

# CULTURE MATTERS IN RUSSIA— AND EVERYWHERE

*Backdrop for the Russia-Ukraine Conflict*



EDITED BY

LAWRENCE HARRISON AND EVGENY YASIN

Culture Matters  
in Russia—  
and Everywhere

Backdrop for the  
Russia-Ukraine Conflict

Edited by  
Lawrence Harrison and Evgeny Yasin

LEXINGTON BOOKS  
*Lanham • Boulder • New York • London*

Published by Lexington Books  
An imprint of The Rowman & Littlefield Publishing Group, Inc.  
4501 Forbes Boulevard, Suite 200, Lanham, Maryland 20706  
www.rowman.com

Unit A, Whitacre Mews, 26-34 Stannary Street, London SE11 4AB


Copyright © 2015 by Lexington Books

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced in any form or by any electronic or mechanical means, including information storage and retrieval systems, without written permission from the publisher, except by a reviewer who may quote passages in a review.

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Information Available

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data Available

ISBN 978-1-4985-0350-1 (cloth : alk. paper) — ISBN 978-1-4985-0351-8 (electronic)

 The paper used in this publication meets the minimum requirements of American National Standard for Information Sciences—Permanence of Paper for Printed Library Materials, ANSI/NISO Z39.48-1992.

Printed in the United States of America

## Contents

### PART I: INTRODUCTION

- |   |  |    |
|---|--|----|
| 1 | Introduction to the Moscow Symposium Collection                  | 3  |
|   | <i>Lawrence Harrison</i>   |    |
| 2 | Transformation of Countries in Transition: Culture and the State | 21 |
|   | <i>Evgeny G. Yasin</i>   |    |

### PART II: REGIONAL/CIVILIZATIONAL/NATIONAL CULTURES

- |   |   |    |
|---|---|----|
| 3 | European Culture: What It Was, Where It Is Going                          | 39 |
|   | <i>Josef Joffe</i>  |    |
| 4 | Quo Vadis, Latin America? Four Cultural Obstacles to Economic Development | 49 |
|   | <i>Oscar Árias Sánchez</i>  |    |
| 5 | Janus in Latin America  | 57 |
|   | <i>Mariano Grondona</i>   |    |
| 6 | How Can African Cultural Capital Prosper?                                 | 65 |
|   | <i>Daniel Etounga-Manguelle</i>   |    |

7	India: Cultural Stability and Long Run Economic Performance <i>Deepak Lal</i>	77
8	China's Quest for a New Cultural Identity from a Confucian Humanistic Perspective <i>Tu Weiming</i>	91
9	Economic and Political Development in Slovenia: Betwixt and Between Europe and the Balkans <i>Katherine Taylor</i>	107
<b>PART III: RELIGIONS AND DEVELOPMENT</b>		
10	Contemporary Russian Orthodoxy: From the Social Paradoxes to the Cultural Model <i>Boris Knorre</i>	127
11	Religious Affiliation and Individual Economic and Political Attitudes in Ukraine <i>Maria Snegovaya</i>	145
12	The Cultural Revolution in the Islamic World and What It Means for the Future of Muslim Societies <i>Pervez Hoodbhoy</i>	163
13	"Creation Theology" in Economics: Several Catholic Traditions <i>Michael Novak</i>	177
14	Fight Ethos versus Work Ethos: The Role of the Catholic Church in Fostering Pro-Development Values in Poland <i>Damian S. Pyrkosz</i>	191
15	Holy Ghost Fire! Pentecostal Religious Culture in Africa <i>Rachel O. Okunubi</i>	211
<b>PART IV: CULTURE'S INFLUENCE ON ECONOMIC VARIABLES</b>		
16	The Role of Culture in Understanding the Process of Economic and Social Change <i>Douglass C. North</i>	233
17	Culture, Cooperation, and Repeated Games <i>Eric Maskin</i>	239
18	The Effect of Culture on the Functioning of Institutions: Evidence from European Regions <i>Mariaflavia Harari and Guido Tabellini</i>	245

19	Culture and Economic Growth: Getting the Theory Right <i>William Easterly</i>	259
20	An Appraisal of the Cultural Change Institute Factors Typology <i>Matteo Marini</i>	267
<b>PART V: CULTURE, PSYCHOLOGY AND ECONOMICS</b>		
21	Cultural Values Influence and Constrain Economic and Social Change <i>Shalom H. Schwartz</i>	287
22	Cognition East and West: Fundamental Differences in Reasoning and Perception <i>Richard E. Nisbett</i>	303
23	American Culture and the 2008 Financial Crisis <i>Geert Hofstede</i>	313
24	Culture of Horizontality and Personal Autonomy: A Humanistic Approach to Culture Change <i>Valery Chirkov and Nadezhda Lebedeva</i>	325
<b>PART VI: MEASURING CULTURE AND CULTURAL CHANGE</b>		
25	Measuring Culture and Cultural Change: An Introduction <i>Ronald E. Inglehart</i>	345
26	Measuring Cultural Capital and Change: Axiological Diagnosis <i>Miguel E. Basáñez</i>	365
27	Trust and Cultural Change in Argentina: A Latin American Comparison <i>Marita Carballo</i>	387
<b>PART VII: THE RUSSIAN CASE</b>		
28	The Economic Wonder: Market and Culture <i>Oleg Chirkunov</i>	411
29	"All Are Guilty, Which Means That Nobody Is!"—Continuing the Talk on Progress in Russian Culture <i>Andrei Konchalovsky</i>	423
30	Basic Human Values of the Russians: Different from and Similar to Other Europeans <i>Vladimir Magun and Maksim Rudnev</i>	431

31	Socio-Cultural Modernization in Russia: Norms and Values System Shift <i>Natalya Tikhonova</i>	451
<b>PART VIII: PROMOTING PROGRESSIVE CULTURAL CHANGE</b>		
32	The Role of the Family in the Acquisition of Values <i>Jerome Kagan</i>	469
33	Can Teachers Empower Youth for Democratic Citizenship? Evaluating Civic Education Pedagogies in Mexican Secondary Schools <i>Fernando Reimers, Maria Elena Ortega, Mariali Cardenas, Armando Estrada, and Emanuel Garza</i>	479
34	The Me to Everyone Cable <i>Reese Schonfeld with Erica Shusas</i>	491
35	New Occasions Teach New Duties: Social Change and Leadership <i>Richard Lamm</i>	495
36	Economic Policy and Cultural Change <i>James W. Fox</i>	503
37	Culture and Legal Dogmatism in an Era of Immaterial Wealth: The Case of Latin America <i>Octavio Sánchez</i>	515
38	A Culture of Profitability <i>Robert Kleinbaum</i>	533
	Index	551
	About the Contributors	565

I

+

## INTRODUCTION

Symposium Collection

Lawrence Harrison

The annual International Symposium on Culture, Civilization, and Economic Development took place at the National Economic Research Center, School of Economics in Moscow on May 15-16, 1997. It was organized by the Higher School of Economics, whose principal research director, Boris Gerasimov, had served as guest editor's director of the journal *Journal of Economic Change* Institute of Asia University's Institute of Culture, the principal research fellow to the 1997 "Culture, Civilization, and Economic Development" Symposium at Harvard, which served as principal research director of the journal *Journal of Economic Change*.

The symposium was held as an attempt to re-examine the relationship between culture and economic development in the transition to modernization and globalization. This is a question of both scientific and political interest. The symposium brought together a wide range of cultural researchers and economists from Russia and from outside. One of the symposium's objectives was to develop new ideas as to how cultural programs might be designed to support the economic development of its cultural values.

The symposium was the first economic event of this scale in Moscow. Its success was the product of all the participants' skills, a sign of the high scientific level of the work in the field of the world.

Award for Electronics; the Abdus Salam Prize for Mathematics; the Joseph A. Burton Award from the American Physical Society; and the Jean Meyer Award from Tufts University. In 2011, he was included in the list of 100 most influential global thinkers by *Foreign Policy* magazine; in 2013, he was made a member of the UN Secretary General's Advisory Board on Disarmament.

**Ronald Inglehart** is the Lowenstein Professor of Political Science at the University of Michigan, and scientific adviser of the Laboratory for Comparative Social Research at the Higher School of Economics in St. Petersburg, Russia. He is also founding president of the World Values Survey Association, which, since 1981, has surveyed representative national samples of the publics of over 100 countries containing 90 percent of the world's population. His research deals with changing belief systems and their impact on social and political change.

**Josef Joffe** is editor of *Die Zeit* and, in his academic incarnation, Fellow of the Freeman-Spogli Institute for International Studies as well as the Hoover Institution, both at Stanford. Since 2004, he has also been Visiting Professor of Political Science at Stanford. He received his Ph.D. in Government from Harvard.

**Jerome Kagan** is Emeritus Professor of Psychology at Harvard University. His research addressed many aspects of human development, with a focus on temperament, morality, and infant cognition. He is a member of the Institute of Medicine of the National Academy of Sciences, a fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, and has received Distinguished Scientist awards from several organizations.

**Rob Kleinbaum** is a director in PRICEWATERHOUSECOOPERS' Advanced Analytics Group. He is the coauthor of *Creating a Culture of Profitability*, a new look at managing corporate culture, and is the author of "Retooling GM's Culture," now standard reading in many leadership programs. Previous positions include Managing Director, RAK & Co; Partner, Strategic Decisions Group; Head of General Motors' internal consulting activity; Mellon Research Scientist, Population Studies Center; and Visiting Assistant Professor of Economics, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, the university where he earned a PhD in economics.

**Boris Knorre** is Associate Professor at the Faculty of Philosophy, National Research University Higher School of Economics, in Moscow; he received his PhD at Lomonosov Moscow State University and did post-doctoral work at the Catholic University of Leuven in Belgium. Since 1998 he has

been participating in the Keston Institute's research project "*The Encyclopedia of Religious Life in Russia Today*" and two Carnegie Endowment programs: "Ethnicity and Nation Building," and "Religion, Society and Security," in the framework of which he has done extensive fieldwork on confessional groups in different regions in Russia. He is an author of the book *In Search of Immortality: Fyodorov's Religious-Philosophical Movement* (2008) and more than 100 articles on the issues of ideology, social impact and cross-cultural comparisons of contemporary religious communities, where he is focusing especially on the culture of Russian Orthodoxy.

**Andrei Konchalovsky** is the noted Russian director/writer of theater and cinema. His films and plays have achieved success not only in Russia but throughout the world. Many of his films have been honored with cinematographic awards, including international festivals.

In summary, Konchalovsky has produced 34 screenplays; 26 films; 8 acclaimed theater productions including 5 operas; 6 books, and more than a hundred opinion articles.

**Deepak Lal** is the James S. Coleman Professor Emeritus of International Development Studies, UCLA. He is the author of numerous books including *The Hindu Equilibrium* and *Unintended Consequences: The impact of factor endowments, culture and politics on long-run economic performance*.

**Richard Lamm** was Governor of Colorado for three terms (1975–1987). He is University Professor at the University of Denver and Codirector of the Institute for Public Policy Studies. A lawyer and a Certified Public Accountant, he has written extensively on matters ranging from health care to immigration.

**Nadezhda Lebedeva** is Professor of Psychology and the Director of the International Laboratory for Socio-Cultural Research at the National Research University Higher School of Economics in Moscow. Her research interests are values, intercultural relations, acculturation, culture and innovations, social and cultural change. She is the author of 26 books and over 200 articles.

**Vladimir Magun** is the head of the Laboratory for Comparative Studies of Mass Consciousness at the National Research University Higher School of Economics and the head of the Unit for Personality Research at the Institute of Sociology of the Russian Academy of Sciences. He has published on the comparative studies of basic values and identities; the dynamics and cross-country comparisons of work values; the revolution of aspirations of Russian and Ukrainian youth; and on the bureaucracy issues.

10

+

## Contemporary Russian Orthodoxy

*From the Social Paradoxes  
to the Cultural Model*

Boris Knorre<sup>1</sup>

Religions have played a global role in the history of mankind, and no wonder; after all each religious system sets or legitimizes a certain system of ideas, values, practices, traditions—and by so-doing offers a corresponding pattern of meaningfulness to life. Although with secularization the direct impact of religion on culture has decreased, religion continues to influence culture. Changes in culture and modernization of social institutions are routinely matched with changes in religion, too. For Russia, Orthodoxy has a particular value, because it formed the basis of its culture. One would hardly dispute today that Orthodoxy is the foundation of the national and cultural historical identity of the Russians. It performs a certain bracing role in Russian society, offering a basis for communication between people who may otherwise dwell at a great distance, both geographically and culturally.

Understanding the Orthodox tradition helps us comprehend the history of Russia, and the particularities of Russian statehood. Orthodoxy is the Russians' clearest cultural tradition. Even Russians who are not religious still value the aesthetics of the Church, such as the ancient cathedrals in many cities and towns and the legacy of ecclesiastic art. This aesthetic tradition lends dignity to the image of the twenty-first-century Russian and renders a humanizing effect to an increasingly technological society. Orthodox ideas find expression in various fields of Russian culture and art.

How can Orthodoxy and the Russian Orthodox Church be correlated with further development of Russia and the resolution of painful problems and social conflicts? What role do the cultural postulates and preferences influenced by Orthodoxy play in improving the quality of life, developing creative capabilities, forming a civil society and, finally, in modernizing Russia as a whole?

The public stance on Orthodoxy is far from unequivocal. The majority of the population nevertheless does trust the Church and considers it capable of rehabilitating society. However, others see in the Church a threat to civil consciousness; they protest initiatives to further expand its influence, such as introducing a course on Orthodox culture in schools and erecting new temples in towns. The relationship between the Church and the society today can be described as one of cognitive dissonance.

We will approach these questions by first analyzing the internal ecclesiastic social culture. We should attempt to understand the ecclesiastic *socium* (i.e., the Church social milieu) from the inside. We will also analyze to what extent Russian Orthodoxy contributes to such qualities as enterprise, initiative, and resourcefulness in the society. But first, let us point out some problems and paradoxes of Russian Orthodoxy.

### SOCIAL PROJECTS OF THE CHURCH

Today social perspectives related to Orthodoxy are not only theoretical and ideological, because it is involved in certain social modernization projects. The most promising seems to be enhancement of the social function of parishes, a project under way for more than three years. In 2010 the Patriarch of Moscow and all Russia, Kirill, referring to the ideas of the Metropolitan Antony Vadkovsky (1846–1912), suggested broadening parishes' social role. "A parish should be not only the place of prayer, but also the center of social life," he said, "so that social collisions, conflicts could be mitigated at parochial level, and low-income sectors could get support, and social imbalance could be eased."<sup>3</sup> These words imply that the Church accepts responsibility for the social world. Three years ago the Patriarch suggested that parish staffs include full-time positions for a social worker, a catechist, and a young people's leader. He stressed that these activities need the attention of professionals, and not amateur volunteers.<sup>4</sup> Some training programs for social workers are being implemented today.<sup>5</sup>

Besides social service, the idea of parish socialization presupposes establishing attractive centers within communities. A parish could become the place where people meet, talk, improve their cultural knowledge, and develop civic consciousness. Such close involvement of the Church in so-

cial life can seem attractive; however, the Russian Orthodox Church has often shown weakness in this area.

Some projects have been successfully implemented. In education, during the past twenty years we have seen the opening of the first higher educational establishment in the history of the Russian church—St. Tikhon's Orthodox University of Humanities, and also the creation of quite successful training centers, such as the Novoalekseevsky gymnasia in the Pereyaslavsky district of the Yaroslavl region. In the sphere of social guardianship, there is the complex serving multiple populations in need in the settlement of Saraktash, Orenburg region; the social center in Nizhniy Novgorod; the "Inspiration" rehabilitation center in Nikolskoye (Moscow region); and also the St. Dimitry sisterhood in Moscow, as well as shelters and guardianship centers at convents. As a rule these activities are initiated by volunteers and organized by individual parishes—one parish takes the burden of all organizational work, the other parishes are uninvolved, and no support at an inter-parish level is even discussed.

There are failures in social ministering. An egregious example has been the refusal of many Orthodox parishes to participate in implementing the twelve-step program for Narcotics Anonymous and Alcoholics Anonymous, programs that help alcohol and drug addicts all over the world.

Meanwhile the Protestants achieve much better success rehabilitating substance abusers. Russia has six to seven thousand Protestant churches and groups. Almost every church engages in social ministering and visits children's homes, pensioners' houses, shelters, and hospitals.

A great gap exists between the declarations the Church makes and the reality. Social ministering has not justified the hopes pinned on it some twenty years ago during the revival of the Orthodox life in Russia. Yury Belanovsky, one of the leading organizers of volunteer operations in the Church, notes that a comparison of the secular and ecclesiastic systems of social ministering and philanthropy does not favor the Church. He says that "in the twenty years of the charitable initiatives of the Russian Orthodox Church they have failed to result in a large-scale, socially reproducible technology, whereas the charitable NGOs have accumulated funds and achieved a rather serious operational expertise."<sup>6</sup> Another disappointment is the Church's lack of strong support for the institution of the family and Orthodox family upbringing.<sup>7</sup>

In the 1990s Orthodox believers had high hopes for the revival of Orthodox gymnasium education. Amid the enthusiasm, the Church had opportunities to marshal major human resources. But because of the clerical community's indifference and lack of general ecclesiastic support, gymnasia found themselves in a difficult financial position. Only 14 percent managed to provide a more or less acceptable educational level, while



others didn't satisfy requirements for secondary schools and were on the edge of closing. The situation of theological schools was pitiable.

Thus, in the sphere of social projects the Russian Orthodox Church has not yet managed to show the initiative, interest and scope of organization expected from it. We attempt to examine the reasons for that below.

### PROBLEMS OF PROFESSIONAL FULFILLMENT IN THE ECCLESIASTIC MILIEU

The opportunities for people in the ecclesiastic community to find creative fulfillment are not promising. As a rule, fewer creative possibilities exist there than in the laic milieu (except for traditional occupations such as liturgical music, icon painter, tailor's cutter, and various specialists in ecclesiastic arts). Common "members of the flock" are almost completely deprived of active participation in the ecclesiastic community. According to journalist Egor Kholmogorov, who is obviously attracted to Orthodoxy, the ecclesiastic bureaucracy does not offer any form of involvement to "the basic element—a male, twenty-five to fifty years old, Russian, independent home owner, with a professional occupation, family, beliefs, hobbies and weaknesses."<sup>8</sup> Not only a "home owner" but any creative person, irrespective of gender, has problems finding fulfillment in the ecclesiastic community because of its organization and cultural model.

Who is involved in the ecclesiastic community? Among active churchgoers, there are both technical specialists and humanitarians, managers, state office workers, teachers, doctors, businessmen, researchers, actors, and persons of almost every profession. (It is difficult to judge their numbers—this should be a matter to research.) The rich and successful members of the Church are usually people who achieved fulfillment before they joined it. We are more interested in how the Church influences the professional and social fulfillment of those who enter it at an early age. Such people may be inadequate on the social and personal levels and eventually become burned out psychologically.

The paradoxes of the contemporary ecclesiastic reality arise from many sources. Among them is the state patronage in the Synod period, when the Church had no need to organize social work independently. Another is the Soviet period, when the Church had to live inside its own walls. Still another is the grievances that arose during the 1990s when the Church's main task was to restore all that had been destroyed during the Soviet years. Whichever historical circumstances we use to justify the present situation, the problem of the Church's vision and its cultural paradigm remains. Many of the Church's attitudes may be found also in the minds of the common people, or at least in the Russian social conscience. Once

we understand these, we can better understand certain cultural characteristics of Russia as a whole. What follows are some problematic features of Russian Orthodox Church culture.

### The Doctrine of Human Nature Stained by Original Sin

Today the dogma of original sin, which says that human nature is tainted by sin from the moment of Adam's fall, remains important.<sup>9</sup> In *The Fundamentals of the ROC Teaching about Human Dignity, Freedom, and Rights*, written and accepted by the leaders of the Russian Orthodox Church in 2008, much is said about human worthiness, based on the belief that the human being is a reflection of God. However, this worthiness cannot be realized entirely during mortal life because human nature is distorted by inherited sin. *The Fundamentals* stresses that "the patristic and ascetic thinking, the Church liturgical tradition, speaks more about unworthiness of a human being that is conditioned by his or her sin, and speaks less about people's virtues." It offers to consider the "condition of human nature obscured by sin" and to distinguish the "worthy and unworthy in human life."<sup>10</sup>

In real Church practice the doctrine of original sin is much more emphasized than in official Church documents. For example, the handbook *Orthodox and Dogmatic Theology* by archbishop Makariy (Bulgakov)—one of the most widespread and fundamental treatises for ROC theology—says that "consequences of sin appear in that all the abilities of the human soul are clouded. The human intellect is darkened, which is seen, inter alia, in inability to distinguish the good from the evil. . . . The heart is defiled by the feelings earlier unknown: hate, envy, despondency, etc. *The will is carried away by unnatural desires and becomes more inclined to the evil, rather than to the good* [emphasis added]."<sup>11</sup> Such a view of human nature is in turn reflected in ordinary pastoral practice—that is, in the language of Church ascetics, in its moral-didactical literature, in sermons, homilies and Church guidance in general. This attitude is an important part of the ROC's cultural code.

A characteristic feature of the ecclesiastic mentality is a heightened concentration on negative images and evil. For some reason, many Church people use such negative images as "fall," "indecent human nature," "dirtiness," "profanation," "sinfulness," "loathsome smell of sin," "rags and tatters," "self-delusion," "devil's temptation" and so on. These phrases serve not only to describe human imperfection but also to shape a specific "aesthetic of disgust" toward the body and emotions as they correlate with its sinful, "fallen" nature.

As the Orthodox missionary Father Andrey Kuraev notes, nowadays in Orthodoxy "a human being is perceived as a source of filthiness."<sup>12</sup>

Contemporary Russian priests and Church writers tend to portray death in graphic physical detail to alert their listeners and readers to the disgusting and fleeting nature of human life on earth.<sup>13</sup> In general in Church teachings, positive and soul-inspiring images occur less often than negative ones.

On the one hand this concentration on the transience of being may stimulate an appreciation of the value of the fleeting moment, and even motivate a person in the short term. On the other hand it may dampen his or her ardor for life. A worldview based on the uncertainty of the next day does not promote long-term planning.

### The Doctrine of "Free Will" Distorted by Original Sin

From the Orthodox point of view, the "fallen" nature of humans means they suffer a corresponding loss of free will; that is, they have a decreased ability to choose between good and evil. In the *Catechism Handbook*, Oleg Davydenkov, a priest and professor at the Orthodox Saint Tikhon Humanitarian University, says that "sinfulness is not a simple lameness of human nature, but some active force, hostile to human, which lives in his limbs and attracts him to sin even in spite of his own will [emphasis added]."<sup>14</sup>

According to one axiom, widely accepted in the Church, the will of the person contradicts the will of God. It is really God's will that directs human life, but as a rule "not the way the individual would prefer"—as archpriest Vladislav Sveshnikov notes.<sup>15</sup> Human will is perceived as unreliable and risky, and has a negative rather than a positive connotation. A person's will corresponds, generally, to "willfulness." The very term has a negative connotation in the Orthodox culture. Sveshnikov scornfully notes that the ways of willfulness are revealed "everywhere where there is the word 'I will'."<sup>16</sup> According to him, "The principle 'I will' is one of the dominant principles of sinful existence."<sup>17</sup>

Orthodox believers have one deeply rooted custom: the mistrustful attitude to personal initiative. Enthusiasm appears not to be an absolutely positive value, but rather a suspicious one, when it is associated with natural will distorted by sin—and so not to be encouraged.

This principle influences not only parish life, but also in Church-laic organizations. Employees, such as monks and sisters, find their zest and resourcefulness undermined by the Church authorities. These qualities, even if they remain, are suppressed, reducing individuals' capacity for work, creative potential and opportunities for self-realization. The social philosopher Erich Fromm believed that principle of "I will" is a prerequisite for a person to realize his or her abilities and ideas. Rejecting this principle, declaring it "sinful" as ecclesiastic ascetics do, is in Fromm's words, an "escape from freedom."<sup>18</sup>

### The Concept of Obedience

For the ecclesiastic social culture obedience means voluntary spiritual subordination to someone in the Church with years of spiritual experience. Obedience is offered to the Church-group actors as the best medicine for healing the human will. "The will distorted by the sin recovers through obedience best of all," Sveshnikov says in the handbook. "The obedience accepted cordially totally eliminates the principle 'I will'."<sup>19</sup>

The concept of obedience began in ancient monasticism. Originally obedience simply described correlating an individual human will with God's will, to bring the person to salvation. However, in the monasteries a concrete practice developed to bring this about. This practice required a complete subjugation of the spiritual disciple's will to that of his teacher, usually an elder priest-monk. The novice monk expressed his readiness to follow the elder's orders for all his life. He made a vow to abandon his own will; that is, a "vow of obedience." This has become the main vow of monasticism.

The institution of obedience became bound with romanticized ideas of eldership and practices of confession-ship in monasteries at the beginning of the Byzantine Empire. Some revival of the institution of obedience occurred in nineteenth-century Russia.

Fyodor Dostoevsky in *The Brothers Karamazov* discusses obedience, rejection of self-will and eldership:

An elder was one who took your soul, your will, into his soul and his will. When you choose an elder, you renounce your own will and yield it to him in complete submission, complete self-abnegation. This novitiate, this terrible school of abnegation, is undertaken voluntarily, in the hope of self-conquest, of self-mastery, in order, after a life of obedience, to attain perfect freedom, that is, from self; to escape the lot of those who have lived their whole life without finding their true selves in themselves.<sup>20</sup>

Dostoevsky emphasizes that obedience is connected with "the power sometimes boundless and incomprehensible" and points to a tradition in Orthodoxy that any order given by an elder within the framework of obedience, cannot be canceled ("be discharged" in Church language) by any higher hierarchical person. In modern Church life it is possible to find similar examples of obedience. Among the interviews we conducted with Orthodox laypeople in 2000–2004 and later, Orthodox followers shared stories about performing orders from their confessors similar to Dostoevsky's. In particular, such traditions are followed by some priest-confessors from the Trinity-Sergiy Lavra. (Obedience is not accepted officially, and Patriarch Kirill, when he was a metropolitan, criticized this custom as well as other manifestations of eldership in his eparchy.)<sup>21</sup>

The practice of obedience is part of the mystical attitude toward spiritual fathers in Russia. It reflects an individual's longing to find someone to free him from the burden of life's choices.<sup>22</sup> In real-life practice, obedience frees one from (or lessens) one's responsibility for one's acts by shifting them onto someone else. It also means accepting that the consequences depend mainly on help "from above." Lay analysts, and some ecclesiastic analysts, like Georgy Mitrofanof, acknowledge this. According to professor and archpriest Mitrofanof, a distinctive infantile interpretation of obedience is aggravated by the developing elision of "Soviet" into "ecclesiastic": "Soviet collectivism, unchanged, set itself comfortably in the ecclesiastic life under the title of 'conciliarism'; social and civic passivity becomes 'humility,' irresponsibility turning into 'obedience'"<sup>23</sup>

### Hierarchy as the Major Element of Identity

Within Church society, hierarchic subordination has a serious, even sacred, meaning, and many Church activities demonstrate it. For example, there are proper rules for meeting hierarchs, not only during the Church services but also during administrative events, when the participating clergymen demonstrate their standing in the ecclesiastic hierarchy. Moreover, this is understood as a prerequisite of future advancement up the hierarchy.

Structurally, the institution of the clergy is somewhat like the army, in that it is divided into three basic hierarchic levels or degrees of priesthood: the first is diaconry, the second presbytery and the third episcopate. These degrees of priesthood in turn are divided into dignities. There are also gradations within a dignity according to length of service, awards and divine service powers.

Hierarchy determines many forms of interrelations between people in the Church. The formation of the Church hierarchy itself, elevation to the holy rank, and assignment of priests to locales also occurs within the framework of vertical relations. For example, a particular community does not determine which priest is appointed to its parish. The appointment comes from "the top," at the disposal of the eparch (the diocesan). The elevation to the initial dignity can in many respects depend on the candidate's wishes, but it is made by ecclesiastical superiors. The same process happens at almost any rung of the ladder.

The hierarchy also leaves a notable mark on business relations within the Church. As the priest Georgy Krylov notes, the rigid subordination in the modern Church tries to imitate the medieval practice of hierarchic collateral subordination and the practice of obedience mentioned above, as though finding justification in this practice.<sup>24</sup> That is, "obedience" for the ecclesiastic culture is also a mechanism to ensure hierarchy in its sacred

meaning. Relations within the Church are characterized by a low degree of confidence both between actors standing at various stages of hierarchy, and those who are hierarchically equal. One may state that there is certain isolation and mistrust between different groups of hierarchy and between clergy and laity in Russian Orthodoxy.

### The Blessing

The most important mechanism reinforcing the existence of hierarchy is the "blessing"—an act in which a person of the highest rank inside the hierarchy symbolically appeals for help for a certain actor in God's name ("divine grace" in the ecclesiastic terms). But in contemporary practice the blessing serves to designate subordination between actors and replaces a handshake at moments of meeting and parting. According to ecclesiastic ethics, in such moments two ecclesiastic actors in the presence of a priest ought to come for the blessing of the highest-ranking priest at the event. A priest comes for the blessing to an archimandrite, an archimandrite comes to a bishop, a bishop to an archbishop, a higher bishop to a metropolitan, and he to the patriarch. Thus, not only the special mystical power of the priesthood is recognized, but also the subordination of various ranks is acknowledged.

But the blessing offers a sanction for certain deeds as well. Various instructions and demands of hierarchic persons designed to regulate functioning inside ecclesiastic organizations are given in the form of the blessing. From the Church's point of view, everything done with a blessing is good, and something done without it can be interpreted as questionable.<sup>25</sup>

A blessing serves as an ideological checkpoint, indicating that a certain act conforms with the principles of the Church. This is especially clear in the humanitarian field: for instance, nowadays confessors influence experts of Russian research foundations, including how they deal with a given project. Some years ago I conducted an interview with an expert at a Russian research foundation, who in some cases gave reviews to research projects according to the blessing of her confessor. "I should tell the truth," she confided, "that we have no time to read applications attentively . . . In complicated cases, if religious issues are touched on, I take consultations from my confessor sometimes. Recently, I asked advice of my spiritual father whether to support one research project or not, and he told me that I shouldn't, and I gave it a negative review."<sup>26</sup>

The researcher K. Russele interprets the practice as a "keeping of Soviet methods of socialization." She notes that the blessing can be a kind of ideological supervision: "Thus, a person is allowed to read good books, but the bad ones are not allowed."<sup>27</sup> The Russian practice of the blessing serves not only as a manifestation of power but at times as a deterrent. In a sense, it replaces open competition.

### Vertical Relations in the Ecclesiastic "Culture of Guilt"

The traditional concept of the depravity of human nature because of original sin has helped to shape a system of relations between actors through the prism of "guilt." It also enforces the hierarchy in the ecclesiastic community. In ecclesiastic ethics, admission of one's "wrongness" is regarded as a necessary aspect of growing up. In *The Essays on the Christian Ethics*, archpriest Vladislav Sveshnikov notes that it is not by chance that a person just entering the "age of reason" is told: "Repent! Even if a person is only seven or eight years old. Repent!—it means, admit your guilt. Guilty means wrong. And so, gradually, half-consciously, a person entering the ways of the rightful life receives an experience of his or her own wrongness."<sup>28</sup>

As believers come of age, they not only retain their feeling of guilt but must acknowledge and feel this guilt even more strongly.

The one who keeps the commandments, comparing his fulfillment of them with the highness and purity of all-saint commandments, constantly admits his fulfillment as extremely insufficient and scanty before God; he sees himself as a person deserving temporary and eternal punishment for his sins, for the non-broken communication with Satan, for his fall common for all human beings, for his own staying in that fall; at the end, for the very insufficient and often wrong fulfillment of the commandments.<sup>29</sup>

This is the indoctrination of guilt, affected at the start of religious indoctrination and kept throughout conscious life. Note that this occurs only if the believer longs to thoroughly fulfill all ecclesiastic obligations, which rarely happens even among observant believers. But it is important to consider the influence of guilt on an actor within the Church.

The admission of guilt has both negative and positive aspects. It can help people to bear life's inevitable troubles and difficulties; it provides a compensatory therapeutic effect because it explains and simplifies the feeling of pain ("woe" in ecclesiastic language). According to Sveshnikov, a Christian is tasked "to adopt and to understand the simple thought that he is necessarily guilty of something, and if he is guilty, he deserves punishment rightfully, so his woes 'serve him right.'"<sup>30</sup> But guilt as status quo leads to pessimism, low self-esteem, and apathy. Sometimes it leads to anesthetization to suffering and even to the feeling of doom and, therefore, to passivity.

The social and cultural attitudes induced by guilt reduce people's possibilities of exercising individual will and creative ambitions. An ecclesiastic actor must admit his a priori, metaphysical guiltiness as an immanent feature. Such inherited guiltiness reduces the person's ability to self-criticize, to analyze whether his or her guilt is real.

### CONCLUSION

In sum, the real problems of modern Russian Orthodoxy are the deficit of trust, poor organizing among the Church actors, and a lack of initiative due to Church administration priorities. These problems are related to another; namely, the absence of a tradition of self-criticism within the Church, which decreases the opportunities to recognize internal problems.

A paradoxical situation exists. Today's Church awakens initiatives among the believers at the same time that it extinguishes them. Church life is sustained in many respects by grassroots self-organization, in particular, parish community organizing. However, beginning with the practice of assigning clergymen "from the top," this self-organization is squelched. Although the Church calls for social projects, when a group gathers to work on any project and their organization develops, church superiors more often than not put this project "into reverse." The Church ceases to bless the initiatives of the organizers, attempting to put everything under its rigid control, therefore discouraging further development.

The problem of trust in the Church is further complicated by how it portrays events in the ecclesiastic mass media. Typically, 50 to 70 percent of the information the diocese releases describes what the diocesan made or did. If, for example, they speak about graduates of an Orthodox school, they do not discuss the dynamics of school life, but describe the role played by the diocesan—mentioning his handing out diplomas or participating in celebrations, usually accompanied by meetings with the bishop.

The problem here is that the real life of the ecclesiastic social medium consists not of festivities and meetings with the bishop, but of everyday labor, and real people attempting to solve real problems. If this life is not accurately portrayed, the illusion of well-being is maintained, which prevents discussions of real problems—about the slipping social initiatives, the deficit of professionalism, human-relations issues, allocation of finances and the like. This then hampers addressing systemic problems such as the lack of self-organization, solidarity, or encouragement of creative initiatives. As a result, the ecclesiastic environment does not have a very positive appeal for young and creatively oriented people. The impossibility of discussing problems in their true form within the Church environment generates mistrust.

Given the current situation, the Church needs to get a clearer view of its cultural and behavioral paradigm, looking beyond corporate settings and cultural stereotypes or at least attempting to profoundly rethink them. This presupposes using mechanisms of self-criticism, which is just what the Church lacks. The theologian and archpriest Alexander Shmeman once noted that historically, Orthodoxy has not a vestige of self-criticism:

The Orthodoxy having been formed as the “true faith”—opposed to heresies, the West, the East, the Turks etc.—is permeated by a complex of self-affirmation, a kind of internal triumphalism grown out of all proportions. To recognize mistakes is to start destroying the foundations of the true belief. The tragedy of the Orthodox history is always seen in the triumph of the external evil: pursuits, the Turkish yoke, treason of the intelligentsia, the Bolshevism. Never in the inside reasons.<sup>31</sup>

If self-criticism and honesty about internal problems are not allowed in the culture of the Russian Orthodox Church, the Patriarch’s organizational innovations may turn out to be nothing more than external “transposition of addends,” with the “sum total” remaining unchanged. Considering that today the Church is expanding its social functions, we may presume that not only its own standing but also Russia’s economic and social situation as a whole depend on the degree of honesty with which the Church can soberly reassess its traditions.

#### NOTES

1. This study uses the data developed in the framework of “The National Research University Higher School of Economics’ Academic Fund Program 2013–2014, Research Grant No. 12-01-0233.”

2. In this context, “the Church” stands for the Russian Orthodox Church of Moscow Patriarchate, the most important and influential religious organization in Russia.

3. “Rech’ Patriarcha Moskovskogo i vseya Rusi Kirilla na tseremonii, posvyashennoy podpisaniyu dogovora o social’nom partnerstve mezhdru Russkoy Pravoslavnoy Tserkov’yu i Ural’skim federal’nym okrugom” [The Speech of the Patriarch of Moscow and All Russia Kirill at the ceremony devoted to signing the social partnership agreement between the Russian Orthodox Church and the Ural Federal Region] // Russian Orthodox church—official web-site of the Moscow Patriarchate. (April 19, 2010—<http://www.patriarchia.ru/db/text/1141705.html>).

4. Doklad Patriarkha Moskovskogo i vseya Rusi Kirilla na Eparchial’nom sobranii g. Moskvy [The Speech of the Patriarch of Moscow and All Russia Kirill at the Moscow city Eparchial Assembly] // Patriarchia.Ru. 23.12.2009. URL: <http://www.patriarchia.ru/db/text/969773.html>.

5. For example, Saint Tikhon’s Orthodox University of Humanities has established a special faculty to train social workers, and two Moscow community centers offer short-term courses for church youth outreach functionaries.

6. Belanovskiy Yuriy. Nastalo vremya i pravoslavnyim pouchit’sya [Orthodox Christians, too, should learn now] // Argumenty i fakty. URL: <http://www.aif.ru/society/article/52724>.

7. Yury Belanovsky, “Vozrozhdeniye sem’yi—obshetserkovnaya zadacha. Razmyshleniya o nashih resursah. (Doklad na XV Mezhdunarodnyh Rozhdestvenskih obrazovatel’nyh chteniyah. Moscow, 2007)” [The revival of the family is the

task of the whole Church. Reflections upon our resources (Paper delivered at the 15th International Christmas Readings on Education)] // Web-Site Patriarshago tsentra duhovnogo razvitiya detey i molodezhi (URL: <http://www.cdrm.ru/project/rch-2007/03.htm>).

8. Kholmogorov E. Netriumfal’nye zametki o triumfal’nom gode [Non-triumphant notes on the triumph year] // Russkiy obozrevatel’. 01.02.2010. URL: <http://www.rus-obr.ru/day-comment/5487>.

9. The doctrine of human nature and will as distorted by “sin” has experienced various interpretations in the history of Christianity, but remained topical until the present day, at least in the Russian ecclesiastical tradition. For more information, see Arkhim. Platon (Igumnov) Pravoslavnoe npravstvennoe bogoslovie [Orthodox moral theology], Prot. Vladislav Sveshnikov Ocherki khristianskoj etiki [Essays on Christian ethics], Ier. Oleg Davydenkov Dogmaticheskoe bogoslovie [Dogmatic theology], Prot. Mikhail Pomazanskiy Dogmaticheskoe bogoslovie [Dogmatic theology]. Platina, California, 1992, svt. Ignatij (Bryanchaninov) Prinoshenie sovremennomu monashestvu [An offering for modern monks], and the writings of Archimandrite Lazara (Abashidze) and Archimandrite Rafail (Karelin)—see the References.

10. Ibidem.

11. Makariy (Bulgakov), archbishop. Pravoslavno-dogmaticheskoe bogoslovie [Orthodox dogmatic theology]. St Petersburg 1868. C. 487. This book remains relevant for the modern Orthodox theology. Today’s catechisms and Orthodox theology handbooks are based on it. For instance, Priest Oleg Davydenkov draws on this book in his methodical writings, such as the three-volume “Dogmatic theology” or the Catechism for the students of the St. Tikhon’s Orthodox University.

12. See: Andrey Kuraev, protodiak. Pravoslavnyim pora pochuvstvovatj’ vkus k kar’ere [It’s time for Orthodox Christians to get a taste for career] // Apologiya klerikalizma. Sbornik statey ob aktual’nyh problemah dialoga Tserkvi, obshestva i gosudarstva (Moscow, 2008), 150–152.

13. For example, a famous Moscow priest Artemy Vladimirov emphasized with a great pathos that “it is very useful for our moral education when we watch how man is being tortured during a death agony.” Vladimirov A., protopriest. A sermon devoted to Assumption Holyday // Radio-broadcast in the program “Radonezh.” 28.08.2005.

14. Davydenkov O. Katehizis. Vvedenie v dogmaticheskoe bogoslovie [Catechism: An Introduction to Dogmatic Theology.] Moskva, Pravoslavnyy Svyato-Tihonovskiy bogoslovskiy institut, 2000. C. 135. According to Sveshnikov, “manifold are the poisonous ‘flowers’ of resistance to the supreme moral truth, for in everyday life there are a number of impure and immoral motions opposing each pure moral one” (p. 34).

15. Sveahnikov VI. Ocherki khristianskoj etiki [Essays on Christian ethics]. M., 2000. P. 196.

16. Ibidem, p. 345.

17. Ibidem, p. 196.

18. Fromm E. Begstvo ot Svobody [Escape from freedom] // Internet-biblioteka “Lib.Ru”—[www.lib.ru/psiho/fromm/fromm02.txt](http://www.lib.ru/psiho/fromm/fromm02.txt) (retrieved on 04.08.2012).

19. Sveahnikov VI., protopriest. Ocherki khristianskoj etiki [Essays on Christian ethics]. M., 2000. P.196.

20. *Dostoyevskiy F.M. Brat'ya Karamazovy* [The Brothers Karamazov]. Sobr. soch. T. IX. Leningrad, 1991. P. 32. Here quoted after *Fyodor Dostoyevskiy* The Brothers Karamazov, translated by Constance Garnett. URL: [http://www.online-literature.com/dostoyevsky/brothers\\_karamazov/5/](http://www.online-literature.com/dostoyevsky/brothers_karamazov/5/).
21. Conducting interviews between 2000 and 2004, I have recorded autobiographic accounts of Orthodox Christian laymen and even members of the clergy reporting cases of having to fulfill quite extravagant mandates of their spiritual fathers, e.g., to refrain from eating apples for one month (as a way to abstain from pleasure). One case is particularly interesting: an "obedient" had to abstain from eating bread for life, because his confessor who had imposed this restraint on him suddenly died without releasing him of it. The man decided never to take bread lest he should disobey the wish of his confessor.
22. *Petr (Mesherinov), hegumen. Dukhovnichestvo: oshibochnoye vospriyatiye* [Ghostly fatherhood: a misperception] // *Kievskaya Rus'*. URL: <http://www.kiev-Orthodox.org/site/spiritual/892/>.
23. *Petr (Mesherinov), hegumen. Sovremennoe tserkovnoe soznanie i svetskie ideologemy iz kommunisticheskogo proshlogo* [Modern ecclesiastical consciousness and secular ideological legacy of the communist past] // *Pravoslavnaia tserkov' pri novom patriarhe / pod red. A.Malashenko, S.Filatova. Moscow, ROSSPEN, P. 133.*
24. *Krylov.G. O korporativnosti v Tserkvi (vzglyad s pozitsiiprikhodskogo svyashennika)* [About corporationism in Church (from the point of view of parochial priest)] // *Bogoslov.Ru. 10.05.2011* (URL: <http://www.bogoslov.ru/text/1667366.html>).
25. See: *Knorre B. Sotsial'noye sluzheniye sovremennoy Russkoy Pravoslavnoy Tserkvi Moskovskogo Patriarkhata kak otrazheniye povedencheskikh stereotipov tserkovnogo sotsiuma* [Social service in the Russian Orthodox Church today as a reflection of behavioral stereotypes of Church society] // *Pravoslavnaia Tserkov' pri Novom Patriarke* [Orthodox Church Under Patriarch Kirill]. M., 2012. Pp. 95–99.
26. Author's fieldwork materials. The interview 18.03.2007. See in more details: *Knorre B. Sotsial'noye sluzheniye sovremennoy Russkoy Pravoslavnoy Tserkvi Moskovskogo Patriarkhata kak otrazheniye povedencheskikh stereotipov tserkovnogo sotsiuma* [Social service in the Russian Orthodox Church today as a reflection of behavioral stereotypes of Church society] // *Pravoslavnaia Tserkov' pri Novom Patriarke* [Orthodox Church Under Patriarch Kirill]. M., 2012. P. 96.
27. *Russele K. (2011). Grammatika tserkovno-prikhodskoy kul'tury* [Grammatics of Church-parishional culture] // *Prikhod i obshina v russkom pravoslavii: kornevaya sistema rossiyskoy religioznosti* [Parish and community in contemporary orthodoxy: root-system of russian religiosity]. M., 2011. P. 307.
28. *Sveshnikov V. Ocherki khristianskoy aetiki* [Essays of Christian ethics]. M., 2000. Pp. 179–180.
29. *Ignatij (Bryanchaninov), ep. Prinosheniye sovremennomu monashestvu* [Income to contemporary monasticism] // *Ignatij (Bryanchaninov), ep. Sobranie sochineniy. T. 4. M., 1995. P. 46.*
30. *Ibidem. P. 180.*
31. *Shmeman A., prot. Dnevnik, 1973–1983 rr.* [Diaries of 1973–1983]. M., 2005. P. 107.

## REFERENCES

- Aristarkh (Lohanov), ierom. Chto nado znat' o tserkovnom etikete* [What one should know about the church etiquette]. Murmansk, 1999.
- Belanovskiy Yu.S. Vozrozhdenie sem'i—obshchetserkovnaya zadacha. Razmyshleniya o nashih resursah—iz doklada na "XV Mezhdunarodnyh Rozhdestvenskikh obrazovatel'nyh chteniyah."* 2007 [The revival of the family is the task of the whole Church. Reflections upon our resources (Paper delivered at the 15th International Christmas Readings on Education)].
- Belanovskiy Yu. Eshche o rastserkovlenii. Kogo vinit' i chto delat' (kommentarii k zapisi v Zhivom zhurnale)* [More on leaving church: who is to blame and what is to be done (a comment on a Livejournal entry)] // *Dnevnik v Zhivom zhurnale. 24.11.2010—http://belanovskiy.livejournal.com/419143.html.*
- Billington Dzh. Ikona i topor* [The icon and the axe]. M., 2001.
- Bremon d'Ars N. Religioznye praktiki vo Francii i ih izuchenie: podhody i metody* [Approaches to studying religious practices in France] // *Religioznye praktiki v sovremennoy Rossii* (red. A. Agadzhanian, K. Russele), M., 2006, s. 33–51.
- Davydenkov O., ierey. Dogmaticheskoe bogoslovie. Kurs lekciy (v 3 chastyah)* [Dogmatic theology. Lectures]. M., 1997.
- Davydenkov O. Katekhizis. Vvedenie v dogmaticheskoe bogoslovie. [Catechism: An Introduction to Dogmatic Theology.]* M., Pravoslavniy Svyato-Tihonovskiy bogoslovskiy institut, 2000.
- Dostoyevskiy F.M. Brat'ya Karamazovy* [The Brothers Karamazov]. Leningrad, 1991. T. IX
- Zabaev I. Osnovnye kategorii hozyaystvennoy etiki sovremennoy russkogo pravoslaviya* [The main concepts of modern Russian Orthodox Christian economic ethics] // *Sotsial'naya real'nost'. 2007, no 9. S. 5–26.*
- Ignatij (Bryanchaninov), ep. Prinosheniye sovremennomu monashestvu* [An offering for modern monks] // *Ignatij (Bryanchaninov), ep. Sobranie sochineniy. T. 4. M., 1995.*
- Ioann (Krest'yankin), arkhim. Opyt postroeniya ispovedi* [An essay on conducting confessions]. M., 1997.
- Kirill (Gundyayev), Patriarkh Moskovskiy i vseya Rusi. Slovo Svyateyshego Patriarkha Moskovskogo i vseya Rusi Kirilla na ceremonii podpisaniya soglasheniya o social'nom partnerstve mezhdru Russkoy Pravoslavnoy Tserkov'yu i Ural'skim federal'nym okrugom* [The Speech of the Patriarch of Moscow and All Russia Kirill at the ceremony devoted to signing the social partnership agreement between the Russian Orthodox Church and the Ural Federal Region] // *Russkaya pravoslavnaia tserkov'—oficial'niy sayt Moskovskogo Patriarkhata. 19 aprelya 2010 g. 17:05—http://www.patriarchia.ru/db/text/1141705.html*
- Kirill (Gundyayev), Patriarkh Moskovskiy i vseya Rusi. Doklad na Eparkhial'nom sobranii g. Moskvy* [The Speech of the Patriarch of Moscow and All Russia Kirill at the Moscow city Eparchial Assembly] // *Ibidem. 23 december 2009—http://www.patriarchia.ru/db/text/969773.html;*
- Knorre B.K. Social'noye sluzheniye sovremennoy Russkoy pravoslavnoy tserkvi Moskovskogo patriarkhata kak otrazhenie povedencheskikh stereotipov tserkovnogo sotsiuma* [The social work of the modern Russian Orthodox

- Church of the Moscow Patriarchate as a reflection of stereotypic behavior patterns of the ecclesiastical community] // *Pravoslavnaia tserkov' pri novom Patriarkhe*. M., 2011. C. 69–121.
- Krest chinovnika [The public servant's cross] // *Rossiyskaya gazeta*. 04.02.2011—Federal'nyi vypusk no 5399 (23) (<http://www.rg.ru/2011/02/04/filipp.html>);
- Krylov G. O korporativnosti v Tserkvi (vzglyad s pozitsii prihodskogo svyashchennika) [On corporativity in the Church—from a parish priest's point of view] // *Bogolov.Ru*. 10.05.2011 (<http://www.bogolov.ru/text/1667366.html>)
- Kuraev A., *protodiak*. Krepostnoe pravo ot vladyki Evlogiya [Archbishop Eulogius' version of serfdom] // *Dnevnik v Zhivom zhurnale*. 08.10.2009—<http://diak-kuraev.livejournal.com/38624.html>.
- Kuraev A., *protodiak*. Pravoslavnyim pora pochuvstvovat' vkus k kar'ere [It's time for Orthodox Christians to get a taste for career] // *Apologiya klerikalizma*. Sbornik statey ob aktual'nyh problemah dialoga Tserkvi, obshchestva i gosudarstva. M., 2008.
- Lazar' (Abashidze), *arkhim*. Muchenie lyubvi [The love torment]. Saratov, 2005.
- Lazar' (Abashidze), *arkhim*. Grekh i pokayanie poslednikh vremen [The sin and repentance of the time of the end] // *Pravoslavie i sovremennost'*. elektronnyaya biblioteka—<http://lib.eparkhia-saratov.ru/books/111/lazar/sin/3.html>;
- Lebedeva N.M., Chirkov V.I., Tatarko A.N. Kul'tura i otnoshenie k zdorov'yu: Rossiya, Kanada, Kitay [Culture and attitudes towards health: Russia, China, Canada]. M., 2007.
- Makariy (Bulgakov), *arkhiiep*. Pravoslavno-dogmaticheskoe bogoslovie [Orthodox dogmatic theology]. SPb., 1868.
- Neposredstvennye voprosy (Materialy nekommercheskoy sluzhby "Sreda") [Immediate Questions (Proceedings of the Sreda Non-Profit Agency)]. Vyp. 1. M., 2011.
- Nravstvennyye osnovy modernizatsii. (Golos Rossii. Programma Vera i mir. Radioperedacha. 22.02.2010) [The moral foundations of modernization] // *Interfaks-religiya*. 22.02.2010—<http://www.interfax-religion.ru/?act=audio&div=39>.
- Osnovy ucheniya Russkoy Pravoslavnoy Tserkvi o dostoinstve, svobode i pravah cheloveka [The foundations of the Russian Orthodox Church's doctrine of human dignity, freedom and rights] // *Russkaya pravoslavnaia tserkov'*. Oficial'nyi sayt Moskovskogo patriarkhata. 26.06.2008—<http://www.patriarchia.ru/db/text/428616.html>.
- Pashkovskiy V.Ye. Psikhicheskie rasstroystva s religiozno-misticheskimi perezhivaniyami: Kratkoe rukovodstvo dlya vrachey. [Mental disorders accompanied by mystical religious experience. A short handbook for physicians] SPb., 2006.
- Pestov N.E. O pokayanii [On repentance] // *Pravoslavie i mir*. 31.03.2009—[http://www.pravmir.ru/article\\_3974.html](http://www.pravmir.ru/article_3974.html).
- Petr (Meshcherinov), *igum*. Dukhovnichestvo: oshibochnoe vospriyatie [Ghostly fatherhood: a misperception] // *Kievskaya Rus'*—<http://www.kiev-Orthodox.org/site/spiritual/892/>
- Petr (Meshcherinov), *igum*. Muchenie lyubvi ili . . . (Razmyshleniya nad knigoy arkhimandrita Lazarya (Abashidze) "Muchenie lyubvi") [Love torment or . . . Reflections on archimandrite Lazar (Abashidze)'s book 'The love torment'] // *Kievskaya Rus'*—<http://kiev-Orthodox.org/site/churchlife/1262/>.

- Petr (Meshcherinov), *igum*. Problemy votserkovleniya [Churching issues] // *Sayt Patriarshego centra duhovnogo razvitiya detey i molodezhi pri Svyato-Danilovom monastyre*—[www.cdrm.ru/proyekt/29-11-07/ig-petr.htm](http://www.cdrm.ru/proyekt/29-11-07/ig-petr.htm).
- Petr (Meshcherinov). Sovremennoe tserkovnoe soznanie i svetskie ideologemy iz kommunicheskogo proshlogo [Modern ecclesiastical consciousness and secular ideological legacy of the communist past] // *Pravoslavnaia tserkov' pri novom patriarkhe / pod red. A.Malashenko, S.Filatova*. M., ROSSPEN, 2012. P. 133.
- Pomazanskiy M., *prot*. Dogmaticheskoe bogoslovie [Dogmatic theology]. Platina, California, 1992.
- Pravoslavnaia tserkov' i modernizatsiya Rossii: vyzovy XXI veka. Kruglii stol v Fonde Liberal'naya Rossiya [The Orthodox Church and the modernization of Russia: the challenges of the 21st century. Roundtable at Liberal Russia Foundation] // *Fond Liberal'naya missiya*. 04.03.2010—<http://www.liberal.ru/articles/4603>
- Rozanov V. Metafizika khristianstva. Temnyy lik [The metaphysics of Christianity. The Dark Face] // *Elektronnye izdaniya proizvedeniya i biograficheskikh i kriticheskikh materialov* <http://www.magister.msk.ru/library/philos/rozanov/rozav020.htm>
- Roman (Matyushin), *ierom*. Eto znayut vse navernyaka [Everybody knows that for sure] // *Pesni russkogo voskreseniya* <http://pesni.voskres.ru/poems/proma221.htm>.
- Sveshnikov V.I., *prot*. Ocherki khristianskoy etiki [Essays on Christian ethics]. M., 2000.
- Snegovaya M. Socio-ekonomicheskie i politicheskie predpochteniya konfessional'nykh grupp: pravoslavnye khristiane i katoliki na primere Ukrainy. Dissertatsiya na soiskanie nauchnoy stepeni kandidata ekonomicheskikh nauk [Socioeconomic and political preferences of religious denominations: Orthodox Christians and Catholics in Ukraine. Ph.D. thesis]. Moskva, NIU-VShYe, 2011.
- Uminskiy A., *prot*. Umiray ezhdnevno, chtoby zhit' vechno [Die every day so as to live forever] // *Tat'yanin Den'*. 09.12.2008—<http://www.taday.ru/text/151073.html>
- Filatov S. Tantsuyushchee pravoslavie. Vologodskiy opyt [The dancing Orthodoxy. The Vologda experience] // *Russian Revieshch*. 2009, fevral' (no 37)—[http://www.keston.org.uk/\\_russianrevieshch/edition37/01-dancing-orthodoxy--filatov.html](http://www.keston.org.uk/_russianrevieshch/edition37/01-dancing-orthodoxy--filatov.html)
- Fromm E. Begstvo ot svobody [Escape from freedom] // *Internet-biblioteka "Lib. Ru"*—[www.lib.ru/psih/fromm/fromm02.txt](http://www.lib.ru/psih/fromm/fromm02.txt) (dostup—04.08.2012).
- Kholmogorov E. Netriumfal'nye zametki o triumfal'nom gode [Non-triumphant notes on a triumph year] // *Russkiy obozrevatel'*. 01.02.2010—<http://www.russ-obr.ru/day-comment/5487>
- Kholmogorova N. Confessiones (otkroveniye o lichnom tserkovnom opyte) [Confessiones. (Revelations concerning personal ecclesiastical experience)] // *Dnevnik v zhivom zhurnale 'Kal'ma-Kari'*. 08.09.2007—<http://nataly-hill.livejournal.com/?skip=10&tag=confessiones>.
- Shatov A. Kak dobrovol'cam izbezhat' professional'nogo vygoraniya [How volunteers can avoid professional burnout] // *Miloserdie.Ru*—<http://www.miloserdie.ru/index.php?ss=1&ts=78&id=10402>.

- Shmeman A., prot.* Dnevnik. 1973–1983 [Diaries of 1973–1983]. M., 2005.  
 Ya huzhe vseh. I eto horosho? [I am the worst. Is it good?] // Neskuchnyi sad. 2009, №3 (Online version: <http://www.taday.ru/text/207122.html>).
- Bellah R. et al., eds.*, *Habits of the Heart: Individualism and Commitment in American Life*, Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1996.
- Davie G.* *The Sociology of Religion*, London: Sage, 2007.
- Luckmann T.* *The Invisible Religion: The Problem of Religion in Modern Society*, New York: Macmillan, 1967.
- Robinson J. A. T.* *Honest to God*. L., 1963.
- Scott M. Kenworthy.* *To Save the World or to Renounce It: Modes of Moral Action in Russian Orthodoxy* // *Religion, Community, and Morality after Communism* / ed. by Mark Steinberg and Catherine Wanner. (Washington, DC: Woodrow Wilson Center Press and Bloomington IN: Indiana University Press, 2008), pp. 21–54.

11

+

## Religious Affiliation and Individual Economic and Political Attitudes in Ukraine

Maria Snegovaya

### INTRODUCTION

The relationship between religion and economic development has been a long-standing topic in social sciences research (Hegel, Weber, Braudel, Robertson, and Samuelsson, Inglehart to name a few). Scholars have argued that some aspects of Christianity have huge potential for encouraging social and economic development, mainly in the theoretical sense. Unlike other social sciences, economic literature has not paid much attention to the impact of the religious factor on economic and political development of societies until recently. However, today there is a growing empirical literature to investigate the causal relationship between religion and economic development: Barro and McCleary (2003), Guiso et al. (2003), Basten and Betz (2009), Radek and Filipova (2009) et al. But the findings are rather contradictory and counterintuitive. One particular problem is that researchers usually frame the issue in terms of statistical work, rather than taking an interdisciplinary approach that would include historic, sociologic, socio-psychological, and theological sciences. A further problem is the paucity of research on Eastern Orthodox denominations in this context. One reason for this neglect may be the lack of sufficient data on Orthodoxy both across nations, as well as within single countries and among individuals.