

**Svetlana Koval'chuk**

---

**PARIS-RIGA-PARIS: THE IMPACT OF THE  
RUSSIAN EMIGRATION IN THE ACTIVITIES  
OF THE RUSSIAN ORTHODOX STUDENT  
UNITY IN LATVIA (1927–1934)**

Following the October 1917 coup-de-etat in Russia, a flow of emigration of Russians (called “the flight”) ensued. It consisted of Russians and Russian citizens taking refuge from the “terrible days” of the revolution, from the ravages of the World War I, from the bloody experiences of the Civil war. This flight started some years before the forced expatriation of the intelligentsia in September–November 1922. This last action is often referred to in literature as “the philosophical ship” thus indicating in a symbolic way to the whole process of repressive measures against the intellectual elite of the country. This process was kept up in the following years as well. The newspapers of Riga continually published lists of names of Russian expatriates who had settled down in Latvia. Thus from the very start of the twenties Riga became a kind of a center of Russian emigration – the Moscow-Riga train kept bringing here people who had obtained legal means for leaving soviet Russia. For some of them it was a short stop on the way to Western Europe, where they hoped to find more comfortable way of living; others elected to stay in Riga. These people – formerly citizens of the Russian empire – found themselves in a position of partly voluntary and partly coercive separation from their native habitat. They came to the conclusion that the main task of the emigres is to

defend Russia in the situation obtaining, and to keep guard of the Russian culture in the form of a missionary effort for the preservation of the spiritual values for the future benefit of the liberated Russia.

It is no wonder therefore that Riga was visited at that time by many well-known public figures of Russia – philosophers, historians, politicians, opinion makers. Here is a typical list of such visits in 1927. In February historians and professors of Carl University Prague Alexander Kizeveter (1866–1933) and Venedikt Miakotin (1867–1937) came to Riga. In May a visit of Vsevolod Stratonov (1869–1938) – professor of the Czech High Technical College took place. Before deportation from his native country he had been the Head of the Physics and Mathematics Faculty at the Moscow University and the founder of the Astrophysics Institute of Russia. In May, 1927 Pavel Miliukov (1859–1943) – a historian, publicist, one-time leader of the Constitutionally-Democratic Party, Foreign Minister of the Temporary government of 1917 delivered lectures in Riga. At the end of October, 1927 Fedor Stepun came to Riga from Berlin to deliver lectures in Russian and in German. He was a philosopher of religion, historysophist, culturologist, sociologist, art theoretician, writer and publicist. In May, 1928 professor, philosopher Sergei Gessen (1887–1950) was lecturing on pedagogics. In May 1928 Sergei Zavadskii (1871–1935) came from Prague to Riga to take part in the Days of Russian culture. He was an Ex-Chairman of the Court of Justice of St. Petersburg, a specialist of law, literature member of the Senate, he was the leader of the Russian academic community in Czechoslovakia, public figure. Ivan Il'in (1883–1954) – religious thinker, a sophisticated interpreter of Hegel's philosophy, activist of the émigré organizations, in particular – of the Russian Army Union – made many presentations in Riga. The invitation to these dignitaries to come to Riga was usually extended by various public organizations. The public presentations of these guests were met by undivided interest on the part of the people of Latvia regardless of the cultural, ethnic or social divisions.

Of special interest within the present thematic framework are the activities of the spiritual leaders of the Russian Student's Christian Movement

(RSCM) in visiting Latvia from 1927 to 1934. It was a well-known youth organization operating in the Russian emigration centres since the beginning of the 1920-ies in various European towns – Paris, Prague, Berlin, Belgrade, Sofia. Of special importance were the visits of Nikolai Berdiaev (1874–1948), Semen Frank (1877–1950), Vasilii Zen'kovskii (1881–1962) and others. It would be interesting to know the details of their talks with the representatives of the Orthodox Church of Latvia – Archbishop of Riga and Mitava Ioann (Jānis Pommer; 1876–1934)<sup>1</sup>, of their lectures in the University of Latvia, of their presentations to the teachers of Russian schools. The eminent scholars established ties with the local emigres – especially young people, who had suffered from the events of the 1917 and the Civil War; they wanted to extend help for their education, enhance their Christian world view and value orientation on the bases of ecumenical approach.

The task of the education of the younger generation was the concern of the older generation of the emigres. In a situation when the ties with their native land had been severed, they wanted to educate their children so that they would be loyal to their new homeland, and would be good Europeans, but would keep their Russian spirit. In the independent Latvia these tasks could be obtained through a network of Russian schools. The demo-

---

<sup>1</sup> The Most Eminent (*Vladyka*) Ioann (Pommer) is a graduate of Riga Orthodox Theological Seminary, of Kiev Theological Academy, has served in various bishoprics in Russia. In 1920 was elected by the General Synod of Orthodox Church of Latvia to serve as bishop of Riga and was released by St. Tikhon, Patriarch of Moscow to serve in the Republic of Latvia in 1921. Since 1925 Archbishop Ioann was elected to the Parliament of Latvia (Saeima) and represented there the interests of the Orthodox population and fought for the official recognition of the Orthodox Church of Latvia. At night on October 12, 1934 he was brutally assassinated. The causes of this tragic event have not been revealed to the present day. In 1982 Archbishop Ioann was canonized by the Russian Orthodox Church Abroad. In 2001 the Synod of the Latvian Orthodox Church celebrated the hieromartyrdom of Ioann Archbishop of Riga and all Latvia. See: Istoriiia v pis'makh. Iz arkhiva sviashchennomuchenika arkhiepiskopa Rizhskogo Ioanna (Pommera). Podgotovka, predislovie i kommentarii IU. L. Sidiakova. V 2-kh tomakh. Tver': 2015 (*History of Letters. From the archives of Hieromartyr archbishop of Riga Ioann (Pommer)*). Collection, Introduction and Commentaries by J. L. Sidiakov. In 2 volumes. Tver': 2015).



cratic legislation of the newly-borne state of Latvia, made it possible to establish new private schools and establishments of higher learning. Such an institution was the Russian University Courses (RUC), established in October 1921 at the initiative of Konstantin Arabazhin (1865–1929)<sup>2</sup>. (At

<sup>2</sup> Isakov S. G. Professor Khel'sinskogo universiteta K. I. Arabazhin. Ocherk zhizni i deiatel'nosti (*Isakov S. G. Professor of the University of Helsinki K. I. Arabazhin. On His Life and Work*) // *Studia Slavica Finlandensia*. T. IV. Helsinki, 1987, pp. 68–111; Koval'chuk S. Konstantin Ivanovich Arabazhin // *Pokrovskoe kladbishche. Slava i zabvenie* // *Sbornik statei*. Sost. S. Vidiakina, S. Koval'chuk (*Koval'chuk S. Konstantin Ivanovich Arabazhin // Pokrovsk Cemetery. The Fame and the Forgetfulness // A collection of Articles*. Collected by S. Vidiakina, S. Koval'chuk. Riga: 2004.

first RUC; later – Russian Institute of University Knowledge – RIUZ)<sup>3</sup>. Intensive work was undertaken with the Russian young people in the direction of national and religious education, vigorous youth organizations were set up<sup>4</sup>. It is worth recalling the letter written on July 28, 1931 by a protopriest of the Riga Cathedral Church of the Nativity of Christ Konstantin Dorin (1878–1942) to baroness Mariia Dmitrievna Vrangel'. The letter contains a list of the most influential youth organizations of Riga at the beginning of the thirties, working intensively among the young people in the nationalistic and religious way. Dorin gave the following list: 1) National Union of Russian Youth, 2) Men's corporation of University of Latvia "Fraternitas Arctica", 3) Russian Academial Society, 4) Society of the Russian Students of University of Latvia, 5) Society of Russian Guides and Scouts, 6) Men's corporation of University of Latvia "Ruthenia", 7) Men's corporation "Fraternitas Rossica" Russian Institute of University Knowledge), 8) Veche, 9) Group of Enthusiasts of Russian Past, 10) gymnastics society "Russian Eagle", 11) Society of young Russian writers "On the Plane of Words". The list continues with the societies of school pupils and graduates of high schools, private technical school and the Russian Orthodox Student's Union (ROSU). Up till 1931, 16 such organizations came into existence, including the already mentioned Russian Orthodox Student's Union – this was the name of the Russian Student's Christian Movement of Latvia, which is the object of the subsequent investigation

<sup>3</sup> Koval'chuk S. Iz istorii vysshei shkoly v dovoennoi Latvii: evrei na russkikh Universitetskikh kursakh v Rige. (1921–1937) // Evrei v meniaiuschchems mire. (*Koval'chuk S. From the history of higher education establishments in the pre-war Latvia: Jews at the Russian University courses in Riga (1921–1937) // Jews in the Changing World.* Riga: 2003, vol. 4, p. 146–158; Tsoia S. Russkii institut universitetskikh znaniy v mezhvoennoi Latvii // Russkii mir i Latviia. Al'manakh (*Tsoia S. Russian Institute of University Knowledge in the Inter-war Latvia // Russian World and Latvia. Almanach*). Riga: 2013. Nr. XXXII, p. 18–200.

<sup>4</sup> See: Protodiakon K. A. Dorin // Baltiisko-russkii sbornik. Materialy po istorii russkoi zhizni v Rige i Kaunase. Iz Arkhiva Guverovskogo instituta / pod red. L. Fleishman, B. Ravdin (*Protodeacon K. Dorin // Balto-Russian Collection Materials on the history of the life of Russians in Riga and Kaunas. From the archives of Hoover's Institute / edited by L. Fleishman, B. Ravdin*). Stanford: 2007. Vol. 2, p. 264.

It has to be stressed that it is intended to minimally rely on the well-known memories of Metropolitan Evlogii (Georgievskii; 1868–1948)<sup>5</sup> and Boris Pliukhanov (1911–1993)<sup>6</sup>. Unfortunately, the investigations of the Russian historian Aleksandr Gurevich “The cultural and historical activities of the Russian emigration according to the materials of the Russian Student’s Christian Movement” are unavailable in Latvia. A. Gurevich has informed the author of the present work, that he did not have the opportunity to work in the funds of the State Archives in Latvia when preparing his dissertation work. Gurevich also asserted that he used the information about the Latvian Union from the materials that have been already published – from the book of Boris Pliukhanov, from the articles of the “News of the Russian Student’s Christian Movement”, from several

---

<sup>5</sup> Bishop of Orthodox Church of Russia, member of the State Parliament of Russia (Duma) II and III (1907–1912), from 1921 responsible for the Russian Orthodox Church parishes in Western Europe. In January 17, 1922 according to the degree of Patriarch Tikhon (Bellavin) became Metropolitan. After cooling of relations with the Metropolitan Sergii (Stragorodskii) suffragan bishop, was dismissed from the overseeing of the Russian Church in Western Europe. As from February, 1931 came under the jurisdiction of the Patriarchate of Constantinople. In autumn, 1945 signed an appeal for re-union with the Moscow Patriarchate and soon received a positive answer signed by Patriarch Aleksii (Simanskii). At the same time he twice appealed to Constantinople to receive permission to return back to Moscow jurisdiction, but no permission was forthcoming and as the result – he bore the title of Exarch for the Ecumenical Patriarch till the end of his days. Metropolitan Evlogii was renown for his ecumenical activities, he supported the Russian Student Christian Movement; he took part from 1920 to 1937 in many conferences of various Christian denominations, and was actively involved in several specialized conferences that lay the foundations of the World Council of Churches. The honorary doctor of theology Metropolitan Evlogii is the author of reminiscences: “The Way of My Life. Reminiscences of Metropolitan Evlogii (Georgievskii)”, composed on his accounts by T. Manukhina. Moscow: 1994

<sup>6</sup> Author of the book «History of Russian Student Movement in Latvia and Estonia», Paris, 1993. In 1929 graduated Riga Lomonosov Secondary School, from 1930 to 1939 was a student of University of Latvia, obtaining Master’s degree in law. Was actively involved in the work of the Union, was a member of corporation “Ruthenia”. During World War II served as Secretary of the Administrative office of the Orthodox Church of Latvia. In autumn 1944 was arrested by the soviet authorities, two years later – released “for lack of criminal offence”. Worked as a consultant on matters of law in Riga till 1992.

publications of contemporaneous historian of Pskov Konstantin Oboznoi, etc. For this reason Gurevich relied mostly on the available sources from the Archives of Russian Federation. Another important source of information for Gurevich was the archives of Paul B. Anderson (1894–1985)<sup>7</sup> – an active member of Young Men’s Christian Association (YMCA). His documents have been preserved in USA Archives of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. On finishing the dissertation research Gurevich paid less attention to the theme of RSCM.

In contrast to the work done by Gurevich we will concentrate on texts from “News of the RSCM” – the main publication of the Russian Student’s Christian Movement, because we are of the opinion that the text of Pliukhanov’s book is largely based on the articles of the “News”. It is quite possible that Pliukhanov had been the author of these texts, seeing that he was in charge of correspondent mission in Riga. The author of the present investigation made use of Russian newspaper publications of the time – “Slovo” (*The Word*), “Segodnia Veчерom” (*Tonight*), “Segodnia” (*Today*). We are convinced that without the corroboration of the archive materials the text of the present article may appear non-convincing. In view of the fact that this article is but a prelude of a more sizable investi-

---

<sup>7</sup> Born in USA, a veteran activist of the American youth Christian organization (YMCA). Worked at YMCA branch in China from 1913 to 1917. Later he worked as Personal Secretary of John Railey Mott (1865–1955) – the leader of YMCA. Paul Anderson took the post of the Secretary of YMCA in Russia and the post of the Director of the “Help to Prisoners-of-War in Russian and Siberia” (1917–1918). On October 25, 1918 was arrested by the State Political Police (The Cheka). For a time incarcerated for religious activities in the Butirsky prison and soon expatriated from soviet Russia. He arrived in Berlin, where he was involved in setting up of Russian polytechnic school for extra mural studies. In 1930 established Advanced Technical Institute in Paris. He supported the work of the Russian Student Christian Movement, the Russian publishing house “YMCA-Press” and Orthodox Theological Institute of St. Sergius in Paris. He held important positions for the work of Russian emigration and RSCM. He was international Secretary of YMCA; from 1938 – Senior Secretary of YMCA for Europe. He was member of the Executive Committee of “YMCA-Press” publishers. Paul Anderson is the author of two small works: *People, Church and State in Modern Russia*. London: Student Christian Movement Press, 1944; *No East or West*. Paris: YMCA-Press, 1985.

gation, it is important to concentrate attention on the necessity for a deeper study of the archive materials concerning the Union. It is intended that this work will make but a modest use of the rich collections of the funds of The National Archives of Latvia: Latvian State Historical Archives (further on: LSHA) bearing on the activities of the Russian Student's Christian Movement (RSCM). These materials having been preserved over scores of years in both Russian and Latvian languages are waiting for the scrupulous eye of an investigator, for up till now they have not been subjected to non-partisan objective analysis.

### The Attitude of Russian Orthodox Church (outside Russia) towards Russian Student's Christian Movement (RSCM)

The Russian Student's Christian Movement from its inception was determined to cooperate with the Russian Orthodox Church. This intention was fixed during the first Congress of the Russian Student's groups in Western Europe that took place in Psherov (Czech Republic) at the end of September, 1929. It was financed and sponsored by Young Men's Christian Association and World Christian Student's Federation. (By the way: the Roman Catholic Church initially categorically declined from ecumenical ideas and from cooperation with YMCA. Roman Catholics even refused to participate in the form of observers.)

The noble intention of approaching the Orthodox Church did not take root from the start. It is possible that the cause for delay is to be connected with the contacts of the student's movement with the American organizations. I assume that the causes are to be looked for also in the division within the very Russian Orthodoxy outside soviet Russia. This became particularly obvious after the Church split in June 1926 that took place at the meeting of the hierarchs in the town Sremski Karlovci where a synod of bishops of the Russian Orthodox Church abroad was established. The existing differences were the cause of a sharp conflict. The so-called White Church – the Russian Orthodox emigrant organization –

was formed<sup>8</sup>. It consisted of influential spiritual leaders, hierarchs who had been evacuated together with the civil population and the military from the Crimea. This group was headed by the influential leader Metropolitan of Kiev Antonii (Khrapovitskii, 1863–1936)<sup>9</sup>. He had been one of the three nominees for the title of the Patriarch at the Synod of the Russian Orthodox Church in 1917–1918 and had drawn more voices than other candidates for the post. But God's will, that was manifested by way of casting lots, fell in favour of Tikhon (Bellavin; 1865–1925).

Thus, Metropolitan Evlogii (Georgievskii) came to confront most of the hierarchs. He was a man of strong character, who attempted to rule his churches in Western Europe in an independent manner. On seeing the encirclement of the Orthodox believers by non-orthodox environment, he tended towards the ideas of inter-confessional cooperation, ecumenism and insisted on the cooperation with Anglican and Evangelical Lutheran churches. The efforts of the Metropolitan in this direction were supported by the professors and teachers of the Paris Theological Institute of St. Sergius<sup>10</sup>. Nikolai Berdiaev, archpriest Sergei (Bulgakov), Anton Kartashev, Lev Zander, and others. The professors shared the position of the Metropolitan Evlogii (Georgievskii), and heartily worked to popularize the ecumenical ideas within the Russian Student's Christian Movement.

This resulted in the negative attitude of hierarchical Synod at Karlovitsi towards the missionary work of Metropolitan Evlogii (Georgievskii); this seriously endangered the possibility of finding clever and able advisers

<sup>8</sup> Later was named The Russian Orthodox Church Outside of Russia.

<sup>9</sup> Makoveckii Arkadii. Belaia Tserkov' vdali ot ateisticheskogo terrora. In: Istoriiia Russkoi Zarubezhnoi Cerkvi (*Makoveckii Arkadii. The White Church Far Away from Atheistic Terror. History of the Russian Church Abroad*). St. Petersburg: 2009.

<sup>10</sup> It is worth noting an important fact in connection with the activities of Paul Anderson. The Orthodox Institute of Theology of St. Sergus was established in Paris with financial help from YMCA. For more detailed information see: Kartashev A. V. Kak sozdavalsia Pravoslavnyi Bogoslovskii institute v Parizhe // Vestnik Russkogo Studentcheskogo Khristianskogo Dvizheniia (*Kartashev A. V. How was the Orthodox Theological Institute in Paris Established // News of the Russian Student's Christian Movement (further on: RSCM)*, 1964. Nr. 4 (75) / 1965. Nr. 1 (76), p. 4–20.

among the clergymen and fostered the schism between various strains of Russian Student's Christian Movement. Unfortunately the schism of the Church caused an irreparable loss of the popular idea about the eventual submission of the Movement to the local Church bodies, and a further unification into a union of Orthodox brotherhoods. In the beginning the RSCM consisted of youth groups and brotherhoods that had different ideas about the tasks of the Movement; some concentrated on the matters of conversion to faith, others were deeply moved by the collapse of the Orthodox culture. The latter saw in the Movement a force that would enhance in the situation of liberty, existing beyond the boundaries of Russia, the possibility to develop religious thought. There were also those who hoped that the Orthodox brotherhoods would become a source of renovation of the emigration and will extend spiritual and material succor to the members. Some were also interested in the work among children and young people, in the charitable aspects, and stated that not so much energy is expended on preaching but more efforts have to be undertaken in the practical work of Christian charity<sup>11</sup>.

The general convention of the RSCM taking place in 1927 in Clermont was attempting to lessen the differences existing between various tendencies and voted for the following resolution: "Russian Student's Christian Movement Abroad considers as the main goal the unification of the young Christians for the service to the Orthodox Church and the involvement of unbelievers for the sake of Christ. It attempts to help the members to work out Christian world view and has set the task to prepare the defenders of the Church and of the Christian faith, so that they would be capable to fight modern atheism and materialism". This formulation was consonant with the generally held emigre opinion that "the Russian tragedy was not contingent or arising out of external causes, but was the result of a long process of turning away from the truth of Christ". The

---

<sup>11</sup> See: *Russkie bez Otechestva. Ocherki antibol'shevistskoi emigratsii 20–40 godov (The Russians without Native Land. Articles about Anti-Bolshevik Emigration during twenties – forties)* / Editor-in-Chief S. V. Karpenko. Moscow: 2000, p. 333–374.

members of the Movement were fully aware that the revolution should not be denied or thoughtlessly ignored, regardless of the hardships that it had brought to the Russian people. There was no way of turning back. They saw their task as necessity “to work hard in the name of spiritual rebirth”. The chief slogan of the RSCM called for the “churching” of life, i.e. – taking efforts towards a way of life that would encompass all aspects of everyday secular living, would be permeated by the values of the Orthodox Church, while the Church would be under obligation to take care of the physical and spiritual growth, as well as the material well-being of the faithful.

Unfortunately, the leadership of RSCM was beginning to evade the control of the Church leaders and refused to submit the governance of the organization to the Church, which they wanted to see only as a spiritual guide, and not an organizational, real-life superiors. The activities of RSCM from the very beginning did not come under the jurisdiction of any of the Patriarchs, Metropolitan or Bishop. Such a state of affairs was not approved by the Episcopal Synod in Sremski Karlovtsi under the presidency of Metropolitan Antonii (Khrapovitskii).

Another important point has to be mentioned. As from 1927 the relations of Metropolitan Evlogii (Georgievskii) with Moscow worsened and finally turned into “rueful conflict with the Patriarchy of Moscow”. This caused loosening of the ties with the Mother Russian Church, that brought in the end to a final schism in 1930<sup>12</sup>. After the severing of the relations with Moscow, Metropolitan Evlogii elected for independence. In February of 1931 he transferred himself and the Russian Orthodox Churches in Western Europe under the jurisdiction of the Ecumenical Patriarchate. This move only worsened the relations with the Metropolitan Antonii (Khrapovitskii). Actually, Metropolitan Evlogii acted in the same way as Estonian Orthodox Church had done earlier. It is known that Estonian Orthodox Church in June 1923 transferred under the jurisdiction of the Patriarchate of Constantinople. It became an autonomous entity

---

<sup>12</sup> Metropolitan Evlogii. *The Way of My Life*, p. 566, 569–575.

under the name of Estonian Orthodox Metropolis, since July 1926 – Estonian Apostolic Orthodox Church. The Moscow Patriarchate did not recognize the canonical changes of the Church in Estonia. The head of the Estonian Orthodox Church was Metropolitan Alexander (Paulus; 1872–1953).

It has to be stressed that the head of Orthodox Church in Latvia Archbishop Ioann (Pommer) took a different way. Up to the end of his life he kept allegiance with the Patriarchate of Moscow, though he kept up friendly relations with Metropolitan Evlogii (Georgievskii)<sup>13</sup>.

The Russian Student Orthodox Union (ROSU) of Latvia joined in 1927 the Russian Student Orthodox Movement and could not, naturally, keep aside from the existing complexity of the situation.

### Nikolai Berdiaev in Latvia

In order to facilitate the work of separate Orthodox youth groups, a positive stimulus was needed. This is the reason why Riga was visited in March 1927 by professor Nikolai Berdiaev – an Existentialist thinker of religious orientation. His philosophical thought was based on the three principles of freedom, personality and creativity. He was the author of philosophical monographs “Philosophy of Freedom”, “Aleksi Stepanovich Homiakov”, “The Meaning of Creativity. A Case for the Justification of Human Being”, etc.

In autumn of 1922 Berdiaev was forced to become a passenger of the notorious “ship of the philosophers”. When coming to Germany, he did not stay for a long time in Berlin and in 1927 moved to Clamart – a small town in France. The philosopher managed to establish a Religious-Philosophical Academy in Paris, thus keeping on the tradition of the respective academy in Moscow from 1919 to 1920, called The Free Academy of Spiritual Culture. In 1925 Berdiaev became the Editor of journal “Put’”

<sup>13</sup> From the archives of hieromartyr Archbishop of Riga and all Latvia Ioann (Pommer). Letters and other documents. Vol. 2. The publication arranged by IU. L. Sidiakov // *Russkii mir i Latvia (Russian World and Latvia. Almanach. Riga: 2009. Nr. XX.*

(The Way) which become the leading publication of religious and philosophical thought of the Russian emigration.

According to the newspaper “Slovo” (*The Word*)<sup>14</sup> the former professor of the Free Academy of Spiritual Culture Nikolai Berdiaev arrived in Riga by train from Berlin on March 30, 1927. After being met at the station with the publicity of flashing cameras by the representatives of the social and student organizations, the renown guest was taken in an automobile to the flat of the brother of the owner of the newspaper “Slovo” (*The Word*) Sergei Belotsvetov (1873–1938)<sup>15</sup>. The talks with the distinguished guest went on well into the night.

The first lecture “The soul of the modern man and Christianity” in the hall of “Ulei” was attended also by the Archbishop of the Latvian Orthodox Church Ioann (Pommer). The presence of the hierarch of the Church underscored the importance of the event and the visit of professor Berdiaev. The Russian Enlightenment Society published in the newspaper “Slovo” an announcement about the forthcoming lecture in the hall of the “Black-heads House” on the Municipal Square.

According to the newspapers of the time, the Riga public was enthusiastically welcoming Berdiaev’s visit. He was considered as “the prophet of freedom”; people relied on his intellectual capacity and on the active effects of his searching words. They wanted to foretaste the influence of one of the most prominent leaders of the Russian emigration – of Russia No. 2 – on the clarification of the perspectives of unification of the spiri-

<sup>14</sup> The owner of the publication was Nikolai Belotsvetov (1863–1935) – some time Managing Director of the insurance company “Salamandra”. Having emigrated to Latvia he continued insurance business, and invested large sums in newspaper “Slovo” (*The Word*), journal “Perezvony” (*Chimes*) and other publications. He was politically tightly connected with monarchic segment of the emigres, who supported the Grand Duke Nikolai Nikolaevich Romanov, General Petr Vrangel’, Duke Anatolii Liven.

<sup>15</sup> S. Belotsvetov worked as teacher of God’s law, was Chief Secretary of the literary journal “Perezvony” (*Chimes*). See: Koval’chuk S. Nikolai Belotsvetov, Sergei Belotsvetov / Pokrovskoe kladbishche. Slava i zabvenie (*Koval’chuk S. Nikolai Belotsvetov, Sergei Belotsvetov // Pokrovsk Cemetery. Fame and Forgetfulness*), p. 157–159.

## Собесѣдование проф. Н. А. Бердяева съ русской молодежью.

О. Н.

Вчера въ помѣщеніи Хр. Союза Мол. Женщ. состоялась бесѣда проф. Н. А. Бердяева съ многочисленной аудиторіей, состоявшей гл. о. изъ представителей русскаго студенчества и молодежи. Темой была исторія религиозно-философскаго движенія среди современной молодежи.

Въ концѣ 1921 г. въ Прагѣ, Софій. Бѣлградѣ, Парижѣ и др. университетскихъ центрахъ почти одновременно возникли первые студенческие христіанскіе кружки. Въ дальѣйшемъ появлялась мысль о необходимости болѣе тѣснаго единенія. Въ 1923 году въ Чехіи была созвана первая русская студенческая христіанская конференція съ участіемъ представителей наиболѣе крупныхъ центровъ скопленія русскаго студенчества.

Разрозненныя организаціи были объединены, возникло «Объединеніе русскихъ студенческихъ христіанскихъ кружковъ». Въ 1924 году состоялся второй съѣздъ, который окончательно сформулировалъ основныя цѣли и задачи христіанскаго движенія.

Главной цѣлью христіанскаго движенія должно явиться «пробужденіе религиозныхъ запросовъ среди молодежи, углубленіе и расширеніе

религиознаго сознанія въ духѣ Православія, нравственное очищеніе и оздоровленіе жизни, организація духовныхъ силъ молодежи для борьбы за христіанскій идеаль и проведеніе христіанства въ повседневную жизнь, какъ личную, такъ и общественную».

Руководителями кружковъ обычно являются духовныя лица, профессора и члены самихъ кружковъ. Одни изъ кружковъ изучаютъ Св. Писаніе, другіе—творенія св. отцовъ, третьи—литургику и т. д.

Имѣются свѣдѣнія, что религиозно-христіанское движеніе вначало охватываетъ и широкіе круги молодежи въ СССР, гдѣ ведется неслышанная работа въ этомъ направленіи.

Профессоръ высказалъ пожеланіе, чтобы и въ Латвіи были организованы религиозно-философскіе кружки русской молодежи, такъ какъ есть данныя полагать, что мысль объ этомъ достаточно созрѣла.

По окончаніи бесѣды была произведена запись въ инициативную группу по организаціи христіанскихъ кружковъ русской молодежи.

Дальнѣйшая запись производится и справку можно получить у Г. Ф. Ваймэковой (Хр. С. М. Женщинъ—Антонинская ул. 1-а).

О.

tual Russia. Ernst Keikhel' (1877–1945)<sup>16</sup> – a journalist who wrote for the Riga newspaper “Slovo”, observed: “The leading role in this very important and difficult case could be played not by politicians or scholars, but only by men obtaining of deep and acute conscience embodying the religious aspects of the extensive Russian soul, the soul of the whole people. One of the most expressive representatives of this “mission of Moses” of the Russian emigration that has been brought ashore by the Bolshevik Red Sea, is undoubtedly Nikolai Aleksandrovich Berdiaev”. Special mention should be made of Berdiaev’s spiritual growth from that of an adept of legal Marxism to conversion to deep Christian faith. From the very beginning of the 1905

<sup>16</sup> Was born in Zaporozhye, in a small village Prishib, that had been established by German settlers. He came from the family of a Lutheran pastor, obtained higher technical education in mining, engineering. When in emigration in Latvia cooperated with newspaper “Slovo” (*The Word*), “Segodnia” (*Today*), “Dlia Vas” (*For You*), etc., translated. In 1939/40 repatriated to Germany. Latvian State Historical Archives (LSHA). Fund 2996. Inv. 10. File 19571.

revolution he became a Christian philosopher, and in emigration turned into a leader, a pastor of the people, scattered in many lands and continents. Berdiaev's words obtained of particular power for the emigres brought by the Providence for the resurrection of the future Russia, which was destined to cure itself from the Bolshevik plague and the destructive atheism<sup>17</sup>.

Subsequent publications concerning Berdiaev stressed that the views of the Paris guest are distinguished by "the eternal foundations of life that unite people", by "the attempts to restore the wholeness of the human spirit", by the common efforts of religion, philosophy and science. Keikhel' stressed Berdiaev's attempts to remain faithful to the articles of faith of the Church and, at the same time – to enrich and to enlarge the framework of the Church with new contents. A very telling citation from the lecture followed at the end the article. "We are looking for the Church that would encompass the wholeness of life, the totality of the worldly experience, all that is valuable in the world, everything that has oppressed the historical being. [...] The Church should encompass everything that is dear to us. Everything we have suffered in the world – our love, our thought and poetry, the whole of our creativity, all our great men of the world, all our elevating moments and dreams, everything that has been transcendental in our lives and in the life of the whole world"<sup>18</sup>.

It is worth noting that the first Berdiaev's visit to Riga was marked by two of his works being published in the German press – an event, in all likeness being initiated by Keikhel'. The newspaper "Rigische rundschau" (The Riga News) published in Nr. 50 an article "Der neue russische Mensch" (A new Russian Man). Another article "Die Pseudoreligion des Socialismus" (The Pseudo-religion of Socialism) was published by "Baltische Monatsschrift" (Baltic Monthly).

A photograph published in the newspaper "Slovo" on April 1, 1927 shows N. Berdiaev together with prof. K. Arabazhin, S. Belotsvetov,

<sup>17</sup> Keikhel' E.N. A. Berdiaev // Slovo (*The Word*), 1927. Nr. 463, p. 2.

<sup>18</sup> Keikhel' E. Mirosozertsanie N. A. Berdiaeva (*Worldview of N. A. Berdiaev*) // Ibid., 1927. Nr. 466, p. 2.

E. Keikhel'. It also depicts the veteran Chairman of the Russian Enlightenment Society of Riga Elpidifor Tihonitski (1875–1942)<sup>19</sup>, the Chairperson of the Christian Union of Young Women (YWCA) Tamara Baimakova (1897–1987), archpriest Kirill (Zaic; 1869–1948)<sup>20</sup>, prof. Vladimir Trofimov (1872–1944)<sup>21</sup>, the some-time professor, art historian of St. Petersburg Nikolai Misheev (1878–1974), artist academician

<sup>19</sup> Coming from the family of Orthodox priest. Graduated from Kazan Theological Academy, Candidate of Theology, teacher at Riga schools. Soon after obtaining of Latvian citizenship in 1925 was elected member of the Parliament of Latvia (Saeima) from the list of the Orthodox voters. On October 14, 1940 E. Tikhonitskii was arrested by the Political Police and accused of counter-revolutionary activities according to the legislation of Russian Federation. Died at a camp in North-Kazakhstan. E. Tikhonitskii was son of archpriest Mikhail (Tikhonitskii), who was shot by Bolsheviks in 1918. In 2003 archpriest was elevated to the rank of Russian neo-martyrs and confessors. Brother of E. Tikhonitskii – Archbishop Vladimir (Tikhonitskii) (1873–1959) for many years served as vicar in the churches in France, Italy, was the Head priest at the church in Nice. After the death of Metropolitan Evlogii in August 1946, he took upon himself the tasks of leading of the Exarchate on the bases of the testamentary order of 1943 by Metropolitan Evlogii, and refused to follow the orders of the Patriarch of Moscow Aleksii I (Simanskii) dated August 9, 1946 about joining of the Patriarchate of Moscow. He led the majority of the parishes in France under the jurisdiction of the Patriarchate of Constantinople and called himself the Ecumenical Patriarch in Western Europe.

<sup>20</sup> Mitred archpriest, graduated from Riga Theological Seminary, finished St. Petersburg Advanced Courses for Missionaries. From 1923 – member of the Synod of the Orthodox Church of Latvia, editor of the spiritual journal “Vera I Zhizn” (*Faith and Life*). In 1929–1933 priest of the Riga Cathedral Church of Christ’s Nativity. Since autumn of 1941 – head of the Orthodox mission in Pleskava (Pskov). See: Golikov Andrei, priest, Fomin Sergei. Krov’iu ubeleunnye. Mucheniki i ispovedniki Severo-Zapadnoi Rossii i Pribaltiki (1940–1955) (*Golikov Andrei, priest, Fomin Sergei. Whited by Blood. Martyrs and Confessors in the North-Western Russia and in the Baltic Region (1940 – 1955)*). Moscow: 1999, p. 132–135.

<sup>21</sup> Graduated from the Faculty of Medicine, Jur’ev (Tartu) University, doctor of medicine, doctoral theses defended at St. Petersburg Military Academy of Medicine. Was teaching at University of Latvia until 1931. At President K. Ulmanis’ initiative was appointed in 1931 to the ministerial post (without portfolio). Underwent repressions in October, 1944. See: Feigmane T. Russkie v dovoennoi Latvii. Na puti k integratsii. (*Feigmane T. Russians in Latvia before the War. On the Way towards Integration*). Riga: 2000, p. 75, 160.

Nikolai Bogdanov-Belskii (1868–1945)<sup>22</sup>, member of the Synod of the Orthodox Church of Latvia Fedor Butsen (1869–1942)<sup>23</sup>, journalists of Riga newspapers “Segodnia” and “Slovo”, Nikolai Berezhanskii (1884–1935), activist of Old Believers faith of Latvia Ivan Zavoloko (1897–1984)<sup>24</sup> and a writer and journalist Ivan Lukash (1892–1940)<sup>25</sup>.

<sup>22</sup> Graduated from St. Petersburg Academy of Arts, studied under the supervision of Academician of the Imperial Academy of Arts Il'ia Repin. Since 1890 was a permanent participant of the *peredvizhniki* exhibitions. In 1914 was awarded the title of Permanent Member of the Academy of Arts. From the middle of September 1921 up to 1944 lived in Latvia. During that time his works had been displayed at exhibitions in Belgrade, Prague, Copenhagen, Berlin, Hamburg, Helsinki, Oslo, Tallinn, Munich, Toronto. In 1936 was awarded the highest decoration of Latvia – Order of the Three Stars. See: journal “Dlia Vas” (*For You*), 1940. Nr 17.

<sup>23</sup> For many years was an activist of Baptist denomination, Chairman of the local Baptist Union, Bishop. In December 1913 converted to Orthodoxy, soon became diocesan missionary of the Riga diocese. From 1923 to 1932 – editor of the journal of the Orthodox Church of Latvia “Vera i Zhizn” (*Faith and Life*), member of the Synod of the Orthodox Church of Latvia, from 1928 was member of the Peter-Paul Brotherhood. He was distinguished by the wide scope of interests – he attended the philosophical lectures of Kallistrat Zhakov (1866–1926), was attracted by Nikolai Rerikh's ideas, actively collaborated with Rerikh's Society of Latvia. Was politically repressed in December, 1940.

<sup>24</sup> Archeographer, teacher, leader of Old Believer's Community, public figure. Graduated from the Russian Faculty of Law, Prague University, obtained Candidate of Law degree. Enhanced his erudition at the so-called Kondakovsky's seminars in Prague (called after Nikodim Kondakov (1844–1925) – a well-known scholar, academician). The seminars offered courses in Byzantine and Old-Russian art, practiced iconographic method of the study of artefacts of art. Zavoloko – an active author of newspaper “Slovo”, leader of the “Group of Enthusiasts of Russian Past” at the Riga Old Believer's Grebenshchikov community. In the second part of the year 1940 was arrested by secret police. Spent 17 years in prison camps. Since 1957 – free-lance scholar at the Institute of Russian literature (Pushkin's House) in Leningrad, regular participant of scholarly conferences on the problems of Old Russian literature in 1960-ies and 70-ies. I. Zavoloko – an enthusiastic collector of manuscripts about the Old Believers community; he had found autographs of “Zhitiiia” (*Life*) of the monk Epifanii and the archpriest Avvakum.

<sup>25</sup> Fleishman L., Abyzov Iu., Ravdin B. Russkaia pechat' v Rige. Iz istorii gazety “Segodnia” 1930-kh godov. (*Fleishman L., Abyzov Iu., Ravdin B. Russian Press in Riga from the History of newspaper “Segodnia” in 1930-ies*). Stanford, 1997. Bk. I. Pp. 76; 82–88; 216–217; Sproge L. Pushkinskii mif Ivana Lukasha // Pushkinskie chteniia v Tartu (*Sproge L. Ivan Lukash's Myth about Pushkin // Pushkin's Readings in Tartu*). Tartu: 2000, p. 331–343.

In using of the newspaper sources we were not, admittedly, interested so much in the contents of the lectures as in the information concerning the meeting of Berdiaev by the public, especially the younger generation. Several years later the names of many Orthodox priests and activists of the Russian culture of Latvia were not mentioned any longer in the press in connection with the coming from Paris of functionaries of RSCM, and this was not without causes, which are to be discussed in a while.

The guests from Paris came to meet the students with the purpose of fostering of the establishment of a network of Christian youth, because – as was indicated earlier – the bases of RSCM was composed of groups of young people's fraternities. In April of 1927 The Russian Orthodox Union of Latvia was still being in a formative stage. Several religious associations were active at that time in Riga without having obtained any official recognition through registration. These were – the Biblical Association – leader priest Mikhail (Burnashev; 1882–1928), Youth association for the study of Church history named after V. V. Bolotov; the lectures and classes were conducted by prof. V. V. Preobrazhenskii. (Unfortunately no more detailed information about prof. Preobrazhenskii is available). There was also a Union of young women and Christian Students association of the University of Latvia.

Lack of official registration of the statutes of the Riga Russian Orthodox Union did not prevent the invitation of a large number of students for meeting with Nikolai Berdiaev. Thus on April 1, 1927 the packed auditorium of the Large Hall (Lielā aula) of the University of Latvia was listening to the lecture on “Christianity, Marxism and the Teaching of Nietzsche”. After this lecture the Paris guest met with the students twice – on one occasion he was invited by Tamara Baimakova – leader of the Young Women's Association (YWCA). The premises of the association were in the centre of Riga on 1-a Antonijas Street. Berdiaev's lecture on “Christian Movement Abroad” dealt in detail with the work of two important Russian theological centres – Orthodox Theological Institute

of St. Sergius<sup>26</sup> and Religious-Philosophical Academy, of which Berdiaev was the President. Berdiaev displayed particular interest as to the religious convictions of young people in Latvia, he suggested that associations of religious-philosophical kind for students should be established in Latvia, and members of the clergy should be asked to join<sup>27</sup>. The guest did not hide, in fact, he insisted that “the movement is a new creative unprecedented venture. It is important to distinguish between two meanings of the Church – the invisible Church which is the Body of Christ, encompassing the whole Real Being, and the visible Church which is a canonical organization. The Student Movement which is secular in its form belongs first and foremost to the first – the integral part of the Church. The Orthodoxy allows for great freedom. [...] The designation ‘Christian’ reveals the very essence of the Movement. “We believe in the Christ Crucified”. The ‘Orthodox’ stands only for ‘the right faith’, ‘Christian’ bears the meaning of the very essence of faith”<sup>28</sup>.

A participant of the discussion Nadezhda Istomina-Bukovskaia many years later recalled the meeting: “The professor asked for questions. At first the audience was silent, later some questions were asked, which bespoke of skeptical attitude with regard to the Christian Movement. This was quite natural, for the professor had spoken in a very theoretical and dry fashion, mentioned the ‘Church’ very often and offered it such a role that the young people were put off, for they were not enthusiastic about the Church”<sup>29</sup>.

<sup>26</sup> See: Tsoia S. Latviiskaia Pravoslavnaia Tserkov' i Sviato-Sergievskii Pravoslavnyi Bogoslovskii institut v 20 – 30-kh gg. XX veka // Pravoslavie v Baltii (*Tsoia S. Orthodox Church of Latvia and Orthodox Theological Institute of St. Sergius in 1920-ies, 1930-ies of the 20th Century // The Orthodoxy in the Baltics*), 2013. Nr 10 (1), p. 33–48. Tsoja's article deals with the fate of the students from Latvia who studied at Theological Institute that was intended as an post-seminary form of education.

<sup>27</sup> Coming to Riga of Professor N. A. Berdiaev // Slovo (*The Word*), 1927. Nr. 463, p. 1.

<sup>28</sup> Pliukhanov B. V. RSHD v Latvii i Estonii. Materialy k istorii Russkogo Studencheskogo Khristianskogo Dvizheniia. (*Pliukhanov B. V. Russian Christian Movement in Latvia and Estonia. Materials for the History of Russian Student Christian Movement*). Paris: 1993, p. 26.

<sup>29</sup> Ibid., p. 48.

The famous professor left Riga for the lecture tour in Tartu, Estonia. The first Berdiaev's visit to Latvia served to enhance the official registration of the organization and the working out of the structure of the Union in Latvia. The leading body became the general meeting of all the members living in the territory. The administrative and representative body of each territory was the Acting Committee, which was instrumental in calling of the general meetings of the membership. It also carried out the decisions of the meeting, oversaw the work of the administration and the financial affairs. It also kept in touch with the centre of RSCM in Paris. The Committee was composed of representatives from the local groups, the Vice-President, Secretary, Bursar and the members elected by the general meeting. It is important to note that alongside periodical fund-raising for the needs of the Union in Latvia, it was also subsidized from Paris for the needs of the leaders of the movement<sup>30</sup>.

### Visit of Semen Frank

In 1928 at the end of February – beginning of March The Russian Enlightenment Society invited from Berlin for lectures within the programme of spiritual awakening of Latvian and Russian school students, religious thinker Semen Frank (1877–1950). He had been the co-founder with N. Berdiaev of the Free Academy of Spiritual Culture in Moscow, also author of the famous collection of religious articles “Vehi” (*Milestones*) and philosophical books “The Subject of Cognition”, “The Soul of Man”, “The Fall of the Idols”, “The Meaning of Life”. Having been brought up from the very childhood on the texts of the Scriptures and having passed through a period of life when he was enthusiastic about Marxist ideas, Semen Frank had become a real Christian and was attempting a veritable synthesis of the rational thinking and religious faith.

---

<sup>30</sup> See: LSHA. Fund 3235. Inv. 3. File 172. On p. 157–160 one can find detailed information by an informer of Political Police of Latvia about the activities of RSCM and the financial situation of the organization.

He was specially interested in the synthesis of the Platonic apophatic theology and the philosophical ideas of Nikolai of Cusa and Vladimir Solov'ev.

E. Keikhel' published in "Slovo" an article "The Spiritual Road of S. Frank" where he wrote: "The average citizen – even an educated one – does not like philosophy; he treats it with scorn and considers it to be lifeless, unnecessary "misty" triviality. At the same time the awful experience of the last decades should have taught the lesson to everybody about the great force of the ideas. These were the "philosophically grounded" ideas that had penetrated the intelligentsia of Russia and had actually maddened its conscience for almost a hundred years had acted as a vermin to gnaw at the core of the oak-tree of "Russia" and had brought to its downfall. After such a conspicuous destructive "success" one has to come to the conclusion that the former light-hearted attitude towards the ideas of political thought might be substituted with a course of action using the spiritual dynamite for more creative purposes?" The author of the article is clearly aware that "the present-day Russian philosophy [...] is ceaselessly concerned with this extremely important matter – the spiritual rebirth of the future Russia". The personal biography of Frank is indicative in this respect for "the gathering of the spiritual Russia", for he has covered the road from engagement with Marxism to deep religiosity and to the conviction that the real meaning of faith is the service to the Lord. The lives of outstanding people are a real testimony of the realization of the eternal laws of the spiritual growth of the human beings "through a veritable touch of the guiding hand of the Providence"<sup>31</sup>.

Professor Frank's lectures took place in the hall of the Russian Club on Bol'shaia Korolevskaia (Grand Royal) Street 1. The first lecture dealt with occultism; during the second lecture "The New Barbarianism" S. Frank discussed the phenomenon of mass culture, the loss of the eternal values. The professor declared that every epoch is characterized by its own style,

---

<sup>31</sup> Keikhel' E. Dukhovnyi put' S. Franka (*Keikhel' E. The Spiritual Path of S. Frank*) // Slovo (*The Word*), 1928. Nr. 801, p. 2.

that every generation follows its own aims and tasks and therefore it is impossible to turn back to the past. One has to accept the general tendency towards primitive way of life. However, there are eternal values the loss of which will mean the end of civilization and a return to a new barbarian way of life. The coming of an epoch of “new barbarity” Frank proposed to interpret “as signs of the weakness of culture and as a reaction to the situation where European culture is available only for the minority of people. [...] The intricate forms of life have become simplistic and are at the service of large masses. A kind of a general youthful regeneration has taken place that goes hand in hand with spiritual slackness”. With the approval of the audience professor Frank offered a citation from German writer and philosopher Hermann Keyserling (1880–1946), who, incidentally, was also born in Latvia. “The former barbarian smelled of the forest; the modern ones – smell of machine oil”. At the end of the lecture the professor accentuated that on the way towards general primitivism not only values of the epoch, but also eternal values may become extinct. Religion is among the latter ones, so are morality, pure science and art. These values are to be secured from the attack of the new barbarism and young people are to be urged to keep them. One has to keep up the spirits but to become tough for the fight for eternal spiritual bases of life<sup>32</sup>.

In a talk with the correspondent of “Slovo” Semen Frank remarked that he keeps in constant touch with the Russian student Christian organizations and often speaks before the audiences of young people. Professor kept to these principles also in Riga. On March 1, 1928 he was invited to deliver a lecture by the Christian youth organization. He spoke in the Large Hall of the University of Latvia. The theme of the lecture was “The Meaning of Life”. In the evening of March 4 the famous professor took part in the closing session of the Week of Spiritual Regeneration at the Hall of the private Russian High School of Liudmila Tailova and delivered a successful lecture on “The Religious Foundations of Sociality”.

---

<sup>32</sup> The New Barbarism. Lecture of Prof. S. L. Frank // Slovo (*The Word*), 1928. Nr. 791, p. 3.

The distinguished event was attended by the Right Reverend Archbishop Ioann (Pommer).

Professor Frank ranks among those visitors of Riga who displayed lively interest about the history of the Old Believers of Riga. He visited the Grebenshchikov community that is situated in the Moscow suburbs of Riga, took a special interest in the ancient icons kept there and partook of the service.

In honour of the guest an informal discussion took place at the initiative of the Young Christian Women's Union and Russian Academic Society in the form of an "academic tea-party". Photographs of the event were published in "Slovo" and "Segodnia Vecherom".

### The activities of professor Vasilii Zen'kovskii and his followers

So we have come at last to the group of leaders of the RSCM in Paris who had been instrumental in shaping of the world view of the youth in Latvia via the efforts of the Russian Orthodox Students Union of Latvia (ROSU) which was member organization of RSCM Latvian branch. We have in mind here the visits to Latvia of professors of the Paris Institute of Orthodox Theology of St. Sergius, which took place at the invitation of public organizations – the Russian Enlightenment Society, Russian Orthodox Students Union, Christian Union of Young Women. Thus in December, 1931 – January, 1932 professor Vladimir Il'in (1891–1974) took an active part in the work of the Winter Congress of the Union in Riga; he also lectured in Riga, Daugavpils, Rezekne, later went to lecture to Finland<sup>33</sup>. During the third decade of December, 1933, very successful

<sup>33</sup> A. Per. Uchenyi s troinym obrazovaniem (*A. Per. A Scholar with Three Educations* // *Segodnia Vecherom (Tonight)*, 1931. 292. p. 3; V. Iu. Russkaia muzyka – faktor mirovoi kul'tury. Na leksii prof. V. N. Il'ina (*V. Iu. Russian Music – a Factor of World Culture. At the Lecture of V. N. Il'in*) // *Ibid.*, 1932. Nr. 2. p. 3; Leksii prof. V. Il'ina (*Lecture by prof. V. Il'in*) // *Novyi Golos (New Voice)*, 1932. Nr. 19, p. 2.

# Проф. Б. П. Вышеславцевъ прѣзжаетъ въ Ригу.

На дняхъ прѣзжаетъ въ Ригу изъ Парижа проф. Б. П. Вышеславцевъ, который прочтетъ въ залѣ Черноголовыхъ слѣдующія лекціи: 23-го января — „Возвышенное и высокое“ (Марксизмъ и Христианство), 25-го января — „Безбожие — божьявнъ пазированнаго сознанія“ (Возбужде въ свѣтъ новыхъ данныхъ психоанализа), 26-го января — „Подознательное и его тайны“ (Истоки окультурныхъ ученій въ свѣтъ новѣйшихъ психологическихъ данныхъ).

Проф. Б. П. Вышеславцевъ родился и воспитывался въ Москвѣ. По окончаніи курса въ московскомъ ун-тѣ Б. П. Вышеславцевъ былъ оставленъ при университетѣ его учителемъ проф. П. П. Новгородцевымъ и вплоть до 1917 г. читалъ лекціи по философіи, по исторіи политич. ученій и по общей теоріи права въ московск. ун-тѣ, въ моск. коммер. институтѣ и въ народн. унив. Шаньзвскаго.

Въ 1922 г. Б. П. Вышеславцевъ уѣхалъ изъ Россіи и поселился въ Берлинѣ, гдѣ продолжалъ свою научно - философскую работу. Принималъ участіе въ основаніи свободной религіозно - философской академіи, председателемъ которой состоитъ проф. Н. А. Бер-



Проф. Б. П. Вышеславцевъ.

дяевъ, и въ основаніи журнала „Путь“ — членомъ редакціи котораго является и въ настоящее время.

Въ Парижѣ Б. П. читаетъ сейчасъ лекціи въ религіозно - философской академіи и въ Богословскомъ Институтѣ, но большую часть ной души.

труда и времени онъ удебляетъ редактированію изданій „Имѣя Прессъ“, въ настоящее время самаго большаго научно - литературнаго и философско - религіознаго русскаго издательства въ мірѣ.

Въ прошломъ году проф. Вышеславцевъ выпустилъ новую книгу — „Этика преображеннаго Эроса“, которая нашла высокую оцѣнку не только въ русской, но и въ иностранной научной критикѣ. За время пребыванія въ эмиграціи онъ помѣстилъ множество статей въ „Путь“, въ „Совр. Запискахъ“ и др. изданіяхъ и выступалъ съ многочисленными докладами во Франціи, въ Германіи, Чехословакии, Бельгіи, Голландіи, Сербіи, Болгаріи, Греціи и, по особому приглашенію въ Римѣ.

Въ послѣднее время проф. Вышеславцевъ много работаетъ надъ проблемами психоанализа и вообще современной аналитической психологіи исторіи религіи (въ частности Индуизма и буддизма), религіозной философіи и мистикѣ. Все это удебляетъ его лекціи и научные труды очень разнообразны, но объединены однимъ идеей преображенія современ-

Оъ плесо  
далеко по  
затъ въ В  
Сара Берн  
врилъ-ли  
печно, ач  
такъ эле  
не издѣ  
въ театрѣ  
выступилъ  
оцѣнкой  
сыграли  
кой моли  
что сраж  
скую а  
картина  
Сара  
тоской  
ѣдл и  
мента  
слена  
стѣла  
шла и  
ловал  
того.

lectures by Boris Vysheslavtsev (1877–1954)<sup>34</sup> took place. Several times representative of RSCM, archpriest Sergii (Chetverikov; 1867–1947) visited Latvia and exerted influence on the young people of Latvia, on their world view and activities, so did also Mother Mariia (in secular life Elizaveta Skobtsova; 1891–1945), hieromonk Ioann (Shakhovskoi; 1902–1989). The guests from Paris visited various geographical localities in Latvia – Riga, Rezekne, Daugavpils, Ludza, Pitalovo (Abrene). The lectures were always conducted in packed audiences.

Incidentally, the libraries of Riga hold to the present time books of Berdiaev, Frank, Zen'kovskii, Vysheslavtsev, issued in 1920-ies–1930-ies in Berlin and Paris by the YMCA Press. There are also translations of their works. Thus, Valters un Rapa published in 1930 a book of Semen Frank “Introduction to Philosophy” in the translation of O. Bergs. A year later in 1931 with the assistance of the youth organization of Evangelical Lutheran Church of Latvia a book by Berdiaev “Christian Faith and the

<sup>34</sup> Prof. B. P. Vysheslavtsev priezhaet v Rigu (*Prof. B. P. Vysheslavtsev Coming to Riga*) // *Segodnia (Today)* 1933. Nr. 19. p. 8; Lektsii prof. B. P. Vysheslavtseva (*Lecture of Prof. B. P. Vysheslavtsev*) // *Ibid.*, 1933. Nr. 22, p. 8.; Prof. B. P. Vysheslavtsev v Rige (*Prof. B. P. Vysheslavtsev in Riga*) // *Ibid.*, 1933. Nr. 23, p. 3.

Christians” was published. It was translated by the Secretary of Latvian Student Christian Movement Romans Vanags.

Of special importance was the visit and the faithful work of professor Vasilii Zen’kovskii (1881–1962)<sup>35</sup> in helping with the development in Latvia of the Russian Orthodox Student Union. Professor Zen’kovskii first came to Riga on January 20, 1928 at the invitation of the Russian Enlightenment Society. The visitor spoke at the Russian Club, where he gave three lectures to packed audiences about Lev Tolstoi as a religious thinker, about the religious awakening of the Russian intelligentsia, about psychology of young people. He had a special meeting in the State High School, met the teachers of Russian schools, visited with great interest the Grebenshchikov community in the Moscow suburb of Riga, delivered a lecture “Science and Religion” for the “Enthusiasts of Russian Past” group, led by Ivan Zavoloko. On January 26, 1928 prof. Zen’kovskii lectured at the meeting of the Young Christian Women’s Union. In the evening of the same day the Russian Enlightenment Society, the Christian Union of Young Women and the Union of Russian Teachers arranged a party in honour of professor Zen’kovskii<sup>36</sup>.

The arrival of prof. Zen’kovskii in January, 1928 enlivened the activities of the Union in Riga. Soon after his visit on June 2 the Riga Court

---

<sup>35</sup> Russian philosopher and teacher, theologian and religious activist. In 1919 the political situation in the Ukraine (Malorossia) forced Vasilii Zen’kovskii – professor of psychology at the Kiev University to emigrate to Yugoslavia, later – to Czechoslovakia, where he became Director of Pedagogical Institute in Prague. After coming to France in 1926 became professor of the Theological Institute of St. Sergius. In 1923–1927 headed the Pedagogical Bureau of the Russian schools abroad, for a short time was editor of the journal “Items of Religious Upbringing and Education”. From our point of view the notable fact is that Zen’kovskii was Chairman of Russian student Christian Movement from 1923 to 1962. In 1942 Zen’kovskii was ordained as priest, later became arch-priest and in 1944 after the death of Sergii Bulgakov was elected Dean of Theological Institute.

<sup>36</sup> Prof. V. V. Zen’kovskii v Rige (*Prof. V. V. Zen’kovskii in Riga*) // Segodnia Vecherom (*Tonight*), 1928. № 16, p. 6; N. I. [Nikolai Istomin]. Religioznoe vozrozhdenie russkoi intelligentsii. Lektsia prof. V. V. Zen’kovskogo (N. I. [Nikolai Istomin]. *Religious Views of Russian Intelligentsia. Lecture of Prof. V. V. Zen’kovskii* // *Ibid.*, 1928. Nr. 21, p. 4.

of Justice approved the registration of the Regulations of the Russian Orthodox Students Union. It was registered in Latvian as *Krievu Pareizticīga Studentu Vienība* under No. 2437 as a non-profit public organization. The relevant document from the archives begins with the statement about the aims of the Union – to unite the faithful young people and to work for the sake of the Orthodox Church. The Union will attempt to help the members to acquire Christian way of thinking, so as to prepare them for the defense of the faith and the Church leading the fight against atheism and materialism of the time. The bases of the work of the Society was defined as an in-depth study of the Orthodox faith. The second paragraph of the Regulations of the Union postulated that in order to reach the set aims, meetings, lectures, disputes will be held, libraries set up, concerts and lotteries for fund raising and summer courses will be organized. It was envisaged to publish a journal of the Union. Keeping of contacts with organizations abroad and in Latvia sharing Christian values was also intended. Any Christian student of eighteen years and older was admitted for membership<sup>37</sup>.

At the end of July 1928 many guests arrived in Riga for the first conference of the Union. The chief guest among them was the leader of RSCM professor Zen'kovskii. He stayed in Riga till August 16, for he was engaged in the work of the conference and at the summer courses for teachers organized by the Ministry of Education where he delivered a course of lectures on child psychology<sup>38</sup>.

Deacon Lev Liperovskii (1887–1963)<sup>39</sup>, doctor Gustav Kul'man (1894–1961)<sup>40</sup> were among the visitors of Riga. So was also Lev Zander (1893–1964)<sup>41</sup> – philosopher, teacher of philosophy, logics and comparative

<sup>37</sup> LSHA. Fund 3235. Inv. 3. File 172. P. 18.

<sup>38</sup> Ot'ezd prof. V. V. Zen'kovskogo (*The Going Away of prof. V. V. Zen'kovskii*) // Slovo (*The Word*), 1928. Nr. 950, p. 2.

<sup>39</sup> About him, see: Vestnik RSHD (*News of the RSCM*), 1963. Nr. 1/2 (68/69).

<sup>40</sup> Zen'kovskii V. V., prot. Pamiati G. G. Kul'mana (*Zen'kovskii V. V., archpriest. In Memoriam of G. G. Kul'man* // Ibid., 1962. Nr. 64, p. 67–68.

<sup>41</sup> Pamiati prof. L. A. Zandera (*In Memoriam of prof. L. A. Zander*) // Ibid., 1964. Nr. 4 (75) /1965. Nr. 1 (76), p. 26–51.

theology, an activist of RSCM and of the ecumenical movement. He was accompanied by his collaborator and wife Valentina Zander (1893–1989). By the way, when from the beginning of 1929 Lev Zander became Secretary of RSCM in the Baltic states, they settled in Riga and were actively involved in the organization of the work of the movement here, till the summer of 1931 when both were transferred to work elsewhere<sup>42</sup>.

On August 1 fifty four delegates from Latvia, Estonia, Lithuania, Poland and Finland arrived for the opening of the well-known first conference of RSCM in the region of the states on the Eastern coast of the Baltic Sea (in Russian – *Pribaltika*). The conference took place at Spaso-Preobrazneskaia convent not far from Jelgava. Archbishop Ioann extended his blessings to the conference and visited it on the day of closing on August 6, 1928. Metropolitan Eulogii (Georgievskii) sent greetings from Paris. The conference was also visited by the friends of RSCM and ROSU E. Tikhonitskii, I. Zavoloko. Rector of the cathedral in the name of Simeon and Anna archpriest Nikolai (Piatnitskii; 1866–1940?) came from Jelgava. Newspaper “Slovo” carried a series on articles reflecting the work of the conference<sup>43</sup>.

A free illustrated booklet of “Slovo” Nr. 31, 1928 contains photographs of the event at the Convent in August. One of them depicts E. Tikhonitskii, archpriest Ioann (Janson), prof. V. Zen’kovskii, deacon L. Liperovskii, doctor G. Kul’man, prof. L. Zander amidst a group of young people. The general impression of all of the participants of the conference in the Preobrazhenskaia Convent were filled with expectations that the ideas of Christian re-birth will soon penetrate the minds of many young people and will tend to spiritual renaissance. L. Zander and other officials of the RSCM felt the specific kind of the mysticism of Latvia:

<sup>42</sup> A. N. [Nikitin A. I.] S`ezd soveta dvizeniia (*A. N. [Nikitin A. I.] Congress of the Council of the Movement*) // *Ibid.*, 1931. Nr. 7, p. 26–30; Pliukhanov B. V. RSCM in Latvia and Estonia, p. 135.

<sup>43</sup> See: newspaper *Slovo (The Word)*, 1928. Nr. 935, 936, 937, 938, 939, 940, 941, 942, 943.

ограниченности  
и правда: боль-  
шого языка  
мъ, «газет-  
но отвѣст-  
ности

ный языкъ  
тъ, чѣмъ  
по языку  
ама газета  
юрки род-

тъ хотъ  
то, вѣдъ,  
бственной

предъловъ  
аго еже-  
ала раз-  
г мате-  
ранныхъ  
ли средъ-  
ценъ на-  
сненіемъ  
что его  
отъ на-  
словами

рѣчи

Вы  
фразу,  
вѣать!

вѣками народное творчество успѣло  
единственный, можетъ быть, въ мѣрѣ по  
богатству словарь, что у нашего народнаго, не-  
книжнаго, а именно народнаго языка имѣется  
все рѣшительно необходимое для выраженія ло-

тумъ, констатированіе, позитивный, индиффе-  
рентный», — и такъ далѣе...

Заботясь о чистотѣ русской рѣчи, не слѣ-  
дуетъ, конечно, перебарщивать: вѣдъ жизнь не  
стоитъ на мѣстѣ, и тотъ языкъ, который пере-

ивномъ  
имъ, ду-  
пившимъ  
мусорами  
для нево-  
скихъ,  
ротовъ  
мостный  
ужась,  
фразы:  
— П  
«Преле  
сигналъ  
вигилья  
Вѣдъ  
«суга»  
пуластъ  
лась и  
кто е  
Въ  
кружи  
этого  
въ пе-  
ти с  
зано  
гутъ  
«предъ  
комъ  
вателъ  
усилъ  
ба е  
тись  
къ  
обра-

## Отчетъ правленія русскаго православнаго студен- ческаго единенія по устройству 1-го сѣзда Р. С. Хр. Движенія въ Прибалтикѣ.

Письмо въ редакцію.

М. Г., г-нъ редакторъ!

Не откажите помѣстить въ уважаемой Вашей газетѣ слѣдующую замѣтку:

«Недавно Русское Православное Студенческое Единеніе подвело итоги перваго сѣзда Русскаго Студенческаго Христіанскаго (Р. Ст. Хр.) Движенія въ Прибалтикѣ, состоявшагося въ началѣ августа мѣсяца с. г. въ Спасо-Преображенской пустыни.

Итоги, вопреки разнаго рода опасеніямъ, оказались утѣшительными. Финансовая сторона сѣзда, которая больше всего внушала опасеній, прошла благополучно: всѣ расходы въ размѣрѣ 1692 латъ, удалось покрыть. Приходъ составилъ, главнымъ образомъ, изъ средствъ, ассигнованныхъ центромъ Р. Ст. Хр. Движенія, взносовъ участниковъ сѣзда и пожертвованій друзей Движенія. Весьма существенную матеріальную поддержку оказали: архіепископъ Іоаннъ, Н. А. Бѣлоцвѣтовъ, проф. В. В. Зѣньковский, фирмы Кузнецовыхъ и бр. Свѣтлановыхъ и многіе другіе, за что и приносимъ имъ глубокую благодарность.

На сѣздѣ имѣло возможность побывать 82 человѣка, изъ коихъ 54 человѣка провели всѣ 6 дней.

На закрытіи сѣзда присутствовалъ и Его Высокопреосвященство арх. Іоаннъ.

Дѣловая сторона сѣзда была проведена весьма успѣшно, ибо находилась въ опытныхъ рукахъ парижскихъ гостей: проф. В. В. Зѣньковского, д-ра Л. Н. Липеровскаго, проф. Л. А. Зандера, д-ра Г. Г. Кузьмана и мѣстнаго духовенства.

Устройство втораго сѣзда въ будущемъ году предполагается въ Печерахъ.

Заключивъ сей краткій обзоръ, приносимъ искреннюю благодарность уважаемой русской газетѣ «Слово», удѣлившей такъ много мѣста подробной информации о ходѣ работы сѣзда (см. газ. «Слово» отъ № 935 до 942) и тѣмъ оказавшей цѣнную услугу всему Русскому Студенческому Христіанскому Движенію.

Спасибо!

Правленіе.

“The environment of the convent, the Russian-type of scenery, the young people living in their own uncorrupted Russian spirit. Such a situation in our refugee lives is unique”. Later L. Zander will publish a large article about the days spent in the Spaso-Preobrazhenskaia Sergius convent<sup>44</sup>. The results of the conference were also enthusiastically reviewed by sub-deacon of the Cathedral Church of the Nativity of Christ Nikolai Litvin (1905–1989)<sup>45</sup>, who was elected Chairman of the Union of Latvia and kept that position for several years<sup>46</sup>. The members of the Congress took part in the liturgy and Walk of the Cross in the convent in connection

<sup>44</sup> Zander L. In the quiet monastery (*Congress in Preobrazhenskaia Monastery*) // Vestnik RSHD (*News of the RSCM*), 1929. Nr. 1/2, p. 48–52.

<sup>45</sup> In 1924 was consecrated as sub-deacon in the Cathedral Church, during the services conducted by Archbishop Ioann (Pommer) conducted liturgical procedures.

<sup>46</sup> Nikiforov I. Rukovoditeli konferentsii khristianskoi molodezhi ob ee itogah (*Nikiforov I. The Leaders of the Conference of the Christian Youth Concerning its Results*) // Slovo (*The Word*), 1928. Nr. 942, p. 2.

with the festival of the icon Theotokos of Tolga. The liturgy service was conducted by rector of the Cathedral, archpriest Kirill (Zaits), eminences of the Riga Churches archpriest Nikolai (Tikhomirov; 1863–1932), archpriest Ioann (Janson; 1878–1954), the abbot of the monastery archpriest Roman (Passit; 1875–1941). There were also present at the altar hierodeacon Ozerov from Pochaev Lavra, who had come to the conference of Russian Christian youth<sup>47</sup>. As from 1928 the reports about the work of the Union in Latvia were dutifully published on the pages of the “Vestnik RSHD” (*News of the RSCM*).

The valedictory attitude of the hierarchy of the Orthodox Church of Latvia, and personally of the Metropolitan himself, towards the guests from Paris and the organization they represented, issues from the faithfulness of the movement to the Letter and the Spirit of Orthodoxy, from their attempts directed to fostering of Russian culture, of the moral growth of the Russian youth. It is worth reminding that the ecumenical contacts of various churches and groups of Christians was a usual occurrence in those days in Europe. Except for the Roman Catholic Church<sup>48</sup>.

An ecumenical activist Stefan Zankov (1881–1965) – professor of the Church canonical laws at the University of Sofia made a special effort to inform His Eminence Ioann (Pommer) about the Movement, about the fact that the World Committee of YMCA had held in Sofia in April 1928 a meeting with the view of working out of the principles of successful work in the Orthodox countries, and in particular with the Orthodox youth<sup>49</sup>.

The News of RSCM published open-hearted articles without any degree of suspicion by archpriest Sergii (Bulgakov), archpriest Sergii

<sup>47</sup> Celebration of the Theotokos of Tolga // *Ibid.*, 1928. Nr. 943, p. 6.

<sup>48</sup> Arsen'ev N. Lozanskaia konferentsiia (*Arsen'ev N. The Lausanne Conference*) // *Vestnik RSHD (News of the RSCM)*, 1928. Nr. 3, p. 1–5.

<sup>49</sup> LSHA. Fund 7469. Inv. 1. File 163. P. 1–8. See also: Zen'kovskii V. Our Life. About the cooperation with YMCA // *Vestnik RSHD (News of the RSCM)*, 1928. Nr. 6, p. 19–22. About 2-nd meeting of the representatives of the Orthodox Churches, the World Committee of YMCA and the national movements of YMCA in Orthodox countries see: P'ianov F. // *Ibid.*, 1930. Nr. 6, p. 10–16.

(Chetverikov), prof. V. Zen'kovskii and his constant opponent N. Berdiaev, as well as other leaders of the Movement. The authors called upon the Orthodox faithful to set aside the suspicion about Young Men's Christian Association concerning its Masonic ties, inter-confessional ecumenism. On the contrary – they entreated to obtain of “spiritual strength to enter into cooperation with the Western Christianity in the forms that have been offered by the pattern of life itself”. This had to be done so as to partake of the huge organizational and cultural capacity of Christianity that has been collected in the West, with the view of making use of this capacity in the work with Orthodox youth<sup>50</sup>. The fight for the minds and the hearts of the Russian young people that have found themselves beyond the boundaries of their own country seemed to be the main task. The hope was alive that Russia will soon throw off the hated Bolshevik yoke and that thousands and thousands of the Orthodox believers will be able to partake in the resurrection of their country. The fact that the YMCA is organizationally dependent of John R. Mott (1865–1955) – an experienced missionary, pastor of Methodist Church of USA, an ideologue of ecumenism, and tireless leader of the World Student Christian Federation did not produce any negative connotations. Neither did the fact (as was indicated earlier) that John Mott was instrumental in setting up of the Paris Theological Institute of St. Sergius, of the YMCA Press that published “News of RSCM” and other materials.

Soon after the Congress on September 1928 newspaper “Slovo” (No. 981) published on page 2 a report about the Congress and offered a short resume of the event. In particular, the financial aspect of the Congress was clarified. The main sponsors of the Congress, as was to be expected,

---

<sup>50</sup> Zen'kovskii V. V. About Cooperation with YMCA // *Ibid.*, 1928. Nr. 6, p. 19–22; Berdiaev N. A. Concerning the Ideology of R.S.C.M. // *Ibid.*, 1929. Nr. 7, p. 9–13; Zen'kovskii V. V. Concerning the so-called “ecumenical question” // *Ibid.*, 1930. Nr. 6, p. 3–7; Chetverikov S. Ecumenism and the Unity of the Church // *Ibid.*, 1930. Nr. 7, p. 3–7.

had been the central office of RSCM in Paris and prof. N. Zen'kovskii personally. A substantial amount was also provided by Archbishop Ioann (Pommer) of Latvia, a businessman Nikolai Belotsvetov, by the Porcelan Factory of Kuznetsov and a firm "Brothers Svetlanov". The Office of the Union extended thanks to all the benefactors, the newspaper "Slovo" was thanked for informative help.

Before the beginning of the new school semester and the lessons at the of Christian study groups the members of the Union came together at the Church of the Monastery for a divine service, conducted by archpriest Roman (Passit) and archpriest Ioann (Janson). A tee party was held together with the priests that was attended also by the abbess of the Troitse-Sergiev monastery Evgenia. Archpriest Ioann made a report on the "Current Tasks of the Movement". He stressed that Christian work is actively conducted among the higher level students, but is almost lacking with regard to high-school students. Those present commemorated the late priest Mikhail (Burnashev), who had been the soul of the Christian group; they sang a suitable commemorative psalm in his honour<sup>51</sup>. Late in the autumn of 1928 Archbishop Ioann (Pommer) sanctified new premises of the Movement at Turgenev Street in Riga next to the old Orthodox Church of Most Holy Theotokos.

With the coming of the year 1929 the first event taking place in Latvia (we will leave out the events taking place outside Latvia and Estonia) worth mentioning took place – the congress organized by the Movement in the Troitse Sergiev Monastery on January 2–27. This event took place in the spirit of general prayer, confession and liturgy and, of course, consisted of reports and vi discussions. Thus L. Zander spoke in detail on "The Fight for Christian Faith in Modern Life", diacon Lipe-rovskii ruminated about "Prayer and Life". The free-of-charge addition of the newspaper "Slovo" No. 4 of 1929 depicts a group of the Student Congress visiting on January 26 the summer residence of His Eminence

<sup>51</sup> At the Student Christian Union // *Slovo (The Word)*, 1928. Nr. 966, p. 6; Chronicle. Riga. Concerning the beginning of RHSE Courses // *Vestnik RSHD (News of the RSCM)*, 1928. Nr. 10, p. 27–28.

Ioann. A tea party was set up for the guests who reported about the work performed at the local level. The Archbishop attentively listened, offered practical advice and suggestions for further work. Nikolai Litvin in the name of the Union asked the Archbishop to become an honorary member of the Russian Orthodox Student Union. The Archbishop was thankful for the invitation and stressed the great work of those who had taken the initiative in guiding the young people. He asked all the members of the Union to approach him with any questions and invited them to make use of his extensive library resources. At the end of the Congress, a spiritual concert was held in the Riga Cathedral Church of Nativity of Christ<sup>52</sup>.

It is important to note that Lev Zander, while being Secretary of RSCM for the Baltic region, displayed great delicacy in relations with the Orthodox Church of Latvia, attempting to make arrangements for any events with Archbishop Ioann (Pommer)<sup>53</sup>.

In February, 1929 Archbishop Ioann (Pommer) approved of a fund-raising for the needs of the Union. 3200 Lats (680 U.S. dollars) were gathered in the result. L. Zander was successful in visiting the towns of

<sup>52</sup> Zander L. Chronicle of the Movement. Riga // Ibid., 1929. Nr. 3, p. 22–24; F.Ts-ko (Tsvirko F.). In the Trinity-Sergius Monastery (Congress of R.S.C.M.) // Slovo (*The Word*), 1929. Nr. 1019, p. 11.

<sup>53</sup> Incidentally, in January 1932 priest of RSCM archpriest Sergii (Chetverikov) will be asking in written form the blessings of the Head of the Orthodox Church of Latvia: Petition to Archbishop Ioann from archpriest Sergii Chetverikov from Paris on 1932, 12/25.01. "Intending to visit the members of the Movement living in Latvia and to get to closer know them I beg Your Eminence to allow me (1) during my stay in Latvia (for two or three weeks) to celebrate, if possible, daily the Holy Liturgy, and on the last day – a morning and evening celebration in one of the churches, which could be attended by the members wanting to take part; (2) to take the confessions and to celebrate the Holy Communion for the willing members of the Movement; (3) to conduct spiritual discussions on general meetings of the groups of the Movement and (4) to visit other towns, besides Riga, where the groups of the Movement are situated, with the view of spiritual discussions and prayer". The application contains the resolution written by Archbishop Ioann (Pommer): "With blessings, on condition that the work is carried out in cooperation with local clergy. In order to have contact, to keep in touch with archpriest K. Zaits". LSHA. Fund 7469. Inv. 1. File 377. P. 136, 137.

Latvia where Orthodox young people were residing in order to set up study groups. In October he reported at Synod of Orthodox Church of Latvia, about aims of the Union<sup>54</sup>. Zander's report was met with approval by the delegates of the Synod. Archbishop spoke in reply and supported the Movement, because the ideas disseminated by the Movement were "ideas of the future, when it will grow and will win the sympathies of the faithful young people. [...] The young people in the study groups are learning Orthodoxy. They get involved in the life of the Church, gain knowledge so as to become well-equipped and faithful fighters. They will be able to carry out this task only under the auspices and with the assistance of all the people of the Church. The young people are worthy of this trust, because they want to serve the Church in truth and with full commitment. But the main feature of the life of the Movement is the fact that it is part and parcel of the Church and is working in consonance with the arch-priests. This ensures that their work will not deviate from the veritable Orthodox path. Therefore, wherever you come across the work of the Student Movement do treat it in a faithful and valedictory manner. Help them in any way you can, knowing full well that it has been approved and sanctified here in Riga"<sup>55</sup>.

The year 1930 started with a religious-pedagogical convention in Rezekne on January 3 to Jan. 5. This town was the home of a successfully working Russian Pedagogical Institute and Russian State High-School, the Headmaster of which was a friend of the Union and an enthusiast of Russian education Ivan Tutyshkin (1876–1939) who also spoke at the convention. The convention was attended by archpriest Ioann (Janson), the Head Priest of the Rezekne church archpriest Grigorii (Schensovich; 1869–1940), priest Evstrarii (Rushanov; 1873–1956) and about 80 delegates (teachers, students, high-school students) from various towns of

<sup>54</sup> News Items. Financial campaign in Latvia // Vestnik RSHD (*News of the RSCM*), 1929. № 5, p. 28–29; New Items. Latvia // Ibid., 1929. Nr. 6, p. 27.

<sup>55</sup> News Items. Report on the Movement at the Synod of the Orthodox Church of Latvia // Ibid., 1929. Nr. 12, p. 28–29.

Latvia and Estonia. Like all other conventions of RSCM the Rezekne convention did not break the Orthodox tradition – it started with general prayer and was finished with Confession and Holy Communion<sup>56</sup>. “Listening to the voices coming from Russia we – all of us – should promise to become the builders of the new Russian culture and to do our utmost here beyond the borders of Russia for the Orthodox Church to perform those deeds that we would be unable to do under the yoke of communism”<sup>57</sup>. The year 1930 ended with a successful Religious-pedagogical Congress on December 26–29 in Riga, thus accentuating the close ties with the Church<sup>58</sup>.

Intensive work was carried out throughout the year 1930 to improve the work of the study groups in the capital city of Latvia and in other localities, which were the grass-level structures of the Union. The News of RSCM No. 1 and No. 5 for 1931 contain the reports of the work of the groups of study led by archpriest Ioann (Janson), protodiakon Vasilii (Mel'nikov; 1886–1972)<sup>59</sup>, students Boris Pliukhanov, Aleksei Bukovskii (1906–?), assistant professor Vasilii Preobrazhenskii (1897–1941)<sup>60</sup> and others.

Another idea was realized – an infant nursery of the Union was set up with the assistance of the Ladies Committee of the Russian Enlightenment Society. It got the approval of Archbishop Ioann and also received

<sup>56</sup> News Items. Congress of Religious Pedagogics // *Ibid.*, 1930. Nr. 3 / Bulletin of the Cabinet of Religious Pedagogics, Nr. 12, p. 5–7.

<sup>57</sup> From the life of the Movement // *Ibid.*, 1930. Nr. 2, p. 32.

<sup>58</sup> Life of the Movement // *Ibid.*, 1931. Nr. 3, p. 30–32.

<sup>59</sup> Golikov Andrei, priest., Fomin S. Whitened by Blood, p. 188–190.

<sup>60</sup> Teacher and public figure. In 1915 entered University of Iur'ev, Faculty of History and Philology. After returning to Riga, continued to study at the Faculty of Philology and Philosophy, University of Latvia, later studied in Prague, in 1932 obtained Master's Degree. From academic year 1920/21 taught Latin, History and Psychology at private high schools in Riga, later taught at the State Russian High-school. Was secretary and singer of psalms in Riga Cathedral Church, activist of the Union from 1928 to 1934. Was arrested by the political police on June 14, 1941, died in prison camp before trial. LSHA. Fund 1632. Inv. 1. File 16762.

his financial support<sup>61</sup>. Many other charitable activities were undertaken by the Union – e.g. setting up of summer camps at the Riga seaside, organizing of groups of “Vitiaz” (*Knighť*), “Druzhinnitsa”, offering language study courses<sup>62</sup>. The News of RSCM constantly published information about the social work of the Union and the people of Riga could avail themselves of various forms of social services.

### Alexander Nikitin – the General Secretary of the Russian Student’s Christian Movement (RSCM)

The Congress of the Council of RSCM took place in Paris on May 27 – June 1, 1931. As the result – the acting Secretary for the Baltic region Lev Zander was transferred to another responsible post<sup>63</sup>. Yet he was responsible for the organization on July 6 to July 12, 1931 a summer session of RSCM in Latgale, near Rezekne<sup>64</sup>. Soon after that event the work in the Baltic region came under the responsibility of the General Secretary of the Movement Aleksandr Nikitin (1888–1949)<sup>65</sup>, who had first visited

<sup>61</sup> This idea was later realized by the Russian Enlightenment Society in 1934, without the cooperation of the Union. See: K. Ver. [Verkhovskaia K.] Damskii komitēt pri Russkom prosvetitel’skom obshchestve stanovitsia na tverduiu pochvu i rasshiriaet svoiu deiatel’nost’ (*Ladies’ Committee of the Russian Enlightenment Society obtains firm ground and expands activities*) // Vestnik RSHD (*News of the RSCM*), 1934. Nr. 66, p. 3.

<sup>62</sup> I. P. Druzhina russkikh mal’chikov “Vitiaz” v Rige (*A team of Russian boys “Vitiaz” in Riga*) // Ibid., 1932. № 6/7. p. 30; Zhizn’ Dvizheniia. Riga. Devich’e družhestvo “Zhi-vonosnyi istochnik” (*Life of the Movement. Riga. Girls team “Life-giving Spring*) // Ibid., 1931. Nr. 5, p. 29–31.

<sup>63</sup> A. N. [Nikitin A. I.]. S’ezd Soveta Dvizheniia (*Congress of the Council of the Movement*) // Ibid., 1931. Nr. 7, p. 26–30.

<sup>64</sup> A. N. [Nikitin A. I.]. IV-i Letnii S’ezd Russkogo Studencheskogo Khristianskogo Dvizheniia v Pribaltike (*4-th Summer Congress of the Russian Student Christian Movement in the Baltic*) // Ibid., 1931. Nr. 8/9, p. 36–39.

<sup>65</sup> It is difficult to find a full biography of Nikitin. It is known that his family comes from St. Petersburg, even before the war he was acquainted with the ideas of YMCA; took part in the war, was settled in emigration in China, later came to Europe. See: Short obituary: Konchina A. I. Nikitina (*Death of A. I. Nikitin*) // Ibid., 1949. Nr. 3, p. 12–14.

Riga – judging from newspaper publications – in January 1931, lecturing on issues of India. Nikitin became a constant visitor of the study groups of the Movement in Latvia and Estonia<sup>66</sup>. His articles were often published on the pages of *The News of RSCM*; these contained his views on the delicate theme of the Russian emigration – that of the conflict of generations, or – by another name – “the conflict of the fathers and the children”<sup>67</sup>, growing with every year. Nikitin started to popularize his new attitude concerning the relations with the Church and the priesthood. For example both “the fathers” and “the children” approved of “churching” of life, but differed in the particular manner of how this should be achieved. Here the differences of age, of education and of life experience became apparent, as did also differences of the spiritual goals. For example, “the fathers” whose views were typically voiced by philosopher, archpriest Sergii (Bulgakov; 1871–1944) were of the opinion that Orthodoxy should not be reduced to “the religion of ecclesiastical propriety and personal saving of the soul”, that it should be geared towards creative transformation of life and towards provision of answers to all tragical questions of the humankind. However the “fathers” who were men of outstanding talents and high culture were confronted by a mass of poorly educated young people who had been taught by the devastating revolution and the dark horrors of the Civil War. “The children” of the Russian emigration, who had learned at the war the terrible “truth of the land” in its most tragic sense, had become aware of their own lack of culture. They looked upon “the educated” and “the seniors who have no knowledge of the real life” in a condescending fashion as do soldiers of the front with regard to the civilian “heroes”. The young generation had lost faith in the bookish wisdom of the “fathers”, they had seen the downfall of the idols. The young people first and foremost were attracted by the practical cultural side of

<sup>66</sup> Secretary of R.S.C. Movement in Riga // *Segodnia Veчерom (Tonight)*, 1931. Nr. 24, p. 3.

<sup>67</sup> See: *Russkie bez Otechestva. Oчерki antibol'shevistskoi emigratsii 20–40 godov (The Russians without Native Land. Articles about Anti-Bolshevik Emigration during twenties – forties)* / Editor-in-Chief S. V. Karpenko. Moscow: 2000, p. 333–374.

the work that found expression in “denationalization”. The task of saving of the Russian nation became ever so topical with the passage of years for the RSCM. This was connected first and foremost with the concern that being severed from their native land in a situation of tough competition for living, the young Russian people will develop the Western-type of practicality, utilitarianism, that material gain will dominate in their minds. The concern was that the young generation of Russians is going to lose the national religious peculiarity of the Russian spiritual type. In order to avoid this kind of depersonalization, the programs of the courses of RSCM in many countries envisaged a many-sided study of Russian culture and history. Such communication provided the opportunity for the young people to feel as Russians in an alien environment. The growth of the figures of membership of RSCM was symptomatic of this process, which – in turn – provided for the lessening of the cultural level of the whole organization, involving non-student individuals and people of middle generation. Thus interest towards matters of religious faith was on the wane. Therefore the former ideas of “churching” of life that were to the fore for the “fathers” and the founder members of RSCM, were transferred to the backstage, because the younger generation was not very much interested in this type of “churching” of life. If they approached the Church, they wanted to see in it a force that would preserve the national mentality from being washed away.

Nikitin thought that the “fathers and children” problem within the Russian emigration has acquired “exclusive tension”. Here are some of his considerations drawn from various articles in the newspapers of 1932: We (i.e. – the children) “are immensely grateful for the Church propriety acquired from our progenitors and for the daily presence of the Orthodox Church”, yet we have an obligation to closely relate to Russia. You are looking for peace of mind from all the terrible experiences in mysticism; we are disposed to activism, though we fully agree that life should be built on spiritual bases”. In an article “Fathers and Children within Russian emigration” Nikitin attempts to argue that “none of the existing

institutions – neither family, nor school, nor the public organizations, nor churches as parish bodies – are capable of offering to the young people the things they need”. The real task is “to approach the young people themselves, to awaken their own resourcefulness in the sphere of moral and national self-education”. It is possible that due to the ignorance concerning the real life situation in soviet Russia, Nikitin postulated: “The work of the whole Communist party in Russia is based at present on the principle of self-activity of young people. The organization of such an activity cannot be left to the “Fathers” alone. In a similar fashion – it cannot be the cause of several individuals”. The significant theses of RSCM, that lay behind Nikitin’s idea consisted in “the extending of help to the young people to fire themselves with the flame of religious enthusiasm, so as to provide the bases for a new institution of religious education outside the existing system of schools”<sup>68</sup>.

### The Beginning of the Split between Orthodox Church in Latvia and RSCM

It has to be reminded that the Union had undertaken in its Regulations in 1928 to provide for the unification the faithful young people, and to work for the benefit of the Orthodox Church. Only few years had passed, and events begun to be taking place on the eve of the new year (1932) that resulted in the separation between RSCM and the Orthodox Church of Latvia, headed by Archbishop Ioann (Pommer).

With the approaching of the New Year, in December 1931 a winter convention of the Union was held in Riga. On the Church side it was attended by archpriest Ioann (Janson), archpriest Kirill (Zaic), protodiakon Vasilii (Mel'nikov). Prof. Vl. Il'in and A. Nikitin had arrived from Paris. What happened at the Convention? What unpardonable mistakes had

<sup>68</sup> Nikitin A. N. Ottsy i deti v russkoi emigratsii (*Fathers and Children in Russian Emigration*) // Vestnik RSHD (*News of the RSCM*), 1932. Nr. 5, p. 17–20; Nikitin A. N. Zhizn' Dvizheniia. V Viunsdorfe (S"ezd RSHD v Germanii (*The Life of the Movement. In Wunsdorf (Congress of RSCM in Germany)*) // Ibid., 1932. Nr. 6/7, p. 25–27.

been made by the Paris guests? Why was the decision of the Synod of the Orthodox Church of Latvia such a resolute one? Full answer to these questions is unattainable, for even today it has been impossible to gather reliable materials pertaining to the event. It has been established on the bases of archive sources: On December 30, 1931 the Synod of the Orthodox Church of Latvia passed a resolution to apply to the Central office of Russian Student's Christian Movement to never send to Latvia Secretary General of RSCM A. Nikitin. Here is the text of archive material. "Protocol Nr. 640. The Meeting of the Synod of Orthodox Church of Latvia on December 30, 1931. Present: His Eminence Archbishop Ioann, archpriest K. Zaits, archpriest A. Makedonskii, Secretary archpriest A. Lismanis and members of the Synod – T. Butsen, I. Beker. The meeting was headed by Archbishop. [...] VI. In view of the fact that Synod has been informed about Aleksandr Nikitin who had been delegated to Latvia as secretary of Russian Student's Christian Movement Abroad, Synod decided: to ask the Office of the Russian Student Christian Movement to never send to Latvia the afore-mentioned A. Nikitin"<sup>69</sup>.

Subsequent events transfer from Riga to Narva, in Estonia. On January 7, 1932 a dispute was held in Sviatogorsk Church (in Narva) between the former Head of Church of Syretsk archpriest Nikolai (Tsvetaev; 1888–?)<sup>70</sup> and Aleksandr Nikitin on the topics of the legitimacy of the Movement in view of the fact that it is not recognized by the hierarchy of the Church, about relations with Masonic movement, about inter-confessional character of the Movement, about the intention of the establishment of new churches, etc. The dispute was reflected in the local press and in the "News of RSCM and was critical of "such people as archpriest Nikolai Tsvetaev". The tonality of the critical publications was not to the liking of archpriest

<sup>69</sup> LSHA. Fund 7469. Inv. 1. File 129.

<sup>70</sup> Graduated from Moscow Theological Academy with Candidate's degree. Served as pastor in Vasknarva (Syrenets) from August, 1927 to March 1931. After obtaining of Estonian citizenship became archpriest in women's monastery Kuremäe (Piuhtitsa). It is known that he served there till 1941.

Nikolai (Tsvetaev)<sup>71</sup> and he approached Archbishop Ioann with a letter presenting his own version of the dispute. One can read in the documents of the archives “The open letter of archpriest Nikolai Tsvetaev, sent from Estonia to Archbishop Ioann in January, 1932”. It is evident from the letter that the discussion had touched on several topics and that the third item contained the central problematic issue – is RSCM an organization working under the auspices of the Church or is it a completely independent body? The author went on: “We see before us a certain organization, having its own designation (“Movement”) and working according to its own Regulations. One has the impression that it is a kind of church, having its own spiritual and secular hierarchy, having its own publications, its own temples (see “The News”, December, 1931) and its own financial resources (the fund-raising week, etc.). On top of that – this organization by its very name insinuates that Orthodox Church is in some sense static or “dead”, and only the organization provides for religious and spiritual “movement” and regeneration”<sup>72</sup>.

The conflict between the Estonian members of RSCM and archpriest Nikolai (Tsvetaev) continued in March of the same year. “Destructive” articles addressed to archpriest Nikolai – according to the information of doctor of philology Tat’iana Shor from Tartu University – were published in March, 1932. On March 17 an article “Darkness” (“Pimedus”) was published in “Staryi Narvskii Listok” (Nr. 30, p. 2) (“Old Narva List”) by Vasilii Volgin – member of the Estonian RSCM. The article contrasted “the dark” archpriest Nikolai (Tsvetaev) with the performance of archpriest Sergii (Chetverikov) of the Movement “Concerning the Ways of RSCM” before the young people of Narva. Volgin wrote that the work of RSCM is either not noticed or is attacked by the clergy. “Is it at all possible to find any justification for the speeches of priest N. Tsvetaev and his fellow

<sup>71</sup> Discussion about Russian Student Christian Movement (re-printed from “Russkii Vestnik” (Russian News). Narva from 10.01.1932) // Vestnik RSHD (*News of the RSCM*), 1932. Nr. 2, p. 18–19; Lagovskoi I. A. Vsem podozrevaiushchim (*To the Suspicious Ones*) // Ibid., 1932. Nr. 2, p. 20–24.

<sup>72</sup> LSHA. Fund 7469. Inv. 1. File 148, p. 12.

friends against the religious unification of the Russian young people on the bases of their native faith? [...] The Movement is determined to overcome this split and to closer approach their pastors. But this is not the gist of the problem. The clergy is moving away from the young people”.

Two days later on March 19, 1932 in another newspaper of Narva “Põhja kodu” (“The Northern Home”) No. 30, an article was published “The fight of the old against the new”. Russian clergy was anxious about the free views of the young ones. The article spoke about two tendencies within the Russian Church, and archpriest N. Tsvetaev was depicted as an active and staunch supporter of the “old-fashioned views about religion” considering that one should follow the old, traditional paths of the Orthodox Church.

The convention and discussions in Riga on January 7, 1932 and the publications in Narva were contemporaneous – in the sense of being inspired – with the discussion of the “fathers and sons” discussion in “The News of RSCM” and with the intention of Metropolitan Evlogii to open a home church in Paris, at the headquarters of RSCM in Paris. This fact was mentioned in the publications of “The News” Nr. 12, for 1931. A similar home church was intended to be established by the members of the Movement in Riga on Turgeneva Street next to the building of the Church of the Annunciation<sup>73</sup>. A reasonable question was in order: Why, for what purpose the Riga Movement should have a separate church? By the way – all efforts to find the No. 12 issue of “The News of RSCM” of the year 1931 with the view of shedding light on the events of December/January 1931/1932 came to nothing. This issue is absent in the House of Russian Emigration named after A. Solzhenitsyn in Moscow; it is unavailable also in the Slavonic Library in Prague (National Library of the Czech Republic, Slavonic Library).

We are of the opinion that after the reception of the open letter of archpriest Nikolai (Tsvetaev), the following letter had been immediately dispatched to Paris of January 27, 1932.

---

<sup>73</sup> Zhizn' Dvizheniia (*The Life of the Movement*) // Vestnik RSHD (*News of the RSCM*), 1932. Nr. 4, p. 31.

*"The Synod of Orthodox Church of Latvia.*

*January 27, 1932.*

*To the Secretary of Russian Student Christian Movement.*

*According to the decision of the Synod of Orthodox Church in Latvia of December 30, 1931, we request the Office of the Russian Student Christian Movement to call back from Latvia of Secretary of RSCM A. I. Nikitin and not to commission him to Latvia.*

*Member of the Synod: /signature unclear/*

*Secretary: archpriest / signature unclear/<sup>74</sup>*

The Latvian State Historical Archives holds the collection of the documents of Archbishop Ioann and a collection of the Synod of the Orthodox Church in Latvia. These materials contain the correspondence of the first part of the year 1932 with Metropolitan Evlogii<sup>75</sup> and with prof. Zen'kovskii concerning the issue of the presence of A. I. Nikitin in Latvia. Metropolitan Evlogii and prof. Zen'kovskii offered laudatory recommendations about the work of Nikitin.

Archbishop Ioann (Pommer) and the members of the Orthodox Church of Latvia were adamant. This led to a disagreement and the worsening of relations between the Church and the Union. On March 2, 1932 a regular dispatch to Paris was made. Here are some of the excerpts from the archival documents.

*"To the Central Office of the Riga Christian Student Movement. Concerning the inquiry of the Office of February 8, 1932 the Synod considers it possible to advance the following motivation for the request to discontinue sending of A. I. Nikitin to the areal of the Orthodox Church of Latvia.*

*1. The Synod had found out that the educational capabilities and knowledge of A. I. Nikitin is totally incompatible to lead an organization of*

<sup>74</sup> LSHA. Fund 7469. Inv. 1. File 148, p. 14.

<sup>75</sup> Sidiakov Iu. Iz Arkhiva arkhiepiskopa Ioanna (Pommere). Pis'ma mitropolita Evlogia (Georgievskogo) k arkhiepiskopu Ioannu (*From the Archives of Archbishop Ioann (Pommer). Letters of Metropolitan Evlogii (Georgievskii) to archbishop Ioann* // The Baltic-Russian Collection. Stanford, 2004. Vol. 1, p. 165–248.

*academic youth concerning the matters of Orthodoxy, because he is unable to deal with even the most elementary issues of Orthodox theology, Orthodox ethics, Orthodox canon and Orthodox faith. If the Secretary's Office is unaware of these facts it is possible to ask A. Nikitin to sit for an examinations. It is to be regretted that Secretary's Office had found it possible to commission A. I. Nikitin to countries where sharp divergencies are taking place concerning matters of faith aimed at annihilation of Orthodoxy.*

*2. With the commissioning of A. I. Nikitin, in the capacity of a leader, the Movement here and in other countries had become an object of criticism, suspicion and doubt. We have received signals from France, Bulgaria, Serbia and other countries warning us concerning the Movement. The Movement has come to be suspected for influences of Masonic and similar Euro-Asiatic and Bolshevistic ideologies, for Khlystic type. It is suspected of the intention of setting up of parallel interconfessionalism and the most primitive adventurism. [...] L. A. Zander has not been subjected to such suspicions. Perhaps this is to be explained by the fact that L. A. Zander being knowledgeable in the Orthodox Word always acted in consonance with the norms of Orthodoxy? And that he selected as his aides like-minded people? A. I. Nikitin and his collaborators was not evidently able to sustain such a style of Orthodox work; his activities executed in an off-hand manner provided pabulum for suspicion and criticism. At present suspicion and criticism has enveloped centres of Orthodoxy (e.g., Sofia, Prague) and even provincial localities (Narva, for example). The Narva dispute fails to clarify the suspicions and criticism; it actually invigorates them. Why was it that the fight was taken up in a far-away Narva by a modest provincial pastor, but not in Sofia or Belgrade, or in Paris, where the motivation for suspicion and criticism would be better voiced by more competent Church people and scholars able to daily watch the centres of the Movement?!"*

The document further reveals that for the Church people – pastors and faithful – who were truthful followers of Patriarch Tikhon (Bellavin), the incident in Narva, the tonality of the dispute, the activities and the phraseology of A. Nikitin reminded of the notorious modernizers of the Church in Soviet Russia – A. Vvedenskii, V. Krasnitskii, I. Krechetovich

and others<sup>76</sup>. The essence of modernization consisted in the fact that the leaders spoke out against the Patriarch Tikhon (Bellavin) and strived for the democratization and modernization of liturgy; they categorically supported the new regime and the changes taking place – the confiscation of the Church property, the abandoning of Church Slavonic language for the use of the modern Russian one.

The third paragraph of the letter states the following:

*“The doubts and suspicions concerning the Movement lead by A. I. Nikitin begun to penetrate within secular public. Why was the leadership of academic young people not entrusted to a competent person or in general to a person well versed in matters of Orthodoxy, but to an ill-educated sergeant?<sup>77</sup> Such questions are addressed to Orthodox Church of Latvia, bearing responsibility for the area in which he is working in the name of Orthodoxy. And the eventual consequences of his activities are tied up with the local Orthodox Church and its leadership. Quite recently (in 1931) the local Catholic Church had a similar unpleasant experience when Church leaders arrived from Poland, who – on investigation – turned out not to be connected with the Church. Is it not deplorable and depreciable in view of such facts, that the Central Office found it feasible to appoint A. I. Nikitin – a completely unknown person for the Synod – to the post of the leader of the Movement in Latvia, without making inquiries in advance in the Synod, and without disclosing any information about the personal qualities of A. I. Nikitin and about the activities initiated by him? Such an approach is envisaged not only by the canon but it is compatible with practical considerations and common decency. The forerunner of A. Nikitin – L. A. Zander had*

<sup>76</sup> Vvedenskii Aleksandr (1889–1946) – one of the leaders of the renewal movement of the Orthodox Church in the Soviet Union in 1922–1946. Permanent Member of the Holy Synod. Rector of Moscow Theological Academy (opened in October, 1923). From October 10, 1941 was in the position “First Hierarchy of the Orthodox Churches in USSR”. Krasnitskii Vladimir (1880–1936) until 1922 was archpriest of Russian Orthodox Church, but went over to renewal movement, obtained important post. It is reported that he cooperated with the secret police. Krechetovich Iosif (1873–1933) – an activist of the renewal movement, held the post of the Metropolitan of Crimea.

<sup>77</sup> An allusion to Nikitin’s military post.

*avoided such a mistake of the Central Office in such a way, that after arriving in Latvia he paid personal visit to the leading hierarchs of the Church and presented all the required details about himself and his collaborators and informed about the planned activities. A. I. Nikitin did nothing of the sort thus demonstrating lack of tactful and civilized communication. He arrived in a situation of suspicious secrecy and acted in similar fashion, he also left in a suspicious way, thus generating only suspicion and doubts. What the Synod did – it only performed its duty and realized its rights by requesting to prevent the appearance within the precincts of the Orthodox Church of Latvia of A. I. Nikitin – a person not known by the Church and bearing reputation surrounded with suspicion and doubts”<sup>78</sup>.*

Some time later – on April 9, 1932 another letter was sent from the Office of the Orthodox Church of Latvia; (number 884). This contained a very vigorous request addressed to the Central Office of the Russian Student Movement “not to send in future any representatives of the Movement to the territory of Latvia”<sup>79</sup>.

By the way, already in 1932 during the summer convention of RSCM in Estonia in the Piukhtitskii Uspenskii Female Monastery the Estonian press published derogatory articles, suspecting the Movement of monarchism and alleging that the young people are inclined towards the restoration of the old regime in Russia. Although the leaders of the Movement publicly denied these allegations and made assurances to the effect that “the Movement pursues no political goals and does not engage in any political activities”, the Latvian officials, for political causes, a year later refused the permission for a similar convention in Latvia<sup>80</sup>. The summer camps “Vitiaz” (Knight) and “Druzhinnitsa” were not banned and continued working.

<sup>78</sup> LSHA. Fund 7469. Inv. 1. File 148, p. 19.

<sup>79</sup> LSHA. Fund 7469. Inv. 1. File 341, p. 285.

<sup>80</sup> Chetverikov Sergii, archpriest. Posle s’ezda (*After the Congress*) // Vestnik RSHD (*News of the RSCM*), 1932. Nr. 8/9, p. 33–36; Postanovlenie coveta Pribaltiki (*The Decision of the Congress of the Baltic region*) // Ibidem, 1932. Nr. 12, p. 27; Pliukhanov B. V. RSHD v Latvii i Estonii (*RSCM in Latvia and Estonia*), p. 166.

Was there a “fathers/children” conflict in Latvia? Indeed, youthful extremism, maximalism, conceitedness, abruptness, a certain muted dissatisfaction was present among the young people of Latvia. But explicit elements of the “fathers/children” conflict were manifested by way of individual activities of some members of the Movement, besides – the Latvian Movement did not obtain of its own press. The archives contain, for example, the following instance of “fathers/children” encounter. Some time in 1932 – so we may surmise – the following event had taken place. Nikolai Litvin, in the capacity of subdeacon of the Riga Cathedral Church of the Nativity of Christ protested against the Archbishop Ioann’s (Pommer’s) refusal to extend an audience to A. Nikitin. As the sign of the protest he discontinued his offices and left the community of the Cathedral Church<sup>81</sup>. To the ironic publications in the name of Archbishop Ioann (Pommer), which multiplied due to the complicated political situation in Latvia, another insinuation was added by Boris Pliukhanov. (Whose reminiscences leave the impression of maximally sterile, well-edited texts). Without offering any details and facts – in a rather restrained manner he informed that “A mistake was committed on the side of the Movement. One of the members of the leading body of the Movement published an interview in the Newspaper “Pēdējā Brīdī” (“In the Last Moment”) which fixated the worsening of the relations and differences between the Movement and the Head of the Orthodox Church of Latvia”<sup>82</sup>.

It is important to keep in mind when thinking about the activities of the Movement in Latvia, that these took place against the background of complicated relations of Metropolitan Evlogii with the Moscow Patriarchate and the Karlovatskii Synod; also – against the background of the necessary transfer of Metropolitan Evlogii under the jurisdiction of the World Patriarch, a feature mentioned above. The situation in Latvia turned out to be a dramatic one. The acuteness of the political fight was growing along with deepening of the economic crisis. Undisguised political persecution of Archbishop Ioann (Pommer) was taking place in

<sup>81</sup> LSHA. Fund 3235. Inv. 3. File 172, p. 113.

<sup>82</sup> Pliukhanov B. V. RSHD v Latvii i Estonii (*RSCM in Latvia and Estonia*), p. 166.

a planned fashion from the rostrum of the Saeima (Parliament) and in several publications<sup>83</sup>. The well directed campaign against the Archbishop was augmented by a stream of letters.

### The events of 1933

Important changes in the work of the Movement took place in September, 1933. The VIII-th General Congress of RSCM was convened after a period of absence in Paris. It re-elected the leading body and secured the rotation of the officials. A. Nikitin was released from the post of the Secretary for the Baltic region and Ivan Lagovskii (1889–1941) was delegated in his place<sup>84</sup>. These changes could no longer save the situation of the Movement in Latvia. Even worse – the Paris Congress was taking place in an atmosphere of disagreement and strife on the background of world economic crisis. Differences became apparent between Berdiaev, Zen'kovskii and archpriest Sergii (Bulgakov), concerning the tasks and the essence of RSCM. The Congress was addressed with an extensive and emotional statement by Nikolai Berdiaev “About the Ideological Crisis of the Movement. The Tasks of the Movement and the Approaching Dangers”. In the capacity of a friend of the Movement the philosopher

<sup>83</sup> Keler L. Nikem ne slomlennyi. Zhizn' i muchenicheskaia konchina arkhiepiskopa Rizhskogo Ioanna (Pommera) (*Not Broken by Anyone. Life and Martyr's Death of Archbishop of Riga Ioann (Pommer)*). Moscow, 1999; Igumen Feofan (Pozhidaev) Arkhiepiskop Ioann (*Archbishop Ioann*). Riga: 2000; Rīgas un visas Latvijas Arhibīskaps Jānis (Pommers). Svētrunas, raksti un uzstāšanās / Sastādītājs pr. J. Kalniņš. (*Archbishop of Riga and Latvia Ioann (Pommer). Sermons, Articles and Speeches*) / Collected by priest Jānis Kalniņš. Rīga: 1993. Vol. 1, 2.; *Kalniņš Jānis pr. Svētais Rīgas Jānis. (Saint Jānis of Riga)*. Riga: 2001.

<sup>84</sup> Graduated from Kostroma Theological Seminary, in 1913 – from Kiev Theological Academy, in 1926 rounded up his education in Pedagogical Institute in Prague. From 1926 worked as assistant at the Chair Psychology and Pedagogics at the Theological Institute in Paris. Author and Editor of *Vestnik RSHD (News of RSCM)*. Arrested and shot on July 3, 1941 by NKVD. A book of reminiscences by T. P. Miliutina was published in Estonia, giving details about the activities of Ivan Lagovskii in RSCM, and presenting history of the Movement in Estonia. See: Miliutina T. P. *Liudi moei zhizni (People in my Life)*. Tartu: 1997.

censured the Movement for overt bureaucracy. i.e. – for turning its leaders into professional civil servants. Berdiaev criticized the Movement because it “consciously avoids political issues, but unconsciously the politics is being introduced into the work of separate organizations by becoming involved in various governmental projects. Under the slogans of non-political nationalism a very specific policy of right-nationalism or fascist policy is being realized, making the impression that this is naturally consistent with Orthodoxy”. The philosopher saw such elements in the youth-work of such organizations as “Vitiaz” and “Druzhinnitsa”. Here he saw tendency towards militarization, even more – the obvious use of the unenlightened instincts of the young people who are looking for the way out, thus introducing national-fascist policy in the Movement<sup>85</sup>. Berdiaev’s manifesto initiated vigorous discussions, during which all the accusations were refuted.

At the same time Berdiaev’s accusations contained not only criticism but actually served to reveal the real situation: the split of RSCM had already taken place. In 1932 the followers of N. Berdiaev – the so called left-wing group led by Fedor Pianov and the Union of Mother Maria “Pravoslavnoe Delo” (“The Orthodox Cause”) separated from the Movement. These groups insisted on the priority of the social work among the Russian emigres. On the other hand, the leaders of the “right” wing of RSCM became more active. They also attempted to follow an independent policy with regard to the central offices, attempting to transform themselves into Russian national organization, by way of gaining of the moral and material support of the religiously-minded segment of the Russian emigration. At the same time they expressed readiness to cooperate with “the national emigration”, in particular with the political organization “National-labour Union of Russian Solidarists” (NLS).

---

<sup>85</sup> Paris, October 1, 1933 // Vestnik RSHD (*News of the RSCM*), 1933. Nr. 9/10, p. 3–5.

## The events of 1934

The friendly relations of the Union with the Archbishop Ioann came to an end. The Russian Enlightenment Society and its leader E. Tikhonitskii also started to avoid contacts with the Union. At the end of January 1933 lectures of prof. Boris Vysheslavtsev were successfully conducted in Riga, the announcement of the event was jointly published in "Segodnia" by the Russian Enlightenment Society and the Union.

In contrast, when the second visit to Riga by Nikolai Berdiaev took place in the spring of 1934, the announcement about professor's lectures were placed in "Segodnia" only in the name of the Union. Berdiaev was taken ill in Riga and had to stay for almost three weeks. Newspaper "Segodnia" (Nr. 59) carries a photograph of the Paris guest, gives a short biography. In the name of Riga Student Christian Union the newspaper announces that a lecture on "The Tribunal on History and the Fate of Culture" is to be held on March 2, "Human Being and Collective" – on March 6, and "Christianity Confronting the Present Social Reality" – on March 9. Berdiaev delivered a special lecture for the students of the University of Latvia (Room Nr. 5) on "The Fate of Individual in the Kingdom of Technology". The guest was greeted in the name of the Rector and the professors of the University by Archbishop Teodors Grinbergs of the Latvian Evangelical-Lutheran Church, the professors of the Faculty of Theology and prof. Vasilii Sinaiskii.

Notwithstanding the complicated relations of the Orthodox Church of Latvia and RSCM, the newspaper "Segodnia" gave wide coverage of the visit of the famous professor, by way of information about his lectures in the Blackhead's House. It seems that the position of the paper was determined by the Editor-Chief Maksim Ganfman (1873–1934)<sup>86</sup>, who, being a convert, was a man of deep religiosity. He

---

<sup>86</sup> Koval'chuk S. Maksim Ganfman // Pokrovskoe kladbishche. Slava i zabvenie (*Koval'chuk S. Maksim Ganfman // Pokrovsk Cemetery. The Fame and the Forgetfulness*), p. 178–181.

displayed great restraint with regard to the specific relations between the Orthodox Church of Latvia and the Movement. Well-experienced correspondents of “Segodnia” reported on the lectures of the prominent philosopher. The lectures of Berdiaev – wrote Kira Verkhovskaia – presented a whole cycle permeated “by a single idea, a single assurance and a single faith”, that “the present-day contradictions will be resolved only by Christianity, that only Christianity is in a position to enlighten the dark chaos of our tangled days”<sup>87</sup>. The reporters called Berdiaev an outstanding philosopher, an original thinker, whose lectures had attracted a special kind of Riga audience. Petr Pil'skii (1879–1941)<sup>88</sup> – a well-known writer and journalist publishing under the pseudonym of P.P. wrote the following: “He remains what he had always been. Even twenty five years later – from when I first saw him – I could still recognize him. But if I would have to listen to yesterday’s lecture with my eyes closed, I would still not be deluded – yes, this is Nikolai Aleksandrovich Berdiaev – his enlightened speech, his tonality and his resoluteness. This old motif of his was audible in different degrees, so was his voice of clear conviction, or maybe – of hope. It dealt with the problem of how to bring together “social democracy” with the “spiritual aristocracy”. And the chief concern was also well known – about the fate and the contradictions of culture”<sup>89</sup>. The next report: “No such attendance is typical for the popular events, for spectacular gatherings, nor for the concert public. These lectures attract their own specific kind of audience – many of them do not appear anywhere

<sup>87</sup> K-va [K. Verkhovskaia]. Khristianstvo pered sovremennoi sotsial'noi deistvitel'nost'iu. Tret'ia leksiia N. A. Berdiaeva v zale Chernogolovykh (*Christianity Facing the Present Social Reality. Third Lecture of N. A. Berdiaev in the Hall of the Blackheads*) // *Segodnia (Today)*, 1934. Nr. 70, p. 6.

<sup>88</sup> Lents L. Petr Pil'skii // *Pokrovskoe kladbishche. Slava i zabvenie Pokrovsk Cemetery. The Fame and the Forgetfulness*), p. 231–233.

<sup>89</sup> P.P. [P. Pil'skii] Sud nad istoriei i sud'ba kul'tury. Leksiia N. A. Berdiaeva v zale Chernogolovykh (*Verdict on History and Fate of Culture. Lecture on N. A. Berdiaev in the Hall of the Blackheads* // *Segodnia (Today)*, 1934. Nr. 63, p. 10.

else. Except – at the lectures of [Ivan Aleksandrovich] Il'in, hieromonk Ioann [Shakhovskoi]”<sup>90</sup>.

The newspaper “Segodnia Veчерom” published reports about several meetings of the guest with young people and visits to the Union of Christian Youth of Latvia and RSCM. In the latter case the sixtieth birthday of N. Berdiaev was celebrated<sup>91</sup>. The last gathering in the name of the Union was conducted by Chairman of the Union Nikolai Litvin, he was assisted by assistant professor Vasilii Preobrazhenskii and Boris Pliukhanov. The celebration of the birthday event was followed by an ardent discussion “About the Ideological Crisis of the Movement”. Berdiaev actually made an exposition of his memorandum “About the Ideological Crisis of the Movement. The Tasks of the Movement and the Immanent Dangers”, which he had addressed in 1933 to the VIII-th general congress RSCM in Paris. (This was discussed above). There were many questions asked: Is there evidence of the split of the Movement? Why is it considered to be a “greenhouse”? Is there a crisis of ideas in RSCM in Paris – in the very centre of the Movement? “Yes – Berdiaev answered. There is a certain degree of indifference with regard to the ideas, to the intellectual, cultural and social movement of the world. The world is in flames, it experiences not only crisis, but almost an agony; it is not possible to isolate oneself from it; some sort of light is necessary that would enlighten and heal it. One has to be active. In order for the Movement to go on existing, one has to get the feeling of history”. The young people of Riga were more interested in solving pragmatic questions; they did not experience ideological crisis, it was rather lack of understanding on the part of population. Nikolai Litvin – Chairman of the Latvian Union sum-

<sup>90</sup> P. Tr. [P. Pilskii] Chelovek i kollektiv. Vtoraia leksiia N. Berdiaeva v zale Chernogolovykh (*Man and Collective. Second Lecture of N. A. Berdiaev in the Hall of the Black-heads*) // Ibid., 1934. Nr. 69, p. 4.

<sup>91</sup> Chestvovanie prof. N. A. Berdiaeva po sluchaiu ego 60-letia (*The Honouring of N. A. Berdiaev on his 60-th Birthday*) // Segodnia Veчерom (*Tonight*), 1934. Nr. 64, p. 5.

marized the discussion: The organization positions itself as faithful layman – i.e. – in the formal sense it is not a Church organization, and is not subjected to ecclesiastical control. There are no signs of moving away from the Union, but the absence of a strong support from the centre, a sign of direction is in evidence. The meeting with Nikolai Berdiaev ended with a common prayer and singing of a religious hymn “Dostoino est”<sup>92</sup>.

The last sizable event in the presence of the members of the Union took place on August 22–28, 1934 when an ecumenical Congress was held in Saldus of the World Student's Christian Federation. Prof. Vasilii Zen'kovskii came from Paris for reading of a report and for meeting with leaders of the Baltic countries, of the countries of Northern Europe, Germany, Holland, Great Britain. A common photograph – the religious leaders from various countries, young people of many nationalities, professors of the University of Latvia Pauls Dale and Janis Rezovskis, Lutheran pastors from Latvia Romans Vanags, Arturs Krauklis and a future pastor Roberts Feldmanis. A book of reminiscences of B. Pliukhanov contains an unclear reference to the leader of the Congress. It turned out that the leader had been general Secretary of the Student's Federation, doctor of theology Willem A. Vissert Hoofh (1900–1985) who later became pastor of Reformed Church of Holland and a well-known leader of the Ecumenical Movement of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, one of the founders of and leaders of World Council of Churches. The Orthodox Church of Latvia was not represented at the Congress, but the delegates took part in the service of the Orthodox Church in Saldus where the liturgy was conducted by hierey Nikolai (Zhunda; 1913–1953)<sup>93</sup>. Many reports were read at the Congress in German. Here is a citation from “Vestnik”:

<sup>92</sup> K. V. [K. Verkhovskaia] Chestvovanie professora N. A. Berdiaeva po sluchaiu ego 60-letii. Sobesedovanie v Pravoslavnom studencheskom edinenii (*The Honouring of Professor N. A. Berdiaev in Connection with his 60-th Birthday. Discussion in the Orthodox Student Union*) // Ibid., 1934. Nr. 64, p. 5.

<sup>93</sup> Golikov Andrei, priest, Fomin Sergei. Krov'iu ubelemnnye. (*Whitened by Blood*), p. 110–112.

“The Chairman of the Ecumenical Council of the World Christian Union for the dissemination of the ideas of peace, Mr. Anrio, who was in charge of the evening session, told many interesting things about the practice of evangelization in Western Europe. It was decided to hold an analogous event in Riga – a week of the evangelization of Russian youth”<sup>94</sup>. In other words – the leaders of the Latvian Union were purposefully stepping on the road of becoming closer with the Lutheran Church.

A month and a half after the Congress a tragic event took place, that produced immense consternation in Latvia and beyond its borders. On the night from October 11 to October 12, 1934 Archbishop Ioann was killed at the hands of unidentified killers<sup>95</sup>. The causes of this tragic event are not revealed up to the present day. The Archbishop was elevated to sainthood in 1982 by the Holy Russian Orthodox Church Abroad. On September 24, 2001 the Synod of the Orthodox Church of Latvia elevated to sainthood The holy Priest-Martyr the Archbishop of Riga and Latvia Ioann (Jānis Pommer).

Metropolitan Evlogii (Georgievskii) and “Vestnik RSCM” published condolences in connection with the death of the priest<sup>96</sup>. It has been possible to establish on the bases of the collection of the documents of the Synod of the Orthodox Church of Latvia in the State Historical Ar-

<sup>94</sup> The Life of the Movement. The Movement in Latvia // Vestnik RSHD (*News of the RSCM*), 1934. Nr. 10, p. 27–30.

<sup>95</sup> For versions of the Archbishop Ioann see: Keler L. Not Broken by Anyone. Life and Martyr's Death of Archbishop of Riga Ioann (Pommer). Moskva, 1999; Igumen Feofan (Pozhidaev) Arkhiepiskop Ioann (*Archbishop Ioann*). Riga, 2000; Rīgas un visas Latvijas Arhibīskaps Jānis (Pommers). Svētrunas, raksti un uzstāšanās / Sastādītājs pr. J. Kalniņš. (*Archbishop of Riga and Latvia Ioann (Pommer). Sermons, Articles and Speeches*) / Collected by priest Jānis Kalniņš. Riga, 1993. Vol. 1, 2.; *Kalniņš Jānis pr. Svētais Rīgas Jānis. (Saint Jānis of Riga)* Riga, 2001; A. N. [Nikitin A. I.]. Sezd Soveta Dvizheniia (*Congress of the Council of the Movement*) // Vestnik RSHD (*News of RSCM*), 1931. Nr. 7, p. 26–30.

<sup>96</sup> His Eminence Ioann, Archbishop of Riga and of Latvia (brutally killed on October 11–12, 1934) // Ibid., 1934. Nr. 10, p. 7–9.

chives of Latvia, that in 1936 leader of RSCM prof. Vasilii Zen'kovskii wrote to Riga to Metropolitan Augustin (Pētersons; 1873–1955) concerning the forthcoming religious-pedagogical meeting in Dassel (Lower Saxony), and extended an invitation to send a representative, so as to work for the unification of the work of local Orthodox Churches<sup>97</sup>. But the Orthodox Church of Latvia ignored Zen'kovski's invitation for co-operation. The cooperation with RSCM was discontinued. By the way, an article by Orthodox priest from Amsterdam Hildo Bos "Orthodox Youth and Orthodox Culture: The Genesis of SYNDESMOS, 1923–1953" contains interesting information about the ecumenical activities of prof. V. Zen'kovskii, and details of the work of the conference at Dassel in 1936<sup>98</sup>.

<sup>97</sup> LSHA. Fund 7469. Inv. 1. File 354, p. 12, 13, 14, 20.

<sup>98</sup> The pedagogical conference in Dassel was conceived as a follow-up to the 1930 conference of pedagogues and was to deal specifically with issues of religious education. Increasing political tensions prevented the Romanians and Serbs to participate. Still the attendance was impressive: Zen'kovskii, Zander, Archimandrite John Shakhovskoi (the future Archbishop of St. Francisco) on behalf of the Russian emigration; Fr Angelos Nissiotis, Prof. Bratsiotis, Dr. Kotsonis (the future Archbishop Hieronymos of Athens) and Dr. Trembelas on behalf of Zoï, the Orthodox Youth Union and the University of Athens; Fr Stephan Zankov, Fr Christo Dimitriev and Mr. Gurnadiev on behalf of the Bulgarian youth. The meeting discussed methods and problems of youth work in the three countries, in particular ways to address the growing estrangement between youth, society and contemporary culture. All organisations presented their methods and problems, and underscored the need for better training of clergy and youth workers. The conference affirmed Zen'kovski's 1933 recommendation for pedagogical offices to be established at universities in Orthodox countries, co-ordinated by a central pan-Orthodox Pedagogical Bureau. At the same time, education led the way to debate on global challenges facing the Orthodox Church. "Not educational programmes," Zen'kovskii stated in his the initial address, "but the essence of Orthodox culture is what we must discuss at conferences like ours. <http://syndesmostemporary.blogspot.com/p/syndesmos-text-database.html> (Last visit 12.10.2015).

## The events following the tragical death of Archbishop Ioann

The tragical death of The Most Reverend Archbishop produced a number of versions; the suspicion fell on a large number of persons. A very dark shadow was thrown over the Union, but its involvement was not proved. At the same time, a blue-print for the closing down of the Russian Student Orthodox Union at the end of 1934 was found. It was alleged that the political work had been conducted in “a chauvinistic spirit”; this was a sufficient argument for the officials.

In studying archival sources we come across the following document, composed on July 1, 1934. The document consists of a compressed type-script on large sheets of paper, offering a detailed analysis of the work of the activities of Russian Orthodox Student Union, as from the day of registration by the Riga District Court on June 2, 1928 up to the summer of 1934<sup>99</sup>. The Regulations of the Union are analyzed, the aims and tasks are revealed. Many telling examples are given of how the secret police had followed the activities of the Union. Besides, the Union had not been a separate case. A network of informers had been disseminated within other social and political organizations of Latvia. We get to know from the report made in March 1932 that a search had taken place in the flat of Nikolai Litvin, who was drawing a stipend of 180 Lats (28 dollars) from Paris. The report analyses the letter confiscated at Litvin's flat sent by V. Zen'kovskii, giving financial details about Riga organization; it analyses also letters sent from Paris from the leaders of RSCM to the leaders of the Union and also separate issues of “The News”. The report contains detailed description about the surveillance of the guests from Paris and local leaders. Among them: V. Zen'kovskii, B. Pliukhanov, L. Zander, I. Lagovskoi, P. Dezen, T. Dezen, archpriest Sergii (Chetverikov), Mother Maria (Skobtsova), N. Berdiaev, E. Tikhonitskii, the family of Belotsvetovy. The occasions of the visits to Riga of the leading figures of the Movement, the

---

<sup>99</sup> LSHA. Fund 3235. Inv. 3. File 172, p. 18–23.

congresses and conventions in the Baltic region and in Paris, the attendance of which was sponsored are mentioned. The close ties of the Union and emigrant organizations in Paris are noted. The political police marked the ideological influence of General Evgenii Liudvig Miller, leader of the Russian War Union on the activities of RSCM in Paris and in the Union in Latvia. The author of the report is of the opinion that the organization had violated its Regulations, in that it had taken the sides of Russian nationalistic chauvinism. It had started to take the lead from the Russian emigre organizations and has stepped on the political course which is far away from the initially proclaimed aim – “the restoration of the great, non-divided Russia”. Yet it was impossible to establish a direct implication with the murder of Archbishop Ioann (Pommer). The concluding part of the report struck a resolute note – it was suggested to close down the Union as an organization detrimental to the interests of Latvia. The conclusion of the political police was heeded, and a decision was taken about closing down of the Union. The decision was published in “Valdības Vēstnesis” (“News of the Government”) Nr. 130 for 1934. The “News of RSCM” published a commentary of the event<sup>100</sup>.

The collection of State Historical Archives of Latvia holds information about the Union also in other funds. E.g. fund 731, inventory 1, file 7 – is a sizable depository containing protocols on many pages, in Latvian and in Russian, about the interviews with the members of the Union, protocols of searches, decisions to hold arrests and to release from incarceration. Intensive reading of the archival materials produces an uneasy feeling of dread, concerning the many-sided events involving explicit and implicit political games, manifestations of human egoism, pride and cheekiness, that had been hidden behind the outer mask of propriety in being engaged in cultural enlightening work with the young people. The aims of the Union, proposed in the Regulations in 1928 were very soon relegated to the background of the concern. The pages of the interviews

---

<sup>100</sup>Priskorbnoe nedorazumenie (*A Regrettable Misunderstanding*) // Vestnik RSHD (*News of the RSCM*), 1934. Nr. 11/12, p. 5–11.

with the police reveal a complicated atmosphere of deceit, lies, persecution, that existed even in the closest environment of Archbishop Ioann (Pommer).

The analysis of this kind of dirty deals is worthy – to reiterate – of a sizable scholarly research concerning the history of the Union in Latvia, as well as (one thinks) of the poor results of the work of RSCM in Latvia. Perhaps such an investigation may become a kind of an alternative to the work done by Aleksandr Gurevich as expressed in his scholarly publications and dissertation “Cultural and Religious Activities of the Russian Emigration According to the History of the Russian Student’s Christian Movement”.

In conclusion. At the end of 1934 the work of the Union was terminated in Latvia. This, however, did not prevent the members to secretly meet and to travel to conventions in Estonia and elsewhere in Europe. The schism and particularization, as it has already been noted, seriously undermined the RSCM in France already in 1932, when the supporters of Berdiaev split off. Hitler’s coming to power in Germany and the growth of chauvinistic tendencies in many countries of Europe in 1933–1935 contributed to the negative processes.

During the second part of the 1930-ies Metropolitan Evlogii (Georgievskii) verbally fixated his reminiscences concerning the activities of RSCM which he approved of and considered as having been necessary for the unification of young people around the Church; he denied the suspicions as to the ties of RSCM with Masonic organizations. “There are so many wonderful pages in the Movement! Unfortunately, it could not sustain the high standards of religiosity. Politics came in; the healthy body became infected with the poison of political struggles. I hold responsible for this N. A. Berdiaev. It was he who sharpened the political issues. I think that the split of the Movement was the result of the “conflict of generations”, of the ideological tumult. It was Berdiaev who exacerbated this unstable, at times controversial platform of the RSCM, thus producing highest spiritual consternation with regard to the acute problems of our catastrophic epoch. [...] The Movement is not to be construed on the

bases of personal churchliness and non-ideological pragmatism, a series of interconnecting elements is required”<sup>101</sup>. In the result peace and common spirit of the Movement disappeared; already in 1932 the left-wingers and followers of Berdiaev – the groups of P’ianov and Mother Maria – split off. The leaders of the “right wing” also attempted to follow a separate line from the centre, with the view of turning the Movement into Russian nationalist organization by way of gaining the support of the “religiously-minded part of the Russian emigration”. Even a third wing came into existence – “nationalists” headed by Aleksandr Nikitin, so as “to avoid accusations of having acquiesced in the existence of soviet Russia”<sup>102</sup>. At present the “Movement” is on the wane – Metropolitan Evlogii (Georgievskii) went on with his ruminations concerning the events of the mid-thirties. The young people have cooled off. The religious ideology calls for valour. It is not enough to just have faith; it has to be implemented in the routine difficulties of the emigrant life. After the first years of religious enthusiasm, a practical period of faith has ensued, and the young people were not ready to meet these challenges. After having lost their native land, they found hope in the idea of soon returning home; this did not happen, and the heroic ideas begun to wane. One has to obtain hard foundation, so as not to be displaced, not to become frightened and to loose conviction that by cultivating lofty spiritual and moral qualities one may also be useful to no one’s native land. This is not only a heroic deed of personal redemption, this is also a kind of heroic deed for the spiritual enlightenment and awakening of the people”<sup>103</sup>.

As to the active leaders of the Movement – Vasilii Preobrazhenskii was arrested on June 14, 1941 by repressive organs of NKVD (secret police) and died at a labour camp even before the sentence was announced. B. Pliukhanov during World War II acted as Secretary at Eparchial Office of the Orthodox Church of Latvia. Nikolai Litvin – the leader of the

<sup>101</sup>Berdiaev N. K voprosu ob ideologii RSHD (*Concerning the Ideology of RSCM*) // *Ibid.*, 1929. Nr. 7, p. 9–13.

<sup>102</sup>Metropolitan Evlogii. *The Way of My Life*, p. 492.

<sup>103</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 492–493.

Movement who had renounced his subdeaconite in 1932 and had left the community of the Orthodox Cathedral Church of the Nativity of Christ, started to serve in 1944 as a psalm singer at Orthodox Church of Sviato-Dukhovskaia in Ikšķile – a small town not far from Riga<sup>104</sup>. When the author of the present article had the opportunity to talk to some of the members of the Union at the beginning of 1990-ies, all the interlocutors – when asked about the tragic events of October 1934 – were unanimous in accentuating their categoricity and sincerity in defense of the ideals of their youth. To such an extent that it only served to enhance the feeling of double-thinking, of withholding of information and even of falsity.

---

<sup>104</sup>LSHA. Fund 7469. Inv. 2. File 246.

## **Parīze – Rīga – Parīze: krievu emigrantu ietekme uz Krievu Studentu Pareizticīgās Vienības darbību Latvijā (1927–1934)**

### Kopsavilkums

Pēc 1917. gada oktobra revolūcijas sākās tā saucamais Krievijas “skrējiens” – visu to cilvēku, kas meklēja glābiņu no Pirmā pasaules kara posta, no revolūcijas “nolādētajām dienām”, no asiņainā pilsoņu kara, – bēga uz ārzemēm. Rīga jau 1920. gadu sākumā kļuva par vienu no Krievijas aizrobežu centriem Eiropā. Daudzi Krievijas impērijas nesenie padotie, pārdzīvojot atšķirtību no dzimtenes, nolēma, ka turpmāk viņu dzīves galvenais uzdevums būs Krievijas kultūras un Pareizticīgās Baznīcas tradīciju saglabāšana. Uz Latviju, uz Rīgu, lai lasītu lekcijas un tiktos ar tautiešiem, sāka braukt pazīstamākie Krievijas domātāji – filozofi, vēsturnieki, sabiedriskie un politiskie darbinieki. Īpašu interesi izrādījuši Krievu Studentu Kristīgas Kustības (KSKK) garīgie līderi – filozofi Nikolajs Berdjajevs, Semjons Franks, Vasilijs Zeņkovskis un citi, kuri laikā no 1927. līdz 1934. gadam visai bieži viesojās Latvijā. Jaunatnes organizācija “Krievu Studentu Kristīgā Kustība” bija plaši pazīstama Parīzē, Berlīnē, Prāgā, Sofijā, Belgradā. Profesors N. Berdjajevs, profesors S. Franks, V. Zeņkovskis tikās ar kolēģiem no universitātes, lasīja lekcijas LU Lielajā aulā un palīdzēja jauniešiem Rīgā un ārpus tās izveidot KSKK filiāli Latvijā – Krievu Studentu Pareizticīgo Vienību (KSPV). Sākumā filozofi no Parīzes un Berlīnes nodibināja ciešas saiknes ar arhibīskapu Jāni Pommeru un

Latvijas Pareizticīgo Baznīcu. Faktiski šīs ciešās attiecības un sadarbība saglabājās līdz 1930. gada beigām – Latvijas Pareizticīgā Baznīca garīgi un materiāli palīdzēja KSPV organizēt konferences, tikšanos gan Rīgā, Rēzeknē, Daugavpilī, gan Valgundes Pareizticīgajā Sieviešu klosterī un citviet. Bet kustības vadītāju (vispirms A. Ņikitina) ambīcijas, ekumeniskās idejas kavēja šo attiecību ilgstošu noturību. Kad 1934. gadā tika zvēriģi noslepkavots arhibīskaps Jānis, tad ēna krita uz Krievu Studentu Pareizticīgo Vienību.

Latvijas Nacionālais arhīvs – Latvijas Valsts vēstures arhīvs glabā Krievu Studentu Pareizticīgās Vienības dokumentus (latviešu un krievu valodā), kas vēl joprojām gaida rūpīgu un vēriģu zinātnieku pētījumu.