

JPRS-UKO-87-019
23 November 1987



JPRS Report

Soviet Union

KOMMUNIST

developing and which imbue and reshape all that is new in culture and science, no less actively than the "live" perception of people to whom the propagandist addresses himself.

It is important to remember that a person's religious beliefs are by no means mandatorily determined by the direct influence of Church doctrine. They could include an incomparably broader range of religious, idealistic apologetics. That is why it is impossible to conduct successful atheistic work without taking into consideration all the features and aspects of contemporary culture which could indicate and, subsequently, strengthen an interest in religious views among people who have not mastered the habit of independent analysis and of a convincing evaluation of such elements. It is at this point that the elaboration of the key problems of atheism as required by the practices of socialist community life becomes particularly important.

In earmarking ways of improving the criticism of religion, Lenin expressed the confidence that the old atheism and old materialism will be supplemented by "the corrections introduced by Marx and Engels" (op cit., vol 45, p 27). Today we can note that the number and quality of works especially dealing with problems of religion, have increased. However, if we were to compare the level of such publications with the requirements which are now formulated in the light of the domestic and international political situation, the only possible conclusion is that so far such requirements are not being met and the criticism to which the party subjected the social sciences for their dogmatism, sluggishness and neglect of the complex and contradictory processes in the development of our society fully apply to religious studies. An almost paradoxical situation exists: the interest of the public in the laws governing the establishment of the individual and the sources and nature of religious-moral quests has increased while the authority of related views of professional researchers of religion has declined. This is no accident, for occasionally they have been limited only to noting the ideological nature ("God-search," "withdrawal from conceptual principle-mindedness," etc.), not always convincingly explaining the reasons for and negative consequences of the reproduction of religious concepts precisely under contemporary circumstances.

The comprehensive study of religion presumes a wider range of knowledge in "related" disciplines: history, philosophy, sociology, ethnography, psychology and others. However, they are obviously insufficiently taken into consideration in the development of atheistic topics. It is difficult to deny the impression that the study of religion stands aside from the other social sciences and is largely an area for cultural and educational work, oriented above all toward popular publications which do not always meet exacting scientific criteria.

The quality of atheistic propaganda is affected particularly adversely by the scarcity of truly fundamental works which bring to light the wealth of the atheistic

legacy of Marx, Engels and Lenin, which creatively apply in explaining changes in contemporary religion the theoretical and methodological tools developed by the classics of Marxism-Leninism. The shortage of highly skilled specialists in religion is being felt with increasing gravity and concern. There is no coordinating center which would seriously develop a long-term strategy for fundamental research in this area. Another vital problem is that of writing highly skilled textbooks on religion and scientific atheism, for the topic itself calls for an outstanding, interesting and profound presentation.

This is not simply a question of another academic discipline. The state of religion affects not only the destinies of individuals but also quite important social processes. The purposeful study of religion is of tremendous importance also in strengthening the joint activities of Marxists and believers in the struggle for the solution of vital global problems, including the prevention of nuclear catastrophe. That is why a radical restructuring is necessary or, in more specific terms, the creation of a streamlined system for scientific atheistic upbringing, in which the elaboration of key theoretical problems would be properly expressed through mass propaganda work. Atheistic upbringing can be the result only of the profound and competent researchers and propagandists who can organically combine conceptual irreconcilability in the assessment of religion with an attentive and sensitive attitude toward believers who are our fellow citizens and participants in the building of socialism by the whole people.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1987.

05003

From the Depth of the Centuries

18020018o Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 12, Aug 87 (signed to press 4 Aug 87) pp 99-105

[Article by Boris Viktorovich Raushenbach, academician, Lenin Prize winner, full member of the International Astronautics Academy]

[Text] In the year 988, 1,000 years ago, Kiev Rus appeared in the "throng" of European Christian countries. The interest shown in this event both at home and far from its borders is understandable.

In studying the historical monuments of our fatherland, I have frequently heard the descriptions provided by tourist guides. Whenever this involves events related to the introduction of Christianity in Rus I was amazed to note that the guides emphasized the religious aspect of the event and only briefly mentioned the socioeconomic and the political aspects of this process and, above all, the exposure of Russia to European culture. In my view,

however, which was based on the works of Soviet historians, the situation was entirely different. The essence of the 1,000-year old events was the development of Kiev Rus as a state and religion was merely a form of this process.

In order to reinterpret the why's and wherefores of those distant events in Kiev Rus, it would be useful to recall Engels' words which actually referred to the latter age of the Renaissance: "This was a period which the French accurately named the Renaissance, whereas Protestant Europe described it one-sidedly and restrictively as the Reformation" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch." [Works], vol 20, p 508).

This shows that judging of events on this scale by taking exclusively the religious component into consideration means passing a "one-sided and restricted" judgment. Unfortunately, some supporters of scientific atheism assume a position which conflicts with Engels' profound thought. By seeking merely the "dark sides" of an event which occurred 1,000 years ago we cannot fully appreciate its complexity and contradictoriness and its objective meaning and significance.

For example, the coercive nature of conversion is comprehensively emphasized. It is true that the history of the spreading of Christianity provides some arguments to this effect. Let us consider merely the so-called conversion by the Crusaders of the pagan tribes in the Baltic area. The method was simple: the knights advanced, defeating those who resisted, grabbing land, building their own castles on them, enslaving the free population and ascribing to this piracy a "decent" appearance by baptizing the survivors. Obviously, however, this was not in the least a matter of conversion but of seizing the land, like the Spaniards did with the American aborigines. However, nothing of the kind happened in Rus, where events developed differently and in the opposite direction, if one may say so (more on this later).

That which happened by the end of the 10th century in ancient Rus was an outstanding event in the history of our homeland. The Grand Prince Vladimir carried out a bold state reform with far-reaching consequences, a reform which I would compare to that of Peter the Great. As during Peter's time, a leap was necessary in the country's development and the mastery of the latest achievements of advanced countries of that time. Vladimir's objective was to become equal to the developed feudal monarchies. To this effect, an energetic feudal reform and the profound changes related to it were necessary. The baptism of Rus is frequently "one-sidedly and restrictively" described precisely as a reform.

(In order to avoid a misunderstanding, let me begin by emphasizing that I am discussing the feudal nature of the reform, the state and ancient Russian society as a whole in modern terms. I do not wish in the least to depict

Vladimir as a kind of conscious "theoretician of feudalism." He expressed the objective needs of social development which determined his natural aspiration to create a state which was equal to other monarchies he was familiar with, including Byzantium.)

In order to gain a better understanding of the processes which shaped the lives of our predecessors during those ancient times we must recall, albeit briefly, the events which preceded that century. The initially dispersed Slavic tribes occasionally united and waged military operations against their neighbors, sometimes in the outlying areas of the Byzantine Empire. Toward the end of the 9th century the first major campaign against Byzantium was mounted, which chroniclers relate to Kiev Prince Askold. This was a period of decay of the patriarchal communal system and the birth of feudal relations. At that time their form was primitive—in autumn and winter a unit headed by a prince roamed on its territory to collect taxes; feudal land ownership did not exist as yet. In spring any surplus (furs, wax, and so on) was shipped down the Dnepr to Byzantium and to the more distant Eastern lands. From there items which were not produced in Rus were imported. Askold laid siege to Constantinople, extracted a big ransom and concluded a treaty with Byzantium which, in all likelihood, contained some advantages benefiting the Russian nobility. This was the first clash between Byzantium and the developing country. These were no longer simply "barbarians" who plundered the border provinces but a more serious entity.

By the end of the 9th century Oleg from Novgorod captured Kiev and united Northern with Southern Rus (Novgorod with Kiev). The outlines of the future ancient Rus state appeared. The still weak unification of Rus within a single entity was maintained with the help of constant battles against unruly tribes. A new successful campaign against Byzantium ended with the conclusion of a treaty advantageous to the Russians and the payment of an annual tribute (protection from attack).

The weakness of the unification of Slavic tribes became immediately apparent following Oleg's death (turn of the 10th century). Their union broke down and it fell upon Igor to restore it by the force of arms. Igor was killed during a campaign mounted against the Drevlyani for a second tribute. This was followed by a fierce revenge on the Drevlyani mounted by his wife Olga, who became the ruler, for his son Svyatoslav was still a minor. Sad experience forced Olga to bring order to the tribute paid by and the obligations of the allied tribes. This was a new step in regulating the laws governing the feudal state.

In assuming power, Svyatoslav concentrated his energy on the external enemies of the new state. After routing the Khazar kaghanate, Svyatoslav's troops reached the Northern Caucasus. His campaign against Byzantium was marked by victories (although not always). On his way back from the campaign Svyatoslav was killed in a

battle against the Pechenegs, who had been informed by the Byzantines on his movements. However, the potential enemies of the Russians to the East and the West had become neutralized.

The internecine struggle between brothers after Svyatoslav's death brought to power his son Vladimir in the year 980. What was the legacy which Vladimir received from his predecessors? Briefly, he found himself at the head of an unstable association of Slavic tribes which could be held together by the constant use of military force (or at least the constant threat of its application). In order to strengthen this association, the young prince made two important decisions. First, he settled in Kiev, in order not to abandon the administration of his state for months or years on end (the length of military campaigns of his predecessors). Second, in modern terminology, he tried ideologically to unite the associated Slavic tribes with the help of a common religion.

The conversion to a settled life in the capital was a major step in the feudalizing of the state: the rulers of the kingdoms which existed during Vladimir's time governed their countries from capital cities. K. Marx deemed necessary particularly to single out this aspect of Vladimir's activities. He wrote that prior to Vladimir the country was ruled by princes-conquerors, to whom Russia was merely a staging ground (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Collected Works," vol 15, p 76, Progress publishers, Moscow, 1986). For example, Svyatoslav intended to move his capital to the Danube, bringing it closer to the areas of combat operations of his own military unit. This is confirmed by the chronicles: before Vladimir, the princes thought of "armies" whereas he thought of "the people of the land... and rules of the landholders." Naturally, this is not to say that Vladimir did not conduct military campaigns. However, he never remained in the lands he conquered but always returned to Kiev. His campaigns were not self-seeking but based on the needs of the state.

Having settled in Kiev, Vladimir undertook the building of defense installations east of the city, thus indicating that he intended to reside in the capital permanently and to defend it from nomads. The calm and confident life of the city was another important prerequisite for the success of the profound state reforms.

Initially he tried to solve the second problem, that of the unification of the allied tribes, by "equalization of rights" of all main tribal gods (and, therefore, the influential clergy groups). Anyone who came from distant lands could see that in the capital not only the Kiev gods but also the gods of his own tribe were worshipped. It is thus that a pantheon to six pagan gods was built in Kiev, the ruins of which have been found in our time by archaeologists. Another point of view is that the pantheon included gods which symbolized the main elements of the ancient concept of the world of the Slavs—

the sky, the earth, the sun, etc. Perun, the god of the Grand Prince, was the head of this group. In this case as well, however, the pantheon was of a pan-Slavic, a unifying nature.

Although today we lack direct confirmation, there is no doubt that these steps taken by Prince Vladimir strengthened the ancient Russian state. It soon became clear, however, that the road which he had so successfully followed was actually leading into a dead end. There were two serious reasons for this. First, even after Vladimir's new developments, the pagan religion presumed an ancient way of life. It was suitable for a patriarchal system but greatly hindered the shaping of new production relations born of feudalism. New laws and customs, a new social awareness and new assessments of events were needed. This could not be provided by the old paganism. Yet it was "this" that already existed in Byzantium. The second reason was that Kiev Rus could not become the equal of the progressive countries in Europe and the Orient and, in today's terminology, could not reach "the level of world standards" without borrowing from them crafts, building techniques, science, culture and many others (in the same way that Peter the Great needed later the experience of Western Europe). All of this too was available in Byzantium.

Why Byzantium? In determining which of the then existing countries to take as a model, Vladimir could have been oriented toward either the Muslim East or the Catholic West. Preference, however, was given to Orthodox Byzantium (the formal split of the once-united church into Orthodox and Catholic occurred only in the year 1,054 but in fact these two churches had become independent much earlier. It is this that allows us to apply our terminology.) Vladimir's choice was largely determined by history but also by his wisdom as a statesman. Quite close economic relations had already existed with Byzantium. Byzantium was close by. Bulgaria, which was related to Rus, had adopted Christianity approximately 100 years before Kiev Rus. This was greatly advanced by Kiril and Metodiy, who created the Slavic alphabet and who preached Christianity in a Slavic language. Today the Slavic peoples justifiable honor them as outstanding educators (in Bulgaria Kiril and Metodiy Day is a national education holiday). Therefore, Vladimir's decision could have been influenced also by the fact that in an Orthodox church, unlike the Catholic, the service could be conducted in an understandable language. It is also worth mentioning that at that time Byzantium was still blossoming; ancient traditions had not disappeared, for Homer and other classics of antiquity were studied in its schools and Plato and Aristotle were still being quoted in philosophical debates.... The Byzantine variant of Christianity met the needs of the feudal society, for which reason it was entirely consistent with Vladimir's plans. This also solved the problem of having all tribes in ancient Rus adopt a single religious cult.

Neither Rus nor Byzantium considered the forthcoming baptism a purely religious act. Simply and very briefly described, Byzantium's viewpoint could be reduced to the following: since Rus was turning to the Orthodox faith and since the Orthodox Church was headed by the Patriarch of Byzantium and the Emperor, automatically Rus became a vassal of Byzantium. However, the growing and already quite powerful ancient Russian state, which had repeatedly and successfully fought Byzantium, was by no means willing to accept such a role. Vladimir and his retinue had a different viewpoint. The baptism and the related borrowing of Byzantine culture and technology did not entail in the least the loss of Rus' independence. According to the prince, Rus would become a state which was friendly with Byzantium but entirely sovereign. As a friend of Byzantium it would give it military assistance if necessary. To say the least, the conversion was substantially hindered by such a major disparity in the views on its consequences.

However, fate was on Vladimir's side. In 986 the Byzantine emperor Basil II suffered a major defeat in war and barely saved his life; in 987 Varda Foka, the mutinied Byzantine military commander marched on Constantinople and proclaimed himself emperor. Finding himself in a hopeless situation, Basil II asked Kiev Prince Vladimir for help. The latter agreed to provide military assistance and thus protect Basil II's throne. His conditions, however, were strict:

The baptism of Rus would take place, metaphorically speaking, "by the Kiev scenario;"

Vladimir would marry the emperor's sister and thus become one of the supreme rulers of Europe.

The emperor was forced to agree. This was a great diplomatic victory for Vladimir. His army (6,000 men) helped to defeat Foka and Basil II retained his throne.

The year 988 was approaching, and so was the baptism of Rus. However, Basil II broke his word by delaying the arrival of his sister Anna to Kiev. Vladimir took decisive action: he laid siege on Korsun (the modern Kherones in the Crimea), which was an important Byzantine stronghold on the Black Sea.

A.K. Tolstoy, who had an excellent sense of humor, described the besieged Byzantines as follows:

"The Greeks saw ships in the bay and men of war around their walls. The talk which went back and forth was 'there is trouble for the Christians, Vladimir has come to be baptized!'"

Korsun surrendered. Vladimir threatened to shift military operations to Byzantine territory. It was now the turn of Basil II to capitulate. Anna's fate was bemoaned in Constantinople for an entire week and one can easily imagine what she thought on her way to meet Vladimir.

Those who like to speak of "baptism by force" can indeed see that force was applied. In the spirit of A.K. Tolstoy's words, one could ironically add that, having defeated the Byzantines, the ancient Rus troops forced the Byzantines to baptize them.

Before addressing ourselves to the feudal reform, let us consider the religious aspect of the matter. It may seem initially that the social role of any religion is always the same, for all religions accept the existence of some kind of mystical force which governs events in the world. In reality, naturally, things are more complex. Religions have their complex history and, in particular, the conversion of Kiev Rus from paganism to Christianity should be assessed in a positive light, as a progressive process, as a transition to a "civilized" religion. For example, human sacrifice was a mandatory element of the pagan cults of many European tribes. Such sacrifice was made on a variety of occasions, including some holidays of the annual cycle. When a rich person died his personal slave was killed and, sometimes, even a few other men and women slaves. Sometimes, on the eve of battle, a soldier was sacrificed. Also known have been cases of human sacrifice related to thanksgiving services.

The natural question is the following: how did Christianity spread? Did this process encounter opposition? Let us reemphasize that it was an internal affair of Kiev Rus. Changes were made on the instructions of the Grand Prince and his immediate retinue, a kind of "government." The country was not subjected to any external pressure. Furthermore, the population was familiar with Christianity: for a number of years small Christian communities, which had appeared during the rule of Princess Olga, Vladimir's grandmother, had existed; she was the first of the supreme rulers of Kiev Rus to accept Christianity (unless we believe the legend of Askold's conversion). This too contributed to the establishment of the new religion.

As is the case with any radical change, the new and progressive features clashed against the opposition of the old, the obsolete ones. That is why it would be useful to see who found such changes to his advantage.

The prince could only benefit, for whereas previously he was simply the head of a tribal alliance, now his power had become sanctified, "given by God." Vladimir's immediate retinue suffered no property or any other loss. The same could be said of the military. Those who traded with Byzantium found new opportunities with the reform. Whereas previously in the markets overseas they were classified as "barbarians" and "skifs," henceforth in Byzantium and in Europe they were respected correligionists and in the Islamic East they were representatives of one of the world's religions. The ordinary members of communities were equally not particularly harmed, for the feudalizing process had not gathered strength as yet. Christianity promised freedom to the slaves. As we know, in ancient Rus slavery was restricted to domestic servants. Slaves were not used in industry

although they accounted for a substantial social stratum. The slave trade, however, was widespread. To this day, in English, German and French, the concept of "slave" is expressed with the word "slav," for Slav slaves were greatly valued on the slave markets. Slavery was not inherent in feudalism and the Church was greatly opposed to it, particularly to the slave traders who sold their fellow tribal members into slavery.

Those who lost everything were the pagan priests. All of a sudden the influential priesthood became totally superfluous. Under these conditions the pagan priests resorted to two essentially different tactics: first, "going into clandestinity," continuing to serve idols, conduct magic ceremonies, and so on, in the peripheral areas and wherever else that was possible; second, mounting an open (even armed) resistance to the entire system of Vladimir's reforms.

Vladimir's reaction to these two tactics was different. He paid virtually no attention to the "clandestine" pagan priests, for they did not threaten the main thing: the feudal reform. This is one of the roots of the so-called twin faith. Vladimir believed that these elements of paganism would gradually disappear as a result of the activities of the Christian clergy. Considering the scale of the reform, it would have been unwise to demand immediate changes in everything (even Peter the Great did not demand of the indentured peasants to wear Dutch clothing).

The reaction to the opposition to the system of feudal reforms was different. In this area Vladimir displayed firmness and mercilessness and, if necessary, used military force. What matters to us, however, is that "the fire and the sword" were not used simply to introduce the new religion but to create a centralized feudal state.

The process of Christianizing developed gradually and, according to contemporary estimates, took approximately a century. Considering the dimensions of the country, this was a very short time: Sweden and Norway, which adopted Christianity virtually at the same time, required, respectively, 250 and 150 years.

Vladimir's state reform appeared gradually to release the potential which had accumulated in ancient Russian society. It marked the beginning of a tempestuous and headlong development of the country, which indicates the timeliness of the reform.

Master builders hired in Byzantium built stone buildings and temples, painted them, and decorated them with frescos, mosaics and icons. Side by side with them worked Russians who learned a previously unknown craft. The next generation would already erect complex structures in the Russian cities virtually without the help of foreigners. Agriculture as well changed and truck gardening appeared in Russia.

The newly arrived clergy not only provided religious services in the new temples but also trained "national cadres" for the Church, as a result of which knowledge and literacy spread. Schools were opened in which, as their mothers cried, Vladimir gathered the children of the upper strata (a method which was subsequently to be used by Peter); young people were sent to study abroad. Records began to be kept. Like any developed country, Kiev Rus began to mint gold coins.

Gradually, ancient Rus became a state with a new high culture. However, we should not think that in pagan times it did not have its own variety of advanced culture. This popular pagan culture would linger a long time and would give ancient Russian art its original and unique features. In speaking of the new culture, I am referring essentially to the large amount of knowledge (from the works of Aristotle to means of building a stone arch) which was then part of world culture.

Strangely enough, chronicles written during Vladimir's time tell virtually nothing about him. This may have been related to the fact that they had been written by the newly arrived Byzantines who, unquestionably, wished for different results from the conversion of the country. Vladimir was not obedient to his spiritual fathers whenever their advice could benefit Constantinople alone and conflicted with the needs of Kiev. It was not the clergy that "commanded" Vladimir but the opposite.

However, whereas the chronicles say nothing about Vladimir, folklore enthusiastically praises him and this is the highest accolade for a political figure of that time. Beautiful Sun Vladimir has been remembered forever in the memory of the people. This is no accident. At all times the people have aspired to make the present better than the past and the future better than the present. The higher the pace of a continuous improvement of life, the happier the person becomes. During the period of Vladimir's reform, the pace of renovation of all aspects of life in ancient Russian society was truly overwhelming. Only yesterday the people of Kiev looked at the wonders of Constantinople with amazement; the next day he saw something similar in Kiev. All of this made them proud of their country and confident in its great future.

As aptly defined by Professor V.V. Mavrodin, at that time "everything was swaddled in optimism, the type of optimism which had been inherent in the early Christianity of Kiev Rus." At first Christianity in Rus was a happy event, which did not deny earthly passions and was alien to monastic asceticism. During Vladimir's time, Rus had no monks or monasteries. All of this was quite natural, for if a person would feel the need to join a monastery, he would have been raised since childhood in the spirit of Christian concepts and ideals. This, however, requires time. Furthermore, first-generation Russian Christians considered the very fact of baptism such a major exploit in personal piety that it made unnecessary the additional feat of leading a monastic

life. Most valued among the virtues preached by Christianity was love for one's neighbor, which was manifested, among others, in the practice of feasts and alms to the poor.

Princely feasts had taken place during pagan times as well. Vladimir kept this custom to which he gave a new meaning. It was during such feasts that "current policies" were freely discussed between the military and the tribal nobility. This helped to unify the feudal class. As to alms to the poor, the people of Kiev could eat for free in the Prince's court. By order of Vladimir, food was taken to the homes of the very old and the sick. One type of charity was also the ransoming of prisoners (slaves) who were then set free.

After feudalism had attained a sufficiently full development, the Church undertook to help the ruling class in keeping the oppressed peasants in a state of obedience; furthermore the Church itself would become the biggest feudal lord. All of this, however, was in the future. Meanwhile, Kiev Rus was ruled by the "kindly prince"—Vladimir the Beautiful Sun.

The thoughtful and energetic policy exercised by Vladimir made Russia part of the system of European Christian states. Its international position was strengthened. Rus became "known and heard... throughout the earth." Karl Marx described the age of Vladimir the "culminating point of Gothic (i.e., early medieval—author) Russia" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Collected Works," vol 15, p 76).

The fast pace of change in the age of Vladimir nonetheless was unable to complete the feudal reform during his lifetime. This required more time and the project was completed by his son, Yaroslav the Wise. As reported in the chronicles, Vladimir plowed, Yaroslav sowed and we (i.e., the next generation) will be harvesting the fruit. What was the nature of Yaroslav's "sowing?"

Assuming the Kiev throne after a hard internecine struggle, Yaroslav undertook no less energetically than his father the pursuit of the initiated reform. Like his father, he built fortifications to protect his lands although now, it is true, primarily in the West. Like his father, he saw to it that nothing would prevent the feudal reorganizations. It would be useful in this connection to recall the so-called "mutiny of the Volkhvy."

In the hungry year of 1024, in the then distant outlying area of Kiev Rus, in Suzdal, a mutiny broke out. It appeared that pagans had risen against Christians. The situation, however, was more complex. According to the chronicler, the rebels struck at the "old child." This gives us an idea of the essence of what happened. During that time a process of breakdown of the previously free communal family was taking place. The tribal leadership—"the old children"—was engaged in expropriating communal lands, gradually becoming feudalized; they collected taxes for the prince, naturally not forgetting

themselves. During the hungry years these developing feudal lords hid food stocks meanwhile becoming richer and enslaving their fellow tribesmen. Consequently, the 1024 uprising was a typical action of the enslaved against the oppressors and a prototype of the future peasant uprisings in the history of our country.

It was under those circumstances that the Volkhvy came out of "clandestinity" and tried to use the uprising for their own purposes—for the restoration of paganism. Yaroslav suppressed the uprising. It is interesting to note that while the Suzdal Volkhvy were practicing their pagan ceremonies Yaroslav left them alone. He acted when the anti-prince uprising (which only appeared anti-Christian) broke out. Like Vladimir, he found it important to consolidate the feudal reforms.

Yaroslav pursued his intensive building, obviously in an effort to make Kiev as good as Constantinople. Since Constantinople was famous with its own Cathedral of Saint Sofia, a grandiose Saint Sofia Cathedral was built in Kiev as well; in both cities golden gates decorated the city's fortifications, and so on. Yaroslav worked hard to develop trade: he began to mint not only gold but also silver currency.

However, Yaroslav's main concern was the creation of a Russian intelligentsia (however arbitrary the use of this concept as applicable to that age may seem). Vladimir was unable to solve this problem for lack of time. What was needed was not merely literacy but for Kiev Rus not to need "imports" of Greek clergy and for it to have its own scientists, writers and philosophers and, if necessary, to be able to wage an ideological struggle, in particular against Byzantium's imperial ideology.

The only place where a person was provided with everything necessary and offered the opportunity to practice the sciences in the Middle Ages was the monastery. Monasteries played the role not only of religious centers but of academies of sciences and universities. Here treatises were written on a great variety of topics and new generations of educated people were trained. Princes and kings visited monasteries not only to pray but also to seek advice, for frequently their most knowledgeable compatriots were to be found there. It is natural that under Yaroslav a Russian monastic institution developed and Russian monasteries appeared.

Descriptions dating from the 15th to the 17th centuries (earlier ones have been destroyed) indicate that most books in monastery libraries were not theological but laic. The monasteries stored chronicles, time charts, a variety of works on geography, philosophical and military treatises and classical works such as Josephus Flavius's "History of the Judaic Wars," and others. A learned monk had to be comprehensively educated. This is confirmed, for example, by the opening of the "Tale of Stefan Permskiy," whose author, Yepifaniy Premudryy, a monk at the Troitse-Sergiyev Monastery (15th century), belittles his talents, as was the custom at that time: "I

have not visited Athens in my youth and did not learn from philosophers their clever or wise words; I have not read Plato or Aristotle..." These words describe the ideal of the monk-scientist.

The monasteries kept chronicles (Nestor), wrote works of a polemic nature (frequently with a clear political undertone), transcribed books (it is to these monastic transcriptions that we owe the opportunity to read ancient manuscripts and that the "Tale of the Lay of Igor" has reached us), and painted icons (Alipiy). Monastery physicians provided free medical aid to the population. Equally important is the fact that the monasteries trained Russian clergymen and the higher clergy, thus replacing the Byzantines. Relations with Byzantium alternately improved and worsened. In 1037, using the difficult situation in which Yaroslav had found himself in the struggle against the Pechenegs, Byzantium forced the prince to set up a Russian metropolitan see, headed by a Greek. Officially, the Russian church fell under the rule of Constantinople and as before Byzantium wanted to make Kiev Rus its vassal. When a military conflict broke out somewhat later between Kiev and Constantinople, the Byzantine historian Michael Psell described it as the "uprising of the Russians." It was not an attack but an uprising! He was obviously unwilling to tolerate the idea that Kiev Rus was independent. In 1051, after the death of the Greek metropolitan, something unheard of happened: Yaroslav alone (without the emperor and the patriarch in Constantinople), "summoned the bishops," and for the first time anointed as Metropolitan Ilarion, a Russian priest from the princely village of Berestovo. Once again the Russian church strengthened its independence.

Metropolitan Ilarion was, unquestionably, a highly talented person. He was the author of an outstanding example of ancient Russian literature—"Sermon on Law and Grace." Judging by the title, one may think that this was a classical theological treatise. The apostle Paul himself, in his "Epistle to the Jews" had raised the question of the correlation between the Old Testament (the law given by Moses) and the New Testament (the grace given mankind by Christ). Naturally, the question was solved in favor of grace. In his work, Ilarion gave a new, a politically topical twist to this classical subject.

Since grace stands above the law, it means that in frequent cases the new is superior to the old. But this also means that nations which have converted later than others are as good as the latter and therefore Byzantium's claim to seniority in terms of Rus was unjustified. More specifically, referring to the baptism of Rus, Ilarion particularly emphasized that this was not Byzantium's merit. The Russians converted on their own free will. This was merely a first step and a great future awaited the Russian people. Being even more specific, Ilarion praised Prince Vladimir—the baptizer of Rus—and his policy. He raised the question of Vladimir's sainthood as a "new Constantine." Emperor Constantine who, many centuries ago, had made Christianity the

state religion of the Roman Empire, introduced Christianity in a country in which it had already become widespread. Vladimir introduced it in a pagan country, which was much harder. Therefore, Vladimir deserved more credit than Constantine. Ilarion further described and praised not only Vladimir's "alms" but also his activities as a statesman and paid proper homage to his predecessors, Svyatoslav and Igor, i.e., he praised pagans!

Actually, Ilarion's work was a sharp ideological weapon in the struggle for the independence of Kiev Rus. This was not left unnoticed by Byzantium which at that point refused to canonize Vladimir.

The spreading of literacy and the building of schools (not only in Kiev) continued under Yaroslav. There are records on the opening of a school for 300 children in Novgorod in the year 1030, where they began to "learn from books." Schools were opened for girls as well. Gradually, literacy spread to all classes, as confirmed by ancient birch-bark documents. Yaroslav himself "frequently read books, both at night and during the day," and "collected many writings and translated them from Greek to Slavic and wrote many books..." "The study of books is very useful." The culture of the population of ancient Rus developed rapidly.

Civilized countries cannot exist without written laws and Yaroslav created the "Russian Law," and many other written codes. In short, having completed Vladimir's reform, Yaroslav turned Kiev Rus into a freely developing feudal state as good as any other. Pride in their country and the desire to be independent from Byzantium and equal to it were shared not only by the people around the prince but by the entire nation. Several decades after Yaroslav's death this was confirmed by Father Superior Daniil, who traveled to Palestine, an event which he described in his "Travels." Seeing that in the Temple of the Holy Sepulcher there were numerous oil lamps, including from Byzantium but not from Rus, he appealed to King Baldwin (at that time Palestine was in the hands of the Crusaders) with a request to allow him to put an oil lamp "from the entire land of Rus." Nowhere should Rus stand lower than Byzantium.

What were the results of the reign of Vladimir and Yaroslav? First, Rus was united within a single feudal state. It was united on the basis of a new and at that time progressive culture, written laws and religion. The old tribal division disappeared. The statehood of the single ancient Rus nation was completed, subsequently emerging as Russians, Ukrainians and Belorussians.

Second, as a result of the reform Rus became equal to the rest of the civilized world. It was equal to the other countries in terms of socioeconomic system (feudalism, which continued its development), culture, crafts, and military affairs. The introduction of Christianity, which

became the ideological foundation of the united feudal statehood of ancient Rus, played a progressive role during the early Middle Ages.

The fast blossoming of the ancient Rus state made a tremendous impression throughout the world. A Western chronicler (Adam of Bremen) called Kiev the "jewel of the East" and the "rival of Constantinople." Perhaps the international reputation of Kiev Rus is best seen through the dynastic marriages. Whereas Vladimir acquired a "worthy wife" by the force of arms, under Yaroslav the situation was entirely different. He himself married the daughter of the King of Sweden; his sister married the King of Poland and his three daughters married, respectively, the Kings of Hungary, Norway and France; his son married the sister of the King of Poland and his grandson, the daughter of the King of England; his granddaughter became the wife of Henry IV, the German King and "Holy Roman Empire" Emperor. Was this not a recognition of the international reputation of the ancient Rus state as a progressive and powerful country? It rose from a conglomerate of "barbaric" tribes, in the eyes of an amazed Europe, in the life of two generations. That was how Vladimir had "plowed" and Yaroslav had "sowed!"

Today we can be justifiably proud of the accomplishments of our great ancestors and gratefully remember their dedicated efforts. The event which took place 1,000 years ago (like all dates of its kind, it is, naturally, conventional) was a major step forward on the long path of history.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1987.

05003

Struggle For the Ideological and Organizational Strengthening of the Party

18020018p Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 12, Aug 87 (signed to press 4 Aug 87) pp 106-115

[Text] Our readers have shown a great deal of interest in the processes governing the internal development of the People's Republic of China and the activities of the CPC. The following article is based on materials from the Chinese press, describing some topical problems of CPC intraparty life and, particularly, the efforts to regulate it.

The last period in the activities of the CPC—one of the largest detachments of the world communist movement—has been marked by important events. The 3rd Plenum of the CPC Central Committee, 11th Convocation, which was held in December 1978, is considered in the PRC a turning point. A decision was made here of shifting the center of gravity of the party and the state to economic building. It was on the basis of this decision that a struggle was launched in the country for the implementation of the "four modernizations:" industry,

agriculture, national defense, and science and technology. The 12th CPC Congress (1982) called for quadrupling the annual industrial and agricultural output between 1980 and the year 2000. This will enable the PRC to emerge in the ranks of the leading countries in the world in terms of the gross output of the main types of such commodities and the volume of its national income.

In aspiring to its objective, the CPC is persistently seeking new ways of building socialism. A broad program for socioeconomic change has been formulated and is being implemented. A profound and comprehensive reform is taking place in the economic system, as a result of which impressive successes have been achieved in the economy and the living standards of the working people has increased significantly. Between 1979 and 1986 the national income of the PRC doubled and so did the real income of the working people. Substantial progress was made in the areas of education, science and culture; sociopolitical life became more active; the activities of the various population strata are intensifying and the role of the democratic principles is growing.

The extensive and complex tasks which the CPC faces today have required a major restructuring and improvement within the party itself, in the activities of which weaknesses, shortcomings and views and moods triggered by the practices of the "cultural revolution" have still not been eliminated. Extensive work must be done to regulate the CPC and ensure its ideological and organizational strengthening.

The decision to regulate was adopted at the 12th CPC Congress in September 1982. The Central Committee accountability reports to the congress indicated that since the "ruinous consequences of the decade of trouble (the "cultural revolution"—editors) had not been entirely eliminated to this day and bearing in mind the increasingly corrupting influence of the ideology of exploiting classes under the new conditions, there are faults... in our party in ideological and organizational aspects and in the work style, and the party style has still not been radically improved" ("12th All-China Congress of the China Communist Party (Documents)," Beijing, 1982, p 84 (in Russian)). Under these circumstances, the report emphasized, the "comprehensive streamlining of the party's style and party ranks" is considered by the CPC "a matter of prime importance, which requires an exceptionally serious approach and most thorough preparations and systematic and consistent implementation" (ibid., p 85).

The CPC planned to implement this project over a 3-year period, starting with the second half of 1983. The "main link" in its successful implementation was to be "the development of a profound, general ideological upbringing within the party." From the organizational viewpoint the streamlining was to take place from the top down: initially in the leading agencies and among leading cadres, going down and ending with the primary