to live in. Moreover, real "danger that they will not return."¹⁴⁸

Aside from certain eccentricities in this report, the clear message was that either England or the United States would be the best alternative. The question now would be to see if the Russian division would remain solely in France, or if it would gradually try to transfer its offices (and necessarily many of the Russian people whom it served) to the United States.

With the complications of the move to Paris, the YMCA put the question of the theological academy on hold. They expected to make a decision sometime in the following year which they would then communicate to the emigration Church leadership. However, here the ingenuity of the Russians came into play and, before the YMCA could react, the Orthodox Church had irrevocably embarked upon a course of action. By July, 1924, the Russian émigrés had completed their plans for a theological academy to train

¹⁴⁸ Bryant Ryall, report on country most favourable for a YMCA-funded Russian Orthodox school, 17 March 1924, Paul B. Anderson Papers, University of Illinois at Urbana Champaign, Box 6: 1-4.

religious leaders from emigrants and especially from the ranks of the RSCM. They, themselves, formed a committee headed by Father Bulgakov and Zenkovsky to determine the curricula and intended student-base. In Paris, the recently relocated Metropolitan Eulogius established his own committee, headed by Michael Osorgin, to seek a location for the school in that city. Thus, unbeknownst to the YMCA leadership, the Russians had already decided what kind of school they wanted and where it would be located.

The first indication the YMCA had of these plans came in a letter from Liperovsky to Dr. Mott on July 28, 1924. He described the plans drawn up by Bulgakov and Zenkovsky, sent an expression of the Metropolitan's gratitude for Mott's promised gift of \$5,000, and asked that the full amount be forwarded at the earliest possible juncture in order that they might be able to fulfil their financial obligations. The émigrés had already purchased the premises for the school in an auction in Paris! Liperovsky described the place in glowing terms. They had bought a former German Lutheran Church which had two adjacent buildings and a large piece of land at 93 rue de Crimée, Paris. The purchasing price, he explained, was 321,000 F of which the Theological Academy Committee had been able to pay 15,000 F immediately out of Russian Church funds. They had an additional 35,000 F in hand, which was demanded on August 6, but the balance had to be paid in last and final instalment 275,000 F on November 18, 1924.¹⁴⁹

Liperovsky assured Mott that the Russians themselves could cover 50,000F of the 275,000F balance, but they required his help if they were to be able to pay off the whole amount.¹⁵⁰ His \$5,000 would be of great assistance, but they also hoped that he could

¹⁴⁹ L.N. Liperovsky [Chateau Argeronne, France], letter to John R. Mott [Geneva], 28 July 1924, Paul B. Anderson Papers, University of Illinois at Urbana Champaign, Box 8: 1.

¹⁵⁰ Liperovsky, letter to John R. Mott, 28 July 1924, 2.

obtain other funds from his diverse sources to help their endeavour. They promised, in turn, to hold funding drives among the emigration in order to procure what they could. However, as Mott was well aware, the emigration did not have access to unlimited resources, and if the Committee could not pay the full amount by the stated date, they would lose their original investment. At the end of the letter, Liperovsky explained that he was writing on the authority of both the RSCM and the Orthodox Church. He had been picked for this task by unanimous agreement from the RSCM presidium and from Father Bulgakov, Father A. Kalashnikoff, Zenkovsky, Berdyaev, Kartashev, Prince G. Trubetskoy, Vysheslavitsev and Metropolitan Eulogius:

I have been charged by them to give you full information about the present status of the question and to ask your kind assistance at this most serious hour in the history of our Christian student movement.¹⁵¹

Only then, did he admit that they were all a little worried about being able to complete their (rash) project. They would consider a mortgage or any other suggestion which Mott cared to make. They were even willing to have the property put in the name of the American Churches, the WSCF or the YMCA; in short, they would accept any conditions which would allow them to pay the full amount.

Rather shocked about this abrupt change of plans, and surprised that the Russians had been able to engineer so complex a matter without the knowledge of the YMCA, Mott telegraphed Kullman in Paris and ordered him to conduct a full investigation. This he duly completed and forwarded the results to Mott on August 4, 1924. Kullman's news was less than pleasing for the YMCA administration. Having made their promise to the émigrés, they could not abandon them even though the purchase had been conducted without their approval or even their advice. Yet, it was made clear in Kullman's

¹⁵¹ Liperovsky, letter to John R. Mott, 28 July 1924 2.

letter that the YMCA would have to bail out the Russians with considerably more money than they had expected. Kullman explained that the information sent by Liperovsky regarding the financing of the Academy was erroneous. He attributed this not to any malfeasance on the part of the Russians, but simply a lack of business experience. When Liperovsky had drafted the letter, he received the figures directly from Metropolitan Eulogius who was, as he himself would admit, no businessman. The actual conductor of the deal, Michael Osorgin (son-in-law of Prince Gregor Trubetskoy), had not been available to help with the writing of the letter to Mott. Thus, Kullman arranged an interview with Osorgin, and found out exactly what contract had been signed by the Russians at the auction.¹⁵² He urged Mott to consider the amended information and act upon it accordingly in order that the entire mission might not be jeopardised.

First, the property was sound. It contained a church with room for 1000-1200 people, four out-buildings which could be used for residence and maintenance staff; there was gas heating in all the houses and running water. The financing, however, was a different matter. The purchase cost was 321,000F, to which was added auction costs, taxes and fees of 50,327.50F and a repairer of 50,000F; this brought the total to a significantly higher amount of 421,327.50F. With all the Russian funds available, the uncovered balance was still 365,000F. Even if a mortgage was obtained, they would still require 207,500 F before the end of the year. Kullman further warned Mott that it was unlikely that the Russians would be able to negotiate a mortgage due to their lack of collateral, and their inability to guarantee a regular income from other sources. He expected, therefore, that the full 365,000F would somehow have to be raised by other

¹⁵² Gustave G. Kullman [Paris], letter to John R. Mott [London], 4 August 1924, Paul B. Anderson Papers, University of Illinois at Urbana Champaign, Box 8: 1-2.

means. As the franc was currently valued at 20F to the American dollar, Mott's original promised gift would only cover 100,000F of the total required sum, leaving 265,000 F (or 13,250 US dollars), still to be paid.¹⁵³

Such news was less than pleasing to the YMCA leadership which had already exhausted its intended funds for the Russian division with the cost of the move to Paris. Few of the leaders in New York were prepared to foot this additional expenditure for what they considered to be a poorly conducted and ill-prepared venture. However, the Russians were not about to accept failure. Their first move, after contacting Mott, was to set up a funding committee directed by Prince B.A. Vassilchikoff.¹⁵⁴ A plea for funds was delivered in every sermon conducted in the Russian Orthodox churches around Europe, and a special donation office was set-up on the new premises. Slowly the necessary money began to come in as destitute émigrés gave money they could ill afford. Some donated jewellery which they had managed to conceal in their escape from Russia. The personal sacrifices were immense as these impoverished individuals managed to collect over 100,000 francs.¹⁵⁵

¹⁵³ Kullman, letter to John R. Mott, 4 August 1924 2-3.

¹⁵⁴ The committee consisted of: Archimandrite John, Archpriest Nikolai Sacharoff, Archpriest G. Spassky, Archpriest, S. Bulgakoff, Prince G.N. Troubetskoy, M.M. Ossorgin, Prince B.A. Vassilchikoff (head), Count A. K. Chreptovitch-Bouteneff, N.T. Kashtanoff, P.A. Vachrusheff, B.P. Gleboff, E.P. Kovalevsky, I.P. Demidoff, Professor A.V. Kartasheff, S.S. Bezobrazoff, V.V. Zenkovsky, L.N. Liperovsky, K.A. Zamen, I.V. Nikanoroff, T.A. Ametistoff (as secretary). Metropolitan Eulogius was titular head of the committee and the two YMCA secretaries, G.G. Kullmann and Paul Anderson were honorary members. Donald A. Lowrie, Saint Sergius in Paris: The Orthodox Theological Institute (London: S.P.C.K., 1954) 8-9.

¹⁵⁵ Lowrie, Saint Sergius in Paris 10. While sums did come in from Anglican sources, the regular sacrificial donations from the emigres were the bread and butter of the institute. Paul B. Anderson, Russian Service in Europe: Annual Report, June, 1924 - June, 1925, Paul B. Anderson Papers, University of Illinois at Urbana Champaign, Box 5: 2-3.

Although Mott could not obtain any additional monies from the YMCA or its affiliated organizations, he did contribute in the call for funding. At his behest, the Swedish philanthropist, E.L. Nobel, donated 40,000F to the enterprise. Another large grant came from a successful émigrés businessman in London, A.K. Oushkov, who donated 100 pounds sterling. Nevertheless, the due date in November was fast approaching, and the total funds collected were still far short of the needed amount. Four days before the final accounting, an act occurred which both the Russians and the YMCA could only attribute to divine providence. A Jewish philanthropist in Paris, M.A. Ginsburg, came to the committee office saying that he had heard about their plight. "How much more did they need?" He inquired. As they told him of the large sum so desperately required, he simply took out a cheque book and made over the sum of 100,000F for the Academy.¹⁵⁶ They were now able to pay their debt and the future Theological Academy was at last the proud possession of the Russian Orthodox Church in emigration.

They decided to call the Academy, St. Sergius, and the school opened its doors before 1924 ended. It had 17 students in 1924/25 out of some 70 applicants.¹⁵⁷ The Church was repaired and consecrated in a massive celebration on March 1, 1925.¹⁵⁸ At the consecration, Metropolitan Eulogius delivered the following sermon:

Five hundred years ago St Sergius built his monastery in the heart of an impenetrable forest. We are setting up this cloister in the midst of a noisy city, the heart of a world civilization...But does not this culture, which long since grew away from its Christian foundations, represent a desert more savage and fruitless than was that of St Sergius?... And how I wish that this place should become a warmly-

¹⁵⁶ Lowrie, Saint Sergius in Paris 10.

¹⁵⁷ Paul B. Anderson, Russian Service in Europe: Annual Report, June, 1924 - June, 1925, Paul B. Anderson Papers, University of Illinois at Urbana Champaign, Box 5: 3.

¹⁵⁸ The interior decoration of the church was paid for by Grand Duchess Maria Pavlovna, and painted by the artist D.S. Steletsky. Lowrie, Saint Sergius in Paris 13.

lighted centre of orthodoxy, that Russian Orthodox people, their souls worn and torn by past experiences, should turn here as once, afflicted by the Tartar yoke, our forefathers repaired to the monastery of St Sergius to receive comfort and spiritual strength for the battle of life...And more, I hope that our foreign friends, representatives of Western Christianity, may also find the way to this shrine...Remember what a significant part of the means for this holy enterprise was given by foreigners. We must show them the beauty of orthodoxy; may this church be a place of brotherly intercommunion and the *rapprochement* of all Christians..¹⁵⁹

With continued fund-raising activities, by the end of 1925 it had debt-free ownership of its property, and was even able to cover in advance four months' expenses for the school, and still leave a balance in the treasury.¹⁶⁰ The unity and personal sacrifices involved in the donation process impressed even liberals and atheists about the still current need for the Church and its possible vitality in the emigration: "Russians are realizing that their unity abroad and their best expression of loyalty to Russia must find ground in spiritual rather than in political, social or economic structures."¹⁶¹ Metropolitan Eulogius formally commended the work of the RSCM, St. Sergius, and the Religious-Philosophical Academy in furthering this trend in his formal report of May 31, 1926.

The ongoing providence for St. Sergius Theological Academy was provided by a windfall from America. In 1926 John D. Rockefeller Jr. at the urging of Mott, Colton, and other interested YMCA representatives, agreed to provided money for a fund "To Strengthen and Enrich the Russian Orthodox Church." This amounted to the sum of \$66,932.50 to be spread over six years in diminishing funds each year.

¹⁵⁹ Lowrie, Lowrie, Saint Sergius in Paris 11.

¹⁶⁰ Paul B. Anderson, "Russian Service in Europe: Annual Report for the Year 1925," Paul B. Anderson papers, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Box 6: 2.

¹⁶¹ Paul B. Anderson, Russian Service in Europe: Annual Report, June, 1924 - June, 1925, Paul B. Anderson Papers, University of Illinois at Urbana Champaign, Box 5: 3.

It encourages new undertakings, yet makes necessary the further discovery and enlistment of financial support to bring them to maturity and stability. Projects would thus prove their worth and timelessness.

Edgar MacNaughton directed the fund's distribution with assistance from Colton and Anderson conducting continual dialogues with Rockefeller's personal almoner, Raymond B. Fosdick and the Russian Orthodox professors at St. Sergius. With such a large subsidy for their continued development, the Theological Academy was able to become "the spiritual powerhouse of the Russian Church in Emigration."¹⁶²

Having experienced already the trauma associated with having insufficient funds, the Russian émigrés involved with St. Sergius were determined to maintain a surplus budget. They were further encouraged in this by the YMCA Russian division's commitment to fiscal responsibility and self-sufficiency. Thus, in a joint effort, MacNaughton and the administrators at St. Sergius used a portion to the Rockefeller fund to derive more permanent sources of money. Regular charities for the Academy were set up among the Russian emigration, among French and foreign circles in Paris, and from the Anglican Church in England. Simultaneously, Colton developed a similar fund in America:

Unitedly we established financially supporting groups in Boston, New York, Philadelphia and Washington. "The Living Church," published in Milwaukee, organ of the High persuasion, carried a Mott-signed article I ghosted on the Academy, its importance and needs.¹⁶³

To aid this endeavour Lev Zander, a young Professor at the Academy, was sent to the United States to tour Episcopal centres; he prepared the way for Father Serge Bulgakov's

¹⁶² Colton, Manuscript for Revised Forty Years with Russians 114.

¹⁶³ Colton, Manuscript for Revised Forty Years with Russians 115.

visit and appearance before the General Convention. As a result, St. Sergius was placed on standing benevolences list of the Episcopalian Church.¹⁶⁴

At the end of his service with the YMCA in 1961, Colton assessed the legacy of the ongoing Theological Institute in Paris:

A steady product of graduate students increasingly supplies the Russian priestly offices outside the U.S.S.R., many in satellite states. Two-thirds of the student body have entered from other Eastern Churches. The high level of scholarship maintained has special timeliness today in the challenge Religion meets everywhere under the pressures of materialism and secularity. The Fund made grants for the entrance of particularly qualified students. Some have gone on with outside scholarship grants to America and British schools. In short, the Academy affords theological professors and scholarly priests the seat for creative thinking. It works for the preservation and continuity of values in the thought, tradition, life and service of the Russian Church in the period of severe trial and readjustment. In recognition of their scholarly worth and collaboration, the Academy later conferred Doctorate degrees on Mott, Paul Anderson and Donald Lowrie.¹⁶⁵

It fulfilled its task of preserving Russian Orthodoxy outside of Russia to such an admirable extent, that before World War Two its program was copied in such countries as Greece and the United States. Through St. Sergius, the original culture and tenets of Russian Orthodoxy as defined by the Great Sobor survived and were extended in the emigration.

The Orthodox Church Schism

The heroic establishment of St. Sergius marked the height of unity within the Russian Orthodox Church in the emigration. Soon after its inauguration, however, old tensions within the Church reasserted their predominance upon the émigrés' spiritual life. These conflicts had a complex history. The Great Sobor of 1917-18 had reestablished the Patriarchate as supreme authority of the entire Russian Orthodox Church, and Tikhon

¹⁶⁴ After World War II, this funding was taken over by the World Council of Churches.

¹⁶⁵ Colton, Manuscript for Revised Forty Years with Russians 115.

had been elected to this position. With the ensuing Bolshevik persecution of the Church, however, and the massive emigration of Russian Orthodox believers to Europe, it became necessary to appoint a prelate who could coordinate Church life outside of Russia. This was duly performed in the Patriarchal ukaz 423 dated April 8, 1921 which appointed Eulogius, Archbishop of the Sees Volynia and Zitomir, to the additional position of leader of all Russian Orthodox in the Western world pending the restoration of free communication between Russia and the outside.¹⁶⁶ The ukaz was received and confirmed by the Supreme Church Administration, then residing in Berlin and under presidency of Metropolitan Anthony Khrapovitzky on April 15, 1921.

However, Eulogius' supreme authority over all churches in the West was immediately challenged by Father Smimov in Paris. He pointed out that the Patriarchal ukaz could be interpreted to mean that Eulogius' first responsibility was still to his Sees Volynia and Zitomir (in Russia), and that any decisions relating to the Churches outside Russia should be made only with the full agreement of the Supreme Church Administration as a check to Eulogius' power. The reason behind this contention was political: while Eulogius was a staunch supporter of the new tenets developed at the Sobor, the Supreme Church Administration was controlled by clerics from the Karlovci Synod in Bulgaria who still believed that the Tsar could be the only true leader of the Church; they were largely reactionaries and monarchists who supported restoration on any terms.

Eulogius unwittingly contributed to the conflict by refusing to challenge the assertions by Smimov and the Karlovci Synod. He was a new emigrant to Europe, and did not wish to begin his work by immediately antagonising a potentially powerful group

¹⁶⁶ Paul B. Anderson, "Obituary: Metropolitan Eulogius," The Slavonic Review 25 (1947): 564.

of the Church leadership. Perhaps in order to demonstrate his willingness to work with these émigrés, he even attended the radical monarchist and White army assemblies held in Germany that year, and proffered the holy grace over their meetings.¹⁶⁷ It was not long, however, before the group abused his conciliatory nature. In November 1921, a meeting of Supreme Church Administration voted to send a public protest to Geneva against the Bolshevik regime. Eulogius immediately objected because such an act was too political and it might jeopardize the Church in Russia. The Administration ignored his order in a deliberate revolt against his authority, and launched the protest. Eulogius was proved correct almost at once. The Bolsheviks had been preparing their case against the prelates of the Orthodox Church and, upon learning of the protest document, they used this as the major charge against both Patriarch Tikhon and Bishop Benjamin for counter-revolutionary acts in the trials of 1922. Although Tikhon escaped with only house arrest, Bishop Benjamin lost his life by hanging partially due to the mistake of the Supreme Church Administration in the emigration.

Realizing the terrible error which he had made, Patriarch Tikhon issued a new ukaz on June 5, 1922 which cleared Eulogius from his responsibility to the Sees in Russia, and commanded "the Supreme Church Administration to be abolished, retaining temporarily the administration of the Russian parishes abroad in the hands of Your Grace [Eulogius]."¹⁶⁸ Eulogius had also been raised to the rank of Metropolitan by the ukaz of January 30, 1922. There now could be no misunderstanding that Eulogius alone commanded the Church outside of Russia.

¹⁶⁷ Williams, Culture in Exile 175-176.

¹⁶⁸ Anderson, "Obituary: Metropolitan Eulogius" 565.

Again, however, Eulogius was reluctant to act expediently. He postponed the fulfilment of the last ukaz of June, 1922 until verification could be received from Patriarch Tikhon and the central Church assembly in Russia. This delay allowed the Supreme Church Administration time to consolidate their authority throughout parishes in the Balkan region. Thereafter, Metropolitan Eulogius could only exert his powers over Northern and Western Europe and over the North American parishes. In order for his decisions to be accepted in the Balkans, they would have to be seconded by the new leader of the Karlovci Synod, Metropolitan Antony.

For a few years the situation remained fairly stable as all the Orthodox prelates struggled to stabilize their Churches in the emigration. However, trouble again began to brew when St. Sergius Theological Academy was established in Paris. Completely directed under the auspices of Metropolitan Eulogius, the Karlovci Synod regarded its completion as an insult, and a threat to the extension of their influence. In 1925, Patriarch Tikhon died in Moscow and the Russian Orthodox Church was left without a supreme authority. As the synod in Russia struggled to reorganize itself after the deprivations of the Bolsheviks and this final blow, it could provide no direction for the Churches outside of Russia. Eulogius was now in a tenuous situation as he had been appointed to his post by the Patriarch Tikhon. With the loss of that moral authority, it was only a matter of time before the Karlovci Synod extended its claims. The YMCA was aware of the problem and agreed with Eulogius that, "Increased rivalry would be unfortunate both because of personalities and because of the bad effect of any evidence of dissension in the church."¹⁶⁹

¹⁶⁹ "There are already evidences that the Metropolitan Anthony will seek to capitalize on the present lack of Patriarch's authority to aggrandize his position in Europe." Paul B. Anderson, Russian Service in Europe: Annual Report, June, 1924 - June, 1925, Paul B. Anderson Papers,

Not only did Tikhon's death facilitate challenges from the Metropolitan Anthony of the Karlovci synod, but it also left the Orthodox Church more vulnerable to Catholic advances and erosion. Monsignor d'Herbigny of the Catholic Oriental institute in Rome published a tract "After the Death of the Patriarch" early in 1926 which reviewed the Orthodox situation in emigration including St. Sergius, and noted the favourable climate, now, for Catholic advance. "In Belgium and France priests have been actively proselytising..." The only holdouts were some German Catholics especially the Benedictine monks, who "are seeing the values to [be] brought into the Roman from the Eastern Church" and sought not to recruit Orthodox believers, but only to understand their faith.¹⁷⁰

The Karlovci Synod also began its attack in 1926, and it aimed at the most vulnerable aspects of Eulogius' leadership. Sending their priests out to meet with the delegates of the RSCM, the Karlovci group preached against continued involvement with the YMCA. They had prepared this onslaught very carefully: Russians in the emigration were conditioned to respond negatively to two groups - the Jews and the Masons - because they almost unanimously characterized the Bolshevik Revolution as a Judeo-Masonic plot. Any person or organization that could be tainted with such a connection would immediately be shunned by the émigré population as a whole.

The YMCA was a perfect scapegoat. As a foreign, American, and largely Protestant organization, it could be assumed that few Russians were completely familiar with its policies or constitution. A legacy of Russian prejudice stereotyped Americans as almost universal Masons, and it should not be difficult to establish some connection with

University of Illinois at Urbana Champaign, Box 5: 3.

¹⁷⁰ Anderson, Russian Service in Europe: Annual Report, June, 1924 - June, 1925 3.

Jews. Moreover, the brief tenure of the YMCA in Bolshevik-controlled Russia with their service among the army in 1918 and the Hecker scandal was enough to prove that they were "secret Communists." Finally, the American symbol for the YMCA, the Red Triangle, could easily be used as evidence that they were Masons (the Triangle) and Communists (Red).¹⁷¹ All that remained was the production of sufficient propaganda which could inform the Russian emigration that the YMCA was involved in an international plot to destroy the Orthodox Church be it for the cause of Masonry, Judaism, Protestantism, or Communism.

Once the YMCA was so tainted, then the Karlovci Synod could easily destroy their Russian Orthodox competitors. The RSCM could be brought under Karlovci jurisdiction and freed from their connection to the YMCA, and those who resisted could be labelled collaborators and secret agents. Eulogius would be usurped on the basis of his close ties with Mott, and his acceptance of YMCA funds for St. Sergius. Most of all, they could roll-back the increasing influence of the religious intellectuals centred at the Religious-Philosophical Academy and St. Sergius by demonstrating their financial and personal ties to the YMCA. Father Sergei Bulgakov, Semen Frank, and Nikolai Berdyaev were the main enemies of the Karlovci Synod because their message of universal, personal, and spiritual Christianity, of acceptance and tolerance, directly contradicted the Synod's quest for power, hierarchy, and the restoration of Russia's great imperial destiny.¹⁷²

The Karlovci Synod had launched a tentative attack in the émigré monarchist journal the Double-Headed Eagle at the end of 1924 in order to assess their enemy's

¹⁷¹ Ralph W. Hollinger, letter to Gustave G. Kullman [St. Cloud], 12 December 1924, Paul B. Anderson Papers, University of Illinois at Urbana Champaign, Box 8: 1.

¹⁷² Nikolai Berdyaev, memorandum, 27 December 1926, Paul B. Anderson papers, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Box 3: 1-4.

ability to counter their effort. The YMCA took immediate note, and with some chagrin realized that the war over opinion would not be easily won. Not only were many of the facts correct, despite gross misrepresentation, but also they would have to be careful not to offend Americans as they defended themselves to the Russians. On December 12, 1924 Ralph Hollinger contacted Kullman to advise him to proceed with extreme caution. They should not offer any documentary evidence to refute the Karlovci claims, because this would just provide further ammunition for their warped representations. Instead they should calmly answer the assertions, point by point, and let their reputation among the emigration do its work: "...the charges are not sufficiently well-grounded to be worthy of such a careful reply"¹⁷³.

Regarding the claim that the YMCA was actively working to support Judaism, Hollinger cautioned Kullman against making any violent protestation.

I do not feel justified, however, in putting into such a semi-formal statement all that you say, which is a rather strong arraignment of the Jewish nation. I might agree with you personally, and might make such a statement in conversation with a Russian, but I should hesitate to put it into writing.¹⁷⁴

While he loathed anti-Semitism and agreed with Kullman that the Karlovci Synod was acting in a despicable manner, he was afraid that certain elements among the YMCA in the United States would react badly to any public statement that their organization accepted the Jewish religion as such. Kullman was warned to remember that the American YMCA was fundamentally Christian; it did not allow Jews to sit on any decision-making boards, and was actively committed to furthering the cause of Christianity worldwide.

¹⁷³ Ralph W. Hollinger, letter to Gustave G. Kullman [St. Cloud], 12 December 1924, Paul B. Anderson Papers, University of Illinois at Urbana Champaign, Box 8: 1.

¹⁷⁴ Hollinger, letter to Kullman, 12 December 1924 2.

As far as the issue of the YMCA's relationship to the Masons was concerned, Hollinger felt obliged to offer Kullman a few home-truths about the situation in America.

If we should include in a statement like this what you say about the Masons, we should have to spend the rest of our lives answering criticisms of our article which would come from the United States and some countries in Europe; in the second place, I do not feel so strongly about the evil influence of Masonic societies as you do. There are a number of prominent Masons among my best friends in the secretaryship.¹⁷⁵

Quite simply, Freemasonry was not widely viewed in a negative manner in the United States. Nearly every small town in the country had its Masonic Hall which acted as a social centre as well as a place for furthering the Masonic ideals. Lacking either the Catholic or the Old World paranoia about the "plots" of Masons, many Americans generally looked upon the order with respect. For this reason, the YMCA would have to handle the Karlovci attacks with the simple assertion that the Association was not directly allegiant to nor controlled by the Masons.

Having been able to assess the armoury of their opponents, the Karlovci Synod moved to spread its propaganda among the RSCM. Here they were most successful among the groups in the Balkans and in Czechoslovakia. They did establish enough legitimacy that, at the general meeting of the RSCM in 1926, a proposal was brought forth to end any further contact or sponsorship from the YMCA. Furthermore, this group at the conference proposed that the RSCM be placed under the complete jurisdiction of the Karlovci Synod, and divest themselves of their allegiance to Metropolitan Eulogius.¹⁷⁶

A quick defense was prepared, led by Nikolai Berdyaev and the Professors of the Religious-Philosophical Academy, and by Vladimir Zenkovsky. They counselled the YMCA

¹⁷⁵ Hollinger, letter to Kullman, 12 December 1924 2.

¹⁷⁶ Ethan T. Colton, "Memorandum to Mr. D.A. Davis and E. MacNaughtan," 7 November 1927, Paul B. Anderson, University Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Box 3: 1-2.

to stay well-divorced from the entire situation, and to make no protestation. Rather, they would handle it in a perfectly Russian manner. After much deliberation, the YMCA temporarily agreed. At that RSCM general assembly, Zenkovsky (President of the RSCM), presented a paper unveiling the complete illegitimacy of the Karlovci Synod.¹⁷⁷ This was then seconded by Nikolai Berdyaev who brought compelling evidence with him of personal communications from the former Patriarch Tikhon which validated Eulogius' position.¹⁷⁸ In conclusion, the Metropolitan Eulogius, himself, appeared with a message not of anger, but of conciliation and forgiveness. The result was an overwhelming vote in confidence of Eulogius and the YMCA, and the decision to completely divest the RSCM from any further dealings with the Karlovci Synod.¹⁷⁹ Those students from Bulgaria who held allegiance to Karlovci left the conference in dismay.

The schism which had just occurred within the RSCM was soon to be repeated among the general Russian Orthodox population. Outraged at the failure of the plan to takeover the RSCM, the Karlovci Synod sent a delegation to Eulogius in 1927 demanding that they be given supreme authority over the Balkans, the Far East and America. When Eulogius refused to allow such an extension, they responded by claiming authority over all Russians in Western Europe and appointed Metropolitan Seraphim (the former

¹⁷⁷ V.V. Zenkovsky, "Notes on the work of the YMCA in Russia, New Haven," 8 December 1926, Paul B. Anderson, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Box 3.

¹⁷⁸ Nikolai Berdyaev, memorandum, 27 December 1926, Paul B. Anderson papers, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Box 3: 2.

¹⁷⁹ Ethan T. Colton, "Memorandum to Mr. D.A. Davis and E. MacNaughten," 7 November 1927, Paul B. Anderson, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Box 3: 1-2.

Archbishop of Finland) new head of Church outside Russia in a direct challenge to Eulogius.¹⁸⁰

On July 27, 1927 the Karlovci Synod was declared illegitimate by Eulogius, and the Russian Orthodox were told to cease attending any services conducted by its priests. This ban, however, did not stop the Karlovci; instead they declared themselves the true Russian Orthodox Church (albeit under no patriarchal authority), and continued their operations throughout Europe. The Church had thus broken. Individual émigrés were forced to choose under who's authority they would place their spiritual well-being. Although the mass majority gave their allegiance to Metropolitan Eulogius, a large percentage, even in his centre of strength in Paris, chose in favour of the Karlovci Synod. Both the Russian Orthodox Church and the cause of the YMCA were weakened by this unbreachable division.

The schism changed YMCA policy toward the emigration. They had hoped that initiatives such as the RSCM would soon be able to be self-directing and self-supporting allowing them to divest themselves of the burden of assistance. However, this evidence of the still strong resentment towards the YMCA and its beliefs proved that there remained much work to be done. As a consequence, in 1928 the Russian Office determined that it could not begin to withdraw its service to the Russian émigrés for an indefinite period of time. Kullman spoke for the Russian division headquarters in presenting this decision to the International Section of the YMCA.

There is a deep and almost uneradicable suspicion against the "firm" - YMCA. Russian society has no ground under its feet. It is poor and atomized by factional strife and political passion. While Russian society has been slowly educated to bear a modest share of the burden of "more obvious" features of our work, like

¹⁸⁰ Colton, Manuscript for Revised Forty Years with Russians 118.

boys and girls work especially, there is little chance to get them to take financial responsibility..."¹⁸¹

Furthermore, he proffered the opinion that the YMCA would lose everything they had already gained in their Russian work if they were to abandon it at this time. And if they left, he personally believed that the émigrés would soon degenerate into divided, hopeless and bitter parochial centres which would be ripe for any authoritarian propaganda.

Let me put my personal conviction quite plainly before you. Ultimately success or failure of the YMCA movement in Orthodox lands depends from its spiritual policy and from it only. Content and methods of work are "obvious and desired". To put it bluntly: can Orthodox youth have this content and these methods, and with it, not merely remain Orthodox but become better and deeper Orthodox. If the YMCA is not merely a very handy social service institution suggesting new ways of physical work, new ways of the use of leisure time, new ways for "second chance" education, if the YMCA is first and foremost a religious movement of youth and a movement of religious education can it then be an Orthodox youth movement with truly Orthodox religious education?

The difficulties of forming a Russian YMCA in the emigration are not due to difficulties "in essentials", namely the spiritual policy, but to difficulties inherent to the entirely abnormal and "unsound" situation of the Russians abroad. Neurotic over-suspicion against the "ЕЕМКАН", poverty, morbid atomization and factional strife, political and religious these are the passing circumstances leading our work in the emigration to take other lines... We are more a movement and less a social welfare institution than any other work started by the American Y in Europe, we are one of the most indigenous, if not the most, we are better rooted in the spiritual tradition of the country we serve, the group of paid secretaries and volunteer leaders emerging from our work can be compared favourably with any other group in Europe. Few movement[s] have the spiritual and cultural prestige we have.

We have formed the European Council of Student Movement, because we are the one oecumenic and irenic religious force able to bind new religious life throughout Europe. It so happens that the Russian Movement secretary becomes the only Federation agent wanted in the Scandinavian countries. This all is not due to personal merit but to the kind of religious reality we stand for. Zenkovsky and Pianoff make a great contribution at the Holland meeting of the Y-Worlds Alliance. Zenkovsky, Pianoff and Vychesavtzeff are likely to share the meetings of the Executive in Geneva in November. There is today, after some of the radical

¹⁸¹ Gustave G. Kullman, letter to Ethan T. Colton, 3 October 1928, Paul B. Anderson Papers, University of Illinois at Urbana Champaign, Box 6: 1.

measures of July 27th, 1927, more willingness to work closely with the YMCA forces gathered in Europe than perhaps ever before.¹⁸²

On October 30, 1928, E.T. Colton responded for the International Section expressing their general agreement with the findings of the Russian division. He accepted the need for continued work, but wondered if it could not be transformed into more practical undertakings which would appeal better to their American backers.

Regarding the spiritual content of the Russian Movement, my single concern has been whether it has been broad enough to bring in more than what might be called one school. As you know, the Russians in America quite generally interpret it as too "other-worldly" and its leaders as ultra-philosophical, this being reflected more in the literature than elsewhere. However, I do not seriously question the main strategy which I understand has been to insure first of all a vital group sufficiently homogeneous to work together... In the generation of their foreign relationships and service they have not contributed to hospitals or Church bodies or Young People's Societies of Christian Endeavour, and if after the Russians reconstructive period is over they should find what they are cooperating with the Russians is something apart from what they know as the "Brotherhood", either their ardor will cool or there will have to be a process of education toward their cooperating with it going counter to the philosophy of the Foreign work in its whole history.¹⁸³

Despite this caution, and indeed prophecy of what was to come during and after World War Two, the International Section did agree to continue supporting the operations of the Russian division.

While acknowledging the natural human tendency to exaggerate the importance of one's own work, it does appear that the Russian Division was completely correct in its judgement of the émigrés' capability for self-organization. Their Russian work may not have seemed practical or in accordance with the usual tasks of Overseas Division offices; nevertheless it was the only effective course which could be taken with the Russian

¹⁸² Gustave G. Kullman, letter to Ethan T. Colton, 3 October 1928, Paul B. Anderson Papers, University of Illinois at Urbana Champaign, Box 6: 2-3.

¹⁸³ Ethan T. Colton, letter to Gustave G. Kullmann, 30 October 1928, Paul B. Anderson Papers, University of Illinois at Urbana Champaign, Box 6: 1-2.

emigration. As Paul Anderson explained in 1926, the YMCA had to restrain itself from starting its own programs until they won the trust of the general emigration, and this could only be done through Eulogius' Church.

The Association's task will therefore be not only to bring young men into the Church, but to aid the Church, with methods, advice and general collaboration, in its own efforts at winning young men. More than in any other situation, the Association must consider means of making the Church attractive to young men and as effective in its program as it is inerrant in its Truth.¹⁸⁴

This was not an easy, nor a rapid process. It involved the establishment of personal contacts and friendships, continued, repeated proof of the YMCA's honourable intentions and commitment to non-intervention in Orthodox life.

What the Russian division had learned through their discussions with the Orthodox leaders, and especially with the religious intellectuals like Berdyaev, Bulgakov, and Vysheslavitsev, was that the "other-worldly stuff" was in fact the Russian's basic beliefs. No other element could appeal to them like spiritual work: money, charity, sports, and material goods either meant little to them or caused immediate suspicion that they were being "bought". It was this very realization which had allowed Berdyaev and his fellow religious thinkers to have such success in Bolshevik Russia. In justifying this to the American leadership, Anderson made the tentative claim,

An answer is not easy, yet the attention at present given in the Soviet press to ideas created and circulated among emigrants, and the fact that dealings with the emigrants is often rated as a criminal offense in Soviet law courts, must mean that what is done abroad has an influence in Russia.¹⁸⁵

¹⁸⁴ Paul B. Anderson, Russian Service in Europe: Annual Report for the Year 1925, Paul B. Anderson Papers, University of Illinois at Urban Champaign, Box 6: 4.

¹⁸⁵ Paul B. Anderson, Russian Service in Europe: Annual Report for the Year 1925, Paul B. Anderson Papers, University of Illinois at Urban Champaign, Box 6: 4.

Thus, even in the emigration, the religious thinkers were still having an impact on their people at home. While individuals and political movements could be stopped, even the Bolsheviks were finding it impossible to prevent the penetration of spirituality. The YMCA would either join this endeavour, or it might as well give up entirely on Russia and return to isolation in the United States. Simply put, they had to accept Russian methods if they wanted to influence Russian people.

Put'

This battle had already been fought between the Russians and the YMCA over the establishment of St.Sergius and over one other endeavour - the creation of a Russian-language, religious-philosophical journal. Both times the Russians were able to get their way accepted by the Americans with the help of the Russian Division Secretaries, and the always concerned attention of Dr. Mott. They would continue to do so until the start of World War Two.

Dr. Mott had already suggested the journal in his meeting with Bryant Ryall in Berlin in April, 1924. Once this was put to the Russian professors at the Religious-Philosophical Academy, they enthusiastically endorsed the proposal. Arrangements were made for a meeting between Nikolai Berdyaev and Dr. Mott by Paul Anderson and Kullman to take place in Switzerland at the end of that year. In an awkward incident, the parties arrived only to find that Berdyaev was being detained by the Swiss authorities at the border near Bern; new Swiss policy denied entrance of any Russian bearing a Nansen passport unless they could prove that they had employment in Switzerland. Accordingly, Mott adjusted to the situation and took himself, Anderson and Lowrie out to meet

Berdyaev in the nearby French town. There, at a small cafe, they drew up the plans for a Russian Orthodox religious-philosophical journal.

Having established the program, the concrete details were hammered out in a series of conferences at the Russian division headquarters in Paris. The first meeting was held on October 6, 1924 and included Anderson, Kullman, Berdyaev and Vysheslavtsev; Anderson acted as chairman. After recapping the history of the initiative, Anderson proposed that the aim of periodical should be to "play a vital part in the development of Russian religious thought."¹⁸⁶ A sub-goal should be working to increase collaboration between Christian East and West, but the major emphasis must remain on Russian religious problems. Berdyaev concurred and warned further of the danger of falling into a "narrow, professional theological journal": he was less worried about international character than about subject matter.

Yet more, true to Orthodox tradition, it must keep a standing chronicle of all significant religious developments in the Western world, Protestant and Catholic. Its attitude towards other spheres of life (art, science, philosophy, education, law and the state, political economy) must be one which tries to permit and integrate all thinking and all activity within these spheres into a truly Christian way of living.

He emphasized that it should be readable by "the broad masses of educated Russians, especially young Russians...,"¹⁸⁷ and he saw it as an opportunity to regenerate and broaden Russian religious thought.

Regarding leadership and the nascent political stance of the journal, all agreed that they should oppose the "still prevailing 'ancien regime' religiosity" [Karlovcii], in

¹⁸⁶ Gustave G. Kullmann, Minutes of a Conference between P.B. Anderson, G.G. Kullmann, Professors Berdiaeff and Visheslavtzeff Regarding the Project of Publishing a Russian Religious Periodical, Paris, 20 October 1924, Paul B. Anderson Papers, University of Illinois at Urbana Champaign, Box 6: 1.

¹⁸⁷ Gustave G. Kullmann, Minutes of a Conference... 1-2

favour of the rejuvenating tendencies begun with the Revolution and the Great Sobor. Berdyaev noted that the RSCM was already expanding this tendency among the émigré intelligentsia. He also explained that a nucleus existed from which further promotion could be launched: Those former members of the Vladimir Soloviev Society and related associations who were now almost entirely congregated in the emigration. Vysheslavtsev gave his complete support to Berdyaev,

The Russian youth struggles with the problems of the State, the War, the Revolution, the class-war and the great spiritual crisis of our days. It wants a really Christian re-thinking of all these relationships. It has a deep sense for the crisis and turns naturally for help to the christian religion and to those who can creatively interpret the message of Christ in terms of the present historical situation. The task of the Journal is to answer this challenge to help.

Kullman was then charged with presenting the suggested format of the journal. It should, he asserted, contain four sections: 1. A strong, mystical editorial, 2. Essays of deep evaluation and explanation of Russian religious thought, 3. Comments on the symbolic meaning of different rites and rituals, 4. "A constant chronicle of developments in the Protestant and Catholic world."¹⁸⁸ This was unanimously agreed upon, and a proposal for the editorial and administration board was tabled and passed. Kullman was suggested as assistant editor from the beginning.

On November 14, 1924 the group met again to discuss a complaint from Colton that had arisen with regards to the administration board. They decided that the journal should be published under the auspices of the Religious-Philosophical Academy: this would not their hide relationship with YMCA, but it would not state it directly either; it would also save them the legal problems of setting up a new organization. Due to the lack of time, they cut the meeting short and agreed to meet at Berdyaev's house in

¹⁸⁸ Kullmann, Minutes of a Conference... 2-3.

Clamart on November 28, 1924 to decide upon the name, the content of the first number, the date of issue, price and circulation.¹⁸⁹

The agreed name for the journal was "Put" (the way). This was chosen because it had special meaning to the religious thinkers who would contribute to the endeavour, and because it would be immediately recognizable to the émigré population at large. In Russia, the first religious-philosophical journal had been called Novyi put'; the circular publication and publishing house for the Vladimir Soloviev Society in Moscow had also been called "Put". Once all the formal details had been arranged, Anderson and Kullman sent off an amended report to Colton and the International Division explaining their intentions. However, despite the fact that Mott had suggested the idea and agreed with Anderson, Kullman and Berdyaev regarding its implementation, Colton had his own ideas about the proposed journal. He had already written these to Anderson even before the meeting with Mott and the formal drafting of the proposal in Paris: on August 9, 1924, Colton had suggested strongly that,

If this publication is to be most useful in its exchange between the Communions, then there must be on the Editorial Board and outstanding scholar of the western Churches - first to direct the Board to the sources of the best Protestant material for use in the magazine; and second to commend to the Western Churches the material that appears from the Eastern Churches.¹⁹⁰

Colton had even gone so far as to suggest that the editorial board should include a non-conformist and an Anglican representative, and he proposed Dr. David Cairns for the

¹⁸⁹ Gustave G. Kullmann, Project of Russian Religious Periodical: Minutes of Second Meeting, St. Cloud [France], 14 November 1924, Paul B. Anderson Papers, University of Illinois at Urbana Champaign, Box 6: 1-2.

¹⁹⁰ Ethan T. Colton [on board the S.S. Majestic], letter to Paul B. Anderson, 9 August 1924, Paul B. Anderson Papers, University of Illinois at Urbana Champaign, Box 6: 1-2.

former. Furthermore, he had insisted that the preparation be gradual and complete in order that he would have a detailed presentation to pass before their sponsors.

Therefore, when Colton received the albeit well-drafted and complete proposal, but one which insisted that the journal be an entirely Russian undertaking, he was appalled. He immediately wrote a vehement and devastating critique to Anderson and Kullman accusing them of being manipulated by the Russians. Anderson and Kullman wrote back separately, using their letters to provide independent expressions of their individual reasons for choosing this course for Put'.

Anderson's letter was dispatched on February 6, 1925. In it he endeavoured to answer Colton's most immediate concerns: He argued that he and Kullman had not supported the proposal because they had been influenced or forced by the two Russians. He asserted that America had much to offer to the Russian religious situation, but would do best by "carefully yet constantly seeking to create a demand for our aid," rather than by "direct actions or in Russo-American unions."¹⁹¹ He gave the example of the Correspondence school which had consistently resisted religious courses on the excuse of no text books. Yet only three weeks ago Vysheslavitsev had said that the Russians were now going to offer Introduction to the Study of Christianity because they, themselves, had found appropriate literature in the YMCA press stocks. He thus counselled the same approach to Put'. Let the Russians direct it and frame it independently and soon they would be pursuing exactly the ends that the Americans wanted.

¹⁹¹ Paul B. Anderson [Bern, Switzerland], letter to Ethan T. Colton, 6 February 1925, Paul B. Anderson Papers, University of Illinois at Urbana Champaign, Box 6: 1.

I believe that the journal...will soon be absorbing as much Anglo-Saxon material as its readers will take. From then on it will be a further process of education, which will be aided by the Press and Cor. School.

Anderson then went on to explain the delicate nuances of his behaviour:

In this journal business, we have a great opportunity. The public is ready for a journal, and is wanting one that will satisfy, not disturb. It is not underhanded policy, but modern teaching method, I believe, to win your public first, then to work on 'em. If we can have corresponding editions in America and England to keep us supplied with interesting (to Russians) things, the local editorial staff will try to do their part. While I shall hold no official position on the journal, yet it will be run on Press funds and through our apparatus, so I hope for ample occasion to push things in the direction we both wish to move.¹⁹²

With Anderson doing the careful appeal to Colton's naturally consensus-oriented character, Kullman was left to provide the emotion and the spiritual persuasion.¹⁹³ While less practically appealing than Anderson's letter, it did serve to soothe Colton's ego, and make him more amenable to the situation.

On March 11, 1925, after a lengthy wait, Colton responded to the two Secretaries by granting an affirmative answer to their program. He still stood by his reservations, but he was prepared to accept the advice of the Russian Bureau. In accordance with his middleman position between the YMCA leadership in New York and the Russian division, he urged them to offer some reconciliation of the varying points of view. He commended Kullman for representing the opinion of the Russian émigrés in such clear and sympathetic light, but warned him that Americans would perceive their feelings of alienation in a very negative way. First, the Americans expected unconditional gratitude from the Russians because "no body of Christians, whom I know, outside the Russian Church is disposed to help perpetuate the latter in quite the form and spirit of the present

¹⁹² Anderson, letter to Colton, 6 February 1925 1-2.

¹⁹³ G.G. Kullman letter to Ethan T. Colton, 7 February 1925, Paul B. Anderson Papers, University of Illinois at Urbana Champaign, Box 6: 1-4.

time." Second, most American religious representatives regarded the Orthodox Church as reactionary and anachronistic. This meant that, if the YMCA-Russian collaboration hoped to solicit help from the more open and tolerant American Church people, it must gain from the Russians clear proofs that "they are not exclusive, ossified, and with a closed mind." Always considering the future ramifications, Colton reminded Kullman that the YMCA funding was limited in time and amount; the Russians must find means of popular appeal or they would eventually have no funding. The stakes were high in Colton's opinion. If the YMCA Russian work failed, then other Americans would seize the opportunity to prevail for "a resurgence of proselytizing missionary undertaking in Russia" and condemn the Orthodox Church to what they believed was a long-overdue grave.¹⁹⁴

Colton then challenged Kullman's ready acceptance of these Russians and the legitimacy of their stated cause. He, personally, found the Berdyaev-Eulogius group rather rigid, and perhaps even outdated and out-of-touch. In fact, Colton said that he had found much more "liberality" inside Russia. To defend his position, Colton referred to an out-of-context phrase from the appeal of Patriarch Tikhon: the greatest service the YMCA could perform "will be on behalf of the rationalists." What Tikhon envisioned, of course, was cooperative YMCA-Orthodox work in Russia where the YMCA huts and student work could bring non-believers back to a certain receptivity of religious value in life, and then the Orthodox Church would take them the rest of the way.¹⁹⁵ In the emigration, however, the YMCA was not prepared to establish the huge organization which would

¹⁹⁴ Ethan T. Colton, letter to Gustave G. Kullman, 11 March 1925, Paul B. Anderson Papers, University of Illinois at Urbana Champaign, Box 6: 1.

¹⁹⁵ Patriarch Tikhon, "To the American Young Men's Christian Association, Berlin," trans. Donald Lowrie, 13 January 1922, Paul B. Anderson papers, University of Urbana-Champaign, Box 3.

facilitate rationalist, sports and academic activities and a quality of life-style necessary to encourage non-believers towards a more Christian life. Nor did the Orthodox church have the resources to lead a general education and missionary work movement among their people which could carry them on to full commitment. Therefore, in this situation compromise had to be made about what the work should be. Colton attacked the religious-philosophical group for not appealing to or winning over rationalists (he suspected that their contribution was only mystical and doctrinal and therefore completely abhorrent to rationalists). For this reason, he asked, "What does a man like Makarov think of them and their writings?"¹⁹⁶

While demonstrating a degree of ignorance about the intricacies of the émigré community, Colton did express a legitimate concern regarding the speeches in the United States by churchmen (he mentioned Studdert Kennedy and "A man who visits Russia and has real weight in making American Religious opinion whom I cannot name"), who honestly "expressed the fear that the Soviet Regime would relent in their anti-religious program too soon - before the Orthodox Church had the superstition and wickedness beaten out of it." Fortunately, for Kullman and Anderson (and by extension the Russian religious philosophers), such attacks were so prejudiced that Colton relinquished his hard-line position: "I have been moved recently to write in defense of the [Orthodox] Church." Therefore, the radicals in the United States unwittingly persuaded Colton. Instead of opposing the original concept of Put', he now only wanted to encourage certain changes,

My contention now is that the time is near at hand when Russian Church Leaders will be the only ones able, successfully, to defend Orthodoxy in a world of scientific knowledge and social conscience, and they can do this only as they themselves are giving a spiritual leadership to their people that enables the issues

¹⁹⁶ Ethan T. Colton, letter to Gustave G. Kullman, 11 March 1925, Paul B. Anderson Papers, University of Illinois at Urbana Champaign, Box 6: 1.

of contemporary life to be met intelligently and triumphantly. I want the Journal to be an instrument to this ends.¹⁹⁷

He thus conceded acceptance of the tactics proposed by Kullman and Anderson as long as it was made clear that the plan will be "hospitable to new ideas and values." Colton then verified that "An interconfessional magazine is not practicable and was never contemplated by us."¹⁹⁸

His conditions were, therefore, practical rather than editorial. There would be a Policy Committee for the new review of three from the Religious-philosophical Academy and two from the YMCA, one of whom would serve as secretary. Moreover, all nominations would have to be acceptable to both bodies. He insisted that the YMCA representatives should be Mott with himself as supplement, and directly appointed Kullman as the other representative and secretary. With regards to editorial policy, the Russians would choose their own editor-in-chief, but he would be advised by a council of two other Russians, one American Church scholar, one British Church scholar (Dean Walter), and the secretary - i.e. Kullman himself. The policy was to be devoted to the "service of the Russian Orthodox Christians," the publisher would be the Religious-Philosophical Academy, and funds would be granted on a year to year basis with no future guarantees.

In this way, Colton hoped to appease both the American leadership of the YMCA and the demands of the Russians led by Berdyaev. He had capitulated on those demands necessary for gamering a Russian audience while standing firm upon points -

¹⁹⁷ Ethan T. Colton, letter to Gustave G. Kullman, 11 March 1925, 2.

¹⁹⁸ Ethan T. Colton, letter to Gustave G. Kullman, 11 March 1925, 2. Colton's earlier letter (see note 197) demonstrates that this was in fact a misrepresentation. But as long as they were all in accordance, nobody need ever know of their earlier disagreement or his personal intentions.

namely money and overseeing - that the Americans insisted upon. As a final panacea to

Kullman he stated:

In the foregoing, while your point of complete autonomy may not be met, it will be noted that the Russian Editor has veto power on all material to appear. We reserve, in the Committee on Policy, a vote and in the editorial council, a voice, believing, if the cooperation is to be something more than subsidy, it will be larger if organized in some way like this.¹⁹⁹

If Colton's conditions seem rather strict, it must be remembered that he had had his own intentions rudely tramped upon by the Russians, by the Russian Division Secretaries, and by Mott himself. Quite understandably, he was feeling rather unappreciated.

Colton then began immediately to solicit official approval for the endeavour from the rather conservative governing committee of the YMCA. By the end of March, 1925, he had given a tentative go-ahead to the Russian Office in Paris, and requested the first drafts of the magazine, and any other useful material which he could employ in soliciting support. Colton sent these materials, along with a personal statement by Berdyaev regarding the editorial line of the journal, to Mott on March 19, 1925. Mott needed these to prepare for an imminent meeting with certain Russian scholars with whom he intended to discuss the proposed journal, and hopefully, obtain their endorsement and subscription to it.²⁰⁰

Berdyaev's statement outlined the reasons behind Put' and, more generally, behind his support for increased communication between the Russian Orthodox émigrés and the West:

The Church is not an institution, is not a hierarchy, is not simply a society of believers. The church is a spiritual organism, the body of Christ; it cannot be

¹⁹⁹ Ethan T. Colton, letter to Gustave G. Kullman, 11 March 1925, 3.

²⁰⁰ Ethan T. Colton, preface letter for Berdyaev's statement to John Mott, March 1925, Paul B. Anderson Papers, University of Illinois at Urbana Champaign, Box 6.

bounded by rationalistic definitions. In the Church, through love, unity and freedom are combined.²⁰¹

Berdyayev insisted that, "[t]he dogmas of the ecumenical councils, the sacraments, the principle of Apostolic Succession - all belong to the divine and inerrant, the eternal in the church." However, he also maintained that this did not mean the Church should be considered as static (any living organism is dynamic), nor had it completed its development, work, and growth. He asserted that Christian work within and for the Church must continue, and will not be finished, until the "Coming of the Kingdom of God." He then explained the purpose of the group of émigrés which he himself was a part of:

Russian Religious thought, which is being carried on in the group now active in Europe in connection with the Religious-Philosophical Academy, the Brotherhood of St. Sofia, and the proposed religious journal, has always confirmed Christian freedom and creative development, has always condemned the evil and error in the human side of the church.²⁰²

He saw signs of progress in their work in the gradual return of former atheist or agnostic intellectuals to the Church in these days of the emigration. He asserted that the new task for the Church was to address, "the positive attitude of Christianity to the life of the world and of mankind, toward culture, toward the social question, toward the creative element in man." He thus embraced the YMCA course of action in his own and other Russians' work; Christian revelation in all aspects of life, not simply a divided, localized application of Christian principles, but a unified, comprehensive approach.

In Berdyayev's opinion, Russian religious philosophy was unique and could have an important contribution to Western thought and way of life, "It has put before Christian consciousness problems which have significance and must be of interest even to Western

²⁰¹ Nikolai Berdyayev, Statement on "The Russian Church," trans. by YMCA Press, March 1925, Paul B. Anderson Papers, University of Illinois at Urbana Champaign, Box 6: 2.

²⁰² Berdyayev, Statement on "The Russian Church," 3.

Christianity."²⁰³ The most important of these were the concepts of unlimited freedom (not individualistic but in relation to a community in spirit, i.e. *sobornost'*); of the organic, coherent approach to knowledge which combines both faith and reason; of the cosmic element superseding that of the material in the Church which is signified by the Russian emphasis on the "transfiguration and resurrection of the world; on the Second Coming of Christ"; and finally, of the apocalyptic spirit in Orthodoxy which turns man towards the future, denies complacency in the present, and searches continually for the Kingdom of God, the "New City," "for the truth of Christ." In a statement very reminiscent of the editorial protestation of Vekhi in 1909, Berdyaev claimed that:

This group represents no narrow tendency, but all the present strength of Russian religious though able to express itself in writing. In this group there are represented various shades of religious thought. But these different shades blend into one in their impulse toward Christian revival and Christian creativeness in life, as against restoration of lifeless forms.²⁰⁴

While his justification cannot be assessed as to its comparative impact on the sponsors of the journal, the complete program was eventually adopted. Berdyaev's letter, the materials from Kullman and Anderson, Colton's personal negotiations, and of course, the moral support of Mott all worked together to enable this initiative.

The first edition of Put' was released in October, 1925. It would go on to release a quarterly edition for the next fourteen years, and become an eradicable testimony of Russia Abroad.²⁰⁵ At the outset it "was received with acclamation by some and sharp

²⁰³ Berdyaev, Statement on "The Russian Church," 4.

²⁰⁴ Berdyaev, Statement on "The Russian Church," 5.

²⁰⁵ "To my knowledge, it was the first secular Russian journal to set forth serious information and discussion of theological and ecclesiastic issues and history... Last, but not least *The Way* played a significant part in acquainting Russia Abroad with select intellectual trends of the contemporary West. It was an important role, for we should not forget that the émigrés, as a group, lived in isolation from the host societies." Marc Raeff, Russia Abroad: A Cultural History

criticism by other reviewers. It is charged with being both too liberal and too Orthodox.²⁰⁶ The former ambassador to the United States, Boris Bakhmeteff, was given a courtesy copy when its first edition came out. He wrote to Colton expressing his admiration for the effort and his pleasure at its contents.²⁰⁷ This was seconded on February 28, 1926 by one Vladimir Nosovith who wrote to commend the first edition of Put' which he had obtained and read.

Nosovith found himself converted and changed simply by reading the journal. He was a 23 year old émigré who had been active in the Civil War on the side of the White forces since the age of 16. Struggling with the economic repercussions of emigration, he attempted suicide in May 1925. Despite firing a bullet into his chest, he survived. This caused him, after a long spell of religious indifference, to try theosophy, then the occult sciences, and then "philosophical free thought." Nothing rang true. After his suicide attempt he contracted tuberculosis and ended up in a French Sanatorium from which he had just now been released. In the Sanatorium he had been exposed to Catholic proselytizing and had come close to converting. In an ironically shocking repudiation of Colton's "appeal to the rationalists," Nosovith asserted "I suffered greatly under these contradictions of heart and reason, cursing the "logic" of my brains which I could neither vanquish nor throw away." And then, he found the answer: "Your quarterly (Russ. Magazine "Put" published by Ymca-Press) became the main cause of my recovery from

of the Russian Emigration, 1919-1939 (New York; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990) 148-149.

²⁰⁶ Paul B. Anderson, Russian Service in Europe: Annual Report for the Year 1925, Paul B. Anderson Papers, University of Illinois at Urbana Champaign, Box 6: 8.

²⁰⁷ Boris A. Bakhmeteff, letter to Ethan T. Colton, 9 December 1925, Paul B. Anderson Papers, University of Illinois at Urbana Champaign, Box 6.

awful suffering of my soul." He especially asked that his gratitude be extended to Vysheslavitsev and Father Bulgakov because their articles,

...led me to bow before the Greatness, Depth, and the Breadth of Orthodox Faith. The remarkable and inspiring articles of yourself [Berdyayev], of Prince Troubetskoi, Father Tchetverikov, Ivanov, Arseniev, Frank, Zenkovsky, Mr. Editor, and your associates happiness and success in your truly missionary enterprise.²⁰⁸

In 1926, Put' published "A Letter from Russia" from an anonymous colleague still in that country.²⁰⁹ The essay explained conditions in the Soviet Union pertaining to the persecution of the Orthodox Church. The Soviets had learned that providing martyrs only weakened their cause for turning Russians against religion. By 1926, they were applying new tactics of trying to buy the populace and turn them away from the Church by ridicule and scorn. This meant using extensive means of propaganda like the propagated in the journals "The Godless" and "The Atheist". Despite these efforts, the author maintained that the Church was emerging victorious from the spiritual battle with the communists.²¹⁰ With Bolshevik repressions, the Church had become the only place free of class barriers in Russia and, as such, it was attracting a new laity who were not simply peasants but intellectuals: some came to seek solace for their personal tragedies; others to seek shelter from the "foreign" ideas of Bolshevism.

...but there are also others. These are young and cheerful, these have brought here not sorrow and suffering, but hope and love, the undiminished enthusiasm of youth... The Churches are not yet overflowing, but most are full. In the countryside, however, the Bolsheviks have made their greatest gains, for there

²⁰⁸ Vladimir Nosovith, letter to the editor [Nikolai Berdyayev] of the YMCA Press [translated], 28 February 1926, Paul B. Anderson Papers, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Box 6: 1-2.

²⁰⁹ "A Letter from Russia," Put' 2 (January 1926): 1-11.

²¹⁰ This may have been the reason for Berdyayev's high hopes at this time for the possibility of spiritual renewal within Russia. "A Letter from Russia" 6.

only the old attend church, all the young have turned to atheism.... In many areas, people have simply developed a double faith and project the side most appropriate for the situation: communist or Christian.²¹¹

This article, perhaps more than any other incident which had occurred in the last six years, gave heart to the YMCA that its purpose still had meaning in Russia. Despite the set-backs and the controversies, they had to continue their work among the emigration. There, they had found a way to combat Communism and godlessness, and there lay the only salvation for Russia.

²¹¹ "A Letter from Russia" 7-10.

4. Engaging the French Intellectual Milieu

Interaction with the "Protestant" Americans through the auspices of the YMCA had a substantial effect upon the Russian emigration. On the practical side, it galvanized their efforts at inter-generational cohesion, strengthened émigré appreciation of the Orthodox Church through the RSCM and other initiatives, and became almost indispensable in their efforts to preserve Russian culture abroad. Yet, it also caused division. As was seen in the previous chapter, ties with the YMCA was a major cause of the schism between Eulogius's branch and the Karlovci Synod in 1927. Even before this definitive break, however, dissention over perceptions of Orthodoxy and its role occurred among all the groups who were involved with religion, especially among the religious philosophers.

The *Bratstvo sviatogo Sofii* had emerged almost intact from its members' encounters with emigration and expulsion. They swiftly regrouped in Europe, and began to re-establish the brotherhood. However, their situation had changed drastically from that of Russia in 1918, and they were now bound to redefine themselves. Different experiences, moreover, forged different perceptions, and those expelled in 1922 began to clash with the brothers who had voluntarily emigrated before that time. Almost immediately upon their arrival in the West, Berdyaev, Frank and Bulgakov had a disturbing argument with Peter Struve who derided their efforts in Russia. He did not accept their claims that spiritual change could alter the Bolsheviks from within, chastising their political naïveté:

...bolshevism cannot be justified, much less extolled, on the basis of the fact that there are tendencies in the Russian Revolution that have a future...I am an empiricist and a realist, and I do not see the connections and

disconnections...Where you see them, there are cancerous tumors, which should be dealt with surgically.¹

Struve had become embittered, and "sickened by any 'reconciliation with facts'" (i.e. acceptance that the Bolsheviks were entrenched in power),² through his experiences in the Civil War.³

His three fellow journeymen on that long road from Marxism to religious-philosophy tried to be gentle with Struve, but they were by no means prepared to discard the lessons they had learned about the Russian people during their post-revolutionary initiatives. Berdyaev, always the most volatile of the group, was vehement in insisting that restoration was impossible and, even more, undesirable. As he tried to explain the aspects of the new era into which he believed the entire world had entered, Struve became more and more intransigent in his denial. The dispute finally provoked a definitive split between the two formidable personalities with each refusing to speak to each other on the streets of Berlin. Bulgakov and Frank were distressed about the breach, but like Berdyaev they found Struve's "liberal nationalism" repellant, and his anti-Bolshevik activism futile. They too had seen the phenomena indicating a new age, what Berdyaev had labelled "End of the Renaissance" (European not Russian religious), and were interested in movements which converged with the flow of transition, not those that tried to turn the clock back to some bygone era.

¹ Peter Struve's reply to P.N. Savitsky, as cited in Modest A. Kolerov, "The Brotherhood of St. Sophia: The '*Landmarks* People' and the Eurasians (1921-1925)," Russian Studies in Philosophy 34.3 (Winter 1995-96): 31.

² Kolerov, "The Brotherhood of St. Sophia" 30.

³ Richard Pipes, Struve: Liberal on the Right, 1905-1944 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1980) 294. Part of the debate has been recovered and printed in I.K. Pantin, "Perepiska P.B. Struve i S.L. Franka (1922-1925)," Voprosy filosofii 2 (1993): 115-139.

Hence, the members of the *Bratstvo* who had been expelled in 1922 saw the work with the YMCA as a positive step which would assist them in furthering the development of religious-philosophy both within the emigration and throughout the West. They also wanted to extend such intercommunication, and engage the secular and clerical representatives of the other Christian Churches. Before this could be carried out effectively, however, they required a tightly-knit society which was unified in purpose to represent the Russian religious-philosophical point of view. To this end, it seemed most logical to simply reconstitute the full *Bratstvo* in the emigration. As the dispute with Struve had indicated, however, this might prove very difficult to accomplish.

Sergei Bulgakov led the effort to reinstate the *Bratstvo*: he presented Kartashev's original constitution⁴ to Metropolitan Eulogius in 1923; the Metropolitan swiftly approved it for the new émigré situation. Most of the original group including Kartashev, Zenkovsky, and Berdyaev were all immediately reinstated, but Nikolai Lossky refused to return. He must have had some presentiment of the nasty internal debates which were about to follow. Pavel Novgorodtsev also declined. He felt too weak to join any new undertakings. Age, the Civil War and the process of emigration had taken its toll on the legal philosopher. He died in 1924.

That year was quite chaotic with the mass movement of émigrés and of the YMCA Russian Division from Berlin to Paris. Bulgakov was also making his own preparations to bring his family out of Prague. Therefore, the reestablishment of the *Bratstvo* proceeded quite sporadically. Frank came back that year with a "new" member, Prince Grigori Trubetskoy, a cousin of the Princes Evgeny and Sergei who had played such a

⁴ Which had gained approval from Patriarch Tikhon in 1918. See chapter 1. It should be mentioned that Struve did not participate in any YMCA activities.

vital role in the religious-philosophical associations in Russia. Both Frank and Trubetskoy strove for some alterations in the original constitution as they found Kartashev's draft a bit constricting and somewhat unclear.⁵ That charge was taken to extreme lengths by another member of the Trubetskoy family: the philologist Nicholas S. Trubetskoy publicly condemned the *Bratstvo* charter on the grounds that it did not adhere to common practice and carried the taint of Catholicism in its hierarchical distribution; needless to say, he did not join.⁶

Boris Vysheslavitsev entered in August after completing his move to Paris, but Ivan Ilyin, one of the thinkers expelled in 1922 who had been brought back to the Church by Pavel Novgorodtsev was not accepted; the combined factors of Ilyin's intransigent commitment to interventionism, of his attachment to scientific psychology, and of the recent nature of his conversion resulted in his exclusion. Despite some extreme vacillation over Struve's parallel approach and his subordination of all concerns, even spiritual, to political tasks, his record and lengthy involvement with the religious-philosophical movement precluded a similar disassociation.⁷ According to the historian Kolerov, however, Lev Karsavin was not permitted into the reconstituted *Bratstvo* despite his loyal

⁵ Frank's particular concern seemed to be with the doctrine of prayer. He had his own special prayer which did not conform to those chosen for the *bratstvo* (probably a remnant of his Jewish background), and was afraid that his renewed inclusion would compel him to cease using it. Bulgakov quickly assured him that the regulations applied only to the observance of general prayer, the form of which was consistent for all Church bodies and must remain so; privately, however, Frank was more than welcome to use alternate forms as he wished as long as they accorded with Orthodox faith. Kolerov, "The Brotherhood of St. Sophia" 34.

⁶ N.S. Trubetskoi, "To Most esteemed Sergei Nikolaevich [Bulgakov]," March 1924, appendix of Kolerov, "The Brotherhood of St. Sophia" 39-44.

⁷ See S.L. Frank, *Biografiia P.B. Struve* (New York: Chekhov Press, 1956) 138.

service to the cause of religious-philosophy while in Russia.⁸ If so, this may be attributed to his increasing involvement in the émigré movement of "Eurasianism" (founded by Savitsky, Vernadsky, Suvchinsky), which advocated a renewal of the ties between the *narod* and intelligentsia through an acceptance of Russia's Eastern roots in a rather extreme form of exclusionary Slavophilism. The former *vekhovtsy* were unanimous in their appraisal that "Eurasianism is a movement backward compared with...the intellectual movements of the twentieth century."⁹ Nevertheless, the *Bratsvo* did accept one Eurasianist, the burgeoning theologian Georges Florovsky (1893-1979), who albeit was already distancing himself from this involvement at the time of his inclusion in 1923.

The Eurasianists, Struve and Nicholas Trubetskoy all evinced the growing division which was occurring within the *Bratsvo* in particular, and within the emigration as a whole. Most of the expelled had come to terms with the Bolshevik regime in so far as they believed it could not be overthrown, and that Russians would have to change it from within. The vast majority of the earlier emigration, on the other hand still held fast to dreams of intervention, military excursions, and restoration. The expelled wanted to bring their knowledge of the changes wrought under Communism to the West both as a warning and as informative of the new era. The émigrés hated, and wanted no understanding about dynamism, spirit, or popular vitality. Finally, the expelled desired to engage the hearts and minds of émigrés and Europeans: they advocated inter-confessional discussions, philosophical advancement, and organizational development; they still aspired to developing a religious-philosophical movement which could not only

⁸ Kolerov, "The Brotherhood of St. Sophia" 34. This is somewhat unclear because Kolerov gives no citation nor any reasons for Karsavin's exclusion.

⁹ Nikolai Berdyaev, as cited in Kolerov, "The Brotherhood of St. Sophia" 35.

oppose the growing appeal of communism, but also graphically portray every one of its limitations in the face of true Christian ethics realized in everyday life. This was a challenge that most émigrés could not accept.

Reasons for *engagement*

Once Put' had been successfully launched in September 1925, the religious philosophers were able to turn their attention to the problem of Russian isolationism. The émigrés had created notoriously closed communities once they settled in their adopted countries, and they tended to interact with the native populations only when necessary for their basic subsistence.¹⁰ They would work and shop, of course, in businesses owned by Europeans, but the rest of their time was usually devoted to exclusively Russian endeavors. With the sheer size of the emigration, many were even able to earn their living in entirely Russian settings.¹¹ Their unwillingness to assimilate was demonstrated by the substantial number who refused to accept citizenship in their new countries, instead maintaining the symbol of their Russian nationality by using the Nansen Passport for identification purposes.¹² For both the émigrés and their "hosts", the Russian community was perceived as a nation within a nation. The aggregate of these closed communities made up the conceptual nation "Russia Abroad".

The Russian Religious-Philosophical Academy was superficially nothing more than another Russian émigré institution with its lectures and courses offered in the Russian

¹⁰ Raeff, Russia Abroad 43-44.

¹¹ Writing for Russian newspapers and journals, teaching at the Russian University in Prague, and so forth.

¹² In 1925 there were still some 500,000 Nansen Passports being used by Russian émigrés. Simpson, The Refugee Problem 106-108, 197-198.

language and devoted to Russian issues and ideas. The aspirations of its leaders, however, went beyond the mere preservation and continuation of Russian culture in exile which was the common goal of most other émigré initiatives. They were trying to engender a spiritual renaissance through the development of a new Christian philosophical approach. Although their primary target was the Russian émigrés, especially their youth, because they intended this renaissance to eventually travel back to Russia, the leaders of the Academy fully supported the participation of interested people of any other nationality. They saw the isolation of the Russian emigration as, in fact, its greatest weakness.¹³

The leaders of the Russian Religious-Philosophical Academy were not ignorant of the causes of émigré introversion. The problem of language, for instance, was one which they themselves had found almost impossible to resolve: not only was it time-consuming and difficult to learn the new languages with enough facility to engage in meaningful communication with Europeans, but also many of the Russian terms which were so essential in their cultural and philosophical conceptions were not translatable into Western languages.¹⁴ The Russian history of centuries of virtual isolation from the West also meant that tremendous work would be needed to overcome the traditional Russian suspicion and fear of foreigners. Moreover, the violent circumstances which had caused the emigration precipitated a general malaise of resentment and depression among the émigrés which precluded any enthusiastic embracing of new people or ideas.

¹³ Berdyaev, "Difficulties of Religious Work Among the Russian Youth," 27 December 1929, Paul B. Anderson Papers, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Box 3: 3; and Nicholas Zernov, "Russian Youth and the Union of the Churches," 18 November 1927, Paul B. Anderson Papers, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Box 3: 3.

¹⁴ sobornost', lichnost', tselnost', mir, narod etc.

Although the leaders of the Russian Religious-Philosophical Academy were sensitive to such fears, they also had to deal with the concrete problems created by this isolationism. Time and again when they had embarked upon projects with the YMCA, such as the RSCM, they had faced resistance and fear from the émigrés whom they were trying to help. After three years of constantly encountering this problem, the American directors of the YMCA Russian Division and the religious philosophers agreed that a more delicate approach to their work must be undertaken. This was why they had all so strenuously fought with the central YMCA administration in New York for Put' to be a solely Russian endeavour. Once it proved to the émigrés that it was addressing Russian concerns, then it could gradually introduce other national and Christian ideas in an attempt to slowly chip away at the émigrés' intransigent isolationism. Over time, they hoped, Put' could become the liaison between the mass of the Russian emigration and all movements for spiritual revival and applied Christian philosophy, regardless of their national or denominational origins. What remained to be accomplished was the creation of some means of informing its Russian readers about international and interdenominational concerns in order to gradually breakdown their intransigent isolationism.

The founders of Put', therefore, were now faced with a dilemma. In Put' they had created a voice which would now be heard by a proportion of the emigration, but how could they expand this voice to include the opinions of the world-wide Christian movement without jeopardizing their audience? They had seen that the time was ripe for Russians to enter the world Christian forum earlier in 1925 when a few members of St. Sergius Institute had participated in the international oecumenical meeting in Stockholm on "Life and Work". There, they had learned how the other Christian denominations were

developing ideas and movements which complimented their own endeavors. Protestants from a multitude of confessions and Catholics were developing new forms of Christian philosophies and movements among youths to encourage the relevancy of Christianity in every day life, principles for a spiritual approach to labour, and initiatives to reunify the whole Christian Church. For the founders of Put', it was a revelation to find other Christians implementing the same type of enterprises which they saw as necessary for their fellow Russian émigrés. In their work with the YMCA, these Russians had already embarked upon the path to oecumenism. Now they had to find a way to encourage the emigration as a whole to participate in the world-wide oecumenical movement without arousing the general Russian suspicions against foreign intrusions.

The first step had been the recreation of the *Bratstvo*. However, that process had been fraught with such controversy that the religious-philosophers were forced to face the magnitude of their task: If their own counterparts who had espoused the same ideas prior to the Revolution in Russia could not now accept their desire to engage in inter-confessional communication, how could they expect the mass of the emigration to embrace their plan? Yet unlike most of the émigrés, the expelled did not consider themselves to be "the defeated". They were not interested in nostalgia, anger, or futile dreams, but rather creativity, action, and growth. Therefore, they took the criticisms in stride and considered them only more reasons for a substantial anti-isolationist assault; the disputation about the *Bratstvo* proved every point which they were trying to make.

They embraced oecumenism as the best path towards accomplishing what may be defined as their four major commitments. Their first concern was undermining the appeal of Communism and, more generally, counteracting the growth of materialism. This aim is most frequently associated with Nikolai Berdyaev who, even before his

expulsion from Russia, had asserted that the appeal of Communism lay in its premise of social justice. Christianity had promised to make all men equal and create a just brotherhood - "the meek shall inherit the earth" - and for Berdyaev, Communism arose because this promise was not fulfilled.¹⁵ He insisted that if Christianity was again made relevant to social and political issues, its true ontological basis would make it infinitely superior to Communism and erode the popularity of the Communist movement throughout the world.

Berdyaev's main approach was to demonstrate through discourse and publications the flaws in Marxist thought as opposed to the basic truths of Christianity. Interaction with intellectuals of other nationalities and denominations was therefore essential: Berdyaev made no pretence to knowing all the ways in which Christian truths could be proven; he knew from his extensive readings that many other philosophers were struggling with comparable problems elsewhere in Europe. If he could engage some of these thinkers in debate, they could combine their forces to providing better explanations about the relevance and importance of Christianity.

His fellow Russians suggested other ways to make Christianity appear superior to Communism. Lev Zander and Nicholas Zernov of the RSCM felt that community and action were important. If Christian movements were formed to provide a meaningful, social and contemplative community, youths would be less tempted to join purely political or ideological bodies. Zernov explained:

¹⁵ This argument is most completely expressed in Nikolai Berdyaev, Christianity and Class War trans. Donald Atwater (New York: Sheed & Ward, 1933), but it pervades almost all of his writings since 1917.

In modern Russia two questions stand out with particular clearness: internationalism and socialism. The Soviet Government for ten years has been endeavouring to solve the problems of social justice and the international brotherhood of mankind. At the basis of their ideology they put atheism and materialism, which for Communists constitute a new religion. We Russian Orthodox Christians can see all the fruitlessness of these efforts, but at the same time we realize that the strength of Communism lies in the fact that it is manfully endeavouring to solve those problems which we Christians have declined to solve. The Church is called to conduct mankind along the ways of social and international justice, but it can only have authority over its members when it becomes unified within itself. Communism for many representatives of Russian youth appears as Divine punishment upon Christians for their sluggishness. Russian Orthodox youth inside Russia, because of political circumstances, is, however, powerless up to the present to express its feelings, and actual confirmation of them can only be found in the student Christian circles of the Russian emigration.¹⁶

Vasily Zenkovsky, who headed the Pedagogical Bureau, saw Christian education as the key to fighting communism. One of the mandates for his centre was to promote "scientific work on educational theory elaborating ideas, methods, programs for education in the spirit of the Orthodox Church."¹⁷ If more students were taught Christian tenets and ethics it would protect them against the appeal of ideology.

The most important element in the Christian fight against Communism (and the most explosive), was unity between the different churches. As long as Christianity remained fragmented along denominational lines, and continued its bigoted squabbling, it could not pretend to represent a body for the brotherhood of mankind. The Russian Orthodox, as the primary recipients of Communist repression, were better placed than

¹⁶ Nicholas Zernov, "Russian Youth and the Union of the Churches," 18 November 1927, Paul B. Anderson Papers, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Box 3: 3.

¹⁷ Vasily Zenkovsky, The Religious Pedagogical Cabinet Attached to the Theological Institute: (1927-1933), Paul B. Anderson Papers, The University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Box 3: 3. This seven page report briefly outlined the initiatives of the bureau and, as of 1932, encouraged more attention to Christian social education in the hopes of mitigating the attraction of ideological movements.

most other denominations to demonstrate its destructive potential with regard to all religions, and to call for a change towards unity.

This [the crisis] puts an awful responsibility on Orthodox society and demands active work and organization; it demands a struggle for faith and the Church; it requires a fundamental re-education; the working out of a more virile character, capable of acting, protecting, attacking; capable of organizing all its Christian forces; of carrying out its Christian belief in life itself. At present not only the Orthodox but the whole Christian world, is facing the problem of applying the principles of Christianity, of carrying out the Gospel teaching all through life.¹⁸

No Christian Church could hold back at these dire times and remain isolated hoping that the problems of the world would pass it by.

Yet, the religious philosophers realized that the Russian Orthodox would not effectively transmit their knowledge of Communism's threat unless its own legitimacy and appeal was vastly enhanced in the West. Therefore, the second goal of engaging in oecumenism was to inform and correct Western perceptions about the Orthodox faith. Metropolitan Eulogius could see the importance of this mission as early as 1923 when the head of Roman Catholic missionaries in Russia, Monsignor d'Herbigny began to publicize his belief that the true Church was that led by the "Living Church" in Russia and by the Karlovci Synod externally. He, therefore, undermined the international reputation of Eulogius' authority outside of Russia, and Patriarch Tikhon's within.¹⁹ Anderson and Kullman confirmed the growing support for this position in favour of the "Living Church" and the Karlovci Synod to Berdyaev in 1925, and in response he outlined a method for

¹⁸ Nikolai Berdyaev, "Difficulties of Religious Work Among the Russian Youth," 27 December 1929, Paul B. Anderson Papers, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Box 3: 3.

¹⁹ One of Monsignor d'Herbigny's articles on this subject was "L'Aspect religieux de Moscou en Octobre 1925," *Orientalia Christiana* 3:20 (1926): 24-30. He also elaborated on this position in *Tserkovny zhizn' v Moskve* (Paris: YMCA-Press, 1926).

defense which must be undertaken immediately in order that Eulogius' Church would not be misrepresented in the West.²⁰

The "Living Church" was being portrayed to the West as a religious reform movement similar to that of the Protestants.²¹ Berdyaev warned Metropolitan Eulogius that he could not simply issue an edict proclaiming the "Living Church" to be illegitimate and heretical. People in the West would disregard it because of their history: The Catholic Church had launched such edicts against Protestantism, yet few people would now deny that the Protestant confessions were true religions. Instead, some forum was needed where the émigré clergy and laity could present convincing evidence to Protestants and Catholics that the leaders of the "Living Church" were either Bolshevik agents or opportunists, and that the movement had no voluntary or widespread following. There, they could also rebut the charges of the Karlovci Synod, and demonstrate the durability of the changes wrought at the Great Sobor. On a more practical level, all steps taken to enhance the prestige and importance of their Orthodox Church might prompt other denominations to financially support their initiatives.²² Such generosity combined with vigorous activity intended to enhance the stature of Eulogius' (and the Patriarch's) authority, might also help convince uncertain members of the emigration to ignore the dissension spread by the Karlovci Synod and Bolshevik propaganda.

²⁰ Nikolai Berdaieff, statement on the status of the Russian Orthodox Church [translation], 19 March 1925, Paul B. Anderson Papers, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Box 29: 1-2, 6.

²¹ Berdaieff, statement on the status of the Russian Orthodox Church 1.

²² Lowrie, Saint Sergius in Paris 74. In 1930 St. Sergius was almost entirely funded by the Friends of the Russian Church led by the Archbishop of Canterbury. This is but one example of the assistance oecumenical connections lent to their existence.

The major target of this missionary drive was the Russian émigré youth who were essential if such work was to be propagated in the future. Mobilizing the youth was the third motivation for participating in oecumenism. It was not sufficient that young Russians simply remain Orthodox and learn the basic Russian cultural traditions. For the work of a Christian renaissance and the application of Christian principles in all aspects of life, the youth needed to be taught concrete methods of organization, how to finance movements, and how to engage in varying forms of social, cultural and political activities. What the *Bratstvo* had learned through their work with the YMCA, however, was that Russians were inherently poor teachers of such skills.²³

They had found that the religious tradition in Russia was truly backward in this area. While the secular intelligentsia had learned sophisticated methods of organization over the past century, the Church had not encouraged - in fact it had actively stifled - similar initiatives by laymen. "Orthodox laymen, who have been freer spiritually than Catholics and less dependent upon the church hierarchy, are not accustomed to social activity nor to responsibility as to the fate of the Church".²⁴ The solution which Berdyaev proposed to the problem of Orthodox action was that, "...we Russians are in need of greater activity and greater organization, and this we must learn from the West".²⁵

²³ The YMCA Russian division corroborated this, and continually pinpointed the absence of a religious tradition of social activity and a weak understanding of basic organizational practices on the part of Russian Orthodox leaders as their major obstacle for religious work among the Russian youth. Paul B. Anderson, The YMCA and The Russian Orthodox Church, 26 November 1926, Paul B. Anderson Papers, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Box 3: 1.

²⁴ Nikolai Berdyaev, "Difficulties of Religious Work Among the Russian Youth," 27 December 1929, Paul B. Anderson Papers, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Box 3: 3.

²⁵ Nikolai Berdyaev, statement on the status of the Russian Orthodox Church [translation], 19 March 1925, Paul B. Anderson Papers, University of Illinois at Urbana Champaign, Box 29.1: 6.

The YMCA provided one major resource for learning the skills of social organization and action. At the world oecumenical conference in Stockholm on "Life and Work" (1925), however, the Russians became aware of how many other denominational movements existed which might be able to teach them even more important lessons of motivating and instituting Christian youth activity. A multitude of such organizations had their headquarters in Paris and were thus readily accessible to the émigrés. An oecumenical initiative which brought in the leaders of French Christian movements might, therefore, inform the Russians of the necessary methods and skills which they lacked.

Finally, oecumenism was appealing because it had long been a central purpose in the Russian religious-philosophical tradition. From its Slavophile beginnings, this world-view held that the crucial element for any true advancements in philosophy, theology, or political, economic, and social theory was an East-West Christian reconciliation.

The best among our Orthodox young people can add to the world's Christian movement characteristics of their own spirituality. But it will increase rather than weaken their own strength, if they will collaborate with the representatives of Western religion and study their methods of activity and organization. Suspicion and fear are always a sign of spiritual weakness. True strength is without fear, and is not afraid of creative initiative and innovation....Only the consciousness that Orthodoxy and indeed all Christianity, is entering upon a new epoch with new problems, and the sensitiveness to the trend of history and to the historical hour, can draw the spiritual energy of orthodoxy out of its state of isolation and unfulfillment. In this respect our friends belonging to other religious denominations may help us. We are entering now, after the World War, an epoch of various kinds of unions among which is also that of Christian forces. It is impossible to keep aloof from such unions, but what we must guard against is not to lose our individual personality, not to diminish the spiritual strength stored up in Orthodoxy, but to see that this entity joins them all.

This vision of oecumenism saw a unified federation of Christian churches forming a powerful spirit throughout the world, "conscious of all the complexity of the movement in the world."²⁶

The Russian religious philosophers regarded their oecumenical endeavors as starting points, and did not expect to cure all the ills of humanity. Their first goal was to teach the intellectual leaders of the Western Churches about their religious-philosophical tradition and its essential concepts such as *sobornost'*, *godmanhood*, and *Sophia*. In tandem with this, they also recognized the need to improve their own understanding of Western thought. Once a degree of philosophical and religious integration was achieved and taught to the young Russian émigrés, there still remained the daunting task which would probably have to be carried out by their descendants: These ideas would have to be brought back to Soviet Russia to inform the repressed people in that country and generate a religious revival. Only then, would the ultimate aspirations of oecumenism have a chance for realization.

There will come a time when Christianity will again receive freedom in Russia, when both parts of Russian Orthodox youth will be welded together into one family, and then it will be able openly to share with the whole non-Orthodox world its bitter and joyful experience of hard trials, and to take an active part in the great task of uniting all Christians.²⁷

Until that time, the religious philosophers regarded themselves as the bearers of the Russian mission to Christianity. Their primary quest was to educate the Russian émigré youth in order that they would carry on this mission, and they felt that their cause and their salvation in this quest was the World Christian oecumenical movement.

²⁶ Nikolai Berdyaev, "Difficulties of Religious Work Among the Russian Youth," 27 December 1929, Paul B. Anderson Papers, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Box 3: 4-5.

²⁷ Zernov, "Russian Youth and the Union of the Churches" 5.

In their isolation, most of the Russian emigration were dealing with the massive changes and upheavals which had occurred in their lives through denial, xenophobia and bitterness. As Sergei Bulgakov identified in the Karlovci Synod and other movements, there was a growing tendency to turn,

Orthodoxy... into a "current", into Orthodoxism, without inner freedom and without the sincere desire, above all and essentially, to *know* the force and depth and beauty of Orthodoxy, to love it and not to use it for purposes of self-defense, in order to give a slap to those who think differently and celebrate differently.²⁸

These émigrés insisted that there was another way. They suggested that although people, governments, and institutions come and go, common symbols and established truths recur eternally. If these symbols and truths could be discovered and established they would provide an invaluable protection against the crisis of change and uncertainty. They advocated that it was precisely this awareness of the eternal purpose of Christianity and the lasting meaning of Christian truths which could only be established through oecumenism. It would provide the disturbed émigrés with the security of their own inner significance and outer stability. Contact with people of other nationalities and congregations should not therefore be shunned, but actively pursued.

The Emergence of Berdyaev as Leader

The *Bratstvo* actually fell prey to these divisive forces. By 1925 it had lost its consistency and its driving purpose. Berdyaev resigned from the brotherhood, soon to be followed by his fellow editor at the YMCA Press, Vysheslavitsev, and by Georges Florovsky. After this time, the movement to *engagement* - to directly entering into communication, involvement, and action with intellectuals from different cultures and faiths

²⁸ Sergei Bulgakov, letter to A.V. Stavrovskii, 1 October 1924, appendix in Kolerov, "The Brotherhood of St. Sophia" 53.

- would have to be led by motivated individuals unsupported by a cohesive group. The end of the *Bratstvo* did not mean a discarding of societal associations, but it did exaggerate personal responsibility to an extraordinary degree.

Berdyaev, due to his natural talents and his commitment to the pursuance of religious-philosophy became the foremost leader. Singly, it was he who forged the crucial links with European intellectuals, and arranged forums for discussion. He was always aided by one or another of the Russian émigrés with regard to ideas and morale, and he always strove for inclusion in so far as it would not jeopardize his beliefs; yet, it was he alone who bore the burden of these efforts. Paul B. Anderson of the YMCA was similarly committed to such efforts and, with the unwavering support of Dr. John Mott, he continually provided Berdyaev with secretarial and organizational aid. Yet, neither could provide the initiating force for propelling the emigration out of their apathy. It was left to Berdyaev to actualize the religious-philosophical aspirations in this challenging situation.

Despite the quarrels with his fellow religious-philosophers, Berdyaev retained considerable prestige among the émigrés, and his involvement with the YMCA further positioned him at the centre of émigré activities. As Chief Editor of the YMCA Press, he kept in contact with most of the writers in the Russian emigration. Although he resigned from the *Bratstvo*, Berdyaev was still on intimate terms with most of the professors at St. Sergius. He was also the editor of *Put'* and, while he did not dictate the opinions written in that journal, he could enlist the help of any of its writers in future initiatives.²⁹ Finally,

²⁹ Lowrie, *Rebellious Prophet. A Life of Nicolai Berdyaev* 199.

as a frequent participant in the meetings of the RSCM and the leader of the Religious-Philosophical Academy, Berdyaev was respected by a great many young émigrés.³⁰

Nevertheless, the crucial factor which enabled Berdyaev to lead the externally-directed movement for European interaction was his growing reputation among Western intellectuals. Berdyaev wrote in a particularly accessible manner: he captured the complex ideas in succinct phrases and utilized immediately recognizable examples; as much as possible he avoided lengthy philosophical or religious abstractions which might confuse the point which he was trying to make. This literary ability combined with the originality of his ideas and of his personal experiences made him very attractive to his counterparts in the West. In Berlin, he established contacts with Max Scheler and Oswald Spengler, and also developed an intimate friendship with Hermann Keyserling. The move to Paris interrupted his concerted effort at expanding ties in Germany just at the moment when his thoughts penetrated the mainstream with the resounding success of his new book A New Middle Ages (1923). This work was almost immediately translated into German, and its themes of medieval integrity and a transition away from sterile rationalism made it extremely popular.

His reputation followed Berdyaev to France. There, he was quickly sought out by French intellectuals who were interested in his spiritual ideas as well as in his knowledge of Russia under Communism. In the words of Stanislas Fumet, who was purportedly the first French writer to invite Berdyaev to his house, "we were very curious to know what

³⁰ As one young émigré, Sophie [Shidlovsky] Koulomzin, commented: "What amazes me now, as I look back at the time, is the interest all these men [the religious-philosophers expelled in 1922] showed in us young Russians they met abroad. They were willing to give us so much of their time and attention, and they gave it so generously...Berdyaev learned that several of us met on a regular basis at our house and offered to come and talk to us." Sophie Koulomzin, Many Worlds: A Russian Life (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1980) 107.

was really happening in Soviet Russia."³¹ Fumet had known about Berdyaev because he had obtained a German-language copy of A New Middle Ages, and he discovered the date of the Russian philosopher's arrival in France through his brother-in-law, Vítia Rosev (Rosenblum) who had retained his connections with the Russian milieu despite his recent conversion from Judaism to Catholicism. Prince E. G. Trubetskoy acted as intermediary and, on the behest of Rosenblum, suggested that the Berdyaevs visit the Fumets at their home on rue Linné in Paris. They agreed, and the meeting took place early in 1925.

Fumet's young wife, Aniouta, who was also a recent convert to Catholicism, eagerly anticipated the visit of the famous Russian philosopher. She had read A New Middle Ages in German and aspired to translate the work into French so that it would reach a wider audience. Upon the Berdyaevs' arrival, she immediately proposed this to him, and was quite gratified at his serious and eager acceptance of her offer. She intended the translation to be published in her husband's collection *Le Roseau d'or* which had been founded in 1924 as a subsidiary of Desclée de Brouwer.³² The book was finally translated and, upon its publication in 1927, Un Nouveau Moyen Age became a bestseller. Moreover, the process had introduced Berdyaev to two French intellectuals who were to play an important part in his life and work over the ensuing decades: Jacques Maritain, the thomist thinker and professor at l'Institute Catholique, was Fumet's partner at *Le Roseau d'Or*; Gabriel Marcel, the playwright and critic who was gradually becoming a towering figure in French philosophy, was the editor of the collection.

The Fumets were also responsible for putting the Berdyaevs in contact with yet another notable French Catholic. At the first meeting at the Fumet's house in 1925, after

³¹ Stanislas Fumet, Histoire de Dieu dans ma vie: souvenirs choisis (Paris: Fayard, 1978) 287.

³² Fumet, Histoire de Dieu... 286-289.

Berdyaev had answered their questions and those of their guests about the Soviet Union with "patience and a lack of artifice,"³³ his wife Lydia interjected with a plea: She was feeling quite bereft in Paris as a lone Russian Catholic in the Orthodox milieu and wished to meet sympathetic Catholic women with whom she could discuss her religion. Lydia Berdyaev asked the Fumets, therefore, for the address of Mme. Léon Bloy, the widow of the famous Catholic writer who had died in 1917. She hoped that Mme. Bloy would welcome her and introduce her to other fellow Catholics. Nikolai Berdyaev was also quite interested in meeting Mme. Bloy because he had studied her husband's books back in Russia along with those of Villiers de l'Isle, Verlaine, Huysmans, Baudelaire, and Joseph de Maistre, and he had felt a great empathy with his ideas.³⁴ Gradually, while the two women enjoyed a burgeoning friendship, Mme. Bloy assisted Berdyaev in establishing strong ties with the French intellectual milieu. He was soon invited to the prestigious *Décades du Pontigny* and his relationship with Jacques Maritain was doubly enforced.³⁵ To his gratification, Berdyaev discovered that the mood in France was quite conducive to an acceptance of his religious-philosophical ideas.

³³ Fumet, *Histoire de Dieu...* 288.

³⁴ Fumet, *Histoire de Dieu...* 292.

³⁵ Maritain, a former agnostic Protestant who had held socialist leanings, converted to Catholicism along with his wife Raïssa Oumansoff, a Jewish Russian émigré, in 1906 due to the influence of Léon Bloy. The story of their conversion is an intense and emotional one: the young couple had become despondent at the lack of spirituality and purpose they found in their philosophical studies at the Sorbonne, and they agreed to commit suicide together if they did not find some concrete meaning to their lives by the end of 1906. Shortly before the appointed date, Raïssa read Bloy's *The Woman who was Poor* and, overwhelmed by its message, she asked her husband to also read the book. The young couple then eagerly approached Bloy who was immensely sympathetic to their plight and slowly convinced them of the salvation they would find in the hands of the Roman Catholic Church. Bloy even presided over their baptism and became their "god-father." This story is most evocatively told by Raïssa Maritain, *Les grandes amitiés* 3rd ed. (Paris: Desclée de Brouwer, 1949).

The Religious Renaissance in France.

Indeed, a certain religious renaissance comparable to that which had flowered so intensely in pre-revolutionary Russia was also occurring in France. Epitomized in the tragic history of the young poet and editor Charles Péguy, a host of French intellectuals had reached a similar point of disenchantment with Positivism, and had begun the long trek to some renewed understanding of spiritual and religious principles. They had been nurtured by Léon Bloy; after his death, Jacques Maritain took over the mantle from his godfather, and became the central focus of the religious revival.

To assist this development, Maritain and his wife Raïssa had decided to form some sort of society in which laymen and clergy could compare views on religion and the relevance of Christianity in their time. As Maritain was rapidly becoming a specialist in the thought of St. Thomas Aquinas at the Institut Catholique, he felt that the meetings should focus on a study of Thomism in order that the participants could develop a more complete and rigorous understanding of its eternal principles. After an abortive attempt in 1914, the Maritains were finally able to create their *Cercles Thomistes* in the Autumn of 1919 at their rented house in Versailles at 21 rue Baillet-Latour.³⁶ Rapidly increasing membership and an unexpected bequest soon caused them to move to a larger house on rue de Parc in the Paris suburb of Meudon.

In choosing the membership of his *Cercles Thomistes*, Maritain followed much the same approach as had the religious-philosophers in Russia in that it should be as diverse a group as possible:

³⁶ Jacques Maritain, Notebooks, trans. Joseph W. Evans (Albany, NY: Magi Books Inc., 1984) 133.

...young persons and old persons, male students and female students, and professors - laymen (in the majority), priests and religious - professional philosophers, doctors, poets, musicians, men engaged in practical life, those who were learned and those who were uneducated - Catholics (in the majority), but also unbelievers, Jews, Orthodox, Protestants.³⁷

The setting for the meetings was also laid out in this initial year and maintained for their entire duration. The atmosphere was familial rather than formal. Raïssa, or her sister Vera if she was unwell, and their mother acted as hostesses welcoming visitors in for a glass of tea in the comfortable salon. Jacques prepared a brief outline for each meeting, but no strict formality was observed as they read through the chosen writings, and moved on to question/debate difficult points or relevant topics. At the end of each meeting, several people would remain to dine with the Maritains, and continue the discussion on an even more personal level. Only by midnight, would the family again be left alone to retire exhausted, but replete in the knowledge that true communication had occurred.

Since its inception, their *Cercles Thomistes* had grown each year. The initial group of students and professors from the Institut Catholique was augmented by intellectuals who were not directly involved in theological matters, but were interested in studying the contemporary relevance of St. Thomas Aquinas' ideas and tenets. At first, the newcomers were almost entirely drawn from Catholics amid the artistic milieu in Paris. This was partially a consequence of the couple's long-held fascination with, and sympathy for the arts. Jacques Maritain had publicized his belief that Thomist principals could be applied to the subject of artistic creativity in Art and Scholasticism (1921).³⁸ As the book became more widely known, its descriptions of the inspiration which God and Christianity

³⁷ Maritain, Notebooks 134.

³⁸ Jacques Maritain, Art et scolastique, 2nd ed. (Paris: L. Rouart et fils, 1927). This has since been translated into English: Art and Scholasticism, and the Frontiers of Poetry, trans. Joseph W. Evans (New York: Scribner, 1962).

could evoke attracted artists who were seeking new forms of expression, and yet were unsatisfied and divided by the current mechanistic or irrationalist models.

A process of fragmentation had begun during the First World War among the artistic milieu. General disillusionment with the traditions of the nineteenth century led artists to seek new foundations for their creativity.³⁹ However, each time that one group would create a new form and declare it to be the standard, another innovation would be launched into the Paris scene, and they would all scramble to try the latest experiment. Between 1916-1924, therefore, they frantically pursued the latest fad in an age which rewarded scandal over artistic merit.⁴⁰ Cubism declined as Picasso left to compete with Jean Cocteau for notoriety in Diaghilev's latest production; Dadaism lost its allure to André Breton's new symbolism as Parisian writers fought to replace Apollinaire; the colossal rise and fall of the *Salle Huyghens* mirrored the personal reputations that the club made and destroyed in the space of one Saturday night.

In 1920 for example, *Les Six* became the rage in Paris when Erik Satie persuaded fellow composers Georges Auric, Francis Poulenc, Arthur Honegger, Louis Durey, Germaine Tailleferre, and Darius Milhaud to combine their formidable talents in a musical show at *Salle Huyghens*. *Les Six* drew Paris spectators into its orbit when its title was bestowed by Henri Collet in his review of the opening show in *Comoedia*; within the year, however, it split apart as each of the six "betrayed Satie," and moved on to pursue greater fame separately.⁴¹ Insecurity had replaced the *schools* of the Edwardian period, and the

³⁹ Mikhail Drushkin, Igor Stravinsky: His Life, Works, and Views (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983).

⁴⁰ Frederick Brown, An Impersonation of Angels: A Biography of Jean Cocteau (Harlow, UK: Longmans, 1969) 159.

⁴¹ Brown, An Impersonation of Angels 159.

fluctuations in their world caused each to believe that they would succeed better alone, that there was some magical apogee that could be reached if only they could move fast enough. The incredibly rapid pace of change in the artistic world of Paris went hand-in-hand with depravity, alcoholism, drug-use, and competitions for the most flamboyant behaviour and apparel. A raft of suicides and deaths from over-indulgence bore testimony to the inability of human beings to maintain this destructive way of life.⁴² As the antics of Parisian artists became more and more wild, individual creators began to look for some reprieve without which they feared that they would have to abandon their careers or face self-immolation.

Alternatives to the insecurity of unleashed experimentalism, however, did exist at that time in France, and the Maritains became part of one of these great movements. Neo-classicism advocated that artists cease their search for the latest novelty, and base their work upon the traditional forms perfected in the past. As nineteenth-century methods were generally unacceptable, neo-classicism urged artists to seek their inspiration in classical Greek, Roman, and Medieval works. This required the dissolute artists to engage in intensive study of often long-forgotten art, apply exacting discipline, and then produce simple, transparent, and perfected creations.

Neo-classicism, which had enjoyed such popularity in Russia at the turn of the century, made its appearance in the Western world during World War One, but achieved significant popularity only after the decadence of the *modems* had run its course in the early 1920s. As it rose to prominence, however, it infiltrated every realm of the

⁴² One of the most famous cases was that of the lover of Jean Cocteau, Raymond Radiguet who, after achieving tremendous fame in 1921 with his scandalous novel Diable au corps [or A Devil in the Flesh, trans. A. M. Sheridan Smith (London: Calder & Boyars, 1968)], fell into a depression and died from alcohol abuse on 12 December 1923.

humanities: art, music, literature, poetry, education, philosophy and theology. Within this spectrum, Jacques Maritain's neo-thomism was a part of the classic revival and it merged with innovations which were all a part of the perennialist perspective. As Maritain became aware of the interest in his ideas, he decided to embark upon an enterprise designed to actively encourage and reward artistic efforts to engage in neo-classical themes, especially religious ones: The *Roseau d'or* collection played much the same role for encouraging French religious publications, as the YMCA press did for Russian ones.⁴³

Paul Valéry espoused the classical over experimentation in poetry and literature, and created a stable school in Symbolism. T.S. Eliot, enamoured with all things ancient, joined his voice to Valéry's in 1917 in Tradition and the Individual Talent, which asserted that tradition was more important than individualistic whims.⁴⁴ The Russian émigré Igor Stravinsky led a similar movement in the musical world. Now looking to the Latin and Slavonic Church pasts for his inspiration, he ignored the dismay of his fans and of music critics and refused to continue his former approach.⁴⁵ In so doing, he joined forces with Satie against the prevailing romantic impressionist trend in compositions. In 1923, Satie declared his debt to Stravinsky:

I love and admire Stravinsky because I perceive also that he is a liberator. More than anyone else he has freed the musical thought of today which was sadly in need of development. I am glad to have to recognize this, I who have suffered so much from the Wagnerian oppression, or rather that of the Wagnerians. For, a

⁴³ see chapter 3

⁴⁴ Drushkin, Igor Stravinsky: His Life, Works, and Views 77.

⁴⁵ For example, the score for Oedipus (1925) was dramatically different, more restrained, than Stravinsky's earlier Rites of Spring (1913), or The Firebird (1912).

few years ago, the genius of Wagner was miserably adored by the combined Mediocrity and Ignorance of the crowd.⁴⁶

The Franco-Russian alliance between Stravinsky and Satie unleashed a new mode of music which preferred the "brevity and conciseness of musical discourse to the ramblings and rumblings of impressionism".⁴⁷

Art was also affected by the neo-classicist revolution. The energies of the émigré Marc Chagall, who found his inspiration from a combination of Hasidic writings and Jewish village life in Vitebsk, brought his own form of neo-classicism to France.⁴⁸ There, his works resounded with the classically-grounded paintings of Maurice Denis, Gino Severini, and Jean Hugo. The émigrés were, thus, able to participate in the revival of traditional forms in the West. While they sought to preserve the past which they had seen destroyed in their own country by Revolution, the Western Europeans and Americans looked for stability in their own past to cure the post-war malaise. Although the need stemmed from different causes, their forces combined in a unified aspiration to provide grounded meaning for their creativity.

A major element inherent in neo-classicism was a return to religion. As they looked to the past to find the foundations and inspiration for their future work, most neo-classicists were drawn to biblical and medieval precedents. There, they found a reassuring unanimity of purpose in man's religious past, and revelled at the unquestioning acceptance of divine influence in everyday life which permeated their works. While the

⁴⁶ Eric Satie as cited in Igor Stravinsky ed. Edwin Cole (Freeport NY: Books for Libraries Press, 1969) 35.

⁴⁷ Nicholas Nabokov, Old Friends and New Music (Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1974) 98.

⁴⁸ Aleksandr Kamenskii, Chagall: The Russian Years, 1907-1922 (New York: Rizzoli, 1989).

Maritains were but a part of a widening group who found solace and valuable lessons in the religious tradition of mankind, circumstances would propel the couple into the limelight. From contributors to a religious renaissance within the neo-classicist movement, they suddenly became the "experts of all things religious." Remarkably, the fragmented and disillusioned Parisian artists seized upon the Maritains' work in this direction as the new answer. They had, perhaps unwittingly, tapped into the prevailing obsession for change, and created an astonishing new fad. By 1925, "God was in!" and their house at Meudon was the place to find him.⁴⁹

The Maritains' home had long been a haven for certain Catholic artists before this fad took hold. Jean and Valentine Hugo, Stanislas and Aniouta Fumet, Pierre Reverdy, Maurice Denis, and Max Jacob (who converted from Judaism in 1909) were ardent participants in the *Cercles Thomistes*, and had tried to spread the couple's Christian message to their peers in the arts. However, the great transformation occurred only when the "enfant terrible" of the Parisian artistic world, Jean Cocteau, made his way to their home in 1924. Attracted to Maritain by his book Art and Scholasticism and devastated by the sudden death of his lover Raymond Radiguet, Cocteau began to visit Meudon to discuss his doubts about, and yet fascination with, Catholicism and religion.⁵⁰ Throughout that year, Cocteau battled the formidable problem of an opium addiction - ironically he had been introduced to the substance by another frequenter of the *Cercles Thomistes*, Louis Laloy, in Monte Carlo - and finally succumbed to treatment at an elite

⁴⁹ Brown, An Impersonation of Angels 246.

⁵⁰ Certain biographers of Cocteau suggest that he was not motivated by a personal Christian revelation, but rather by a desire to attract a new lover, Jean Bourgoing, who was intensely religious. Cocteau is also attributed with confiding to a friend that he sought out the Maritains only to prevent some boy from committing suicide over an unrequited love for him. See Brown, An Impersonation of Angels 247.

hospital in Paris. He spent his convalescence under the sheltering care of Jacques Maritain and, briefly, became a part of the Meudon household.

His moment of revelation came one day in the winter of 1924-25, after he had recovered, when he entered the Maritains home for a dinner engagement and caught sight of their visiting friend Père Charles (Henrion) garbed in the magnificent white robe of the North African Burburs. Cocteau was astounded by the tranquillity of the young monk and, after a night of intense conversation with Père Charles and the Maritains, he finally decided to renew his vows. He took mass the next morning in the Maritains' chapel from the hands of Père Charles.⁵¹ In the typically Parisian manner of that time, his conversion was no private matter: Cocteau published a letter to Maritain describing his shock upon meeting Père Charles, his doubts and his struggle with depression and opium, and his final decision to embrace God and the Catholic Church for all in Paris to read.

This publicity sparked an immediate reaction as a host of artists suddenly became ardently religious. The house at Meudon was besieged by a flock of eager converters seeking to ride on Cocteau's coat-tails, and make their reputation as new "Catholic artists." By 1925, when a young artist mentioned God, his colleagues and mentors would say: "you must talk to Jacques Maritain; he will answer you better than I can."⁵² The influx soon became so large that Jacques and Raïssa decided to hold what they termed laughingly "esoteric" meetings in addition to the regular sessions of *Cercles Thomistes*

⁵¹ Jean Cocteau, Lettre à Jacques Maritain (Paris: Librairie Stock, 1926). Maritain's response was published in Jacques Maritain, Reponse à Jean Cocteau (Paris: Librairie Stock, 1926). The popularity of these confessions may be indicated by the fact that Maritain's response ran to at least 17 editions.

⁵² Maurice Sachs, Le Sabbat: souvenir d'une jeunesse orageuse (Paris: Gallimard, 1960) 143.

one Sunday a month. The re-organization was necessary both to provide enough free time for them to pursue their other obligations, and to establish a certain direction and purpose to the discussions.⁵³

Of the new converts, the impressionable, aspiring writer Maurice Sachs was the most notorious. Only eighteen at the time, Sachs came to Meudon with a sense of awe and anticipation.

When the door opened, I saw in the entrance a man who resembled all the images of Christ; I had never seen features transposed into such a great gentleness; the straight-forward and clear blue eyes were humid with tenderness and the grand lock of hair which covered a part of his forehead gave him an air of infancy....I melted under his regard, shrunk, became all child, I felt detached from everything around myself and, as if by a miracle, even from the heaviness of my impurities. My guiltiness dissolved in the fire of this love of good which possessed a man entirely and not at all, that under his gaze I felt absolved of all my faults, renewed and perfectly happy.⁵⁴

If Jacques Maritain was Jesus Christ for Sachs, then Raïssa and her sister Vera Ousmanov, were Mary Magdalene and Martha. With romanticized enthusiasm, Sachs flung himself into Catholicism: he was baptized at Meudon in 1926 with Raïssa as his god-mother, and immediately entered the Dominican Order.⁵⁵ Almost as rapidly, however, he discovered that he was not yet prepared to embrace the vow of chastity, left the Order, and became a "fallen-away Catholic" before the decade was out.

This incident caused considerable embarrassment for the Maritains, and has largely affected their historical record. While the couple maintained that they were trying to create an "intellectual apostolate," the most famous conversions which they had assisted seem to have a dubious character. Cocteau continued his "depraved" life-style

⁵³ Maritain, Notebooks 134-135.

⁵⁴ Sachs, Le Sabbat 146-147.

⁵⁵ Sachs, Le Sabbat 155-180.

as a homosexual and opium addict; the symbolist writer Paul Sabon converted at Meudon in 1925 only to commit suicide eight months later; even Erik Satie's death-bed conversion in 1925 was held up to intense scrutiny.⁵⁶ For the most part the Maritains were, and continue to be, accused only of naïveté and perhaps an over-eager proselytising zeal. They focused so intensely upon their mission that they did not consider the possibility that they might be used by opportunistic artists seeking yet another "crazy fad" to add to their list of notorious exploits.

The Oecumenical Circle

It was into this atmosphere that Berdyaev and the other émigrés leaving Berlin entered when they arrived in Paris in 1924. Not only the turn towards religion, but also the exaggerated appeal of fads caused the French intellectual and artistic milieu to be quite accepting of the Russians. The religious-philosophers were in tune with the mood of Neo-classicism, and by the benefit of their "foreignness" they were an automatic attraction. Moreover, the elite group who had chosen to stay in Russia under Bolshevism until their abrupt expulsion were a remarkable change from the swarms of displaced nobility and tsarist officers. For Berdyaev, there could be no better situation in which to embark upon inter-confessional and inter-cultural communications.

His broad plan to wrest the émigré community out of their intransigent isolation was initiated in the last days of 1925 after Put' had been launched. Anderson and Kullman from the YMCA Russian Division urged him to take concrete steps toward establishing a formal oecumenical discussion group which could serve as the first step to breaking down denominational ignorance, and they offered whatever organizational

⁵⁶ Brown, An Impersonation of Angels 243-246. This was also questioned by Sachs.

assistance he might require. Lev Zander, head of the RSCM in Paris, seconded their appeal noting the dangerous vacuum in which most of his young members were trapped. Contacts with young French people, he insisted, would bring purpose and opportunity into the émigrés' lives. It was Zander who conceived of the idea to use the new premises of the RSCM to hold discussions with leading Protestant and Catholic personalities in France.⁵⁷

With energy and enthusiasm, therefore, Berdyaev set to work. He composed a detailed list of Russian émigrés who should be invited to an oecumenical meeting as representatives of the Orthodox.⁵⁸ For the Catholics, Berdyaev's first personal choice was Mme. Léon Bloy who had done so much to assist his entrance into French society. He turned to Maritain for the remainder, asking him to select representatives from his *Cercles Thomistes*.⁵⁹ The last group which remained to be enjoined were the French Protestants. Although the YMCA was a largely Protestant organization - and Anderson, Kullman and their Anglican friend Dean Walter were already invited - they had few contacts with the Reform Church or other Protestant congregations in France.

Berdyaev, thus, sought the assistance of a seemingly odd person, asking the Abbé Laberthonnière to suggest the names of prominent Protestant theologians and philosophers who might be interested in oecumenical discussions with the Russians and

⁵⁷ Pasteur Marc Boegner, L'exigence oecuménique: Souvenirs et perspectives (Paris: Éditions Albin Michel, 1968) 36.

⁵⁸ "Berdyaev's Guests for the Oecumenical Conference," 10 January 1926, Paul B. Anderson Papers, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Box 3. For a complete list of the people invited to the first meeting of the *Oecumenical Circle* please see Appendix A.

⁵⁹ "Maritain's List of Guests for the Oecumenical Conference," 4 January 1926, Paul B. Anderson Papers, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Box 3.

the French Catholics.⁶⁰ "Odd", because the Abbé was Catholic and, even more, an outcast to most of his fellow believers since he had been condemned in the Papal encyclical *Pascendi*.⁶¹ The reason why Berdyaev appealed to this Catholic to help him enlist the participation of Protestants remains a mystery. What is known, however, is that the Abbé Laberthonnière was extremely helpful in this regard, and he managed to bring France's leading Protestant theologians to the Russian oecumenical meetings.⁶²

On January 10, 1926 Gustave Kullman finally received all the lists of people to be invited to the proposed oecumenical meeting. Unfortunately, on that day, Kullman was also afflicted by a temperature above 103 degrees. He, therefore, placed an emergency call to Sophie Zernova, one of the leaders of the RSCM who was currently working in the YMCA-Russian Division office, explained the situation and asked her to take over. Zernova agreed and gathered the lists from the seriously-ill Kullman. She then compiled the names and typed out the sixty-six invitations which read as follows:

You are cordially invited to take part in the first meeting of the Circle for Religious Studies which will take place on Thursday the 14th of January 1926 at 4 o'clock in the afternoon at 9 rue Dupuytren, Paris VIe, (Métro Odéon).

Introduction theme of the discussion: N. A. Berdyaev - "The Notion of Faith in the Orthodox Religion."⁶³

⁶⁰ Abbé Laberthonnière, letters to Nikolai Berdyaev, 10 and 26 December 1925. Paul B. Anderson Papers, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Box 3.

⁶¹ In 1913, two of his major works Le témoignages des martyrs and Sur le chemin du catholicisme were placed on the *Index*, and he was forbidden to publish again in his lifetime. Frederick Copleston, A History of Philosophy, Vol. 9 (New York: Doubleday, 1985) 237.

⁶² "Laberthonnière List of Guests for the Oecumenical Conference," 2 January 1926, Paul B. Anderson Papers, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Box 3.

⁶³ G.G. Kullman, letter to Sophie Zernova, 10 January 1926, Paul B. Anderson Papers, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Box 3.

The meeting was held in the large, basement cafeteria which usually housed the RSCM assemblies, thanks to the benevolence of Lev Zander who agreed to put the room at their disposal for one Thursday every month. Thus, the *Oecumenical Circle* began.

The membership of the *Circle* was deliberately quite diverse to allow it to address the plurality of concerns which had prompted its creation. A slight majority of mature theologians and religious philosophers gave it the necessary expertise to define the major points of liturgical and doctrinal differences. While it should not be misrepresented as an official Church endeavour nor as a meeting of all the foremost religious intellectuals in France and the emigration, it did bring together a substantial proportion of influential thinkers and religious leaders. Furthermore, with its inclusion of both French and Russian youths, the *Oecumenical Circle* was insured against transience. The youth would be able to carry on the ideas developed in these meetings to other forums and initiatives. No formal minutes or record of the meetings of the *Oecumenical Circle* are known to exist, and we can rely only on the reminiscences of some of its members, reports issued in *Put'*, and one unique case where a visitor took notes of the proceedings.⁶⁴ What emerges from this albeit scanty source material is the picture of a dynamic assembly in which foregoing assumptions were ravaged, rules of procedure often completely disregarded, and intense debates engaged.

Some of the topics discussed, which are listed in the discovered historical documents, also demonstrate that the *Oecumenical Circle* provided its participants with an in depth lesson into the major facets of the history and beliefs of each Christian denomination. Berdyaev opened the circle with a talk on "The Notion of Faith in the

⁶⁴ Emmanuel Mounier, "Entretiens II" [unpublished], 1928-1930, Emmanuel Mounier Papers, Châtenay-Malabry, France in the private collection maintained by Mrs. Paulette Mounier (copy obtained from Dr. John Hellman, McGill University, Montréal).

Orthodox Religion." When the group met again, the orthodox Thomist and Dominican, Père Gillet rose to present a Catholic rebuttal with his talk "On Analogy in the Knowing of God."⁶⁵ Completing the round table, the third meeting was led by the Pasteur Lecerf who led the discussion with his paper, "Religious Knowing and the Notion of Dogma." For the next four years, this remained the general procedure for the *Oecumenical Circle*. A topic for discussion would be chosen by the members, and then three circular presentation-discussion sessions would be held at which each confession could put forth their views.

The concentration of the first year's meetings on the questions of faith, theologies of knowledge, and the differences between the constitutions of the denominations proved to be very important for the world oecumenical movement. In 1927, the second major oecumenical conference was held in Lausanne on the question of "Faith and Order". There, the Orthodox representatives, Sergei Bulgakov and Boris Vysheslavtsev, and the Protestants Marc Boegner and Wilfred Monod, were able to bring the discoveries of the *Oecumenical Circle* to the world forum.⁶⁶

Put' reported on the *Oecumenical Circle* in its third issue of March-April, 1926. Moreover, despite its necessarily Russian Orthodox administration, the journal quickly demonstrated its commitment to oecumenism. In the second issue of January 1926, it published an article by Samuel Kavert on the Stockholm Conference of 1925 which outlined the intentions of the World Oecumenical Movement, and the achievements of the

⁶⁵ "Sobraniia pravoslavnyikh', katolikov i protestantov v Parizh," Put' 3 (March-April 1926): 382. This theme is elaborated in Père Martin-Stanislas Gillet, Les harmonies eucharistiques: essai théologique (Lille: Desclée de Brouwer, 1914).

⁶⁶ Pasteur Marc Boegner, L'exigence oecuménique: Souvenirs et perspectives (Paris: Éditions Albin Michel, 1968) 36.

Conference.⁶⁷ The same issue also included an article by Jacques Maritain, "Metaphysics and Mysticism," in order that the French Thomist's views could be disseminated to a wider Russian audience than the members of the *Oecumenical Circle*.⁶⁸ The third issue of *Put'* not only listed the lectures which had been given, and were soon to be delivered, at the *Oecumenical Circle*, but also included an article by an S. Ollard on "Anglo-Catholicism."⁶⁹ The June-July issue published Professor N. Glubokovsky's article on the role of Orthodoxy in Christian unity⁷⁰ and, in October-November, Gustave Kullman at last made his contribution, "Protestantism and Orthodoxy" in tandem with an anonymous "A.K." who wrote, "The Attitude of the Anglican Church towards Orthodoxy."⁷¹ Until 1930, when the *Oecumenical Circle* was disbanded, *Put'* regularly reviewed its achievements. Even after that date, the journal continued to present alternate denominational perspectives and encourage the cause of oecumenism.

By the end of 1928, not only were the monthly Thursday sessions still occurring, but the *Oecumenical Circle* had also branched off into more intimate gatherings which met at the homes of Maritain and of Berdyaev.⁷² On December 17, 1928, a young protégé of Maritain, Emmanuel Mounier, who took voluminous notes of every meeting, recorded one at the home of Maritain in Meudon where the Orthodox and Catholic

⁶⁷ *Put'* 2 (January 1926): 237-238.

⁶⁸ *Put'* 2 (January 1926): 209-218.

⁶⁹ *Put'* 3 (March-April 1926): 357-360.

⁷⁰ *Put'* 4 (June-July 1926): 490-494.

⁷¹ *Put'* 5 (October-November 1926): 610-612, 616-618.

⁷² Emmanuel Mounier, "Entretiens II," 17 December 1928, 16. Other such offshoots may have been formed by the Protestant members or by the Abbé Labertonnière, but we have no record of this.

members of the *Oecumenical Circle* exchanged a list of questions which they wanted each other to answer over the coming years. The Orthodox Russians asked the Catholics to comment on the following eight issues:

1. The *Catholic Action* movement? The *Apostles*? The role of laymen? The personal responsibility of each to his own point of view?
2. The universality of the Church and the national element. Catholicism and Latinism. Is it possible to identify universality and supranationality? The national Church and nationalism: to what point can universal Catholicism be consolidated with national interests.
3. The missionaries. The directions of the Pope in this sphere. The Catholic Church in China.
4. The Pope and the Church. The dogma of infallibility
5. Science and Religion. The attitude of the Catholics towards bible critique.
6. How is the Orthodox church seen in the eyes of Catholics. The Church and grace. Attitude of the Catholics towards dissidents. Catholics and Protestants.
7. Asceticism and mysticism in the West. Their development through the course of history. The temperance or sobriety in the mystical graces.
8. The sense of eschatology among the Catholics.⁷³

The first of these questions was given an initial response at that meeting. Jacques Maritain told the Orthodox Russians about the opinion of Pope Pius XI regarding laic activities and *Action Catholique*. The Pope supported these initiatives, and recalled that in the early Christian Church, lay members of the Church had held a distinct position within the hierarchy. Only gradually did apostolic work become the complete purview of clerics and, in the Middle Ages, fall under the control of the Grand Orders. Maritain then referred to the recent letter from Cardinal Gasparri of January 24, 1928 in which he

⁷³ Emmanuel Mounier, "Entretiens II," 17 December 1928, 16-17.

defined *Action Catholique* as "the cooperation of the laity in the apostolate."⁷⁴ The Russians were confused about such active spiritual work, and one assumed that the Catholic organization was a modern recreation of the Jesuit missionary or Dominican inquisition initiatives. He stated that the Orthodox only permitted such bodies for the purpose of contemplation, never for action.⁷⁵ Hence the participants were made aware of a major divergence: Orthodoxy traditionally encouraged wholly inward development, whereas the Catholics embraced realizing the spirit through activity "in the world".

The Catholics then responded by asking the Orthodox to elaborate their views about eight similar themes:

1. What was the role of laymen in the Orthodox Church and what was the personal responsibility of each to his own point of view?
2. The universality of the Orthodox Church and the national element. Is it possible to identify universality and supranationality? The national Orthodox Church and Russian nationalism: to what point can universal Orthodoxy be consolidated with national interests?
3. The Catholic Church in the eyes of the Orthodox.
4. Asceticism and Mysticism in the East.
5. The view of eschatology among Russians
6. The Old Believers.
7. The Doctrinal Authority in the Russian Church
8. Russian and the Far East. The Slavophiles. Eurasianism.⁷⁶

From these topics, it is apparent that over the course of the *Oecumenical Circle's* existence, its members attempted to relate the crucial aspects of their different histories

⁷⁴ Emmanuel Mounier, "Entretiens II," 17 December 1928, 18.

⁷⁵ Emmanuel Mounier, "Entretiens II," 17 December 1928, 18.

⁷⁶ Emmanuel Mounier, "Entretiens II," 17 December 1928, 17.

to one another. It is not known what the Protestants were asked to explain, but judging from the similarity between the Orthodox and Catholic lists, it may be surmised that they gave lectures about their evolution as a Church, their divisions and particular confessions, their views of mysticism, eschatology, nationalism, and their approach to laic action.

The theme which appears to have emerged as the central point of disagreement was that of Church organization. While the Orthodox and Protestants shared a somewhat similar system of peers, the Catholic hierarchical organization continually disturbed the Russian émigrés. By 1929, the *Oecumenical Circle* seemed to arrive at a certain understanding about this issue. As Maritain put forth, the Catholics put the "mystical body" in priority over the "organic body" of the Church, the mystical body of course being manifested in the person of the Pope. Whereas the Orthodox seemed to tend more to the Protestant conception of the "invisible Church,"⁷⁷ the only temporal representative of this would be the entire congregation.

More precisely, Prince Kovalevsky differentiated Orthodoxy along the lines of spirit and matter: the Catholic Church, with its hierarchy, brought the spirit of God into matter through the person of the Pope, and this spiritual essence then devolved downwards through the ranks of the Church. The Protestants left the spirit to its own realm and focused almost solely upon the matter - the congregation. The Orthodox, however, divorced their entire conception of Church from matter. The Church was "universal because it sanctified all humanity" and, as a spiritual essence, it connected with all of its believers.⁷⁸ The Western denominations, therefore, were limited in the eyes of the Orthodox by their separation from the spirit. Either they had to turn the Spirit into matter

⁷⁷ Emmanuel Mounier, "Entretiens II," April 1929, 22.

⁷⁸ Emmanuel Mounier, "Entretiens II," April 1929, 21-22.

(Catholic) or they relegated it to the unknown (Protestant). The Russian Orthodox could not accept such limitations because in their tradition, spirit was as real and tangible as matter.

As one Russian explained in an offshoot meeting at Meudon:

Our divergence with the Catholics? There is above all in the Catholics the idea of a hierarchical society, where an exaggerated importance is attributed to certain exterior signs. The Church, for us, must divest itself of all material elements: it is universal, because it sanctifies all humanity even before it reaches out, all the universe belongs to it, the least of laws. The Catholics have chosen, as the sign of their catholicism, the unity of government. It desires to be universal in time and space. Whence the pope is placed as guardian of all authority and all infallibility. For us infallibility is in the totality of the Church which is the body of the Church.⁷⁹

The Catholic Thomists led by Maritain continually protested this understanding. The hierarchy, they maintained, did not diminish, nor render material, the spirit (holy ghost); rather the holy ghost was automatically manifested in the decisions made by their Church leaders - the Pope after all was directly linked to God. Here, the Orthodox countered with history, and asked how the Catholics resolved disputes between the Council of Rome and the Pope. Maritain and the Abbé Journet tried to sidestep the question, responding that this was "inconceivable" because the holy ghost was operating through both bodies, and it could not contradict itself.⁸⁰

The Protestants now became involved as Pasteur Monod challenged this assertion on the basis of its incongruity with the historical record and the functional organization of the Catholic Church. However, instead of being supported by the other Protestants,

⁷⁹ Emmanuel Mounier, recording comments of "Kni Kof" (one of the Princes Kovalevsky), "Entretiens II," April 1929, 21.

⁸⁰ Emmanuel Mounier, "Entretiens II," April 1929, 22. Journet was a member of the *Cercles Thomistes* and a new addition to the *Oecumenical Circle*. He was a prominent Dominican theologian at Friburg.

he was opposed by the Calvinists led by Pasteur Lecerf who declared themselves to be more in sympathy with the Catholic Thomist position.⁸¹ They too saw their organization as imbued with the holy spirit and did not like the Russian assertions as to the material nature of their organization.⁸² Yet, they also asserted that the Protestant heritage was more from the "mystical body" than Maritain was prepared to admit because Protestantism was, of course, an offshoot of the Catholic Church.

Abbé Laberthonnière, on the contrary, rose in indignation against the assertions of his fellow Catholics. He did not accept their easy answer, and accused Maritain of using the speculative logic which imbued Thomist scholasticism as a crutch, instead of concretely addressing the legitimate question of the Roman hierarchical legacy. This caused Père Gillet to interject with considerable heat as he found both Maritain's explanation a weak expression of Thomist principles and Abbé Laberthonnière's criticism of scholasticism inappropriate. Marc Boegner, who was chairman of this session, was at last forced to rise and cry out: "my Fathers, don't all talk at once when you have not received your parole!"⁸³

It was becoming increasingly evident that the most acrimonious debates were occurring between the representatives of one denomination, rather than between those of different confessions. Just as the Russian *Bratstvo* had succumbed to internal dissension over the questions of inter-communication, the role of Orthodoxy, and, of

⁸¹ Emmanuel Mounier, "Entretiens II," April 1929, 23.

⁸² Boegner attests to the lack of unity between the Reform Church, modernist Protestants and the Calvinists at the meetings. Boegner, L'exigence oecuménique 37.

⁸³ Boegner, L'exigence oecuménique 37.

course, their approach to Bolshevism, the Catholics and Protestants found themselves clashing in matters of doctrine and of the purpose of their churches.

However, just as that lesson was becoming accepted by all the members, external forces intervened in the *Oecumenical Circle*. That terrible debate between the different Protestants, and the quarrel between Maritain, Gillet, and Laberthonnière became somehow publicized in French clerical circles. At the end of 1929, therefore, the high prelate of Paris, Monsignor Chaptal, issued an edict forbidding Catholics to attend any assembly which included the Abbé Laberthonnière.⁸⁴ The unorthodox Abbé had all too frequently provoked controversy in Rome, and Chaptal presumably did not wish his See to become the centre of such attention. Moreover, the notoriety of the debate destroyed the consciously-protected anonymity of the *Oecumenical Circle*: Catholics were not supposed to partake in such activities in the first place; above all they were not supposed to attack each other and their Church in front of "non-believers." By 1930, therefore the *Oecumenical Circle* ended. The Maritains, Gillet, the Fumets and all the other Catholics did not feel that they could risk excommunication for this endeavour.

In the final analysis, the *Oecumenical Circle* did seem to accomplish a realization on the part of its members that denominational differences might not be as grievous as philosophical or generational ones. This point goes a long way towards explaining the eventual collapse of the Circle and the ways in which it propagated itself into other forums. It had also fulfilled one of its major initial goals: that of informing and providing material for Put' in order that other denomination's concerns could be communicated to the Russian émigrés. Moreover, most members would agree that the formal *Oecumenical Circle* was no longer necessary. Its expansion into more intimate bodies, as early as

⁸⁴ Boegner, L'exigence oecuménique 37.

1928, at Meudon and Clamart were providing a more satisfactory forum for discussion. These were also private initiatives which could largely be kept immune from Church or State censorship. And concerning the wider, world oecumenical situation, the international oecumenical movement, although restricted by the depression, was moving into its maturity. Their purpose had been accomplished at least to the extent that the members of the *Oecumenical Circle* now felt comfortable in taking a part in the world oecumenical meetings which were to occur throughout the 1930s. Therefore, the *Oecumenical Circle* was eventually superseded by bodies both more intimate and more international. Whether the Russians would have become involved in the international forums without this first exposure remains a matter for conjecture. What it certainly did accomplish was to introduce the Russians to the French intellectual milieu and allow them to solidify relationships with particular French groups.

The links which had been forged through the *Oecumenical Circle* benefitted the emigration as a whole, and provided the religious philosophers and their students in particular with the means to further and expand their movement. Out of those dramatic and controversial meetings would arise a series of circles all committed to placing spirituality again at the centre of human activity. Although each descendant group focused upon a particular field of study, their participants would move between the collectivities expanding their appreciation and their understanding. In this way, the diverse Franco-Russian societies permeated one another; literature, philosophy, economics, politics, and religion were each provided with their own singular forums designed to maximize the cultural strengths provided by the Russian and French intellectuals. A host of new publications captured the movements, and reported on the

discussions therein for all interested readers; books and pamphlets filled the remaining gaps as the foremost thinkers from both milieus commented upon the experiences which they were enjoying in these many-faceted circles. And at the centre of it all were the salons at Clamart and Meudon where Berdyaev and Maritain presided over their "intellectual apostolate."

In concrete terms, the first outcome of the *Oecumenical Circle* was a dramatic increase in funding and encouragement to the poverty-stricken young Russian émigres. In 1927, three additional sources of assistance were ensured by the work of the YMCA Russian Division and certain members of the *Oecumenical Circle*. First, the YMCA of France Groupe de la Seine, directed by Charles Kiès, agreed to provide gymnasium facilities in Paris and a Summer Camp outside the city. Kiès was impressed with the middle ground fostered at the *Oecumenical Circle*: the Russians there adhered to neither the White Tsarist nor the Soviet position, and therefore carried no taint which would offend his French Protestant members. He was, thus, quite happy to offer the services of his organization to the RSCM and other young Russians affiliated with the *Oecumenical Circle*.⁸⁵

Second, through the efforts of Dean Walter and the new connections established by the RSCM with the students at St. Albans seminary, an Anglo Church fund was set up to assist the maintenance of St. Sergius Theological Institute. This was essential at this time because the American Church fund was limited to a three year contract which expired in 1928; alternative sources of funding were thus necessary if St. Sergius was to

⁸⁵ Eugen Kiès, letter to Paul B. Anderson, 13 June 1927, Paul B. Anderson Papers, University of Illinois at Urban-Champaign, Box 8.

remain vital.⁸⁶ Out of this evolved the Fellowship of St. Sergius-St. Albans which still flourishes today. Yearly conferences and then exchanges allowed the Russian theological students to gain an appreciation of Anglican ritual, and in turn, the British students learned more about the still relatively-unknown doctrines of Orthodoxy. By 1928, a review, *Sobornost* was initiated by the Fellowship, and it regularly reported upon their activities, and the growing inter-communication between the two faiths, cultures, and traditions.⁸⁷ A detailed exposition of Russian émigré *engagement* in Britain is beyond the scope of this study, but it may be said that the relationship did ensure the survival of St. Sergius Theological Institute during many of the most barren years of the Great Depression, and it assisted several young émigrés (for example, Nicholas Zernov) in pursuing active careers in English academic and religious institutions.

Finally, through the efforts of Paul Anderson and the French Protestants Suzanne de Dietrich and Marc Boegner, the *Comité Française d'Entr'aide Universitaire* was created with a mandate of providing financial assistance to Russian university students. Anderson and de Dietrich sat on the managing committee; Boegner was part of the honorary committee which included many notable French bureaucrats and professors such as Herriot, Minister of Public Instruction, and Léon Brunschwig.⁸⁸ By 1937 the day to day direction of the Committee was undertaken by Sophie Zemova who had established her necessary connections with the French Protestant and University milieu during the life

⁸⁶ Paul B. Anderson, letter to Gustave G. Kullmann, 18 January 1927, Paul B. Anderson papers, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Box 8: 1-4.

⁸⁷ The Paul B. Anderson papers contain a considerable amount of information on the Anglo-Russian involvements. See Boxes 8, 15, 16, 28-30.

⁸⁸ "The Russian Students' Fund, Paris," 1928, Paul B. Anderson Papers, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Box 22.

of the *Oecumenical Circle*. The entire interactive endeavours of the Russians at the Religious-Philosophical Academy, St. Sergius, the RSCM, Put' and the "Circle," therefore succeeded somewhat in its primary goal of breaking down the isolation of the Russian émigrés, and mitigating their alienated and impoverished state.

The Studio Franco-Russe

One of this first offshoots of the *Oecumenical Circle* was the literary *Studio Franco-Russe*.⁸⁹ It began in 1928 under the leadership of Jean Maxence, editor-in-chief of the famous Parisian publication Cahiers de la quinzaine. Maxence had heard about the activities of the *Oecumenical Circle*, and wondered if similar meetings - but on literary and artistic themes rather than strictly religious ones - would not be profitable and informative. He thus began to invite selected Russian and French intellectuals, many of whom were concurrently attending the *Oecumenical Circle*, to his *Studio Franco-Russe*. Here, writers and philosophers were encouraged to engage in ferocious debate over a chosen subject or artistic method. The results would then be published in a booklet: the two principle debaters, one Russian and one French, would present their views in essay form followed by notes on the general debate.

Between 1928-1932, fourteen such debates were held and their outcomes published in Cahiers de la quinzaine. The first four were gathered in a collection entitled Rencontres, but the remaining ten were published in their entirety as books. The majority of debates concerned the work of particular famous writers. However, the breadth of the *Studio Franco-Russe* is indicated in the publications resulting from debates on literary, philosophical, and spiritual movements. Through Cahiers de la quinzaine, Franco-Russian

⁸⁹ For a list of the participants, please see Appendix A.

interaction was able to transcend simply religious discussion, and address other issues.

This proved to be quite important for the Russians who participated in the *Studio Franco-Russe*: many were very young and just starting their careers as writers; the debates gave them exposure to the French literary and publishing milieu, and allowed them to develop connections which would help them publish their future works. While Zaitsev and Adamovich were already established writers who could easily sell their materials to the Russian or, in the case of Adamovich, the French and international press, Berberova and Fedotov were launched at the *Studio Franco-Russe*. Their talent may have guaranteed their international success regardless of this introduction, but the memoirs of the less-appreciated Yanovsky which describe the desperate plight of the "Russian Montparnasse" writers, demonstrate that most aspiring Russian émigré writers would have given anything for such an opportunity.⁹⁰

The debates at the *Studio Franco-Russe* were legendary for their acrimony. In contrast, somewhat, to the *Oecumenical Circle*, the intent was not merely to foster unity or understanding, but rather to arouse the most fervent opinions and objections in order that the participants could strengthen the exposition of their views. However, one similarity did arise between the two circles: the most strenuous objections were most likely to come from those who would be naturally considered allies.

Little by little, the "national" divergences which intrigued the assistant and which they were pleased, at the beginning, to emphasize, have disappeared in the oppositions which arise from a difference of assimilation of a unique cultural heritage. One does not wait to state that there are, at our reunions, two Franco-Russian groups in attendance. And by this fact not only is our initial goal found and even overcome, but also it becomes immediately possible to give to the

⁹⁰ Vasily Yanovsky, Elysian Fields: A Book of Memory (Dekalb, IL: Northern Illinois University Press, 1987).

debates all amplification, all necessary breadth for these studies which are more and more real.⁹¹

Berdyaev and Maritain, for instance, received the harshest condemnation from their national compatriots, not from the opposite, expected side. Hence, Maritain would come home so upset and depressed after each engagement where he was so violently attacked by Mauriac, Maxence, or Valéry that Raïssa would advocate that he cease participating.⁹² Berdyaev was similarly disturbed by the attacks of both young and old Russians, many of whom - like Zaitsev - he had already fallen-out with since his expulsion.⁹³

Moreover, although the *Studio Franco-Russe* was more immediately concerned with literary themes than was the *Oecumenical Circle*, it gradually evolved towards a similar orientation. Again and again the issue of religion would enter the debates of the *Studio Franco-Russe* where the participants found themselves divided not along national lines, but according to their approach to spiritual matters. The final debate in 1932 on the question of a renewed spirituality in France and Russia was the culmination of such questioning and, despite the protestations of the more secular and anti-spiritual members, the conclusion of the *Studio Franco-Russe* mandated that their era required spiritual solutions:

All this has been said by others before us and better. But it seems equally good to impose, on our era, the call for certain "primary truths". The Studio franco-russe has largely contributed to this. And if other reunions must be placed, later on, in similar conditions, those who would participate in them will find it easier to

⁹¹ Wsevolod de Vogt, "Le renouveau spirituel en France et en Russie," Cahiers de la quinzaine 22.1 (1932): 11-12.

⁹² Raïssa Maritain, Journal de Raïssa, ed. Jacques Maritain (Paris: Desclée de Brouwer, 1963) 206-207.

⁹³ Berdyaev, Dream and Reality 269.

penetrate the issues with the example before them of how we have tried to incite our friends.⁹⁴

The aspirations of the founders of the *Oecumenical Circle* had clearly struck a note of sympathy at the *Studio Franco-Russe*; it lent its contribution, through the medium of literature and the arts, to a reintegration of spiritual principles in all aspects of life. As the Russian initiators of the *Oecumenical Circle* had hoped, Franco-Russian collaboration was spreading, and it was motivated by a religious principle.

Clamart Tuesdays

The most direct descendant of the *Oecumenical Circle* after its disbanding in 1930 was the inter-confessional meetings hosted by Nikolai Berdyaev at his home in Clamart. These sessions, which occurred one Tuesday each month, had begun before the closure of the formal circle because Berdyaev and certain other members wanted to engage in more intimate, detailed discussion than the large gatherings of the *Oecumenical Circle* permitted. Put simply, they discovered that the mandate of the *Oecumenical Circle* was too large for their present capabilities: As long as the Orthodox, Protestants and Catholics still had only the most superficial comprehension about their divergences in theological, liturgical, and philosophical matters they could not adequately address many of the issues which had originally inspired the *Oecumenical Circle's* creation. Thus, while a certain success was achieved insofar as mitigating Russian émigré isolation and providing the RSCM youth and the older Russian intellectuals with French contacts, unity of the Christian Churches remained an as-yet unreachable goal.

⁹⁴ Wsevolod de Vogt, "Le renouveau spirituel en France et en Russie," Cahiers de la quinzaine 22.1 (1932): 23.

Maritain had concurred completely with Berdyaev on this point, and he had actually held the first limited gathering at his home in Meudon on December 17, 1928.⁹⁵ There he brought some of the Catholics and Orthodox from the *Oecumenical Circle* together for an intense dissection of their major divergences. It was through this introduction that Emmanuel Mounier became a belated addition to the formal *Oecumenical Circle* meetings at the premises of the RSCM. Berdyaev soon took over the role of host with his Tuesdays at Clamart beginning on January 29, 1929.⁹⁶ Initially there was some overlap with select meetings held at Meudon in April and May, but gradually, Clamart became the central location.⁹⁷ Together, Berdyaev and Maritain propelled the interconfessional discussions into new and fertile domains.

Although the Clamart Tuesdays replaced the *Oecumenical Circle*, its composition was rather different. With the censure against Laberthonnière, he could no longer be included if Maritain and the other Catholics were to attend. Moreover, his exclusion after 1930 caused the Protestants (whose initial participation he had enlisted) to also withdraw. There is evidence, however, that the Orthodox and the Protestants were meeting separately in other forums.⁹⁸ Between 1930 and 1932, therefore, the Clamart Tuesdays

⁹⁵ Emmanuel Mounier, "Entretiens II," 17 December 1928, 16-17. Maritain also mentions "interconfessional meetings at our house and at Clamart, the home of Nikolai Berdyaev." Maritain, *Notebooks* 159.

⁹⁶ This is noted in Maritain, *Notebooks* 159. Mounier, the late arrival, recorded the first meeting he attended as 16 April 1929, Emmanuel Mounier, "Entretiens II" 18-21.

⁹⁷ Mounier chronicled two other such meetings at Meudon in 1929, one of which took place eight days before the regular session of the *Oecumenical Circle* (probably in April), and the other on 13 May 1929. Emmanuel Mounier, "Entretiens II" 21-30.

⁹⁸ Marc Boegner, for instance, remembers the last meeting with the Abbé Laberthonnière: in 1932, they had a week long oecumenical retreat at Mutterhouse, the family estate of Suzanne de Dietrich, near Niedarbronn. The guests were: Père Brillaïs (Superior of the Oratory), Abbé Laberthonnière (still a priest at the Oratory), one German and one Austrian Catholic theologian, an Anglo-Catholic from Mirfield, several Lutherans, the Reform Church contingent from Paris

were a strictly Orthodox-Catholic circle. Only after the sad demise of the Abbé would the three denominations again be reunited.⁹⁹

Initially at the end of 1928 and the start of 1929, the group invited to the Clamart Tuesdays and the Meudon Mondays was mostly culled from the *Oecumenical Circle*, but it did include a few additions: Jacques and Raïssa Maritain and Nikolai Berdyaev of course attended or hosted; Emile Dermenghem, George Fedotov, Stanislas Fumet, the Abbé Jakoubisiak, Vladimir Ilyin, Boris Vysheslavtsev, Louis Massignon, the Abbé Laberthonnière (until 1930), and Pêtr Kovalevsky seem to have been the main participants from the *Oecumenical Circle*. What is perhaps most interesting is who was not included, or did not agree to attend, the supplementary meetings at Clamart and Meudon.

For the Catholics, perhaps the most noteworthy omission was that of Père Gillet. This eminent Dominican theologian who taught Thomist principles at the Institut Catholique and had now become the head of the Dominican Order appears to have been a natural choice. However, a clue to his disassociation might be found in the disputes which occurred at the *Oecumenical Circle* between Père Gillet and Jacques Maritain. Père Gillet was a proponent of "orthodox" Thomism as opposed to the neo-Thomism of Maritain and his disciples; it is perhaps possible that the initiators did not want to distract the Orthodox-Catholic understanding with internal quarrels between

(Boegner, Suzanne de Dietrich, and Pierre Maury), and the Russians - Berdyaev, Bulgakov, Vysheslavtsev, and Zander. Boegner, *L'exigence oecuménique* 74.

⁹⁹ As Congar remembered: "Paris also offered other possibilities. There was a Franco-Russian circle, which was the meeting-place for Orthodox, Catholics, and Protestants. Nicholas Berdyaev was its outstanding personality, together with Jacques Maritain, who without doubt owes his awakening to an historical understanding of things and his sense of historical typology to his contact with Berdyaev. Emmanuel Mounier, who was associated with the launching of *Esprit*, also frequented this circle where I also made the acquaintance of Pere Lev Gillet and other Orthodox friends." Congar, *Dialogue between Christians* 7-8.

differing Thomists. Be that as it may, it is likely that Berdyaev, for one, did not miss him. In his autobiography he characterized Gillet thusly: "Least of all did I like the Dominican Père Gillet: his Torquemada-like behaviour towards Abbé Laberthonnière was positively revolting."¹⁰⁰

The other exclusions of Catholics appear to have been more practical. None of the students of Mlle. Clare Jullien or herself were participants at the supplementary meetings at Meudon and Clamart. This was paralleled by the Orthodox, who also did not include the members of the RSCM, such as Nicholas Zernov and his sister Sophie or Lev Zander, at the Clamart and Meudon meetings. Clearly the intent was to limit the discussion to theological and philosophical issues, and to not engage in wider organizational perspectives.

As Père Gillet was excluded, or perhaps chose not to attend, so to were the Princes Trubetskoy, Bezobrazov, Nicholas Lossky and, most surprisingly, Sergei Bulgakov. The loss of these formidable thinkers does not appear to be the result of Orthodox disputes which emerged at the *Oecumenical Circle*. Rather, it seems to have been caused by more external influences. These émigrés had probably split with Berdyaev over the issue of the second Orthodox Schism: in 1927 the Metropolitan of Russia (head of the Church since Tikhon died in 1925) Sergei insisted that every believer take an oath of loyalty to the Soviet Regime. Eulogius took no action on the behalf of his entire flock outside the USSR. This did not result in a formal schism until 1930 when Eulogius took part in prayers with the Archbishop of Canterbury for suffering Christians within Russia.¹⁰¹ Interpreted as a direct act of disloyalty to the Soviet Government,

¹⁰⁰ Berdyaev, Dream and Reality 254.

¹⁰¹ Zernov, The Russian Religious Renaissance 218-220

Metropolitan Sergei moved to reprimand Eulogius, force his congregations to obey the oath, and strip him of his power. Instead, Eulogius sought protection from the Oecumenical Patriarch of Constantinople along with most émigré believers. Berdyaev was one of the few exceptions. His decision alienated many of his friends and colleagues.

My relations with ecclesiastical circles among the Russian émigrés went from bad to worse...This [his public decision] proved the occasion of violent abuse from the political and ecclesiastical pillars of émigré reaction.¹⁰²

Mat' Maria (her former married name was Elizabeta Skobstova, d.1945), and Georges Fedotov (1886-1951) were two of the few to join him, and Fedotov was threatened with dismissal from St. Sergius on this account. Berdyaev felt compelled to respond with an article "Does Orthodoxy admit Freedom of Conscience" in Put', and endangered even his associations there. For this reason, the shift in membership should not seem too surprising.

Sergei Bulgakov's retreat from the new Clamart forum is perhaps the most tragic example. After more than thirty years of intensely close friendship between himself and Berdyaev, they were finally divided by circumstances and intransigence. Bulgakov had never turned insular, and had always embraced expansion, inter-communication, and new ideas; although he had long been more formally attached to the Orthodox Church than Berdyaev, there was never any hint of reprimand on either's part regarding their singular approaches to religion. Yet, in 1930 the two divided over this irreconcilable breach. As a result, Berdyaev lost not only most of his connections at St. Sergius, but also his

¹⁰² Berdyaev, Dream and Reality 271.

dearest friend. Only during the terrible years of World War Two would the two again be reconciled almost on the eve of Bulgakov's death.¹⁰³

The additions to the interconfessional meetings at Clamart reflected a new approach on the part of both Maritain and Berdyaev. Berdyaev brought in Georges Florovsky, the former Eurasianist, who as a theologian was now extremely interested in the Western confessions. Maritain included Charles du Bos, the famous literary critic who "converted" (renewed his vows) to Catholicism in 1927 under Maritain's influence. In 1929, du Bos brought over the budding existentialist philosopher and dramatist Gabriel Marcel who had just converted to Catholicism at the age of forty having undergone a series of intense mystical experiences during World War One.¹⁰⁴ Others who joined that year included the Russian musician Nicholas Nabokov who was becoming a close friend of the Maritains, and Olivier Lacombe who was Maritain's colleague and disciple at the Institut Catholique and the *Cercles Thomistes*. Also from the *Cercles Thomistes* were Père Jean-Pierre Altermann, Père Aupiais and Louis Laloy. In 1930, a young Russian Catholic, Helen Iswolsky, was also included as was Maritain's "brother" Pierre Van der Meer (both were the godsons of Léon Bloy). In 1931, the Thomist historian at the Collège de France, Etienne Gilson, and the Comte de Pange were introduced to the meetings.¹⁰⁵

¹⁰³ See Constantine Mochulsky, letter to Helene Iswolsky, 26 July 1945, Helene Iswolsky papers, University of Scranton, Box 1.

¹⁰⁴ Marcel was the son of a Jewish mother and an irreverently "paganist" father who did not deign to have his son baptized. Seymour Cain, *Gabriel Marcel* (London: Sheed & Ward, 1963) 220.

¹⁰⁵ All these personages were mentioned as participating in discussions at meetings recorded in Emmanuel Mounier, "Entretiens II, III, IV," 1928-1932.

descended into internal battles within one confession as differing members perceived opposing realities as to what they really believed and held as true. The Clamart Tuesdays were not free of such animosity, however its participants did attempt to narrow the reasons for divergence, especially between the Orthodox and Catholic perspectives. Helen Iswolsky recalled their outcome in a rather pessimistic fashion.

During that year I visited, with the Maritains, the Russian Orthodox thinker Nicholas Berdiaeff in his home in Clamart...The discussions which took place were of considerable interest, and touched upon the most intricate theological problems. They were especially absorbing when Maritain and Berdyaev led the conversation; it was a bout between two thinkers of exceptional speculative force and erudition. Yet Maritain was too strictly a Thomist, and Berdyaev too much a representative of Eastern mysticism, to be able to agree. Though always courteous and friendly, the conversations at Clamart did not lead to a definite understanding.¹⁰⁶

Iswolsky went on to elaborate exactly where the misunderstanding lay. As a close friend of both Berdyaev and Maritain, she was most interested in their conflict, and not the entire proceedings of the Tuesday meetings. Her remembrance is, however, quite valuable for delimiting the extent of collaboration which would be possible for the two hosts.

Another problem linked with the study of Berdyaev's thought is his concept of knowledge as a mystical gnosis which does not require the light of human reason. Not only does this concept contradict the Catholic interpretation of the word "knowledge" (and it was on this point that Berdyaev clashed most frequently with Maritain), but even the interpretation given to this word by certain Protestant schools, for instance by the Biblicism of the Barthian school.¹⁰⁷

According to Iswolsky, therefore, it was the key concept of Sophiology or integral knowledge which remained the primary stumbling block to East-West understanding. The problem identified by the Slavophiles and Soloviev and their aspirations for unifying

¹⁰⁶ Helen Iswolsky, Light before Dusk: A Russian Catholic in France, 1923-1941 (Toronto: Longmans, Green & Co., 1942) 86.

¹⁰⁷ Iswolsky, Light before Dusk 92.

reason and faith, still seemed to remain an unattainable goal for their heirs in the emigration.

In her later autobiography, Iswolsky reiterated many of her former complaints, but also elaborated on the conflict that she had perceived. She asserted that Berdyaev's philosophical orientation was "different" from that of Maritain, and yet that it did not "contradict" the French neo-Thomist's thought in any "essential way."¹⁰⁸ Furthermore, despite her Catholicism, Iswolsky had aligned herself with Berdyaev by the end of her life when she wrote this second autobiography: All misunderstandings were placed on the limitations of Maritain and his French Catholic colleagues or on the insularity of the Russians; Berdyaev was the only person who fully comprehended the issues discussed. According to Iswolsky, he was different from Maritain because he adhered to the "mystical spirituality of the Eastern Church" whereas the neo-Thomist, naturally, relied on scholastic prepositions and the Western mode of speculation. This divergence related to oecumenical dialogue in its widest sense: Berdyaev hoped to foster East-West reunification by having Western rational thought informed and completed by revealed knowledge or faith; Maritain aspired to explanations which did not appeal to revelation, but were based on logic and metaphysical "truths". This conflict over knowledge was basic to the Orthodox-Catholic debate. As long as the Orthodox, siding with Berdyaev, looked for an increased appreciation of mysticism and revealed knowledge on the part of the Catholics, they would be disappointed. The Catholics, instead, were seeking a rational, scholastic description of Orthodox theology and practice.

Iswolsky insisted that Berdyaev was quite aware of this problem, but hoped that it could be overcome. She found him to be in great sympathy with Catholicism,

¹⁰⁸ Iswolsky, No Time to Grieve (Crestwood: St. Vladimir's Press, 1985). 184.

especially "its new, progressive leadership," and asserted that he had a "direct 'feel' for it."¹⁰⁹ This she attributed to the influence of his maternal grandmother, the French Catholic Countess de Choiseul, and of his wife Lydia who was also Catholic. Moreover, she validated his reasons for believing in the possibility of a rapprochement by insisting that "Russian religious thought as represented by Berdiaev, not only attracted Maritain but also influenced him and his entourage, especially the younger members." However, in her final analysis, Iswolsky still deemed the meetings to be a failure: "Due to the tensions caused by various arguments during the meetings, they were soon discontinued, never to be resumed at Clamart."¹¹⁰

Emmanuel Mounier, on the other hand, seems to have regarded the Clamart Tuesdays and the Meudon Mondays, as a valuable educational forum at which he took copious notes. In these notes he rarely revealed his personal opinions, but rather tried to record the lectures and debates as accurately as possible. In doing so, he left an invaluable transcription of the oral discussions which otherwise would have been impossible to recover in their original format or flavour. Iswolsky has maintained that the primary conflict occurred between Jacques Maritain and Nikolai Berdiaev. Its basis was their approach to knowledge and philosophy, and she transposed this to a wider conflict between the Russian Orthodox and French Catholics. Mounier's notes from the sessions

¹⁰⁹ Iswolsky, No Time to Grieve... 184. Berdiaev's hope of reconciling Thomist scolasticism with Russian religious-philosophy was characteristic of his personal approach to philosophy. Lev Shestov constantly charged that Berdiaev had gone so far with his commitment to freedom and yet had stopped short of the essential step insofar as he did not try to dismantle or remove logic and morality. For Shestov these were the ultimate limitations to human thought. Of course, Shestov always rebelled against the constraints of reason thereby breaking the tenuous balance in "religious" - "philosophy" on the side of religion. Léon Shestov, "Nicolas Berdiaeff: La gnose et la philosophie existentielle" trans. B. de Schloezer Revue philosophique 22 (1949): 2-23.

¹¹⁰ Iswolsky, No Time to Grieve... 184-185. As Conger demonstrates in his recollections, this is an exaggeration. The oecumenical meetings were still occurring in 1932 and, at least in other venues, for some time after that. Iswolsky, therefore, means *she* stopped participating.

which formed Iswolsky's opinion, indicate that her observation was accurate, but obscured a more complex divergence.

The problem had arisen during the meetings of the *Oecumenical Circle* framed within the issue of Roman hierarchy versus equality in the Orthodox Sobor. There, it had evolved into a bitter dispute over the characterization which each faith lent to its conceptualization of the Church body. This argument had not been resolved due to the sudden closure of the Circle with the ban edict on Laberthonnière, and arose in a different form to illustrate a crucial difference between Eastern-Russian Orthodox and Western-Catholic thought. The controversy was broached at one of the first Clamart Tuesdays in 1930, sparked by the Polish Catholic Kovarski's lecture evaluating a recent essay by Berdyaev, "l'Orient et l'Occident" which had evolved from the debates at the *Studio Franco Russe* at Cahiers de la quinzaine.¹¹¹

He appraised Berdyaev's main contribution in terms of clarifying the relationship between spirit (the holy ghost), the cosmos (God), and the individual (potentially Jesus Christ). The holy ghost, Berdyaev had asserted, impacted more on the cosmic life than on the individual, and the cosmos was the spirit which was imbued in the Orthodox Church: "We integrate the cosmos to the Church. When the holy ghost is in a saint, it acts in reality upon the cosmos which encompasses all."¹¹² In the West, on the other hand, as Kovarski interpreted Berdyaev's article, "the western: patristic is preoccupied, above all, with the problems of the moral order, individual salvation and justification,

¹¹¹ Nikolai Berdyaev, "l'Orient et l'Occident," Cahiers de la quinzaine 20.9 (1930).

¹¹² Emmanuel Mounier, "Entretiens II," 21 January 1930, 99.

coming under the influence at that time of Roman (Stoic) juridicism and thought."¹¹³ In the ensuing discussion Berdyaev clarified this:

Moreover the western religions are all characterized, even before the conflict which divided catholics and protestants, by a tendency to individualism. The grace acts each time and for each [individual]...Another aspect of this opposition, is your [Western] tendency to neutralize the cosmos, which leads to the mechanism of modern times.¹¹⁴

This, he explained, was why the Catholics could assert that the holy ghost was acting directly through their Pope. In the Western conceptual tradition an individual could gain access to the holy ghost without the intermediation of the cosmic life, manifested by the Church and the organic collective.

The contrary view lay at the heart of the Russian conception of *Godmanhood* and its complete distinction from superficially similar Western ideas of individualism or Nietzsche's *übermensch*. While both the Western and Russian traditions saw the potential for one person to evolve beyond his/her material limitations and become the "new man", they disagreed over how this transformation occurred. In the Russian religious-philosophical paradigm, such fulfilment could only be achieved within the loving embrace of the organic community; man without brothers was nothing; at the extreme, Jesus Christ without the apostolate could not have fulfilled his destiny. This was diametrically opposed to the Western view that man could achieve through his own devices: That Christ had been born son of God with all the abilities necessary to manifest his destiny, and that his apostolate were students and servants, not vital supports. In other words, Russian religious-philosophy accepted that man developed through life, whereas the Western view still adhered to the idea that he was made intact at the moment of conception.

¹¹³ Emmanuel Mounier, "Entretiens II," 21 January 1930, 98.

¹¹⁴ Emmanuel Mounier, "Entretiens II," 21 January 1930, 99.

Although Berdyaev agreed here with Maritain's earlier assertion that the basis for the Orthodox Church was the "organic body," he also replaced the "mystical body" with the individual as the basis of the Catholic Church. This explained for him, as it had for Ivan Kireevsky almost one century before, why the Protestant schism and other heresies had arisen: they were jealous of the divine connection held only by the Pope, and wished to seize an element of revelation for themselves. Berdyaev was always careful to distinguish his opinions from the official Orthodox theological view.¹¹⁵ However, in his conception, the Orthodox Church was a not merely a temporal body or a collection of individuals. Rather it was first and foremost an eternal spirit or essence in which the congregation was grounded, just as "nature is grounded in the supernatural."¹¹⁶ The Holy Ghost did not act directly within any member of the Church; it acted on the spirit or cosmos in which the Church was founded. Every believer, thus, had access to the holy ghost be they a mystic, priest, or layman, but each must gain that access through the all-embracing, eternal spirit of the Church.

It was almost as though the true Church was an ether where God resided and the holy ghost performed its work. The physical Church was simply the earthly representative of this ether. Or, as Berdyaev responded to Maritain's and the Abbé Augustin's request for clarification, "for the Orthodox, man is the terrestrial hypostasis of God."¹¹⁷ The Catholics could comprehend hypostasis in the Trinity in the sense that each person - God, the holy ghost, and Christ - was substantially distinct from and yet related to the others and collected in its own sphere. Ernst Renan had said of the Catholic doctrine,

¹¹⁵ Emmanuel Mounier, "Entretiens II," 21 January 1930, 99.

¹¹⁶ Emmanuel Mounier, "Entretiens II," 21 January 1930, 98.

¹¹⁷ Emmanuel Mounier, "Entretiens II," 21 January 1930, 99.

"it must make [of Jesus] a divine hypostasis."¹¹⁸ However, they could not conceive of man as also being a hypostasis, even a terrestrial one. That definition was reserved for Jesus Christ. Berdyaev explained how the Orthodox reconciled this: "There is no distinction between natural and supernatural creation, between nature and grace, at least not the trenchant distinction of which you have read."¹¹⁹ For Berdyaev, the supernatural process by which God created Christ out of his own spirit was no different than the natural process by which He created man.

At this, Gabriel Marcel who was such a recent convert to Catholicism had to comment: "But, the original Fall implies such a distinction!" "No," responded Berdyaev, "there was no distinction between nature and grace before the Fall"¹²⁰ and, of course, man was created before the Fall and his expulsion from Eden. Even after, Berdyaev continued, although a distinction was caused by the Fall, "grace" was still the holy spirit acting in nature. For that reason, he explained, the Orthodox do not use the term "grace," but rather they refer to the "gift of the holy ghost." "The Father is transcendent, the Son is transcendent and immanent, the holy ghost is immanent in nature...and man is the hypostasis of God."¹²¹

They had at last reached the heart of impasse. In Catholic scholasticism, the main proof of God's infallibility was precisely this distinction between nature and grace which Berdyaev had discounted. When the other Orthodox supported Berdyaev saying that their faith had always disparaged Catholicism for making an untenable distinction between

¹¹⁸ Ernest Renan, Vie de Jésus (Paris: Arléa ed. integral, 1992) 67.

¹¹⁹ Emmanuel Mounier, "Entretiens II," 21 January 1930, 99.

¹²⁰ Emmanuel Mounier, "Entretiens II," 21 January 1930, 99-100.

¹²¹ Emmanuel Mounier, "Entretiens II," 21 January 1930, 100.

"spirit in itself," and "spirit acting in nature," the Catholics replied that they were confused: it was not a contradiction but the crucial mystery upon which the foundation of their Church rested. Furthermore, replied several Catholics in heated fashion, "the greatest mystery of faith should never be considered absurd;" with great passion, Maritain concluded: "This [Berdyaev's theory] would be a humiliation that God would not impose on us."¹²²

Perhaps the most ironic note at the meeting was sounded when the Orthodox attempted to soothe the Catholics. They assured them that the official Orthodox school was rationalist and anti-mystical. In other words, Maritain and his fellow Thomist scholastics would probably find they had more in common with the official Orthodox if only those intransigent conservatives could overcome their xenophobia enough to engage in discourse with the other Christian religions. They, the Orthodox at Clamart, were a new school of Orthodox - the Sophiological school - who derived their ideas from the Slavophiles, Soloviev, and the Russian "Religious Renaissance", and whom the official school degradingly termed "modernist".

Maritain must have appreciated the irony as well as still being quite upset, for he retorted:

And the question is to find out why the modernist thinkers are so insupportable to us [Catholics] and why you [the modernists] are so sympathetic to us!¹²³

Berdyaev wisely ended the meeting on this note, promising to have the currents of Orthodox thought explained at their next reunion. A seed had been planted, however, at that dramatic gathering which may have found no sympathy with Maritain, but which

¹²² Emmanuel Mounier, "Entretiens II," 21 January 1930, 100.

¹²³ Emmanuel Mounier, "Entretiens II," 21 January 1930, 100-101.

affected some of the younger French visitors to the extreme. On the way to the railway station, for their trip back to Paris, Mounier was taken aside by Gabriel Marcel who confided that he was very interested in making a closer study of the Russians at these meetings. He considered the possibility of engaging in related meetings between a few of the Russians and a few of the younger French in order that they might, as a common source, look at the texts from which their divergences arose. He was deeply preoccupied with the Russians' conception of the theory of knowledge, and wanted to discover its basis. For Marcel, the Russian Orthodox seemed to be approaching a "sort of naturalization of the supernatural."¹²⁴

From this and ensuing discussions, Marcel gradually came to discern that the major conflict of the group was not merely Orthodox/Catholic, but rather objective versus subjective or idealist versus personalist and existentialist. He found that the view of Berdyaev, regarding man evolving throughout his experiences in life, related to the new issue of *being* which had been raised so frequently at the German universities he had attended. In these lectures, Heidegger, Husserl and Jaspers had been elaborating an entirely new approach to philosophy which permitted the inclusion of the subjectivist stance. Indeed Heidegger's "being-in-itself" made it the central approach. For Marcel, his conversion to Catholicism had supplicated his mystical tendencies, but failed to fulfil those of his intellect, and therefore, he conceived of a plan to embark immediately upon more intense philosophical discussion with the personages from Clamart, especially Maritain and Berdyaev.

¹²⁴ Emmanuel Mounier, "Entretiens II," 21 January 1930, 101.

Marcel's Christian Philosophical Society

Marcel had two main reasons for proposing the creation of a philosophical society as an adjunct to the Clamart Tuesdays in July 1930. He had become deeply involved in the existential trends in Germany during the early 1920s, and continued to evolve his own existential perspectives upon his return to France. At the Clamart meetings, and through his recent conversion to Catholicism, he had realized that existentialism had not fully explored the realm of metaphysics. He saw in both the French and Russian philosophers who attended the Clamart Tuesdays, a valuable resource for clarifying and illuminating the contributions which could be made by Christian thought and metaphysics to the burgeoning philosophy of existentialism. Second, as a recent convert, he was plagued by certain doubts about Christianity and, in particular, the Catholic Church. He hoped that a Christian philosophical forum would help alleviate his inabilities to reconcile certain Christian concepts with his own philosophical training.

Marcel first proposed his idea to Charles du Bos because the literary critic was a close friend, and had been his introduction to the Clamart meetings. Moreover, he knew that du Bos found the Franco-Russian interaction to be stimulating and helpful. As early as March 6, 1929, du Bos had written an enthusiastic description of the meetings to Marcel:

I have found your letter upon returning from a very interesting seance at Berdyaev's between the catholics and the orthodox where Massignon gave us a penetrating and precise talk on Saint Christine the Admirable at the end of which ensued, between Berdyaev and several remarkable young Russian philosophers on the one hand, and Jacques and Raissa Maritain, Massignon, and myself on the other, a very satisfying exchange of views.¹²⁵

¹²⁵ Charles du Bos, letter to Gabriel Marcel, 6 March 1929, fond Gabriel Marcel, Carton 16, Bibliothèque Nationale, France.

Marcel then approached Maritain because he could ensure the inclusion of some of the foremost Thomist thinkers in Paris, and was himself a formidable metaphysician. While Marcel did not intend for his philosophical society to be simply another Thomist forum, he also wanted the additions which the Thomists could make. By the end of July, both Maritain and du Bos had agreed that it was an excellent suggestion. They suggested that Etienne Gilson be immediately included, and they proposed that each member should then invite one other in order that the group be kept as small as possible. Certainly, when the discussions verged into territory where none of them were experts, they would bring in a specialist, but on the whole they wanted to keep the society to around eight or ten participants so that it would remain small and intimate.¹²⁶

Marcel was quite relieved to find such an easy acceptance of his idea, and began to outline the issues for discussion. He was specifically disturbed, at this time, with the problem of *evil*, especially in the context of predestination, and he appealed to du Bos, "...but will you follow me into this terrain?"¹²⁷ Marcel explained: his most persistent doubts since his conversion had been provoked by his inability to reconcile Nietzschean criticisms with his new-found faith. Nietzsche's presentation of alternatives "beyond good and evil" had greatly affected Marcel, and he wanted to see how Christian philosophers refuted or clarified Nietzsche's assertions in order that he himself might be able to reconcile his doubts. He therefore suggested that the group begin with a study of "certain fundamental texts ([Zara]Thoustra for example)" and juxtapose these with more contemporary texts in order to "...see what can be extracted as an assimilatable truth and

¹²⁶ Charles du Bos, letter to Gabriel Marcel, 30 July 1930, fond Gabriel Marcel, Carton 16, Bibliothèque Nationale, France.

¹²⁷ Gabriel Marcel, letter to Charles du Bos, 11 August 1930, fond Gabriel Marcel, Carton 16, Bibliothèque Nationale, France.

a living reality." Marcel wanted to study the problem of *evil* because he hoped this would lead to a "...better understanding of where to place the line of demarcation between that which is faith, and that which is not."¹²⁸ He reiterated this sentiment in a later letter to du Bos with a touching revelation of his torment:

The need of a certain intellectual evidence which I talked about for so long with you at our last meeting, prevents me from believing; and I am convinced that I have not arrived at that [the evidence] satisfactorily; it is my faith itself which is vitally endangered.¹²⁹

Marcel demonstrated in this letter that he desperately needed the knowledge and reassurance which might be provided by such a philosophical society. Without it, he seriously feared that he might be drawn away from the Church and God, perhaps forever. Considering the attitude of his contemporaries in existentialist philosophy - Sartre, Heidegger, Nizan, or Merleau-Ponty - Marcel's doubts become quite comprehensible and immediate.

By September 1930, Gilson had agreed to join the proposed society which seems to have formally begun at the end of that year.¹³⁰ In addition to Berdyaev, they invited Lev Shestov, who was himself a founder of existentialism. It is, as yet, impossible to recreate the discussions which might have been held within this august circle, however a glance at its known participants provides some insight as to its intellectual import. Marcel, Berdyaev and Shestov were all to fully embrace the existential approach, and to redefine it within a spiritual framework; in this they moved in concert with the few other

¹²⁸ Gabriel Marcel, letter to Charles du Bos, 11 August 1930, fond Gabriel Marcel, Carton 16, Bibliothèque Nationale, France.

¹²⁹ Gabriel Marcel, letter to Charles du Bos, 16 September 1930, fond Gabriel Marcel, Carton 16, Bibliothèque Nationale, France.

¹³⁰ Gabriel Marcel, letter to Charles du Bos, 16 September 1930, fond Gabriel Marcel, Carton 16, Bibliothèque Nationale, France.

religious existentialist such as Martin Buber and Karl Jaspers. Maritain and Gilson, on the other hand, remained Thomists devoted to the scholastic methodology for their entire careers and, while informed about the new currents, could never accept their subjectivity and amorphous nature.¹³¹

Berdyayev remembered the meetings in a most flattering light considering the rather unremitting critical tone of his autobiography:

I must not omit to mention the philosophical gatherings at Gabriel Marcel's home: they were, in my opinion, the only kind of meetings likely to have a permanent value. They were attended not only by the French but by Germans, Russians and Spaniards, both young and old, whose contribution had a decisive influence on the work of the group. It was probably the only place in France where problems of phenomenology and existentialist philosophy were seriously studied.¹³²

He admired Marcel, although they later diverged over political issues, and commended him for his thorough knowledge of German philosophies which he found so uncommon in France. However, aside from Marcel's idea of "the mystery" - of unavoidable subjectivist involvement in the object of study - Berdyayev made no mention of his works or later central tracts on *being*.

Lev Shestov, also must have rather shocked the "seeking" Marcel, for he was a philosopher who made no concessions to other's egos or feelings. This singular Russian was one of the first to elucidate the existentialist-type of philosophy at the turn of the century through penetrating comparisons of Dostoevsky and Nietzsche and, to a lesser extent, through an examination of Tolstoy. By this time, his most intense scrutiny was

¹³¹ du Bos avoided any complete elaboration of his philosophy before his untimely death in 1939, preferring to restrict himself to literary criticism and commentary about the mood of his times.

¹³² Berdyayev, Dream and Reality 266.

reserved for the Danish philosopher, Søren Kierkegaard.¹³³ As an existentialist, Shestov quite deserved the label of being Nietzsche's most authentic follower: He based his entire philosophy upon an unreserved hatred of rational thought and systematization. He bluntly resolved the Orthodox/Catholic dispute about the "Fall" in a way which almost no one could accept:

In what is only an empty phantom, in nothingness, man suddenly perceives omnipotent necessity. That is why everything that the fallen man undertakes to save himself only brings him closer to the abyss. He wishes to flee necessity and he changes it into an immutability from which it is impossible to escape. Certainly he can not fight against necessity, but he can hate it, curse it. But immutability must be adored, for it leads him to the kingdom of the spirit, it gives him the "eyes of the mind" and thanks to the "third kind of knowledge" it brings to birth in him "love for what is eternal and infinite, the intellectual love of God."¹³⁴

In many ways his speculations about the forced subjection of human activity to rational ideas anticipated Marcel's later castigations against mass technocracy.¹³⁵ On another plane, his commitment to freedom philosophically superseded that of Berdyaev.

The Last Judgement decides whether there shall be freedom of will, immortality of the soul, or not - whether there shall be a soul or not. And maybe, even the existence of God is still undecided. Even God waits, like every living human soul on the Last Judgment. A great battle is going on, a battle between life and death, between real and ideal, and we men do not even guess what is happening in the universe and are deeply convinced that we need not know, as though it did not matter to us! We think that the important thing is that we should arrange our lives as well and as comfortably as possible, and that the principal use of philosophy itself, as of all human creations, is to help us attain a placid and carefree existence...Consequently our whole moral struggle, even as our rational inquiry - if we once admit that God is the last end of our endeavors - will bring us sooner or later to emancipation not only from moral valuations, but also from reason's eternal truths. Truth and the Good are fruits of the forbidden tree; for limited creatures, for outcasts from paradise. I know that this ideal of freedom in relation

¹³³ Lev Shestov, Kierkegaard and the Existential Philosophy, trans. Elinor Hewitt (1936; Athens: Ohio University Press, 1970).

¹³⁴ Bernard Martin, ed., A Shestov Anthology (Athens: Ohio University Press, 1970) 314.

¹³⁵ Gabriel Marcel, Man against Mass Society, trans G. S. Fraser (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1952).

to truth and the good cannot be realized on earth - in all probability does not even need to be realized. But it is granted to man to have prescience of ultimate freedom.¹³⁶

Although Berdyaev derided the rigid framework into which most philosophy (especially Marxism) and theology (for example Thomist) had been placed, he still adhered to some basic systematization, to logic and ethics, in order to describe his fundamental beliefs about relationships and development.¹³⁷ Shestov, on the other hand, would not allow such strictures. In a most extreme stance, he derided every such structure as falsely created, idolatrous, and negative.

In his approach, he proffered one solution to the problem which tormented Marcel. Indeed, Shestov asserted, it was quite possible to go beyond good and evil and yet retain faith. In his conception, all that was required was to follow the example of non-rational beings and accept, finally, that there are things in the universe which may not be understood.

Look at the moth that throws itself fearlessly into the flame without asking anyone whomsoever, without asking itself, what will happen to it and what awaits it. You also, sooner or later, will have to throw yourself into the flame where all your eternal truths will be consumed in a trice like the wings of the moth.¹³⁸

Embrace faith, discard reason: this was Shestov's existentialist answer to mankind. His extreme expressions did identify the crucial paradox which undermined Marcel's faith in that he wanted to be a good Catholic, but felt unable to accept the constraints of the doctrine so rigidly expressed in rational structures. However, his solution would not have permitted Marcel to remain a "good" Catholic (especially an obedient one), nor would it

¹³⁶ Bernard Martin, ed., A Shestov Anthology 58.

¹³⁷ This point is well illustrated in James C. Wernham, Two Russian Thinkers: an Essay in Berdyaev and Shestov (Toronto, University of Toronto Press, 1968) 84-92.

¹³⁸ Bernard Martin, ed., A Shestov Anthology 33.

earn him respect in most philosophical circles. Such a risk was beyond Marcel; as Berdyaev wryly remarked, "I was less happy with the fact that, despite his avowedly searching and questioning attitude, he always gave the impression of knowing exactly where he wanted to arrive, namely in the Catholic Church."¹³⁹

Shestov's ideas might have been unpalatable to Marcel, but Berdyaev's continued to resonate. During 1933, a series of letters between Gabriel Marcel and Charles du Bos suggests that Berdyaev was still exerting considerable influence upon Marcel. After an initial respite from his religious doubts, Marcel had plunged back into depression. However, that same year he read Berdyaev's seminal work, The Destiny of Man.¹⁴⁰ This work was a more refined philosophical contemplation of the problems which faced modern man and society than Berdyaev's earlier manifesto A New Middle Ages (although some might say that it lacked the raw power and impact of the earlier book). On August 25, 1933, Marcel wrote to du Bos in a state of extreme excitement:

Have you read the book of Berdyaev? I found it to be capital. It is a lecture which passionately and profoundly troubles me. The objectives of current Catholic theology which have been clashing within me are presented by Berdyaev with an extraordinary force. How much - I must avow - I feel more in contact with his thought than with that of Jacques [Maritain]! We must talk at length when you have read this book, so rich and so profound.¹⁴¹

In The Destiny of Man, Berdyaev pinpointed the errors of Renaissance humanism through a study of the ethics of law, redemption and creativity, and demonstrated how these

¹³⁹ Berdyaev, Dream and Reality 266.

¹⁴⁰ Nicolai Berdyaev, The Destiny of Man, trans. Nathalie Duddington, 2nd ed. (London: Geoffrey Bles, 1937). This book first came out in London in 1931 and was published in French in 1936; Marcel seems to have obtained and read the first English edition.

¹⁴¹ Gabriel Marcel, letter to Charles du Bos, 25 August 1933, fond Gabriel Marcel, Carton 16, Bibliothèque Nationale, France.

errors had perverted Christianity in order to advocate the need for a new Christian humanism.¹⁴²

When du Bos urgently responded to Marcel, that same day, he suggested that, while he agreed with Marcel about the importance of Berdyaev's ideas and was himself now more inclined to feel more contact with the Russian than with Maritain, nevertheless Marcel's spiritual problems were more likely a consequence of the attitude of the Vatican than of any revelations he found in The Destiny of Man.¹⁴³ Four days later, Marcel corrected du Bos' interpretation and allayed his fears that he might be abandoning Catholicism for Orthodoxy. What he had intended to impart, rather, was the impact of Berdyaev's critique of the humanist ethics of redemption; it was not current events, but Berdyaev's philosophy which had clarified, for him, the roots of his lack of faith.¹⁴⁴

Recalling the original discussions of the *Oecumenical Circle* and the Clamart Tuesdays, The Destiny of Man was, by in large, a juxtaposition of Berdyaev's long-held concept of creativity merged with the resolutions which these meetings had obtained. In his critique of the ethics of redemption (which he said, evolved from Renaissance humanism), Berdyaev tried to answer the question of "good and evil"; he also gave his own interpretation of "being and non-being" which had originally prompted Marcel to form his philosophical society. Berdyaev maintained that the atheistic principle (which tormented Marcel) arose from a "legalistic distinction between good and evil" which insisted that people must attempt to conquer evil. Their failure to eradicate evil led them

¹⁴² Berdyaev, The Destiny of Man 86, 95.

¹⁴³ Charles du Bos, letter to Gabriel Marcel, 26 August 1933, fond Gabriel Marcel, Carton 16, Bibliothèque Nationale, France.

¹⁴⁴ Gabriel Marcel, letter to Charles du Bos, 30 August 1933, fond Gabriel Marcel, Carton 16, Bibliothèque Nationale, France.

to blame God for either creating a world in which evil existed, or for giving them the ability to recognize evil.¹⁴⁵ Although he understood this rationale, Berdyaev asserted that it was illogical. Human beings had freely chosen the "Fall" and their new awareness; they could not blame God for their ability to know good and evil. He further postulated that God had not created the dichotomy between good and evil. Rather it was a product of uncreated freedom, the *Ungrund*.¹⁴⁶ While God created the world and humanity, he was unable to prevent the influence of the *Ungrund* on his creation. It was precisely this freedom which led humanity to choose the Fall and subjugated them to a world in which evil would always exist. Berdyaev's philosophy thus exonerated God for the existence of evil.

However, God, the loving Father, did send His son Christ to give people the message of redemption: "God shares the fate of the world: He offers the ultimate succour, the Kingdom of Heaven, but He cannot save humans from evil on earth."¹⁴⁷ For Berdyaev, redemption was the "message of love":

"Christ's teachings and his ultimate personal sacrifice for humanity proved to people that God would always love them and always receive them into His kingdom; redemption placed the spiritual person, the God-man, at the centre of life, superior to all abstract ideas including good and evil...Christianity in its original and virginal form not merely questioned the supremacy of the idea of the good, but sharply opposed its own morality based upon it...Christianity has placed man above the idea of the good...The idea of the good, like every other idea, must yield and make way for man. It is not the abstract idea of the good, but man who is God's creation and God's child."¹⁴⁸

¹⁴⁵ Berdyaev, The Destiny of Man 103.

¹⁴⁶ Jacob Böhme, cited in Nicolai Berdyaev, The Destiny of Man 103.

¹⁴⁷ Berdyaev, The Destiny of Man 103.

¹⁴⁸ Berdyaev, The Destiny of Man 105, 122.

Christ told humans "to love one another." By founding His religion on love, Christ established the fact that God's morality is different from legalistic, worldly morality: love must be directed at a concrete person; it is impossible to love an abstract idea.¹⁴⁹ Thus Christ gave people redemption and replaced good and evil with love. People could improve their lot by aspiring to God's morality of love on earth, and they were guaranteed an end to their trials in Heaven.

What is apparent in this work, is how much Berdyaev remained unconvinced by the Catholic arguments at Clamart and at the *Oecumenical Circle*. He maintained the original Russian Orthodox criticism of the Roman hierarchy, insofar as it preached self-improvement and self-serving sacrifice (i.e. salvation through "good works") instead of the central message of love. However, he had also realized that all Christian Churches were to blame for the sorry state of Christianity in their era. Moreover, from his continued exposure to the existentialists in Marcel's philosophical society and other French milieus, Berdyaev had arrived at an alternative to Nietzsche: beyond good and evil was not the overman, but the person; Christ had founded his religion upon his love of the person, rather than upon love of good. This innovation marked every philosophical work of Berdyaev's written after 1930. Whenever he perceived that a thing (an idea, a class, a church) was placed above the person, he condemned it for idolatry.

While it would be a gross exaggeration to say that Berdyaev provided a solution for all of Marcel's religious doubts, the correspondence between du Bos and Marcel indicates that Berdyaev did manage to answer a crucial one. Two years later, Marcel

¹⁴⁹ "Love means seeing the other in God and affirming him in eternal life; it is the radiation of energy needed for that eternal life. The Christian ethics of the Gospel is founded upon the recognition of the significance of each human soul which is worth more than all the kingdoms of this world. Personality has unconditional value as the image and likeness of God. No abstract idea of good can be put above personality." Berdyaev, The Destiny of Man 107.

would publish his seminal philosophy Être et d'avoir which performed a remarkable integration between Christianity and existentialism. He had finally found a way to resolve the assertions of Nietzsche and substantiate *being* in Christian principles. Thus, the Russian Sophiologist conception of *Godmanhood* entered Western existentialist philosophy, and the dialogue between I and Thou (a "person") versus I and You (a "thing" or, "an individual") was at last engaged.

Russian encounters at Meudon Sundays

Such philosophical discussions were unappealing to the Franco-Russian artistic groups which met at Meudon during the 1930s. Yet, at their essence the same opposition to objective, materialist enslavement was apparent. While the French artists may have been drawn to Meudon in the late twenties and early thirties as the latest vogue, the Russian émigrés who gravitated to the Maritains' house saw their work in an entirely different light. Prior to the Revolution, they had witnessed a similar fragmentation and depravity among their own intelligentsia and, like the Maritains, many had formed societies and salons intended to provide traditional and often religious direction to the "dissipated youth." Thus, they found at Meudon both a remembrance of their past way of life in Russia, and a continuance of that work.

Russian émigrés could feel comfortable and engage in serious discussion at Meudon partially because the atmosphere was so familiar. Like their former salons in St. Petersburg and Moscow, the Maritain household was directed by a strong feminine presence.¹⁵⁰ Perhaps more importantly, with the womens' Russian backgrounds, they

¹⁵⁰ Julie Kernan, Our Friend Jacques Maritain: A Personal Memoir (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1975) 58.

could act as intermediaries between the French and the émigrés, clearing up points of difficulty over translation or meaning. Thus at Meudon, unlike most other places in Paris, the émigrés did not have to carefully monitor their expressions in the still unfamiliar language of French.

As the conversation would flow from subject to subject unrestricted to any one discipline, the Russians and French could exchange views about the changes of their day and express their own understanding of what the spiritual meant and how it could be applied to any art or life. Despite the Maritains' record for conversions, it seems that the Russian émigrés never felt pressured or self-conscious about the religious differences between Orthodox, Catholic or even Jewish perspectives. As Helen Iswolsky noted,

I always observed that the Russians who visited Maritain immediately trusted him and his wife and abandoned the defensive attitude which they so often adopted when among Catholics.¹⁵¹

Once at ease, the Russians could then engage in what they considered to be the most serious work of their lives. Whatever their individual careers, they felt they were fighting the same battle as the Maritains: a united struggle to find a divine source for their work and their personal lives.

As the "esoteric" Sundays continued through the 1930s, the Russian émigré participants thought that they were assisting a truly important movement directed by the Maritains. By encouraging the representation of religious themes, figures, and light as legitimate subjects for portrayal, and manifesting them in their own work, they were part of an effort,

...to stimulate the revival of religious art in France; they helped to rid the latter [music] of bad taste which so often accompanies the best of intentions...No doubt one of the most important results of the activity of the French Catholic intellectuals

¹⁵¹ Iswolsky, Light before Dusk 85.

was to prove that faith can be expressed in forms of beauty today as it was in the Middle Ages.¹⁵²

By 1930, therefore, the Maritains had seen that it was possible to bring people to God, and to provide the arts with a spiritual basis: Not by doctrine, but by example.

I must add that the experience of our study meetings taught me a very precious thing: namely, that discursive and demonstrative argumentation, doctoral erudition and historical erudition are assuredly necessary, but of little efficacy on human intellects such as God made them, and which first ask to see.¹⁵³

There was, thus, a unanimity of purpose between the Maritains' work, that of the YMCA, and that of the Russian religious philosophers which became more and more evident as their relationship deepened during the oecumenical sessions. In many ways, the Maritains were carrying out the same efforts with young artists which the writers of *Vekhi*, the *Bratstvo sviatogo Sofii*, and Berdyaev's Religious-Philosophical Circle had attempted to carry out among the intelligentsia in Russia, not to mention those which Mott and the YMCA had fostered in America and among the emigration. However, once the trends merged in Paris at the end of the 1920s, they were able to combine their Russian and French forces towards a united end.

The greatest foe which emerged to combat their work, ironically, was the ideologies which they had always abhorred. The Russian émigrés devoted their time and energy at Meudon because they had seen what could happen if young intellectuals remained bereft of spiritual direction; the Bolshevik success in Russia remained a tormenting shadow over their lives in exile. Suddenly, they had a second chance to prevent art from becoming the captive of "social realism," and those émigrés who became part of the Meudon initiative did not want to lose the French youth as they had their own

¹⁵² Iswolsky, Light before Dusk 72.

¹⁵³ Jacques and Raïssa Maritain, Oeuvres Complete, Vol. 1 137.

in Russia. In the Parisian artistic world, however, the odds for their success were not rated very highly.

His [Maritain's] hand of France pointed towards Rome, via Meudon, the weather like taking the air of God; but the sky without doubt was too pure, too blue, too pale. It could not be long until it turned to the storm. With that, the spirits and the arts turned towards Moscow.¹⁵⁴

The mood of the times was so bleak that those who would not be drawn to Meudon or who had left the house unfulfilled, judged the whole initiative to be futile. The Maritains with their French and Russian supporters could not resurrect a dead Church, a dead religion; they could not close the Pandora's box opened in the nineteenth century by Nietzsche, Darwin, Marx and Freud and confirmed by World War One that God was dead.

It [communism] does not have the mission that Raissa and Jacques Maritain, both born close to catholicism, could fill, to awake around them the sleeping Catholics. They throw pepper in the eyes and in the nostrils. One salutary, eternal aid to all the Catholic clan. One can begin again to live, because one was always intensely alive around Maritain; he is the spice of the modern French church. But they cannot make good on the impossible. They cannot make out of the Church an actuality that she has lost in the spirit of all which is young, in the spirits without repentance. And they cannot keep a crowd around them of souls who come out of infatuation more than by vocation.¹⁵⁵

It was with as much fascination as ridicule that Parisian intellectuals watched the antics at Meudon, wondering when the futility of their quest would finally dawn on those participants, and make them give up their "silly spirituality" for the only true absolutes of Communism or Fascism.

It must have been completely frustrating, therefore, to watch the meetings persist and the work to continue. Even after Meudon was destroyed by the cataclysm of World

¹⁵⁴ Sachs, Le Sabbat 172.

¹⁵⁵ Sachs, Le Sabbat 174.

War Two, its disciples continued their work and remembered the experience as the crucial turning-point in their lives:

...I still consider Maritain's teaching on man and society extremely valuable and unique in those days. Far from offering us an ironclad doctrine, which is usually associated with that of scholasticism, he made a dynamic and creative appeal to the spiritual forces. He gave us the feeling that we stood on the threshold of a new era in which heaven and earth, the City of God and the city of man, would be brought together.¹⁵⁶

Whether or not the Maritains' aspirations were futile in a world in which the concrete beliefs of communism and fascism answered so many more doubts than their effervescent hopes of a Christian revival, their influence over artists at this time created a body of masterpieces which continue to inspire people today. The paintings of Chagall, Hugo, and Cocteau are regarded with the same wonderment as the compositions of Stravinsky and Lourié are listened to, and the writings of Green and Ghéon are read. Despite their individual techniques and mannerisms these works, and those of the other Meudon participants, all are pervaded with a sense of something other-worldly which both confuses and delights.

Clamart Sundays

The increasing lure of ideologies, however, forced the religious philosophers to re-engage the political sphere in a way that they had avoided since Vekh in 1909. While the artistic meetings flourished in Meudon, two miles away Berdyaev's Sunday teas became a fluid centre for political action involving first Russian émigrés and then a wider circle of French intellectuals and other interested visitors as the inter-war years progressed. As has already been shown at the oecumenical sessions at Clamart on

¹⁵⁶ Iswolsky, No Time to Grieve... 180.

Tuesdays, the atmosphere cultivated by Berdyaev was similar and yet distinct from that at Meudon. Berdyaev had started his Sunday afternoons as soon as he became settled in Clamart in 1924. At that time, he did not yet know the Maritains and would not have realized that his gatherings occurred in conflict with theirs. Nevertheless, even once the two philosophers became friends, they each continued to hold their separate Sunday gatherings: if an interesting subject was intended for one Sunday at Meudon, Berdyaev might cancel his teas and bring that Sunday's group over to the Maritains;¹⁵⁷ in return, Jacques Maritain infrequently would find time on his busy day, to travel over to Clamart and partake of the discussion there.¹⁵⁸

Until the 1930s, however, Meudon was a glittering centre for the discussion of abstract Thomism and its application to daily life and the arts. Clamart, on the other hand, brought together a much smaller group of the Russian émigré religious intelligentsia and their sponsors from the YMCA for serious discussion about the modern crisis, youth morale, and the need for a united Christian response to cure these problems. While Meudon achieved the height of urbanity and good taste - in addition to holding an unlimited number of guests - Clamart cultivated the intimate rural atmosphere of some "country-house in the very heart of Russia."¹⁵⁹ The Maritains' finely prepared, gourmet feasts served on delicate china, contrasted with the simple, but delicious, home-made fare and oversized tea-cups at Clamart.

¹⁵⁷ Iswolsky, No Time to Grieve... 183.

¹⁵⁸ Paul B. & Margaret H. Anderson, "N.A. Berdyaev and his household in Clamart," n.d., Paul B Anderson Papers, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Box 32: 1-5.

¹⁵⁹ Iswolsky, Light before Dusk 71-73, 88.

Not only did a rather different atmosphere prevail at the house in Clamart, but also the intensity and direction of the conversation varied from the norm at Meudon. In one way, Berdyaev's Sunday salon was less structured than Maritain's *Cercles Thomistes*, his "esoteric" meetings, or his later "Russian Sundays": The conversation was not directed by a specific outline, nor was it limited to scholasticism and the specialized study of Thomist thought. Rather, at Clamart, "the continual flow of conversation was like a round table talk continued from Sunday to Sunday" engaging whatever subject was of interest that day. Nevertheless, Berdyaev dominated the discussions, often shifting from debate to lecture:

His [Berdyaev's] talk was not what is usually called "conversation"; it was as if he spoke aloud to himself, as if his thoughts flowed under our very eyes, like a slow, never-ending torrent.¹⁶⁰

In other ways, however, the Sunday meetings at Clamart were even more directed, or perhaps more purposeful, than those at Meudon. Throughout the 1930s, the work pursued at Clamart was directed towards concrete efforts to begin new initiatives.

In the first years after his arrival in Clamart, Berdyaev was preoccupied with organizing and furthering the *Oecumenical Circle*; hand in hand with this, the Clamart Sundays acted as an editor's forum for the latest additions to Put'. By the end of the 1920s, however, Berdyaev and his guests turned their attention from solely religious matters to more political, youth-oriented efforts. Berdyaev had long held very definite political views about which he had written extensively, but only acted upon intermittently in Russia. His expulsion from Soviet Russia, however, combined with his exposure to the apocalyptic opinions of Hermann Keyserling, Max Scheler and, above all, Oswald Spengler in Berlin (1922-1924) had caused him to perceive that not only Russia, but the

¹⁶⁰ Iswolsky, Light before Dusk 94; Iswolsky, No Time to Grieve... 190.

entire world, was verging on the brink of a catastrophe. This prophetic vision had caused him to write A New Middle Ages in 1923. By 1930, the world situation had deteriorated to such an extent that Berdyaev finally contemplated serious political engagement. He was further motivated by the connections which he had been able to establish between French and Russian émigré intellectuals. With access to a wide variety of journals and publishing houses and a certain influence over several promising young people, he would be able to spread his ideas in potentially significant dimensions. Thus, the house at Clamart became more than a salon for theologians and philosophers during the 1930s; it evolved into a meeting-ground for an entirely new political movement.

The first political program which arose from Clamart was, understandably, wholly Russian. Gathering several select students from the Russian Religious-Philosophical Academy, Berdyaev inspired the creation of the *Post-Revolutionaries*. Led by a former prince, Yuri Shirinsky-Shikhmatov,¹⁶¹ the *Post-Revolutionaries* were a youth movement which sought to study events in the Soviet Union. Like Berdyaev, they accepted the communist revolution as "an accomplished fact" and a positive, if albeit misdirected, proof of dynamic spirit in that country. Their goal was to find ways in which to "surpass and surmount" the Communist revolution, in hopes of reforming the Soviet Union "in accordance with the ideas of genuine Russian humanism."¹⁶² To this end, they published a small journal called Utverzhdenie (Affirmation).

¹⁶¹ Yuri Shirinsky-Shikhmatov who was highly educated earned his living in Paris as a taxi driver, but pursued his education at night at the Russian Religious-Philosophical Academy. He was devoutly Orthodox and, although of noble birth, he did not use his title. Iswolsky remembered him as a "tall, slender, charming man with an extensive knowledge of the social and political sciences." His wife had been married before to a militant Russian socialist who was tried by the Bolsheviks and then committed suicide. Iswolsky, No Time to Grieve... 188.

¹⁶² Iswolsky, Light before Dusk 105.

In accepting certain positive elements to the Revolution, the *Post-Revolutionaries* cut themselves off from the majority of the emigration. For Berdyaev, this was no new phenomenon. Yet, it did cause Utverzhdenie to remain a largely unknown publication.¹⁶³ There is no indication in the archives of the YMCA Russian Division that they sponsored this endeavour, and in fact, the only testimony to its existence occurs in the memoirs of Berdyaev and Iswolsky, and in a brief mention in Maritain's True Humanism.¹⁶⁴ Clearly, the *Post-Revolutionaries* were not able to transmit Berdyaev's message in the manner which he intended. As Yuri Shirinsky-Shikhmatov bore out his days driving a taxi while writing his next essay for Utverzhdenie, Berdyaev continued to seek other opportunities.

One Sunday in 1930 when Paul Anderson and several concerned friends of Berdyaev's met at Clamart to discuss the morale of the young émigrés, the established political writer and former Socialist Revolutionary, Ilya Bunakov-Fondaminsky, suggested that they found a new review.¹⁶⁵ While Put' gave voice to the philosophical and oecumenical issues of religious-philosophy's "third way", there was no organ for its more concrete economic, political, and social understandings. Moreover, Put' was largely restricted to established, older writers. A new review might combine their energies with those of the still widely-unheard émigré youth. His idea was supported enthusiastically by George Fedotov and Mat' Maria (Elizabeth Skobtsova) who had gravitated to Clamart

¹⁶³ Written solely in Russian, it could not attract a wide audience among the émigrés because it did not ascribe to the accepted views - White Russian, Menshevik, or to a lesser extent Socialist Revolutionary - nor were its writers of established reputation in the community.

¹⁶⁴ Jacques Maritain, Humanisme intégral: problèmes temporels et spirituels d'une nouvelle chrétienté (Paris: F. Aubier, 1936).

¹⁶⁵ Paul B. Anderson, "Annual Report for 1936," Paul B. Anderson papers, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Box 6: 1-16.

due to their sympathy for Berdyaev's decision to remain under the Orthodox Church in Moscow. Skobtsova, as the former wife of an SR, could bring considerable political experience as could Fondaminsky. Berdyaev, being already involved in the somewhat similar initiative of the *Post-Revolutionaries*, agreed to assist, and bring what sponsorship he could from Put'.

The YMCA and the older members of the emigration were not simply being over-protective in their concern with the youth. Since 1925, the Russian Montparnasse (the district where the young émigrés congregated) had become a den of depravity where the émigré youth drank to mask their hunger and hopelessness at the lack of opportunity.¹⁶⁶ Suicides and early deaths marked the young intelligentsia who were given no opportunity to publish in the established reviews. While the *Studio Franco-Russe* had provided some with connections to the French press, few possessed the fluidity to express their ideas in languages other than Russian, and the Russian émigré press was largely reserved for those writers who had established their reputations in their own country prior to the Revolution.

For Berdyaev, Bunakov-Fondaminsky, Mat' Maria and the directors of the YMCA Russian Division, the concern was not only that young Russian émigrés might dissolve into depression and depravity - they had established the RSCM in order to prevent this very occurrence - but also that they might be drawn into communist or fascist movements as the only alternative to their sorry plight. Instead, they decided to offer a more professional, publicity-orientated alternative which might launch Russian émigré youth upon a constructive path. The new review Novyi grad (the New City) was quickly

¹⁶⁶ For a description of the conditions, see: Vasily Yanovsky, Elysian Fields: A Book of Memory (Dekalb, IL: Northern Illinois University Press, 1987); Nina Berberova, The Italics are Mine, trans. Philippe Radley (New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1969).

outlined, and began to be published in Paris in 1931.¹⁶⁷ Largely supported and contributed to by the established writers at Put' and funded by the YMCA Press, Novyi grad allowed Russians to voice their opinions about the state of the modern world from a Russian Orthodox perspective.¹⁶⁸

Despite the rapid contraction of the YMCA Press budget due to the Great Depression in the United States, Paul Anderson was able to concoct a plan whereby new books and the new journal Novyi grad could be handled by commission - printed by the new publisher *la Société Nouvelle d'Éditions Franco-Slaves* (S.N.I.E.), and thus drastically reduce the cost of overhead.¹⁶⁹ In this way, he was able to divert sufficient funds to the endeavour. The YMCA also supported the rationale of Novyi grad:

...an attempt on the part of liberal modern Russians in emigration to project the type of society in which Christian principles, as well as human achievements and individual and social weaknesses are taken into account. The first number has drawn a great amount of criticism, favourable and unfavourable. Kerensky, for instance, in reviewing "The New City" in his paper states that "The New City" will bring into the camp of democracy and democratic socialism a new brigade of very valuable fighters." Berdiaeff, Vysheslavitzeff, Fr. S. Boulgakoff, Fedotoff and others of our nearest collaborators participate in this undertaking, and it means for the Association an opportunity to collaborate in an entirely new venture for Russians, namely the attempt to take full account of social and political factors of the modern day along with Orthodox religious truths.¹⁷⁰

Its initial editors were Fondaminsky, Fedotov, and Feodor Stepun who, despite his decision to remain in Germany, had not lost contact with his old colleague Berdyaev.

¹⁶⁷ For a list of its contributors, see Appendix A.

¹⁶⁸ "Ot Redaktsii," Novyi grad 1 (January 1931): 3-7.

¹⁶⁹ Notwithstanding the financial assistance it received from the YMCA, Novyi grad was not able to maintain itself as a regular publication. The first issue at the end of 1931 was followed by concurrent quarterly publications of the next four issues in 1932. However, in 1933 and 1934 its circulation was reduced to only two issues per year, and from 1935-1939 it was only published on an annual basis.

¹⁷⁰ Paul B. Anderson, Letter to Ethan T. Colton, 31 December 1931, Paul B. Anderson Papers, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Box 6: 3-4.

From the first, Novyi grad argued against both the status quo and the alternatives of either Communism or Fascism. Instead it proffered the view of Christian social justice predicated by an Orthodox perspective which embodied many of the tenets of religious-philosophy especially *sobornost'*.¹⁷¹

Social Studies Meetings at Meudon

Perhaps influenced by this type of activity at Clamart, Jacques Maritain decided to add a new element to his Sunday meetings in 1930 which he called "social-studies" discussions. Although he held only one such meeting in 1930, by the next year his "social studies" group became firmly established. The decision to engage in political discussion could not have been an easy one for Maritain: since 1927, when he broke with the *Action Française*, he and Raïssa had actively shunned politics and related topics; they had been scarred by the public and private condemnation from former friends (especially Henri Massis) who considered the breach to be treachery.¹⁷² Moreover, the majority of those who frequented Meudon were not very interested in politics or economics, rather their concerns tended to be religious, artistic, and theoretical.

When the first "social studies" session met in May, 1930 to discuss the "fecundity of money," therefore, the participants were not the usual group who gathered either at the Meudon Sundays or even at Berdyaev's oecumenical Tuesdays. Maritain's two colleagues from the Institut Catholique, Abbé Lallement and Olivier Lacombe were in attendance, as was his brother-in-baptism, Pierre van der Meer. The others, however,

¹⁷¹ Feodor Stepun, "Zadachi emigratsii," Novyi grad 2 (1932): 15-28.; P. Bitsilli, "Na putiakh k novomu gradu," Novyi grad 10 (1935): 106-111.

¹⁷² Bernhard Doering, Jacques Maritain and the French Catholic Intellectuals (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1983) 46-48.

were young university students who had had little previous contact with the Meudon circles: François Henry, Etienne Borne, and Jacques de Monléon.¹⁷³ As the meetings expanded in 1931, Lacombe and van der Meer were replaced by Emmanuel Mounier, Helen Iswolsky, Pierre Linne,¹⁷⁴ Georges Izard, Marcel Arland, and André Déléage who were all young political activists. Periodically, Berdyaev would tear himself away from the critical meetings for Novyi grad, Put' and the *Post-Revolutionaries* in order to observe, and perhaps redirect, the movement emerging at Meudon. However, the "social studies" meetings were almost entirely the purview of young French intellectuals, and they were largely directed by Lallement who acted as the "expert" on capitalist theory and economics.¹⁷⁵

In 1931, as the "social-studies" meetings at Meudon began to consume approximately one Sunday each month, the participants were gratified by the Vatican's acknowledgment of the world crisis with the issuance of Pope Pius XI's *quadragesima anno*. Despite the Catholic Church's open opposition to oecumenism and a unified Christian front, it accepted that the growing appeal of Communism and other ideologies with their promises of social justice was eroding the Church. In this encyclical, therefore, Pope Pius XI condemned the excesses of capitalism, expressed a new urgency in the need for reforms, and supported the concepts of a "just wage," guarantees of employment

¹⁷³ Maritain, Notebooks 161.

¹⁷⁴ the treasurer of the *Cercles Thomistes*

¹⁷⁵ His prominent position is evident in the notes taken by Emmanuel Mounier at these meetings, "Entretiens IV," 1 February 1931 and 19 April 1931.

and some form of profit-sharing with workers.¹⁷⁶ The encyclical was probably the final motivation for Catholics like Jacques Maritain to engage in serious social discussions.¹⁷⁷

Therefore, rather than any direct influence it seems that Berdyaev's political work merely converged with a new awakening in the minds of Maritain and some of his followers. Helen Iswolsky was deeply involved in the "social studies" work. Although she had been so quick to point out the theological and philosophical differences between Maritain and Berdyaev, here she vouched for the tremendous parallels in their view of the current social and political problems:

But where Maritain and Berdiaeff really met and understood each other intimately, was in the field of social problems. They shared the same Christian humanist conception, and here practically no differences existed between them. They pursued for many years a common task based on deep friendship, which only war and the tragedy of Europe have unfortunately interrupted.¹⁷⁸

In this, the two men both engaged and yet opposed the trend of their time.

The so-called "common" or "working" man had become the focus of almost all alternate political movements during the 1920s and 1930s. On a practical level, this was a result of their increased political force which came with universal enfranchisement, and their greater liquid wealth which was a by-product of industrialization. Emotionally, the "plight of the working man" combined with the new, sophisticated methods of mass manipulation (propaganda), created a powerful, political weapon which was eroding the clout of the establishment. The rising ideologies of the period capitalized upon this

¹⁷⁶ As cited in J. Salwyn Schapiro, Movements of Social Dissent in Modern Europe (Princeton, NJ: Van Nostrand, 1962) 37.

¹⁷⁷ Iswolsky stated: "He [Maritain] has urged the Church to turn its attention to the working classes threatened with complete de-Christianization, arguing that it is because they did not find justice in the Christian world that they have followed atheistic leaders." Iswolsky, Light before Dusk 83.

¹⁷⁸ Iswolsky, Light before Dusk 86.

evolution in order to try and seize control of governments. Fascism, in its variety of forms, and Communism were the politics of the "masses" and, as such, increasingly successful. For Berdyaev and Maritain, this trend was comprehensible, but its outcomes deplorable; they embraced the cause (social justice), but not the means (mass ideology).

Berdyaev had held this stance since his contribution to Vekhi in 1909, and his experiences under Bolshevik Communism only confirmed his view. Maritain, however, despite a brief flirtation with Socialism in his pre-religious, student days and a distant liaison with *Action française* had not seriously considered the economic underpinnings which made ideological movements so appealing. The "social studies" meetings were begun to address this lack of knowledge. Gradually the group tried to explain which aspects of Capitalism caused a reduction of human spiritual value and, conversely, which elements made Communism so appealing to the working man. As Iswolsky remembered,

At the time of which I speak I had myself made an extensive study of sociological theories and especially of the history and evolution of communism, the tragedy suffered by my country having naturally inspired me with a special interest in these problems. I had already reached the conclusion that it was useless to attack godless Marxism unless one could propose in its place a Christianity which would give the working classes a constructive and just social system.

In Maritain and his group (for he had already quite a number of followers) I found the very men who were able to create this constructive system and who had the faith and courage to apply it.¹⁷⁹

Therefore, the same underlying principle governed the "social studies" meetings as had moved the other Meudon initiatives in the arts and in the *Cercles Thomistes* and the Clamart efforts for oecumenism, the *Post-Revolutionaries*, and Novyi grad.

The meetings moved into full intent in November, 1930 with a discussion of Socialism and the Communist Revolution in France. That day a tenuous bond was formed between Mounier, Arland, Déléage and Georges Izard. Quite influenced by the

¹⁷⁹ Iswolsky, Light before Dusk 83-84; 76.

growing pacifist movements in Europe, Izard initially found Arland much too activist in the mode of George Sorel.¹⁸⁰ Yet Arland, with his desire for heroic action, was quite concerned with the current situation in the Soviet Union: he vehemently opposed the French intellectuals' refusal to sign a petition protesting the imminent execution of some 50 intellectuals by the Soviet government. Maritain responded that, if the Soviets had massacred some 5000 peasants (in the collectivization drive), they were unlikely to bend to world opinion regarding a mere 50 intellectuals.¹⁸¹

Maritain suggested that the USSR was undergoing an entire transformation, and deserved as much sympathy and assistance as the French could give, rather than prejudiced condemnation. For Déléage, the Soviet events were a curious experiment, made bewildering by their ability to totally eradicate any mention or reference to God in writings, ideas or expressions. Beyond that, however, the people were damned and did not interest him further.¹⁸² Mounier, however, felt a greater sympathy for the victims of this experiment, and argued for involvement which might mitigate the worst excesses.¹⁸³ At this, the conversation turned to the Communist leaders in that Country. Izard asserted an intimate, theoretical, knowledge of the Russian socialist parties and their leaders, then noted that they seemed to have forgotten any innate "love of the people"; Arland agreed, pointing to the French example of Robespierre and the extent to which he advanced over time: "Certainly one day about the age of 18 he loved the people, but not later." Raïssa Maritain contradicted them, admitting that while she knew only secondary leaders from

¹⁸⁰ Emmanuel Mounier, "Entretiens III," 30 November 1930, 150-161.

¹⁸¹ Emmanuel Mounier, "Entretiens III," 30 November 1930, 156.

¹⁸² Emmanuel Mounier, "Entretiens III," 30 November 1930, 157.

¹⁸³ Emmanuel Mounier, "Entretiens III," 30 November 1930, 157.

the Russian Revolution and not the great ones, she could assure them that those leaders were "ardent, convinced, and genuinely devoted to the people." "The revolution", she continued "sparked a magnificent enthusiasm among the youth, among the students."¹⁸⁴ Arland asked for clarification, "was it a love of the people which inspired the students, or a love of the ideology?" Raïssa Maritain responded "It is the same."¹⁸⁵

Such a statement now indicates how cursory was this group's understanding of ideological phenomenon and, moreover, how little they had yet learned from the Russian religious philosophers. At that time, however, they had not experienced life under an ideological regime. After a humorous aside, as Raïssa realized to her shock that she was defending the Bolshevik revolutionaries, they moved on to discuss the Christian's role at such times. When Izard suggested non-involvement and resignation, Maritain stepped in with his illuminating assertion that if one were resigned, one was not acting as a Christian: "the saints are revolutionaries!" Izard retorted pragmatically, "yes, but in the final analysis it is rare to find in the same man the profoundness of the religious idea and the spirit of revolution."¹⁸⁶ For Mounier, this struck a responding chord and caused him to evaluate his aspirations for political action: Was it possible that they could lead a new form of revolution; one within the controlled boundaries of the religious idea? Thereafter, the "social studies" meetings began an exacting dissection of capitalism and communism in order to determine the potential parameters of a "third way" (this title was suggested off-hand by Raïssa Maritain) in which Christians could acceptably engage in political

¹⁸⁴ Emmanuel Mounier, "Entretiens III," 30 November 1930, 158.

¹⁸⁵ Emmanuel Mounier, "Entretiens III," 30 November 1930, 158.

¹⁸⁶ Emmanuel Mounier, "Entretiens III," 30 November 1930, 158-159.

action.¹⁸⁷ For Mounier, such training would be invaluable in his future pursuits as he tried to establish just such a Christian body, one that endeavoured to respond to the issue of social justice.

Esprit

Despite their virulent criticism of consumerism and the modern materialist mentality, the Meudon "social-studies" circle did not dissolve into bitter pessimism. Rather, they began to consider concrete forms of political and journalistic action which might influence a change among the French populace and then throughout the world. Just as Berdyaev had helped Shirinsky-Shikhmatov form the *Post-Revolutionaries*, and assisted in the creation of Novyi grad, Maritain and the senior members of the social-studies circle began to assist Emmanuel Mounier in realizing his own political aspirations through the creation of a new French journal and movement. Before the next social-studies meeting on March 8, 1931, Mounier approached Maritain with the idea he and his new friend, Georges Izard, had recently conceived. Upon receiving Maritain's endorsement, they began the first of a long series of conferences about the proposed review at Meudon two days later. At this first meeting, Maritain voiced two concerns which were indicative of his still nascent involvement with socio-political activity: the new review would have to be careful in its selection of "leftist art" to be reviewed, and it would have to differentiate itself from Robert Garric's Revue des Jeunes.¹⁸⁸

¹⁸⁷ This process has been specifically described from two different perspectives in John Hellman, Emmanuel Mounier and the New Catholic Left, 1920-1950 (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1981) and in Catherine Baird, "Religious Communism? Nikolai Berdyaev's Contribution to *Esprit's* Interpretation of Communism," Canadian Journal of History 30.2 (1995): 29-47.

¹⁸⁸ Emmanuel Mounier, "Entretiens IV," 22 February 1931, 63.

First, Maritain's preoccupation with the arts was not uncharacteristic both because of the personal work which he had undertaken in the "esoteric" meetings at Meudon, and because of the prevailing interest of that time in France. In the 1920s, La Nouvelle Revue Française [N.R.F.] was the most important publication in the nation and, until later in the 1930s, it remained largely the organ of writers and artists whose aspirations coincided with its famous editor, André Gide. However, when Mounier and Izard approached Maritain with their idea for a new journal, they were contemplating an approach which would not only be grounded in spiritual and religious tenets, but also perceived philosophy and political activism to be more important than art.

Second, Maritain's concern regarding the Revue des jeunes was pragmatic and personal. His brother-in-baptism, Pierre van der Meer, controlled the publication of this review through the house Desclée de Brouwer; Maritain did not want to embark upon a competitive endeavour which might cause conflict within his established circle.¹⁸⁹ Moreover, through his own forays in the publishing world with the *Roseau d'or* collection, Maritain was well aware of the fierce expenditure and difficulties entailed in setting up a new publication. He, thus, counselled Mounier and Izard to test their ideas at smaller houses, such as Clouard, and prepare themselves for critical and even denigrating examinations of their proposed ideas and format.¹⁹⁰ In this way, Maritain gave perhaps the best advice possible. As the budding journalists explored the publishing houses of Paris, beginning with the friends they had made at Meudon, Clamart, the *Studio Franco-Russe* and other encounters, they accumulated both sponsors and knowledge which helped to make their effort a success.

¹⁸⁹ Emmanuel Mounier, "Entretiens IV," 22 February 1931, 64.

¹⁹⁰ Emmanuel Mounier, "Entretiens IV," 22 February 1931, 63.

The "social-studies" Sundays at Meudon continued, galvanized by the realization that their results were helping to form the editorial consensus of the budding review.¹⁹¹ At the oecumenical Tuesdays at Clamart, conversation increasingly turned from religious issues between the Christian denominations to the concrete philosophies of the anthropological conception of man, and to individual freedom as opposed to divine predestination.¹⁹² These were subjects which might help Mounier define the philosophical outlook of the new journal which they had decided would be called *Esprit*. Gabriel Marcel, Charles du Bos, Nikolai Berdyaev, Pierre van der Meer and a host of other contacts from the older generation joined Maritain in wholeheartedly assisting in its creation. They facilitated the founders' interaction with similar groups, they described their own experiences in publishing and editing, and most likely, they also began or continued to influence the formulation of the new movement's philosophy which came to be called "Personalism".

The Personalism developed by Emmanuel Mounier and his group *Esprit* followed Raïssa Maritain's suggestion of the "third way" between the dominant political positions of individualism, liberalism, democracy, and capitalism on the one hand, and of collectivist communism, fascism, or nazism on the other. Convinced that the modern world was in a serious state of crisis, Personalism blamed capitalism for social, political, and economic inequalities, and attacked what they termed "the established disorder."¹⁹³ It made a

¹⁹¹ For example, On Sunday April 19, 1931 Abbé Lallement avoided his previous abstractions and turned to the concrete influence which capitalism and materialist concepts had upon the daily lives and mentality of people. A major issue that day was how capitalism disorganized and weakened the family. Emmanuel Mounier, "Entretiens IV," 19 April 1931, 92-99.

¹⁹² Emmanuel Mounier, "Entretiens IV," Tuesday 5 May 1931, 110-115.

¹⁹³ This term was used during the debates at the *Studio Franco-Russe* on "Le Renouveau Spirituel," *Cahiers de la quinzaine* 22.1 (1932): 16.

distinction between the individual and the person. The former, Personalists declared to be alienated from other *individuals* due to the separation which came from possessing private property and judging others on the basis of wealth. The latter, they viewed as innately connected with other *persons* by virtue of each being "created in the image and semblance of God."¹⁹⁴ In championing the inherent dignity of each human being, Personalism opposed any collective ideology which placed nation, class, race or any concept or idea above man. Economically and politically, it accepted the "truth" of Communism's aspirations for social justice while exposing and denying the underlying "lie" of its materialist construction of social relations.¹⁹⁵

From this position, *Esprit's* version of "personnalisme communautaire" proposed a benign revolution to transform modern man and society. Its foundation was spiritual or, true to edict of Péguy, "la revolution sera morale ou elle ne sera pas".¹⁹⁶

He [Mounier] called for a revolution without violence, but based on the transformation of every separate person and of his way of life, liberated from the struggle for money and from the pressures of an impersonal state. A community of men, linked by love and mutual service was to replace the centralized, all-powerful state.¹⁹⁷

Revolution would thus begin within each person and extend to the community, before it could affect the wider nation or world as a whole. The Personalist concept of community corresponded in some ways to the Russian idea of *sobornost'*, to Proudhon's *commun*

¹⁹⁴ Emmanuel Mounier, Personalism, trans. Philip Mairet (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd., 1952) 18-19.

¹⁹⁵ This platform was elaborated by Nikolai Berdyaev, "Verité et mensonge du communisme," Esprit 1 (1932): 322-339.

¹⁹⁶ Emmanuel Mounier, "Refaire la Renaissance," Oeuvres de Emmanuel Mounier, Vol 1 (Paris: Éditions de Seuil, 1961) 37.

¹⁹⁷ Iswolsky, No Time to Grieve... 186.

or to Max Scheler's *Gesamtperson*, but it also contained certain distinctly French Catholic images.

The Non-Conformist Movements of the 1930s

Concurrent with Mounier's embarkation towards the Personalism of *Esprit* appeared a number of "non-conformist" movements¹⁹⁸ which similarly opposed capitalist liberal democracy on the one hand, and the ideologies of Fascism or Communism on the other in favour of a new spiritually-based conception of man. A young Russian émigré of Jewish descent who had participated in the Socialist Revolutionary Party during the 1917 Russian Revolutions managed to combine Russian Populist ideas with the latest existentialist and psychological thought developed in Germany into the concept of *personnalisme fédéraliste*.¹⁹⁹ Alexander Lipiansky-Marc (1904-), joined a band of like-minded intellectuals in Paris during the late 1920s to form another Personalist movement which they called *Ordre Nouveau*. Recently described as the innovator of the word "personalism" Lipiansky-Marc launched his movement into the Paris milieu with a 1931 manifesto which declared: "WE ARE NEITHER INDIVIDUALISTS NOR COLLECTIVISTS, WE ARE PERSONALISTS!" Although the group, which included such prominent young intellectuals as Denis de Rougement, Arnaud Dandieu, and Robert Aron, approached

¹⁹⁸ Jean-Louis Loubet del Bayle, Les Non-conformistes des années 30 (Paris: Éditions de Seuil, 1961); Jean Touchard, Le gauche en France depuis 1900 (Paris: Éditions de Seuil, 1977).

¹⁹⁹ See Catherine Baird, "Russian Personalism" 9-32.

Personalism from a more systematic and even Nietzschean perspective, they shared many of the aspirations of Mounier and *Esprit*.²⁰⁰

When the first number of *Esprit* was published in 1932, even the *N.R.F.* had come to take the rising movement of Personalism seriously. That year, it published a special section entitled "Cahier de revendications" in which the foremost young Personalists were enjoined to state their ideas and political positions. In addition to the *Esprit* and *Ordre Nouveau* groups, three others had made their appearance in the Paris press and were represented in the *N.R.F.*: *Combat*, *Plans* and *Réaction*. *Plans* was already established with a "stylish" journal under the editorship of Philippe Lamour and, until 1933, it gave a home to the members of *Ordre Nouveau* who could not yet afford their own review. Influenced by the utopian socialism of Saint-Simon modernized since by Henri de Man, *Plans* embraced the philosophy of *planisme*: Specific social, economic and political plans should be drawn up by a new technocracy in order to correct the imbalances of capitalism without resorting to the radical transformation of communism. Planisme was by far the most corporatist type of non-conformism and, thus, the review was able to attract collaborators such as Hubert Lagardelle, Le Corbusier, and Pierre Winter.

Réaction which first appeared in 1930 was the most order-oriented variety of these journals. Edited and lead by Jean de Fabrègues,²⁰¹ its writers included Jean-Pierre Maxence (editor of *Cahiers de la quinzaine*), Thierry Maulnier, and two of the leaders of

²⁰⁰ Christian Roy, "Alexandre Marc and the Personalism of L'Ordre Nouveau, 1920-1940," M.A. Thesis, McGill University, 1987, 21. Alexandre Marc was the sole author of the above manifesto. Roy has further substantiated his claim that Marc founded the personalist movement in "Alexandre Marc et la Jeune Europe, 1904-1934: L'Ordre Nouveau et aux origines du Personnalisme," diss., McGill University, 1992.

²⁰¹ At one-time he was the secretary to Charles Maurras of the infamous *Action Française*. Then he had come under the influence of Jacques Maritain and finally broken with the fascist movement in 1930.

Ordre Nouveau, Arnaud Dandieu and Robert Aron. Despite their worship of Georges Bernanos and their quest for violent action, the group remained committed to the personalist vision of the spiritual value of mankind:

Order is the law of being. To recognize order is to recognize our dual mystery: body and spirit. body represents our solidarity with nature and with other men; spirit is more than intelligence, it is the eternal soul, the daughter of God...It is to recognize that we strive towards ends higher than ourselves.²⁰²

Like the other personalist movements, *Réaction* attacked democracy as decadent, capitalism for its relegation of human value to a number, and Communism for its "faceless collective."

Combat, mirroring the experience of *Ordre Nouveau*, was late to make its appearance as a publication. Written by Jean de Fabrègues, Thierry Maulnier, Jean-Pierre Maxence, Robert Francis, Georges Blond and Pierre Andreau, the first issue was released in 1936. Highly philosophical in tone, it reiterated many of the Personalist ideas:

The struggle that we wish to lead here is the struggle for a new synthesis, for a reconciliation of the intellect and the real in their essential union and true relationship. That is to say that this journal will be devoted neither to the games of pure intelligence nor to the needs of a conscripted intelligence. We will attempt to reestablish the spirit and the world, the intellect and politics, man and society in their proper relations and in their true unity.²⁰³

This review too, endeavoured to spread the cause of a "new social humanism," to reintegrate materialist man with his forgotten spiritual essence, and to endow life with more value than simply the pursuit of profit, of domination, or of levelling egalitarianism.

As the overlapping of names may already have indicated, these groups were all in close contact with one another, and could generally support a plurality of views instead

²⁰² Réaction April 1930, as cited in David Ennis, "Toward Commitment: The Reorientation of French Social Thought in the 1930s," diss., Boston University, 1979, 85.

²⁰³ Combat January 1936, as cited in David Ennis, "Toward Commitment: The Reorientation of French Social Thought in the 1930s," diss., Boston University, 1979, 86.

of setting themselves up in direct competition. Denis de Rougement, for instance, soon came over to *Esprit* from *Ordre Nouveau*, and yet still contributed to his old group's review. Furthermore, many of the young Russian émigrés found the Personalist movement to be so appealing that they decided to make their own contribution to it. *Esprit* was their first choice, both because of the friendship which they had established with Emmanuel Mounier at Clamart, and because of its international perspective and sensitivity to Soviet issues: In addition to offices throughout France, the *Esprit* movement established bases in Glasgow, Oxford, Cambridge, London, Brussels, Palermo, Milan, Cracow, Prague and Salamanca.²⁰⁴

Helen Iswolsky was instrumental in bringing the Russian émigrés to *Esprit*. She had become involved with the *Post-Revolutionaries* shortly after her introduction to Clamart and wrote in their review Utverzhdenie whenever money could be raised for a new issue.²⁰⁵ As a steady participant in the "social studies" meetings at Meudon, she had also become engaged in the nascent *Esprit* movement at its foundation. After the journal was launched in October, 1932, Iswolsky brought them to meet her friend Mounier. *Esprit* was excited at the opportunity to gain assistance from those who had intimate experience with the Bolshevik regime in Russia, and who retained enough contacts to be able to gain more accurate and immediate information about what was happening in the Soviet Union at that time. In return, the *Post-Revolutionaries* were excited at the offer of a more secure forum than their intermittently-released Utverzhdenie. An alliance was formed and, by 1933 the Russian group wrote articles under the name, "the Four", in Esprit, adding their perspective and news to the growing review.

²⁰⁴ Emmanuel Mounier, "Entretiens V," 13 April 1932, 103.

²⁰⁵ Iswolsky, No Time to Grieve... 188.

Iswolsky also acted as the conduit between Esprit and Novyi grad. In 1934, she began to spend more and more of her Sundays at Clamart. There she was introduced by Berdyaev to the editors of Novyi grad, and developed a close friendship with its leading young star, Georges Fedotov. The Novyi grad writers were excited to learn of the initiatives at Esprit which so closely mirrored their own intentions. In full agreement with Berdyaev that the émigré milieu needed greater exposure to the French world around them, they hired Iswolsky to become Novyi grad's expert on French youth movements. Thus in 1934 and thereafter, Helen Iswolsky would write about the latest French personalist developments, and the emerging views of the non-conformist French youth.²⁰⁶ Esprit benefitted from this exposure, gaining a new audience among some Russian émigrés, and it returned the favour by publishing an article in Russian from Novyi grad entitled, "The awakening of young France."²⁰⁷ It was through the assistance of Esprit that Helen Iswolsky was able to publish her first major monographs L'Homme 1936 en Russie soviétique, Femmes soviétiques, and L'ame de Russie aujourd'hui.

Personalism did not only arise in France. At the same time as these reviews were beginning in that country, others arose in Britain, the United States, Portugal, Belgium, Germany, and Mexico. In 1932, the N.R.F. noted the new movements: Commonweal, the *Catholic Worker* movement, Commonwealth, The Personalist Los Angeles, Personalismo Catolico, and New Britain. At this time, Personalism was fast becoming the new revolution of choice for many intellectuals around the world.

²⁰⁶ E. Izvolskaia, "Dukhovnyi put' frantsuzkoi intelligentsia," Novyi grad 11 (1936): 120-127; "Frantsuzkaia molodezh' i problemy sovremennosti," Novyi grad 13 (1938): 163-172.

²⁰⁷ A.M.I., "Probuzhdenie molodoi Frantsii," Esprit 7 (1934): 89-90.

The outright Christian, or at least spiritual, aspirations of Personalism, combined with its diverse origins, may situate it within the general Christian resurgence of the inter-war years. In its message, its view of human responsibility and dignity, and its quest for a more truly Christian form of economics, politics, and social organization, personalism may be linked to the ongoing efforts of the YMCA and YWCA, the WCSF, and the World Oecumenical Movement. It was also grounded largely in the new religious (or spiritual), philosophy which was being developed by Karl Barth, Jacques Maritain, Etienne Gilson, Nikolai Berdyaev, Gabriel Marcel, Martin Buber, Max Scheler, Semen Frank, and Lev Shestov along both the new existentialist and older, more perennialist lines. As such, it was part of the phenomenon of Christian or spiritual resistance against materialist ideologies, economic technocracies, and atomizing politics which prevailed during the *entre-deux-geurres* years.

As these "youth" endeavours continued side-by-side, the older generation, who were engaged in one way or another in the World Christian Movement, lent their support: Put' periodically reported upon issues raised in Esprit or Nowyi grad, giving free advertisement as well as a sense of significance; Charles du Bos published frequent abbreviations of Esprit articles in Vigile in order to widen the audience of the review. Instead of the passing of the torch from one generation to the other, it appears that all those who committed themselves to a Christian future worked together in a great, international cooperation.

Furthermore, the older generation was just as interested as the younger in combating the rising ideologies as well as the problems created by individualist capitalism. In journals, philosophical books, novels, and other publications they exposed the problems of the current time, and suggested ways by which Christianity could be

more truthfully applied. They sent petitions to the Vatican and continued to work with other churches to promote a unified, renewed Christian front which might resolve many of the most pressing crises and inequalities. By 1934, they began utilizing the weapon of the collective manifesto in an attempt to warn the populace of impending dangers, and to state their position on the most dramatic of events occurring in France and in the world. In 1934, for instance, when France seemed imminently threatened by Fascist insurgence with the marches and riots of the *Croix de Feu* and related groups, the leading French Catholic intellectuals issued "Pour le bien commun". The manifesto declared their complete opposition to Fascism, and outlined the potential destruction that such a regime might cause in their country. It was signed by such familiar names as Charles du Bos, Stanislas Fumet, Etienne Gilson, Gabriel Marcel, Jacques Maritain, Etienne Borne, Olivier Lacombe, Yves Simon, and Jacques Madaule to list just but a few.

In every publication of this sort, the message was the same. Changes must be made to the current system, but they could not be changes of violence, of class warfare, of racial nationalism. The transformation must take a "third way" which incorporated a spiritual conception of the divine worth of each human being. A society must be created in which work had a creative purpose and was not simply drudgery. Politics had to cease being the purview of elites, and instead take into account the unique abilities and needs of each citizen in the land. The "third way" embraced decentralization of powers in order that those most affected could make decisions about their economy and their governance. It envisioned a Christian socialism or humanism which would be more righteous, but also more uplifting to personal pride.

Oecumenical Outcomes

In this they were aided by the continued growth of oecumenicism, and its clarification of Christian unity and purpose. The *Oecumenical Circle* and its descendent in the Clamart Tuesdays had intended to assist the education of influential spokespeople from the individual Churches about the traditions, principles, and culture of alternate denominations. This task seemed well on the way to completion during the 1930s. Members of the original *Oecumenical Circle* and the ensuing Tuesday meetings at Clamart went on to lecture at their universities, orders, federations, and societies: while Bergson still awed his audiences at the Sorbonne with his theories about intuitive knowledge, oecumenical and Christian issues reigned supreme at the College de France, the Institut Catholique, the Protestant Faculty of Theology, St. Sergius Theological Institute, and the Russian Religious-Philosophical Academy. The Thomists (Etienne Gilson, Abbé Lallement, Père Gillet and Jacques Maritain), the Protestant Pasteurs (Lecerf, Jundt, Monnier, and Monod), the Orthodox theologians (Bulgakov, Zander, Florovsky, and Kovalevsky), and philosophers (Berdyayev, Lossky, Ilyin, and Vysheslavtsev) all took part in the *Oecumenical Circle* and then returned to teach their classes with this new information.

In these courses, budding oecumenists like Yves Congar received their education into the newly evolving theologies and religious philosophies. Some professors wholeheartedly embraced the transformation which was occurring: religion became a vital source in their lectures, and they inspired their students to approach it with rigour, discipline, and intense responsibility. The byword was *engagement*. Whether these teachers were proponents of a Thomist revival, of Sophiology, or of the Kierkegaardian approach to Protestantism, they advocated a new religious commitment and involvement

in all aspects of life. Pasteur Lecerf remained a most notably popular convert to this approach. By the early 1930s his classes in Calvinist dogma and his rigorous approach to reason for faith became so popular that students were abandoning their other courses *en masse* to take his.

Spiritually and intellectually Pastor Lecerf was very close to the thomistic pattern characterized by an objective attitude and a search for an understanding of faith through the sober but confident use of reason. His course on dogma was optional but students were forsaking other courses such as that given, for instance, by Pastor Wilfred Monod whom I visited several times, in order to attend the lectures of Lecerf which introduced them to Calvinistic dogmatic thought. In French Protestant thought of the time, there was a clearly discernible tendency to return to the Reformers, together with a repudiation of liberalism which soon found an outlet in the dialectical theology of Karl Barth.²⁰⁸

Karl Barth had developed concurrently many themes which corresponded to those promoted by the Russian religious philosophers. Although Barth, like Maritain, was not predisposed to accept the principle of *Sophiology* and the primacy of faith over reason, he was a proponent of Christian action and of "authentic" Christian belief. Like Berdyaev, he saw the need for a revitalization of Christian principles in order to combat the rising appeal of ideologies.²⁰⁹ Others, like Monod and the convinced "liberal" Protestants, were slowly shunted aside in this drive for action and authenticity. Their platitudes of an unclear "brotherly love" and their "bourgeois" principles of moderation and refinement seemed to belong to an earlier age. In the interwar period, these could not compete with the commitment of the new thinkers; Monod resigned his post as President of the General Committee of Churches in 1933 to make way for the more accepted trend of Christian action and involvement represented by Lecerf, A.N. Bertrand, and Pierre Maury.²¹⁰

²⁰⁸ Congar, Dialogue between Christians 7.

²⁰⁹ Congar, Dialogue between Christians 11.

²¹⁰ Boegner, L'exigence oecuménique 76.

The Catholics were also facing an internal revolution. Complacency in their superiority was giving way to a need to make Catholicism relevant to the working man and the intellectual, and to a need to work with the other denominations instead of waging war against them. Père Congar was closely involved in these endeavors, and was giving sermons on oecumenism at Catholic Churches throughout France.

It was providential for me that I was invited to conduct the Christian unity octave at the Sacre-Cœur in Paris in January 1936. Incredible nervous exhaustion obliged me to preach leaning on the edge of the pulpit. The importance of the occasion was not confined to me. The students from the Protestant Faculty of Theology came up to listen to me for an hour every afternoon and I had a very considerable audience. At the end of my eight conferences, I went and discussed them either with the Protestants at the rue Jean-de-Beauvais or with the Orthodox at the Institut Saint-Serge and I paid several visits to Father Sergei Bulgakov.²¹¹

Even the Catholic journals joined this almost revolutionary wave: In 1932, the leading Catholic intellectual journal of the times, La vie intellectuelle, began publishing articles devoted to Protestant and oecumenical issues, and included essays by Russian Orthodox explaining certain points of doctrine. Other publications which either continued or began to solicit oecumenical essays after 1932 were: La vie spirituelle and La vie intellectuelle (after 1945, in Témoignage chrétien), Irenikon, Russie et chrétienté, L'Unité de l'Eglise, L'Unité dans la lumière, Oecumenica, Blackfriars, The Eastern Churches Quarterly, Catholica, and Geistige Arbeit.

Moreover, the Clamart Tuesdays, in conjunction with the new popularity of oecumenism, inspired a series of interconfessional meetings among students. In 1935, Yves Congar remembered,

... from 1935 onwards, I took part in several of them [ecumenical gatherings]. The meetings which took place at Whitsun, usually at Protestant Centers [Chaintreauxville, Boissy l'Aillier, La Rochedieu etc], since their mixed attendance made it very difficult to find hospitality in Catholic establishments, were called a

²¹¹ Congar, Dialogue between Christians 17.

"Franco-Russian retreat." The participants were mostly students, the Protestants being both federal and post-federal. I remember many very enriching exchanges of opinion pursued in an atmosphere of great sincerity and candour, in which we really expressed our innermost convictions.²¹²

The early initiatives of the *Oecumenical Circle* and its offshoots at the *Studio Franco-Russe* and at Clamart, had provided both a popular appeal and a protection. Not only could people be encouraged to participate in these and other assemblies by the lure of "discovering Russia," but also the work of committed oecumenists - especially Catholic ones - was sheltered from the vigilant eyes of Rome. They were not meeting Protestants or Orthodox, they were learning about Russians.

The Russian Orthodox had succeeded, therefore, in making their religion and their culture a cause for study and interest to the French. The Orthodox study group *Istina* under the directorship of the Dominican Père R.P Dumont flourished during the 1930s and promoted a greater understanding of their theology and history.²¹³ The Abbé Paul Couturier, who had already been engaged in charity work among the Russian émigrés, was persuaded to embrace the cause of oecumenism and a close working relationship with the Orthodox clergy in 1932.²¹⁴ The Abbé Gratieux (a frequent visitor to the *Circle Thomistes*) gave lectures on Khomiakov and the Russian Slavophiles at the Institut

²¹² Congar, Dialogue between Christians 13-14.

²¹³ "Père Dumont was connected with the work from its earliest days. For a time he was its sole living representative and he had been responsible for giving it a definitely ecumenical orientation. Père Dumont did not devote himself to technical historical studies or academic theology but he acquired and maintained a fund of extremely accurate and detailed information. Without courting open notoriety, Père Dumont gained the confidence of all with him he was called upon to work: the Roman Curia and ecclesiastical superiors, the Orthodox both in France and in the East, the Ecumenic Patriarchate in Constantinople, the World Council of churches at Geneva, the Catholic Conference for Ecumenical Questions, and so on. When the history of it all comes to be written it is to him that we shall have to look and I have no doubt that the files of *Istina*, admirably maintained by a very well-informed secretary, will prove an exceptionally rich source of documentation." Congar, Dialogue between Christians 33.

²¹⁴ Congar, Dialogue between Christians 10.

Catholique, and he inspired the Abbé Baron to write a book on Khomiakov in 1932.²¹⁵ Articles on Soloviev were plentiful during the 1930s in Paris and in many other countries. While some might question the Western receptiveness to Russian Orthodox ideas and theories, there is no doubt that they received considerable exposure during these years.

In 1937, the advances made by all these interrelated endeavours were tested at the World Oecumenical Conferences on "Practical Christianity" in Oxford that July, and on "Faith and Order" in Edinburgh the following month. Père Congar submitted his cap-stone book Chrétiens desunis. Principes d'un oecumenisme catholique for the Conferences at Oxford and Edinburgh. It was the first volume of the celebrated collection Unam sanctum²¹⁶ which was to outline the Catholic Church's responsibility to oecumenism: A duty which was only attempted at Vatican II. Unlike the Stockholm and Lausanne Conferences of 1925 and 1927, therefore, Catholics openly participated in the World Oecumenical Movement in 1937, despite the still enormous doubts of Rome.

The Oxford and Edinburgh conferences were also quite dramatically different experiences for the Russian Orthodox than their earlier forays at Stockholm (1925) and Lausanne (1927) had been. First, the Orthodox prepared for the 1937 conferences by holding a meeting of all branches of Orthodoxy in Athens in December, 1936.²¹⁷ This

²¹⁵ "For some time the Abbe Pierre Baron had been talking to me about Khomiakov on whom he wished to write a thesis and he took me to a course of lectures which the Abbe A. Gratieux was delivering on Khomiakov and the slavophil movement at the Institut Catholique...The Abbe Gratieux was not only my first Russian teacher but also 'the last of the slavophiles', as his nephews maliciously dubbed him. Since he had known the son of Alexis Stepanovich Khomiakov personally and had had numerous conversations with him, he constituted a link in the living tradition of slavophil thought. Together with Etienne Paillard, I had the pleasure of assisting the Abbe to complete for publication some work he had begun in 1906 at the instigation of Pere Portal." Congar, Dialogue between Christians 8.

²¹⁶ Boegner, L'exigence oecuménique 99-102.

²¹⁷ Paul B. Anderson, "Report for 1937," Paul B. Anderson papers, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Box 6.

resulted in a degree of new unity on the part of the Orthodox when they encountered the Protestants and Catholics in 1937. For the Russians, the Athens meeting diluted the "historical jealousy" between the Slavs and the Greeks.²¹⁸ As evidence of this, the University of Athens invited Professor Kartashev from St. Sergius in Paris to spend a term studying with them, and after his departure they had Georges Florovsky replace him. They also agreed to hold another pan-Orthodox conference in 1939.

At the 1937 conferences, the Orthodox appeared in force and were fully recognized by the World Protestants for the first time. The efforts undertaken by the Russian Orthodox in Paris were rewarded by the election of Georges Florovsky to the elite Committee of Seven at the Edinburgh Conference: he was the only Orthodox elected to the Committee; Bezobrazoff was named as his alternate. Boris Vysheslavitsev was engaged for part-time service by the research committee of the Oxford conference throughout the year, and the Orthodox Sophiologists contributed a book to the conferences entitled Kirche, Staat und Mensch which was edited by Vysheslavitsev. Even the RSCM had gained a new international prestige and their members fully participated in the Youth Sections of the two conferences. As Paul B. Anderson was proud to report to his superiors at the YMCA, "The principal effect of the conference on our Russian work, as a whole, was the greatly increased recognition of Russian Church contributions by practically the entire oecumenic movement."²¹⁹

At Stockholm (1925) and Lausanne (1927), the Russian Orthodox participants had usually felt constrained to play the role only of teachers. By 1937, however, the oecumenical groups in Paris and the wide publication of Russian Orthodox material in

²¹⁸ Anderson, "Report for 1937" 2.

²¹⁹ Anderson, "Report for 1937" 3.

diverse presses seems to have succeeded in teaching the West about their unfamiliar religion. Sergei Bulgakov did not present a simple paper on the basic traditions of Orthodoxy at the Edinburgh Conference: instead, he gave a long, complex talk on Mariology and the concept of Saint Sophia which alternately fascinated and horrified his listeners. The most conservative Protestants were appalled by his assertion that the conceptualization of the Virgin Mary was an essential facet to the furthering of oecumenism. On the contrary, however, the Roman Catholics who were now a major contingent at the conference were quite amazed and pleased to see Bulgakov take such a bold step in dismantling denominational prejudices.

The Metropolitan Eulogius, Georges Florovsky, Nikolai Berdyaev, Boris Vysheslavitsev, Lev Zander and a host of other Russian theologians and philosophers emerged at the 1937 conferences, proud to express their ideas to "now informed" Westerners. With the Protestants, their groundwork of the past decade enabled the Russian Orthodox to establish closer ties and a greater degree of material support. For their long-time sponsors at the YMCA Russian Division in Paris, the Russians' confidence and new ability to engage in international discussions was an impressive commendation of their years of work. Their greatest pleasure came when the Russians convinced the American Church representatives at last to recognize the importance of the Orthodox Church in exile, and to fully support it.

During 1937, we carried through, eventually to the end, the plan which has engaged us for several years, of securing better recognition of the Russian Church needs by the American Episcopal Church, and by the American Church in Paris...winning over the active collaboration of Dean Beekman and the vestry of Holy Trinity in Paris. It was thanks to Dean Beekman's definite interest that a still more important result was secured, the passing of a resolution at General Convention of the Episcopal Church (Cincinnati, October, 1937) in accordance

with which the American Church accepts as its task the moral and material support of the needs of the Russian Church, both abroad and in Russia.²²⁰

As Anderson reported, the émigrés were able to impress the Americans with their "quality and powers of leadership in the task of the oecumenic movement". Finally, at Edinburgh, a dozen of the American clerics were brought together with the émigrés, and plans were definitely made which ensured their support of Dean Beekman when he raised the question of Russian support at the General Convention.²²¹

This was quite an amazing achievement when we consider that barely ten years previously, the YMCA Russian Division secretaries despaired that the Russians would ever learn methods of organization and leadership. Yet by 1937, they were winning major concessions from the American Churches, Sophie Zernova had become acting director of the Committee to Aid University Students in France, and the RSCM leadership had developed to such an extent that the YMCA released most of its operations into the Russians' own hands with Lev Zander as its international director.

The work of the *Oecumenical Circle* may, therefore, be said to have fulfilled one of its major goals. In concurrence with the multitude of other initiatives both YMCA-Russian and Franco-Russian, it had taught the participating émigrés how to organize, direct, and control their activities in the West. The particular efforts of Jacques Maritain and Nikolai Berdyaev, also bore fruit at the 1937 conferences with the increased integration of Roman Catholics and the Orthodox.

In character of work there were two notable advances. First was the increase in collaboration between Orthodox and Roman Catholics in an honest search for the basis for unity. This was seen both in the conference attended by Orthodox and Roman Catholics of importance, and in the continued increase in interest paid by

²²⁰ Anderson, "Report for 1937" 5.

²²¹ Anderson, "Report for 1937" 5.

Roman Catholic organs of oecumenic purpose in the undertakings with which we are related. *Irenikon* published by the Benedictine monks of Amay, Belgium, commissioned Mr. Zander, General Secretary of the RSCM to write a report on the Edinburgh conference, which it published and favourably recommended. The whole Orthodox-Roman Catholic relationship has become a definite part of our work.²²²

Although many endeavors such as the Dominican's *Istina* or the Benedictine's *Irenikon* arose discretely from the Clamart Tuesdays, one must wonder if the collaboration witnessed in 1937 would have been possible in the absence of the many Franco-Russian "retreats" and the education effected at Clamart. The Tuesday meetings had sparked so many publications and so much instruction at various colleges in Paris that they had broken down much of the resistance on the part of Orthodox and Catholics towards oecumenism. Moreover, the Clamart meetings had been able to clarify the most fundamental philosophical and theological divergences between the two religions: those meetings, and especially the crucial December 1930 session, demonstrated that the conflict was not between French and Russians, nor between Catholics and Orthodox, but rather between "modernists" (Sophiologists and Existentialists) and traditionalists (Positivists and Scholastics). Through these personal and then published transmissions, the Clamart Tuesdays added an invaluable clarification which broke through at least one of the multitude of barriers facing the oecumenical movement.

²²² Anderson, "Report for 1937" 6.

5. Facing the Trial of War

The politicization of religious-philosophy (French and Russian), through the "non-conformist" movements and Personalism, provoked vehement attacks as the world became more polarized in the march to World War Two. From the "Right" came the charge that "non-conformist" communalism and *Esprit's* Christian aspirations for social justice were nothing more than blatant Communism. The "Left" responded in kind, charging that the inherent spirituality (labelled "mystical superstition") which these movements embraced, as well as their medieval rhetoric and symbols, made them transparently Fascist. Taken together, the disparagements of the two opposite ideological positions seemed to vindicate the Personalists' assertions that they indeed represented a "third way", and actually caused some committed intellectuals to convert to their perspective, or at least to doubt their former certitude.¹

However, the sheer numbers and political strength of the established ideologies of Communism and Fascism made them both formidable adversaries and seductive attractions to the loosely-connected and diffuse "non-conformists". The latter tendency was exhibited as early as 1934 when the "third way" suffered its first fragmentation: Georges Izard had created a radical wing within the *Esprit* group which was intended to take their message to the streets. However, soon the *Troisième Force* began to exhibit Communist sympathies which disturbed the leaders of *Esprit*, especially Mounier and his

¹ For example, André Gide - one of France's most popular literary and intellectual critics, and the editor of *N.R.F.* - had been a fairly staunch proponent of Communism until Berdyaev's article "La vérité et mensonge du communisme" in *Esprit*, and a disillusioning visit to the Soviet Union caused him to reevaluate his beliefs. Thereafter, Gide became very lukewarm towards Communism, although he never fully joined the religious/spiritual movement. Albert J. Guerard, *André Gide* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1951): 26-28.

elder mentors Berdyaev, Marcel and Maritain. That year, the *Esprit* collectivity decided to split from the *Troisième Force*.² The next year, a similar breach occurred between *Esprit* and *Ordre Nouveau* because of the latter's "Letter to Hitler" in which the group expressed their criticism of Hitler's repressions against intellectuals in Germany, but also commended his nationalist and economic platform.³

It seemed as though the riots in the streets of Paris that year were indicative of the mood, and the Christian religious movements were not immune from the lure of either the "left" or the "right". The "third way" found it increasingly difficult to hold its ground, especially as its policy of "outward action" or *engagement* converged with this passionate mentality. Intending to galvanize intellectuals out of abstract contemplation and into action, the proponents of the "third way" could not control the dynamic impulse, nor the purposes for which action was being applied.⁴ In this, they were suffering much the same experience as that of the Russian intelligentsia in 1917. The Personalists had conquered apathy only to find the tenets of their movement altered and superseded by the events of their day. Their decentralized federalism, communal societies, local power over political and economic decisions could as easily apply to Fascist or Communist movements if the overriding principal of the inalienable and divinely valued *person* was poorly defined or discarded. Furthermore, the astute Personalist attacks on democracy, liberalism, the bourgeois, and capitalism served to weaken the established order.

² Emmanuel Mounier, *Mounier et sa génération*, ed. Paulette Mounier-Leclercq (Paris: Éditions du seuil, 1956) 151-154.

³ "Lettre à Hitler," *L'Ordre Nouveau* November 1933: 1; Emmanuel Mounier, *Mounier et sa génération* 174; Emmanuel Mounier, "Des pseudovaleurs spirituelles fascistes: Prise de position," *Esprit* 2.16 (1934): 533-540, and "Réponse à l'ordre nouveau," *Esprit* 2.19 (1934): 199-203.

⁴ For example, this is stated in Emmanuel Mounier, "Éloge de la force," *Esprit* 1.5 (1933): 819-826.

Contrary to their aspirations, therefore, the nascently defined Personalist movement most often did not move in to fill the vacuum. Rather, established ideologies on the "right" and the "left" gained from their activity.⁵

Given this situation, it became imperative to draw extremely clear distinctions when defining the "third way". As Iswolsky asserted,

Berdiaev and Maritain, and all those who were leaders of the religious renaissance, Russian Orthodox, Catholic and Protestant, could not but realize that their philosophy must draw a clear line between Christian personalism and the totalitarian concept of man as the tool of the dictator in the Kremlin...Hitler's National Socialism, with its *Valhalla*, its pagan "supermen" and anti-Semitic fanatics were obviously just as inhuman as the instigators of the Moscow purges.⁶

Aware of the growing trend towards taking absolute sides as the impending war approached, they realized that many held or were turning to ambiguous, if not "outright anti-Semitic and reactionary" positions.⁷ They saw this among people of all nationalities including the Russian émigrés. Nevertheless, those steadfastly involved in the "third way" continued their work right up until the outbreak of war. At the start of 1939, Ilya Bunakov-Fondaminsky and the émigrés associated with Novyi grad, Put' and several other circles decided to launch a new oecumenical group in order to capitalize upon the good-will which had been achieved at Edinburgh and Oxford in 1937. Still supported by certain Dominican monks, their rationale for starting a new project on the eve of the war was expressed by Father Mailleux: "Go on doing whatever you have to do, no matter what happens in the future. God will take care of it."⁸

⁵ John Hellman, Emmanuel Mounier... 6-8.

⁶ Iswolsky, No Time to Grieve... 205.

⁷ Iswolsky, No Time to Grieve... 205.

⁸ Iswolsky, No Time to Grieve... 209.

For the Russian émigrés, the dubious atmosphere on the eve of World War Two was no new phenomenon. They had extensive experience with "turn-coats" and traitors. In Tsarist Russia, a number of the intelligentsia had "sold" themselves to the Tsarist police to act as informants and double agents; in the Bolshevik regime priests as well as laymen had "converted" to Communism out of fear, greed, or truly changed beliefs; even in the emigration "spies" like Serge Efron⁹ worked within their midst. Suspicion of one's fellow-man, therefore, was a part of every-day life for the Russians, and betrayal more expected than not.

This background served Russian émigrés well during the occupation for it made them reluctant to openly join any overt political movement be it pro-Nazi or anti-Nazi. This tendency was augmented by their traditional isolationism in emigration which the religious philosophers had limited, but not by any means overcome. Moreover, those Russian émigrés involved in promoting the "religious renaissance" could have but little attraction to either pole. As a result, their non-involvement allowed the vast majority to survive the war untainted by charges from either the Nazi occupiers or later from the Free French. In contrast, their French Catholic and Protestant counterparts had less experience with what was to become dubbed "collaboration". Their friends amid the Russian emigration felt pity for their naïveté, concern for their well-being, and a fatalistic acceptance of the tragedy such lessons would bring. Unlike the American emancipators, the Free French in London and the myriad of other French exiles, the Russian émigrés could fully

⁹ Husband of the émigré poet Marina Tsvetaeva who was exposed as a Soviet agent in September 1937. In addition to passing information to the Soviet Union, he also supplied propaganda materials to cells in Paris and worked actively on the plot to assassinate a former Soviet agent Ignace Reis in Lausanne (successful). He escaped before arrest to Spain and then was transferred to the USSR. There he was executed for his failure to avoid exposure. Helene Iswolsky, No Time to Grieve... 202.

empathize with the challenges faced by those under occupation and at Vichy. They knew, from their own experiences, that "resistance" and "collaboration" had varying degrees of culpability; their faith demanded that "final judgement" be reserved for God.

The Russian emigration in France had another burden which escaped those from less directly involved nations. Among their ranks were not only those who stayed silent, who secretly voiced their condemnation of Nazi policy, or who worked to counteract it. The emigration also contained people who were not simply "collaborators", but who embraced Nazism in its fullest dimensions without the slightest twinge of remorse. Those émigrés who had most ardently opposed the work of the religious philosophers throughout the inter-war years and who held aspirations of their restoration to a White Russia through the deliverance of the great Führer Hitler, made the complicity of many later tainted by collaborationism seem paltry.

Withdrawal of the YMCA Russian Division

The mobilization of 1939 heralded the death-knell for most of the journals, schools, and movements enjoined in oecumenism, religious renaissance, and Personalism. For the Russian spiritual intelligentsia, the closures included Put', Novyi grad, and Berdyaev's Religious-Philosophical Academy. These were partially caused by new French laws limiting "foreign" activities in the country, but mostly predicated by a drastic change in the fortunes of the YMCA's Russian division. By the eve of the war, the YMCA suffered a severe retrenchment. During the Depression, its assets and popularity had steadily eroded in the United States. The Russian division had constantly fought against the prevailing tide of isolationism and cut-backs from their head office in New York, but when war actually broke out, they were unable to prevent their own recall. The YMCA Russian

division did not completely close down. In 1940, Paul B. Anderson still headed the office, but the bulk of his labour was directed towards activities reminiscent of the YMCA role in World War One. He led the relief work among French POWs and interned civilians who were put into camps by the Pétain government on orders from the German Wehrmacht. While Anderson was in charge of relief operations in the Occupied Zone, Donald Lowrie and his wife Helen Ogden Lowrie, assumed a similar role in Vichy.¹⁰

In the spring of 1940, Anderson moved the central office of the Press and RSCM to Mezières in order to avoid damage from the predicted bombing of Paris. When the Nazis approached Paris that summer, the YMCA Russian division again moved its offices. This time they travelled to Pau which was just beyond the demarkation line in non-occupied France. A substantial number of the Russian emigration had already fled to that town, and, in Pau, the Press was also near to the RSCM summer camp at the Chateau de Claracq. The Correspondence School, now called Home Study Section of the Russian Superior Technical Institute, survived, but had to shift its curriculum from pure and applied sciences to auto-mechanics, electric wiring, and radio because the German censors would not allow passage of printed work in Russian containing vast amounts of figures or diagrams. However, the famous White Army general, Baron Wrangel, made his auto repair shop available to students in Paris as a lab; Professor Oleg Yadov did the same at the *École des travaux publiques*. The official Russian Superior Technical Institute did manage to continue its teaching during the war with a total enrolment of only six students in any given year. The YMCA-Russian employment office, which Sophie Zernova had

¹⁰ Paul B. Anderson, No East or West 80.

been directing since 1933, ceased its previous function, and undertook the evacuation of children from the occupied zone until 1941.¹¹

The most successful émigré endeavour of the war years was Mat' Maria's (Elizabeta Skobtsova) Paris House of Hospitality. Formed in 1931 with the financial assistance of the YMCA and some sums from St. Sergius, the recently confirmed nun housed and fed chronically unemployed and destitute Russian labourers, and dispensed charitable aid in the factories and mines near Paris. Her efforts were a part of the trend at that time in France. Like Mat' Maria, certain French Catholics inspired by *Quadragesima Anno* devoted themselves to missionary work directed at their own labour force.¹² With the rising toll wreaked by the depression, the work of Mat' Maria had grown throughout the 1930s.¹³ It was most necessary in 1934 and 1935 when the French government passed laws limiting the employment of non-French workers.

The House of Hospitality was the charitable base of Mat' Maria's movement *Action Orthodoxe*, founded with Georges Fedotov of Novyi grad in 1931. The acerbic nun had decided that a journal would not suffice in mitigating the worst deprivations suffered by young émigrés and she had come to the conclusion that their efforts would be better spent in hard labour. Thus, she saw *Action Orthodoxe* as a movement intended to cement YMCA and religious-philosophical aspirations. Her group sought activism on the

¹¹ Anderson, No East or West 79-80.

¹² Simone Weil epitomized one face of this Catholic movement by going into the mines and working with the labourers. She simultaneously spread the word of God to workers and the cause of social justice to intellectuals and capitalists in harsh opposition to all forces, Catholic or not, who supported the status quo. See, John Hellman, Simone Weil: An Introduction to her Thought (Waterloo, Ont.: Wilfred Laurier University Press, 1982); Diogenes Allen and Eric O. Springsted, Spirit, Nature and Community: Issues in the Thought of Simone Weil (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1994).

¹³ Mat' Maria, "Krest i serp s molotom," Novyi grad 6 (1933): 72-74; "Pravoslavnoe delo," Novyi grad 10 (1935) 111-116; "Pod znakom nashego vremeni," Novyi grad 12 (1937): 115-122.

part of lay Orthodox through meetings and articles in Novyi grad. Not only did it aspire to busy the hands of the "idle" émigré youth, but also it tried to demonstrate to émigré workers that social justice could be found through Christianity, and not simply through Socialism or Communism.

As the name *Action Orthodoxe* indicated, Mat' Maria and her followers perceived themselves to be a Russian Orthodox equivalent to the movement *Action Catholique* and its varying subsidiaries. In France, the shift from "establishment" Catholicism to social action and physical activity began with Pope Pius XI's call for secular engagement in 1928-29. It expanded after 1931 with the formation of the Catholic Association of French Youth (ACJF), Jeunesse Agricole Catholique (JAC), Jeunesse Etudiante Chrétienne (JEC), Jeunesse Ouvrière Chrétienne (JOC), and their female counterparts (JACF, JECF, and JOCF). The activities of *Action Orthodoxe* bore the most resemblance to those of the JOC(F) while the RSCM and Religious-Philosophical Academy can be seen as parallels to the JEC(F) and its affiliate Fédération des Scouts de France.¹⁴

With the start of hostilities in 1939 and the rapid erosion of YMCA funding, *Action Orthodoxe* and Mat' Maria's House of Hospitality still managed to function. Despite its reduced budget, she received moral support from the faculty at St. Sergius and actual help in the form of Father Dmitrii Klepinin who was assigned to serve in her "soup-kitchen". The two laboured to the point of complete exhaustion, helped by Klepinin's wife Tamara and Mat' Maria's son Yuri, as the House filled "to overflowing" with Russians made destitute by the war.¹⁵

¹⁴ Eugen Weber, The Hollow Years: France in the 1930s (New York: Norton, 1994) 183-189.

¹⁵ Anderson, No East or West 79; Iswolsky, No Time to Grieve... 208.

St. Sergius survived the war thanks to judicious use of savings collected by their fund-raising appeals in the late 1930s; other direct YMCA initiatives all but ceased with the occupation. Paul Anderson caught the last boat from France in July, 1941 leaving the courageous Lowries as the only American YMCA representatives in war-torn France. That same year YMCA relief operations were cancelled throughout Europe. The newly-formed United Nations took over their responsibilities in 1943 through the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration (UNRRA). Effectively, the Christian task of the YMCA was hereafter ended along with their particular interest in the Russian emigration. In 1920, the YMCA had been determined to combat their exclusion from one country - the Soviet Union. By 1940, it had lost almost all of Europe.

For the Russian emigration, this retrenchment meant the loss of their livelihood, their publications, and their movements. For the remainder of the war, YMCA involvement consisted only of personal food packages sent by concerned people, like the Andersons, to their closest friends in the occupied lands. Quite astonishingly, considering their abandonment of Europe, the YMCA resisted encroachment from the United Nations in only one sphere. In 1943, Anderson was sent to Washington to request a government licence for financial transfers to a new potential YMCA base in the Soviet Union, and he contacted Andrei Gromyko (the Soviet Ambassador to the United States), seeking permission for the YMCA to work in POW camps in that country. The YMCA had never got over its rude expulsion from the Soviet Union, and to the last fought for their re-entry. The Soviets, however, were no more anxious to allow such involvement at this juncture than they had been under Lenin; they simply ignored Anderson's appeal.¹⁶

¹⁶ Anderson, No East or West 82.

The YMCA Press almost entirely relocated to America, with the exception of its retail outlet Les Éditeurs Réunis directed by Russians in Paris. While this deprived the former émigré staff including Berdyaev and Vysheislavtsev of their jobs, it did enable the company to continue printing Russian-language books. Upon his return to the United States, Anderson found an opportunity to expand the operations by assisting in the creation of another Russian printing house. In the late 1930s, the Ford Foundation had set up an East European Fund. Its creator and first president was George F. Kennan who agreed with Anderson that émigrés from Russia should be encouraged to preserve their memories of that land and their flight through literature. During World War Two, therefore, Kennan allocated a grant of one million dollars from the East European Fund to establish the Chekhov Publishing House in New York. When Kennan's presidency was cut short by his appointment as American Ambassador to the Soviet Union in 1942, he installed Philip E. Mosely, a Russian specialist at Columbia University, to lead the new publishing endeavour. Mosely, a close personal friend of Anderson, helped the newly-returned YMCA secretary be elected to Chekhov's board of twelve trustees which included businessmen and professionals who had a competence in the Russian language and culture.¹⁷ Anderson perceived there to be no conflict between his new position at Chekhov and his continued directorship of the YMCA Press because he believed the Russian-language market would eventually increase and be able to support two publishing firms. In fact, during his tenure on the board of Chekhov, it donated 10,000 dollars of its million dollar grant to the YMCA Press in order that it could increase production and maintain a balanced budget.¹⁸

¹⁷ Anderson, No East or West 83-84.

¹⁸ Anderson, No East or West 84.

In 1944, another trick of fate allowed the YMCA to further profit from the Chekhov endeavour. Cut-backs at the Ford Foundation cost the Chekhov House its annual grant, and the house had to be liquidated. By that time, it had published only 200 works. Through some careful negotiations, Anderson managed to have the residue of books transferred to the YMCA Press National Board, which he directed, gaining both volumes and potential authors from the Chekhov.¹⁹ These new stocks were then transferred to Paris and distributed by Les Éditeurs Réunis. The advantage of the Chekhov takeover was largely due to the form of literature accepted by that establishment. While the YMCA Press published mostly works relating to religious issues, Chekhov had concentrated on secular works. During the last years of the war, therefore, Les Éditeurs Réunis was able to sell most of the new stock to POW camps throughout Europe and the Soviet Union through the auspices of the UNRRA.²⁰ Thus, Anderson was able to not only maintain, but augment the Press despite the dislocation and confusion of the market economy caused by the war.

A New Emigration

The YMCA was not the only body to depart Europe with the Nazi Occupation. In the United States alone, French exiles numbered about two hundred thousand, and the majority came from the intellectual or artistic milieus. Among them, the promoters of the Catholic (spiritual) renaissance, were well represented. Their veritable father, Jacques

¹⁹ Paul B. Anderson, No East or West: The Memoirs of Paul B. Anderson (Paris: YMCA Press, 1985) 85.

²⁰ "The one thing we found it possible to do for the Russians on a relatively large scale was to send books in their language to the POW camps." Secular and classic literature, therefore, was accepted in the Soviet Union and among Russian prisoners in German war camps, where the YMCA Press' religious material would have been rejected. Anderson, No East or West 85.

Maritain, was one of the earliest escapees. In 1934 Maritain had suffered a severe loss of faith in the concept of *engagement*, and his active political endeavors towards creating an "Apostolic Order". Scarcely one month after his famous manifesto, "Pour le bien commun" had been released, it was compromised by the bombing action of Carmelite seminarians in Lille. In calling for intellectuals to engage in action according with the new spiritual philosophy, Maritain had not expected them to embrace any action over the basic premises of his own and his colleagues ideas. He condemned himself for impetuously inciting the young, and henceforth vowed to reserve his work to more detached means²¹.

With his disillusionment, Maritain retreated largely from his involvement in Mounier's *Esprit* and other overt political action and, in 1935, he resolved to spend most of the year abroad. He had received an invitation to speak at the University of Chicago where the youngest university president in the history of the United States, Bob Hutchins, was trying to implement a perennialist revolution in education.²² Hutchins had enlisted the help of a budding philosopher, Mortimer Adler, who had become an expert in Thomist philosophy while teaching Western Civilization and Great Books courses at Columbia University. Together, the two hoped to revitalize American education by implementing an interdisciplinary approach grounded in the great works of philosophy and literature which

²¹ "Alors, vous comprenez, me dit-il, compromettre aupres des seminaires, pour des engagements dans l'action, tout l'oeuvre philosophique qui est notre oeuvre propre, nous ne le pouvons pas." Jacques Maritain as cited in Mounier, Mounier et sa génération 145.

²² Arthur Cohen, ed., Humanistic Education and Western Civilization: Essays for Robert Maynard Hutchins (New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1964); See also Robert M. Hutchins, St. Thomas and the World State (Milwaukee, WI: Marquette University Press, 1949), Education for Freedom (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1943), The Higher Learning in America (New York: Yale University Press, 1936), No Friendly Voice (New York: Greenwood Press, 1936); Mortimer Adler, Philosopher at Large: An Intellectual Autobiography (New York: MacMillan, 1977).

each contained some aspect of perennial values discovered through the course of Western development. In these truths and values, which Adler and Hutchins considered to be eternal, lay both meaning for man's current life and a protective buffer against aberrant change.²³ Although their revolution was by no means solely Christian or religious, it did adhere to the basic premise which Maritain had long embraced: namely that the truths of the past were relevant to the present and could be applied therein.

It was due to Adler's respect for the Thomism of Maritain that the University of Chicago issued its invitation to the French philosopher. Hutchins was also supportive of the idea because he had seen the advance to perennialism enacted by Maritain's close friend Etienne Gilson in his creation of the Pontifical Institute at the University of Toronto. Maritain, in return, must have been relieved to be offered the opportunity to revert to more familiar work. Encouraged by Gilson, he temporarily bequeathed his *Cercles Thomistes* into the capable hands of Olivier Lacombe, abandoned his Sundays, and departed with his wife and sister-in-law for a prolonged visit to the United States and Canada. For the next four years, Maritain continued to journey over to America at least once every year in order to teach courses and give lectures at universities there. In the spring of 1939 he obtained a teaching position at Princeton University in Thomist philosophy. Quite aware of the ominous spectre of war, he insisted that Raïssa and Vera accompany him so that they might not be separated in such an eventuality, and the family, thus, spent the war years in the United States.

The Maritain family was not alone in exile. Around them congregated others from the Meudon Sundays including Julien Green, Etienne Gilson, Charles Boyer, Yves Simon,

²³ The perennialist philosophy of education is most succinctly outlined in Theodore Brameld, Cultural Foundations of Education (Westport, CN: Greenwood Press, 1957).

René de Messières, and Father Couturier, (had fate not condemned him to an early death in the spring of 1939, Charles du Bos who also spent much of the late 1930s in America, would have undoubtedly been counted here as well).²⁴ However, the group did not ignore the angst of their colleagues in Europe. Despite Maritain's bad experience with manifestos, he agreed to draft another collective attempt in 1942 in order to demonstrate support for his fellow countrymen, and protest the grasp of totalitarianism throughout Europe. Devant la crise mondiale was published and signed that year by forty-four spiritually-committed Catholics as a censure against anti-Semitism in particular, and against all collectivist movements of Fascism, Nazism, and Communism while calling for a unity behind the new international order of the United Nations.

Maritain also published the book France, My Country that same year which condemned the political demoralization of the Third Republic. This he largely blamed for his country's defeat. Ironically, considering his and Raïssa's personal choice regarding family,²⁵ Maritain also pointed to the decreased birth rate in France as a causal factor for their inability to stop the Nazis. In outright support of the resistance, Maritain declared the success of his endeavors:

Before the war, French intellectual life was undergoing a brilliant revival... In the past twenty years or so a religious renaissance of the most genuine and fruitful kind was occurring in France, both in the spiritual field and in that of social service, and its harvest was now being brought in among the young intellectuals and among the working-class youth.²⁶

²⁴ Devant la crise mondiale: manifest de Catholiques européenne séjournant en Amérique (New York: Éditions de la Maison Française, 1942) 1.

²⁵ Maritain and Berdyaev shared one other similarity: they both formed celibate marriages with their spouses.

²⁶ Devant la crise mondiale 27-29.

He thus chastised all French for considering any collaboration with the "satanic" Nazis, and encouraged them to remain true to the gains of the spiritual renaissance. Resistance to all totalitarianism was his byword from America as he waited impatiently for the cessation of hostilities, and the ability to return to his homeland.

Among those who found themselves stranded with the outbreak of war, were the hundreds of artists who escaped, like Anaïs Nin and Arthur Lourié, deliberately leaving just ahead of the German forces on the last boats departing from France. An elite group, moreover, were the project of a specific rescue mission after France's occupation. In the autumn of 1940 many of the leading French artists were congregated in Marseilles around the surrealist André Breton and his principal agent Varian Fry who had the invaluable use, at that time, of an American passport. With the help of Daniel Bédérite (an old socialist militant), and Hygiène (a functionary of the préfecture de police) this group of French and German exile artists made an appeal to Eleanor Roosevelt for the rescue of those most in danger from the German menace.²⁷ Appreciative of the potential public relations value of emancipating some of the most famous artists in Europe, Eleanor Roosevelt accordingly formed the *Emergency Rescue Committee*. Fry became her principle agent and, with 3,000 dollars in his pocket and a host of visas, he returned to Marseilles with her list of 200 names of noted "painters, sculptors, novelists, poets, and political writers" to be assisted in their escape.²⁸ The Committee thus effected the removal to America of luminaries of varying origin as Franz Werfel, Marc Chagall, Heinrich Mann, André Malraux, Henri Matisse, and André Breton.

²⁷ Daniel Lindenberg concluded that "this actually meant the most famous." Daniel Lindenberg, Les années souterraines (1937-1947) (Paris: Éditions la Découverte, 1990) 144.

²⁸ Daniel Lindenberg, Les années souterraines (1937-1947) (Paris: Éditions la Découverte, 1990) 146.

Upon reaching the United States they were reunited with other artists such as Igor Stravinsky, Nicholas Nabokov, and Jean Cocteau who had extended their brief sojourns in 1939 indefinitely until the war had ended. Most other Russian émigrés of the original 500,000 in France, however, faced quite a different war experience. The majority had either died, returned to Russia, or had to endure the rigours of occupation/Vichy France. Some, however, did manage to escape after the Nazis had defeated their resident country. One of the most compelling stories is that of Helen Iswolsky and her family. Like over one million Parisians, she hastened out of the city the day the Nazis moved in, catching, as she had in Russia back in 1917, the last free train out of the city. Iswolsky had already moved her mother out of Paris to Pau when the Blitz (Blitzkrieg) started in May, 1940. She, however, remained to fulfil the responsibilities of her teaching job. On June 22, 1940 she was contacted by Jean de Saint-Chamant, a friend of hers who worked at the Ministry for Information; he had heard news of the collapse at the Maginot line, and advised her to leave Paris and join her mother immediately.²⁹ The next day, as the Nazis advanced on the city, she joined the throng of Parisians escaping their grasp.

The Iswolskys stayed in Pau for almost one year, where Helen found solace, work, and support from the *Esprit* group located there and other old friends from Paris. Stanislas Fumet, the Dominican, Father Carré (who replaced Robert Garric as editor of *Revue des jeunes* in 1936), and *Esprit's* relatively new German émigré philosopher Paul Landsberg became her principal new confidants. In Iswolsky's opinion:

It was from these various groups assembled at our meetings that the initiators of the Pau underground resistance gradually emerged. They were to show great

²⁹ Iswolsky, No Time to Grieve... 210-211.

courage, and some of them died heroically at the hands of their Nazi persecutors.³⁰

Opportunity would decree that she, herself, play little part in these resistance activities. After the war, however, she learned that Paul Landsberg had fallen as one of the heroes of the French resistance.

Instead, Iswolsky was invited to America by Governor Paulding, the editor of the New York Personalist journal Commonweal. He met her briefly in Pau on his way to Marseilles while escaping from France, and offered to sponsor her and her mother should they be able to make her way to the United States. This she accomplished with aid from two quarters: Boris Bakhmeteff and the Tolstoy Foundation³¹ had created an "Humanity Fund" for Russian intellectuals out of which Iswolsky was granted the necessary monies to pay for their travel from France, and a Russian Jewish doctor, Kovarsky, then recommended her to HIAS - a Jewish Aid Society - which arranged and paid for ship passage to America. With her escape arranged in the spring of 1941, Iswolsky had only to make the final decision. In her memoirs, she recalled seeking out Father Carré to asked his advice whether to stay and work for the resistance or go to America. Accordingly, he reminded her of the several anti-Hitler articles she had written in Esprit and Novyi grad, and urged her to escape possible reprisal in the hands of the Nazis should they soon move into the Free Zone. Thus convinced, Iswolsky travelled to Marseilles to arrange her visas through Spain and Portugal (the HIAS ship left from Lisbon), and returned to pack her mother and their few belongings before they set out

³⁰ Iswolsky, No Time to Grieve... 212.

³¹ The Tolstoy Foundation had been created in 1928 by Alexandra Tolstaya who moved to the USA after her expulsion from Russia in 1922 (she had been a prominent member of VOKPG). It operated a house for new Russian arrivals to the United States where they could take refuge until a job and material means could be obtained for them.

on their flight. They departed in May, 1941 just before Admiral Darlan ousted Pierre Laval from the Pétain government and instituted the imprisonment of foreigners in Vichy camps.³²

The trip was difficult and, at times, extremely frightening. As they entered Spain, Iswolsky suddenly recalled her signature on the "Guernica Manifesto" published by French intellectuals protesting Franco's and Hitler's indiscriminate bombing of that city, but she passed the border without notice for her indiscretion. In Portugal they had to surpass difficulties over sleeping arrangements on the boat, visas to America, and the loss of their entire savings which had not yet made the transfer from Pau to Lisbon. Nevertheless, accompanied by the widow of Vadim Rudnev and the wife of Georges Fedotov,³³ both of whom they had met in transit, they managed to catch the ship, and were finally on their way to freedom in America.

In the summer of 1941, the United States was not yet involved in the war, and Portugal and Spain remained neutral. Such ships travelled the southern route from Lisbon to the Canaries, to San Domingo and Havana, before travelling the American coast-line for New York. This long detour was taken to avoid the Nazi-Anglo submarine warfare in the northern Atlantic, and to carry on the Spanish/Portuguese trade with their former colonies. Stopped only once by a British destroyer intent on checking their cargo, they reached America with no trouble. There, the Iswolskys were met by the former President of Russia's Provisional Government, Alexander Kerensky, who, like Maritain, had

³² Iswolsky, No Time to Grieve... 213-218.

³³ Georges Fedotov and his wife had been separated in their flight from France. After managing to evade the Gestapo, he was rescued by the underground. With the help of de Gaulle's associates, he was transferred to Africa and then on to America.

been invited to lecture at American universities prior to the war. He arranged for her first temporary lodging at the house of his dowager friend, Mrs. Kenneth Simpson.

It was fortunate that they had such loyal friends because they arrived in America with forty-five dollars in hand. The Bank in Lisbon had promised to transfer their savings on to its branch in New York; once they arrived, however, to Iswolsky's dismay she discovered that there was no branch of the Portuguese bank existing in New York! Destitute, and at that time abandoned by her French (the Maritains) and American (Paulding) friends, Iswolsky had to find some other refuge for herself, her mother, and her brother who arrived barely a week after them. Again the Tolstoy Foundation came to her aid; the Iswolskys were given lodging for as long as they needed at the Reed Farm in the Hudson Valley where Alexandra Tolstaya housed Russian émigrés.

There, finally settled, Iswolsky gradually sought out her former acquaintances among the French exiles (predominantly Maritain and her spiritual advisor Father Couturier), and the Russians Arthur Lourié, and Georges Fedotov. Through Tolstoya, she also met more established Russian émigrés who had made their home in America since the 1920s. These included the sociologist Nicholas Timashev, and the historian Michael Karpovich. These connections were invaluable to Iswolsky for they provided her with employment, publishing opportunities, and the continuation of the work in oecumenism and spiritualism which she had become committed to at Clamart and Meudon.

Reconnected with Governor Paulding, Iswolsky was able to submit several articles she had written about her flight and the situation in France to the Commonweal. Through Maritain she renewed her acquaintance with one of his Meudon Sunday frequenters, Julie Keman who, as an editor for Longmans-Green, agreed to contract a book on Iswolsky's

experiences.³⁴ In 1942, with the preface written by Maritain, she published her first English-language work Light Before Dusk: A Russian Catholic in France. In return, Iswolsky added her name to Maritain's manifesto "Devant la Crise Mondiale," which she regarded as an important statement of support for the resisters she had left behind in France. Maritain also helped Iswolsky get started on a lecture tour organized by his friends, the religious publishers Frank Sheed and Maisie Ward. Thus, throughout 1942 and 1943, Iswolsky travelled to Catholic colleges in the United States and Canada to talk about her work in France, and the potential Russian contribution to the religious renaissance.

Connection by connection, Iswolsky found herself being introduced to the elements of Personalism and Catholic work in America. Julie Kernan brought her in contact with Dorothy Day and Peter Maurin of the *Catholic Worker Movement*.³⁵ Frank Ward reunited her with another Russian Catholic whom she had met in Paris: the indomitable Baroness Catherine de Hueck who, in 1942, ran Friendship Houses in Harlem, New York and Chicago intending to improve relations between Black and White Americans.³⁶ Iswolsky immediately recognized kindred movements to that of Clamart and Mat' Maria's *Action Orthodoxe* which she had known in Paris, and remained involved in these efforts for the rest of her life. Thus, despite her second exile, Iswolsky managed

³⁴ Contract between Helene Iswolsky and Longmans & Green to publish her book Light before Dusk, 1941, Helene Iswolsky Papers, Scranton University, Pennsylvania, Box 1; No Time to Grieve... 220-230.

³⁵ See letters between Julie Kernan and Helene Iswolsky, 1942-1944, Helene Iswolsky papers, Scranton University, Pennsylvania, Box 1.

³⁶ Helene Iswolsky, letters to Catherine de Hueck-Doherty, 1942-1959, Helene Iswolsky papers, Scranton University, Pennsylvania, Box 2.

to continue her work for the "third way". This, however, was not as easy for her colleagues caught behind enemy lines in France.

Issues of Collaboration

The phenomenon of French collaboration with the Nazis in both the Occupied Zone and Vichy has been a subject of intense historical scrutiny especially since Robert Paxton entered the fray in the early 1970s with his revealing studies: Vichy France, Parades and Politics in Vichy, and Vichy France and the Jews.³⁷ Utilizing Nazi documents captured by the Americans in their invasion of Germany, Paxton presented substantial evidence that most French in 1940 were not outright opponents of their Nazi conquerors, and that concerted efforts at resistance began only at the belated date of 1942. Collaboration, he persuasively asserted, was a general phenomenon in the first years of the Occupation, and not simply the purview of a select, perverted few.

Inspired by his disclosures, numerous researchers of modern French intellectual history have endeavoured to prove that proto-Fascist ideas were rife within most movements formed in the 1930s be they stipulatively of the "right", the "left", or even of the "non-conformist". It is this third group which is of the most interest to the present study. Spear-headed by Zeev Sternhell's 1983 challenge Ni droite, ni gauche, a widening diversity of historians have analyzed the aspects of Fascist and Nazi impulses in the ideas promulgated by *Esprit*, *Ordre Nouveau*, and other Personalist and/or non-conformist

³⁷ Robert O. Paxton, Vichy France: Old Guard and New Order, 1940-1955 (New York: Knopf, 1972); Parades and Politics in Vichy: The French Officer Corps under Marshall Petain (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1966); Michael R. Marrus and Robert O. Paxton, Vichy France and the Jews (New York: Basic Books, 1981).

movements.³⁸ The Russian émigré religious philosophers who comprise the focus of this work were most closely related with these groups. Therefore, the tendencies among the Russian émigrés in World War Two France must be examined in this light.

Sternhell was inspired by omissions in earlier studies of the non-conformists. His suspicions were provoked by the laudatory nature of Jean Touchard's and Loubet-del-Bayle's examination of these groups in the 1930s³⁹; they were further aroused by the failure of either study to link the ideas expressed by these individuals in the 1930s to their activities during World War Two. Instead, both writers approached the 1930s as a discrete period and mentioned, only as footnotes, examples of collaboration in the war. Sternhell, thus, decided to proceed from the opposite direction. Beginning with proven occurrences of collaboration with the Nazi's, he delved into individual backgrounds in order to discover where they had gained their sympathy to the Nazi ideology. His search led him as equally to the non-conformist movements as to the declared Fascist movements - *Action Française*, *Ligue de Fascistes* - of the interwar period.

One difficulty with Sternhell's work, which may apply to other "Fascist-disclosing" endeavors, is its pre-determination and reliance on historical hindsight. Sternhell does perform a warranted, intense scrutiny of non-conformist writings in the 1930s, however he considers these not in the context of that time, but from the perspective of a decade later. Moreover, in looking specifically for indications of Fascist tendencies, he utilizes a

³⁸ Zeev Sternhell, *Ni droite ni gauche: L'idéologie fasciste en France* (Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1983). This has been translated into English as *Neither Right Nor Left: Fascist Ideology in France*, trans. David Maisel (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1986). See also John Hellman, *The Knight-Monks of Vichy France* (Montréal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1993); John Hellman, "Personnalisme et fascisme," *Le personnalisme d'Emmanuel Mounier* (Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1985); David Ennis, "French Social Thought in the 1930s," diss., Boston University, 1979.

³⁹ Jean Touchard, *La gauche en France depuis 1900* (Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1977); Jean-Louis Loubet del Bayle, *Les non-conformistes des années 30* (Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1961).

lens through which to examine them which may be inappropriate.⁴⁰ For Sternhell, any condemnation of "liberal values" or "democracy", and acceptance of words such as "elite" or "hierarchy" are clear signs of nascent Fascism. However, it might equally be argued that these are just as legitimately signs of a tradition which long pre-dates either Fascism or Nazism: Catholicism advocated authoritarian leadership by an elite through a clearly-defined hierarchy, and shunned the encroachment of secular-liberal values and the egalitarian view of democracy throughout its history.

Non-conformist, French Personalist movements such as *Esprit* and *Ordre Nouveau* never formally aligned themselves with the Catholic Church. On the other hand, they also did not deny their substantial bias towards Catholicism, nor their partial origins in Catholic thought; *Esprit*, especially, declared as its mentors Charles Péguy, Leon Bloy, and Jacques Maritain. The Russians contributing to the foundation of *Esprit* might have denigrated theories of hierarchy, but they also avowed the need for an elite (order of the intelligentsia) and, with their predilection for the Slavophile theory that faith must control reason, they too had little sympathy with rationalistically defined "liberalism". Concerning egalitarian democracy, Russian philosophers such as Berdyaev, Florovsky, Vysheslavtsev, and Lossky shunned the artificial construct that condemned every person to be governed by the same motivation (the common good), and opposed the subjection of the individual to the will of the "faceless" majority.

⁴⁰ In Robert Soucy's review of this book in *American Historical Journal* 90.1 (February 1985) he says: "Less convincing is Sternhell's insistence that 'authentic' French fascists, although presumably 'neither left nor right' were socialists who were violently anti-bourgeois and anti-conservative...A basic flaw...is his reliance on the writings of fascist intellectuals ('authentic fascists') rather than on police reports detailing the financial backing and conservative clienteles of actual fascist movements" (148).

The protest from both the Russian Orthodox and the French Catholic perspective for a "third way", therefore, was anti-liberal, anti-capitalist, and in a certain manner anti-democratic. The question which remains, however, is does this mean that the "third way" was Fascist? As we explore here the activities of the Russian religious émigrés and their French counterparts during World War Two, the distinctiveness of the "third way" becomes all important. Did it really exist or was it just a part of the Fascist and Nazi phenomena? And if its professed adherents did attempt to continue the pursuit of this new philosophy for mankind during the Occupation and Vichy, the implication of collaboration in the annals of history must be explained.

Status of the "Third Way" on the Eve of War

The Russian émigré religious intelligentsia was considerably diminished in France by the time the Occupation and the Vichy regime were established. Put' and Novyi grad had ceased publication, and the Religious-Philosophical Academy also closed in 1939. Although Saint Sergius Theological Institute and the RSCM survived, they were forced to retreat into isolation. Thus, the work of the religious renaissance could be maintained, but its further expansion was prevented for the duration of the war. In fact, it suffered increasing limitation and decline. A large component to the strength of this multifaceted endeavour had been the easy inter-european communication of the inter-war years. The journals had relied upon contributions, circulation, and editorial ideas from members predominantly in Germany, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania. St. Sergius and the RSCM had recruited their students and leaders from all over Europe, including Britain. Therefore, as the Nazi ideology and its censoring repressions became more

entrenched, first in Germany and then throughout Eastern Europe, the voices of those émigrés of the spiritual intelligentsia fell silent.

Feodor Stepun, for example, removed himself from the editorial board of Novyi grad in 1934 in order to avoid attracting notice from the Nazi authorities in Germany. Despite this, in 1937 he was deprived of from his teaching post at the University in Dresden as a warning to cease his dissemination of alternate views. His last essays for Novyi grad in 1938 and 1939 posed considerable threat to his personal welfare, and he ceased attempting any future publications with the start of the war; Izboldin, his Novyi grad colleague in Germany, also ended his publishing and speaking activities. The German occupation of Czechoslovakia similarly muzzled Nikolai Lossky, Chetverikov and Peter Savitsky (Put', Novyi grad).⁴¹ Sergei Hessen (Novyi grad) was caught in Poland by the advancing Soviet troops in 1939, but somehow escaped detection as a Russian émigré; less lucky were Lev Karsavin of Put' and Ivan Lagovsky of the RSCM who were discovered by Soviet forces in Lithuania and Estonia respectively, and deported to the Gulag.

A small contingent of the younger religious-philosophical émigrés had made their way to Britain before the outbreak of hostilities. By 1940, Nicholas Zernov (RSCM), and Evgenii Lampert (Novyi grad) were completely cut-off from their colleagues in now-occupied France. Time had also proved an enemy to this contingent of the Russian emigration. Their numbers had been consistently reduced during the 1930s with the deaths of the most aged or weak. The elder Trubetskoys who had played such a vital role at Put' and in the original *Oecumenical Circle* succumbed in 1931, 1932, and 1937.

⁴¹ Tragically, at the end of the war the new Communist government of Czechoslovakia turned Chetverikov over to the Soviet Government and he was interned in the Gulag where he died sometime in the early 1950s. Zernov, The Russian Religious Renaissance 337.

Karpov and Kisavetter died in 1937 and 1933 respectively, and the patriarch of the Kovalevsky family, Evgraph, lingered only to 1941.⁴² Hence, a severely reduced émigré contingent in France was left to face the trial of war.

The inter-denominational and Russo-French initiatives of the spiritual intelligentsia during the inter-war years had been motivated by two considerations: Making a Russian Orthodox contribution to the cause of international Christian unity, and overcoming the isolationist tendencies of the Russian emigration in order that they might perceive a purpose for their existence and not fall into the two-fold danger of depression and futile hatred. The original common denominator in these quests was the struggle against Communism's appeal both within and outside of Russia. With the rise of the Nazi menace in Germany, their fight against Communism's dehumanizing materialism broadened, albeit slowly, to encompass what they regarded as the paganist perversion of nationalist aspirations and the authoritarian encroachment on personal freedom embodied in broadly-labelled Fascism.

The Russian religious philosophers' identification of this new threat may, through hindsight, be regarded as tardy. In 1934, Novyi grad published only a few preliminary assessments of Hitler's now all-encompassing power in Germany, and it was only at the end of 1935 and the beginning of 1936 that both Put' and Novyi grad declared their outright opposition to Fascism in all its myriad incarnations.⁴³ In 1936, the philosophical and political theorists of the religious renaissance, finally established the link between their two enemies: both their old foe and the new one relied on absolute control of their governed populations through the means of propaganda, censorship, and violence; to

⁴² Zernov, The Russian Religious Renaissance 333-360.

⁴³ "Ot redaktsii" Novyi grad 11 (1936): 3-11.

describe this they used the term totalitarianism to apply to both Communism and all forms of Fascism. By 1936, therefore, their fight ceased its narrow focus against materialist Communism, and spread to embrace a Christian denial of the legitimacy of all facets of totalitarian ideology.

The émigré religious philosophers, having formed this connection, stepped up their opposition to Fascism because they began to see that it posed a specific threat to their emigration. Fascism's self-declared hatred of Communism made it subtly appealing to many "White" elements of the diaspora who had long held feelings of bitter resentment for their usurpation by the Communists in Russia. The trappings of militarism which accompanied most Fascist phenomena also struck a chord with the displaced White Army officers and soldiers; Fascism might seduce the majority of the emigration who, in their desperation and depression, had only hesitantly begun to involve themselves in the Christian movement. Indeed, according to Berdyaev, the RSCM had already begun to exhibit authoritarian tendencies, and he began to distance himself from the organization.⁴⁴

The religious philosophers, therefore, began to reorganize themselves to stave off the threatening seductive power of Fascism through journals and books and in their classes at the Religious-Philosophical Academy and St. Sergius. Recognizing the limitations of these means to reach a wide audience, six émigrés from very diverse backgrounds banded together to form the Ligue mutual antidefaitistie Russe en France in 1936. The founding committee was composed of several members of the old Socialist Revolutionary Party from Russia: Marc Slonim, M.M. Pipenko, G.A. Grekhoff, and V.J. Lebedev who were all involved in the large Russian émigré weekly Poslednie novosti. It

⁴⁴ Berdyaev, Dream and Reality 247-248.

also included Yuri Shirinsky-Shikhmatov, leader of the *Post-Revolutionaries* and contributor to Esprit, and Nikolai Alexeev of Nowyi Grad.⁴⁵ The League was first investigated by the Paris police on May 19, 1936, who submitted the following report:

The A-D [League members] are all hostile to communism and have not entered into relations with the Soviet Government. Putting themselves in rapport with Moscow only in the case where war is declared, they would then agitate for the incorporation of patriotic émigrés from their country into the Red Army. But in all ways, the A-D would prefer that the émigrés take the course of enrolling in the armies which would ally with Russia.⁴⁶

They encouraged émigrés to take a part in the French army when the draft was reinstated that year in response to Germany's rearmament of the Rhineland. The League hoped that such involvement would both reduce xenophobic, anti-Russian remarks from French nationalists, and save military-oriented émigrés from the temptations of Nazism and Fascism.

As it turned out, their concern was not unrealistic. In 1936, former White Army officers began a concerted effort to recruit émigrés for a new army allied with the Nazis. They had negotiated with Hitler a promise of their restoration in return for troops. The Russian émigré army would aid the Axis powers in expectation of becoming the new ruling power in a Russia "emancipated from the demonic forces of Communism."⁴⁷ In response to this new White Russian/Nazi alliance, the Ligue escalated its opposition,

⁴⁵ A report from the police contained detailed information about all of the members, including the date which they arrived in Paris, their address, and their passport numbers. "Ligue mutual antidefaitistie Russe en France," 19 May 1936, Préfecture de Police, Paris V, Carton 1706, 7023.c

⁴⁶ "Ligue mutual antidefaitistie Russe en France," 19 May 1936, Préfecture de Police, Paris V, Carton 1706, 7023.c

⁴⁷ "Affairs Diverse Concernent la Russie: mutual antidefaitistie Russe en France," 19 May 1936, Préfecture de Police, Paris, Carton 1706, 7023c.

verging closer to a seeming collaboration with Soviet Russia.⁴⁸ When forced to assume a polar position, they decided to support the Soviet regime and to oppose any military threat to their former homeland regardless of the taint of Communism which would be attached to such a political stance.

In so doing, however, the League abandoned the "third way". From its very conception, the majority of directors had been uninvolved in the religious renaissance; only Alexeev and Shirinsky-Shikhmatov adhered to the spiritual principles which had been developed by Berdyaev and his colleagues among the émigré intelligentsia. While the two tried to temper the outpourings of their new organization in order that a distinction might be made between the opposition of Nazi expansionism and the embracement of Communism, their open defense of the Soviet Union's territorial integrity made this impossible. It might be argued that necessity overruled semantic considerations. However, by aligning with pro-socialist émigrés who did not yet accept the "third way" conception of man's spiritual inviolability, Alexeev and Shirinsky-Shikhmatov corrupted their unique vision, and weakened the quest for a religious renaissance.

The White Russians⁴⁹ who were now secretly aligned to the Nazis wasted no time

⁴⁸ This was indicated at a meeting of the League held on April 30, 1936 at the "Chien" on Blvd. Montparnasse. The following speeches were given: L.A., "Notre action-Notre program"; Vladimir Lebedoff, "La position exacte"; A. Petroff, "Le menaces à l'égard de la Russie"; N. A. Alexeeff, "Est-ce que l'Armée Rouge defendera la Russie"; M. Slonim, "La Marie des Grandeurs"; Schirincky, "Le pleunichers et les insulteurs"; Pilipenko, "Les Avertissements du mutualité de defense"; Sementchenkov, "Le problem actuel"; Grekkoff, "Les Cosaques et le mutualité de defense"; G. Alexeeff, "Au service du parole d'autre mer." See "Affairs Diverse Concernent la Russie: mutual antidefaitistie Russe en France," 19 May 1936, Préfecture de Police, Paris, Carton 1706, 7023c.

⁴⁹ The Préfecture de Police in Paris kept a dossier that listed Russian émigrés that had sympathies with (if not direct employment from), Hitler and Nazi Germany:

1. Biorklund, Boris, Finn agent of Alfred Rosenberg, relations with Jean de Andia.
2. Krutshkoff, Pierre, Orthodox priest of Cossack origin, member of the Congrerie de la Verité Russe.
3. Skalon, Alexandre, son of the Russian General, lived in Berlin, Party of Russian National Socialists in Germany, relation with Party of Boris Sobinoff, came in company of Meller Zakomilsky

in attacking the League on exactly this premise. Finding support among members of the Fascist *Action Française* they produced a convincing argument to insist that the League was no more than a branch of the Soviet foreign office, the Comintern.

After having taken notice of the programme of action of the "Front of Defense" we declare that this organization is in fact the Russian branch of the unique Front International created by the Comintern in light of the decision taken in the month of August, 1935 by the Cadres of Moscow. The Russian nationalist organizations formally decline all solidarity with this organ of Soviet propaganda whose goal, we see, is to induce errors in the French public opinion, and to create an atmosphere of war which amounts to a civil war.⁵⁰

The position demonstrably hardened among the Russian emigrants. By 1938, anyone who advocated a patriotic response to a potential Nazi attack on Soviet Russia was considered a Communist and a Soviet spy; anyone who attacked the precepts of Communism was liable to be considered a Fascist.

In 1938, the Soviet government entered the fray by prompting demands to the Nansen Office of the League of Nations that they end, at once, all relief and contributions to the Russian emigration.

4. Kologriov, Jean, former captain of the Cavalry, convert to Catholicism after a stay of several years in Rome. Ordained priest, speaks and writes German.

5. Souchitzky, Ukrainian, rumoured to be an agent of the Gestapo

6. Pianitzky, correspondent of Souchitzky

7 Sossine, legionnaire agent, Russian National Socialist Party in France, French-Mutualist in Bologna

Congress of White Russians takes place at 46 rue St. Didier

"Affairs Diverse Concernent la Russie," 7 April 1936, Préfecture de Police, Paris, Carton 1706, 7023c.

⁵⁰ "Ligue mutual antidefaitistie Russe en France," 19 May 1936, Préfecture de Police, Paris V, Carton 1706, 7023.c. The report cited the preliminary facets of the Russian opposition:

"Recently a live opposition was made by rightist elements in the emigration which has been sent to certain Parisian journals, notably to 'l'echo de Paris' on April 18, and to 'L'Action française' on April 16. This was followed by a protest meeting held at 15 Avenue Hoche at the 'Free Tribune of the Russian Emigration'. Under the presidency of the ex-squadron chief A. Barauoff, a manifesto was adopted unanimously by those assembled at the Congress". At the end of the report, the Police noted that, 'The 'Front of Defence' represents one face of the Russian emigration. It has not formed its own rebuttal.'

These two brochures, utilizing arguments of Soviet inspiration, demand the Office cease financing the emigration, "who are occupied in weaving plots against the USSR." It is curious to reveal in these writings a declaration of rapport by Georges Bernhardt, who for a long time has laboured to give aid to the Russian emigration.⁵¹

Polar radicalization became more intense. For the writers of Put' and Novyi grad and for the religious philosophers, it was becoming increasingly more difficult to maintain the distinctions of their "third way". No matter how carefully they explained their viewpoint, the eradication of the moderate or alternate position condemned them to continually being accused of Communist or Nazi sympathies.

The French "non-conformists" also suffered retrenchments prior to the outbreak of World War Two caused by the prevailing tide of polarization.⁵² Still a very young movement that had just begun to define concretely its parameters, it began to fragment into diverse schisms as early as 1933. *Esprit* split with the *Troisième Force*⁵³ and then *Ordre Nouveau* in quick succession. *Ordre Nouveau* had provoked warnings from the older generation: Maritain had repeatedly suggested that Mounier cease his connection with *Ordre Nouveau* because of its positions;⁵⁴ in 1933, Gabriel Marcel had formally

⁵¹ "Affaires diverse concernant la Russie," 25 May 1938, Préfecture de Police, Paris V, Carton 1706, 7023.c Russian emigres interested in 2 brochures published in Geneva dealing with the Nansen Office: 1. by "Centre d'Etudes de Paix et Démocratie"; 2. by M. Leo Lambert secretary of Paris bureau of "Par le Droit d'asile".

⁵² For example, historians such as Michel Winock lead the alternate view, bluntly calling Personalism "philocommunism" in Histoire politique de la revue Esprit, 1930-1950 (Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1975).

⁵³ *La Troisième Force* led by Georges Izard, became involved with *Front commun* and the S.F.I.O.; warned by both Maritain and Berdyaev about the danger of associating with those who increasingly expressed communist sympathies, Mounier became obliged to cease all cooperation with *La Troisième Force* on November 22, 1934. Emmanuel Mounier, Mounier et sa génération, ed. Paulette Mounier-Leclercq (Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1956) 154.

⁵⁴ For example, on November 9, 1932, Maritain wrote Mounier to chastise him for association with "the revolutionaries". Mounier, Mounier et sa génération 103.

withdrawn his sponsorship. This act caused a response of confused indignation from one of the *Ordre Nouveau* leaders, Alexandre Marc (Lipiansky):

Cher Monsieur,

Depuis qq temps déjà, du bruits fâcheux arrivent à mes oreilles: d'aucune prétendent q vs tiendriez sur mon compte ds propos nettement désobligeants, & vs jugeriez fort sévèrement mon attitude. J'avoir q je n'arrive p à prendre as bruts tt à fait au sérieux. Je sais, en effet, q vs me connaissez depuis longtemps, q vs avez participé régulièrement aux travaux d mon Groupe. d' Et. religieuses q vs avez suivi, avec sympathie, l'organisation & le développement d l'ordre Nouveau depuis sa fondation, q vs m'avez fait l'honneur d sollicite ma participation à ds organismes d'Et philosophiques, etc...etc... Vs avez donné dernièrement eu tte indépendance, puisque je ne vrai sollicité eu protestant contre une mesure unique insoutenable. Dirigée contre moi. Tt cela m'incite à croire q vous propos ont été mal compris ou peut être même déformés. Ms je tiens à eu avoir le coeur net. Je vs prie d-c d me faire savoir par écrit se ls bruits auxquels je faisais allusions plus haut si vraiment, dénués d tt fondement.

L'attendrai votre réponse avec une impatience q vs comprendrez facilement. Je vs serais obligé d ne p une faire attendre trop longtemps.

Veuillez transmettre mes hommages à Madame G. M. & croire, cher Monsieur à mes sentiments dévoués à l'ON à vs même.

Alexandre⁵⁵

Even Berdyaev had expressed some reservations about *Ordre Nouveau* to Mounier, but he saved most of these for his articles about French movements to be published in *Novyi grad*.⁵⁶

Still Mounier and the *Esprit* group persevered in their connection with *Ordre Nouveau*: Mounier had a close, respectful relationship with Marc which he did not want to jeopardize, and he aspired to create a decentralized union of the "non-conformists". He felt that *Ordre Nouveau* was closest to his version of Personalism. The group's "Letter to Hitler" in 1934, however, forced a public breach when *Esprit* condemned this

⁵⁵ Alexandre Marc, letter to Gabriel Marcel, 9 December 1933, Gabriel Marcel Papers, *Bibliothèque Nationale*, Paris, Carton 52. The letter has been reproduced in the original, without translation, in order that its essence might not be deformed.

⁵⁶ Nikolai Berdyaev, "O sotsial'nom personalizme," *Novyi grad* 7 (1933): 44-61; also A.M.I. "Probuzhdenie molodoi Frantsii: 'Esprit,'" *Novyi grad* 7 (1933): 89-91; Nikolai Berdyaev, "Iskaniia sotsial'noi pravdy molodoi Frantsiei," *Novyi grad* 9 (1934): 56-65.

communication on the grounds that it smacked of an acceptance of Fascism. While compiling the censorious article for *Esprit*, Mounier sent a private message to assure Berdyaev:

I will explain to you myself, or Maritain, if you see him first, the conflict with *l'Ordre Nouveau*. You see the profound reasons. The movement oriented itself clearly towards an anti-open fascism and a petit-bourgeois technocracy that we cannot admit.⁵⁷

Mounier, thus, remained loyal to the founding principals of the Personalist movement, and retained the support of his mentors. Berdyaev commended Mounier on his rigorous maintenance of the movement's integrity, and he expressed sympathy for the problems of fragmentation. He, himself, no stranger to divisions having had to break with so many of his former colleagues both in Russia and in France over philosophical and political perspective, Berdyaev supported Mounier's decision with the reminder that impeccable means were essential for a consistent philosophy. The greatest threat was always the lure of easy "catch-words", sometimes concealing a "confusion of ideas and values and exercising a subtle appeal to the divided mind and heart of a decadent intelligentsia."⁵⁸

Thus encouraged, Mounier maintained his resilient line, and *Esprit* was able to regroup and continue its work in 1935. Mounier characterized the divisive experience as a tempering process, and proclaimed, "a new stage had truly begun around *Esprit* with the reorganization of the groups initiated at the start of the summer and which works very well today."⁵⁹ One of the new groups, which came to replace the *Troisième Force*, was composed of about thirty young intellectuals who met at the cafe at Saint-Sulpice to

⁵⁷ Mounier, "à Nicolas Berdiaeff," 15 February 1936 [date of letter is incorrect, actually 1934], in *Mounier et sa génération* 174.

⁵⁸ Berdyaev, *Dream and Reality* 206.

⁵⁹ Mounier, *Mounier et sa génération* 154.

discuss *Esprit's* policy towards social, economic, judicial, and political questions. At their first meeting on May 13, 1934, Berdyaev was nominated to act as intermediary. Three days later, the Russian philosopher also became a participant in *Esprit's* new philosophical group. It was divided into three sections which would work "to define spiritual means, to study our metaphysics of the Person and of the Community, to study Marxism."⁶⁰ Berdyaev worked mostly with the third group, lending his expertise to the youthful endeavors of Marcel Moré.

As *Esprit* worked to delineate their philosophy of *personnalisme communautaire* throughout 1935 and 1936, the group was continually approached by new and former associates who sought some basis for unity. Despite what he considered a definitive break, Mounier was still being pursued by the leaders of *Ordre Nouveau* in 1935 when Gibrat, Lousteau, and Robert Aron initiated a meeting. Their timing was excellent: still remorseful about the previous year's debacles and increasingly worried about the world crisis, Mounier had begun to suffer serious doubts about the direction of his movement. However, once he began to talk to the men at *Ordre Nouveau* he again saw their negative tendencies:

They said to me that they would put all their strength into *Esprit*, all their company, and that *Esprit* would become the laboratory of our generation. They prepared a sort of central directory of all the youth movements - a little close to what I thought - but this seemed to me very "elite," even in the manner of an engineer thinker. And even their title. "Work and nation," once more goat cheese and cabbage.⁶¹

He was also approached by certain syndicalist groups, and Gaston Bergery's S.F.I.O. Although Mounier did not refuse to hear their arguments, he consistently rejected

⁶⁰ Mounier, Mounier et sa génération 142.

⁶¹ Mounier, Mounier et sa génération 169.

them.⁶² Others, like the new Belgium group *Communauté* led by Raymond de Becker were cautiously admitted. Both Berdyaev, who had been in communication with de Becker for the past two years, and Maritain attended the first congress of *Communauté* with Mounier. From this tentative alliance, and fruitful discussion with Emile Galey's new group *Croisade*, Mounier wondered if a new united front of Personalism might not be developed. On paper, he drafted plans for a potential "Centre of movements for the Personalist Revolution" which would include *Esprit*, *Communauté*, and *Croisade*.⁶³

The following year, however, rising tensions caused by the Spanish Civil War made *Esprit's* call for a Personalist revolution seem irrelevant; the comparatively clear mandates of Fascism on one side or Communism on the other, became much more appealing than esoteric discussions of human spirituality. That summer, Mounier had to assure his friends in other countries that *Esprit* was still vital.⁶⁴ To try to bolster his movement he worked to further the ties with the Belgium group *Communauté*, but found that Raymond de Becker was leaning in undesirable directions. On all sides he seemed besieged, and thus he turned back to his original commitment to faith and the Church. On March 7, 1936, he wrote a very religious letter to his non-believing, assistant editor Touchard:

You have the human need that renders me more Christian. I believe in the value, in the necessity for direction; and there is not a priest that I can make a friend, that I have envied to bring on board the boat Mounier! Our non-believing friends, who desire the Christ more violently than indeed our habitual "brothers", you are the unfortunate ones, robbed by the pharisees of the spiritual penitence as the others are by the riches of the being of material security: you are the corps of Christ, you allies, and if I cannot count on your benevolent indulgence to relieve

⁶² Mounier, Mounier et sa génération 164.

⁶³ Mounier, Mounier et sa génération 161.

⁶⁴ Mounier, Mounier et sa génération 173-174.

me of this tiresome task, I could not of course know that I could not have wiped up the soles of your feet in the other world...⁶⁵

This desperate appeal, filled with allusions to the Gospel and its representation of Mounier as Christ demonstrated a fundamental breakdown in purpose and confidence in the movement. In his private journal, just four days after writing this uncharacteristic letter, Mounier confided his worst private fears: "*Esprit*, our faith, is at the point of death."⁶⁶

It was at this point, when the movement seemed besieged by failure after failure and the world situation appeared to have gone beyond any solutions the Personalists could propose, that a final attack against *Esprit* was launched; this time by the Catholic Church itself. In the summer of 1936, Maritain warned Mounier that the Vatican was considering placing *Esprit* on the Index. Their attackers were the leaders of *Action Catholique*, headed by Monsignor Courbé, who found the essays in *Esprit* too sympathetic to Communism and having the potential to confuse true Catholics. For such a fervent believer as Mounier and many of his colleagues, this attack must have been devastating. However, contrary to what might be expected, the movement did not simply dissolve in the face of this last onslaught, but rallied to the challenge.

Mounier immediately started a group to compile information for their appeal, and contacted the Papal Nuncio in order to arrange a meeting to present this information. The appeal was dextrous and clever. *Esprit* argued first that it was not a Catholic review although its founder (Mounier) and most of its collaborators were Catholics, therefore it should not be judged by the same yardstick as a journal under Catholic sanction. They then asserted that their movement had been inspired by the very Pope's edict,

⁶⁵ Mounier, Mounier et sa génération 175.

⁶⁶ Mounier, Mounier et sa génération 175.

Quadragesima Anno, and aspired to fulfil the command of the Pope.⁶⁷ Laying out their political stance, *Esprit* followed the line inaugurated by Berdyaev in 1932 that it was not pro-Communist, but insisted upon recognizing both the truths and critical fallacies of Communism: social justice was necessary and needed to be established in the modern world; the Communist way, however, could not lead to justice because it dehumanized people to a class, instituted state monopoly of capital, and did not recognize the spiritual value of the human being. Thus, *Esprit* clearly delimited its position as Christian opposed to Communism or Socialism. In the end their appeal was successful and the Vatican decided not to move against the review. *Esprit* had convinced the cardinals and Pope Pius XI of "our spirit and of the necessity for our action."⁶⁸

Having overcome such a tenuous moment, the *Esprit* movement renewed its purpose and began a thorough assessment of the Spanish Civil War. Concurrently, Mounier published Manifeste au service personnalisme in order to present the Personalist movement to a wider audience in book form. Over the next two years, they continued their assault against Fascism and watched in desperation as war drove ever closer. In tandem with Novyi grad, *Esprit* discussed the origins of Fascism, its appeal, and reasons for its success. No less enamoured with the Popular Front which had just collapsed in France, the writers of the two journals were united in their opposition to the growing alliance between Nazi Germany and Fascist Italy, and its auguring for France.⁶⁹ In 1938 and 1939, after a scathing critique of the Munich Agreement, Mounier was sufficiently depressed with the inability of *Esprit* and its related movements to stop the tide to war,

⁶⁷ Mounier, Mounier et sa génération 177-185.

⁶⁸ Mounier, Mounier et sa génération 190.

⁶⁹ "Et maintenant (Éditorial signé Esprit)." *Esprit* 6. 66 (1938): 801-806.

that he considered removing the group to a communal retreat in the countryside. There, he hoped to establish a lay apostolate centre where the *Esprit* friends would more exactly define their purpose, and engage in a new form of influence, education, which Mounier now perceived as having more potential than political writings.⁷⁰ Before these plans could crystallize, however, the war broke out.

Nazi Occupation

With the invasion of France and the Nazi Occupation of more than half that country, the situation became untenable for the Russian spiritual intelligentsia. Metropolitan Eulogius was placed in extreme danger by the anti-Nazi activities of several of his priests in other countries. The most prominent incident concerned Metropolitan Alexander who directed the Orthodox Church in Brussels. Unwilling to cease his anti-German sermons from the pulpit, he was arrested by the Nazis upon the completion of their invasion of Belgium early in 1940.⁷¹ He was conducted by the SS to Moabit prison in Berlin where he died before the end of the war. Metropolitan Alexander was under the jurisdiction of Metropolitan Eulogius, and his arrest implicated that entire branch of the Orthodox Church.

Moreover, unbeknownst to Metropolitan Eulogius and his followers, their competitors in the Karlovci Synod had been conducting positive negotiations with the Nazis since 1938. When the Germans broke through the Maginot Line, and began their advance on Paris, the full magnitude of their situation was finally realized by Eulogius:

⁷⁰ Iswolsky, No Time to Grieve... 116; Mounier, Mounier et sa génération 211-222.

⁷¹ "Affairs Diverse Concernent la Russie," 15 November 1940, Préfecture de Police, Paris, Carton 1706 file 7023.c

He was personally regarded as an enemy by the Nazis because of the indiscrete preaching of his subordinate Alexander, whose rival Church was allied with the Nazis. Preparing for the worst, Eulogius retreated to Saint Sergius Theological Institute to await the Nazi reprisals.⁷² Once the Nazi Occupation of Paris was completed, the Germans did indeed deal with the Russian Orthodox Church. They decreed that the Karlovci Synod was the only official branch which they would recognize, and they closed Eulogius' churches at Clinchy and Asnieres. Metropolitan Seraphim of the Karlovci Synod in Paris was granted sole authority over all matters pertaining to the Russian Orthodox Church. His command centre at 52 rue Boileau was augmented by the donation of Eulogius' former headquarters at 65 rue Michel Ange.⁷³ In all, Metropolitan Eulogius was deprived of his former clerical responsibilities with the exception of his post at St. Sergius.

Nevertheless, the now "former" prelate of all Russian Orthodox Churches outside of Russia did escape Nazi arrest and imprisonment. At the time, the mysterious forces that had prompted the Nazi occupiers to spare Eulogius were unknown. After the war, however, it was discovered that three prominent members of the German military directly intervened to protect St. Sergius and its Russian Orthodox priests: A. von Trott, Count Moltke, and Count York von Wartenberg were all established noblemen with impressive records, but had a secret personal affection for Eulogius.⁷⁴

⁷² His fears were indicated by a decision to appoint Sergei Bulgakov, still recovering from an operation to remove a cancerous tumour from his throat, as Dean of the Institute, and Professor Kartashev as Inspector. This way, if Eulogius was arrested by the Germans there would be a set order of leadership to replace him. Donald A. Lowrie, Saint Sergius 42-43.

⁷³ "Affairs Diverse Concernent la Russie," 15 November 1940, Préfecture de Police, Paris, Carton 1706 file 7023.c.

⁷⁴ Lowrie, Saint Sergius in Paris 45.

Thus saved by "divine intervention," Eulogius fended off the nay-sayers, and determined to keep the theological school running for the duration of the war. By 1951 completely cut off from its financial assistance sent from Britain and the United States except for the few personal "gifts" which Paul B. Anderson managed to get through, St. Sergius had to rely on what savings it had collected in the late 1930s, and a few other discrete sources. Later in 1941, some aid was provided by Dr. Adolf Keller of the World Alliance for Friendship to Churches; Melle Gundvor Sahlin of Sweden sent clothing and funds. Help also came from some surprising sources: One émigré, K. D. Pomerantsev who came into a substantial sum of money during these years, gave generously between 1941-43.⁷⁵ The income for Saint Sergius was transformed from a regular influx to what personal donations it could solicit and obtain, but it was enough to survive.

Despite their financial constraints, the seventeen students and twelve remaining professors - Bulgakov, Ilyin, Cyprian Kern, Kartashev, Peter Kovalevsky, Motchulsky, Fedotov, Afanassiev, Spassky, Vysheslavitsev, Weidlé, and Zander - continued their work preparing a new core of Orthodox theologians and priests. In 1940, they lost Fedotov and Afanassiev to the exodus: Fedotov escaped to America, and Afanassiev took over a parish in Tunis until 1946. However, the two were replaced by Zenkovsky in 1942 when he was released from the Vichy POW camps, and by Frank who managed to escape from Germany.⁷⁶

The Academy - it changed its name from St. Sergius Theological Institute to St. Sergius Theological Academy in 1940 - operated without heat, sufficient food, and no new

⁷⁵ Pomerantsev personally donated nearly 500,000 francs to the institute. Lowrie, Saint Sergius in Paris 45.

⁷⁶ Lowrie, Saint Sergius in Paris 42-43.

publications for the five years of the war. Over one hundred texts were confiscated in 1941 by the occupational German government because they contained some Hebrew or Jewish reference, and they were regularly visited by the Gestapo for interrogations and harassment. They also lost Lev Zander to arrest by the Gestapo that year. He was interned in the Nazi camp in Compiègne by the authorities who refused to believe that he was not biologically a Jew.⁷⁷ These deprivations took their toll on the Institute: Sergei Bulgakov succumbed from poor nutrition and cancer in 1944; Metropolitan Eulogius survived the war, but died shortly after in 1946 due to age and poor health.

Initially, the Occupation was met with confusion on the part of residents living in France. As Robert Paxton so clearly points out, even the Communists in that country made no protest, nor did they form any outright resistance because, under the Soviet-Nazi pact concluded in 1939, they were stipulative allies to Nazi Germany.⁷⁸ There was a major exodus out of Paris upon the Germans arrival but, as the treaty was drawn creating an Occupied Zone and Free Vichy France, life gradually returned to normal. In general, therefore, Paxton's theory seems to hold true for the Russian émigrés as it does for the French. While the French were applauding the efforts of Pétain in Vichy to create the *Revolution Nationale* and revitalize France, the Russian émigrés like the religious philosophers were mostly running for cover or keeping a very low profile.

Iswolsky, Fedotov, and Afanassiev were not the only émigrés to join the exodus. Despite his resistance to the humiliation of flight, Berdyaev packed up his family and cat, and left Clamart for safer climes. They voyaged to Pilat, near Arcachon, to stay with a

⁷⁷ Lowrie, Saint Sergius in Paris 43.

⁷⁸ Paxton, Vichy France 37.

French friend Monbrison.⁷⁹ There they were joined by Ilya Bunakov-Fondaminsky and Constantine Mochulsky, the literary expert on Dostoevsky for the Sorbonne and St. Sergius. However, by August, the Nazi forces had overtaken even these areas, and Berdyaev feared they were endangering their hosts: "...and in August we all returned separately by various detours to Paris."⁸⁰ Stymied in their attempt to escape the Occupation, the Berdyaev family returned to the house at Clamart. Mochulsky, Bunakov-Fondaminsky, Mat' Maria, Jaba (Novyi grad), Pianov (RSCM), and the novelist Adamovich were all that was left of Berdyaev's once great circles; they visited Clamart whenever time and means would permit for the traditional Sunday teas. However, new visitors were always welcome, and the émigré symbolist writers Gregory Otsup and Stavrov, the poet Piotravsky, Miss Kliatchkin, and the journalist Mrs. Kallash joined the meetings.⁸¹ The former centre of new philosophical, oecumenical, and political work, now became a small garden of spiritual solace within the tumult of war.

If Iswolsky was endangered by her anti-Nazi writings in Esprit and Novyi grad and Metropolitan Eulogius by the actions of his priests, Berdyaev was seriously threatened in Occupied France. He had consistently attacked all forms of Fascism, categorizing such ideologies as equally evil to materialistic Communism. Moreover, once Hitler came to power in Germany, he portrayed the Nazi regime as the actualization of the "dark ages"

⁷⁹ Lowrie, Rebellious Prophet 268.

⁸⁰ Constantine Motchulsky, letter to Helene Iswolsky, 26 July 1945, Helene Iswolsky papers, University of Scranton, Pennsylvania, Box 1: 3.

⁸¹ Lowrie, Rebellious Prophet 269; Constantine Motchulsky, letter to Helene Iswolsky, 26 July 1945, Helene Iswolsky papers, University of Scranton, Pennsylvania, Box 1: 4.

he had predicted in his A New Middle Ages.⁸² If anything he was more revolted by Nazism than by Communism, and he wrote about the Soviet-Nazi Pact of 1939 as Russia stooping to the absolute depths of depravity.⁸³

History shows constant signs of a fatal lapse from the human or divine-human to the sub-human or demonic. Out of his idolatrous and demonolatrous instincts man conjures up real demonic powers which in turn seize control of him. "The beast rising out of the sea" is a highly suggestive apocalyptic image of the last demonic attempts of the kingdom of Caesar to dominate and to enslave man and the world.⁸⁴

However, aside from consistent visits by the Gestapo, "always in twos", to interrogate both Berdyaev and his wife Lydia, they left the family alone.

Berdyaev's biographer, Donald Lowrie, asserts that the Russian philosopher had a friend highly placed in the Third Reich who constantly intervened on his behalf: the identity of this man was never disclosed.⁸⁵ For Lowrie, the proof of this came from one incident in 1941,

One day an announcement appeared in the Swiss newspapers that I had been arrested. A week or so later agents of the Gestapo arrived to make enquiries about the origin of the rumour. According to them the rumour caused some alarm in Berlin (this was undoubtedly an exaggeration), and they wanted to assure me of the authorities "benevolent attitude" towards me. The situation was embarrassing and distasteful to me.⁸⁶

Berdyaev, himself, never mentioned that he suspected he had a protector in Germany; he attributed his good fortune to fate, the inability of the Gestapo to find any incriminating

⁸² "I had attacked National Socialism and Fascism on more than one occasion, and it was well-known that I was an ideological opponent of the 'new order.'" Berdyaev, Dream and Reality 304.

⁸³ Donald Lowrie, Rebellious Prophet 267.

⁸⁴ Berdyaev, Dream and Reality 287.

⁸⁵ Lowrie, Rebellious Prophet 269.

⁸⁶ Berdyaev, Dream and Reality 305.

evidence, and perhaps "that, apparently, nothing could wipe out the Germans' respect for philosophy."⁸⁷

If there was an unknown benefactor amid the Nazis, he remains hidden to the annals of history. However, Berdyaev also gave no immediate cause for arrest during the occupation because he refrained from any publishing or activities which might implicate him. Moreover, during the brief sojourn in Pilat, Father Dmitrii Klepinin and his wife Tamara had stayed at Clamart, and they had carefully secreted any incriminating evidence among the philosopher's papers.⁸⁸ One also recalls Berdyaev's exalted position in Russia under Bolshevik rule: Aside from periodic interrogations, they had refused to act against him in any violent manner, and had even preferred to exile him, rather than imprisoning or executing him. Since that time, Berdyaev's worldwide notoriety had increased manifold and, while most today would argue that the Nazis cared not at all about world opinion, there were other exceptions like Berdyaev. Albert Einstein and Sigmund Freud had both been allowed to leave Nazi Germany despite their vociferous attacks against the regime and their Jewish origin: Therefore, Berdyaev may have also been too important a figure to be arrested.

There is one other curious parallel in Berdyaev's experience with both the Bolsheviks and the Nazis. Upon his expulsion from Soviet Russia, the GPU had tried repeatedly to enrol him as a secret agent abroad⁸⁹. In Occupied France, he was visited by a Russian émigré Nazi in 1941 who requested him to write pro-Nazi essays in favour of their invasion of the U.S.S.R. that summer. Just as he had curtly refused the GPU offer

⁸⁷ Berdyaev, Dream and Reality 306.

⁸⁸ Lowrie, Rebellious Prophet 277.

⁸⁹ Dmitri Volkogonov, Lenin: A New Biography (New York: Free Press, 1994) 88-90.

in 1922, Berdyaev threw the Russian Nazi out of his house in Clamart.⁹⁰ Nevertheless, in both cases the authorities believed that he might be turned to their cause. One possible explanation for their gross misconception might be that neither the Nazis nor the Bolsheviks ever comprehended Berdyaev's philosophy. On the other hand, his willingness to admit certain truths in Communism and the superficial similarities between his conception of a "new middle ages" and the Third Reich may have given these ideologues reason to hope. Like so many of his close colleagues they may have ignored what Berdyaev always considered the heart of his belief: the absolute and undeniable freedom of man.

For the duration of the war, Berdyaev remained silent with the one exception of participating in the oecumenical religious conferences organized by Madeline Davy, in 1944.

Mlle Davy, a learned and gifted woman, was responsible for a series of conferences near Paris devoted to the study of religious and philosophical problems. It was on this occasion that I came into conflict with Gabriel Marcel, who accused me of anarchism and similar crimes of which I happen to be rather proud.⁹¹

He never participated in any resistance activities, but he also avoided any taint of collaboration by his complete refusal to entertain any dubious elements from either the French or the Russian emigration.

If Paxton's theory of non-involvement applies to the Russian émigrés, his assertion of the widespread French sympathy for Pétain's *Revolution Nationale* is even more

⁹⁰ Lowrie, Rebellious Prophet 269.

⁹¹ Berdyaev, Dream and Reality 306. For more information see Marie-Madeleine Davy, Nicholas Berdyaev: Man of the Eighth Day, trans. Leonara Siepmán (London: Geoffrey Bles, 1967).

appropriate. Substantial, organized resistance activities on the part of the French, especially in the Free Zone, did not begin until 1942 when Laval usurped Pétain as defacto president and began an outright collaboration with the Nazis. The Resistance became most active, only with the Nazi movement over the demarcation line in 1943, and the actual, if not definitely-stated end to any French government. In the first years of the war, the activities of the *Esprit* group varied widely. Those caught in the Occupied Zone in 1940, tended to withdraw into silence and non-activity awaiting some reorganization to attract them. Most, however, managed to escape to Vichy France where some participated in the *Revolution Nationale*. Mounier's personal activities during this period were perhaps the most dubious. He continued to publish *Esprit*: In it he wrote several essays which caused much controversy and dismay among others of the old *Esprit* and related groups in their acceptance of the "new reality", and their advocacy of several elements of Pétain's new program. By 1941, Marcel Moré and Etienne Borne had broken with Mounier over his "unclear" position.⁹² Heedless of the danger of his activities, Mounier ardently participated in the new Vichy youth movements, and personally helped found the elite training school *Uriage*. Recently, the orientation of that school has come under intense historical scrutiny, and its record has not been left unblemished.⁹³ Mounier's writings, sponsorship, and general activities of this period have, therefore, acquired a rather tainted character. The picture that emerges is one of a frustrated man, unable to complete his aspirations before the war, and then unwilling to retreat into obscurity during this period.

⁹² Diane de Bellescize, *Les Neuf sages de la Résistance* (Paris: Plon, 1973) 34.

⁹³ See John Hellman, *The Knight-Monks of Vichy France* (Montréal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1993).

In choosing to become engaged in Vichy's *Revolution Nationale*, Mounier damaged his reputation as a leader of the "third way". His new passion for a potential Christian corrective (Knight-Monks) to Nazism (Storm troopers) was a dangerous romantic delusion. Perhaps caused by some residual notion of loyalty to France's once great past or out of a genuine belief that only a recreation of the Middle Ages - not a *new* Middle Ages - would suit the "new order" in Europe, Mounier entered a game that was completely beyond his capabilities. He was quickly destroyed by the "authentic" collaborators of Vichy: Esprit was closed at the end of 1941; shortly after, Mounier was imprisoned for the next two years. This defeat, combined with the trials of prison life gradually eroded Mounier's faith in a true spiritual cause, and caused him to question even his belief in Catholicism.⁹⁴

Most of Mounier's former sponsors and mentors, as well as the bulk of the former *Esprit* group, avoided this transformation during the brief existence of Vichy France. The majority relocated to Lyon where, under the direction of Stanislas Fumet, they established the underground Christian paper Temps nouveau. Associated with this review was one of the first resistance groups in Vichy France, *Liberté*. Here the old Christian Democracy of Marc Sangier's *Sillon* was combined with the new Catholic movement which Maritain and Fumet had participated in at Sept, Vigile, Temps present, and La vie intellectuelle.⁹⁵

Temps nouveau exercised an influence important, not only on those from the university milieu, but also on a small group of writers the foremost of whom were Martin du Gard and André Gide.

⁹⁴ Emmanuel Mounier, letter to Gabriel Marcel, 22 October 1944, Gabriel Marcel Papers, *Bibliothèque Nationale*, Paris, Carton 52.

⁹⁵ Diane de Bellescize, Les Neuf sages de la Résistance 29.

Somewhat to the surprise of the previously non-religious writers, they now found themselves defending "the spirit of Christianity against Nazi ideology."⁹⁶

Although Mounier frequented the nascent Christian resistance meetings, he did not become greatly involved until almost the end of 1941 in the short interval between his removal from *Uriage* and his arrest. It was here that a good deal of Mounier's post-war anti-Catholicism found its roots. The traditional Catholic hierarchy censured the activities around Temps nouveau, both out of support for Pétain's *Revolution Nationale* (which at first promised to return education into Catholic hands), and under the guise of an authority which could not admit any self-determined Catholic movement. The Catholic hierarchy had not forgotten that they had banned Marc Sangier's Christian Democratic movement before World War One, and they did not appreciate its resurgence at such a volatile time.⁹⁷

Direct action was left to the capable hands of Uriage graduate Henri Frénay's *Combat*, Emmanuel d'Astier's *Liberation* and Jean-Pierre Lévy's *Franc-Tireur* which only became fully organized in the summer and fall of 1942. With the closure of *Uriage* at the end of that year, the formation of its former students and professors into the philosophical arm of the Resistance served, somewhat, to clear both their names and that of Mounier from the taint of collaboration. The group around Temps nouveau, who largely consisted of the French participants from the Meudon and Clamart gatherings, restricted their resistance to philosophy and the publication of inspirational and condemnatory essays. The familiar personage of Gabriel Marcel re-emerged at Lyons, tied to a philosophical discussion group responsible for drafting the constitutional program for a freed France.

⁹⁶ Diane de Bellescize, Les Neuf sages de la Résistance 34-35.

⁹⁷ Diane de Bellescize, Les Neuf sages de la Résistance 38.

He worked with many newcomers such as Roland de Pury, Joseph Hours, Paul Bastid, and a long-time *Esprit* contributor Jean Lacroix, in the conceptualization of a healing philosophy for a France so divided and torn by the Occupation experience.⁹⁸

Hence, most of the mentors of *Esprit* and the personalists therein retained an impeccable reputation throughout the trying war experience. Even the most committed resistance men did, for reasons of necessity or out of genuine hope, carry quotations from the great Marshal Pétain on their mastheads until 1942. Nevertheless, they never confused their aspirations for a Christian renaissance with the warped means of Nazism, and they maintained a "safe" distance from the collaborators at Vichy. Mounier, alone among the original founders, bore some taint of disreputableness; in his anxiety to see some sign that his proposed revolution might become reality, he embraced tactics and relationships which were thereafter to scar both his reputation and his psyche. Let us take a moment to compare his actions to those who purported to embrace Personalism during the 1930s, but from whom Mounier had kept well-distanced: Gaston Bergery became Pétain's ambassador to the USSR; Robert Loustau, Jean Jardin, Robert Gibrat, Xavier de Lignac, and Albert Ollivier of *Ordre Nouveau* held prominent political positions in Vichy⁹⁹; even Mounier's first teacher, Jacques Chevalier, disgraced himself as Minister of Education for Vichy with his anti-masonic work. Within this context, Mounier's transgressions appear more as self-delusion than outright collaboration. Regardless, after World War Two, Mounier largely abandoned the "third way" having lost his faith, and his rigorous sense of purpose.

⁹⁸ Diane de Bellescize, Les Neuf sages de la Résistance 38.

⁹⁹ Paul Lipiansky and Bernard Rettanbach, Ordre et Démocratie, deux sociétés du pensée: de L'Ordre Nouveau au Club Jean-Moulin (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1967) 91.

Resistance

The only mention which might indicate some popularity for Marshal Pétain's *Revolution Nationale* on the part of the Russian religious philosophers is the name adopted by Mat' Maria's House of Hospitality in Paris; in 1940 she registered her establishment with the Nazi authorities as the "Canteen of the Marshal".¹⁰⁰ However, the story of what became of her remaining *Action Orthodoxe* suggests that the name was coined either out of irony or simple necessity. Mat' Maria became immediately active in the resistance following the Nazi Occupation. One eye-witness who assisted feeding and housing the destitute at her House of Hospitality remembered:

Father Dimitri's [Klepinin] attitude to all that happened at this time was rather different from Mother Maria's. One day she read to him, with evident approval, a Resistance pamphlet, telling of how they would punish the people who helped the Germans. Father Dimitri said: "Dear God, what is all this talk of vengeance? Must we prolong this suffering forever?" Mother Maria flushed and said nothing. She felt it was a just reproof.¹⁰¹

Not only did she read the underground press with great relish, but she also transmitted secret messages, and provided food and lodging to any French member of the resistance as well as to her usual Russian clientele.

At the end of 1941, as the Nazi occupiers began to institute the policy of the "Final Solution" against the Jews in France, the work of *Action Orthodoxe* took on a more serious vein. Father Dmitrii Klepinin was troubled by requests from Jewish Russian émigrés that he baptize them in order that they might escape the horrible deportation. He approached Mat' Maria with his dilemma one day:

¹⁰⁰ Constantine Motchulsky, letter to Helene Iswolsky, 26 July 1945, Helene Iswolsky papers, University of Scranton, Pennsylvania, Box 1: 3.

¹⁰¹ Koulomzin, *Many Worlds* 228. Koulomzin goes on to discuss the arrest, questioning and fate of Father Dimitri on pages 228-229.

What can I say to those people who come to me and say: "I must be baptized, Father, but I am not a believer," said Father Dimitri as if thinking aloud, "What shall I do?" He hesitated a moment. Mother Maria did not speak. "I think Christ would give me that paper if I were in their place," he said quietly. "So I must do it."¹⁰²

Thus, he dispensed baptismal certificates to all whom requested this service. His action saved several dozens of Jews from detection as the current policy in France, quite different from that in Germany, stated that Jews were determined by religion not race.

This method of circumventing Nazi policy, however, placed all who worked for *Action Orthodoxe* in great jeopardy. One moment of intense fear came on the night that Ilya Bunakov-Fondaminsky was arrested by the Gestapo. Having never forsaken his Jewish faith out of protest to the rising tide of anti-semitism and having written many anti-Nazi tracts in Nowyi grad, he was doubly culpable in the eyes of the Nazi authorities. They caught him at the end of 1942 and sent him off to prison with the other Jews awaiting deportation. There he was tortured in hopes that he might reveal something vital about his émigré colleagues, but he remained silent. The French underground discovered his plight (probably through Mat' Maria), and offered to help him escape from the camp before the deportation could occur; Bunakov-Fondaminsky refused their offer stating that he "wanted to share to the end the fate of his brothers, the Jews."¹⁰³ He died in the camp's prison hospital after an operation in 1943, and was baptized in the Russian Orthodox faith just before he died.

Having escaped detection of their resistance activities due to Bunakov-Fondaminsky's heroic silence, Father Klepinin and Mat' Maria continued their relief work in all its dimensions. Finally, however, their luck ran out early in 1943 when an informant

¹⁰² Koulomzin, Many Worlds 227.

¹⁰³ Iswolsky, No Time to Grieve... 208.

told the Gestapo about their baptizing activities.¹⁰⁴ They were arrested along with Pianov of the RSCM, Kazachkin, and Mat' Maria's son Yuri in a Nazi raid of the House of Hospitality on February 9, 1943.¹⁰⁵ Until January 1944 they were interned in Compeigne where their friends Mochulsky and Berdyaev could write to them and receive replies. However, as the Nazi defeat began, the Germans speeded up their extermination project and the *Action Orthodoxe* group was transported to Poland. Mat' Maria was sent to Ravensbruck; Klepinin, her son Yuri, Pianov and Kazachkin were deported to Buchenwald.¹⁰⁶ In March, Klepinin alone was sent on to the death camp "Dora" where he fell sick and died in the "Death House" that same month.¹⁰⁷ He was thirty-nine years old. Mat' Maria and her son Yuri also succumbed to the deprivations at their respective camps. To the end, Mat' Maria was remembered as dispensing aid, cold common-sense, and enshrouding herself in her fervent religious faith.

In addition to the heroic endeavours of the *Action Orthodoxe* personages, two other resistance actions in Occupied France on the part of the Russian emigration deserve mention. The first involved Berdyaev's protégé, Yuri Shirinsky-Shikhmatov, leader of the *Post-Revolutionaries*. Iswolsky's old friend, Shirinsky-Shikhmatov had chosen not to flee during the exodus. Unwilling to forsake his anti-Nazi commitment which had led him to join the central committee of the Ligue mutual antidefaitistie Russe en France, he continued to seek possible colleagues with whom to begin resistance activities. His

¹⁰⁴ Anderson, No East or West 81.

¹⁰⁵ Constantine Motchulsky, letter to Helene Iswolsky, 26 July 1945, Helene Iswolsky papers, University of Scranton, Pennsylvania, Box 1: 1.

¹⁰⁶ Constantine Motchulsky, letter to Helene Iswolsky, 26 July 1945, Helene Iswolsky papers, University of Scranton, Pennsylvania, Box 1: 1.

¹⁰⁷ Koulomzin, Many Worlds 229.

opposition to the Occupation was manifested first in his decision to don the yellow arm-band despite his Russian Orthodoxy; his wife, a former Socialist-Revolutionary, was Jewish, and he wanted to demonstrate his support for her as well as his abhorrence of anti-semitism. Listed today as one of the "heroes of the resistance" his activities during the Occupation remain shrouded in mystery. Iswolsky discovered after the war was over that he had been arrested by the Nazis in 1942, sent to a concentration camp and, there, was beaten to death.¹⁰⁸

Two Russian émigrés also organized the first active resistance movement in France. From a base created at their place of employment, the Paris Musée de l'homme, the ethnographers Boris Vildé and Anatole Levitsky began the first information-collecting network in August 1940.¹⁰⁹ Cited by Paxton as an exception to the general French compliance with Nazi occupation, the Russians at Musée de l'homme passed a substantial amount of information to the Free French in London and later to the active resistance in both the Free and Occupied Zones in France which allowed them to function more effectively.¹¹⁰ They also managed to bring together several prominent professors, writers, and scientists in a concerted resistance effort. From this cell originated the first military resistance organization in Occupied France led by Colonel La Rochère and Colonel Hauet. They also produced the first underground journal Résistance which released its premier issue on December 15, 1940. The group from the Musée de l'homme even managed to provide the Resistance with its first seven rifles.

¹⁰⁸ Iswolsky, 189.

¹⁰⁹ Martin Blumenson, The Vildé Affair (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co, 1977).

¹¹⁰ de Bellescize, Les Neuf sages de la Résistance 24. See also Paxton, Vichy France 40.

Collaboration

Despite the heroic dimensions of the sacrifices made by these individuals, the picture of émigré life in Occupied France should not be obscured by their example. For every Mat' Maria and Father Klepinin, there were thousands of Russian émigrés who survived the war by remaining unnoticed by virtue of their compliance with Nazi laws, and their approach of isolation and neutrality; there were also hundreds who engaged in entirely opposite activities. The subject of Russian émigré "Fascism" has, to date, been comprehensively examined by John Stephan's The Russian Fascists which provides a careful description of the various Fascist organizations initiated among the Russian emigration throughout Europe, in the United States, and in the Far East.¹¹¹ His analysis of Russian Fascism and direct compliance with the Nazis in France was necessarily superficial because of the inaccessibility of official (including police) files dealing with the issue.¹¹² The following section will, therefore, make no attempt to undermine his discoveries; it is merely intended to add more information to the base which he has provided.

The Préfecture de Police in Paris became aware that certain White Russian organizations were involved in negotiations with the Nazis as early as 1936. However, as these groups were most active in foreign territory (namely Germany), they decided only to monitor meetings held in Paris, and not act directly against the possible threat. With

¹¹¹ John J. Stephan, The Russian Fascists: Tragedy and Farce in Exile, 1925-45 (New York: Harper & Row, 1978).

¹¹² In France archival materials dealing with the World War Two years are still kept in strictly-guarded files, only accessible to those scholars who have been deemed "appropriate" by the Ministry of Culture [See Paxton, introduction, Vichy France]. In my own experience in 1995 at the Préfecture de Police in Paris, I was not permitted to view files on even the émigrés past the year 1940. The information which follows was obtained only because of a "lucky" (on my part) clerical error by which some later reports were filed in the carton for the 1930s.

the drastic reversal of governance in Paris following the occupation, the Nazi Russian émigrés were now able to "come out of the closet" and engage in direct action. Despite their subservience to the new Nazi authority, the Préfecture de Police still managed to collect information on a wide spectrum of collaboration movements occurring in their city.

In 1936, the French police had intercepted communications between the White Russian Nazi organization in Germany and certain émigrés residing in France. The following year, they discovered that the group in Germany, led by a former White Army officer from Wrangel's army, General von Lampe, had made official overtures to Franco and the Fascists in Spain on January 30, 1936 congratulating him on his military victories over the Communist Republicans in that country. From an aide of Franco, he received the following reply:

My general, I have the honour of expressing to you in the name of his Excellence the Head of the Government and of the Spanish Nationalist Army his gratitude for the sentiments of respect and the commitment that you have manifested in the letter transmitted by you to Berlin to one of the members of the Spanish Falange. We know well that you understand best of all our crusade for the liberation of Spain from the Red hordes, that you are the true representatives of Russia.¹¹³

Later in 1937, the police received more ominous information that the White Russian Nazis were forming a military detachment to aid Hitler. They found this particularly disturbing as certain Russian émigrés in Paris were actively funding the initiative, and recruiting potential soldiers from among Russian workers in France. The Russian émigré army was led by Biskoupsky under the direction of General Blomberg, and most substantially funded by a British knight, Deterding, who had close ties with Goering and Goebbels and was now residing as an émigré in Nazi Germany. As of the 26 November, 1937, Deterding had contributed some two million pounds sterling towards the endeavour.

¹¹³ "Affaires diverse concernant la Russie, 1936," 24 June 1937, Préfecture de Police, Paris V, Carton 1706, 7023c.

There were 4,600 recruits at that time, and at least a thousand had come directly from France. Deterding was offering 2,000 Francs to each Russian émigré who enrolled, and this was at a time when the French had restricted employment of émigrés in their factories and mines in favour of native French workers. Quite simply, the prospect of military action combined with the assurance of a better-than-average payment was undeniably attractive to young Russian émigrés who could see few similar opportunities in France. The army was to be ready for combat by 1938, posing yet another danger to the already unstable situation of world peace.¹¹⁴

Aware of the potential of this appeal, the Paris police conducted a thorough investigation of all resident Russian émigrés to determine their bias. They discovered that General Miller, Wrangel's foremost aide in the Russian Civil War, knew about the army, but opposed its creation. General Skobline, however, was fully in favour of the move as indicated by a note from one of his veterans, Linnikov, who was recently arrested in Bulgaria, and whose files were seized by the police there. However, the Paris police were comforted by the news that the last congress of the Nazis at Nuremberg had decided not to grant General Skobline the 1,000 marks per year that he had requested. From this they concluded that the Nazis in Berlin put little stock in "l'Union de l'Empire Russe" whose central seat existed in Paris, and they apparently derided the importance of the pro-Nazi activities of Russian émigrés.¹¹⁵

A year later, on August 8, 1939, the Paris police discovered the first traces of an alliance between the Karlovci Synod and Hitler. They were given a copy of a letter

¹¹⁴ "Affaires diverse concernant la Russie, 1936," 26 November 1937, Préfecture de Police, Paris V, Carton 1706, 7023c.

¹¹⁵ "Affaires diverse concernant la Russie, 1936," 26 November 1937, Préfecture de Police, Paris V, Carton 1706, 7023c.

addressed to Hitler from Metropolitan Anastasy by the Yugoslavian police which commended the Führer for his anti-Bolshevik actions; the police report concluded:

One can see in this proposal the state of the pro-Hitlerian spirit which reigns amid the majority of the emigration, those who see only good in the victory of the Nazis over the Soviets.¹¹⁶

Although the Préfecture de Police was perfectly aware of the schism between Eulogius' Church and that of the Karlovci, they did not consider, at this time, that such overtures could be part of a wider collaboration: That in return for the Karlovci Synod's support and their pro-Nazi influence over Orthodox believers, Hitler might agree to proclaim them the only legitimate Orthodox Church.

The following year saw little interest in the émigré condition on the part of the Paris police, with the exception of one brief notation that the Russian periodical in France, Novoe slovo, was possibly a pro-Nazi paper as it printed such articles as "Jews as Tyrants of the Russian People". Despite the new legislation banning all hate-literature in France, especially that of the anti-semitic variety, Novoe slovo was not repressed, and it continued to be published until 1947.¹¹⁷

A significant contingent of the Russian emigration in France, therefore, welcomed the Nazi Occupation with open arms. Not only did the more radical "Whites" feel themselves to be in complete accord with Nazi aspirations and policy - especially towards Communists and Jews - but also émigré labourers found their situation ameliorated by the new German government. With their intention to use the resources in France to supply their enormous military apparatus, the Nazi occupiers were prepared

¹¹⁶ "Affaires diverse concernant la Russie, 1936," 10 August 1938, Préfecture de Police, Paris V, Carton 1706, 7023c.

¹¹⁷ "Affaires diverse concernant la Russie, 1936," 3 August 1939, Préfecture de Police, Paris V, Carton 1706, 7023c.

to hire every able-bodied worker regardless of national origin; émigré engineers and miners, who had been unemployed by the French nationalist quotas, gained renewed jobs under the occupational government.¹¹⁸ The French police noted the effect that such employment had on increasing the Nazis' popularity, and engendering considerable loyalty from those previously excluded by the native French government.

Russian labourers and pro-Nazis were soon joined by a much more numerous contingent. The German invasion of the Soviet Union on June 22, 1941 caused a resurgence of hope among the vast majority of the emigration that they might soon be able to return to their native land. The Russian diaspora was, with the exception of those few engaged in the religious renaissance, still almost entirely committed to the overthrow of Communism in Russia by any means. They fully supported outside intervention, first by the allies in 1919 and later by the potential Nazi attack. Although the Bolsheviks had been entrenched in Russia for more than twenty years, most members of the emigration believed that the Russian people, whom even the religious philosophers persistently distinguished from their Communist rulers, would welcome an invasion intended to eradicate the Communists and restore the rightful elite (now in emigration) to their proper place.

The ambitions of the greater emigration rested upon two pillars of faith: first, that the people of Russia would not greatly resist an attempt for restoration because they had been so badly abused by the Communists, and still considered their leadership to be alien and evil; second, that the Nazi forces would willingly conquer Russia, and then withdraw in favour of a native Russian government led by émigrés who had proven their

¹¹⁸ "Affaires diverse concernant la Russie, 1936," 4 March 1941, Préfecture de Police, Paris V, Carton 1706, 7023c.

loyalty and allegiance to Nazi Germany. This second condition mandated that émigrés in France and elsewhere in Europe put aside their petty differences and suspicions, and immediately align themselves to the Nazi cause.

The Karlovci Synod led this appeal among the emigration in France. On June 25, 1941, three days after Operation Barbarossa began, the Paris police intercepted some of their first pamphlets intended to arouse the emigration:

We have learned that tracts printed in the Russian language inciting Russian refugees to join the ranks of the German army by fighting the Soviets are distributed by worshippers who frequent the Russian Church at 65 rue Michel-Ange.¹¹⁹

They also discovered the creation of a specific military organization intended to effect the goal of restoration.

Since the entrance of the USSR into the war, the White Russian milieu in the Capital [Paris] has envisioned the formation of voluntary corps destined to be paratroopers in the fight against the Soviets. To this effect, the Committee of Russian émigrés, directed by M. Modrach, proceeds to enlist these volunteers. Several White Russians have already expressed their desire to enrol in these corps.¹²⁰

With consternation, and perhaps resignation that one could not expect anything better of the unreliable "métics," the Paris police watched helplessly as the Russian emigration, fully sanctioned by the occupying government, began to form itself into military units to aid the Nazi invasion of Russia.

The French Police were not the only ones who watched these events with dismay. The religious philosophers had worked for twenty years to combat the concept of restoration, and even more its actualization by the means of outward intervention, insisting

¹¹⁹ "Affaires diverse concernant la Russie, 1936," 25 June 1941, Préfecture de Police, Paris V, Carton 1706, 7023c.

¹²⁰ "Affaires diverse concernant la Russie, 1936," 25 June 1941, Préfecture de Police, Paris V, Carton 1706, 7023c.

that Russia could only be liberated from within. It was due to this perception that they had engaged the youth of the emigration in more positive, creative endeavors in order that they might find beneficial outlets for their frustration, and not be seduced by demagoguery or false hopes. Now, silenced by Nazi censorship, fragmented, and reduced in numbers, they could only observe the success, or lack thereof, of all their work.

Many members of the RSCM, of *Action Orthodoxe*, and many who taught and studied at St. Sergius were able to resist the almost unbearable temptation of joining the mission to "rescue Russia." Others, however, even among the RSCM whom the religious philosophers had counted among their own numbers, saw an undeniable opportunity in the Nazi attack, and they chose now to refute the seemingly hopelessly idealistic pursuit of a religious renaissance. Thus, both youth and adult joined the staunch supporters of the "White" movement who had never been swayed by Berdyaev and his colleagues, and who had fought against the religious renaissance every step of the way. These true Russian émigré collaborators - who had held one allegiance and then forsook it for another at the opportune moment - were turned not by the paganist rhetoric of the Nazi ideology, but by the blunt, fundamental religious appeal from fellow Orthodox émigrés:

Message addressed to Young Russians and also to all Russians...Orthodox Christians prepare all against the Empire of the Red Anti-Christ . Do not listen to the propositions which are made to you about peace with them, these propositions have become more than unimportant because it is not possible to have Peace between Christ and Satan as has been commanded by God; I authorize you, all you the believers, to treat the ideas which you have been given as the joke of an imposter, in order that Christians can not be subjugated to Satan. By the will of God, I bless all souls who will rise against the Red Satanic authority, and I pardon the sins of all who take part in the formations which engage individually for fighting, and in fact will give their lives for the cause of Russian Christianity. Go without fear you who combat the Anti-Christ, as the Saint said: "do not fear that which kills the body, the soul will not be killed. Joy of

Heaven waits for those who die, while only the terrestrial joy awaits those who stay in the world.¹²¹

This message, preached by Metropolitan Anthony on April 20, 1920 was resurrected in 1941 to persuade the undecided and those of weakening resolve.

The religious philosophers had been able to foster hope for an internal transformation in Russia throughout the inter-war years as every hope for foreign intervention was dashed, and nation after nation moved to recognize the Bolshevik regime. However, in 1941 when the massive German Wehrmacht rode inexorably towards Moscow, it became the symbolic herald of a new dynamism in the aggressive, militaristic émigré milieu. Now it was not the White message that appeared to be anachronistic, futile, and lacking in energy; rather it was the proponents of the mythical *sobornost'*, "A New Middle Ages", and the spiritual "Order of the Intelligentsia" who seemed hopelessly out-of-touch with reality.

On June 30, 1941, the Paris police received confirmation that the White Russian émigrés had committed themselves to a firm alliance with the Nazis. With those who directly called themselves "Russian Fascists" numbering some 35,000,¹²² further supported by the Karlovci Synod's youth groups in Central Europe and France, the remnants of the White Army, and the now pro-Nazi engineers, the forces to liberate Russia from its Communist "conquerors" proudly declared their intentions:

With the first news of the start of hostilities between the Great National-Socialist Germany and the Judeo-Marxist and Masonic tyrants, our group has decided.

In the name of all Russian fascists and of volunteer Youth domiciled in France, we have presented ourselves to the competent authorities of the Great

¹²¹ Speech by Metropolitan Antony given 20 April 1920 resurrected in 1941. "Affaires diverse concernent la Russie, 1936," 30 June 1941, Préfecture de Police, Paris V, Carton 1706, 7023c.

¹²² "Affaires diverse concernent la Russie, 1936," 30 June 1941, Préfecture de Police, Paris V, Carton 1706, 7023c.

Germany in Paris in order to declare to them that we are ready to take arms finally in participating in the fight against the common enemy which is the Judeo-Bolshevism.

Knowing that all hope rests in the grace of God, we must appeal to all for whom the Country is Dear, from the group that the united have formed in Paris under the name of l'UNION FASCISTE RUSSE and from the patriotic organization LE JEUNE VOLONTAIRE to raise the flag of the three colours [the White Russian flag].

That God aids us! We defend the Orthodox religion and will not die without honour to our Russian land.

Heil Hitler

Vive le Duce

Vive le Mikado

Vive Rodzaievsky

Gloire à la Russie¹²³

Such manifesto appeals were soon followed by concrete action as émigrés flocked to a special camp set up in Calais to train as volunteers for battle in the USSR against the hated Communists.¹²⁴

The apex of the émigré movement for their restoration to Russia through the aid of the Nazi forces came on November 22, 1941. That night some 100,000 émigrés - including at least one French police informant - congregated in the Salle Rochefoucault to hear a speech from Georges Grebkoff, stipulative chief of the Russian emigration in France in the eyes of the Occupation government.¹²⁵ Grebkoff, ironically one of the former leaders of the Ligue mutual antidefaitistie Russe en France, had just been nominated Governor General of liberated Kiev, now held by the Wehrmacht. For his

¹²³ Colonel V. A. Bogouslavsky and Soldat A. B. Grigorovitch-Bursky, "Adresse à tous les saints de la Russie," 24 June 1941, Préfecture de Police, Paris V, Carton 1706, 7023.c.

¹²⁴ "Affaires diverse concernant la Russie, 1936," 23 September 1941, Préfecture de Police, Paris V, Carton 1706, 7023c.

¹²⁵ This document is a transcript from the meeting and contains the central speech. "Affaires diverse concernant la Russie, 1936," 22 November 1941, Préfecture de Police, Paris V, Carton 1706, 7023c.

audience that night, it seemed as though their dreams of a restored Russia were finally within their grasp.

In lengthy discourse, Grebkoff identified the "true" enemy of the Russian emigration:

Only the English and the Bolsheviks are not happy with my work: and they view with displeasure the existence of our committee!

Only the Bolsheviks and the English and their allies the Jews, were interested in creating discord among the Russian emigration in order to make the German authorities believe that the Russians abroad are not capable of avoiding calumny and vain oaths.

Despite this paltry opposition, he maintained that he would remain director of the "Office of Russian Émigrés in France" just until the "new order" (Russia under White leadership) was firmly established. He then outlined, for this audience from the emigration in France, the exact dimensions of the nascent leadership which was preparing to be the restoration government of Russia:

The Baron Michael Alexander TAUBE, senator, former minister of public instruction under the tsarist regime and member of the "Curatorium of the Hague, Professor of the Faculty of St. Petersburg", he is until this day Professor of the University of Ministers in Germany. His name is known among all civilized names. The Baron Taube has willingly seconded me in my work. He is named by the German authorities as "Sachverständiger für russisch Fragen" that is "expert for Russian questions". The second savant of our emigration is the general Nicolai Golovin, who takes an equal part in our committee. He has willingly accepted the title of President of the council associated with "the Office of the Russian Emigration in France". He is also chief of the Russian military organizations in France.

In addition to these two formidable personalities from among the emigration, Grebkoff applauded the work of Vladimir Modrach in helping to establish the committee in France for the restoration to Russia, and for his successful recruitment of volunteers and supporters from the emigration therein.

After a great deal of self-congratulation about the good works already promulgated by his organization for Russian émigrés, Grebkoff felt it necessary to issue a strong

warning against the propaganda from London and Moscow, and especially a condemnation of the Orthodox Christians who were preaching about patriotism to the USSR. The fact that, at this intensely celebratory meeting, the leader of the pro-Nazi émigrés even deigned to mention these "traitors", was indicative of a certain influence which they were still able to wield. It was particularly revealing that he directly condemned the Manifesto of July 25, 1941, and devoted a third of his speech to revealing the franco-masonic and Jewish links to the Orthodox "patriots" of Soviet Russia.

The milieu of our emigration were often directed by the men who were allied with the franco-masons of the Jew world, and in the counter-espionage service of countries hostile to Germany! A great part of our youth has been voluntarily or involuntarily drawn into the ranks of the enemies to Germany, even during the first period of the war. It is certain that Germany hesitates to serve these men. The government of the Reich sees in the Russian emigration an amorphous mass, they do not distinguish between this organization or not, nor between different doctrines. One can no longer count on anyone, and one does not know whom they are really talking to. Yes Gentlemen! Here is the Russian tragedy. One cannot count on anyone.

Thus, the White Russians and Russian Fascists were less worried about the possible appeal the Orthodox "Defensists" might have for young Russian émigrés, than about the spectre of untrustworthiness that such manifestos produced for their Nazi allies.

Grebkoff concluded his attack with a citation of the usual list of horrors committed by the Bolsheviks, summed up by their murder of the Tsar and his family as final proof of the "Defensists" misguided treachery. Pinpointing the *Post-Revolutionaries* and indirectly, Berdyaev, he questioned their hopes for spiritual change within Russia:

I address myself to those Russians and I say to them that here, for twenty-three years, the émigrés have waited abroad for this evolution or for this national revolution. For twenty-three years, these Russians have implored God finally to see justice done by what means? By the country. During all these years, the Russians in celebration of their holidays, have raised their glass and drank for Russia. They have said "We are here on foreign soil, but we keep vigil. We are ready at any moment to respond to the appeal of our brothers to throw off the Soviet regime"! Unfortunately, it has not been perceived that this vigilant sentimentality and that our feeble view of these cups of champagne have served

as opium along with the banal phrases which accompany the hope that the icon responds at this moment.

Proclaiming the feeble utopianism of these hopes, Grebkoff called for an acceptance of reality. He asserted that the Judeo-Communists had been systematically eradicating the entire population of Russia for the past twenty-four years in a diabolical plot to destroy their homeland. No amount of waiting for change would help their brothers in Russia; they were unable, with their leaders dead or in exile, to effect such a transformation. "Yes" Grebkoff implored, "I am convinced that if the German army had not attacked the Soviets on June 22, the Russian people would cease to exist."

In a final convincing onslaught against the horrible deprivations suffered by the people of Russia at the hands of the Communists, Grebkoff commanded the audience to choose a side. They must once and for all commit themselves to the salvation of the Nazi invasion and restoration of their homeland, or accept the spectre of Communist Russia transported to all free lands in Europe. There could be no more waiting, no more futile discussion, and above all no more indecision.

We live in an epoch where an hesitation of neutrality is criminal. The Russian emigration must decide what she will do. She will choose between the muzzle of the Jews and the Red Star on one side, and the German reliability on the other, which carries this device to his belt - "God is with us".¹²⁶

Only their acceptance now, of their responsibility for the reconstruction of liberated Russia and of their loyalty to Hitler, could save the people of Russia from death in the concentration camps of the Gulag or from starvation.

This plea to the few remaining moderates was made convincing by the immaculate, previously neutral, record of Grebkoff as a leader of charitable initiatives

¹²⁶ "Affaires diverse concernant la Russie, 1936," 22 November 1941, Préfecture de Police, Paris V, Carton 1706, 7023c. 1-15.

among the emigration. His condemnation of the Bolshevik government and Soviet system was accurate, judicious, and extremely persuasive. As he claimed, the Nazis had made no stated intention of permanently occupying all of Russia, and had, in fact, made promises to certain Russian Fascists that they would allow them to take over the reins of Russia's reconstruction. The Russian Orthodox perception that Jews were both evil, and instrumental in the Communist takeover of Russia made Hitler's policies towards that group understandable and perfectly acceptable to the White Russians. The coincidence of the émigrés' peaking frustration over Western inaction towards Communism with the startling success of the initial Nazi invasion culminated here in an embrace of National Socialist aims. Grebkoff did not arise from any vacuum; he simply voiced the viewpoint of a large preponderance of the diaspora.

The conclusion of the White Russian émigré aspirations are known today only in their finality; perhaps in years with the full disclosure of war-time archives it will be possible to trace each émigré's activities, and produce a complete picture of the era. As yet, we remain with the knowledge of the Nazi retrenchments in 1942/1943, their critical defeat at Stalingrad, and their ultimate failure in the East in 1944. As the Soviet forces swept over Eastern Europe for Berlin to meet the American and British liberators of France and Western Europe, those émigrés fighting for the Third Reich were demolished, and those who survived were transported to the Gulag and death. In France, the Russian collaborators, for there can now be no doubt about their open allegiance with the Nazi regime, were most likely uncovered and executed either officially or arbitrarily with their French counterparts.

Seen from the Russian émigré perspective, the process of collaboration assumes its most basic of forms. Those who worked directly to aid Nazi Germany did so because

they wanted something that they believed the Germans could provide: the Karlovci Synod aligned itself with Hitler in return for supremacy over Russian Orthodoxy; the Russian Fascists and others who fought with the Wehrmacht in Russia were still fighting the old Civil War on the part of the Whites. They had never changed their aspirations or intentions. They had always desired to reconquer Russia and dispose of the Bolsheviks no matter who their allies were or what means had to be used.

Moreover, White and Monarchist elements had embraced theories that the Nazis would later come to hold dear long before Hitler even emerged from Austria: Jews were the enemies of all Christians, engaged in a diabolical plot with Freemasons to destroy the world and enslave its people. Let us not forget that one of the foundations of Nazi anti-semitism - the "Protocols of the Elders of Zion" - had been written by a Russian Orthodox monk, and given to Hitler by Alfred Rosenberg, a Baltic-Russian émigré. Collaboration on the part of these Russian émigrés would be nothing more than an expected seizure of what must have seemed to them a divinely-guided opportunity. Therefore, the connotation of treachery and a sudden reversal of loyalty inherent in the modern use of the word "collaboration" cannot apply to these Russian émigrés: they had always espoused the Nazi ideology (it might be better to say that Nazism germanized White Russian ideology); they simply lacked the chance to actualize it until World War Two.

It was a somewhat different situation for liberal, moderate socialist, and Christian renaissance adherents among the emigration who, like Grebkoff, came to join the Nazi cause. They did indeed experience the complete reversal of former allegiance. In their case, the motivation might be explained as greed, frustration, fear, or simply the opportunistic belief that Nazi Germany could finally return them to a restored Russia. Individually, few would have embraced Nazi methods in any other conditions and fewer

still agreed with all the elements of White Russian and Nazi ideology. Despite their treachery, and in some cases their heinous crimes, they were most guilty of choosing a side which would cause them to sacrifice their morality, their beliefs and, above all their honour. In this sense, those who died as Resistance heroes were much luckier than these collaborators; they may have suffered, but they did not lose their integrity, and perhaps, their souls.

6. Dispersal and Decline

The end of World War Two brought about massive celebrations in all the victor countries. It also saw the slow liberation, rehabilitation and, where possible, reunification of families so torn and destroyed by Nazi and Japanese depredations. In France, a swift accounting was taking place both officially and privately: collaborators were imprisoned or executed. For most people, the cessation of hostilities meant that they could return to their loved ones, and get on with their lives. The prevailing mood, therefore encompassed relief, sometimes anger and revenge, but above all a desire and intent to return to normalcy.

The Russian religious philosophers in emigration were by no means immune to the overall sense of relief. Although scarred by their experiences, and especially by the tragic deaths of their friends at the hands of the Nazis, they steadfastly prepared to resume their pre-war activities. However, the world was quite different now, and the increasingly-aged diaspora no longer found a congenial atmosphere for their ideas in the transformed West. This change did not come just from the Nazi-Communist polarization of the war years, nor from the disillusionments and betrayal induced by acts and suspicion of collaboration. Rather the atrocities of the war years had far-reaching effects which were to undermine the quest for spiritual rebirth.

Prior to the war, the religious philosophers and their French colleagues, especially the Personalists, had believed that the dynamism and spirit of *engagement*, if harnessed, would lead to a new era of spiritual brotherhood: A "New Middle Ages" in the terminology of Berdyaev. They had feared and fought against the extremism of the collectivist ideologies, especially Communism and Fascism, because they rightly foresaw that they

could lead to a perversion of these forces and inaugurate, instead, a new "Dark Ages". World War Two, in all its horrible dimensions, verified their prophecy. The war had demonstrated just how dangerous the spirit of *engagement* could be if fully unleashed and transformed into mass movements instead of personal transformations. In this, the war may be characterized as an era of betrayal which undermined human confidence in mankind.

At the end of the war, the proponents of a "third way" who had endeavoured to maintain their originality and neutrality had every reason to expect that their approach would enjoy a tremendous increase in popularity. After all, had they not accurately diagnosed the current malaise of mankind and then been, tragically, proven correct? In the context of the "third way", the expected lesson for the world was that any abnegation of personal responsibility which was a necessary precursor to the pursuance of an ideology, or any other mass movement, was a violation not only of God, but of humanity. In what could be perceived as a "watershed" moment, they hoped that the world would now refuse all ideologies, and begin the slow, but promising evolution towards true spiritual development and the creation of a brotherhood of mankind.

Some of the religious-philosophical émigrés even saw signs of a transformation within their former homeland. The wartime relaxation of Communist repressions seemed to have opened a crack in the Party's almost impenetrable materialist shield which, if encouraged, might cause substantial changes for personal freedom in that country.¹ They perceived that the forced interaction between the West and Soviet Russia, brought about by their war-time allegiance, had created a connection which, if allowed to flourish, might prevent the government in Russia from continuing its ruthless attacks against its

¹ Helene Iswolsky, Soul of Russia (London: Sheed & Ward, 1944).

own people; it might cause the Communists to transform their approach.² They saw the Soviet POWs as a valuable means for transporting these new (and old), ideas back into Russia where they might promote popular demands for freedom in all aspects of life. Finally, some even thought that they might be allowed to return in order to lead this change.

These tentative aspirations were quickly extinguished. The post-war world refused to shun monist ideologies. These had begun the fighting and, because there were two, irreconcilable ideologies governing the winners - "Communism and Democracy" - it would not be long before the war continued albeit with different weapons and manifesting quite a different character. From the perspective of the "third way" the immediate euphoria at the end of the war had caused them to mistake a brief ceasefire for a possible end to hostilities. Hence, in the resulting "cold war" when religious-philosophy could have been able to illuminate the deep-seated falsifications of the entire issue, it was shunted to the sidelines and condemned to obscurity.

Rather than condemn ideologies, mankind's loss of confidence was so deeply rooted that it turned instead against humanist ideals. For centuries philosophers had struggled to explain the paradox of humanity - that we are both divine and animal, spiritual and material - and the conflicts into which these irreconcilable aspects continually drove us. Ascetics had shunned the material in search of perfecting their spiritual selves, and, as a result, had abandoned humanity; materialists denied the existence of the spirit. Most creations, however, were sparked and driven by the inspiration of the spirit then

² Nicolas Berdyaev, "Soviet Russia in World War II, Part I," The Living Church 5 March 1940: 1-2. See Paul B. Anderson Papers, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Box 5.

rendered, albeit humanly imperfect, through matter, and their greatness was judged by how well they honoured both of our paradoxical characteristics.

World War Two, however, destroyed humanity's sense of permanence, and the conception of purpose was overturned. In so doing, it broke the polarized balance between spiritual and material in human understandings of their own being. Beyond the necessary purgative of blame levied against individuals, governments, concepts and institutions which had participated in the atrocities was a deeper malaise. Culpability gradually became attached not only to the propagators, but to the neutral: to anything - any person, idea, belief, society - which did not stop these terrible events from happening. God, or at least human efforts to know and to reach God, were deemed fruitless, self-indulgent, and at worst dangerous in the light of this cataclysm which God, or the divine in humans, did not prevent. This century has been called the "Age of Relativity."³ Since the Second World War, it might also be called the age of impermanence. Only the negation of the spiritual essence in man could make every value and meaning "relative" to material surroundings and, so-founded, everything ceased to have any infinite or "permanent" character. Live for the here and now. Put faith only in that which we can see and touch, which gives us immediate gratification or fulfils an immediate need. Live only for the material. Religious-philosophy could not prosper in such an age. Its perennial worldview, preoccupation with spiritual development, and aspirations for *Godmanhood* had no resonance among people seeking only normality, safety, and, in some cases, revenge. Even its language, its words of "love," "brotherhood," "unity," "divine," "organic

³ Paul Johnson, A History of the Modern World, From 1918 to the 1980s (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1983).

community," were completely foreign to the prevailing drive for practical, scientific, and material goals.

Aside from the new hegemony of materialism, religious-philosophy was also suffering an internal haemorrhage. Collaboration, resistance, occupation, the "Final Solution," and the sheer preoccupation with survival had sapped the vital energy which had fuelled the search for spiritual alternatives; they had also engendered a spirit of mistrust and suspicion making any wide-spread collective effort impossible. Religions had been tainted by individual and institutional acts condoning, and in some cases, actively assisting Nazism. The private organizations which had so generously funded the cause of religious-philosophy could and would no longer continue their involvement. Most of all, the leaders who had propelled the religious renaissance were of a generation which had achieved advanced age before the war: during and shortly after, most of them succumbed; the most committed of the young who had been groomed as their successors had fallen in the cataclysm.

Secularization

The enormous public demands of the Second World War had sharply polarized religious and secular bodies. Whereas, in the interwar years, an institution or movement could easily declare itself to be concerned with both spirituality and material betterment, it now had to choose a side. This change greatly affected the YMCA and, as a consequence, the Russian emigration. Prior to the war the YMCA had been the single-most important sponsor of the emigration: through the Press, the RSCM, the Religious-Philosophical Academy, Put', Novyi grad, and its financial support for St. Sergius, it had encouraged the émigrés to venture out of their closed communities into *engagement* with

Western society. The Russian division had helped young Russians obtain an education and/or employment. The inspiration of Mott, Colton, Lowrie, Anderson and countless other secretaries had acted as a bulwark against despair and, above all, isolation. After the war, however, the YMCA became increasingly secular, and consciously fostered its athletic and educational programmes at the expense of those encouraging morale and spiritual betterment. In the process, they gradually abandoned their involvement with the emigration, and left them to rely almost entirely upon their own community in order to maintain their institutions and preserve their culture.

Part of the decline and separation may be attributed to the massive insurgence of State-type intervention. First, the United Nations with its many subsidiary bodies (most importantly, UNESCO, WHO, and the Security Council), gradually supplanted private and charitable organizations in their work.⁴ As the institution represented every nation, it could not declare a particular cultural or religious basis; it had to be strictly neutral and secular. The government of the United States augmented this process with programmes such as the Peace Corps and the Marshall Plan. Again, because these were State initiatives, they had to be strictly secular.

Even internally, most Western governments soon took over the role provided by private organizations as they completed the evolution of State intervention required by the War Effort. In the United States, the National Science Foundation and other government bodies replaced the Carnegie, Ford and Rockefeller Foundations as the main subsidizer of research, and the development of new ideas. In Canada, first the Canada Council (a Crown Corporation) and then direct Federal Government bodies - NSERC, MRC, SSHRC -

⁴ An example of this change was the way in which the United Nations took over much of the responsibility for morale and conditions in POW camps that had previously been the bailiwick of the YMCA.

took control.⁵ This process was repeated in France, Great Britain, Germany, and so forth. State involvement vastly increased revenues, and provided a more objective process by which recipients might be chosen (ending much discrimination on the basis of religion or race). The result was an amazing increase in the number of professional scholars each seeking to expand knowledge in their own particular field. The incredible advancement of technology in the last fifty years must, in part, be attributed to this transformation.

However, there were detriments to State-sponsored pursuit of knowledge. Science was valued over the Humanities and the Arts causing a scientification of study: political science, sovietology, behavioral psychology, sociology, and other applied sciences became dominant while those studying non-quantifiable, non-objective humanist concerns were largely relegated to the fringes. If the government was going to provide the money, it also demanded that the results have some relevance to its current concerns: Study could no longer be pursued out of simply curiosity or belief, it had to legitimize its practical purpose. Individual or collective initiatives which did not adhere to the State's definition of what was practical were essentially ignored. Finally, State control began to cause the emulation of State morals.

The State was secular and represented every person in the country equally (at least in the ideal). If a private organization proclaimed itself to be interested in only one religion, in one culture, in one way of thinking it could not receive State funds. Initially ignored, such bodies were gradually perceived as entrenched establishments of White, Christian, and Male supremacy. It was no longer enough that they existed without State assistance, they had to be changed, forced to include everyone (even in their leadership),

⁵ Donald Fisher, The Social Sciences in Canada (Waterloo, Ont.: Wilfred Laurier UP, 1991).

or forced to close: The YMCA for example had to allow non-Christians to sit upon its governing bodies (it had always allowed people of any race, religion, or belief to participate), and had to allow women entry (although they did have the YWCA for women and today men are still not allowed to enter that organization). Gradually, and quite arbitrarily, the concept of a private body for people of like concerns was entirely eroded as "political correctness" gained hegemony over the public consciousness.

This is explained not to deny that racial, religious, and sexist abuses had been, and continue to be, propagated, but rather to demonstrate how uncongenial the atmosphere would be to the advancement of religious-philosophical thought.⁶ It was not scientific, and frequently warned of the dangers of scientific exploration unrestrained by ethics, morals, or other human and spiritual concerns. It was not "practical": not because it did not address the most serious and vital problems of human beings, but because it did not work at the particular level nor within the existing framework. Finally, while most religious-philosophical thinkers described herein tried to foster maximum inclusiveness, Christianity was now perceived increasingly as rigid, controlling, and non-accepting by most proponents of political correctness; those who do not deem it be specifically threatening to minority rights, at best regard it as irrelevant and non-supporting of their agenda.

The YMCA Russian division was a casualty of this transformation. During World War Two, the YMCA's gradual disassociation from work among the Russian émigrés and religious initiatives in general, left Paul Anderson and Donald Lowrie to pursue such work

⁶ Regarding particularly Russian studies, this observation has been supported in an article by Paul J. Friedrich, "Some Recent Works on Communism and Christianity," Slavic Review 22.2 (1963): 321-328. He states: "Christianity has generally ceased to be a relevant factor in the life of Western societies. Everywhere, most notably among intellectuals, God is no longer a matter of great concern" (321).

on their own. The war years were incredibly busy ones for Anderson, and were marked by new connections and endeavors increasingly divorced from the YMCA. In 1944, he was assigned to the UNRRA in Germany to assist with relocation and aid among the POW camps there.⁷ He also published his first monograph that year, People, Church and State in Modern Russia.⁸ After the war he continued his writing, and began the formidable task of organizing an archive of all the papers from his work with the Russian Division. He was pushed to do this by a request that he write the testimonial for Dr. John Mott who became a recipient of the Nobel Peace Prize in 1946. Mott had now retired from the WCSF along with Ethan T. Colton from the YMCA main office.⁹

The loss of their once great leaders, Mott, Colton, and Anderson heralded the end for YMCA Russian work, and indeed for their involvement in Christian renewal. Anderson resigned as active director of the YMCA Press in 1946 leaving the position to Donald Lowrie who had served so courageously in France during the occupation. Lowrie would stay, however, only until 1955 when he turned the organization over to Jean (Ivan) Morozov, a Russian émigré from the RSCM.

In their view, this was part of the process of natural maturity and acquired autonomous responsibility: The YMCA had never intended to remain the perpetual caretaker of the Russian emigration. Yet, earlier YMCA policy would have demanded a gradual evolution to autonomy for the RSCM with the maintenance of close ties to other Associations. These would have been fostered by meetings, dissemination of literature,

⁷ Anderson, No East or West 85.

⁸ Paul B. Anderson, People, Church and State in Modern Russia (London: Student Christian Movement Press, 1944).

⁹ Ethan T. Colton's Forty Years With the Russians appropriately ends in 1939.

and exchanges organized in a co-centric series of connections of diminishing intensity: the closest involvements would be among the RSCM and other YMCAs in Europe; a more distant interaction would occur between these groups and those operating in North America; finally, each group from Associations throughout the world would send representatives to yearly conferences of the WSCF. This did not occur. With the retirement of Mott, the World Federation lost most of its impetus. European and North American Associations split into secular (the majority of which provide gyms, courses, and hostels), and spiritual.¹⁰ The two branches, soon ceased to have any communication with each other beyond the meagre relationship of sharing the same name. The émigré RSCM became even more isolated. Not only was it a spiritual or "thinking" association, but also it did not bear the official YMCA name. Thus, in time, it became lost to the whole organization and forgotten.

The fate of the YMCA Press was even more disturbing. Here it appears that both the Central YMCA and the Russian émigrés pushed for total dissociation. The Central YMCA's financial restrictions encouraged it to divest itself of any unnecessary expenditure. There had always had been members in the leadership who opposed the Press as a risky and untraditional involvement,¹¹ and no longer was the will to promote religious/spiritual literature dominant. On the side of the émigrés, their old, ineradicable instinct towards isolation re-emerged after the war. In the leadership of the RSCM were now people who espoused what Berdyaev would call "conservative, reactionary, and obscurantist

¹⁰ One American whom I interviewed called these "thinking" Ys which continued to foster Christian values and morals as a curative to dissipation, but they continued to decrease into the barest minority. Chief archivist Maynard Brichford, personal interview, June 1994, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

¹¹ See Chapter 3. This was extremely evident on concerns expressed about the Put' initiative.

tendencies,"¹² and they began to prevail while Donald Lowrie headed the Press. At the time of his resignation, which was fraught with accounting problems and a general chaos in the institution, the RSCM leadership pressured the YMCA to sell the Press to them.¹³ With undo haste and little consideration, the Central office agreed, thus ending its control over publishing decisions.¹⁴

Without the American involvement, the now Russian-owned Press reverted to the tendency of isolationism, largely ceasing its engagement in oecumenism, in teaching Russians of other national and Christian perspectives, and devoted itself to émigré writings and dissident literature from the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe. Despite its major coup in publishing Solzhenitsyn's Gulag Archipelago in 1964 for publication, its production and sales continually declined. In 1994, its current director, Nikita Struve, confided his belief that the YMCA Press might soon cease to exist.¹⁵ The Press began to work exclusively with the RSCM, St. Sergius, and other Russian Orthodox seminaries in the emigration and, aside from the dissident literature which seems to have provided

¹² This process had begun just before and during the course of World War Two. Berdyaev, himself, had warned about the trend and had dissociated himself from the RSCM in 1938. Activities of certain members of the leadership during the Occupation of France were extremely isolationist and even dubious. See Chapter 6. The original leadership was also now dispersed: Berdyaev cut himself off from the RSCM long before his death in 1948; Bulgakov died in 1944; Zenkovsky - the leader of the RSCM - was forcibly removed by the Nazis during the war and after, he emigrated to the United States. Zernov, who seemed to be the most likely candidate from the younger generation to take over the leadership and maintain its commitment to *engagement* and religious-philosophy, emigrated to England during the war and did not return.

¹³ Paul B. Anderson, "A Brief History of the YMCA Press," 1971, Paul B. Anderson Papers, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Box 4: 17.

¹⁴ Paul B. Anderson, however, did remain an advisor for the Press throughout his life, albeit as a private individual. Anderson, "A Brief History of YMCA Press" 12.

¹⁵ Nikita Struve, personal interview, November 1994. This seemed to be a hasty and overly pessimistic view on the part of Struve. Due to the new revival of émigré writings in the former USSR, the YMCA Press has never enjoyed such prosperity. It has just begun a joint Russian-French publishing endeavour, and now issues manuscripts out of Moscow as well as Paris.

its main source of revenue, the new works it published were mostly reserved to the subject of the Russian Orthodox religion.

All that remains of the massive inter-war YMCA work among Russians today is the residual name YMCA/IMKA Press on the masthead of publications issued out of Les Éditeurs Réunis on rue de la Montaigne St. Geneviève in Paris. The descendants of the first Russian diaspora do not openly acknowledge their ancestors' close connection with the American organization. The YMCA also lost a precious element when they ended their work with the Russian emigration; namely, its unifying purpose of promoting world Christianity. The YMCA today does not acknowledge that a Russian-language publishing house in Paris still uses its name.¹⁶ Such a bleak finale is mitigated as this story proceeds. Although the intense East-West *engagement* of the inter-war years ended, the YMCA Press still pursued the original cause of the expelled religious philosophers. The *Post-Revolutionary* movement to promote change in their homeland.

After 1950, therefore, the movement for world unity was largely divided into that controlled by secular economic¹⁷ and political¹⁸ bodies, and Christian/religious unity

¹⁶ Secretary of the Central YMCA repository, telephone interview, Chicago, October 1994.

¹⁷ For histories of the European Economic Community see Derek W. Urwin, The Community of Europe: A History of European Integration since 1945 (London; New York: Longman, 1991); Commission of the European Communities, Étapes européennes: Chronologie de la communauté européenne, 6e ed. (Luxembourg: Office des publications officielles des communautés européennes, 1987); Allen M. William, The European Community: The Contradictions of Integration (Oxford, UK; Cambridge, MA: B.Blackwell, 1991); Alan S. Milward, The European Rescue of the Nation-State (London: Routledge, 1994); Max Jansen, History of European Integration, 1945-1975 (Amsterdam: Europa Instituut, University of Amsterdam, 1975); Steps to European Unity: Community Progress to Date: A Chronology, 6e ed (Luxembourg: Office des publications officielles des communautés européennes, 1987); The European Community at the Crossroads: The First 25 Years (Kingston, Ont.: Centre for International Relations, Queen's University, c1983); Sources for the History of European Integration (1945-1955): A Guide to Archives in the Countries of the Community = sources de l'histoire de l'intégration européen, (1945-1955): guide des archives conservées dans les pays et la communauté (Leyden: Sijthoff, 1980).

fostered by newly-established church bodies.¹⁹ The latter, which for the émigrés would involve St. Sergius, the RSCM, the St. Sergius-St. Albans Society, and the World Council of Churches, seemed to retreat from worldly concerns to focus upon solely religious and theological matters.²⁰ A division had been created, therefore, between secular and religious considerations leaving little role for laymen who might wish to combine both of these.

The change was evinced in the fates of many of the prominent religious philosophers after the war. Nikolai Lossky, the intuitivist philosopher, no longer found secular institutions willing to sponsor his intellectual pursuits. He retreated into the confines of the Russian Orthodox Church where he would at least be able to continue writing about and teaching his ideas. St. Sergius had inspired another theological institute, St Vladimir, to open its doors in New York State in 1938.²¹ It was here, that

¹⁸ For histories of the United Nations see Philippe Drakidis, The Atlantic and United Nations charters: Common Law Prevailing for World Peace and Security (Besançon: Centre de recherche et d'information politique et sociale, 1995); Thomas Hovet, A Chronology and Fact Book of the United Nations, 1941-1985, 7th ed. (Dobbs Ferry, New York: Oceana Publications, 1986); Max Harrelson, Fires All Around the Horizon: The U.N.'s Uphill Battle to Preserve the Peace (New York: Praeger, 1989); Evan Luard, A History of the United Nations (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1982); Clark M. Eichelberger, United Nations: The First 25 Years (New York: Harper & Row, 1970); Lalita Prasad Singh, United Nations and the Birth of States (New Delhi: Gitanjali Publishers, 1986).

¹⁹ Organizations such as the World Council of Churches (founded in 1939) and the Roman Catholic Church at Vatican II (throughout the 1950s and 1960s) became the new centres for oecumenism.

²⁰ Loss of confidence may have been a factor in this apparent retreat: The World Council of Churches, especially, felt shame at its hesitancy to outrightly condemn the Nazis at the beginning of the War. See Willem Adolph Visser't Hooft, Le mouvement oecuménique et la question radical (Paris: UNESCO, 1954). In the case of St. Sergius, the great leaders of religious engagement in every day life - Sergei Bulgakov, Karsavin, and Metropolitan Eulogius - had died during or shortly after the War. Moreover, the Theological Institute had suffered such deprivations that a necessary re-building was required.

²¹ It moved to Crestwood New York in 1962 because of an expanding student body. Sophie Koulomzin, Many Worlds: A Russian Life (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1980) 294.

Lossky decided to expend the remainder of his energies; he became a professor in philosophy at St. Vladimir's in 1946 where he produced the comprehensive History of Russian Philosophy.

Lossky was followed in this decision by Berdyaev's close colleague and the expert in Russian Orthodox Church History, Georges Florovsky. He, too, gravitated to St. Vladimir's after an active, international life teaching and engaging in oecumenical initiatives throughout Europe. Until 1948, Florovsky tried to encourage greater Orthodox participation in the World Council of Churches, and he was a leading figure in the constitutive Assembly of the World Council of Churches in Amsterdam that year. After the Assembly, however, he decided to move his family to the United States, and took up a position in Dogmatic Theology and Patristics at St. Vladimir's seminary. Hoping that the mood in America would be more conducive to his oecumenical endeavors, Florovsky embarked upon an intensive lecture circuit through universities, church bodies, and especially in *Metropolia*; a grouping of 15 disputed autocephalous Russian Orthodox Greek Catholic Churches under control of the Ecumenical Patriarch of Constantinople.²² However, his popularity soon became a curse when, in 1955, he was dismissed summarily by the Holy Synod of *Metropolia*, and forced to leave his position at St. Vladimir. He spent one year as associate professor at the Holy Cross Orthodox Theological School in Brookline, Massachusetts, then, in 1957, was appointed professor of Eastern Church history at Harvard.²³ His association with the Russian Research Centre at Harvard ended in 1964 in favour of a position as visiting professor at Princeton.

²² This had resulted from the split led by Metropolitan Eulogius in 1931 due to Soviet-engineered pressure from the Russian Patriarchate. See Chapter 4.

²³ See Paul B. Anderson, "Georges Vasilievich Florovsky, : His American Career (1948-1965)," Greek Orthodox Theological Review 11.1 (Summer, 1965) 7-107.

He died there in 1979 at the age of eighty-five still working on the translation of The Ways of Russian Theology.²⁴

The last central figure in the former *Bratstvo sviatogo Sofii* to find a haven within the Church was Vasily Zenkovsky. The erstwhile leader of the RSCM and specialist in pedagogy returned to his position as a professor at St. Sergius after the end of World War Two. There he remained until his death in 1962 teaching philosophy and writing. Like Lossky, he produced a formidable History of Russian Philosophy (1948,1950).²⁵ While Boris Vysheslavitsev and Ivan Ilyin did not choose this path of complete retreat, they did serve out their last days within the religious environment fostered by the World Council of Churches in Geneva. The trend throughout the world to radical division between "in the world" and "in the Church," also affected the youngest émigrés or those who had been born outside of Russia. They either became religious scholars and priests or specialized academics. This is not to say that those who pursued secular fields did not maintain their Orthodox religion, but rather that they did not actively espouse or integrate their beliefs with their work.²⁶ It appears, therefore, that without the ever-present support

²⁴ As a final irony and proof of the YMCA-Press's changed approach, Florovsky was constrained to translate this work himself because the YMCA-Press refused to re-publish it. Anderson had had it published by the Press in 1937, and had intended to disseminate it much more broadly through translations, but then the war intervened. After, the new émigré directors of the Press refused to have anything to do with a reissuance. It was only in the late seventies, that Anderson persuaded Florovsky to re-edit the book for future translation and even a Russian re-publication.

"It is not surprising that The Ways of Russian Theology is not now available in any language, as the author encountered a good deal of criticism on the part of certain other theologians, historians and philosophers in the Paris Russian colony." Paul B. Anderson, testimony to Georges Florovsky (1979), Paul B. Anderson papers, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, box 32.

²⁵ See Bibliography and Nicholas Zernov, The Russian Religious Renaissance of the Twentieth Century (New York: Harper & Bros., 1963), 340-341

²⁶ Short biographies of all such personages (both clerical and secular) can be found in Zernov, The Russian Religious Renaissance 331-391.

of the YMCA, the émigrés found it most convivial to remain within their own isolated circles protected by their Church. They seemed to find the outside world of Western society uncondusive to their own development. Almost no connective initiatives such as the Religious Philosophical Academy, Put', Novyi grad, or the *Oecumenical Circle* were undertaken in the post-war period.

A Changing Mood in France

In France, this transformation may be explained by another factor beside the abnegation of the American YMCA. Many of the émigrés who left that country for England or America did not do so just because of the terrible problems of reconstruction in the aftermath of the war. They also moved because the atmosphere in that country became increasingly uncomfortable both among the Russian émigré and the French intellectual milieu.

Characteristically, the émigré community had been riven by political jealousies and quarrels. These divergences were magnified during World War Two with the polarization toward either Soviet (Communist) or Russian (Nazi) patriotism. However, with the end of the war, the rifts were never given a chance to heal, because the Soviet government suddenly acknowledged their long-ignored countrymen. In a startling shift in policy, all outstanding criminal records of émigrés were cancelled in 1945, and they were encouraged to return to the USSR.²⁷ Thousands who had felt a resurgence of patriotism with the Nazi invasion of Russia, now flocked to Soviet embassies to apply for visas for their return. Countless others in Russia Abroad began to castigate these "traitors" (those

²⁷ Hence the false hopes evoked immediately after the end of the war as mentioned in the introduction to this chapter.

who applied for visas) as Communist spies and fellow-travellers whom they accused of hiding in their midst, undermining their opposition to Communism, and creating dissention among the rightful White movement for a monarchist restoration. Hence, immediately after the community had been torn by rumours and often accurate accusations of Nazi collaboration, it was again fragmented this time by the threat of hidden Communists.

World War II ended with a complete reshuffling of the centers of gravity of the Russian emigration and with often unexpected reversals of loyalties in relation to the Soviet regime in general and the Moscow Patriarchate in particular. It was often the most right-wing, conservative elements, more often with military traditions of emotional patriotism rather than political understanding of the Soviet-marxist system, who were overcome with emotion upon seeing the Soviet victory and who viewed the tsarist uniforms and ranks restored in the Soviet armed forces as "evidence" of a Russian national revival. The appearance of church delegations consisting of real bishops from Russia did the rest of the job. Thousands of Russian émigrés in France, China, Manchuria and elsewhere joined "Societies of Soviet Patriots", took Soviet passports and applied for repatriation. But the Soviets allowed only a small proportion to actually avail themselves of the right to return to the USSR. "Soviet patriots" were more useful as residents in the West, where they could demoralize the émigré community, sow discord in it and effect further church splits by creating and perpetuating parishes and dioceses of the Moscow Patriarchate in addition to those of the Karlovcians, the Evlogians and the Russian Orthodox Church of America and Canada.²⁸

As indicated, the action was most beneficial for the USSR as a tactic in distracting émigré opposition. It also served to undermine Western confidence and trust in Russian émigrés as a whole which might deter their use of the latest wave of Soviet refugees released from German POW camps for providing vital information about the military and government within the USSR. As the forties evolved, moreover, it also became a method to demonstrate the moral supremacy of Communism, and the depravity and hopelessness of Western bourgeois democracy: Each émigré applying for a visa could be used by the

²⁸ Dimitry V. Pospelovsky, The Russian Church Under the Soviet Regime, 1917-1982, Vol. 1 (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1984) 255.

Soviet Government as an example of disaffection with the Western way of life. Therefore, they became another pawn in the burgeoning Cold War.

The thousands who so hastily availed themselves of the opportunity to return home were acting purely out of emotion, having forgotten the crucial lessons of recent and more distant times. The chance was undeniably appealing. Even the religious philosophers who had been expelled in 1922 were allowed to return as Nikolai Berdyaev discovered when he explored the possibility of obtaining a visa himself (an act which confirmed the suspicions of many of his harshest enemies among the émigrés). However, Berdyaev, unlike many of the other supplicants, did not forget the lessons of history. He remembered the opposition he had faced in his last years in Russia. Moreover, he was intimately aware of the experiences faced by other émigrés who had decided to return, prior to World War Two, often in a flash of patriotic fervour. Alexis Tolstoy and Maxim Gorky had been two of the earliest to return in the late 1920s: Tolstoy then ceased his independent creativity and wrote only to the "Party line", gradually disappearing from the artistic world altogether;²⁹ Gorky, after a brief celebration of his homecoming, found his earlier freedom of expression sharply curtailed, and ceased making any criticisms about the regime until his death in 1936.

By far the most tragic and memorable story was that of Marina Tsvetaeva. The eloquent poetess had struggled to make her reputation in the émigré circles in Paris, but had been shunned due to the dubious activities of her husband, Serge Efron. Then, he disappeared, shortly to be followed by her daughter, leaving Tsvetaeva destitute in Paris. When she discovered that they had returned to the USSR - Efron had been recalled by

²⁹ His only major work in Russia was a biography of Peter the Great which made flattering comparisons to Stalin. See Alexey N. Tolstoy, Petr Pervyi (Leningrad: Khudozh. lit., 1971).

his superiors in the NKVD, and Alya had decided to join the Komsomol - she saw no alternative but to follow them. Back in the USSR, she was unable to have her works published and, moreover, could not find her family because they had been deported to the Gulag. She became so depressed she finally committed suicide.³⁰ These incidents, combined with Berdyaev's knowledge about the active repression of other Soviet writers like Anna Akhmatova and Boris Pasternak, caused him to seek further assurance that he would be allowed to continue his work and freely publish his ideas. He decided to demand, as a test, that the Soviet government permit the publication and sale of all of his existing books in the West as a testimony of their good faith.³¹ This request met with continual stonewalling, and Berdyaev eventually abandoned his dreams of meting out his last years on his native soil.

In all likelihood, this was fortunate for the philosopher as his two colleagues who found themselves behind Soviet lines during World War Two suffered quite horrible fates: Lev Karsavin of Put' and Ivan Lagovsky of the RSCM were discovered by Soviet forces in Lithuania and Estonia respectively; both were deported to prison camps in the Gulag; Karsavin died there in 1952, and Lagovsky perished at some unknown date between 1950 and 1954. The several thousand émigrés whom the USSR accepted back between 1945-1948 appear, unfortunately, to have been similarly treated: If they were not deported to

³⁰ This tragedy is mirrored in the fate of Prince Sviatopolk-Mirsky who returned earlier only to be purged. Iswolsky, No Time to Grieve... 200-203.

³¹ Lowrie, Rebellious Prophet 273; Berdyaev, Dream and Reality 308-309.

the Gulag, they were marginalized in remote locations, and generally not allowed to continue their intellectual pursuits.³²

If the émigré milieu was torn by recriminations and suspicion, the French intellectuals had turned positively hostile. Before the war, as the *Studio Franco-Russe*, *Esprit*, and the whole host of Franco-Russian initiatives demonstrate, French intellectuals were extremely interested in the ideas and culture of these Russians who had been thrust into their midst; even avowed Socialists like André Gide were open to discussion and interaction with the decidedly non-communist Russian religious-philosophers.³³ After the war, however, Marxism enjoyed flourished in France because of the predominant role it had played among the Resistance; to be a patriot, in many ways necessitated becoming Socialist.

The totalitarian grasp of Marxism over all cultural pursuits in France was represented by Sartre's hegemony. What Raymond Aron dubbed "*le sinistrisme*" made and broke intellectual careers, and propagated vindictive literary battles such as the famous dispute between Sartre and Camus. In the artistic world, Marxism held complete power until 1968, and retained its predominance until much later.³⁴ Even Berdyaev's former young protégé, Emmanuel Mounier was affected by the change. In a private letter to Gabriel Marcel in 1944, he decried his earlier faith in religion, and asserted that

³² It now appears that almost all those who returned were immediately deported to the Gulag. A few were not harmed, but also they were not allowed to express their ideas freely. See Pospelovsky, *The Russian Church...* vol. 1 256-280.

³³ In reviewing the article on 4 January 1933, Gide exclaimed "Remarkable, the article by Berdyaev; 'Truth and Falsehood of Communism,' which I read in the first edition of *Esprit*. I read it with the keenest satisfaction and relief." André Gide, *Journals, 1889-1949*, trans. and ed. Justine O'Brien, Vol 3 (London: Secker & Warburg, 1949) 256.

³⁴ See Raymond Aron, *Plaidoyer pour l'Europe décadente* (Paris: Robert Laffont, 1977).

progressive socialist christianity represented the only hope for mankind.³⁵ He had resuscitated Esprit again in 1944, but found that many of his former colleagues would not return because they felt uncomfortable with the stance which he had taken in the early years of Vichy; with its new participants, the review became increasingly pro-Communist, and lost its unique Personalist character.

The move to Marxism on the part of French intellectuals destroyed the allure of the émigrés.³⁶ Even Berdyaev who had been able to attract such large numbers of young French intellectuals prior to the war, found himself rather ignored. He spent his three post-war years trying to resurrect religious-philosophical work around a new review called Cahiers de la Nouvelle Époque. Its first issue was released only in 1947, and declared its aim as facilitating some creative synthesis between the spiritual and the social:

To return to the religious sources, to be strengthened in a new spirituality, to remake the Christian unity, to recreate the total man split by the illusion of rational thought, to replace the abstract individual by the living person, to marry the interest of the masses with that of the elites, the individual liberty and the

³⁵ "Changeons les mots. Au lieu de l, disons: la résistance ou le gaullisme, ou le courant révolutionnaire française de 1944. Ses faiblesses et ses fautes ne nous sont pas moins sensible qu'un chrétien les fautes et les faiblesses de son église. Mais pour que nous ayons le droit d'en juger et les moyens de les [éliminer], ne faut-il pas d'abord nous posons la même question préalable et fondamentale: sommes-nous, oui ou non, de cette église? Le mort n'est ici qu'imagé, et image déficiente, car il n'est pas question d'église, mais d'option politique. Je traduis donc. Voulons-nous de toute la force de notre jugement et de notre volonté politique la révolution profonde dans les institutions politiques et sociales, dans les idées et dans les mœurs, qu'appelle en 1944 le destin historique de la France et que, mal et bien..., s'est amorcé dans cette matrice de la France nouvelle." Emmanuel Mounier, letter to Gabriel Marcel, 28 October 1944, Gabriel Marcel Papers, Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris, Carton 52.

³⁶ It even diminished the power of France's own leaders of a religious renaissance. Maritain retreated from public, artistic life to work for UNESCO and to become France's ambassador at Vatican II. Gabriel Marcel was constantly besieged by the Marxists for his intransigent commitment to Christian existentialism. He survived the battles and continued to teach a number of young protégés (he even played a part in the education of Quebec's Premier René Levesque), but the post-war era was not an easy period for religious thinkers.

becoming community, to harmonize the national specificity with the oecumenical spirit....³⁷

In this review, Berdyaev continued to reject the new division between social and spiritual problems: among the former French Personalists this was represented by the narrow commitment of Mounier's resurrected Esprit on the one hand, and Dieu Vivant on the other.

The belated appearance of the review illustrated the lacklustre appeal of spiritual ideas which plagued Berdyaev's last endeavours. Among the Russian émigrés, he could find few who were interested in any further association with him: the St. Sergius faculty completely shunned him, as did the RSCM, and most Russian workers at the YMCA Press.³⁸ They considered him to be dangerous either because of his unorthodox approach to religion, or because of their suspicions that he harboured sympathies for Communism.³⁹ The reaction of the French intellectuals to his new review was even more ironic considering how the "Red" connection had plagued the philosopher for so many years among the emigration. They now perceived Berdyaev to be antagonistic to their new "faith" in Marxism, and to be irrelevant in his preoccupations with human spirituality. Only his relatively new French companions from the war years, former Esprit writers Marcel Moré, Jacques Madaule, and André Philip, participated in the review.

³⁷ Nikolai Berdyaev, "A nos lecteurs," Cahiers de la Nouvelle Époque 1 (1947) 6.

³⁸ In fact Cahiers was published by a French house because the Press refused to pay for this initiative of their former Editor-in-Chief. Olivier Clément, Berdiaev: Un philosophe russe en France (Paris: Desclee de Brouwer, 1991) 117-118.

³⁹ He had to write Helene Iswolsky in 1948 begging her for articles from intellectuals in the United States because he could not solicit sufficient contributions from within France. See Nikolai Berdyaev, letter to Helene Iswolsky, 7 February 1948, Helene Iswolsky papers, University of Scranton, Pennsylvania, Box 1.

The Cold War in America

Despite the secular/religious schism and the negative atmosphere for religious-philosophy, it might be thought that the exigencies of the Cold War would at least make the opinions of the émigrés valuable for American policy-makers. After all, events in the late 1940s and the Korean War had provoked the American Government to pour millions of dollars into the new field of "Sovietology" in order that they might "know thine enemy." Similar initiatives were begun in Great Britain, Germany and, to a lesser extent, in Italy and France. Surely the émigrés who *were* Russian would have been an invaluable asset especially those few hundred who had remained in Russia after the revolutions, and had witnessed the methods of Communist rule first-hand as it were. Moreover, after World War Two, the economic crisis in France and the change in intellectual climate had prompted thousands of the émigrés to relocate to America and, to a lesser extent, Great Britain. Therefore, the "West" in the Cold War now had leading Russian intellectuals and scholars ready at hand.

From the standpoint of the "West" - especially the Americans - however, the émigrés did not present such a clear utility. First, there was the problem of secret agents. With the start of the Cold War and the humiliation of Soviet Russia's success in building atomic bombs as early as 1949, the American populace was becoming increasingly convinced that Russian agents were living among them. Paranoia ran rampant throughout the early 1950s culminating with the McCarthy trials. If Americans feared moles and such embarrassments as Britain's "Burgess and Philby" fiasco, they were even more suspicious of obvious Russian émigrés. This situation was made more complex by

the problem of the "Displaced Persons" (DPs).⁴⁰ Native Russians, be they Soviet or old Russian, were generally deemed too dangerous to be involved in secret policy deliberations. The vast reservoir of their knowledge was, therefore, often left untapped.

Instead, the Americans decided to create their Centres of Russian Studies - circles of Sovietologists - staffed mostly with academics specializing in economics, history, politics, and the military. These professionals were quite different from the russophile intellectuals who had begun the major Russian Studies Institutes in the West just before and following the Russian Revolution.⁴¹ Then, the prime motivation had been to understand more about this relatively unknown culture; partially in order to comprehend the Bolshevik success, but even more to bring the glory of Russian literature, ideas, and art to Western students.⁴² After World War Two, however, the intent behind studying Russia changed. New Slavic Departments blossomed in many American universities, replacing specifically Russian specialities in isolated fields.⁴³ Initially these continued to inculcate an understanding of Russian culture largely because they were still staffed by

⁴⁰ The thousands of Soviet prisoners from German concentration camps who were released at the conclusion of the war. Many did not want to return to their homeland and sought asylum in the United States in return for military information about the USSR.

⁴¹ Such as Bernard Pares who founded Slavic Studies at the University of London and Ernest Denis who founded the *Institute d'études slaves* in Paris.

⁴² With the massive emigration after 1917, elite Russian scholars had become available to offer university courses in certain aspects of Russian language, culture, and history. Initially, they operated as specialists within a departmental field: Michael Karpovich joined the History Department at Harvard University in 1927; Nicholas Timashev and Pitrim Sorokin taught Sociology at Fordham University and Pittsburg University respectively; George Vernadsky taught Russian history at Yale; Mochulsky, Mirsky, and Pëtr Kovalevsky lectured at the Sorbonne. The Eastern European countries and Germany employed émigrés in most fields, but they excelled especially in Byzantine studies, Religion and, of course, Russian Literature.

⁴³ Harvard inaugurated its centre in 1949 which was to come to work so closely with the State Department. Similar faculties were begun at Columbia, Fordham, Yale, the University of California, Oxford, Paris, and, in Munich as part of the Free Europe Program.

the old émigré professors. Nevertheless, as the Cold War became all-encompassing, the tenor and direction of scholarship shifted to institutional and empirical study.

After the Korean War, Slavic Studies were largely replaced by Sovietology. At Harvard University, Michael Karpovich resigned his directorship in 1954 due to failing health.⁴⁴ There were some indications, however, that he no longer concurred with the policies behind the Centre for Russian Studies. He may not have been deterred by the political purposes towards which information gleaned by its scholars was being utilized, but with the increased government intervention in the course of studies.⁴⁵ Still, the character of the Centre undeniably changed when Karpovich stepped down, and a new generation of Russian scholarship was born. These scholars took what is now called the "Cold War" or "Hard-line" approach towards issues relating to that country. Their unsympathetic condemnation of Soviet totalitarianism served to unveil many of the atrocities propagated by the Bolshevik regime, especially those of Stalin, which undeniably had the effect of legitimizing the West's position in the Cold War.⁴⁶ While some of their early predictions have not been borne out by the events of recent years, they did have legitimate reasons for their moral condemnation of the leadership in that country.

⁴⁴ He died in 1959.

⁴⁵ The increased funding to Harvard and the massive recruitment by the CIA, the State Department and other Government bureaus of graduates from the Centre was a dramatic transformation. Moreover, some of the professors became governmental consultants on Russian affairs. This was also the time of the Red Scare in the USA when professors were harshly censored and reprimanded for teaching any "positive" understanding of Communism in general and Russia in particular.

⁴⁶ For example: Merle Fainsod, How Russia is Ruled (Cambridge, MA.: Harvard University Press, 1953); Z.K. Brzezinski, The Permanent Purge (Cambridge, MA.: Harvard University Press, 1956); Adam Ulam, The New Face of Soviet Totalitarianism (Cambridge, MA.: Harvard University Press, 1963); Robert Conquest, The Great Terror: Stalin's Purge of the Thirties (New York: E.P. Dutton, 1971).

The hegemony of the "Cold Warriors", as they are sometimes disparagingly labelled, did not last long. After Khrushchev's famous speech on "The Crimes of Stalin" in 1956, a wave of reform began to sweep through the newly established Slavic Centres in the West. True to the pathos of Turgenev, the sons turned against the fathers, and began to reassess, then attack their former mentors' conclusions and assumptions. What began was a reaction to intransigent anti-communism. In questioning one extreme, however, the sons moved on to their own. From the early 1960s through the late 1970s, a rising swell of what was called "pink" scholarship began to prevail in America's universities.⁴⁷ However, materialist means and ends were not abandoned; they were simply transformed from an anti-communist to a soft pro-marxist paradigm. As this trend gained strength it swept through the Slavic centres which were now being established at every major university at an uncontrollable rate due to the massive amount of public monies available for educational expenditure.⁴⁸

The battles were intense: so-called conservative institutions went head to head with "liberal" ones; speculation, charges of falsification, and unheeding denial ran

⁴⁷ In Europe this process of encroaching Marxism began right after the war. Berdyaev described a meeting in Geneva in 1947: "I have a special reason for noting this occasion, since I had the unexpected experience of being thrown back into the Russian atmosphere of fifty years ago, when Marxism was exercising the power of attraction not primarily of a political or social programme, but of a philosophy of life. Marxism was the point round which the whole conference centred, although, except for my own paper, it was no part of the agenda. There is a craving for belief in modern man, similar to that which inspired the Russians throughout the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Faced with the futility of his own existence the modern European finds himself stranded high and dry." Berdyaev, Dream and Reality 326.

⁴⁸ Stephen Cohen (Princeton) became the stipulatory leader of the "Revisionists" who were to include Alexander Rabinowich, Jerry Hough, Moshe Lewin, and later Sheila Fitzpatrick, Robert Tucker and countless others.

rampant.⁴⁹ Revisionists refused to accept that the Gulag was relevant,⁵⁰ and Cold Warriors denied that there was any free-thinking occurring among the Russian populace.⁵¹ The "what if" school began to publish an extraordinary amount of material rehabilitating Trotsky,⁵² Bukharin,⁵³ and others in order to show that Communism was not intrinsically evil, but only its successful leaders were. Stephen Cohen tried to isolate Stalin from Lenin thus exonerating the latter from the worst atrocities of what was becoming called "Stalinism"; he was supported by the work of Moshe Lewin.⁵⁴

Just as quickly, the "Secondary Revisionists" entered this turmoil with their arguments against the political preoccupations of their mentors. They proclaimed both the Cold Warriors and the Revisionists to be misguided because they had failed to take

⁴⁹ These battles have been revisited by the "Cold Warriors" recently with a book-form publication of selected articles by Leopold Labedz, The Uses and Abuses of Sovietology, (Oxford: Transaction Publishers, 1989)

⁵⁰ This became astonishingly obvious after the translation and publication of Solzhenitsyn's Gulag Archipelago which bluntly unveiled the scope of the Purge and Gulag atrocities. Cold Warriors triumphantly proclaimed vindication; Revisionists shouted "bias," "irrelevant and unrepresentative of true socialism." "They simultaneously refused to identify with the Soviet Union or to be greatly concerned about injustice in any of the Communist societies." Paul Jacobs and Saul Landau, The New Radicals: A Report with Documents (New York: Random House, 1966) 12. As Sartre had said in France, "one must not reveal the truth about Stalin's camps for fear of depriving the French workers of socialist hope." Leopold Labedz, The Uses and Abuses of Sovietology (Oxford: Transaction Publishers, 1989) 221.

⁵¹ This is best exemplified in Zbigniew Brzezinski's The Permanent Purge: Politics in Soviet Totalitarianism (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1956) which asserted that the USSR must be overthrown from without because there was no independent thinking forces among the people individually; it was, in his opinion, incapable of popular reform or internal transformation.

⁵² Issac Deutscher, The Prophet Armed: Trotsky, 1879-1921 (New York: Oxford University Press, 1954); The Prophet Unarmed: Trotsky, 1921-1929 (New York: Oxford University Press, 1959); The Prophet Outcast: Trotsky, 1929-1940 (New York: Oxford University Press, 1963).

⁵³ Stephen Cohen, Bukharin and the Bolshevik Revolution (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1971).

⁵⁴ Stephen F. Cohen, Rethinking the Soviet Experience: Politics and History since 1917 (New York, Oxford University Press, 1985); Moshe Lewin, Lenin's Last Struggle, trans. A.M. Sheridan Smith (New York: Pantheon Books, 1968).

into account the millions of "people" in Russia, and the pressure which they must have brought to bear upon their leaders. The bifurcation of the field now began to seem endless as peasant studies,⁵⁵ women's studies,⁵⁶ monographs on workers in Petrograd,⁵⁷ in Moscow,⁵⁸ nationalities,⁵⁹ and so forth began to hit the college book stands.⁶⁰

The only problem was, that as areas of study became more particular, larger moral and perspective issues became obscured. A study of steel workers in 1917 showed their intense support for Bolshevism, but negated the overall unpopularity of the Party among Russia as a whole.⁶¹ A study on the causes of the Great Purges omitted due attention

⁵⁵ Moshe Lewin, Russian Peasants and Soviet Power: A Study of Collectivization, trans. I. Nove (Evanston Ill.: University of Chicago Press, 1968); Maurice Hindus, Red Bread: Collectivization in a Russian Village, Forward by Ronald G. Suny. (Bloomington, Ind., University of Indiana Press, 1988); Ronald G. Suny, The Baku Commune, 1917-1918: Class and Nationality in the Russian Revolution Princeton N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1972).

⁵⁶ G.W. Lapidus, Women in Soviet Society: Equality, Development, and Social Change (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1978); Women, Work and Family in the Soviet Union (Armonk NY: M.E. Sharpe, 1982); B. Farnsworth, Alexandra Kollontai: Socialism, Feminism, and the Bolshevik Revolution (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1980).

⁵⁷ Alexander Rabinowitch, The Bolsheviks Come to Power: The Revolution of 1917 in Petrograd (New York, W.W. Norton, 1976); A.S. Smith, Red Petrograd: Revolution in the Factories, 1917-1918 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983).

⁵⁸ W. Chase, Workers, Society, and the Soviet State: Labour and Life in Moscow, 1918-1929 (Urbana: University of Indiana Press, 1987); Diane Koenker, Moscow Workers and the 1917 Revolution (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1981).

⁵⁹ J.B. Dunlop, The Faces of Contemporary Russian Nationalism (Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1983); B.Z. Rumer, Soviet Central Asia: "A Tragic Experiment" (Boston: Boston University Press, 1989).

⁶⁰ The inter-war correspondent E.H. Carr began to achieve his greatest success at this time on the basis of his "unbiased" (i.e. neither Cold War nor Revisionist) popular accounting of Soviet History; Chamberlin, fortunately, was also resuscitated. E.H. Carr, A History of Soviet Russia Series, 15 vols (New York: MacMillan, 1951-53, 1954, 1958, 1971-72, 1976-78, 1982). William Chamberlin, The Russian Revolution, 1917-1921 2 vols. New York, 1935.

⁶¹ Alexander Rabinowitch, The Bolsheviks Come to Power: The Revolution of 1917 in Petrograd (New York, W.W. Norton, 1976)

to the millions who died, unwittingly exonerating Stalin and the Communist Party of sheer murder.⁶² Finally, a study of the Bolshevik food policy during the era of War Communism proclaimed it to be an amazing success given the circumstances, but then ended its description at the end of 1920 just before the famine that would have killed some 40 million Russians had not Americans so generously given relief.⁶³

This reflection illustrates the problems caused by unrestrained materialist investigation unbalanced by moral, cultural or spiritual considerations. Cannot the devolution of Sovietology be explained at a fundamental, ontological level? When endeavouring to achieve knowledge, the object of study may be examined externally, and described in all its composite forms: this approach, over time, necessitates more and more deconstruction (i.e. the study of smaller and smaller parts of the whole) according to the law of empirical analysis; logic should then be applied in order to draw the minute particles together in order to produce a summative comprehension of the whole. However, the potential morass which eternally plagues this rational, materialist methodology is the potential for losing sight of the purpose of study (i.e. to know the whole). Increasing particulation frequently becomes an end in itself, thereby obfuscating the primal requisite of logical reconstruction.

This problem created the impetus for subjective, personalistic, existential, or religious-philosophy in the first place. Again and again over the ages, lone thinkers insisted that before study must come an understanding and acceptance of *why* one wants

⁶² J. Arch Getty, The Origins of the Great Purges: The Soviet Communist Party Reconsidered, 1933-1938 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985); J. Arch Getty and Roberta T. Manning, eds., Stalinist Terror: New Perspectives (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993).

⁶³ Lars T. Lih, Bread and Authority in Russia, 1914-1921 (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990).

to study. An appreciation of the essence, of being in itself, must predicate any utilized methodology, and this core must be continually revisited in order to ensure that the direction of investigation has not devolved from the track of its original purpose. One must remember over and over again the "forest" while examining the "trees" if you like. Or, in the religious-philosophical paradigm, one must love (approach as "thou") before one can understand. Regardless of the potential wealth of ideas which the Russian émigré religious philosophers might have contributed to Sovietology's understanding of the Russian-Soviet reality, the omission of their basic ontological insights was indeed a tragedy for the field.

Moreover, the Russian émigrés, especially the religious philosophers, did have a great deal to say about the Cold War even though many of them were to die in the early days of that hostility. Berdyaev's main grievance in his last few years was the renewed intolerance between the United States and the USSR. In his conception, a "Cold War" was just as futile and destructive to the cause of world and Christian unity as World War Two had been. He did not deny the ever-pervasive trend towards repression in his homeland: In reference to the *Zhdanovschina* which emerged at the end of 1946, Berdyaev wearily stated,

This problem is proving a source of increasing mental agony. My hopes seem to be disappointed. After a heroic war the hopeful process and movements within Soviet Russia⁶⁴ failed to take the expected course. Freedom is again in danger. The affair of Akhmatova and Zoshchenko made a particularly painful impression on me. To read the Soviet newspapers and periodicals is a no less unpleasant experience. The "general line" is being imposed with new vigour, and the effect is suffocating.⁶⁵

⁶⁴ The increasing liberal policies instituted during World War II, and popular trends which began shortly before and during the war, noted in Nicholas Timasheff, The Great Retreat: The Growth and Decline of Communism in Russia (New York: E.P. Dutton & Co., 1946).

⁶⁵ Berdyaev, Dream and Reality 323-324.

However, he was somewhat comforted by signs of a renewed vigour in the Orthodox Church in Russia and, even more, by auguries that, "as a result of the revolution and war, the religious movement is growing and the Christian faith is if anything stronger than ever before among the Russian people."⁶⁶

Yet, knowing all the evils abroad in his country more personally than most Western people, Berdyaev still opposed the coming Cold War. He never recanted his acceptance of the Revolution, nor his belief that the country would move away from intransigent Marxism of its peoples' own accord simply because Communism was a "dead end". As far as increasing pressures by the Western powers were concerned, Berdyaev felt they were misplaced and dangerously hostile. He believed the same old idolatrous commitment to a monist ideology to be the root cause of the rising intolerance between the two spheres. His analysis was not anachronistically superficial: Berdyaev acknowledged even in 1940 during the height of the war that,

...any conversation between Western democracy and the Soviets is devoid of any common moral basis. The two parties have completely different world views.⁶⁷

However, he insisted that this did not preclude both sides from sharing "common interests or even common enemies." He, therefore, was cautioning the powers not to negate issues in which communication might be possible simply out of intransigent opposition.

Furthermore, he believed that the void between the two spheres was being falsely magnified through manipulation by ideologists in both camps. While humanist democracy - which he applauded because of its commitment to freedom, but which he also

⁶⁶ He did accept the limits of isolation faced by this milieu as well as fearing a certain hegemony of conservative and nationalist elements led by the priests he and his colleagues had opposed even prior to the 1917 revolutions. Berdyaev, Dream and Reality 324.

⁶⁷ Nicolas Berdyaev, "Soviet Russia in World War II, Part II," The Living Church 17 April 1940: 1. See Paul B. Anderson Papers, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Box 5.

approached warily with its tendencies to ochlocracy - was indeed contrary to the mode of leadership in the USSR, it was not, he maintained, dead among Russian people. Moreover, as the Cold War was beginning to emerge, he found the increasing opposition not between Democracy and Communism, but between Capitalism and Democracy. This, he asserted, was absurd. Capitalism, in his view, was just as limited and fruitless as Communism; it was also just as inapplicable to the entire population of any country.

In the first place, the contraposition of capitalist and non-capitalist countries is a pure abstraction. Even if the order of a given country is to a certain extent capitalistic, this means neither that everything done in that country is capitalistic nor that it does not contain valuable elements, quite independent of the economic order. Chamberlain may be connected with the capitalist circles of the City, but this does not imply that he cannot be a sincere defender of liberty and honor, the enemy of violence, the advocate of peace among the nations. Monism is always a falsehood.⁶⁸

He had begun to fear that this artificial dichotomy would obscure the real goal of humanism and humanist democracy. If the West blindly sought to destroy Russia in order to eliminate or even contain the Communist cancer, they would violate their own inalienable laws of human decency, and leave democracy to become the ideologues of free-market Capitalism. He thus counselled a dualist approach, always maintaining the "meaning of human personality and freedom, ungoverned and undetermined as they are from without" combined with an acceptance that humans cannot return to the past which, in itself, "demands a constant revision of one's attitude to Russia in light of the far-reaching social revolution that has taken place and is still continuing there." In his final years, however, he did express a profound uncertainty that this policy might be followed in the future: "I can endeavour to unite these two facets within myself, but can their unity

⁶⁸ Berdyaev, "Soviet Russia in World War II, Part II".

be achieved on the open stage of history?"⁶⁹ In America and among other proponents of the "West" in the Cold War, the answer appeared to be "no". Rather than trying to understand the culture and subtle forces working among their Communist opponents, these countries overwhelmingly supported the materialist speculations of the Sovietologists.

The negative mood of these times may be illustrated by the later life of Helene Iswolsky, that earnest disciple of Berdyaev who tried so valiantly to continue active religious-philosophical *engagement*. As the most active heir to the Russian religious-philosophers, Iswolsky laboured to maintain French morale from her base in America during the war. In 1944, she got a job at Voice of America writing religious broadcasts for transmission to France. There she worked with Denis de Rougemont, the Swiss Protestant writer for both Ordre Nouveau and Esprit during the 1930s. She also established a firm friendship with a former Meudon participant, the writer Julien Green, who helped defend her from the anti-religious attacks of André Breton at the radio station.

Finally, the war ended, and while many of Iswolsky's French friends returned to their native land, she remained behind in America to pursue a new initiative. Intent on resurrecting the seminars she had attended at Clamart, Iswolsky decided to "bring Berdyaev to life" in the United States.

I think that every vital problem, religious, philosophical, moral, and social, was discussed in our little group, presided over, or rather led with kindness and patience by our host, Berdiaev...It was thus that I learned from Berdiaev himself the main trends of his religious and social teaching. They were often developed by him right there, at our "round table", and later revised, rethought, and put into final shape in his major works. Speaking for myself, I have realized throughout the years how much I owe Berdiaev. When he called me to his "round table", he offered me the rare opportunity of widening and activating my spiritual

⁶⁹ Berdyaev, Dream and Reality 325.

development without, in any way, interfering with my basic faith. His contribution to my ecumenical formation was essential.⁷⁰

Although she was busy with helping *The Catholic Worker* movement spread their message of Catholic spirituality and pacifism, assisting Catherine de Hueck-Doherty formulate the philosophical basis for *Madonna House*,⁷¹ and lecturing at Fordham University, Iswolsky felt a need to pursue oecumenical work more intensely.

In 1945, therefore, she began a movement from her apartment in New York city intended to further oecumenical understanding between the three Christian Churches. Initially she simply held meetings attended by the remnants of the Meudon, Clamart, and *Esprit* groups left in America: Denis de Rougemont, Arthur Lourié, Governor Paulding, Georges Fedotov,⁷² and two other infrequent visitors at Clamart, Irma de Manziarly and Vladimir Yanovsky. During the first year, however, the multiple talents therein agreed they should publish a journal to disseminate their ideas. Out of this her review *The Third Hour* was founded as a direct descendant of *Esprit* and *Put'*. The name derived from a passage in *Evangile* depicting the time when the Holy Spirit descended upon the apostles and they began to speak in different tongues.⁷³ Its central purpose was to demonstrate that language barriers and religious differences could be overcome by the unifying message of Christ. Committed to acceptance of variation, its articles were printed in Russian, French, and English as each writer preferred. The New York group expanded

⁷⁰ Iswolsky, *No Time to Grieve...* 192.

⁷¹ After World War Two, Catherine de Hueck had married a wealthy Chicago publisher, Eddie Doherty and together they started the *Madonna House* in Combermere, Ontario as a lay-apostolate training centre reminiscent of a full-time Clamart or Meudon.

⁷² Who became increasingly embittered by his lack of opportunity in the United States, and was finally to succumb to alcoholism in 1951.

⁷³ Iswolsky, *No Time to Grieve...* 249-251.

when Governor Paulding brought over Anne Fremantle who, in turn, introduced W.H. Auden and Mrs. Porter Chandler or "Bebo" as she was affectionately known; Bebo soon replaced Iswolsky as host of The Third Hour group due to her vastly larger apartment.

Iswolsky, also, did not forget her friends in France and, as soon as communication was restored, she resumed contact with Berdyaev and some of the other survivors from the House at Clamart. Her first letter was carried by a rather unusual courier: Jean Paul Sartre, visiting the United States after the cease-fire to spread his new concept of atheist existentialism, received tremendous attention in the New York press in 1945. While Iswolsky did not know Sartre personally, she had read about his visit and the expected date of his return to France. Hesitantly approaching the soon-to-be "emperor" of the French artistic world, she requested he carry over her inquiring letter to Berdyaev; with good grace and magnanimity he agreed.⁷⁴

Once their contact had been reestablished, Berdyaev and Iswolsky corresponded on a monthly basis throughout 1945, and then less regularly until his death in 1948. She asked for advice on her new periodical, sent him her book and articles which she had written during the war, and supplied the Berdyaev family with food packages of goods not easily attainable in post-war France.⁷⁵ In return he sent her contributions to be published in The Third Hour, provided her with news of the Paris front, and solicited her support and opinions of his new publishing endeavour Cahiers de la Nouvelle Époque⁷⁶.

⁷⁴ Iswolsky, No Time to Grieve... 250.

⁷⁵ Nicolai Berdyaev, letter to Helene Iswolsky, 20 December 1945, Helene Iswolsky papers, University of Scranton, Pennsylvania, Box 1.

⁷⁶ Nikolai Berdyaev letters to Helene Iswolsky, 1945-1948, Helene Iswolsky Papers, Scranton University, Pennsylvania, Box 1.

It was due to this renewed communication that Iswolsky, in her preamble to the first edition of The Third Hour, stated that in the review,

On one hand the texts constituting an ensemble at the same time varied and homogeneous will be read with interest by those same people who do not hold the same religious attitude towards the world as the writers who figure in the review's title page. On the other hand, even the fact of the publication of a review conceived in this spirit - which at the moment where one learns of the simultaneous birth in France of two similar reviews "Dieu Vivant" and "Cahiers de la Nouvelle Epoque" - is symptomatic and deserving of attention.⁷⁷

This spirit, which Iswolsky evoked in her first editorial, was a modest one, quite divorced from the grand preoccupations which she and her colleagues had been involved in prior to World War Two. While it maintained the devotion to renewed spiritualism in the world, it held no pretension of leading a great movement, of being wildly popular, or of converting the next generation. Instead, The Third Hour functioned as the reflective journal of people "reunited by a communal spiritual hunger, by a common hope, in a manner curiously resembling Ovid 'the face turned towards the sky'...".

This collectivity no longer aspired to lead a "revolution" of personalism or *sobornost*'; rather they hoped to raise the voice of conscience in what they now viewed as an almost hopelessly brutal world. Their advocacy had also changed: from growth and transformation, they had receded to pacifism and a call for sanity.

The publication of this review which is as a kernel of peace in a world torn apart by discord, fragmented as never before, said one of the most brilliant writers of the collection.⁷⁸

Iswolsky singled out Nikolai Berdyaev, as being one of the most prominent expounders of peace and understanding in the post-war world.

⁷⁷ Helene Iswolsky, "Preamble," La Troisième Heure 1 (1946): 1.

⁷⁸ Helene Iswolsky, "Preamble," La Troisième Heure 1 (1946): 1.

The masters who inspired this publication remained the same as those called upon by the "third way" in Paris: Vladimir Soloviev continued to have essential meaning for their search. Yet, Iswolsky added an additional "father" to her new movement: She eulogized Dr. John R. Mott, "citizen of the world" for his efforts to "reunite the Christians of the world, without regard to their race, nationality, and religion."⁷⁹ Despite its small issuance and its fringe nature, The Third Hour at last managed to effect the unity attempted in Paris between American, French, and Russian (Protestant-Catholic-Orthodox) perspectives with complete disregard for national or denominational pride and jealousy. Its tiny circulation did not prevent its collection in countries throughout the world. As one Australian reviewer was prepared to state:

If, in history, our epoch will be counted as the one where the hatred, the mistakes, the tortures, the destruction of the fellow-man in order to erect in an ideological system and scientifically organized on a ladder never seen before: not less did she [the epoch] arise equally from those, like the companions at the Third Hour, who hold as the point of their departure, the love, the innate taste of justice, the intense sense of the solidarity of human beings.⁸⁰

Iswolsky's passion for Soloviev also brought her into involvements with Canadians in the early sixties. She was first introduced to these circles by Catherine de Hueck and Etienne Gilson at the Pontifical Institute in Toronto. Iswolsky's Canadian contacts were extended to Dr. Karl Stern at the McGill and Université de Montréal's psychology departments, and Professor Paplauskas-Ramunas at the Education and Philosophy

⁷⁹ Helene Iswolsky, "Preamble," La Troisième Heure 1 (1946): 1-2.

⁸⁰ Halina Izdebska, "La Troisième Heure," (n.d.), Helene Iswolsky Papers, Scranton University, Pennsylvania, Box 1: 1-2.

Department of Ottawa University.⁸¹ With them, Iswolsky continued to pursue her study of Vladimir Soloviev and his oecumenical and philosophical contributions to their time.

Helen Iswolsky died in 1975 after living a life in three countries filled with intellectual, spiritual, and oecumenical endeavors. A true member of the "intellectual apostolate" (Maritain) or "order of the intelligentsia" (Fondaminsky) she bridged the gap between Russians, French and Americans as almost none of her peers or mentors were able to emulate. Her life was completely devoted to the cause of laic action and, in the absence of any greater legacy to date, she deserves to be remembered for her tenacity and her constancy to unity, Christianity, and peace in our world.

Scholarly Utilization of Religious-Philosophy

If religious-philosophy was not advancing significantly during these years, was it at least serving as a fruitful area of study for a better understanding of conditions specifically within Russia and, generally, throughout the world? A brief survey of literature suggests that only a few in the West found these writings of vital importance and relevant to their ongoing research. The story of research may best begin with the death of Nikolai Berdyaev, for after his demise some attempt was made to preserve at least our knowledge of Russian religious-philosophy if not the vitality of the movement in itself.

In 1948, Berdyaev grew weaker and felt unable to accept any more speaking engagements outside of Clamart.

Berdyaev grew increasingly preoccupied with the sorry condition of the world. In a penetrating article, "The Third Way" he showed the absurdity of dividing the world into two hostile camps, neither one of which could claim complete moral

⁸¹ Dr. A. Paplauskas-Ramunas, letter to Helene Iswolsky, 21 August 1954; 29 October 1954, Helene Iswolsky Papers, Scranton University, Pennsylvania, Box 1.

integrity. A third front was needed, the battle front of truth - truth to be achieved in freedom at whatever cost.⁸²

To the end, he retained his faith in a different, better path for mankind to follow, and that way was never divided from the divinity of man. In his own assessment made in the last years of his life, Berdyaev described his success at active spiritual initiatives among the emigration, the French, and internationally as "rather meagre".⁸³ Nevertheless, in this last year he finished two final books which were to be published posthumously: Samoprazhnenie (his autobiography, 1949), and The Realm of Caesar and The Realm of Christ (1951). His autobiography was translated into many languages and remains one of the finest characterizations of that age.⁸⁴ The last book encapsulates his life's work and his vision.

Berdyaev died on March 20, 1948 at his little desk, leaving a cherished cigar smoking in the ashtray at his elbow, working to the last moment. He was buried in the little cemetery in Clamart with his wife: The only Russian plot in that section directly abutting the graves of Resistance heroes. As in life, the other Russian émigrés in that cemetery are placed as far distant from his grave as possible, slotted into their aristocratic categories of the Trubetskoys, the Osorgins, the Golitsyns....

At his burial, there were a host of friends and admirers from many different countries and confessions. Eulogies and obituaries filled the pages of almost every major newspaper, and reviews of his work were featured in almost all religious and Russian

⁸² Lowrie, Rebellious Prophet 277.

⁸³ Berdyaev, Dream and Reality 246.

⁸⁴ Berdyaev's autobiography also remains the single-most important source for every scholar who writes about him. Even the most recent biographies compiled in the former Soviet Union, such as A. Vadimov, Zhizn' Berdiaeva (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993) use this book as their primary source and inspiration.

émigré journals. Today, the grave remains untended and forgotten with the names eroded by time, and obscured behind a wild rose bush. The fate of his house, and of the foundation, provides an incredibly ironic and sad testimony to the decline of religious-philosophy, and the hypocrisy of the materialist age.

In 1980, the leaders of the Berdyaev Association (this society had been formed shortly after his death for the purpose of encouraging studies about Berdyaev) discussed plans to rent his former house from its new owners in order to found an "Institute de philosophies spirituelle".⁸⁵ Why did the house have to be rented? In 1956, shortly before the death of Berdyaev's one surviving relative, his sister-in-law Eugenie Rapp, the YMCA Press sold his house to provide for her maintenance. Rapp should have had substantial financial resources from the continued royalties paid on Berdyaev's many books. However, such payments were not rendered to her by the YMCA Press because, supposedly, the legal copyrights were not in order. Thus deprived of her legacy, Rapp could not meet the mortgage, let alone her own monetary needs. The YMCA Press sold the house to none other than the Union of Orthodox Parishes of the Moscow Obedience better known as the "Petel" Union which was controlled by the USSR.⁸⁶ While this sale, in itself, might not have offended Berdyaev considering his continued allegiance to the Orthodox Church in Russia, the involvement of KGB agents in the "Petel" Union certainly would have.

The ramifications of this distasteful situation became apparent when Tamara Klepinine warned the Berdyaev Association leaders that every book that Berdyaev had

⁸⁵ Tamara Klepinine, letter to Paul B. Anderson, 21 September 1980, Paul B. Anderson papers, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Box 29.

⁸⁶ Tamara Klepinine, letter to Paul B. Anderson, 21 September 1980, Paul B. Anderson papers, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Box 29.

written, published by the YMCA Press, was out of print because they were secretly sending them into the USSR. If the Association achieved some affiliation with the "Petel" Union, information about who was receiving these "forbidden" works in the USSR might just be transmitted to officials in that country.⁸⁷ As far as this author has been able to ascertain, the Berdyaev Association dwindled during the 1980s; their last act was to pay for the restoration of his home with funds that Mr. Ancoraola had received from UNESCO.⁸⁸ The Berdyaev house remains the home of Russian Orthodox priests from the "Petel" Union; the plan of creating a centre of the Berdyaev Foundation for the study of his philosophy and similar themes was apparently dropped. The big salon and dining room where all the vibrant discussions occurred, is now a private chapel.⁸⁹ The Berdyaev Foundation is moribund, and Berdyaev's papers which were copied by Eugenie Rapp and his memoria have disappeared. All that remains is the desk and his books in the upstairs study, a forlorn testimony for curious visitors to gaze upon once they discover the complicated means by which to gain entry.

These developments were a product, largely, of disinterest on the part of Western scholars. In each decade, some scholars of philosophy would again turn back to the works of the religious-philosophical tradition in order to add their particular interpretation

⁸⁷ Tamara Klepinine states: "Andronikov's intervention was in a certain sense useful as a warning. I must add that at the first meeting (see my letter of July 25) Metropolitan Philaret suggested that a member of the Petel Group should enter in the Bureau of the Berdyaev Association. No word of this was said now and a new treasurer of it was elected (to replace B. Fize) who is a French lady, Mme. Roussel." Tamara Klepinine, letter to Paul B. Anderson, 21 September 1980, Paul B. Anderson papers, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Box 29.

⁸⁸ Tamara Klepinine, letter to Paul B. Anderson, 21 September 1980, Paul B. Anderson papers, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Box 29.

⁸⁹ The irony of this situation is undeniable. After several conflicts with St. Sergius, Berdyaev had broken off all contact with the institute and with the Orthodox Church of Eulogius. He remained Orthodox, but decried patent religiosity. Today, those whom he would not associate with, live in his house.

of a certain mode or symbol employed. The vast majority, however, seemed totally consumed with Heidegger and Derrida or Wittgenstein and Carnap, with constructivism, deconstructivism, post-modernism or with the whole school of logical empiricism. A brief accounting of monographs dealing with Nikolai Berdyaev, for example, illustrates the relative sparsity: Prior to 1956, 8 biographies or philosophical appraisals were written in the West; for the next thirty years when scholarly production grew exponentially, only 20 works concentrated on his life and ideas; since 1989, however, already 9 new monographs have appeared - 3 from the new Russia - and signs indicate that such works will surpass the thirty "Cold War" years output by the end of this millennium.⁹⁰

Historians have been, by and large, most uniform in their avoidance of the émigré phenomenon, and of the work which was attempted by the religious-philosophical thinkers.⁹¹ Until recently, most Western historians focused upon Soviet issues and those nineteenth century movements which had led directly to the formation of the Bolshevik Party; the religious-philosophical alternative was considered to have lost the struggle, and, thus, to be irrelevant. Moreover, as this chapter indicates, cultural and other "esoteric" studies of Russian history became more or less unsupportable and difficult to integrate within the dominant Materialist paradigm.

An example of the reluctance during these years to engage in discussions about religious-philosophy, was the 1959 Colloquium on Berdyaev. Arranged by a small committee of professors from Columbia and Union Theological universities, the Colloquium was really Paul B. Anderson's initiative. He arranged for an invitation from the Cathedral of St. John the Divine in order that the meeting could be held there on

⁹⁰ Titles are listed in the Bibliography.

⁹¹ See Introduction.

December 3, 1959.⁹² He planned for three papers to be presented: "Berdyayev as a pre-Revolution thinker"; "Berdyayev as a European philosopher"; Christian Elements in Berdyayev's philosophy."

Then, however, he had to find people willing to deliver each of the stated papers. For the first topic he contacted Nicholas Timashev and Michael Karpovich. Timashev replied that he was too busy; Karpovich was seriously ill. Anderson contacted Merle Fainsod at Harvard to inquire if anyone at his Centre for Russian Studies was conducting research into pre-Revolutionary religious-philosophy, and might be able to deliver the speech. Fainsod suggested an Albert Todd Jr. as a possible candidate.⁹³ It is unknown whether Anderson was unable to contact him, did and he refused, or decided that he was not qualified enough to give the speech, but on October 13, 1959 he sent a desperate request off to Helen Iswolsky whom he had briefly met back at Clamart:

The Committee at its meeting last Friday asked me to transmit to you their request that you give a paper on the first topic. Father Alexander Schmemmann particularly emphasized the vast knowledge and deep comprehension which you have of that era of Russian life which was important at the turn of the century - the religious-philosophical meetings in St. Petersburg, Vyekhi and Berdyayev's early writings, in particular *Philosophia Neraventstva* and *Smysl Tvorchestva*. We know of no one who could cover this topic so well as you.⁹⁴

Iswolsky immediately agreed to give the speech, but Anderson's difficulties had already forced him to postpone the Colloquium until February 2, 1960, and at the time of his letter to Iswolsky, he had not yet been able to find a speaker for the second topic.

⁹² Paul B. Anderson, letter to N.S. Timasheff, 5 August 1959, Paul B. Anderson papers, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Box 5.

⁹³ Merle Fainsod, letter to Paul B. Anderson, 17 September 1959, Paul B. Anderson papers, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Box 5.

⁹⁴ Paul B. Anderson, letter to Helene Iswolsky, 13 October 1959, Paul B. Anderson papers, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Box 5.

Representation was slightly better at the celebration for the 20 year anniversary of Berdyaev's death in 1968. Again organized by Anderson, this meeting fielded speeches by William Burgess, Paul Anderson, Fielding Clark, Reverend Paul Oestreicher, Father Vladimir Rodzianko and Philippe Sabant. Nevertheless, compared to the massive interest in the Soviet Union represented by the thousands of articles and volumes coming out on Soviet topics, the issue of religious-philosophy was clearly suffering an intense "dry-spell". Ironically, if one thinks of the typical artist's fate, Berdyaev and the other religious-philosophers enjoyed more fame during their lives than after they had passed away.⁹⁵

Earlier representatives of the religious-philosophical tradition suffered a similar lack of concentrated attention. From the Slavophiles: Khomiakov's ideas are only widely accessible in the West through the one article excerpted in Russian Philosophy⁹⁶; that volume also contains a famous article by Ivan Kireevsky. Only in 1984 did a more complete collection of Kireevsky's works become available: Izbrannye stat'i published by Sovremmenik house, Moscow!⁹⁷ Regarding the Aksakovs, Pëtr Kireevsky, and Yuri Samarin, the scholar might best turn to secondary renditions courageously performed by three men: Peter Christoff,⁹⁸ Andrei Walicki,⁹⁹ and Nicholas Riasanovsky.¹⁰⁰

⁹⁵ A list of Graduate Theses on Berdyaev until 1960 was compiled by Paul B. Anderson. I have continued it until 1989. Please see the Bibliography.

⁹⁶ Alexis Khomyakov, "On Recent Developments in Philosophy," Russian Philosophy Vol. 1 eds., James Edie, James Scanlan, Mary-Barbara Zeldin (Tennessee: University of Tennessee Press, 1978) 221-270.

⁹⁷ Ivan Kireevsky, Izbrannye stat'i, ed. B.A. Kotel'nikov (Moscow: Sovremmenik, 1984).

⁹⁸ Peter Christoff, An Introduction to Nineteenth Century Slavophilism 4 Vols. (The Hague: Mouton & Co. Pub., 1961).

⁹⁹ Andrei Walicki, The Slavophile Controversy (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1975).

Dostoevsky is and always has been, thanks to his international literary reputation, massively published in most languages. Vladimir Soloviev is more widely accessible in libraries, and even in English translations, thanks to efforts during the life-time of the religious-philosophical emigration.¹⁰¹

The central figures of Russia's religious renaissance were even more ignored. Only Berdyaev's writings have been widely translated into English, French, and other languages. Bulgakov, Frank, and Struve were paid a minimal degree of attention;¹⁰² Florensky, Gerzhenson, Kistiakovsky, Novgorodtsev, the Trubetskoys, Stepun, and the other philosophers have been lucky to have even one monograph devoted to their life's work at this time. Those religious-philosophers who were also literary figures were more popular in this era, but Rozanov, Bely, Merezhkovsky, Viacheslav Ivanov and Gippius have been by no means widely examined for their religious ideas, and even Blok was almost solely studied for his poetical style.

One exception to this rule is Vekhi. The collection was finally published in English in 1967-69 in the Canadian Slavic Studies, translated and edited by Marshall Shatz and Judith Zimmermann. It was complemented by ancillary articles from Canadian and American scholars assessing its historical context and its current legacy.¹⁰³ Vekhi was

¹⁰⁰ Nicholas Riasanovsky, Russia and the West in the Teaching of the Slavophiles (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1956).

¹⁰¹ Vladimir Soloviev, The Meaning of Love, trans. Jane Marshall (London, Geoffrey Bles, 1945); The Justification of the Good: An Essay on Moral Philosophy, trans. Nathalie Duddington (London: Constable & Co., Ltd, 1919); Semen Frank ed., The Solovyev Anthology trans. Nathalie Duddington (London: SCM Press, 1950). Frank initiated the first two translations.

¹⁰² Perhaps surprisingly, Struve was largely recaptured by Richard Pipes in his two volume biography.

¹⁰³ Leonard Schapiro, "The Vekhi Group and the Mystique of Revolution," The Slavonic Review 34 (1955-1956): 56-76; Stuart Tompkins, "Vekhi and the Russian Intelligentsia," Canadian Slavonic Papers 2 (1957): 11-25; Nikolai P. Poltoratzky, "The Vekhi dispute and the Significance of

then published as a book and its companion volume Iz glubiny (From under the Rubble) was brought out in both English and Russian. But then, in the mid-1970s, interest waned and the process stopped.

Yet, not all Western scholars discarded the religious-philosophical and cultural repository. James Billington applied many of these themes to great success and interest in his study The Icon and the Axe.¹⁰⁴ Two émigrés also managed to continue to inject the cultural approach towards interpreting the Soviet Union at the height of Sovietology: Vladimir Weidlé's Russia Absent and Present and Russia's Task, and Nicholas Timashev's The Great Retreat.¹⁰⁵ The latter, surprisingly, was often seized upon by the Second Revisionists as an exemplary study although its acceptance was mostly mandated by Timashev's inclusion of regular "people," and rarely for its clear description of a fundamental breakdown in societal cohesion or its hints of a post-revolutionary, spiritual (anti-materialist) revival emerging among the populace.¹⁰⁶ Martha Bohachevsky-

Vekhi, "Canadian Slavic Review 9 (1967): 86-106; Nikolai P. Poltoratzky, "Lev Tolstoy and Vekhi," The Slavonic Review 42 (1963-64): 332-352; A.M. Kelly, "Attitudes to the Individual in Russian Thought and Literature, with Special Reference to the Vekhi Controversy," diss., Oxford University, 1970; C.J. Read, Religion, Revolution and the Russian Intelligentsia from 1900-1912: The VEKHI Debate and Its Intellectual Background (London: MacMillan, 1979).

¹⁰⁴ James Billington, The Icon and the Axe: An Interpretive History of Russian Culture (New York: Vintage Books, 1966). Billington's study has received considerable attention by scholars in the USSR (and today's Russia) since the early 1980s as one of the most original and fruitful Western pieces of scholarship. He has also been able to maintain closer ties with intellectuals and scholars in Russia than most Western academics due to his position with the Library of Congress in the United States. Recently he has helped in the recussitation of the formerly "closed" Soviet archives: documents have been already retrieved, translated, and are now being utilized by Western scholars as may be seen in Richard Pipes, The Unknown Lenin: From the Secret Archive (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1996).

¹⁰⁵ A Professor at Fordham since 1940, he has specialized in legal history. Since 1960, he acted as one of the editors of Novyi zhurnal. Nicolas Zernov, The Russian Religious Renaissance of the Twentieth Century (New York: Harper & Row, 1963) 345.

¹⁰⁶ Nicholas Timashev, The Great Retreat: The Growth and Decline of Communism in Russia (New York: E.P. Dutton, 1946).

Chomiak's study of Sergei Trubetskoy and Bernice Glatzer Rosenthal's of Dmitrii Merezhkovsky both tried to show that Marxism was by no means pre-ordained for Russia, nor was Materialist Socialism the only current of thought in the pre-Revolutionary years. In 1982, they augmented the material from Vekhi with a collection of essays from a wider diversity of the religious thinkers in Revolution of the Spirit.

A few specialists in other fields also determined that the religious-philosophical ideas were of vital importance both for knowing the Russians/Soviets and for Western development, and they made conscientious efforts to preserve this legacy. The most prominent of these is George Kline. Known also for his seminal works on the philosophies of Marx, Hegel, Spinoza, and Whitehead, Kline continually fostered Western appreciation of Russian philosophy. In so doing he helped "in bringing about a much wider awareness of the contributions of Russian thought, and also in demonstrating their relevance to Western European experience more narrowly conceived."¹⁰⁷ He translated volumes crucial for an understanding of Russian philosophy, especially Vladimir Zenkovsky's History of Russian Philosophy (1953), and aided the translation, editing and publication of the three volume Russian Philosophy which became the first English source containing original writings from all of the major Russian philosophers.¹⁰⁸ Over half of this collection is devoted to the religious-philosophical tradition, making it widely accessible to the English speaking public.

¹⁰⁷ Philip T. Grier, "George L. Kline's Influence on the Study of Russian and Soviet Philosophy in the United States," Philosophical Sovietology, eds. H. Dahm, T. J. Blakeley, and G.L. Kline (Dordrecht: D. Reidel Publishing Company, 1988) 243-266.

¹⁰⁸ James Edie, James Scanlan, and Mary-Barbara Zeldin eds., with the collaboration of George Kline, Russian Philosophy (Tennessee: University of Tennessee Press, 1976) first published in 1965.

Kline also inspired students to engage in careers devoted to the study of Russian philosophy, and especially the religious-philosophical tradition. James Scanlan, Mary Zeldin, and James Edie (his fellow collaborators on Russian Philosophy) went on to contribute important works to this issue. George Young and Philip Grier were also indebted to Kline, and his book Religious and Anti-Religious Thought in Russia (1968), provoked studies of the impact of Nietzsche in Russia and other related works.¹⁰⁹

Finally the work of scholars in Slavic literature and languages should not be ignored. As the Sovietology Centres multiplied, these departments indirectly flourished. It was discovered that a scholar could not easily access the vital empirical evidence without the benefit of knowing the language, and so the demand for native-speaking Russians, and Westerners who developed a fluidity in the language, rose every year. Ironically this process provided a place for the émigrés who were being largely ignored in their divergent specializations, and it soon became a familiar sight in Western universities to behold expert émigré writers, scientists, engineers, philologists, philosophers, and tacticians teaching the "A, B, V, s" of Russian to college students.¹¹⁰

However, in these albeit-degrading positions, the émigrés found a haven where they could survive and prosper, and then gradually continue the work of furthering and preserving their culture for more receptive times. Gleb Struve, Temira Pachmuss, Nina Berberova, and Simon Karlinsky (to list a bare minimum) kept the émigré literature and poetry alive through assessments, translations, and new research.¹¹¹ As an isolated

¹⁰⁹ For example, Bernice Glatzer Rosenthal, ed., Nietzsche in Russia (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1986).

¹¹⁰ This is poignantly illustrated in Vladimir Nabokov's Pnin (1953; 1955; New York: Avon Books, 1957).

¹¹¹ See either the Introduction or the Bibliography.

block, their studies were largely restricted to fiction, poetry and drama in accordance with the new specialized limitations of "Languages and Literature."¹¹² Nevertheless, they did manage to evoke a growing interest among their Western students about the deeper meanings inherent in Russian culture and ideas.

In the West, therefore, Sovietology dominated the field of Russian Studies, and religious-philosophy became marginalized. However, the sheer endurance and faith of Russian émigrés did much to mitigate this decline. By preserving and translating their literature, not to mention, contributing their own creative works, Russia's émigrés refused to lose their past. This may have seemed an indulgent pastime for most scholars in the West, but it was not viewed thusly everywhere in this world. In fact, the enduring work of Russia's religious-philosophical, and even non-affiliated, diaspora was to have an underground, but incremental effect on the "unchangeable totalitarian enemy" of these times: The USSR.

¹¹² This can be verified in the list of dissertations published every few years by the Slavic Review. A separate section is labelled "Literature" and this is where most dissertations mentioning any of the émigré and Silver Age Russians can be found. Under "Political Theory", "History" and other more general headings there is a complete absence of any studies involving the religious-philosophical thinkers between 1960-1980.

7. The Return of Religious Philosophy

If one was to look only to Western sources, decline and dispersion of religious-philosophy might indeed seem to be the whole story. However, we are now discovering that after World War Two a process of recovery and revival began in the Soviet Union. The reissuance of Vekhi began to merge with a genuine feeling of discontent over Communist Party hegemony in the sixties and seventies, and it entered the dissident "underground". Nadezhda Mandel'shtam, the widow of the purged writer Osip, began using references to the work in her autobiographical reflections.¹ Alexander Solzhenitsyn, a member of the next generation and unfamiliar with the original publication of Vekhi came to it through a copy of Maxim Gorky's Untimely Thoughts. He either managed to obtain access to Vekhi or learned enough about the collection that in his novel August 1914 he was able to have a central character comment upon reading the articles only to find "the complete reversal of all he had read before, yet true, piercingly true!"²

The YMCA Press contributed to this process. Although they had largely ceased their inter-cultural endeavours, they disseminated dissident literature in the West, and secretly returned a large proportion of the émigré works to Russia. In 1971, Paul Anderson commented upon their efforts:

In spite of the Soviet embargo, which prohibits importation of Russian language literature for sale, a limited but increasing volume of YMCA PRESS books find their way into the USSR. This can be seen from references to its authors in literary, philosophical or polemic atheistic articles in big Soviet journals. But chiefly it is

¹ It is specifically mentioned in Nadezhda Mandel'shtam, Hope against Hope; A Memoir, trans. Max Hayward (New York: Atheneum, 1970) 221; Hope Abandoned, trans. Max Hayward (New York: Atheneum, 1974) 273-290.

² Alexander Solzhenitsyn, August 1914, trans. Michael Glenny (New York: Farrar, Straus & Giroux, 1972) 20.

expressed in letters from independent readers or in conversations which visitors to the USSR have with thoughtful persons there. It is evident that YMCA PRESS is in some measure continuing to fulfil its purpose of maintaining and developing Russian Christian culture³

In 1974, an undeniable sign of the resurgence of the Vekhi idea emerged when the collection Iz-pod glub (From Under the Rubble) was published containing articles from Solzhenitsyn (then emigrated to the United States) and several other authors still in Russia. The title was obviously chosen deliberately. It referred directly to the collection Iz glubiny (From the Depths, 1918). Not only was the title and thematic content of the articles similar to Vekhi and Iz glubiny, so too did many of the authors turn "to religious thought as the only way out of the spiritual impasse they felt the prevailing ideology had created".⁴ Solzhenitsyn neatly summed up the connection: "the ulcers we are shown [in Vekhi] seem to belong not just to a past historical era, but in many respects to our own times as well."⁵

To most Westerners, it seemed that Communist hegemony in the Soviet Union was an unbroken, non-disputable given fact. What was happening that would allow not only the *Samizdat* transmission, but even the reading of such clearly "banned" materials? During World War Two, Stalin had halted much of the anti-religious efforts in order that the Church might help improve morale for the war effort. Although the Central Committee of the Communist Party still, periodically, insisted on the need to again resume the

³ Paul B. Anderson, "A Brief History of YMCA Press", 1971, Paul B. Anderson Papers, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Box 4: 12.

⁴ Marshall S. Shatz and Judith E. Zimmerman, eds., Vekhi (Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe, 1994) xxix.

⁵ Shatz and Zimmerman, eds., Vekhi xxix.

crusade against religion,⁶ no direct acts were taken against the Orthodox Church; moreover, on April 10, 1945 Stalin and Molotov received the newly elected Patriarch Aleksi and other leading hierarchs, albeit in a closed meeting.⁷

The Church made the most of the brief period of "favour," and requested that new theological academies be formed to replace those destroyed in the twenties and thirties. Stalin agreed to this, and even assented to the creation of a Church printing press.⁸ Now the Church was finally able to train replacement clergy, as well as publish and transmit religious literature. Quite aware that the best repository of such literature, especially that written in the twentieth century, was the YMCA Press in Paris, the new Patriarch sent a delegation to meet with its new director Donald Lowrie. He readily agreed to send whatever books they requested in order to fill the libraries at the new seminaries and academies. For almost thirty years that the YMCA had been trying to distribute these books in Russia, and at last the opportunity had come.

Through its delegate, the Orthodox Church in Russia chose some 700 volumes of the YMCA Press books: three complete series of every publication they had produced in the life-time of the House. The Church did not even refuse those books which were

⁶ In September, 1944 it released a decree 'calling for renewed antireligious efforts through 'scientific-educational propaganda.' In 1945 another Central Committee resolution was made for the 'intensification of atheistic propaganda by the mass media.' See David E. Powell, Antireligious Propaganda in the Soviet Union: A Study in Mass Persuasion (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1975) 38.

⁷ Dimitry V. Pospelovsky, The Russian Church Under the Soviet Regime, 1917-1982, Vol. 1 (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1984) 301.

⁸ The magnitude of this decision may be illustrated thusly: Before World War Two there were no legitimate seminaries: in 1944 one was opened in Moscow and included an academy for higher theological (doctoral level) studies. After this meeting six other seminaries - Odessa (1945), Leningrad, Minsk/Zhirovitsy, Lutsk/Volhynia, Stavropol,(1946) and Kiev (1947) - and one other academy - Leningrad (1946) were established. Pospelovsky, The Russian Church... Vol. 1 302.

blatantly anti-communist in tone.⁹ While fervently expressing his hope that the requests would continue, Lowrie worked quickly to prepare the books for transport to the USSR. In the final counting, it was not 700, but "over 1,300 books representing most of the three hundred titles we have published since our organization" that were sent.¹⁰ The new Church repositories, therefore, became one centre where Soviet citizens could obtain and read the "forbidden" religious-philosophical works.

The literature of the émigrés, especially the explosive critiques of Communism made by the religious philosophers, entered the Soviet Union in another way as well. In 1944, out of gratitude for Soviet emancipation of Czechoslovakia from the hands of the Nazis, Eduard Bènes sent the "Prague Archive" back to Russia. This enormous collection contained a copy of almost every émigré periodical and book as well as many personal recollections of those who had fled or been expelled from Russia.¹¹ Although the "Prague Archive" was supposed to be sealed upon its arrival in Moscow - the Communist authorities rightly thought that the material within would be damaging to their control over the minds of the Soviet people - it now seems that it was placed in a "Special Collection" within the Lenin Archive. It was difficult, therefore, but not impossible for trusted scholars at the Academy of Sciences to gain access to this collection.¹²

⁹ Donald A. Lowrie, "Report from Paris," 5 March 1947, Paul B. Anderson papers, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Box 6: 3.

¹⁰ Donald A. Lowrie, "Thirty Years of Work with Russians," 9 August 1947, Paul B. Anderson papers, University of Illinois at Urbana Champaign, Box 6: 5.

¹¹ Sergei P. Postnikov, Politika, ideologija, byt i uchenye trudy russkoi emigratsii, 1918-1945: bibliografiia iz kataloga biblioteki R.Z.I. & Arkhiva (New York: Norman Ross Pub., 1993), 2-4.

¹² For example, Piama P. Gaidenko has now described her personal experience in discovering the works of Berdyaev. She was working in the "special archives" on a graduate project when she came across copies of Put'. Entranced, she found herself putting aside her other work as she began a full scale re-education into religious-philosophy through the essays printed in its many volumes. "The Philosophy of Freedom of Nikolai Berdiaev," Russian Thought After Communism:

In the mid-fifties, there was yet another widening of the crack in strict dialectical-materialist hegemony: the comprehensive histories of Russian Philosophy by Lossky and Zenkovsky were published in 1954 and 1956 respectively. Both were released in "limited editions" which meant that only 500-1000 copies were printed. Moreover, both histories were translated back into Russian from the English translation in the West, and the Lossky version was mysteriously transformed in the process.¹³ "Limited editions" were supposed to be distributed only to those people who had demonstrated their unbreakable loyalty to Communism. However, several copies of both books were deposited in the main libraries of the Moscow, Kiev, and Leningrad Universities, and, although one required permission to see the books, most graduate students were not denied access.

The second generation of Soviet citizens, largely ignorant of the religious-philosophical heritage from the pre-revolutionary and émigré writers, were thus able to uncover its alternative ideas with a little persistence. The potential of this was not immediately realized, but it did begin to manifest itself in the USSR during the late fifties and onwards. Suddenly, underground organizations began to form: some were directly contained within the Church; others held distant but concrete ties with the religious establishment; and a third group maintained their secularity. However, these dissident movements did share a common bond in that all were dissatisfied with the current Soviet

The Recovery of a Philosophical Heritage ed. James Scanlan (Armonk NY.: M.E. Sharpe, 1994) 104.

¹³ Zenkovsky's was retranslated from George Kline's English translation of the book, and appears to be quite accurate when compared to the original. Stanislas Dzhimbinov, "The Return of Russian Philosophy," Russian Thought After Communism ed., James Scanlan (Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe, 1994) 16-17.

regime, angry at the repressions, the Gulag, the mental hospitals, and wanted to effect change from within in their country.

The Church dissidents began to form after renewed repressions against Orthodoxy were commanded in 1954. These were aimed at the new press given to the Orthodox Church in 1945 which the Communist Party now considered a substantial threat to the propagation of atheism. School books and all educational texts immediately proclaimed the atheist stance more harshly and more dogmatically.¹⁴ Special obligatory classes in atheism were introduced at the school and college level. A central Institute of Scientific Atheism was even founded. Committed believers were not ignored during this time of new repressions. Special committees formed out of the Communist Party, the Komsomol and the Znanie society would go to the homes of known Christians in an attempt to convert them. When this did not work they were threatened with demotion, dismissal, and other forms of discrimination.¹⁵

Although the clergy was encouraged to defect, leave the church, and a few indeed did so,¹⁶ by and large the general Church response was one of entrenched resolve. As the persecution increased, clerics and their students began to find tenets of hope in the religious-philosophical writings which had been sent over by the YMCA Press. They began to talk of *sobornost'*, and to engage in oecumenical discussions with the Baptists

¹⁴ Pospelovsky, The Russian Church... Vol. 1 331.

¹⁵ See Richard Marshall Jr., ed., Aspects of Religion in the Soviet Union, 1917-1967 (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1971) 140-143.

¹⁶ The most famous was Reverend Professor Alexander Osipov of the Leningrad Theological Academy who "defected," by leaving the Church in 1959. Others to leave were Evgraf Duluman, Pavel Darmansky, and Nikolai Spassky. Pospelovsky, The Russian Church... Vol. 1. 332.

and even the Catholics.¹⁷ The Communist Party tried to quell these attempts at subtle resistance by infiltrating the Churches with their own agents from the KGB and other organizations. This policy of making the Church subservient to the Party from within had always been quite successful, for it delegitimized the hierarchy in the eyes of believers.¹⁸ However, when combined with the obvious and direct persecution of the Church, the renewed attempt at undermining Christianity failed. By 1959, the "Catacomb" sect began to renew its ties with the official Orthodox Church having gained new respect for its endurance of State harassment. A newly unified Orthodox Church with stronger ties to the other Christian religious bodies in the USSR began to represent a serious threat to Communism.

Following the spirit of the oecumenical endeavors begun by the religious-philosophical émigrés, the Russian Orthodox Church also began to try and mend the schisms in the emigration. The rationale was quite simple: unity would mean greater numbers, which in turn could exert more influence on the Communist government for Church rights and independence. In 1966, therefore, the Patriarch of Russia sent a letter to the Archpastors of the Church Abroad, seeking to overcome the schisms of 1927 and 1930.¹⁹ While a formal reunification was never effected, the Orthodox Church in Russia was clearly showing its independence and initiative.

¹⁷ Pospelovsky, The Russian Church... Vol. 1 338-9, 372-4.

¹⁸ Remember the reaction of the Eulogius group in Paris when Metropolitan Sergei of Moscow demanded they swear loyalty to the Soviet regime in 1927 (see Chapter 5). The "Catacombs" who considered themselves to be the only "True" Orthodox also broke away after this declaration. They were one of the strongest centres of religious dissidence in the USSR and repeatedly appeared in KGB files (1956-61 and 1971-72). Pospelovsky, The Russian Church... Vol. 1 366.

¹⁹ This did not entirely succeed and there are still several different Russian Churches all finding their allegiance in different Patriarchs. However, the process is continuing today. Pospelovsky, The Russian Church... Vol. 1 384.

As the Church collected its united strength, the Communists began to study it with close attention. How, they asked, could it have survived and now be growing after all the repressions they had committed it to, and after all the re-education they had performed of Soviet people? They decided that the new Church revival had to be attributed to influence from thinkers such as Dostoevsky, Vladimir Soloviev, V. Ekzempiarsky of Kiev, P. Florensky, Berdyaev, Bulgakov and others.²⁰ Bulgakov received the greatest attention as "the theoretical source for the religious liberalism of the First Russian Revolution and the Renovationism of the 1920s, now inclined in the ideological arsenal of the Orthodox Church."²¹ Fortunately for the Church, however, they did not point their attacks at the repositories of this "dangerous literature" within the Seminaries and Academies: the YMCA Press books remained on their shelves free for any theological student to peruse; the writings could slowly inculcate a strong opposition to Communist power in Russia.

Just how potent this influence would be for religious dissidence was demonstrated in the 1970s. In 1973, the Moscow Seminar was started by Alexander Ogorodnikov.²² Bringing a group of fervent believers interested in the religious-philosophical tradition together, the Seminar was created to perform missionary work, to disseminate Christian

²⁰ Dmitry V. Pospelovsky, Soviet Studies on the Church and the Believer's Response to Atheism: A History of Soviet Atheism in Theory and Practice, and the Believer, Vol. 3 (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1988) 25.

²¹ K.S. Siniutina, "Kritika khristianskoi sotsiologii S.N. Bulgakova" 12 VNA (1971): 94. Also see M.M. Sheinman, Khristianskii sotsializm (Moscow: s.n. 1969) 162-82; N.P. Krasnikov, "Evolutsiia sotsial'noi kontseptsii pravoslaviia" Voprosy istorii 9 (1971) 16-23.

²² Ogorodnikov's parents were staunch Communist believers and he himself studied Marxist philosophy at two Soviet Universities before embarking on post-graduate studies at the All-Union Institute of Cinematography. Influenced by Pazzolini's film The Gospel According to St. Matthew he converted to Orthodoxy at the beginning of the seventies. He was subsequently expelled from the institute for making a religious film. Ostracized he decided to start his own private religious community in the Moscow Seminar. Pospelovsky, ...the Believer's Response to Atheism Vol. 3 166.

ideas and teachings, to work especially with young people and children. It hoped to begin a "moral regeneration and enlightenment of Russia through the word of Christ."²³ In its Statement of Principles, the Seminar demonstrated its connection to the émigré experience, and its intention to work for the *post-revolutionary* ideal:

Development of an Orthodox *Mirovozzrenie* and...theological education. The Russian émigrés have preserved the very depths of our national soul, of Russian religious thought...we must take over their burden....The imperishable beauty of the Church revealed Russia to us...To love Russia means to take up its Crisis.²⁴

Finally, more than twenty years after his death, a clear sign that Berdyaev's hope for a post-revolutionary evolution in Soviet Russia led by Christian principles and engendered in religious thought was finally delivered. And it was propelled largely by the meagre return of his and his colleagues books and writings to the USSR.

The Moscow Seminar, of course, was not ignored by the Communist authorities. They harassed its members from the very beginning, and increased their efforts as the Seminar began to grow. Regardless, the seminar soon had groups in cities as distant as Ufa, L'vov, and Smolensk, although the heart of the movement remained firmly centred in Moscow and Leningrad. Like all the religious-philosophers before them, they felt it necessary to spread their ideas through the medium of a journal. As State approval obviously would not be granted, they painstakingly produced Obshchina²⁵ by hand and distributed it "underground" through the *samizdat* press. The first issue was confiscated, but other subsequent issues did achieve a limited circulation.²⁶

²³ Pospelovsky, ...the Believer's Response to Atheism Vol. 3 167.

²⁴ As cited in Pospelovsky, ...the Believer's Response to Atheism Vol. 3 167.

²⁵ A direct reference to their commitment to *sobornost'*.

²⁶ Pospelovsky, ...the Believer's Response to Atheism Vol. 3 167.

By 1978, State action against the Moscow Seminar increased to a fevered pitch: eight of its members were incarcerated; others were expelled from their jobs or from the universities they attended. Finally Ogorodnikov was sentenced to one year in prison for "refusal to work."²⁷ At the end of the year, he received an additional six years hard labour for disseminating anti-Soviet propaganda within the camp. Even in 1986, under Premier Gorbachev, when his case again came before the courts, he received another three years hard labour for "violation of camp discipline."²⁸

The Church was not the only group which fostered dissidence in these years. During the famous dissident trials of the sixties, no less than two organizations were condemned for anti-Soviet activities whose members directly stated their allegiance to Berdyaev. The first was a group of professors, writers and students in Leningrad who were arrested in 1967. They professed to being disciples of Berdyaev, and were accused of working directly for the overthrow of the Communist government. In the arrest report, they were charged with storing illegal arms and working with an underground organization stemming from the Ukraine to the Urals.²⁹ Another Leningrad group was arrested on April 5, 1968. They called themselves the "Pan-Russian Christian-Social Movement for the liberation of the people." Their centre was in Leningrad, but like the other group, they had associated cells in Kiev, Minsk, and Irkutsk. Again they stated that they were disciples of Berdyaev, and were trying to institute his post-revolutionary

²⁷ This was the horrible "catch-22" which the Communist government used against dissidents. They could not be hired in any State Organization (which controlled all work in the country) because of their beliefs, but then could be tried for "refusal to work" because unemployment was illegal in the USSR.

²⁸ Ogorodnikov was released only in 1987 with the initiation of *glasnost*.

²⁹ "The Moscow Trials," Commonweal 1 March 1968: 647.

aspirations in the USSR. This group was composed of writers, linguists, and historians of literature and philosophy.³⁰

Some of the contemporary journalists assessing the dissident phenomenon were surprised, and discouraged, that its proponents always seemed to belong to the intellectual "elite", never exhibiting any mass representation.³¹ However, considering these two examples, dissidence appeared to be partially fostered by exposure to alternatives, and the subsequent realization that there were ways in which Communism could be reformed or overthrown altogether. As these ideas, especially those of the religious-philosophical bent, were only accessible to students and scholars, then mass dissemination of the émigré and pre-revolutionary literature would have to occur before greater numbers could be expected.³²

Finally, dissidence was widely represented by writers. They suffered the most from Soviet censorship as they continued to rebel against the constraints of "Socialist Realism". Solzhenitsyn is by far the most famous of these, but Sinyavsky and Ginsburg were also well known. The writers were by no means universally attracted to, or even familiar with, the religious-philosophical tradition. Sinyavsky and Ginsburg represent a much more secular trend concerned primarily with human rights and freedom; they derived much of their inspiration from the American democratic model.³³ Solzhenitsyn,

³⁰ Le Monde 19 April 1968: 5.

³¹ "The Moscow Trials," Commonweal 1 March 1968: 648.

³² It is also possible, of course, that the religious-philosophical ideas appealed only to intellectuals. Remember the problem which Emmanuel Mounier faced in trying to make Esprit and Personalism widely popular. See Chapter 6.

³³ The famous Andrei Sakharov should also be included in this stream.

however, did become an adherent of religious-philosophy. In the Gulag Archipelago he stated:

...the outflow from Russia of a significant part of her spiritual forces...deprived us of a great and important stream of Russian culture. Everyone who really loves that culture will strive for the reunion of both streams, the one at home and the tributary abroad. Only then will our culture attain wholeness.³⁴

This call was to inspire another form of dissidence: not outspoken revolt against the Communist repressions and hegemony, but cautious circumvention of the Party's censorship laws. This last group would be very important in returning more and more of the religious-philosophical legacy to the Russian people at large.

The Return

The start of this work, to insert non-accepted fragments into State-published documents, began in 1960. That year, the Central Committee agreed that a special Soviet Encyclopedia of Philosophy should be published in order to strengthen the general populace's understanding of dialectical materialism. They even allowed entries for non-marxist philosophers (Kireevsky, Soloviev, Fedorov etc...), so that their work might be appropriately denigrated and shown to be inferior. However, in 1967, the fourth edition of the encyclopedia included such oddities as articles written by the courageous scholar of philosophy, thirty-year-old Sergei Averintsev which gave a fair representation of Soloviev's and the Slavophiles' ideas. In the next edition, published in 1970, the entry on Soloviev was substantially longer than those for leading Marxist philosophers, and it was entirely unbiased to the extent that its authors appeared to be almost in favour of his

³⁴ Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn, The Gulag Archipelago (New York: Harper & Row, 1973) 615.

ideas.³⁵ More astonishingly, new topics and names were included (although there were a few misspellings): Florensky, Rozanov, Merezhkovsky appeared, and Averintsev's twenty-seven articles sympathetically described unheard of topics like Sophia, Salvation, Theodicy, Chiliasm, and Eschatology.³⁶

When the final copy reached the Soviet censors of philosophical materials, they were outraged. Immediate demands were made that its release be halted or that it be completely revised. However, the director of the Sovetskaia ensiklopediia Publishers, Fedor Konstantinov, did not want to admit that such a mistake had occurred under his charge. When reprisals were at last demanded he sacrificed his second-in-command, Aleksandr Spirkin, and the young editors, Iu. Popov and R. Gal'tseva.³⁷ The fifth volume of Filosofskaia ensiklopediia however, was published unchanged, and sold without restraint. Russian readers now had access to some introductory ideas of the religious-philosophical tradition. This was the last edition ever published of the encyclopedia; the embarrassment caused its cancellation.³⁸

Grigorii Skovoroda's works somehow slipped through the censors in 1973, but otherwise that decade was too dangerous for more extreme revelations to be attempted. Nevertheless, it is now apparent that such academics who found value in religious thought were studying it on their own, and preparing a substantial number of publications

³⁵ The authors of this article were Valentin Asmus, Sergei Khoruzhii and 2 others. Stanslav Dzhimbinov, "The Return of Russian Philosophy," 17-18.

³⁶ Stanslav Dzhimbinov, "The Return of Russian Philosophy" 18.

³⁷ Stanslav Dzhimbinov, "The Return of Russian Philosophy" 19.

³⁸ It should be noted that in 1969 Khomiakov's poems and plays were published in one volume. See A.S. Khomiakov, Stikhotvoreniia i dramy, ed. B.F. Egorov (Leningrad: Sovetskii pisatel', 1969).

so that they would be ready for immediate release the instant that the censor's guard went down.³⁹ In 1979, an ally was discovered in "Mysl'" Publishing House. They were willing to take the risk of issuing excerpts of Ivan Kireevsky's⁴⁰ and of the Aksakov brothers' writings.⁴¹ In 1982, they released a large volume of Nikolai Fedorov's collected works.⁴²

Again there was a scandal. Iovchuk, director of Philosophy in the Academy of Sciences demanded the head of the scholar who had permitted this book to be published, and he ordered its immediate recall. For this transgression, Arsenii Vladimirovich Gulyga lost his position. However, when the police visited the stores, they found that all copies of the book had already been sold.⁴³ Despite repression and the repercussions, the appeal of the literature could not be denied, and other scholars found it an undeniable temptation to continue the process of revelation.

³⁹ R.A. Gal'tseva, "Sub specie finis (Utopiia tvorchestva N.A. Berdiaeva," Ocherki russkoi utopicheskoi mysli XX veka (Moscow: Nauka, 1992) 10-76. Although it was written 1974, it was only published much later. This is also true of a work on the Slavophiles by Khoruzhii (1990), and a collection of Khomiakov's ideas (1988).

⁴⁰ I.V. Kireevskii, Kritika i estetika, ed. Iu. V. Mann (Moscow: Iskusstvo, 1979).

⁴¹ Filosofskoe nasledie (Moscow, Mysl' 1979-1983); K.S. Aksakov and I.S. Aksakov, Literaturnaia kritika (Moscow: Sovremennik, 1981).

⁴² N.F. Fedorov, Sochineniia, ed. A.V. Gulyga, comp. and intro. S.G. Semenova (Moscow: Mysl', 1982).

⁴³ "Iurii Andropov, the *gensek* (General Secretary) 'himself', has a chat about this book with Georgii Mokeevich Markov, who was utterly blameless (in this case). The repressions fell on the deputy of the editor-in-chief of the *Philosophical Heritage* series, Gulyga, who was demoted to a rank-and-file member of the editorial board. The name Arsenii Vladimirovich Gulyga should be mentioned together with A. G. Spirkin among those very, very few members of the official philosophical establishment for whom the unenlightened materialism of the "revdems" (revolutionary democrats) was never able to obscure all of Russian thought." Stanislav Dzhimbinov, "The Return of Russian Philosophy" 21.

The Fedorov scandal seemed so great as to derail another daring publication attempt. Gulyga had been working at that time with the philosopher A. Losev on a massive three volume collection of Soloviev's writings. Now it seemed, it would be impossible to sneak this past the awakened censors. However, initiative often prevails, and Losev merely edited out the most extreme religious expressions of Soloviev's thought in order to produce a slim one volume introduction to his work. It was published in 1983. Again the scandal erupted, but the solution this time was to ban its sale in any large Soviet city. The provinces, however, received full access to the book.⁴⁴ In 1984, a more complete collection of Kireevsky also slipped through.⁴⁵

Religious thought might have held little interest for scholars in the West and for their funding agencies during this period, but in the USSR it was a temptation, "forbidden fruit," and increasingly it became the total commitment in certain people's lives. In the West there was increasing separation of the spiritual and the material, and people turned more and more to rational science and big mechanistic plans to solve all the problems of their lives. Although never an official policy, atheism (or at least indifference to religion), became generally manifested among the peoples of almost every Western democratic country. In the Soviet Union, however, they had tried pure atheism and pure materialism. As the dissident and circumventive examples herein described demonstrate,

⁴⁴ Dzhimbinov, "The Return of Russian Philosophy" 21.

⁴⁵ I.V. Kireevskii, Izbrannye stat'i (Moscow: Mysl', 1984). There were also continued attempts to bring out more general assessments of the Slavophiles as a group throughout this period. See for example: Literaturnye vzgliady i tvorchestvo slavianofil'stov, 1830-1850 godov ed. K.N. Lomunov (Moscow: Nauka, 1978); V.A. Koshelov, Esteticheskie i literaturnye vozzreniia russkikh slavianofilov (1840-1850-e gody) (Leningrad: Nauka: 1984); N.I. Tsimbaev, Slavianofil'stvo: Iz istorii russkoi obshchestvenno-politicheskoi mysli XIX veka (Moscow: Izdatel'stvo Moskovskogo universiteta, 1986). While all of these were quite critical of the Slavophile legacy, they increasingly represented the ideas in a fair light.

certain Soviet people found it insufficient. Religion was gaining strength and popularity, and the demand for more and more Russian religious-philosophical writings grew inexorably throughout the Cold War Years. By the time of Gorbachev, these people were poised for any sign that the Communists were unsure how to proceed, and then they would burst forth with their insistence that the religious-philosophical tradition be returned to the Russian people.

The Policy of *Glasnost'* and the *Return*.

The circumvention of Soviet censorship persisted throughout the early 1980s as more and more religious-philosophical tracts by pre-revolutionary and émigré Russians were disseminated to the populace at large. Although mass accessibility and wholesale republication of these materials were effected only after 1988, several Russian scholars assert that the *Return* was inevitable regardless of official government policy. Stanislas Dzhimbinov, who chronicled the process in a 1992 article, stated:

All this is being related with the sole purpose of leading the reader to the stunning conclusion that the return of Russian philosophy was inevitable, even if there had not been a perestroika...Something was irreversibly set into motion at the end of the seventies...The lovchuks would forbid one thing, but something else would appear. They would forbid this something else, and a third would appear... Repression no longer functioned as effectively as before.⁴⁵

He, thus, perceived the *Return* to be the product of a largely spontaneous, "from below" movement: once the door to this rich, native Russian heritage had been opened for Soviet citizens, it was impossible to stop the natural process by which further knowledge would be demanded and achieved.

⁴⁵ Stanislav Bemovich Dzhimbinov, "The Return of Russian Philosophy," 22.

Whether or not the growing rebellion in certain academic circles would have actually resulted in the eventual publication of every banned work will never be known for, in 1988, the Communist government turned volte-face, and granted official sanction for the *Return*. The movement "from below" was seized upon and quickly enacted "from above". Some signs indicating an unprecedented relaxation of Soviet censorship appeared when Premier Mikhail Gorbachev announced that *Glasnost'* would have to accompany the economic and political restructuring process (*Perestroika*) if it was to have any chance of true success. However, the Politburo resolution of 1988 came as a complete surprise to most: a new series, *Iz istorii otechestvennoi filosofskoi mysli*, was commanded to systematically re-publish the collected works of all the leading religious philosophers from both the nineteenth century *and the emigration*. It would be issued as an appendix to the journal Voprosy filosofii which was published by none other than "Pravda," the official publishing house of the Communist Party.⁴⁷ At first, it seemed rather unusual that the Politburo would directly concern itself with such a seemingly extraneous issue, but as the first few volumes appeared the political ramifications became apparent. In one of the most extreme turn-about in Soviet history, the Communist Politburo was not just permitting, but directly commanding the publication of works which directly opposed its governing philosophy.

The manipulations behind such a revolutionary turn are, as yet, unclear. Although Premier Gorbachev repeatedly justified the new "openness" as a necessary precursor to responsible change and greater popular commitment, he remained committed to the

⁴⁷ Dzhimbinov, "The Return of Russian Philosophy" 22. See also Robin Aizlewood, "The Return of the 'Russian Idea' in Publications, 1988-91," Slavonic and East European Review 71.2 (July 1993): 490-499.

Marxist-Leninist paradigm and its supremacy in the USSR.⁴⁸ Why, therefore, would he sanction a Politburo decision to republish works which clearly opposed Communism at its essence? In an early assessment of the new series, Iuri Senokosov identified Anatolii Iakovlev as the major lobbyist for this decision, but he did not explain how Iakovlev managed to persuade the staunch Politburo Communists to promote the publication of what was clearly anti-Communist literature.⁴⁹ Iakovlev is the son of Aleksandr Iakovlev who was "punished" for expressing opinions counter to the strict Party line, in 1970 with the post of Soviet Ambassador to Canada. As Aleksandr Iakovlev later went on to become an advisor to Gorbachev while *Perestroika* was being planned, the influence his son possessed may be explained. However, the connection between the Iakovlev family and Russian religious-philosophical ideas remains a mystery.⁵⁰

This mystery notwithstanding, the results of the Politburo decision were, frankly, incredible. Before, only a mere fraction of Russian philosophical writings were accessible,

⁴⁸ For early assessments of *glasnost* in relation to history, before the edict promoting the *Return*, see Stephen Wheatcroft, "Unleashing the Energy of History, Mentioning the Unmentionable and Reconstructing Soviet Historical Awareness: Moscow 1987," American Slavic and East European Studies 1.1 (1987): 85-132 and "Steadying the Energy of History and Probing the Limits of *Glasnost*: Moscow July to December 1987," American Slavic and East European Studies 1.2 (1987): 57-114.

⁴⁹ "Ne zacherknut', ne nachinat' znachala...(beseda s. Iu. Senokosovym)," Vestnik vysshei shkoly 11 (1990): 51-57.

⁵⁰ A potential revelation came in 1992 when the former Premier, Mikhail Gorbachev participated in a colloquium at McGill University. There, Dr. Valentin Boss asked him if it was not true that Pierre Trudeau (former Prime Minister of Canada) had been somewhat instrumental in his decision to embark upon *Perestroika*. To the astonishment of most of the audience, Gorbachev agreed. It is rumoured that Aleksandr Iakovlev held several private meetings with Trudeau during his ambassadorship in Canada and, as a result, returned to the USSR assured that Canada would support a radical transformation of their economy. He believed that it would lend its weight at the U.N. and other international bodies to advocate that no "advantage" be taken of the USSR during its "weakened" transitional state.

and those were largely restricted: Soloviev,⁵¹ Losev,⁵² Chaadaev,⁵³ Leontiev,⁵⁴ a Russian translation of Nikolai Lossky's History of Russian Philosophy and a limited edition of Vladimir Zenkovsky's History of Russian Philosophy,⁵⁵ Skovoroda, Ivan Kireevsky, and Nikolai Fedorov. After 1988, a veritable flood increasingly focusing on the émigré religious philosophers ensued; the entire religious-philosophical tradition which had been preserved only in the emigration was brought back to Russia. In the series *Iz istorii otechestvennoi filosofskoi mysli* alone, an impressive number of volumes were released in the second half of 1989 indicating the thirst for such "forbidden fruit": Berdyaev, Bakunin, Chaadaev, Kavelin, Pisarev, Potebnia, Shpet, and the complete Soloviev (2 volumes). This list became even more daring the following year as writings from Florensky (2 volumes), Frank, Iurkevich, Kropotkin, Losev, Rozanov (2 volumes) and Tkachev were brought back. The plan for 1991 was similarly adventurous, with the proposal of Rozanov, Bulgakov, Em Ivanov, Lossky, Novgorotsev, Shestov and Vysheslavtsev. That year, however, only the supplements on Losskii, Novgorotsev, and Em appeared, although a surprise addition was the publication of a large volume

⁵¹ The fourth volume of his "Letters" was published in 1923. After that, no reissuance of any Soloviev works appeared in the Soviet Union until the eighties.

⁵² Eight books were issued in small runs from 500-1500 copies between 1927 and 1930.

⁵³ Five previously unknown "Philosophical Letters" printed in Literaturnoe nasledstvo 22-24 (1935). A commemorative one volume collection of his works were to be published in 1956 in honour of 100 years after his death, but it never appeared. Only in 1987 was the Chaadaev Collection issued by "Sovremennik" Publishers, edited by B. Tarasov who also wrote the foreword.

⁵⁴ Konstantin Leont'ev, "Moia literaturnaia sud'ba," Literaturnoe nasledstvo 22-24 (1935).

⁵⁵ Published also by "Inostrannaia literatura" in 1956 again in a limited, numbered edition. Unlike Losskii, this was the original Russian version. Both books resided in special archives of the major Soviet libraries, and only became available to the general reader sometime in the 1970s.

containing both *Vekhi* and *Iz glubiny*.⁵⁶ "Pravda" House and its philosophical organ *Voprosy filosofii*, explained the alteration on financial grounds: there was just not enough money to produce all the promised volumes; *Voprosy filosofii* was to be henceforth published by the now private house "Nauka," and would hopefully be able to fulfil its stated intent in the following years.

In 1992, however, no new volumes had appeared and, although "Nauka" promised a series including Sergei Bulgakov (two volumes), Ivan Ilyin (two volumes), Viacheslav Ivanov, Aleksei Khomiakov (two volumes), Lev Shestov (two volumes), Evgenii Trubetskoi (two volumes), and Boris Vysheslavtsev, only the Bulgakov work appeared in 1993, and Ilyin and Shestov in 1994. The seeming trend was that interest and/or ability to republish was tapering off in the former Soviet Union. This could be explained on wholly financial grounds considering the accelerating economic problems in Russia which the entire world has witnessed during the past few years. It might also be interpreted as a sign that Russian religious-philosophy could not compete with the now-massive accessibility to the entire diversity of Western ideas. A more ominous view was to see the apparent decline as indicative of a governmental reaction back towards repression corroborated by the attempted *coup d'état* against Gorbachev, and later by certain acts taken by Boris Yeltsin.

As this thesis was being written, however, in 1995 and 1996 the process to recover the émigré legacy has itself regained its earlier vivacity; scarcely one month goes by without several advertisements for the impending re-publication of émigré works in the pages of *Literaturnaya gazeta*, not to mention the rapidly expanding production of articles on one or another issue particularly related to the religious-philosophers in a widening

⁵⁶ James P. Scanlan, "Overview," *Russian Thought After Communism: The Recovery of a Philosophical Heritage*, ed. James P. Scanlan (Armonk NY: M.E. Sharpe, 1994) 6.

flood of journals. After, what now appears to be the pangs of transition, Voprosy filosofii has resumed its commitment to reclaiming the lost, forbidden, history of the religious philosopher in *iz istorii otechestvennoi filosofskoi mysli* which both continues its publication of collected works, and also reports upon details of history through articles published in the parent journal. M.A. Kolerov, for example, has written several articles, one of which has been crucial for this thesis, that focus upon the activities of the religious philosophers while they remained in Russia until their expulsion in 1922, and shortly thereafter in the emigration.⁵⁷

Although Voprosy filosofii led the way, it was not the only repository for the *Return*. The unforeseen opportunity to distribute religious-philosophical writings caused two prominent Russian-language publishing houses in France to relocate or open branch offices in Russia. Thus, in May 1990, "Phenix-Atheneum" (formerly "Atheneum" in Paris) opened its doors in St. Petersburg and Moscow with the specific intent of publishing archival materials and formerly censored works relating to the religious-philosophical renaissance.⁵⁸ With the deliberate reference to the "Phoenix rising out of the ashes," this House has begun the immense task of resurrecting the lost historical framework, and bringing back the émigré literature to Russia. Its collections to date are Minuvsheye and Zvenya which include mostly memoir and archival materials, Litsa which offers a forum

⁵⁷ M.A. Kolerov, "Bratstvo sviatogo Sofii," Voprosy filosofii 7.10 (1994): 143-166; "Filosofskii zhurnal Mysl', (1922)," Voprosy filosofii 8.1 (1995): 179-184; "Novy Vekhi: k istorii 'vekhovskoi' mifologii (1918-1944)," Voprosy filosofii 8.1 (1995): 144-166.

⁵⁸ As stated in their prospectus: "The most important spheres of activity of 'Phenix' are search and annotated publications of original source documents on the political, social and cultural history of Russia in the XIX-XX centuries. The documents are published in almanacs, collections and as separate books. The themes of publications are rather broad in scope: religion, science, painting, literature, theatre, political repressions, resistance, revolutions, wars, politics etc." Vladimir Alloy, About "Phenix-Atheneum" Publishers (The Internet: "Phenix-Atheneum" Publishers, webpage).

for émigré and current poetry, and Postscriptum: A Literary and Art Journal. In a continued attempt to validate its work in the West as well as in Russia, Phenix-Atheneum has solicited the contribution of such scholars as Richard Davis, John Malmstad, Richard Pipes and Marc Raeff. The second French house to move increasingly into the Russian market has been the YMCA-Press which has cited Paris-Moscow on its publications intended for Russia since 1994.

The *Return* also affected native Russian journals, many of which had been staunch Communist Party organs, and it further spawned a host of new publications. In addition to Voprosy filosofii, the periodical Filosofskie nauki began to publish an increasing number of articles from the religious philosophers until it closed for financial reasons in 1991. The official journal, Vestnik, of St. Petersburg State University and Moscow State University also turned their philosophy sections over to the history of the Russian religious-philosophical tradition. The former daily bastion of "socialist realism," Literaturnaya gazeta, now includes long reviews of the *Return* books and, in 1989, it published special sections appraising some of the most preeminent religious-philosophical thinkers.⁵⁹ Even the Kommunist joined the republication and spiritual discussion fray in 1989, albeit having recently changed its name to Svobodnaia mysl'.

The newly-created journals unabashedly declare their sole interest in reclaiming old *Russian* ideas, and some are able to exist even though they publish nothing but philosophical assessments. Some titles include: Stupeni, Paralleli, Chelovek, Logos,

⁵⁹ Vladimir Bibikhin, "Konstantin Nikolaevich Leont'ev," Literaturnaya gazeta 15 April 1989: 5; Arsenii Gulyga, "Vladimir Sergeevich Solov'ev," Literaturnaya gazeta 22 April 1989: 5; Petr Palievskii, "Vasil' Vasil'evich Rozanov," Literaturnaya gazeta 29 April 1989: 5; Sergei Polovinkin, "Evgenii Nikolaevich Trubetskoi," Literaturnaya gazeta 6 May 1989: 5; Hegumen Andronik (Trubachev) and Pavel Vasil'evich Florenskii, "Pavel Aleksandrovich Florenskii," Literaturnaya gazeta 13 May, 1989: 5; Sergei Khoruzhii, "Lev Platonovich Karsavin," Literaturnaya gazeta 20 May 1989: 5.

Voprosy metodologii, Filosofskie issledovaniia, Put', Vybor, and Nachala. It is indicative that two of the above have chosen names which deliberately recall both the emigration and the pre-revolutionary period: Put' was both the title of the Moscow publishing house attached to the Vladimir Soloviev Society (1907-1914) which greatly contributed to bringing out the books of the religious renaissance philosophers, and the name of Berdyaev's, YMCA-sponsored, Russian religious-philosophical magazine in Paris (1925-1939); Logos was the name of the first religious-philosophical review to be published in the emigration in Berlin between 1919-1923.

The extent of the movement to recapture Russia's "lost heritage" may be exemplified by the case of the valuable collections Vekhi (1909) and Iz glubiny (1918). In 1990 the Vekhi was republished in Russia, and made widely accessible for the first time since 1918. The path-breaker, however, was not "Pravda," but "Novosti" publishing house: this signalled a new competitiveness to be the first to release such explosive materials, and "Novosti" tried to ensure huge sales by reviewing the release in its popular weekly Moskovskie novosti [Moscow News]; Vekhi was heralded as being a book "of legendary significance".⁶⁰ The resulting public interest spurred three other publishing houses to purchase the rights and issue their own editions in the following year: "Ural'skogo universiteta" in Sverdlovsk, "Pravda" in Moscow (this edition also included Iz glubiny and was a surprise addition to the series *Iz istorii otechestvennoi filosofskoi mysli*), and "Molodaia gvardiia" also in Moscow (this issuance included Blok's Intelligentsiia v Rossii); by 1991 the total number of copies in circulation was 215,000.⁶¹

⁶⁰ "Vekhi," Moskovskie novosti 31 (5 August 1990): 2.

⁶¹ Shatz and Zimmerman, introduction, Vekhi xxix, xxxiv.

Since Vekhi and Iz glubiny made such astonishing "come-backs" in Russia, there has been an increasing trend to republish other collections, especially the religious-philosophical émigré journals. In 1992, the house "Inform-Progress" released the multi-volume collection of each issue of Berdyaev's journal Put' from 1925-1939. The actual process the publishers used to gather all the articles is a testimony to both how important they regarded the journal to be, and how fragile the communication still remains between East and West. Instead of simply contacting an American or Canadian library for an existing copy of the journal,⁶² "Inform-Progress" sent its researchers to every library and archive to piece together volume after volume.⁶³

The recovery thus spans the entire spectrum of writings from the first Slavophiles, through the Silver Age thinkers, and into the continued work of the first emigration. In fact, it is proceeding at such a pace that scholars in the West are almost struggling to catch up. Fortunately, the publishing house M.E. Sharpe responded with alacrity when informed of the dimensions of this new interest. It has been publishing a review which translates the most pertinent articles from Russian periodicals (especially from Voprosy filosofii) in Soviet Studies in Philosophy, now titled Russian Studies in Philosophy⁶⁴. This journal is edited by none other than the persevering scholar of Russian philosophy,

⁶² McGill University, for example, stores the entire collection of Put' except for the very first volume of 1925, and there are complete collections at Amherst, Harvard, and several other Universities.

⁶³ In their explanation about the process used to gather the collection, the editors state: "In the preparation of this publication we were faced with serious difficulties. Not in one library did we find a whole collection of the journal, and the quality of the printed material we wished had been better. For improving the publication we were prepared to give all of our strength, however, we did not have several modern methods which would have enabled this." Put' Kniga 1 (Moscow: Inform-Progress, 1992) 3.

⁶⁴ The publishers also produce a complimentary review in literature under the name Soviet Studies in Literature/Russian Studies in Literature.

James P. Scanlan.⁶⁵ He has recently performed the invaluable task of attempting to systematize the extent and particularity of the religious-philosophical *Return* in Russian Thought After Communism: The Recovery of a Philosophical Heritage. The phenomenon has also been the subject of at least one major conference, the proceedings of which have just been published in Judith Kornblatt and Richard Gustafson (editors), Russian Religious Thought.⁶⁶

In essence, however, it is apparent that Russians today have regained almost full access to an entire trend of *native* thinking which has been denied to them for more than seventy years. The pioneer works of the two foremost Slavophiles, Ivan Kireevsky and Alexis Khomyakov, have been almost fully recovered. Although Dostoevsky and Tolstoy were always partially allowed under the Soviet regime due to their international notoriety, Soloviev, Leontiev, and Fedorov, once repressed, are now returned.⁶⁷ Berdiaev has been, by far, the most thoroughly reclaimed and examined of the émigré religious philosophers,⁶⁸ but his many colleagues have not been ignored.⁶⁹ Bulgakov has been

⁶⁵ Scanlan was one of the editors of the three volume Russian Philosophy which has played a valuable role in preserving this legacy through the "barren years" in the West. See Chapter 7.

⁶⁶ Judith Deutsch Kornblatt & Richard Gustafson, eds., Russian Religious Thought (Madison Wisc.: University of Wisconsin Press, 1996).

⁶⁷ Vladimir Solov'ev, Sochineniia v dvukh tomakh, eds. A.F. Losev & A.V. Gulyga, 2 Vols. (Moscow: Mysl', 1988); Vladimir Solov'ev, Sochineniia v dvukh tomakh, ed. N.V. Kotrelev, intro. V.F. Asmus, 2 Vols. (Moscow: Pravda, 1989); A.F. Losev, Vladimir Solov'ev i ego vremia (Moscow: Progress, 1990); A.F. Losev devotes a chapter to Soloviev in Filosofia, mifologia, kul'tura (Moscow: Politicheskaiia literatura, 1991); V.P. Pazilova, Kriticheskii analiz religiozno-filosofskogo ucheniia N.F. Fedorova (Moscow: MGU, 1985); S.G. Semenova, Nikoali Fedorov: Tvorchestvo zhizni (Moscow: Sovetskii pisatel', 1990).

⁶⁸ See M.A. Kolerov and N.S. Plotnikov, "New Publications of the works of N.A. Berdiaev," Soviet Studies in Philosophy 30.2 (Fall 1991): 70-90; N.A. Berdiaev, Filosofia svobody. Smysl' tvorchestva (Moscow: Pravda, 1989).

largely recovered and Frank is receiving some attention. However, of the four Marxists-turned-religious philosophers, Struve has engendered remarkably little attention. In fact, Russians appear to view Novgorodtsev as being a much more interesting subject of study. There has been, as far as this author has been able to ascertain, few attempts at reclaiming the Trubetskoy legacy. Yet, the unique paths taken by Lev Shestov into irrational existentialism, and Ivan Ilyin into monarchist nationalism and jurisprudence are receiving a great deal of attention in Russia today.⁷⁰

Moreover, all of these works are now being appraised by Russian scholars⁷¹ and through the resurrection of old critiques from their contemporaries.⁷² Archival material is being retrieved and published in an attempt to resurrect the missing contextual

⁶⁹ Articles by Lev Karsavin, I Fichte, and Paul Tilich are included in the compilation, Pamiatniki religiozno-filosofskoi mysli Novogo vremeni (St Petersburg: Aleteia, 1991). See also L.P. Karsavin, "Asketizm i ierarkhiia," Minuvshee: istoricheskii al'manakh 11 (Moscow: Atheneum-Feniks, 1992): 211-231; M.O. Gershenzon, "Krizis Sovremennoi Kul'turii," Minuvshee: istoricheskii al'manakh 11 (Moscow: Atheneum-Feniks, 1992): 232-248; S.N. Bulgakov, Sochinenia v dvukh tomakh 2 Vol. (Moscow: Nauka, 1993).

⁷⁰ A list of the most recent Shestov republications may be obtained in the notes to Taras D. Zakdalsky, "Lev Shestov and Religious Thought," Russian Thought After Communism 162-164; Ivan Ilyin is similarly traced in Philip T. Grier, "The Complex Legacy of Ivan Il'in," Russian Thought After Communism 184-186.

⁷¹ Examples of articles that appraise Berdyaev include: E.A. Stepanova, "Exhausted Marxism: An Examination of Marxist Doctrine in the Traditions of Russian Religious Philosophy," Soviet Studies in Philosophy 29.4 (Spring 1991): 15-34; V.N. Adiushkin, "The Social Philosophy of N. Berdyaev in Light of *Perestroika*," Soviet Studies in Philosophy 30.4 (Spring 1992): 50-62; P.P. Gaidenko, "Landmarks: An Unheard Warning," Russian Studies in Philosophy 32.1 (Summer 1993) 34-51; Andrei Smirnov, "The Path to Truth: Ibn-'Arabi and Nikolai Berdyaev (Two Types of Mystical Philosophizing)," Russian Studies in Philosophy 31.3 (Winter 1992-93) 120-134; R.A. Gal'tseva, "Sub specie finis (Utopiia tvorchestva N.A. Berdiaeva)," Ocherki russkoi utopicheskoi mysli XX veka, ed. R.A. Gal'tseva (Moscow: Nauka, 1992) 10-76.

⁷² For example, in 1994 N.A. Berdiaev: pro et contra was released in St. Petersburg containing a lengthy compilation of the many reviews and personal comments made between 1900 and 1940 by fellow Russians. N.A. Berdiaev: pro et contra, Series Russkii put', ed. A.A. Ermichev, Vol 1. (St Petersburg: Isdatel'stvo Russkogo khristianskogo humanitarnogo instituta, 1994). This institute is planning the following future editions: Konstantin Leont'ev and Pavel Florenskii and O. Pavel Florenskii. Isbrannii sochineniia.

background of which most contemporary Russians, including leading scholars, are almost entirely bereft.⁷³ To date, few historical monographs, biographies, or analytical studies have appeared in Russia, but three new biographies of Berdyaev covering his years in Russia have been published: the most notable and innovative is that by Yuri Tsvetkov, under the pen-name A. Vadimov, which appeared in 1993 just before his tragically early death at the age of 28.⁷⁴

With the valuable new connection to the YMCA-Press in Paris, it may be expected that every single émigré publication handled by the original Press directed by Anderson will eventually return to Russia (if the original imprints are all still in the possession of the Paris office).⁷⁵ No greater vindication of the YMCA Russian division program, of the labour of those secretaries, and of their arduous efforts at soliciting funds from the Central YMCA could have occurred. Today, John Mott, Paul Anderson, Gustav Kullman, Ethan

⁷³ In regards to the preparation of the collection *Vekhi*, for example, the letters to and from its editor Gershenzon have been retrieved and are published in B. Proskurinaia and V. Alloi, "K istorii sozidaniia 'Vekh'," Minuvshee: Istoricheskii al'manakh, vol. 11 (Moscow-St. Petersburg: Atheneum Feniks, 1992) 249-291. The memoirs of Lossky, Reshchikova, Leont'ev and Serkov have also been published. See B.N. Lossky, "Nasha sem'ia v poru likholet'ia 1914-1922," Minuvshee: Istoricheskii al'manakh, vol. 11 (Moscow-St. Petersburg, Atheneum Feniks, 1992) 119-198; V.A. Reshchikova, "Vysylka iz RSFSR," Minuvshee: Istoricheskii al'manakh, vol. 11 (Moscow-St. Petersburg, Atheneum Feniks, 1992) 199-210; A.V. Leont'ev, "Nezapechatlennyi trud: iz arkhiva V. N. Figner," Zven'ia: Istoricheskii al'manakh Vol. 2 (Moscow-St. Petersburg, Atheneum Feniks, 1992) 424-488; A. Serkov, "Rasgovor cherez 'reshetku'. Perepiska M.A. Osorgina i A.S. Butkevicha," Zven'ia: Istoricheskii al'manakh Vol. 2 (Moscow-St. Petersburg, Atheneum Feniks, 1992) 489-538.

⁷⁴ Tsvetkov was also the compiler and curator of a Berdyaev Museum in Moscow. Aleksandr Vadimov (Tsvetkov), Zhizn' Berdiaeva: Rossiia (Oakland, CA: Berkeley Slavic Specialities, 1993). See also N.K. Dmitrieva and A.P. Moiseeva, Nikolai Berdiaev: zhizn' i tvorchestvo (Moskva: Vysshiaia shkola, 1993).

⁷⁵ A warning letter by Tamara Klepinine to Paul B. Anderson on 21 September 1980, however, signals that this may not be quite so simple. "I explained that there is an immense interest in Russia for Berdyaev's books and ideas, and almost all his Russian books have become out of print because they are being (secretly) sent to Russia." Tamara Klepinine, letter to Paul B. Anderson, 21 September 1980, Paul B. Anderson papers, University of Illinois at Urbana Champaign, Box 29.

T. Colton, and Donald Lowrie (and many others) are proven completely right in their belief that the émigré legacy, if preserved, would some day prove invaluable to the populace of Russia.

Conclusion

When Berdyaev was approaching the end of his life, he began to consider the contributions which he had made through his writing, his teaching, and his intellectual associations. His final accounting was self-deprecating.¹ Attune as always with the mood of the times, in 1948 he concluded that his life's work would prove to be of little importance, and that his legacy would not long survive him. The marginalization of religious-philosophy abroad, the secularization of the YMCA, and the renewed isolation of Russian émigré communities and institutions all seemed to confirm this pessimism, and his untended grave in Clamart became a symbol of the émigrés' predicament as a whole.

Yet, the "defeated exiles", who doubted the survival of their culture and singular world-view, would have been astonished by the recent revival of religion in the former Soviet Union. After witnessing the Communists' unrelenting persecution of their Church for more than seventy years, how could they have envisioned a public admission by the leader of the USSR and the Communist Party, Mikhail Gorbachev, that he had been baptized as a child? While Gorbachev's initiation of official discussions with Pope John Paul II and his implementation of *Perestroika* and *Glasnost'* were not without precedent, the permitted magnitude of the Russian Orthodox millennium celebrations in 1988 signalled a basic shift in policy. The Slavs of the Soviet Union followed the government's cryptic signals by flocking to churches, especially at Easter, Advent and Christmas services. As *Glasnost'* came to be perceived as more than Communist propaganda, genuinely free discussion began for the first time since the 1920s.

¹ Berdyaev, *Dream and Reality* 325.

Having undermined the Communist principle of official atheism, Gorbachev unleashed pent-up forces which soon eluded his control. This he compounded with the cessation of censorship and the Politburo decree to launch *Iz istorii otechestvennoi filosofskoi mysli* which published the long-forbidden works of Russia's religious philosophers. Thus, in what may come to be called "Gorbachev's Revolution", he simultaneously eviscerated his own avowed ideology while granting the full dissemination of an alternate world-view. The results of his policies were certainly nothing less than revolutionary: the Soviet Union is no more; the Communist Party survives, but no longer commands the fate of the Slavic peoples. And concerning the émigrés, especially the religious philosophers, they have been vindicated and rehabilitated. Berdyaev's works and the writings of most other religious philosophers are now much in demand as Russian intellectuals and publishers seek to return that proscribed heritage to their country.

The speed at which this recovery is being performed suggests that Russians are seeking particular and vital meanings from the concepts expressed within the religious-philosophical tradition. Their hopes appear to fall broadly into three categories. First, with the collapse of the Communist regime, Russia's future course became uncertain, and a vacuum was created which demands to be filled by some new world-view. Although Western models, especially the American capitalist-democratic version, have rapidly pushed their way into the Russian consciousness, many Russians are uncomfortable with the thought of adopting a clearly foreign purpose and way of life. Another alternative is that of ethnic or racial nationalism which can be expansionist and violent, or exclusionary. If derived from the most extreme Western forms such as Fascism or Nazism, or even the less aggressive "self-determination," it would also be a foreign importation as it remains

questionable whether or not a distinctly Russian nationalism ever existed.² The most appropriate solution for many intellectuals today, therefore, seems to be the resurrection of uniquely Slavic concepts which could replace the Communist paradigm, but which would also be characteristic of their native culture. The lost Russian religious-philosophical tradition has re-emerged as the most comprehensive programme for the future in accordance with their national identity.³

Second, the religious philosophers were also fervent and expressive critics of materialist Marxism, and their detailed elucidation of its ontological flaws is affecting new historical interpretations of the Soviet era which attempt to integrate the warnings from the *vekhovtsy* with the increasingly revealed facts about Communist rule. Rather than outright negation, a description involving socio-economic dynamics or "Great man" theories, Russian scholars today appear to be grasping for an understanding of "la vérité et la mensonge du Communisme" (Berdyayev). Can the Soviet excesses wrought against so-called "enemies of the people" be reconciled with the hope which Communism proffered to workers of the world for social justice?⁴

Third, their recent repudiation of materialist Marxism followed shortly thereafter with a substantial rejection of American, materialist Capitalism suggests that Russians are

² Richard Pipes, "The Historical Evolution of Russian National Identity," Barbara Frum lectures (Toronto; Montreal: 1996) Chapter of prepared manuscript for forthcoming publication. 133-147.

³ See, for example: S.S. Khoruzhii, "Khomiakov i printsip sobornosti," Zdes' i teper' 2 (1992): 68; T.I. Blagova, "filosofia rannikh slavianofilov. I.V. Kireevskii o tsel'nosti dukha," Vestnik Moskovskogo universiteta. Seriya 7. Filosofii 4 (1991): 14; A.T. Pavlov, "The question of the Uniqueness of Russian Philosophy," Russian Studies in Philosophy 33.1 (Summer 1994): 37-49. See also this American view on the subject: George Kline, "The Potential Contribution of Classical Russian Philosophy to the Building of a Humane Society in Russia," XIX World Congress of Philosophy (Moscow, 22-28 August 1993): Invited Lectures (Moscow: XIX World Congress of Philosophy, 1993) 34-50.

⁴ See the Round-table discussion: "History, Revolution, Literature," Soviet Literature 5 (1990): 153-166.

seeking a completely different approach to knowing and living. If it is materialism, and not simply certain ideologies, political systems, and economic strategies which has been deemed bankrupt, then clearly a new order of understanding is required. Here, the concepts of the religious-philosophical tradition assume their most immediate relevancy and become directly pertinent: human beings are more than a composite of atoms because each person possesses a divine, and unique value; there should be no "masses" which can be directed by one person, but only freely-chosen associations of individuals working communally for a certain end; not only reason, but also revelation or faith must be applied for true knowledge. Some supporters of the *Return*, therefore, hope it will foster repentance, and then a new comprehension of personal responsibility which will make it impossible for human sacrifices (in the literal sense) to be demanded by Communism or any other cause. Concurrently, the most optimistic intellectuals desire a transcendence by which individuals will cease to be totally consumed with their material existence, and will begin to awaken to the spiritual, or religious, vision of mankind's destiny.⁵

As such, the return of the "third way" does appear to have some relevance to Russia's past and future problems. Yet, is it likely that the Russian people will put aside their fears and material needs and engage the "third way"? We wait pessimistically for Dostoevsky's Grand Inquisitor to again have the final word:

You want to go into the world and you are going empty-handed, with some promise of freedom, which men in their simplicity and their innate lawlessness cannot even comprehend, which they fear and dread - for nothing has ever been more unendurable to men and to human society than freedom!... But in the end they will lay their freedom at our feet and say to us, "We don't mind being your slaves so long as you feed us!" They will, at last, realize themselves that there cannot be enough freedom and bread for everybody, for they will never, never be

⁵ For more information, see: "Religion and Literature (A Round-table Discussion)," Russian Studies in Literature 29.2 (1993): 37-94; "Religiia i politika v postkommunisticheskoi Rossii (Materialy "Kruglogo stola"), Voprosy filosofii 7 (1992) 6-33.

able to let everyone have his fair share! They will also be convinced that they can never be free because they are weak, vicious, worthless, and rebellious. You promised them bread from heaven, but I repeat again, can it compare with earthly bread in the eyes of the weak, always vicious and always ignoble race of man? And if for the sake of bread from heaven thousands and tens of thousands will follow you, what is to become of the millions and scores of thousands of millions of creatures who will not have the strength to give up the earthly bread for the bread of heaven?⁶

Hungry and uncertain today, will the Russians abandon themselves into a new slavery for money and security just as, in Dostoevsky's view, millions had thrown themselves into the arms of the Catholic Church: Just as the people of Russia themselves once sacrificed their humanity for the "bread-land-peace" promises of Communism?

Such negative realism may, perhaps, be mitigated by the observation that renewed interest in religious-philosophy is not limited to Russia. In the West, as well, the *Return* is affecting reassessment of historical methodology and some of the standard interpretations. As George Gibian has recently asserted,

In retrospect we see it confirmed that such heterogeneous observers of the cultural scene as Malia, Struve, Billington, and Amalrik were the ones to whom we should have been paying closest attention...Moreover, perhaps we should now apply ourselves to trying to identify the reasons why the reports, analyses, and representations of the artists and humanists were perceptive, revealing, and borne out by later developments. We might also learn something from the striking distortions, omissions, and plain erroneous conclusions in the works of some other prominent specialists in political, social, economic sciences.⁷

Statements of this kind reflect the growing interest shown by Western scholars in the cultural history of Russia and its non-materialist developments.

The extent of this shift in historical perceptions may be exemplified by recent developments regarding the study of Vladimir Soloviev. Lenin's intellectual nemesis is

⁶ Fyodor M. Dostoevsky, The Brothers Karamazov, trans. David Magarshack (London: Penguin Books, 1982) 296-297.

⁷ George Gibian, "Viewpoints," AAASS NewsNet (March 1997): 23.

now the subject of intense scrutiny and interest. Come full circle, the Vladimir Soloviev Society⁸ has been reconstituted by Russians and Americans out of the Transnational Institute⁹ to bring together anyone interested in Russian spiritual ideas for discussions at conferences, newsletters and the Internet. Its central mandate is to rebuild and foster new ties between Russia and the West which acknowledge some of the insights provided by Russian religious-philosophy. Furthermore, this society has managed to arrange for the construction of a Vladimir Soloviev museum within the Institute of Philosophy in Moscow. At this time, as statues of Lenin are being torn down in cities all over the former Soviet Union, Soloviev's is being raised before the new edifice.

Not only have the Russian religious philosophers been returned, but their European counterparts, the Personalists, are also enjoying a renaissance. In the late eighties, the Association for the Study of Persons came into being, propelled by scholars from a diversity of disciplines at Boston University. It now holds international conferences

⁸ Membership in the organization includes such leading students of Russian philosophy as George Kline, James Scanlan, and George Young, as well as several Slavic language specialists like Caryl Emerson and Judith Deutsch Kornblatt. In Russia: Leonid Polyakov and Nelli Motroshilova (both of the Institute of Philosophy in the Russian Academy of Sciences). The Vladimir Soloviev Society has also spawned a subsidiary collectivity: the "Berdyaev List". The director of this initiative is George Young.

⁹ The Transnational Institute was formed in 1981 in Vermont to sponsor a series of projects and exchange programmes between the United States and Russia. These have involved close ties and interaction with the Russian Orthodox Church both in that country and in America. The central motivation for its formation appears to have been the rising fear of nuclear war: in 1981 its first project was *Bridges for Peace* (discontinued in 1995). The founders thought that one way to reduce the Cold War tensions was to have Americans visit the USSR, and Russians to come to the USA. In this way, people from each nation would be able to see the other not as a faceless enemy, but as simple human beings. 800 Russians came to the USA during its lifetime, and 1,200 Americans were sent to Russia and the former republics. The founders were groups of Vermont and New Hampshire Congregational Churches (The United Church of Christ), and centred in Norwich Vermont. The president of the Transnational Institute is Clinton G. Gardner, a graduate of Camp William James, started in 1940 with backing from Franklin D. Roosevelt on the initiative of Eugen Rosenstock-Huessy (a philosopher émigré from Nazi Germany) and Freya von Moltke (widow of Helmuth von Moltke). For detailed information, see Jack J. Preiss, Camp William James (Norwich, VT: Argo Books, 1978).

through the International Forum on Persons (IFOP)¹⁰, and publishes a review entitled The Personalist Forum. The periodical's statement of intent shows a commitment to the humanist ideas which were frequently expressed by the Russian and French proponents of the "third way", although their own summary of purpose might have been more elegant and might have pronounced their spiritual principles more concretely.

The Personalist Forum seeks to provide a forum for thinkers interested in exploring two personalist hypotheses: that it is the personal dimension of our being and living that is definitive of our humanity, and that the personal dimension of being-human offers a clue to the ordering of reality. Having no ready-made answers to offer nor a creed to demand, we take personal categories seriously and speak in a language that strives for maximum comprehensibility.¹¹

Similarly the IFOP attempts to provide a contemporary, academic congress which somewhat resembles the various circles of the inter-war Personalist movement.¹²

Another resurgence of French Personalism from the thirties may be found in a curious federalist association in Europe. This group which was begun and is still directed by one of the only remaining French Personalists, Alexandre Marc, is called Le Centre International de Formation Européene (CIFE), and includes historians, political scientists, economists, and other scholars as well as some political figures. Its activities involve the

¹⁰ The first was held at Mansfield College, Oxford in September 1991. Selected papers from this meeting can be read in The Personalist Forum 8 (1992).

¹¹ Statement articulated by Professor Erazim Kohak of Boston University, The Personalist Forum (The Internet: The Personalist Forum webpage).

¹² "The International Forum on PERSONS organizes an international and interdisciplinary academic conference on persons every two years. The aim of the conference is to encourage original research on the concepts and theories of personhood, personal identity, and personalism, and their application in fields such as law, medicine, philosophy, politics, psychology, and theology." Its impending conference set for Prague in August, 1997 dedicates sessions to discussing the work of *Esprit*, *Ordre Nouveau*, Alexandre Marc, and Emmanuel Mounier; they will also examine, among other subjects, the "emergence of countries from totalitarian regimes," and personalist-type writers including those who specialize[d] in "Eastern Orthodoxy, Catholicism, Liberation theology." Robert Fisher, The International Forum on Persons (The Internet: The Personalist Forum webpage).

publication of pamphlets discussing Marc's brand of federalism (still reminiscent of the *Ordre Nouveau* program),¹³ other federalist theories,¹⁴ and problems which the group identifies in the current efforts of the European Union (EU). CIFE flourishes through grants donated by the EU which permit it to maintain its own publishing house, "Presses d'Europe," and to hold yearly conferences for scholars either studying federalism or the antecedents of "fédéralisme personnaliste" in the French Personalist movement, Proudhon, and other related histories. It should also perhaps be noted that federalism as both a philosophical and political principle is being widely discussed in Russia today; one of its unlikely pioneers in the present context being Ruslan Khasbulatov, the speaker of the Duma who was outgunned by President Yeltsin in 1993.

A full description of the Personalist movement is far from completion. However, preliminary studies indicate that its influence might reach well beyond France. John Hellman and William Rauch suggest links between inter-war Personalism and the post-war bureaucratic elite, especially those who figured prominently in François Mitterand's Socialist Party.¹⁵ Rauch has traced some connections between French Personalism and Christian Socialist parties in Germany as well as France. Former leaders of *Esprit* and *Ordre Nouveau* came to participate in the construction of the European Community, and former EU President Jacques Delors acknowledges his debt to Personalism.¹⁶ Its

¹³ To cite only one example, Alexandre Marc, Comment supprimer le chômage en Europe? (Nice: Presses d'Europe, 1993).

¹⁴ For example, Ferdinand Kinsky, Federalism, A Global Theory: The Impact of Proudhon and the Personalist Movement on Federalism (Nice: Presses d'Europe, 1995)

¹⁵ John Hellman, Emmanuel Mounier and the New Catholic Left, 1930-1950 (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1981); The Knight- Monks of Vichy France (Kingston: McGill-Queens University Press, 1994). William Rauch, Politics and Beliefs in Contemporary France: Emmanuel Mounier and Christian Democracy (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1972).

¹⁶ Jacques Delors is currently a member of the Centre International de Formation Européene.

influence on Vatican II, on Catholic movements in North America, and its connection with religious dissident movements within the Eastern European, Soviet Bloc countries, especially Poland, are subjects awaiting investigation. If Personalism is to be characterized as a French variant of Russian religious-philosophy, it seems that it too has insights to give concerning current developments in our world.¹⁷

Therefore, study of both the Russian religious philosophers and the Personalists appears to have become a fertile field for exploration. The development of their thought, the details of their relationships and their personal biographies, and the impact which their ideas have had upon events in this century may, with further examination, continue to augment our understanding. This thesis has found, for instance, that the history of Russia's religious philosophers lends a less negative perspective to the larger picture of Russia Abroad. Their actions gave a purpose to the emigration. Not only were they to preserve the Russian traditions and culture which were being eradicated in their homeland, but they also attracted people from other cultural backgrounds to their cosmopolitan vision of humanity. This they did at a time when that very term came to be used in Stalin's Russia as a term of abuse.

Furthermore, their story suggests that religious-philosophy never ceased to be a viable alternative despite the almost three-quarters of a century of Marxist hegemony. Rather than being the logical and inevitable end of centuries of social imbalance and political oppression in Tsarist Russia, the Bolsheviks become only one agent-of-change. The history of the religious philosophers also directed this study to a more in-depth exploration of many supposedly minor events and organizations in this century. Of all of

¹⁷ The connection between French Personalism and Russian religious-philosophy has been discussed in Catherine Baird, "Russian Personalism: The Influence of Russian Populism on French Personalism, 1930-38." M.A. thesis (McGill University, 1992).

these, it was the YMCA and its affiliated associations which came to stand out as the essential bulwark for Russian religious-philosophy in particular and the emigration in general. The remarkable contribution of the YMCA press enabled the continuation, the preservation, and finally, the transference of these ideas back to Russia. Therefore, this thesis has found that the YMCA provided the means by which the Russian religious philosophers' *Post-Revolutionary* aspirations could be finally realized.

Change is occurring in the former Soviet Union, and religious-philosophical ideas are playing a significant role in this transformation. Whether or not one finds merit in religious-philosophy, these concepts can no longer be ignored in either the West or in Russia. This, then, is the most lasting testament to the efforts of Berdyaev and his fellow religious-philosophers: They did not let these ideas die. Hence, some ninety years after Russians first began their quest for bringing about the "religious renaissance", their aspirations are still emulated and have become newly-awakened in our time.

APPENDIX A

VOKPG 1921 (initial membership of 63 as reported in Pravda no. 160, July 23, 1921).

Communist cell

Name	Official Position	Title in VOKPG
Lev Kamenev	President of Moscow Soviet	Honorary President
Leonid Krasin	Commissar of External Trade	
Maxim Litvinov	Deputy Commissar of Foreign Affairs	
Anton Lunacharsky	Commissar of Education & Culture (Narkompros)	
Alexei Rykov	Vice President of the Soviet of Labour and Defense	Vice-President
Nikolai Semashko	Commissar of Public Health	
Alexander Smirnov	Member of Collegium of Commissariat for Food	
Alexander Svidersky	Member of Collegium for the Commissariat for Workers and Peasants Inspection	
Ivan Teodorovich	Commissar of Agriculture	
Alexander Shliapnikov	Chairman of VTsIK Metalworkers' Union, Member of Presidium of Supreme Economic Council	

"Bourgeois Cell" - initial 53 members

Name	Occupation/ Affiliation	Position and Fate if known
Avsarkisov		Exiled
Biriukov P.I.	Tolstoyan	Exiled
Bulgakov V.F.	Conservator of the Tolstoy Museum	Exiled
Velikhov P	Professor	Exiled
Gorky, Maxim	Soviet writer, Bolshevik	Not arrested
Golovin, Prince, F.A.	Former President of 2nd and 3rd Duma	Exiled

Gurevich, Emmanuel Levovich		Exiled
Djivelegov, A. K.	Professor	Exiled
Diatrontov	Professor	Exiled
Dovarenko, A.G.	Professor, Agronomist in Cooperatives, Statistician	Exiled
Emshanov		Exiled
Zaitsev, Boris K.	Writer	Exiled
Karpinsky, Aleksandr Petrovich (1846-1936)	President of the Academy of Sciences, geologist	Stayed in Russia
Kishkin, Nikolai Mikhailovich	Member of Kadet party central committee, Doctor physiotherapist, leader of Zemgor	Head of Administrative Branch of VOKPG; received death sentence; exiled
Klassen		Exiled
Konidratiev, N.D.	Professor of Economy	Exiled
Korobov, Dmitri Stepanovich		One of the leaders of VOKPG; received death sentence; repressed in Russia
Kurnakov, Nikolai Semyonovich (1860-1941)	Academician at A of S, Chemist, Lenin Prize 1928, Stalin Prize 1941.	Stayed in Russia
Kuskova, Ekaterina Dmitrievna	Agronomist, Journalist, Kadet	A leader of VOKPG; received death sentence; exiled
Kutler, N.N.	Tsarist minister of the interior 1905-06	Exiled
Kukhovarenko		Exiled
Levitsky		Exiled
Levitsky, V.A.	Medic	Exiled
Marr, Nikolai Yakolevich (1864-1934)	President of Academy of Material Culture; Orientalist, Linguist and Archeologist	Stayed in Russia
Matveyev		Exiled
Nolde		Exiled
Oldenburg, Sergei. F.	Academician	Exiled
Paufler		Exiled

Prokopovich, Sergei, Nikolaevich	Economist, Professor, 1st Minister of the Prov Govt, Kadet	Leader of VOKPG; received death sentence; exiled
Rodionov Nikolai Sergeevich		Exiled
Rozanov	Professor	Exiled
Rubnikov	Professor, Agronomist; Cooperatives	Exiled
Sadyrin, P.A.	President of the Direction of Agricultural Cooperatives	Not arrested
Smidovich		
Sabashnikov, Mikhail, Vasilevich		
Salamatov, Petr Timofeevich		Arrested in home of Cooperatives and employees of the society of rural peasants: not at VOKPG meeting 27/08/21
Stanislavsky, Konstantin, Sergeevich (1863-1938)	Actor and Director, became people's artist of USSR	Stayed in Russia
Steklov, Vladimir Andreevich (1863-1926)	Vice- President of Academy of Sciences till 1926, Mathematician	Stayed in Russia
Tarasevich Lev Aleksandrovich	Professor, Medic	Released immediately after arrest
Teitel		
Tolstoya, Alexandra Levovna	Daughter of Tolstoy, philanthropist	Exiled
Ugrimov, A.I.	President of Moscow Society of Agriculture	
Fersman, Aleksandr Yevgenievich (1883-1945)	Academic at A of S, noted minerologist and geochemist	Stayed in Russia
Figner, Vera Nikolaevna (1852-1942)	Revolutionary, populist	Not arrested
Frese		
Chaianov, A.V.	Professor, Economist	

Cherkasov, Ivan Alexeevich		Leader of VOKPG; received death sentence.
Shaposhnikov Nikolai Nikolaevich		
Sher, V.	Menshevik	
Shtshepkin, Mitrofan, Mitrofanovich	Professor, Rector of the Zootechnic Institute	Repressed in Russia
Yasinski, Vcelvolod Ivanovich	Professor	Emigrated
Yushin-Sumbatov, Aleksandr, Ivanovich	Stage Adaptor	Released immediately after arrest
Efros		

Filosovskii Parakhod: The People Expelled From Russia in 1922

	NAME	REFERENCE	DETAILS OF ARREST, IF KNOWN ¹
1	Abrikosov, V.V.	Led own spiritual group	
2	Aikhenvald, Yuri	Critic; writer	Repressed in Russia
3.	Antonovskaia, Nadeahda Grigor'evna		"Not found"
4	Artobolevskii, I.A.		
5.	Avsarkisov	VOKPG	
6.	Belkin, V.P.	YMCA/ARA	
7.	Baikov, A.L.		
8.	Biriukov, P.I.	VOKPG	
9.	Bitsilli, P.M.	Free Academy student	
10.	Berdyaev, Nikolai Alexandrovich	Free Academy of Spiritual Culture; <i>Bratsvo</i>	
11.	Bogolepov, A.	Historian	"Not found"

¹One list has been recovered of Yagoda reporting to Lenin. Designations are "arrested for exile" with some variations, and "not found". It is generally not established what happened to those who somehow avoided the first sweep. A. Massal'skoi & I. Seleznevoi, "Vsekh ikh von is Rossii" *Rodina* (1992), vol. 10. p.67.

12.	Bol'shakov, Andrei, Mikhailovich		"Not found"
13.	Bronstein, Isaiah Evseevich		"arrested for banishment to freedom abroad"
14	Brutskus		"arrested for banishment to freedom; liquidation by telephone"
15	Bukshpan, Ia	Free Academy of Spiritual Culture	Repressed, not exiled
16	Bulatov, A.	Specialist of co-ops - with these 3 (Iziumov, Bulatov and Kudriasev). Cooperative Zadruga was liquidated	
17	Bulgakov, V.F.	VOKPG	
18	Bulgakov, Sergei Nikolaevich	Priest and Philosopher; <i>Bratsvo</i>	"Not found" (Expelled in January 1923)
19	Butov, Pavel Il'ich		"Not found"
20	Chaadaev		"Not found"
21	Chertkov, V.G.	VOKPG; Tolstoyan	
22	Dan, Feodor	Menshevik	
23	Dshivelegov, A.K.	VOKPG	
24	Prof. Diatrontov	VOKPG	
25	Dovarenko, A.G.	VOKPG	
26	Eichenwald, G.P.		
27	Emshanov	VOKPG	
28	Eremeev, Grigori, Alekseevich		"According to the agreement undersigned by President Kommissart Dzerzhinsky decrees that actions by char.[acter] pertains to antisoviet organization in West. Do not exile to freedom, Await all judgement. keep under arrest. Do not free"
29	Ermolaev, Nikolaie Nikolaevich	Professors Union Petrograd	"According to the agreement undersigned by President Kommissart Dzerzhinsky decrees that actions by char.[acter] pertains to antisoviet organization in West. Do not exile to freedom, Await all judgement. keep under arrest. Do not free"
30	Evdokimov, Petr Ivanovich	Professors Union Petrograd	"Arrest for banishment to Freedom in West"
31	Geretskii, Viktor, Iakovlevich		"Not found"

32	Golovin Prince, F.A.	VOKPG	
33	Golovanov, D.I		
34	Gurevich, Emmanuel Levovich	VOKPG	
35	Gusarov, Ignatii Evdokimovich	Professors Union Petrograd	"According to the agreement undersigned by President Kommissart Dzerzhinsky decrees that actioned by chares pertains to athisoviet organization in West. Do not exile to freedom. Await all judgement until arrest. Do not free"
36	Gutkin, A.Ia		"Arrest for banishment to freedom; for liquidation by telephone"
37	Florovsky, A.	Historian	
38	Frank, Semen	Free Academy of Spiritual Culture; <i>Bratstvo</i>	
39	Frenkel', Grigori Ivanovich		"Not found"
40	Iasinsky, V.I.		
41	Ilyin, I.A.	<i>Vol'fila</i>	
42	Izgoev-Lande, A. S.	Philosopher and Journalist; <i>Bratstvo</i>	"Arrest for banishment to freedom; for liquidation telephone"
43	Iziumov, A.	Specialist of co-ops	
44	Kagan, A.S.		"Arrest for banishment to freedom; for liquidation by telephone"
45	Kantsel', Efim Semenovich		"Exile, suspend first until receiving from tovarish Tsiperovicha guarentee and substantiation of such things,/ by order of Commissart 31/Aug/1922"
46	Kargens, Nikolai Konstantinovich		"Arrest for banishment freedom"
47	Karsavin, Lev, P.	Rector of U of St. Petersburg; <i>Vol'fila</i> ; <i>Bratstvo</i>	"Arrest for banishment to freedom"
48	Kharinton, Boris		"Arrest for banishment to freedom; for liquidation by telephone"
49	Kissavetter, A.A.	Historian	
50	Klassen	VOKPG	
51	Klemens		"Not found"

52	Konidratiev (Khondratev) N.D.	VOKPG	
53	Krokhmal', Viktor Nikolaievich	Literature Expert, Petrograd	"Release to exile decree. Kommission under president minister Dzerzhinsky. From 31-Aug-1933 on the basis of his personal letter to minister Dzerzhinsky in which he assured his own loyalty to Soviet power"
54	Kudriavtsev, V.	Specialist of co-ops	
55	Kukhovarenko	VOKPG	
56	Kuskova, E.	VOKPG	
57	Kutler, N.N.	VOKPG	
58	Lapshin, Ivan Ivanovich	Philosopher, Professors Union Petrograd	"Arrested for banishment to Freedom"
59	Levitsky	VOKPG	
60	Levitsky, V.A.	VOKPG	
61	Lodyshenskii	Economics Professor	
62	Lossky, N. O.	Vol'ila; Bratsvo	"Arrest for banishment to freedom; for liquidation by telephone"
63	Lutokhin, D.A.		"Arrest for banishment to freedom; for liquidation by telephone"
64	Martsinkovskii, V.F.		
65	Matveyev	VOKPG	
66	Matusevich, I.A.		
67	Mel'gunov, S.M.		
68	Miakotin, V.A.	Historian	
69	Nolde	VOKPG	
70	Novikov, M.M.	Rector of U of Moscow, Zoologist	
71	Odintsov, Boris Nikolaevich	Professors Union Petrograd	"Arrest for banishment to freedom"
72	Oldenburg, Sergei. F.	VOKPG	
73	Osokin, Vladimir Mikhailovich	Professors Union Petrograd	"Arrest for banishment to freedom"
74	Osorgin, Michael	VOKPG	
75	Ostrovsky, Andrei	Professors Union Petrograd	"Arrest for banishment to freedom"
76	Pauller	VOKPG	

77	Petrishchev, A.B.		Banish
78	Peshekonov, A.V.		
79	Pletnev, P.V.		
80	Pol'ner, Sergei Ivanovich	Professors Union Petrograd	"Arrest for banishment to freedom"
81	Prokopovich, Sergei	VOKPG	
82	Pumpianskii, L.M.		"Arrest for banishment to freedom; for liquidation by telephone"
83	Rodionov, Nikolai Sergeevich	VOKPG	
84	Prof Rozanov	VOKPG	
85	Rozhkov	Petersburg literary	"Not found"
86	Prof. Rubnikov	VOKPG	
87	Rozenberg, V.A.		
88	Sadykova, Iu. N.		"Arrest for banishment to freedom"
89	Savvich	Professors Union Petrograd	"Give up to judgement from participation in agitation. Soviet organization abroad do not exile, keep within country"
90	Selivanov, Dmitri Fedorovich	Professors Union Petrograd	"Arrest for banishment to freedom"
91	Soloveichik, Emanuel Borisovich		"Not found"
92	Sorokin, Pitrim Aleksandrovich	Sociologist; <u>Ekonomist</u>	"Arrest for banishment to freedom"; USA
93	Saratonov, V.V.	Head of Faculty of Math at State U of Moscow	
94	Stein, Viktor Maritsovich	Professors Union Petrograd	In agreement with decree. Commission under president minister Derzhensky - from exile into freedom and leave Petrograd. See personal statement.
95	Stepun, Feodor	Free Academy of Spiritual Culture; <i>Bratstvo</i>	
96	Tel'tevsky, Aleksei Vacilevich	Professors Union Petrograd	"According to the agreement undersigned by President Kommissart Dzerzhinsky decrees that actioned by chares pertains to antisoviet organization in West. do not exile to freedom, Await all judgement. Hold under arrest. do not free"
97	Troshin, P.V.		

98	Prince Trubetskoi, Sergei, E.	Philosopher; <i>Vol'fila</i>	
99	Velikhov	Agronomist, VOKPG	
100	Vettser, German Rudol'fovich		"Not found"
101	Visloukh, Stanislav Mikhailovich	Professors Union Petrograd	"Arrest for banishment to freedom"
102	Volkovyissky, N.	Critic of Gumilov	"Arrest for banishment to freedom; for liquidation by telephone"
103	Vysheslavtsev, Boris	Free Academy of Spiritual Culture; <i>Bratstvo</i>	
104	Zaitsev, Boris	VOKPG	
105	Zamiatin, E.I	Writer	"Exile- postpone first until person gives orders: by Order of Kommissart Minister Derzhensky 31.Aug.1922" (Actually never sent out, allowed to remain in Russia)
106	Zbarskii, David Solomonovich		"Not found"
107	Zenkovsky V.V.	<i>Bratstvo</i>	
108	Zubashev, E.L.		"Arrest for banishment to freedom; for liquidation by telephone"
109	Zvoryikin	Professor of economy	

Fig. 2²

²Intellectuals Arrested for Exiled in 1922: includes those who were repressed in Russia and not actually sent abroad. I could only trace 109. The 160 figure was given by S. Fediukin, *Velikii Oktiabr' i intelligentsia* (Moscow, 1972) 287. At the Institute of Russian History in Moscow, its director Andrei Sakharov gave a number of 144; Iaroslav Leont'ev, a young scholar who is studying the expulsion estimates their number to be closer to 200 if not more. Kogan states 174 arrested and 160 expelled in "Vyslat za granitsu" 66.

Jacques Maritain's *Cercles Thomistes* (1919-1939).

Name	Occupation if known
Abbé Jean-Pierre Altermann 1.	Editor of <i>Vigile</i>
Père Aupiais	
Albert Camilleri 1.	
Mlle. Marie Clément 1.	
Roland Dalbiez 1.	Psychiatrist
Maurice Denis	Painter
Mlle Noëlle Denis 1.	Becomes Mrs. Denis-Boulet, daughter of Maurice Denis
Émile Dermenghem	
Abbé Dondaine 1.	
Jacques Froissart (Father Bruno)	
Stanislas and Aniouta Fumet	
Father Garrigou-Lagrange 1.	
Henri Ghéon 1.	Writer and Critic, converted by Claudel
Prince Vladimir Ghika 1.	Priest, rose to an order because of Maritan
Père Gillet	Priest
Etienne Gilson	Thomist philosopher; professor
Baron Alexandre Grunelius and wife the former Antoinette Schlumberger	Converted by Maritain
Abbé Guérin	
Charles Henrion 1.	Priest, North Africa
Willard Hill	Businessman
Maxime Jacob	Writer, critic
Abbé Charles Jourmet 1.	Professor at Fribourg
Olivier Lacombe	Philosopher
Abbé Lallement 1.	Professor at Institut Catholique
Louis Laloy	Writer
Abbé Lavaud 1.	
Mlle. Leuret 1.	
Pierre and Jeanne Linne	
Jacques Maritain 1.	Host

Raissa Maritain 1.	Hostess
Louis Massignon	Orientalist, specialist in Islamic studies
Mlle. Moreau	
Vera Oumansoff	Sister to Raissa
Abbé Péponnet 1.	
Dr. Pichet 1.	
Abbé Richaud 1.	
Paul Sabon	Surrealist poet, conferred by Maritain
Mme. Marthe Spitzer 1.	
Pierre Termier	Geologist
W.R. Thompson	Entomologist
Vaton - Vitia Rosov	Brother of Aniouta Fumet
Robert Valléry-Radot	Writer and critic, entered Trappist monastery
Pierre Van der Meer de Walcheren	
Abbé Zundel 1.	Publisher, godson of Leon Bloy

1. denotes the first members of the circle. ³

³Names have been compiled from a study of Maritain, Notebooks, Raissa Maritain, Les Grandes Amitiés, Julie Krnan, Our Friend Jacques Maritain, Emmanuel Mounier, Entretiens unpublished 1926-1932. It does not pretend to be complete, but does offer an overview of the number and composition of these meetings

Guests invited to the first meeting of the Oecumenical Circle on January 14, 1926.

#	Name	Occupation	Denom	Contact
1	Adler			
2	Mlle. Marie-Thérèse d'Alverny	Student	C	Jullien
3	Mr. Paul B. Anderson	YMCA; Episcopalian	P	
4	Mrs. E. Barlow			
5	M. A. Bastianell			Laberthonnière
6	M. l'abbé Beaussart		C	Maritain
7	Mr. Nikolai Berdyaev	Put', YMCA	O	
8	Rev. S. S. Bezobrazov	Put', St. Sergius	O	Berdyaev
9	Mme. Léon Bloy		C	Berdyaev
10	Pasteur Marc Boegner	President of French Federation of Student Christian Associations, Pastor Church Passy. French Reform Church.	P	Laberthonnière
11	M. l'abbé Bottinelli		C	Laberthonnière
12	Rev. Sergei Bulgakov	Put', St. Sergius	O	Berdyaev
13	Mlle. Claire Carrière	Student - Jullien	C	Laberthonnière
14	Mlle. Marie Czapska	RSCM?	O	Klepinin
15	M. Roland Dalbiez	Psychiatrist	C	Maritain
16	Pasteur Dartigua	Reform Church	P	Laberthonnière
17	Mme. Noële Denis-Boulet	Cercle Thomistes	C	Maritain
18	Mme. S. de Dietrich			Laberthonnière
19	M. l'abbé Durantel		C	Laberthonnière
20	Emile Dermenghem	Cercle Thomiste	C	Maritain
21	Mr. George P. Fedotov	St. Sergius	O	Berdyaev
22	Count F. Ferzen		O	
23	Mme. Aniouta Fumet	Translator	C	Maritain
24	M. Stanislas Fumet	Roseau d'Or	C	Maritain
25	Le Rev. Père Gillet	Cercle Thomistes	C	Maritain
26	M. René Gillouin			
27	Mlle. G. Goriars	Student - Jullien	C	Jullien

28	Prof. V. N. Ilyin	Put'	O	Berdyaev
29	M. l'abbé Jakoubisiak		C	Berdyaev
30	M. Léon James			Laberthonnière
31	Mlle. Clare Jullien	Teacher	C	Laberthonnière
32	Prof. A. Jundt	Lutheran Theology Prof.	P	Laberthonnière
33	Mr. Yuri A. Kalemin		O	Berdyaev
34	Mr. A Karpov		O	
35	Prof. A. V. Kartashev	Put'	O	
36	Mr. Nicholas Klepinin	YMCA, RSCM	O	
37	Mr. Evgraph Kovalevsky	St. Sergius	O	
38	Mr. Maxime Kovalevsky		O	
39	Rev. Petr Kovalevsky	St. Sergius	O	
40	M. l'abbé Laberthonnière	Philosopher, Oratorian	C	
41	M. Jean de la Laurencie		C	Berdyaev
42	Mme. J. Laurial	Student - Jullien	C	Jullien
43	Pasteur Lecerf	orthodox calvinist theologian at the Collège de France	P	Laberthonnière
44	M. Edmond LeRoy	Prof. of Philosophy at the Collège de France	C	Laberthonnière
45	Mr. Nicholas Lossky	Put', Professor Prague University	O	
46	Mgr. Lourie		C	
47	Mr. M. V. Malinin		O	
48	Mr. I. I. Manuchin		O	
49	M. Jacques Maritain	Cercle Thomistes	C	
50	Mme. Raïssa Maritain	Cercle Thomistes	C	Maritain
51	M. Louis Massignon	Cercle Thomistes	C	Maritain
52	Prof. Henri Monnier	Calvinist theologian	P	Laberthonnière
53	M. Jacques Monod	Prof. of Reform Theology	P	Laberthonnière
54	Pasteur Wilfred Monod	Federation of Protestant Churches, Reform Church	P	Laberthonnière
55	Mr. P. P. Suvchinsky	Put'	O	Berdyaev
56	Princess C. E. Trubetskaya		O	Berdyaev

57	Prince. G.N. Trubetskoi	Put'	O	Berdyayev
58	Prince S.E. Trubetskoi		O	Berdyayev
59	Mr. Boris Vysheslavtsev	Put', YMCA	O	
60	M. Jean Walhiz			Laberthonnière
61	M. Dean Walter	YMCA, England, Anglican	P	
62	Mr. Lev Zander	Put', St. Sergius	O	
63	M. J. Zeiler			Laberthonnière
64	Mr. Nicholas Zernov	YMCA, RSCM	O	
65	Miss. Sophie Zernova	YMCA, RSCM	O	
66	Mr. V. Zlobin	Gippius' secretary	O	Berdyayev

fig. 4^a

Cahiers de la Quinzaine: Studio Franco-Russe - 14 sessions lasting from 1928-1932

Names	Nationality	Information
George Adamovitch	Russian	Established Writer (French and Russian Press)
Marc Aldanov	Russian	Established Writer (International and Russian Press)
Paul Bazan, Comte de St. Aulaire		Ambassador to France
Nina Berberova	Russian	Aspiring writer, mistress of Khodasevich
Nikolai Berdyayev	Russian	Established philosopher (International and Russian Press)
René Brasillach	French	Publisher
John Charpentier	French	
Keam Chauvy	French	
Jean Chuzeville	French	Writer
Louis Dumur	French	
Georges Fedotov	Russian	Teacher at St. Sergius, aspiring political writer
A. Fransque	French	

^a "List of guests for interconfessional meeting," 14 January, 1926, Paul B. Anderson Papers, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Box 3.

Stanislas Fumet	French	Publisher
Marie-Therese Gadala		
Henri Ghéon	French	Established Dramatist and Poet
R.P. Léon Gillet	French	Dominican Priest and Lecturer at Institut Catholique
Nadezhda Gorodetzky	Russian	
H. Guillaume		
Daniel Halévy	French	Writer
Georges Izard	French	Aspiring political writer - Esprit 1931-34
Marguerite Jules-Martin	French	
M. Kantor	French	
N. Koulmann		
Olivier Lacombe	French	Thomist, young Lecturer at Institute Catholique
René Lalou	French	Writer
Pere de Lescure	French	
Alexandr Lipiansky	Russian (Jewish)	Aspiring political and philosophical writer - Plans, Ordre Nouveau
Emile Lutz		
Lucien Marceaux	French	
Jacques Maritain	French	Thomist, Established philosopher (International Press)
Francois Mauriac	French	Established Writer (International Press)
Henri Massis	French	Action Francaise Established Writer....
Jean Maxence	French	Publisher Cahiers de la quinzaine, writer
N. Millotti		
Constantine Motchoulsky	Russian	Professor at the Sorbonne, budding literary critic
Emmanuel Mounier	French	Aspiring philosophical writer - Esprit
P Mouratov	Russian	
Marcel Peguy	French	Writer, son of Charles Peguy
André Pierre	French	
S. Ravinsky	Russian	
Denis Roche	French	

Desire Roustan	French	
Joulia Sazonova	Russian	
Robert Sébastien		
S. Sharchoun		
E. Terechkovitch	Russian	
N. Tourgueneva	Russian	
Guy de Traversay	French	
Marina Tsvetaeva	Russian	Aspiring poet
Paul Valéry	French	Established writer
René Vincent	French	
Wsevolod de Vogt		
Boris Vysheslavtsev	Russian	Russian Religious-Philosophical Academy
Vladimir Weildé	Russian	St. Sergius
Boris Zaitsev	Russian	Established writer (Russian press)
M. Zetlin	Russian	

fig. 5⁵

Berdyaev's Clamart Tuesdays (Meudon Mondays) 1928-1932?

Name
Père Jean-Pierre Altermann
Abbé Augustin
Père Aupiais
Nikolai Berdyaev
Charles du Bos
Abbé Cadiou
Père Yves Congar
Emile Dermenghem
Ditch
George Fedotov

⁵ Names were taken from Cahiers de la quinzaine 1928-1932.

Georges Florovsky
Stanislas Fumet
Etienne Gilson
Vladimir Ilyin
Helen Iswolsky
Abbé Jakoubisiak
Prince Kovalevsky
Kovarski
Abbé Laberthionnère
Olivier Lacombe
Louis Laloy
Roland Manuel
Gabriel Marcel
Jacques Maritain
Raissa Maritain
Louis Massignon
Emmanuel Mounier
Nicholas Nabokov
Comte de Pange
Puech
Pierre Van der Meer
Boris Vysheslavtsev

fig.6^a**The Writers of Novyi Grad:**

Names	Location	Other Involvements
N Alekseev		Put'
S. Belozarov		

^aThese names have been taken from primarily two sources. The unpublished *Entretiens* II & IV of Emmanuel Mounier and Jacques Maritain, Notebooks...

Nikolai Berdyaev	Clamart	Put', Esprit
P. M. Bitsilli	Sofia	Annales contemporaines
Father Sergei Bulgakov	Paris	St. Sergius, Put'
Ilya Bunakov (Fondaminsky)	Paris	Sovremeny zapiski
Georges Fedotov	Paris	St. Sergius
Father Lev Gillet	Paris	Esprit, Dominican Order
Sergei Hessen	Berlin, Prague	
Vladimir Ilyin	Paris	St. Sergius
B Izhbaldin	Berlin	
Helen Iswolsky	Paris	Esprit
Yuri Ivask		
I Kheraskov		
Ekaterina Kuskova	Berlin	Kadet
I Lagovsky	Paris	RSCM
Evgeni Ilich Lampert	Berlin/Paris/ Oxford	
Nikolai Lossky	Paris/Prague	Put'
P Mikhailov	Paris	
Konstantine Motchulsky	Paris	St. Sergius/ Sorbonne, Action Orthodoxe, RSCM
A. Petrishchev		
G.N. Polkovnikov		
Yu. Rapoport		
Raoul Rei-Albaretz		
A. Savel'ev		
P Savitsky	Berlin-Paris- Prague	Put', Director Euroasian Press
G.F. Siegfried	London	
Elizaveta Skobtsova (Mat' Maria)	Paris	Action Orthodoxe
S. Stein		
Feodor Stepun	Dresden	
Marina Tsvetaeva	Paris	
V.Varshavsky	Paris	

D. Vladimirov		
Boris Vysheslavitsev	Paris	Put', St. Sergius, YMCA
Vladimir Weilde	Paris	St. Sergius, Put'
Vladimir Yanovsky		
Lev Zakutin	Paris	
Sergei Pavlovich Jaba	Paris	Action Orthodoxe, St. Albans-St. Sergius Fellowship

Esprit Group

Name
Marcel Arland
Nikolai Berdyaev
Dr. René Biot
André Bridoux
Etienne Borne
Maxime Chastaing
André Déléage
Georges Duveau
Louis-Emile Galey
Marcelle Girardot-Magdinier
Henri Guillemin
Daniel Halévy
Edmond Humeau
Georges Izard
Jean Lacroix
Paul Landsberg
Jacques Lefrancq
Jacques Madaule
Gabriel Marcel
Gabriel Marty
Jacques Maritain
Louis Massignon

Adrien Miatiev
René Millienne
Jacques de Monléon
Marcel Moré
Emmanuel Mounier
André Philip
Rabi
Ramuz
Denis de Rougemont
Pierre-Henri Simon
Jules Supervielle
Jean Sylveire
Pierre-Aimé Touchard
André Ulmann
Gilbert de Véricourt
Pierre Verité

APPENDIX B

1. **Decree of the All-Russian Central Executive Committee¹****Regarding the All-Russian Hunger Relief Committee**

After seven years of continuous warfare - external and domestic - which has undermine the foundations of the economic life of the country, the Republic has been visited by a most heavy elementary calamity: failure of the crops, which has affected a number of the most fertile districts. The population of the districts affected by this disaster facing famine, and all the terrible consequences that follow in its train. Only the united and concerted efforts of the people and the most strenuous work can stave off this new calamity.

In view of the above, the All-Russian Central Executive Committee resolves:

1. To create an All-Russian Hunger Relief Committee for the purpose of fighting the famine, and all the other sequels of the failure of the crops.

2. The Committee is granted the use of the emblem of the Red Cross, which is to figure in its seal.

3. In order to cope with the task formulated in part 1, the Committee shall have the right: a) to acquire in Russia and abroad - food and feed supplies, medical stores, and other articles required by the hunger-stricken population; b) to distribute the material reserves at the disposal of the Committee amongst the population affected by the failure of the crops; c) to enjoy preferential rights in the matter of carriage of goods without waiting their turn, and also to own special means of conveyance and rolling stock; d) to take all necessary measures for the collective feeding of the needy; e) to render agricultural assistance to the population in the famine-stricken districts; f) to render medical assistance in these regions; g) to inaugurate public works for employment of the sufferers; h) to make collections and, generally speaking, to take any steps necessary for the attainment of the aims of the Committee.

4. The Committee shall have the right to organize local sub-committees, to found branches in various localities, and also to appoint separate representatives.

5. In order to attract assistance and monetary means from abroad, the Committee shall have the right to open branches abroad, to encourage the founding of sub-committees abroad, and to send its representatives there. The Committee shall enjoy unrestricted freedom in communicating with the above mentioned institutions and representatives abroad.

6. The Committee shall have the right to deliberate such measures emanating from central and local authorities, which it will consider as having any bearing on the cause of relief to the famine-stricken, and to communicate with the said authorities with a view to concerting such measures with the plans of the Committee. All institutions of the Republic, both central as well as local, shall be bound to render the Committee every assistance.

7. The Committee shall have a publication of its own dealing with matters referring to the activity of the Committee and shall also publish booklets and placards, and convoke conferences for the purpose of discussing matters connected with the Hunger Relief Action.

8. The Committee shall enjoy all rights attaching to a legal body, and shall be entitled to transact business, to enter into agreements, to acquire property, and to appear as claimant or respondent in law-suits, - in accordance with the law.

9. The means of the Committee shall be made up of: a) free contributions. b) articles and materials in kind, and monies, assigned to the Committee by the State.

10. The activity of the Committee shall not be subject to the control of the Labor-Peasant-Inspection. Accounts of its activity and accounts in respect of expenditure, the Committee shall

¹State department archives 861.48/1550

submit to the Central Executive Committee, and bring such accounts to the public notice.

11. The original members of the Committee belonging to it at the time of its constitution, also the chairman and his substitutes, shall be confirmed in their capacity by a resolution of the Central Executive Committee. Further elections of members of the Committee shall rest with the Committee itself.

12. The Committee shall organise itself, and conduct its business, in accordance with a Constitution to be confirmed by the Central Executive Committee.

M. Kalinin, President of the Central Executive Committee.

A. Enukidze, Secretary to the C. EX. COMM.

Moscow, Kreml, July 21 at 1921.

2. Riga Agreement: ARA - Litvinov, 20 August 1921²

Whereas a famine condition exists in parts of Russia, and

Whereas Mr. Maxim Gorky, with the knowledge of the Russian Socialist Federative Soviet Republic, has appealed through Mr. Hoover to the American people for assistance to the starving and sick people, more particularly the children, of the famine stricken parts of Russia, and

Whereas Mr. Hoover and the American people have read with great sympathy this appeal on the part of the Russian people in their distress and are desirous, solely for humanitarian reasons, of coming to their assistance, and

Whereas Mr. Hoover in his reply to Mr. Gorky, has suggested that supplementary relief might be brought by the American Relief Administration, an unofficial volunteer American charitable organization under the chairmanship of Mr. Herbert Hoover, hereinafter called the ARA., and the Russian Socialist Federative Soviet Republic hereinafter called the Soviet Authorities.

That the ARA will extend such assistance to the Russian people as is within its power, subject to the acceptance and fulfilment of the following conditions on the part of the Soviet Authorities who hereby declare that there is need of this assistance on the part of the ARA.

The Soviet Authorities Agree:

First That the ARA may bring into Russia such personnel as the ARA finds necessary in the carrying out of its work and the Soviet Authorities guarantee them full liberty and protection while in Russia. Non-Americans and Americans who have been detained in Soviet Russia since 1917 will be admitted upon approval by the Soviet Authorities.

Second That they will, on demand of the ARA immediately extend all facilities for the entry into and exit from Russia of the personnel mentioned in (1) and while such personnel are in Russia the Soviet Authorities shall accord them full liberty to come and go and move about in Russia on official business and shall provide them with all necessary papers such as safe-conducts, *laissez passer*, etc, to facilitate their travel.

Third That in securing Russian and other local personnel the ARA shall have complete freedom as to selection and the Soviet Authorities will, on request, assist the ARA in securing same.

Fourth That on delivery by the ARA of its relief supplies at the Russian ports of Petrograd, Murmansk, Archangel, Novorossiisk, or other Russian ports as mutually agreed upon, or the nearest practicable ports in adjacent countries, decision to lie with the ARA, the Soviet Authorities will bear all further costs such as discharge, handling, etc. Should demurrage or storage occur at above ports mutually agreed upon as satisfactory, such demurrage and storage is for the account of the Soviet Authorities.....

²Cited from Rex A Wade, Documents in Soviet History Vol. 2 (New York: Academic International Press, 1993) 278-281.

Twenty-fifth That its personnel in Russia will confine themselves strictly to the ministration of relief and will engage in no political or commercial activity whatever. In view of paragraph (1) and the freedom of American personnel in Russia from personal search, arrest and detention, any personnel contravening this will be withdrawn or discharged on the request of the Central Soviet Authorities....

3. **Lenin's Plan to Destroy the Russian Orthodox Church³**

The following document elucidating Lenin's plan for exterminating the Orthodox Church was released through dissident sources in the 1960s, but was disparaged as a fake by both Soviet and Western scholars; in 1994, however, James Billington led an investigation team from the Library of Congress into the Soviet Archives where they discovered the original, translated it, and disseminated it on the Internet. Although Richard Pipes has just released a book containing it and other explosive sources in the Unknown Lenin (1996), it is still unfamiliar enough to deserve full exposition in this thesis. Moreover, it so aptly demonstrates Lenin's attitude and approach to any opposition.

"Copy To Comrade Molotov.

Top Secret For members of the Politburo.

Please make no copies for any reason. Each member of the Politburo (incl. Comrade Kalinin) should comment directly on the document. Lenin.

In regard to the occurrence at Shuia, which is already slated for discussion by the Politburo, it is necessary right now to make a firm decision about a general plan of action in the present course. Because I doubt that I will be able to attend the Politburo meeting on March 20th in person, I will set down my thoughts in writing. The event at Shuia should be connected with the announcement that the Russian News Agency [ROST] recently sent to the newspapers but that was not for publication, namely, the announcement that the Black Hundreds in Petrograd [Piter] were preparing to defy the decree on the removal of property of value from the churches. If this fact is compared with what the papers report about the attitude of the clergy to the decree on the removal of church property in addition to what we know about the illegal proclamation of Patriarch Tikhon, then it becomes perfectly clear that the Black Hundreds clergy, headed by its leader, with full deliberation is carrying out a plan at this very moment to destroy us decisively.

It is obvious that the most influential group of the Black Hundreds clergy conceived this plan in secret meetings and that it was accepted with sufficient resolution. The events in Shuia is only one manifestation and actualization of this general plan. I think that here our opponent is making a huge strategic error by attempting to draw us into a decisive struggle now when it is especially hopeless and especially disadvantageous to him. For us, on the other hand, precisely at the present moment we are presented with an exceptionally favorable, even unique, opportunity when we can in 99 out of 100 chances utterly defeat our enemy with complete success and guarantee for ourselves the position we require for decades. Now and only now, when people are being eaten in famine-stricken areas, and hundreds, if not thousands, of corpses lie on the roads, we can (and therefore must) pursue the removal of church property with the most frenzied and ruthless energy and not hesitate to put down the least opposition. Now and only now, the vast majority of peasants will either be on our side, or at least will not be in a position to support to

³ Vladimir I. Lenin, letter to V.M. Molotov, 19 March 1922, trans. James Billington. (World Wide Web: Library of Congress, File: ae1bkhun.bkg, 1994).

any decisive degree this handful of Black Hundreds clergy and reactionary urban petty bourgeoisie, who are willing and able to attempt to oppose this Soviet decree with a policy of force.

We must pursue the removal of church property by any means necessary in order to secure for ourselves a fund of several hundred million gold rubles (do not forget the immense wealth of some monasteries and lauras). Without this fund any government work in general, any economic build-up in particular, and any upholding of soviet principles in Genoa especially is completely unthinkable. In order to get our hands on this fund of several hundred million gold rubles (and perhaps even several hundred billion), we must do whatever is necessary. But to do this successfully is possible only now. All considerations indicate that later on we will fail to do this, for no other time, besides that of desperate famine, will give us such a mood among the general mass of peasants that would ensure us the sympathy of this group, or, at least, would ensure us the neutralization of this group in the sense that victory in the struggle for the removal of church property unquestionably and completely will be on our side.

One clever writer on statecraft correctly said that if it is necessary for the realization of a well-known political goal to perform a series of brutal actions then it is necessary to do them in the most energetic manner and in the shortest time, because masses of people will not tolerate the protracted use of brutality. This observation in particular is further strengthened because harsh measures against a reactionary clergy will be politically impractical, possibly even extremely dangerous as a result of the international situation in which we in Russia, in all probability, will find ourselves, or may find ourselves, after Genoa. Now victory over the reactionary clergy is assured us completely. In addition, it will be more difficult for the major part of our foreign adversaries among the Russian emigres abroad, i.e., the Socialist-Revolutionaries and the Milyukovites [Left Wing Cadet Party], to fight against us if we, precisely at this time, precisely in connection with the famine, suppress the reactionary clergy with utmost haste and ruthlessness.

Therefore, I come to the indisputable conclusion that we must precisely now smash the Black Hundreds clergy most decisively and ruthlessly and put down all resistance with such brutality that they will not forget it for several decades.

The campaign itself for carrying out this plan I envision in the following manner:

Only Comrade Kalinin should appear officially in regard to any measures taken—never and under no circumstance must Comrade Trotsky write anything for the press or in any other way appear before the public.

The telegram already issued in the name of the Politburo temporary suspension of removals must not be rescinded. It is useful for us because it gives our adversary the impression that we are vacillating, that he has succeeded in confusing us (our adversary, of course, will quickly find out about this secret telegram precisely because it is secret).

Send to Shuia our most energetic Clear-headed, and capable members of the All-Russian Central Executive Committee [VTsIK] or some other representative of the central government (one is better than several), giving him verbal instructions through one of the members of the Politburo. The instructions must come down to this, that in Shuia he must arrest more if possible but not less than several dozen representatives of the local clergy, the local petty bourgeoisie, and the local bourgeoisie on suspicion of direct or indirect participation in the forcible resistance to the decree of the VTsIK on the removal of property of value from churches.

Immediately upon completion of this task, he must return to Moscow and personally deliver a report to the full session of the Politburo or to two specially authorized members of the Politburo. On the basis of this report, the Politburo will give a detailed directive to the judicial authorities, also verbal, that the trial of the insurrectionists from Shuia, for opposing aid to the starving, should be carried out in utmost haste and should end not other than with the shooting of the very largest number of the most influential and dangerous of the Black Hundreds in Shuia, and, if possible, not only in this city but even in Moscow and several other ecclesiastical centers.

I think that it is advisable for us not to touch Patriarch Tikhon himself, even though he undoubtedly headed this whole revolt of slave-holders. Concerning him, the State Political Administration [GPU] must be given a secret directive that precisely at this time all communications of this personage must be monitored and their contents disclosed in all possible accuracy and detail. Require Dzerzhinsky and Unshlikht personally to report to the Politburo about this weekly.

At the party congress arrange a secret meeting of all or almost all delegates to discuss this matter jointly with the chief workers of the GPU, the People's Commissariat of Justice [NKIu], and the Revolutionary Tribunal. At this meeting pass a secret resolution of the congress that the removal of property of value, especially from the very richest lauras, monasteries, and churches, must be carried out with ruthless resolution, leaving nothing in doubt, and in the very shortest time. The greater the number of representatives of the reactionary clergy and the reactionary bourgeoisie that we succeed in shooting on this occasion, the better because this "audience" must precisely now be taught a lesson in such a way that they will not dare to think about any resistance whatsoever for several decades.

To attend to the quickest and most successful carrying out of these measures, there at the congress, i.e., at the secret meeting, appoint a special commission, the participation of Comrade Trotsky and Comrade Kalinin being required, without giving any publicity to this commission, with the purpose that the subordination to it of all operations would be provided for and carried out not in the name of the commission but as an all-soviet and all-party order.

Appoint those who are especially responsible from among the best to carry out these measures in the wealthiest lauras, monasteries, and churches.

Lenin.

March 19, 1922.

I request that Comrade Molotov attempt to circulate this letter to the members of the Politburo by evening today (not making copies) and ask them to return it to the secretary immediately after reading it, with a succinct note regarding whether each member of the Politburo agrees in principle or if the letter arouses any differences of opinion.

Lenin.

A note in the hand of Comrade Molotov:

Agreed. However, I propose to extend the campaign not to all gubernias and cities, but to those where indeed there are considerable possessions of value, accordingly concentrating the forces and attention of the party.

March 19. Molotov.

APPENDIX C

Exact numbers for the diaspora are difficult to establish due to the chaos in organization at that time and imprecise record-keeping. This is not an unusual problem in emergency situations when the immediate demands of relief supersede orderly accounting. Moreover, between 1920-1922, émigrés and POWs from WWI who had not yet been repatriated were not distinguished from each other. This appears to be the major reason for the apparent numerical discrepancies. By utilizing a chronological approach, therefore, many of the number conflicts can be resolved.

On November 1, 1920, the American Red Cross (ARC) estimated that it was assisting 1,963,500 Russians who composed 80% of the total number of Russians in Europe. This figure did not include the bulk of Wrangel's army and their followers who were still at sea, nor did it include the Russians in Bulgaria, Rumania, or the Far East. From this accounting, the sociologist H. von Rimscha extrapolated the following estimate:

Category	Number
American Red Cross statistics (1,963,500) as 80%	2,455,000
The Wrangel emigration	130,000
China (the Far East)	300,000
Other States	50,000
Total:	2,935,000

Fig. 1.¹

While this figure is by far the largest estimation of the emigration it appears more reasonable if the Russian POWs are taken into consideration. By 1917, Germany alone had over 2 million Russian POWs² interned in camps and at the end of the Russo-Polish War in 1920 numbered 50,000

¹ H. von Rimscha, Der russische Bürgerkrieg und die russische Emigration, 1917-21. (Jena: s.n., 1924) 50-51.

² Ethan T Colton Forty Years with Russians 4.

although more than half were members of the White Army and would not return. The repatriation of POWs and deaths resulting from typhus and the influenza epidemic appear to have reduced the number of Russians abroad by 1 to 1½ million or more. This is verified by the figures given by the Countess Bobrinsky who headed the Russian information and relief office in Constantinople which do not include POWs or non-Russian ethnicities.³ Thus in 1922, despite the new influx of refugees fleeing the Volga famine of 1921, Dr. Nansen of the League of Nations estimated 1.5 million and B. Nikitine, 2 million Russian emigrants.⁴

In 1936, Dr. Izjumov conducted a survey of the Russian émigré archive in Prague for Sir John Hope Simpson's Refugee Survey. His results for 1922 found less than 1 million Russians in Europe thus casting grave doubts upon the earlier established figures.

Country	American Red Cross on 1 Nov 1920	Countess Bobrinsky 1 Jan 1921	Dr. Izjumov for 1 Jan 1922
Poland	1,000,000	400,000	150,000-180,000
Germany	560,000	300,000	230,000-250,000
France	175,000	65,000	60,000- 68,000
Austria	50,000	5,000	3,000- 4,000
Turkey	50,000	65,000	30,000- 35,000
Finland	25,000	25,000	31,000- 32,500
Italy	20,000	15,000	8,000- 10,000
Yugoslavia	20,000	50,000	33,500
Estonia	17,000	20,000	14,000- 16,000
Bulgaria	12,000	12,000	30,000- 32,000
U.K.	15,000	15,000	8,000- 10,000
Hungary	5,000	5,000	3,000- 4,000

³ Simpson, The Refugee Problem 82.

⁴ Simpson, The Refugee Problem 80, B. Nikitine, Revue des science politiques (Paris) 1922 II p. 191. The 2 million estimate is corroborated by Soviet Statisticians in P.P Jourid and N.A. Kovalevsky, Ekonomischeskaia Geografya S.S.S.R., Vol. I (1934): 73, 78.

Egypt	4,000	---	1,000- 1,500
Lemnos	3,500	---	---
Greece	2,500	4,000	3,000- 3,200
Cyprus	1,500	---	600- 700
Czechoslovakia	1,000	5,000	5,000- 6,000
Sweden Norway	1,000 1,000	---	{1,000- 1,500
Latvia	---	15,000	16,000- 17,000
Rumania	---	8,000	35,000- 40,000
Switzerland	---	4,000	2,000- 3,000
Tunis	---	7,000	5,000- 5,500
Corsica	---	---	1,800
Total:	1,963,500	1,020,000	635,600-755,200

Fig. 2.⁵

At first glance, Dr. Izjumov's figures seem to dispute the legitimacy of the von Rimscha, Nansen, and Nikitine estimates. However, these disparities may be explained by the course of events and approaches used. The American Red Cross figures given in Fig. 2. still omit the 20% free of assistance, those included in the Wrangel exodus, and émigrés in the Far East and other countries which had led H. von Rimscha to estimate a figure close to 3 million Russians abroad. Concentrating only on Europe, for the moment, this still leaves a figure of approximately 2.5 million at the end of 1920. When viewing the figures of Countess Bobrinsky at the Central Office in Constantinople in 1921, which are essentially concurrent with the ARC statistics, we see the effect of POWs and naturalized Russian ethnicities in the newly created Baltic and Polish states. While the ARC did not distinguish between these groups, the Countess Bobrinsky based her estimates solely upon émigré Russians who had contact with her organization. Assuming a POW and non-Russian ethnic population of approximately 1 million, the Countess Bobrinsky can then be

⁵ Simpson, The Refugee Problem 82.

correlated to the ARC accounts. Regarding H. von Rimscha's additional million people (which is reflected partially in the Nansen figures and wholly in the Nikitine estimate) these may be explained by the inclusion of the Far East, other countries, and the lack of communication so prevalent at this time. Moreover, by 1922 the effects of the Volga famine had emerged into the refugee picture as thousands slipped across the border of the R.S.F.S.R. to avoid starvation. With Poland accounting for some 4,000 Russians per day during 1921⁶, the Nansen and Nikitine figures of January 1922 appear much more reasonable.

Finally we must address the figures for January, 1922 as presented by Dr. Izjumov. With no critique intended, these figures appear to be the most accurate assessment of the total, final accounting of the Russian diaspora. They are corroborated by the 1924 assessment of the Young Mens Christian Association's (YMCA) Russian division which estimated the total number of Russian émigrés in Europe to be 800,000.⁷ However, in 1922, it is highly unlikely that Russians in Europe numbered so few. Considering the impact of the famine and the continuing fluidity of movement on the borders of the R.S.F.S.R., a figure of between 1.5-1.7 million Russian refugees (double the amount stated by Dr. Izjumov) is not unreasonable for this period.

In order to explain the discrepancy we must turn to Dr. Izjumov's sources which remain the Prague archive. Begun in 1919 with the intention of maintaining Russian culture abroad and collecting the fruits of Russian intellectual endeavors throughout all the lands of exile, the Prague archive remained reliant upon the meticulousness of the émigrés. For the earlier emigration this was admirably fulfilled: the intellectuals, aristocrats, and skilled workers who escaped the Bolshevik regime between 1918-1920 were usually quite prompt about sending their stories, magazines, and messages to the Prague archive.⁸ However, regarding the largely peasant, indigenous, population

⁶ Simpson, The Refugee Problem 76.

⁷ Paul B. Anderson, "Report on the Russian Emigration," 1 September 1924, Paul B. Anderson Papers, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Box 6.

⁸ For problems relating to even this group of émigrés please see Raeff Russia Abroad 13, 200.

who escaped the famine and who comprise, for the most part, this missing million, such details bowed before the immediate necessities of one's next meal. As the majority of the famine victims either died or returned to the R.S.F.S.R., it is not surprising that their stories do not appear in the annals of the Prague archive. Their number is not a statistical dispute, but a testimony to the impact and magnitude of one of Russia's greatest tragedies. Nansen and Nikitine, thus, accounted to varying degrees for an uncountable multitude which remains a brief, mysterious interlude in the history of the twentieth century.

Regarding the numbers of the emigration, the last issue is that of the Far East. Although H. von Rimscha may have exaggerated the 300,000 in China and the Far East in his survey, these numbers cannot be criticized in view of the continuous fluidity of borders in that area of the R.S.F.S.R. The Siberian opposition to the Bolsheviks was the most obdurate and difficult to quell, being extinguished only at the end of 1922. The last American YMCA centre in Russia, the Vladivostok Association, stood its ground until 1923. Thus, the Far East remained largely uncountable. What is known statistically applies to the years 1924 and henceforth: 50,000 Russian émigrés established a community in Kharbin and some 70,000 remained throughout the other countries in this area.

To sum up the statistical issue, it appears that by 1924 the emigration had essentially established itself with some seven to eight hundred thousand Russians in Europe, 130,000 in the Far East and a few thousand in North and South America. Thus the final total of the Russian diaspora appears to be just less than one million persons.

Selected Bibliography

A. Journals which contain helpful information on the topics discussed within:

Action française
 Cahiers de la quinzaine
 Cahiers d'une Nouvelle Époque
 * The Catholic Worker
 Combat
 * The Commonweal
 * Esprit
 * Irenikon
 * Istina
 * Literaturnaya gazeta
 L'Ordre Nouveau
 Nouvelle revue française
 Novoe vremia
 Novoe slovo
 Novyi grad
 * Novyi zhurnal
 The Personalist Forum
 Plans
 Poslednie novosti
 Put'
 Rul'
 * Russian (Soviet) Studies in Literature
 * Russian (Soviet) Studies in Philosophy
 Segodnia
 Sept
 Temps nouveau
 Les Temps present
 The Third Hour
 La Vie intellectuelle
 La Vie spirituelle
 Vigile
 * Voprosy filosofii
 * Voprosy literatury
 Vozrozhdenie

(* denotes that the publication is still current)

A catalogue of almost all Russian émigré periodicals is found in Tatiana Ossorguine-Bakounine, ed., L'Émigration russe en Europe - Catalogue collectif des périodiques en langue russe, 1855-1940 (Paris: Institut d'études slaves, 1976). This has since been updated by T.L. Gladkova and Tatiana Ossorguine-Bakounine, eds., L'Émigration russe -

Revue et recueils, 1920-1980 - Index général des articles (Paris: Institut d'études slaves, 1988) with a preface by Marc Raeff. See also, Mark Kulikowki, "A Neglected Source: The Bibliography of Russian Émigré Publications since 1917", Solanus new series, 3 (1989): 89-102.

B. Archives utilized for this thesis:

Affaires diverse concernant la Russie, Préfecture de Police, Paris V, Cartons 10.

Paul B. Anderson Papers, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 35 Boxes.

Helene Iswolsky Papers, Center for Eastern Christian, Studies Scranton University, Pennsylvania, 9 Boxes. (This repository also contains all issues of The Third Hour).

Gabriel Marcel Papers, Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris III, Cartons 60.

Emmanuel Mounier Diaries, "Entretiens" I-V, 1926-1933, photocopied from the Emmanuel Mounier Archive at Châtenay-Malabry, France (access given by Dr. John Hellman).

State Department Files, National Archives of the United States II, Washington, D.C., spools 861.48 and 861.404.

The author of this dissertation was unable to obtain access to one particular source of primary information - Nikolai Berdyaev's papers - due to a mysterious sequence of events. The Rossiiskii Gosudarstvennyi Arkhiv Literatury i Iskusstva (RGALI) has maintained his pre-expulsion materials throughout the Soviet regime. At some relatively recent date, it also received a considerable amount of material, especially letters, from his émigré years. These are collected in Fond 1496; op. 1; 1007 ed.khr.; 1870-e-1954 gg.

The addition seemed very strange considering proof which I found that his papers had been deposited and *sealed* for fifty years in the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris in 1959.¹ However, Berdyaev's heir, Eugenie Rapp, had made copies of excerpts from his note-books and correspondence which she considered to be "neutral" enough to be accessed by students; she clearly stated that she did not want the bulk of his archival materials to be used by students, and this was why she had them placed in a sealed repository. The copies were supposed to be made available to students at the Berdyaev

¹ "To this she [Eugenie Rapp, Berdyaev's surviving sister-in-law] replied that the material deposited now at the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris was sealed in closed packages and was to remain so for 50 years after which it became the property of the Bibliothèque Nationale..." Tamara Klepinine letter to Donald Lowrie, 3 February 1959, Paul B. Anderson Papers, Box 5: 1.

Foundation in Paris but, upon my arrival at Clamart in 1995 I was repeatedly informed that no such copies existed. Moreover, the Bibliothèque Nationale denied any knowledge of the sealed archive. Later, from a long-time employee at the B.N. (who shall remain nameless), I learned that the Berdyaev collection had been removed by the former director of the library during the 1960s, and had never been returned. Its current whereabouts is entirely unknown.

From this, I assumed that the materials in RGALI were the missing copies made by Rapp. This was confirmed in 1996 by a colleague of mine, Iaroslav Leont'ev, who managed to obtain brief access to the collection (I was denied entry because another scholar was working on the material). He sent me a brief overview of some of the material which corroborated much of the information I have presented herein regarding Berdyaev's relationships with French intellectuals. Therefore, somehow the copied material was returned to Russia. The fate of Berdyaev's full archive, however, remains a tragic mystery.

For archival materials on the emigration as a whole, a good starting point is, Sergei P. Postnikov, Politika, ideologiya, byt i uchenye trudy russkoi emigratsii, 1918-1945: bibliografiia iz kataloga biblioteki R.Z.I. & Arkhiva (New York: Norman Ross Pub., 1993). For collections outside of Russia, see: Carol A. Leadenham, comp., Guide to the Collections in the Hoover Institution Archives Relating to Imperial Russia, the Russian Revolutions and Civil War, and the First Emigration (Stanford, CA.: Hoover Institution Press, 1986); Russia in the Twentieth Century - The Catalog of the Bakhmeteff Archive of Russian and East European History and Culture (Boston: G.K. Hall, 1987); Steven A. Grant and John H. Brown, The Russian Empire and the Soviet Union - A Guide to Manuscripts and Archival Materials in the United States (Boston: G.K. Hall, 1981); Janet M. Hartley, Guide to Documents and Manuscripts in the United Kingdom Relating to Russia and the Soviet Union (London, New York: Mansell Publishing, 1987).

C. Material on the Russian emigration as a whole:

Agurskii, Mikhail. Ideologiya natsional-bol'shevizma. Paris: YMCA-Press, 1980.

Andreyev, Catherine. Vlasov and the Russian Liberation Movement - Soviet Reality and Empire Theories. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.

Beyer, Thomas R., G. Kratz, and X. Werner. Russische Autoren und Verlage nach dem ersten Weltkriege. Berlin: Arno Spitz, 1987.

Beyssac, Michèle. La vie culturelle de l'émigration russe en France: Chronique (1920-1930). Paris: P.U.F., 1971.

Champcommunal, J. La condition des Russes à l'étranger et spécialement en France. Paris: Recueil Sirey, 1925.

Chelyshi, E. P., and D.M. Shakhovski, eds. Kul'turnoe nasledie rossiiskoi emigratsii, 1917-1940. 2 Vols. Moscow: Nacledie, 1994.

Delage, Jean. La Russie en exile. Paris: Librairie Delagrave, 1930.

Dvinov, B.L. Politics of the Russian Emigration. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1955.

Gorboff, Marina. La Russie Fantome: l'Émigration russe de 1920 à 1950. Paris: L'Age d'Homme, 1995.

Gousseff, Catherine, and Nicholas Saddier. "L'émigration Russe en France, 1920-1930." *Memoire de Maitresse d'Histoire*. Department d'histoire des slaves, University of Paris, 1983.

Halperin, Charles. "Russia and the Steppe: George Vernadsky and Eurasianism." Forschungen zur osteuropäische Geschichte 36 (1985): 55-194.

Hardeman, Hilde. Coming to Terms with the Soviet Regime: The "Changing Signpost" Movement among Russian Émigrés in the Early 1920s. DeKalb: Northern Illinois University Press, 1994.

Hassell, J.E. Russian refugees in France and the US between the World Wars. Philadelphia: Transactions of the American Philosophical Society, 1991.

Hughes Feishman, L., and O. Raevskaya-Hughes, eds. Russkii Berlin, 1921-1923: po materialam arkhiva B.I. Nikolaevskogo v Guverovskom Institute. Paris: YMCA-Press, 1983.

Huntington, W.C. The Homesick Million. Russia-out-of-Russia. Boston: Stratford, 1933.

Johnston, Robert. New Mecca, New Babylon: Paris and the Russian Exiles, 1920-1945. Kingston, Ont.: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1988.

Kostikov, Viacheslav. Ne budem proklinat' izgnan'e... Puti i sud'by russkoi emigratsii. Moscow: Mezhdunarodnye otnosheniia, 1994.

Kovalevsky, Pierre. Zarubezhnaia Rossiia. Paris: Librairie des cinq continents, 1971.

Ledré, Charles. Les émigrés russe en France: ce qu'ils font, ce qu'ils pensent. Paris: L'illustration, 1930.

Ponfilly, Raymond de. Guide des Russes en France. Paris: Éditions Horay, 1990.

Prianishnikoff, L. Novopokolentsy. Silver Spring, Md.: Multilingual Typesetting, 1986.

Raeff, Marc. Russia Abroad: A Cultural History of the Russian Emigration, 1919-1939. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990.

—. "L'émigration et la cité nouvelle." Cahiers du monde russe et soviétique 29.3-4 (1988): 543-552.

—. "Novyi Grad and Germany: A Chapter in the Intellectual History of the Russian Emigration of the 1930s." Felder und vorfelder russischer Geschichte. Eds. I. Auerbach, A. Hillgruber, and G. Schramm. Freiburg; Breisgau: Rombach, 1985.: 255-265.

—. "V pomoshch' issledovaniiu zarubeshnoi rossii." Novyi zhurnal 196 (1995): 348-358.

—. "Institutions of a Society in Exile: Russia Abroad 1919-1939." Rossia/Russia 6 (1988): 95-117.

Riasanovsky, Nicholas. "The Emergence of Eurasianism." California Slavic Studies 4 (1967): 39-72.

Rineland, L. Hamilton. "Exiled Russian Scholars in Prague, the Kondiakov Seminar and Institute." Canadian Slavonic Papers 16.3 (1974): 331-352.

Schlögel, Karl, ed. Der grosse exodus: die russische Emigration und ihre Zentren 1917 bis 1941. Munich: C.H. Beck, 1994.

Shkarenkov, Leonid K. Agoniia beloi emigratsii. 2nd ed. Moscow: Mysl', 1986.

Simpson, Sir John Hope. The Refugee Problem: Report of a Survey. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1939.

Sorokin, Pitirim Aleksandrovich. Leaves From a Russian Diary, and Thirty Years After. Boston: Beacon Press, 1950.

—. A Long Journey: The Autobiography of Pitirim A. Sorokin New Haven, Conn.: College and University Press, 1963.

Stephan, John J. The Russian Fascists: Tragedy and Farce in Exile, 1925-45. New York: Harper & Row, 1978.

Stolypin, A. P. Na Sluzhbe Rossii. Frankfurt: Possev Verlag, 1986.

Wenzer, Kenneth Clarke. "The Transmigration of Anarchocommunism." Diss. The Catholic University of America, Washington, 1985.

Williams, Robert C. Culture in Exile - Russian Emigres in Germany 1881-1941. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1972.

D. Works dealing specifically with Russian religious-philosophy

i) General:

Pamiatniki religiozno-filosofskoi mysli novogo vremeni. St Petersburg: Aleteia, 1991.

"Religion and Literature (A Roundtable Discussion)." Russian Studies in Literature 29.2 (1993): 37-94.

"Religiia i politika v postkommunisticheskoi Rossii (Materialy 'Kruglogo stola')." Voprosy filosofii 7 (1992) 6-33.

Aizlewood, Robin. "The Return of the 'Russian Idea' in Publications, 1988-91." Slavonic and East European Review 71.2 (1993): 490-499.

Anderson, Paul B. No East or West: The Memoirs of Paul B. Anderson. Paris: YMCA Press, 1985.

—. People, Church and State in Modern Russia. London: Student Christian Movement Press, 1944.

Belyi, Andrei. Mezhdu dvukh revoliutsii. 2nd ed. Chicago: Russian Language Specialities, 1966.

—. Nachalo veka. 2nd ed. Moskva: Gos'. izd-vo Khodozh. lit-ry, 1966.

Berlin, Isaiah. Russian Thinkers. New York: The Viking Press, 1978.

Bird, Thomas E. The Ecumenical world of Orthodox civilization. The Hague: Mouton, 1974.

Chirovsky, Andriy. Pray for God's Wisdom: The Mystical Sophiology of Metropolitan Andrey Sheptytsky. Chicago: Metropolitan Andrey Sheptytsky Institute of Christian Studies, 1992.

Colton, Ethan T. Forty Years with Russians. New York: Associated Press, 1940.

Edie, James M., James P. Scanlan, and Mary-Barbara Zeldin, eds. Russian Philosophy. 3 Vols. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1994.

Grier, Philip T. "George L. Kline's Influence on the Study of Russian and Soviet Philosophy in the United States." Philosophical Sovietology. Eds. H. Dahm, T. J. Blakeley, and G.L. Kline. Dordrecht: D. Reidel Publishing Company, 1988. 243-266.

Friedrich, Paul J. "Some Recent Works on Communism and Christianity." Slavic Review 22.2 (1963): 321-328.

Heller, Michel. "Premier Avertissement: Un Coup de Fouet." Cahiers du monde russe et soviétique 20.2 (1979): 131-172.

Hippius Z.N. and Bunakov, I.I., eds. Chto delat' russkoi emigratsii? Paris: YMCA Press, 1930.

Iswolsky, Helen. Light before Dusk: A Russian Catholic in France, 1923-1941. Toronto: Longmans, Green & Co., 1942.

—. No Time to Grieve...: An Autobiographical Journey. Philadelphia: The Winchell Company, 1985.

—. Soul of Russia. London: Sheed & Ward, 1944.

Kogan, L.A. "Vyslat' za granitsu bezzhalostno' (Novoe ob izgnanii dukhovnoi elity)." Voprosy Filosofii 9 (1993): 62-74.

Kolerov, Modest A. "The Brotherhood of St. Sophia: The 'Landmarks People' and the Eurasians (1921-1925)." Russian Studies in Philosophy 34.3 (Winter 1995-96): 26-61.

—. "Filosofskii zhurnal Mysl', (1922)." Voprosy filosofii 8.1 (1995): 179-184.

—. "Novyi Vekhi: k istorii 'vekhovskoi' mifologii (1918-1944)." Voprosy filosofii 8.1 (1995): 144-166.

Koulomzin, Sophie. Many Worlds: A Russian Life. Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1980.

Kornblatt, Judith Deutsch. Meeting of the Chosen Peoples: Judaism and the Russian Orthodox Renaissance. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1992.

Kornblatt, Judith Deutsch & Richard Gustafson, eds. Russian Religious Thought. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1996.

Kuvakin, Valery A., ed. A History of Russian Philosophy from the Tenth through the Twentieth Centuries. Vol. 2. Buffalo, NY: Prometheus Books, 1994.

Lenin, V.I. Collected Works. 45 Vols. Trans. Yuri Sdobnikov. Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1970.

Leont'ev, Ia. V. "Likvidatsiia VSERPOMGOLa: Pis'ma E.D. Kuskovoi k V.N Figner 1921-1922." Russkoe Proshloe 4 (1993): 330-342.

—. "Nezapechatlennyi trud: iz arkhiva V. N. Figner." Zven'ia: Istoricheskii al'manakh Vol. 2. Moscow-St. Petersburg: Atheneum Feniks, 1992. 424-488.

Losskii, B.N. "Nasha sem'ia v poru likholet'ia 1914-1922," Minuvshee: Istoricheskii al'manakh. Vol. 11. Moscow-St. Petersburg: Atheneum Feniks, 1992. 119-198.

Lossky, N.O. History of Russian Philosophy. New York: International University Press, 1951.

Lowrie, Donald A. Saint Sergius in Paris: The Orthodox Theological Institute. London: S.P.C.K., 1954.

Maksimov, Iuri. "1922 god: Bol'sheviki, zapad i intelligentsiia (Vospominaniia ochevidtstva)." Diplomaticheskii Ezhegodnik. Moscow: Mezdunarodnye otnosheniia, 1992. 385-405.

Marshall, Richard Jr., ed. Aspects of Religion in the Soviet Union, 1917-1967. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1971.

Massie, Suzanne. Land of the Firebird. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1980.

Obolenskii, A. P. Ukazatel' avtorov predmetov, retsenzii k zhurnal'no put'. New York: Transactions of the Association of Russian American Scholars in the USA, 1986.

Pascal, Pierre. Les grands courants de la pensée russe contemporaine. Paris: Librairie Fischbacher, 1971.

Pospelovsky, Dimitry V. The Russian Church Under the Soviet Regime, 1917-1982. 2 Vols. Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1984.

—. Soviet Studies on the Church and the Believer's Response to Atheism: A History of Soviet Atheism in Theory and Practice, and the Believer. Vol. 3. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1988.

—. Soviet Antireligious Campaigns and Persecutions. Vol. 2. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1988.

Reshchikova, V.A. "Vysylka iz RSFSR." Minuvshee: Istoricheskii al'manakh. Vol. 11. Moscow-St. Petersburg: Atheneum Feniks, 1992. 199-210.

Rosenthal, Bernice Glatzer, ed. Nietzsche in Russia. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1986.

Rosenthal, Bernice Glatzer, and Martha Bohachevsky-Chomiak, eds. A Revolution of the Spirit: Crisis of Value in Russia, 1890-1924. New York: Fordham University Press, 1990.

Scanlan, James, ed. Russian Thought After Communism: The Recovery of a Philosophical Heritage. Armonk NY.: M.E. Sharpe, 1994.

Serkov, A. "Rasgovor cherez 'reshetku'. Perepiska M.A. Osorgina i A.S. Butkevicha." Zven'ia: Istoricheskii al'manakh. Vol. 2. Moscow-St. Petersburg: Atheneum Feniks, 1992. 489-538.

Tyrkova, Adriana. Na putiakh k svobode. New York: Chekhov Press, 1952.

Woihrlin, William F., ed and trans. Out of the Depths: A Collection of Articles on the Russian Revolution. Irvine, Calif.: Charles Schlacks Jr. Publisher, 1986.

Zernov, Nicholas. The Russian Religious Renaissance of the Twentieth Century. New York: Harper & Row Pub., 1963.

ii) Personages and Collectives

Nikolai Berdyaev

For a full bibliography of his works, please see:

Klepinine, Tamara Bibliographie des oeuvres de Nicolai Berdiaeff. Paris: Institute d'études slaves, 1982.

Berdyaev, Nicolas. Dream and Reality: An Essay in Autobiography. trans. Katharine Lampert. New York: MacMillan, 1951.

Books about Berdyaev prior to 1956

Allen, Edgar Leonard. Freedom in God : a Guide to the Thought of Nicholas Berdyaev. New York: Philosophical Library, 1951.

Attwater, Donald, ed. Modern Christian revolutionaries; an introduction to the lives and thought of: Kierkegaard, Eric Gill, G. K. Chesterton, C. F. Andrews [and] Berdyaev. New York: The Devin-Adair Company, 1947.

Clarke, Oliver Fielding. Introduction to Berdyaev. London: Geoffrey Bles, 1950.

Lampert, Evgenii. Nicolas Berdyaev and the New Middle Ages. London: J. Clarke & Co., Ltd., 1945.

Porret, Eugène. Berdiaeff, prophète des temps nouveaux. Neuchâtel: Delachaux & Niestle, 1951.

Ressler, Roman. Das Weltbild Nikolai Berdjajews; Existenz und Objektivation. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1956.

Schultze, Bernhard. Die schau der kirche bei Nikolai Berdiajew. Roma: Pont. institutum orientalium studiorum. Munich: s.n., 1938.

Seaver, George. Nicolas Berdyaev; an Introduction to his Thought. New York: Harper, 1950.

Shestov, Léon. "Nicolas Berdiaeff: La gnose et la philosophie existentielle." Trans. B. de Schloezer. Revue philosophique 22 (1949): 2-23.

Spinka, Matthew. Nicolas Berdyaev, Captive of freedom. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1950.

Books about Berdyaev between 1956-1989

Balasubramanian, R. The Personalistic Existentialism of Berdyaev. Madras: Centre of Advanced Study in Philosophy, University of Madras, 1970.

Cain, Lucienne Daniel-Mayer. Berdiaev en Russie, précédé de la Russie est sortie des ombres. Paris: Gallimard, 1962.

Calian, Carnegie Samuel. The significance of Eschatology in the Thoughts of Nicolas Berdyaev. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1965.

Davy, Marie-Madeleine. Nicolas Berdiaev : l'homme du huitième jour. Paris: Flammarion, 1964.

Dietrich, Wolfgang, fl. Provokation der Person : Nikolai Berdjajew in den Impulsen seines Denkens. Berlin, Gelnhausen: Burckhardthaus-Verlag, 1975.

Ganth, Jerome. Nicolas Berdiaeff, philosophe de la liberté. Beyrouth: Dar el-Machreq [distribution: Librairie orientale, Beyrouth], 1968.

Green, Garrett. A Kingdom not of this World: A Quest for a Christian ethic of Revolution with Reference to the Thought of Dostoyevsky, Berdyaev, and Camus. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1964.

Klamroth, Erich. Der Gedanke der ewigen Schöpfung bei Nikolai Berdjajew; ein umfassender überblick über das Werk dieses grossen Russen des 20. Jahrhunderts. Hamburg: H. Reich, 1963.

Klein, Paul. Die kreative Freiheit nach Nikolaj Berdjajew : Zeichen d. Hoffnung in gefallenen Welt. Regensburg: F. Pustet, 1976.

Klimov, Alexis. Nicolas Berdiaeff ou la révolte contre l'objectivation. Paris: Seghers, 1967.

Köpcke-Duttler, Arnold. Nikolai Berdiajews Weg einer schöpferischen Bildung. Frankfurt, Main: Haag & Herchen, c1982.

Lowrie, Donald Alexander. Rebellious Prophet: a life of Nicolai Berdyaev. New York: Harper, 1960.

Murdoch, Paul Campbell. Der Sakramentalphilosophische Aspekt im Denken Nikolaj Aleksandrovitsch Berdjaevs. Erlangen: [s.n.], 1981.

Nucho, Fuad. Berdyaev's Philosophy: The Existential Paradox of Freedom and Necessity, a Critical Study. Introduction by Dr. Richard Kroner. Garden City, NY: Anchor Books, 1966.

Poltoratskii, N. P. Berdiaev i Rossiia ; filosofii istorii Rossii u N. A. Berdiaeva. New York: Ob-vo druzei russkoi kul'tury, 1967.

Redlikh, Roman. Filosofia dukha N. A. Berdiaeva. Frankfurt, Main: Posev, 1972.

Richardson, David Bonner. Berdyaev's Philosophy of History. An Existentialist Theory of Social Creativity and Eschatology. Preface by Charles Hartshorne. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1968.

Segundo, Juan Luis. Berdiaeff: une réflexion chrétienne sur la personne. Paris: Aubier, 1963.

Vallon, Michel Alexander. An Apostle of Freedom: Life and Teachings of Nicolas Berdyaev. New York: Philosophical Library, 1960.

Wernham, James C. S. Two Russian thinkers: an essay in Berdyaev and Shestov. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1968.

Books and articles about Berdyaev since 1989

Adiushkin, V.N. "The Social Philosophy of N. Berdyaev in Light of *Perestroika*." Soviet Studies in Philosophy 30.4 (1992): 50-62.

Clement, Olivier. Nicolai Berdiaeff. Paris: Desclée de Brouwer, 1991.

Dmitrieva N.K., and A.P. Moiseeva. Nikolai Berdyaev: zhizn' i tvorchestvo. Moskva: Vysshaia shkola, 1993.

Duval, Jean-François. Flamboyante liberté : essai sur la philosophie de Nicolas Berdyaev, visionnaire et prophète de notre temps. Preface by M.-M. Davy. St. Vincent sur Jabron: Editions Présence, 1992.

Ermichev, A. A., ed. N.A. Berdyaev: pro et contra, Series Russkii put'. Vol. 1. St Petersburg: Izdatel'stvo Russkogo khristianskogo humanitarnogo instituta, 1994.

Gagnebin, Laurent. Nicolas Berdiaeff, ou, De la destination créatrice de l'homme : essai sur sa pensée. Lausanne: L'Âge d'homme, 1994.

Gaidenko, P.P. "Landmarks: An Unheard Warning." Russian Studies in Philosophy 32.1 (1993) 34-51.

Gal'tseva, R.A. "Sub specie finis (Utopiia tvorchestva N.A. Berdiaeva)." Ocherki russkoi utopicheskoi mysli XX veka. Editor R.A. Gal'tseva. Moscow: Nauka, 1992. 10-76.

Harris, Shelini. Berdiaev's Concept of "Personality" as it Relates to his Understanding of Good and Evil, Ethics, and Politics. (n.p.) 1993.

Kolerov, M.A., and N.S. Plotnikov. "New Publications of the works of N.A. Berdiaev." Soviet Studies in Philosophy 30.2 (1991): 70-90.

Lee, Sang Bae. Freedom as the Fundamental Motif of the Thought of Nicolas Berdyaev. (n.p.), 1992.

Rieger, Michael. Inkarnation : christliches Heilverständnis im Kontext franz÷sischsprachiger Theologie der Menschwerdung. Frankfurt am Main; New York: P. Lang, 1993.

Slaatte, Howard Alexander. Time, existence, and destiny : Nicholas Berdyaev's philosophy of time. New York: P. Lang, c1989.

Smirnov, Andrei. "The Path to Truth: Ibn-'Arabî and Nikolai Berdiaev (Two Types of Mystical Philosophizing)." Russian Studies in Philosophy 31.3 (1992-93): 120-134.

Stepanova, E.A. "Exhausted Marxism: An Examination of Marxist Doctrine in the Traditions of Russian Religious Philosophy." Soviet Studies in Philosophy 29.4 (1991): 15-34.

Vadimov, Aleksandr. Zhizn' Berdyaeva: Rossiia. Oakland, CA: Berkeley Slavic Specialities, 1993.

Dissertations and Thesis on Berdyaev compiled by Paul B. Anderson²

Allrich, Rudolph S. "The Concept of Creativity in the Anthropology of Nikolai Berdyaev and its Implications for Christian Ethics." S.T.M. thesis. New York: Union Theological Seminary, 1940.

Andelson, Robert V. "The Social Ethic of Nikolai Berdyaev." Diss. Berkeley: University of California, 1954.

Axer, Engelbert. "The Knowledge of Reality and God According to Nikolai Berdyaev." Diss. (University and date unknown).

Kennedy, Paul V. "A Philosophical Appraisal of the Modernist Gnosticism of Nikolai Berdyaev." Diss. New Orleans: St. Louis University, 1936.

Knapp, Charles C. "Nicolas Berdyaev, Theologian of Prophetic Gnosticism." Diss. Victoria, 1948.

² Paul B. Anderson papers, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Box 5.

Knudsen, Robert D. "Symbol and Myth in Contemporary Theology: With Special Reference to R. Niebuhr and Nikolai Berdyaev." S.T.M. Thesis. (University unknown), 1952.

McKee, William W. "Freedom in the Philosophy of Nikolai Berdyaev." S.T.M. Thesis. (University unknown), 1941.

McManus, David. "L'idée théandrique chez V. Soloviev et chez N. Berdiaeff." Diss. Paris: Sorbonne, 1953

Sheldon, Dr. James Gail. "The Orientation of Nikolai Berdyaev: His Relation to Jacob Boehme, Dostoyevsky, Nietzsche, and Ibsen." Diss. (University and date unknown).

Weonham, James. "Existence and Objectivation in the Thought of Nikolai Berdyaev." S.T.M. thesis. (University unknown), 1937.

Williams, Bert. "Berdyaev's Philosophy of History." Diss. Boston University, 1949.

Wills, Robert J. "The Understanding of Man in the Writings of Barth, Hūgel, Nikolai Berdyaev and John Wood Oman." S.T.M. thesis. (University unknown), 1948.

Extension of Anderson list from 1960 until 1989 (Listed in chronological order)

Donovan, Margaret. "The Role of Russian Religious Thought in the Writings of Nicholas Alexandrovich Berdiaev, 1870-1948." Diss. U of Wisconsin, 1960.

Banerjee, Maria. "The Religious and Metaphysical Interpretation of Dostoevskij from Vladimir Solov'ev to Berdjaev: A Study of Six 'Great Commentaries'." Diss. Radcliffe, 1962.

Elmore, Joe. "The Theme of the Suffering of God in the Thought of Nicholas Berdyaev, Charles Hartshorne, and Reinhold Niebuhr." Diss. Columbia U, 1963.

Murphey, Paul. "The Concept of Death in the Theology of Nicholas Berdyaev, Paul Tillich and Helmut Thielicke." Diss. Vanderbilt U, 1964.

Troutman, Perry. "Nicolas Berdyaev's Concept of Human Creativity: A Theological Critique." Diss. Boston U, 1964.

Indinopulos, Thomas. "Certainty and Christianity: A Polemic Based Upon Rudolf Bultmann, Emil Brunner, and Nicolas Berdyaev." Diss. U of Chicago, 1965.

Hales, Graham. "A Comparative Study of the Apologetical Values in the Christian Mysticism of W.R. Inge and Nicolas Berdyaev." Diss. Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1966.

Goodman, Donald. "Freedom, the Person, and Community: Berdyaev and the Marxist Leaven." Diss. Fordham U, 1967.

Didoha, Michael. "Conceptual Distortion and Intuitive Creativity: A Study of the Role of Knowledge in the Thought of Nicholas Berdyaev." Diss. Georgetown U, 1969.

Harnett, David. "Nicolas A. Berdyaev: An Intellectual Portrait." Diss. Harvard U, 1970.

Koo, Yung Whan. "Nicholas Berdyaev's Concept of Freedom and the Free-will Defence." Diss. Princeton Theological Seminary, 1970.

Shahan, Robert. "A Consideration of the Evidence Adduced by Berdyaev for the Reality and Priority of Freedom over Being." Diss. Northwestern, 1970.

Story, James. "Journey Through Paradox: A Critical Analysis of the Thought of Nicholas Berdiaev, 1899-1914." Diss. Columbia U, 1971.

Kajevich, Reverend Stojilko. "Nikolay Berdyaev's Theory of Uncreated Freedom and Its Metaphysical Origins." Diss. De Paul U, 1975.

Pittman, David. "The Character of Human Freedom and Its Implications for the Paris Minister: An Exploration Based on the Thought of Nicolai Berdyaev and Frederick S. Perls." Diss. School of Theology at Claremont, 1975.

Swarte, Carolyn de. "Spirituality in Slavonic Christianity and the Philosophy of Nicholas Berdyaev." Diss. Northwestern, 1975.

Graves, Thomas. "The Relevance of the Personalistic Thought of Nicolas Berdyaev for the Christian-Marxist Dialogue." Diss. Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1976.

Trollope, Margaret. "Creativity in Thomas Aquinas and Berdyaev." Diss. U of Southern California, 1976.

Caddick, L. "The Reality of Spirit: The Response to Reductivist Critiques of Theism in the Later Work of Berdyaev." Diss. London University, 1978.

Petterson, John. "The Life of the Spirit: Nicolas Berdyaev's Vision of the Dialectic of Spiritual Life and the Application of this Vision to the Contemporary Problem of an Image of Man." Diss. Vanderbilt U, 1978.

Wingerter, Joseph. "Berdyaev's Concept of Symbolic Definitive Conceptualization." Diss. University of Calgary, 1979.

Seastrand, Paul. "Freedom and Spirit: An Interpretation of Evaluation of Nicolai Berdyaev's Doctrine of the Spirit." Diss. Claremont, 1980.

Clavet, Robert. "La vision théandrique du monde chez Nicolas Berdiaeff et la fin de la crise du monde modern." Diss. Université de Montréal, 1988.

McLachlan, James. "Existentialist Interpretations of the Desire to be God: Radical Freedom in Sartre and Berdyaev." Diss. U of Toronto, 1989.

Sergei Bulgakov

The full list of Bulgakov's writings may be found in:

Naumov, Kliment. Bibliographie des oeuvres de Serge Boulgakov. Paris: Institut d'études slaves, 1984.

Bulgakov, Sergei, N. Avtobiograficheskie zametki. 2nd ed. Paris: YMCA-Press, 1991.

—. Sochinenia v dvukh tomakh. 2 Vols. Moscow: Nauka, 1993.

Evtuhov, Catherine. "Sergei Bulgakov: A Study in Modernism and Society in Russia, 1900-1918." Diss. University of California at Berkeley, 1992.

Zander, Lev. Bog i mir. 2 Vols. Paris: YMCA-Press, 1948.

Mikhail Gershenzon

Davies, Donald E. "Mikhail Gershenzon's 'Secret Voice': the Making of a Cultural Nihilist." Religious and Secular Forces in Late Tsarist Russia: Essays in Honor of Donald W. Treadgold. Ed. Charles Timberlake. Seattle and London: University of Washington Press, 1992. 168-184.

Gershenzon, M.O. "Krizis Sovremennoi Kul'turii." Minuvshee: istoricheskii al'manakh. Vol. 11. Moscow: Atheneum-Feniks, 1992. 232-248.

Gershenzon, M.O., and Viacheslav Ivanov. "A Corner-to-Corner Correspondence." Russian Intellectual History: An Anthology. Ed. Marc Raeff. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1966. 372-401.

Georges Florovsky

Anderson, Paul B. "Georges Vasilievich Florovsky,: His American Career (1948-1965)." Greek Orthodox Theological Review 11.1 (Summer, 1965): 7-30.

Florovsky, G.V. Puti russkoe bogoslovie. Paris: YMCA Press, 1937.

—. Complete Works. New York: Northland, 1979.

Semen Frank

Frank, Semen L. S.L. Frank. Munich: (s.n.), 1954.

—. God With Us: Three Meditations. Trans. Natalie Duddington. London: J. Cape, 1926.

—. Iz istorii russkoi filosofskoi mysli konsta 19: nachala 20 veka. Washington: Inter-Language Literature Association, 1965.

—. The Unknowable: An Ontological Introduction to the Philosophy of Religion. Trans. Boris Jakim. Athens, Ohio: Ohio University Press, 1983.

—. The Light Shineth in Darkness: An Essay in Christian Ethics and Social Philosophy. Trans. Boris Jakim. Athens, Ohio: Ohio University Press, 1989.

Ivan Ilyin

Il'in, I.A. Sobranie sochinenii. 2 Vols. Moscow: Russkaia kniga, 1993.

Poltoratzky, N.P. Ivan Aleksandrovich Il'in: Zhizn', trudy, mirovozzrenie (Sbornik statei). Tenafly, NJ: Hermitage Press, 1989.

Poltoratzky, N.P. ed. Nashi zadachi (Ivan Il'in). Jordanville, NY: Holy Trinity Monastery and the Telex Corporation, 1991.

Lev Karsavin

Karsavin, L.P. "Asketizm i ierarkhiia." Minuvshee: istoricheskii al'manakh. Vol. 11. Moscow: Atheneum-Feniks, 1992. 211-231.

Mat' Maria (Elizabeta Skobtsova)

Gakkel, Father Sergii. Mat' Maria 1891-1945. Paris, YMCA press, 1980.

Merezhkovsky & Gippius

Gippius, Zinaida. Dmitrii Merezhkovskii. Paris: YMCA Press, 1951.

Pachmuss, Temira. D.S. Merezhkovsky in Exile : The Master of the Genre of Biographie Romancée. New York: P. Lang, 1990.

---. Women writers in Russian Modernism : An Anthology. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1978.

---. Zinaida Hippius; An Intellectual Profile. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, c1971.

---. Intellect and Ideas in Action - Selected Correspondance of Z. Hippius. Munich: W. Fink, 1972.

Rosenthal, Bernice Glatzer. D.S. Merezhkovsky and the Silver Age: The Development of a Revolutionary Mentality. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1975.

Pavel Novgorotsev

Novgorotsev, Pavel. Ob obshchestvennom ideale. Ed. A.V. Sobolev. Moscow: Pressa, 1991.

---. Russian Schools and Universities in the World War. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1929.

Walicki, Andrei. Legal Philosophies of Russian Liberalism. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987.

Lev Shestov

Martin, Bernard, ed. A Shestov Anthology. Athens: Ohio University Press, 1970.

Moreva, L.M. Lev Shestov. Leningrad: Izdatel'stvo Leningradskogo universiteta, 1991.

Shestov, Lev. Sochinenii v dvukh tomakh. 2 Vols. Moscow: Nauka, 1993.

---. Izbrannye sochineniia. Moscow: Russkaia kniga, 1993.

---. Apofeoz bespochvennosti. Leningrad: Izdatel'stvo Leningradskogo universiteta, 1991.

---. Kirgegard i ekzistentsial'naia filosofiia. Moscow: Progress-Gnozis, 1992.

Vladimir Soloviev

Cioran, Samuel D. Vladimir Solov'ev and the Knighthood of the Divine Sophia. Waterloo, Ont.: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1977.

Frank, Semen L., ed. The Vladimir Soloviev Anthology. Trans. Natalie Duddington. London: S.C.M. Press, 1950.

Losev, A.F. Filosofiia, mifologi, kul'tura. Moscow: Politicheskaiia literatura, 1991.

—. Vladimir Solov'ev i ego vremia. Moscow: Progress, 1990.

Soloviev, Vladimir. The Justification of the Good: An Essay on Moral Philosophy. Trans., Nathalie Duddington. London: Constable & Co., Ltd., 1918.

—. The Meaning of Love. Trans. Jane Marshall. London: Geoffrey Bles, 1945.

—. Sochineniia v dvukh tomakh. Eds. A.F. Losev, and A.V. Gulyga. 2 Vols. Moscow: Mysl', 1988.

—. Sochineniia v dvukh tomakh, Ed. N.V. Kotrelev. Intro. V.F. Asmus. 2 Vols. Moscow: Pravda, 1989.

Feodor Stepun

Stepun, Feodor. Vergangens und Unvergängliches (The Fulfilled and the Unfulfilled). New York: Chekhov, 1956.

—. Encounters. Munich: (s.n.), 1962.

—. Theater und Film. Munich: (s.n.), 1953.

Peter Struve

Pipes, Richard. Struve: Liberal on the Left, 1870 - 1905. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1970.

—. Struve: Liberal on the Right, 1905-1944. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1980.

Frank, Semen L. Biografiia, P.B. Struve. New York: Chekhov Press, 1956.

Sergei N. Trubetskoy

Bohachevsky-Chomiak, Martha. S.N. Trubetskoi: An Intellectual Among the Intelligentsia. Belmont, Mass.: Nordland, 1976.

Vladimir Weidlé

Weidlé, Vladimir. Posle "Dvenadtsati". Paris: YMCA Press, 1973.

—. Zadacha Rossi. Paris: YMCA Press, 1956.

—. Russia Absent and Present. New York: Vintage Books, 1961.

—. O poetakh i poezii. Paris: YMCA Press, 1973.

—. Bezymiannaia strana. Paris: YMCA Press, 1968.

Vasily Zenkovsky

Zenkovsky, Vasily. Apologetika. Paris: YMCA Press, 1957.

—. Das bild des Menschen in der Ost Kirche. Stuttgart: (s.n.), 1951.

—. Nasha epokha. Paris: YMCA Press, 1955.

—. Russkie mysliteli i Evropa. Paris: YMCA Press, 1955.

The Slavophiles and other 19th Century Religious Philosophers

Aksakov, K.S., and I.S. Aksakov. Literaturnaia kritika. Moscow: Sovremennik, 1981.

Bolshakov, Serge. The Doctrine of the Unity of the Church in the Works of Khomyakov and Moehler. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1946.

Christoff, Peter. An Introduction to Nineteenth Century Slavophilism. 4 Vols. The Hague: Mouton & Co. Pub., 1961.

Fedorov, N.F. Sochineniia. Ed. A.V. Gulyga; Comp. and intro. S.G. Semenova. Moscow: Mysl', 1982.

Khomiakov, A.S. Stikhotvoreniia i dramy. Ed. B.F. Egorov. Leningrad: Sovetskii pisatel', 1969.

Kireevskii, I.A. Filosofskoe nasledie. Ed. Iu. V. Mann. Moscow: Mysl' 1979-1983.

—. Izbrannye stat'i. Ed. B.A. Kotel'nikov. Moscow: Mysl', 1984.

Koshelov, V.A. Esteticheskie i literaturnye vozzreniia russkikh slavianofilov (1840-1850-e gody). Leningrad: Nauka: 1984.

Lomunov, K.N., ed. Literaturnye vzgliady i tvorchestvo slavianofil'stov, 1830-1850 godov. Moscow: Nauka, 1978.

L'vov, V.E. "Zagadochnyi starik: Povest' -khronika." Neva 5 (1974): 65-122.

Pazilova, V.P. Kriticheskii analiz religiozno-filosofskogo ucheniia N.F. Fedorova. Moscow: MGU Press, 1985.

Riasanovsky, Nicholas. Russia and the West in the Teaching of the Slavophiles. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1956.

Semenova, S.G. Nikolai Fedorov: Tvorchestvo i zhizn'. Moscow: Sovetskii pisatel', 1990.

—. "Nikolai Fedorovich Fedorov (Zhizn' i uchenie)." Prometei 11 Moscow: Molodaia gvardiia, 1977. 86-105.

Tsimbaev, N.I. Slavianofil'stvo: Iz istorii russkoi obshchestvenno-politicheskoi mysli XIX veka. Moscow: Izdatel'stvo Moskovskogo universiteta, 1986.

Walicki, Andrei. The Slavophile Controversy. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1975.

Vekhi

Kelly, A.M. "Attitudes to the Individual in Russian Thought and Literature, with Special Reference to the *Vekhi* Controversy." Diss. Oxford University, 1970.

Poltoratzky, N.P. "The *Vekhi* dispute and the Significance of *Vekhi*." Canadian Slavic Review 9 (1967): 86-106.

Poltoratzky, N.P. "Lev Tolstoy and *Vekhi*." The Slavonic Review 42 (1963-64): 332-352.

Proskurinaia, B. & V. Alloi, "K istorii sozidaniia 'Vekh'." Minuvshee: Istoricheskii al'manakh. Vol. 11. Moscow-St. Petersburg: Atheneum Feniks, 1992. 249-291.

Read, C.J. Religion, Revolution and the Russian Intelligentsia from 1900-1912: The VEKHI Debate and Its Intellectual Background. London: Macmillan, 1979.

Schapiro, Leonard. "The *Vekhi* Group and the Mystique of Revolution." The Slavonic Review 34 (1955-1956): 56-76.

Shatz, Marshall S. & Judith E. Zimmerman, trans. and eds. Vekhi: "Landmarks". Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe, 1994.

Tompkins, Stuart. "Vekhi and the Russian Intelligentsia." Canadian Slavonic Papers 2 (1957): 11-25.

E. Selected Works on or by Related French Intellectuals:

Devant la crise mondiale: manifest de Catholiques europeene séjournant en Amérique. New York: Éditions de la Maison Française, 1942.

Amato, Joseph. Mounier and Maritain: A French Catholic Understanding of the Modern World. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 1975.

Aron, Raymond. Plaidoyer pour l'Europe décadente. Paris: Robert Laffont, 1977.

Baird, Catherine. "Religious Communism? Nicolai Berdyaev's Contribution to *Esprit's* Interpretation of Communism." Canadian Journal of History/Annales canadiennes d'histoire 30 (April 1985): 29-47.

Bellescize, Diane de. Les Neuf sages de la Resistance. Paris: Plon, 1973.

Blumenson, Martin. The Vildé Affair. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co, 1977.

Boegner, Marc. L'exigence oecuménique: Souvenirs et perspectives. Paris: Éditions Albin Michel, 1968.

du Bos, Charles. Approximations. Paris: Éditions Corrêa, 1924-38.

Cain, Seymour. Gabriel Marcel. London: Sheed & Ward, 1963.

Cocteau, Jean. Lettre à Jacques Maritain. Paris: Librairie Stock, 1926.

Congar, Yves. Dialogue between Christians. London: Geoffrey Chapman Ltd., 1966.

Craw, William & William Kidd, eds. French Writers and Politics 1936-1944. Glasgow: University of Glasgow Press, 1987.

Doering, Bernard E. Jacques Maritain and the French Catholic Intellectuals. Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 1983.

Dunaway, John M., ed. Exiles and Fugitives: The Letters of Jacques and Raissa Maritain. Allen Tate, and Caroline Gordon. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1992.

Ennis, David. "Toward Commitment: The Reorientation of French Social Thought in the 1930s." Diss. Boston University, 1979.

Fumet, Stanislas. Histoire de Dieu dans ma vie: souvenirs choisis. Paris: Fayard, 1978.

Gide, André. Journals 1889-1945. Trans., and Ed. Justin O'Brien. London: Secker & Warburg, 1949.

Hellman, John. Emmanuel Mounier and the New Catholic Left, 1930-1950. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1981.

—. The Knight-Monks of Vichy France. Montréal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1993.

—. "Personnalisme et fascisme." Le personnalisme d'Emmanuel Mounier. Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1985.

Heurgon-Desjardins, Anne, ed. Paul Desjardins et les décades de Pontigny. Paris: Press Universitaires de France, 1964.

Jennings, Jeremy, ed. Intellectuals in Twentieth-Century France: Mandarins and Samurais. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1990.

Journet, Charles. L'Union des églises et le Christianisme Pratique. Paris: Grasset, 1927.

Judd, Tony. Past Imperfect, French Intellectuals, 1944-1956. Berkeley: U of California Press, 1992.

Kelly, Michael. Pioneer of the Catholic Revival: The Ideas and Influence of Emmanuel Mounier. London: Sheed & Ward, 1979.

Kernan, Julie. Our Friend Jacques Maritain: A Personal Memoir. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1975.

Lindenberg, Daniel. Les années souterraines (1937-1947). Paris: Éditions la Découverte, 1990.

Lipiansky, Paul, and Bernard Rettanbach. Ordre et Démocratie, deux sociétés du pensée: de L'Ordre Nouveau au Club Jean-Moulin. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1967.

Loubet del Bayle, Jean-Louis. Les Non-conformistes des années 30. Paris: Éditions de Seuil, 1961.

Marcel, Gabriel. Être et avoir. Paris: Desclée de Brouwer, 1935.

Maritain, Jacques. La personne et le bien commun. Paris: Desclée de Brouwer, 1946.

—. Notebooks. Trans. Joseph W. Evans. Albany, NY: Magi Books Inc., 1984.

—. Reponse à Jean Cocteau. Paris: Librairie Stock, 1926.

—. Raïssa's Journal. Trans Joseph W. Evans. Albany, NY: Magi Books, Inc., 1974.

—. Humanisme intégral: problèmes temporels et spirituels d'une nouvelle chrétienté. Paris: F. Aubier, 1936.

Maritain, Jacques and Raïssa. Oeuvres Complete, 10 Vols. Freiburg, Suisse: Éditions Universitaire, 1982.

Maritain, Raïssa. Les grandes amitiés. Paris: Desclée de Brouwer, 1941.

Mounier, Emmanuel. Personalism. Trans. Philip Mairet. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd., 1952.

—. Mounier et sa génération. Ed. Paulette Mounier-Leclercq. Paris: Éditions du seuil, 1956.

—. Oeuvres de Emmanuel Mounier. Ed. Paulette Mounier-Leclercq. 4 Vols. Paris: Éditions de Seuil, 1961.

Paxton, Robert O. Vichy France: Old Guard and New Order, 1940-1955. New York: Knopf, 1972.

—. Parades and Politics in Vichy: The French Officer Corps under Marshall Petain. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1966.

Paxton, Robert O., and Michael R. Marrus. Vichy France and the Jews. New York: Basic Books, 1981.

Roy, Christian. "Alexandre Marc and the Personalism of L'Ordre Nouveau, 1920-1940." M.A. Thesis. McGill University, 1987.

—. "Alexandre Marc et la Jeune Europe, 1904-1934: L'Ordre Nouveau et aux origines du Personnalisme." Diss. McGill University, 1992.

Sachs, Maurice. Le Sabbat: souvenir d'une jeunesse orageuse. Paris: Gallimard, 1960.

Sternhell, Zeev. Ni droite ni gauche: L'idéologie fasciste en France. Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1983.

Suther, Judith. Raïssa Maritain: Pilgrim, Poet, Exile. New York: Fordham University Press, 1990.

Touchard, Jean. Le gauche en France depuis 1900. Paris: Éditions de Seuil, 1977.

—. "L'Esprit des années 1930: Une Tentative de Renouveau de la pensée politique française." Tendances politique dans la vie française depuis 1789. Paris: Hachette, 1960. 240-259.

Visser't Hooft, Willem Adolf. Le mouvement oecuménique et la question radical. Paris: UNESCO, 1954.

Weber, Eugen. The Hollow Years: France in the 1930s. New York: Norton, 1994.

Winock, Michel. Histoire politique de la revue Esprit, 1930-1950. Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1975.

F: Some studies of the émigré literary milieu

A full bibliography is presented in:

Foster, Ludmilla Z. Bibliography of Russian Emigré Literature, 1918-1968. Boston: G.K. Hall, 1970.

Appel, Alfred, and Simon Karlinsky. The Bitter Air of Exile: Russian Writers in the West, 1922-1972. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1973.

Batalden, Stephen K., ed. Seeking God: The Recovery of Religious Identity in Orthodox Russia, Ukraine and Georgia. DeKalb, Il., Northern Illinois University Press, 1993.

Berberova, Nina. The Italics are Mine. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1969.

Broude, Inna. Ot Khodasevicha do Nabokova : nostal'gicheskaja tema v poezii pervoi russkoi emigratsii. Tenafly, N.J.: Ermitazh, 1990.

Gibson, Aleksey. Russian poetry and criticism in Paris from 1920 to 1940. The Hague: Leuvenhoff Publishing, 1990.

Glad, John. Conversations in Exile. Durham: Duke University Press, 1993.

Karlinsky, Simon. Marina Tsvetaeva: The Woman, Her World, and Her Poetry. Cambridge, UK; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1985.

Kline, George. "Variations on the Theme of Exile." Brodsky's Poetics and Aesthetics. Eds. Lev Loseff and V.A. Polukhin. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1990. 56-88.

McMillin, Arnold, ed. Under Eastern Eyes : The West as Reflected in Recent Russian Emigré Writing. London: MacMillan, 1991.

Pachmuss, Temira. A Moving River of Tears : Russia's Experience in Finland. New York: P. Lang, 1992.

—. Russian Literature in the Baltics Between the World Wars. Columbus, Ohio: Slavica Publishers, 1988.

Pyman, Avril. A History of Russian Symbolism. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1994.

Senelick, Lawrence, ed. Wandering Stars : Russian Emigré Theatre, 1905-1940. Iowa City: University of Iowa Press, 1992.

Yanovsky, Ia. Elysian fields: A Book of Memory. Dekalb: Northern Illinois University Press, 1987.