

G. Alpyspaeva* , H. Aubakirova 

Saken Seifullin Kazakh Agrotechnical Research University, Astana, Kazakhstan

*e-mail: galpyspaeva@mail.ru

“STAND UP FOR THE FAITH, FOR CHRIST”: ORTHODOX CHRISTIANS OF KAZAKHSTAN AND THE RENOVATIONIST SCHISM IN THE RUSSIAN ORTHODOX CHURCH (1920-1940S)

The article is devoted to the study of the history of the struggle of the Orthodox in Kazakhstan for the objects of worship in the 1920-1940s during the period of renewal schism in the Russian Orthodox Church (ROC). The methodological basis of the work is the civilizational approach, the principle of historicism, the authors use a complex of general scientific and special historical methods of research. As sources, the normative documents on state-church relations and the materials of the business of local authorities and management were used. Documents from the regional archives of the Republic of Kazakhstan are analyzed. The task of the study is to study and identify the regional features of the renewal movement in Kazakhstan in the first decades of Soviet power and the position of ordinary believers in the years of the split. The Orthodox confession was one of the numerous in the republic, occupying the second place after Islam. The schismatic movement in the Russian Orthodox Church reached the regions of Kazakhstan and manifested itself in the confrontation between the “tikhonovists” and the “renewalists”. This struggle was most acute in the cities of Kazakhstan, where the church clergy switched to the side of the Renovationists. In the provinces and districts of the republic, the renewal did not find wide support among the Orthodox population. Most of the common people remained loyal to the ideas of Patriarch Tikhon. Archival sources testify to the political component of the schism and the formal support of the “renewalists” by local Soviet authorities in the 1920s. But in the 1930s, the anti-religious policy of the Soviet state led to the closure of religious sites, regardless of the communities’ affiliation with any particular direction of the Renovationalist schism.

Key words: Church Schism, Soviet power, Kazakhstan, religious communities, archival sources.

Ғ. Алпыспаева*, Х. Аубакирова

С. Сейфуллин атындағы Қазақ агротехникалық зерттеу университеті, Астана, Қазақстан

*e-mail: galpyspaeva@mail.ru

«Сенім үшін, Христос үшін тұр»: Қазақстанның православиелік христиандары және Орыс православие шіркеуіндегі жаңартуға бағытталған қозғалысы (1920-1940 жж.)

Мақалада 1920-1940 жылдардағы діни ғимараттар үшін православие сенімі өкілдерінің күрес тарихындағы өзекті тақырыптардың бірі қарастырылған. Авторлар әртүрлі зерттеу әдістерін қолданады. Оларға өркениеттік тәсіл, тарихизм принципі, жалпы ғылыми және арнайы зерттеу әдістерінің кешені жатады. Діни қатынастар жөніндегі нормативтік құжаттар мен жергілікті өзін-өзі басқару органдарының іс жүргізу материалдары осы тақырыпты ашудың қайнар көзі болды. Қазақстан Республикасының Өңірлік мұрағаттарынан алынған құжаттарға көп көңіл бөлінді. Кеңес өкіметі орнаған кездегі жаңару қозғалысының аймақтық ерекшеліктерін анықтау және зерттеу және қарапайым сенушілердің көзқарасы зерттеудің маңызды міндеттерінің біріне айналды. Исламнан кейін республикада екінші орын православие дініне тиесілі. Қазақстандағы Орыс Православие шіркеуіндегі раскольников қозғалысы “тихоновцев” пен “новопленцев” арасындағы қақтығыста пайда болды. Нәтижесінде православиенің діни қауымдастықтары екі лагерге бөлінді, олардың арасында шіркеу нысандары үшін өткір күрес болды. Бұл қайшылықтар әсіресе шіркеу дінбасылары жаңарушылардың жағына өткен Қазақстан қалаларында айқын көрінді. Сонымен бірге православиелік православие халқы жаңа ұсыныстарды қолдамады. Қарапайым сенушілердің көпшілігі Патриарх Тихонның идеяларын сақтауды жөн көрді. Мұрағат дереккөздері жергілікті өзін-өзі басқарудың саяси ықпалын және “жаңартушыларға” көрінетін қолдауды растайды. Алайда, кеңес өкіметінің дінге қарсы саясатының нәтижесінде 1930 жылдары көптеген діни нысандар жабылды.

Түйін сөздер: шіркеудің ыдырауы, Кеңес өкіметі, Қазақстан, діни бірлестіктер, мұрағат деректері.

Г. Алпыспаева*, Х. Аубакирова

Казахский агротехнический исследовательский университет им. С. Сейфуллина, Астана, Казахстан

*e-mail: galpyspaeva@mail.ru

«Постоять за веру, за Христа»: православные Казахстана и обновленческий раскол в Русской Православной Церкви (1920-1940-е гг.)

Статья посвящена изучению истории борьбы православных Казахстана за объекты культа в 1920-1940-е годы в период являющийся цивилизационный подход, принцип историзма, авторы применяют комплекс общенаучных и специальных исторических методов исследования. В качестве источников использованы нормативные документы по государственно-церковным отношениям и материалы делопроизводства местных органов власти и управления. Анализируются документы из фондов региональных архивов Республики Казахстан. Задача исследования – изучить и выявить региональные особенности обновленческого движения в Казахстане в первые десятилетия Советской власти и позицию рядовых верующих в годы раскола. Православная конфессия была одной из многочисленных в республике, занимая второе место после ислама. Раскольническое движение в Русской Православной Церкви достигло регионов Казахстана и проявилось в противостоянии «тихоновцев» и «обновленцев». В Казахстане православные религиозные общины разделились на сторонников и противников обновленчества, между верующими шла непримиримая борьба за объекты культа. Наиболее острой эта борьба была в городах Казахстана, где церковное духовенство переходило на сторону обновленцев. В волостях и уездах республики обновленчество не находило широкой поддержки у православного населения. Большинство рядовых верующих оставались верны идеям Патриарха Тихона. Временные переходы на сторону обновленцев были связаны с передачей им объектов культа. Архивные источники свидетельствуют о политической составляющей раскола и формальной поддержке «обновленцев» местными советскими органами власти в 1920-е годы. Но в 1930-е годы антирелигиозная политика советского государства привела к закрытию объектов религиозного культа, независимо от принадлежности общин к какому либо направлению обновленческого раскола.

Ключевые слова: церковный раскол, советская власть, Казахстан, религиозные общины, архивные источники.

Introduction

The history of the post-revolutionary renovation movement in the Russian Orthodox Church (ROC) is a current discourse on the topic of state-church relations in the first decades of Soviet power. In the 1920s and 1930s, the Kazakh Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic (KazASSR) was the part of the USSR as the part of the RSFSR. The post-revolutionary Renovatianist split in the country also affected the regions of Kazakhstan. During the period under review, the Orthodox confession in the republic was quite numerous and ranked second after Islam in terms of the number of believers.

The growth in the number of Orthodox Christians in the region occurred at the beginning of the 20th century due to the autocracy's resettlement policy. The most noticeable increase was observed in the Steppe regions of the Kazakh Territory. In the Semipalatinsk region, Orthodox believers made up 20.69% of the region's population (Obzor Semipalatinskoi oblastiza 1911 g., 1913: 110). In the Turgai region in 1915, the proportion of Orthodox Christians made up 36.02%; in the region, there were 88 parish churches, 99 chapels and prayer houses (ReviObzorTurgaiskoioblastiza 1915 g., 1916: 9). In

1911, 831,899 people professing Orthodoxy lived in the Akmola region, which constituted 57.6% of the total population of the region (Alpyspaeva et al., 2022: 977), and in 1915 – 887,903 people (Obzor Akmolinskoi oblasti za 1915 g., 1917: 87).

At the beginning of the 20th century, the Orthodox living on the territory of Kazakhstan were organizationally united in three dioceses of the Russian Orthodox Church: Omsk, Orenburg, and Turkestan. The parishes of the Semirechensky and Syr-Darya regions were part of the Turkestan diocese. The Omsk diocese included Orthodox parishes on the territory of Akmola and Semipalatinsk regions. In the cities of Kazakhstan, Semipalatinsk and Akmola, there were vicariates of the diocese. Parishes in the Ural and Turgai regions were under the jurisdiction of the Orenburg diocese; from 1908 to 1920, it was officially called the Orenburg and Turgai diocese.

Justification of the choice of articles and goals and objectives

The choice of the research topic is determined, firstly, by the relevance and poor study of the topic of the schism in the Russian Orthodox Church in the

first decades of Soviet power, and the need to study its regional aspects. The Orthodox confession in the republic, as noted above, was one of many; the processes occurring within the confession influenced the spiritual state of a certain part of Kazakhstani society.

Secondly, the materials of the Kazakh archives were not used fully as a source base for studying the regional aspects of the schismatic movement in the Russian Orthodox Church in the 1920s-1940s. Meanwhile, the funds of the regional archives of Kazakhstan contained source material in the form of documentation of the office work of local authorities, which were responsible for issues of religious policy of the Soviet government. The range of thematic sources is diverse in character and in its informativeness. For example, the most informative are the reports, reviews and summaries coming from the administrative departments of the district and provincial militia, since the employees of these departments supervised the observance of religious legislation by believers of different denominations. Documents, the authors of which are believers, are also full of information: letters, statements, appeals, complaints. Interesting as sources of texts of agitational materials for carrying out anti-religious propaganda, material of current statistics and other documentary sources.

It is necessary to note that there are difficulties in working with sources. Documents on the designated topics are scattered and not systematized within individual funds, and official statistics are absent. Current statistical materials are contradictory. Any official information about the activities of religious communities, whether statistical or factual, is biased and not always reliable. The collectors of this information were, as a rule, Soviet officials. The reliability of the information they provided depended on the specific purposes of collecting the information. When working with documents, it is also necessary to take into account the fact that secular sources deposited in archival funds are distinguished by a biased attitude towards religion.

In the context of the above mentioned, the purpose of this article is to fill the gap in the study of this aspect of state and church relations in the republic on the basis of a critical analysis of archival sources and to show the regional features of the development of renovationism in Kazakhstan in the 1920-1940s, the attitude towards the schism of the church clergy and flock.

Scientific research methodology

For the scientific study of the problem of the renovationist schism of the Russian Orthodox Church in Kazakhstan, it is very useful to turn to the experience of Russian researchers, in whose works this problem has found objective coverage.

First, it is necessary to note the classic work of the authors A.E. Levitin-Krasnov and V.M. Shavrov on renovationism in the Russian Orthodox Church (Levitin-Krasnov, Shavrov, 1996: 2-25). This considerable work characterizes the fundamental differences between the pre-revolutionary movement for church reform and post-revolutionary renovationism. The contradictory assessment of the activities of the leaders of the post-October renovationism and the characterization of their positions in the schism encourage the study of this controversial period in the history of Orthodoxy. The depth and fundamental nature of the research, the richness of documentary materials allow us to evaluate the work as a valuable source for the scientific study of post-revolutionary renovationism.

The work of V.V. Lobanov is devoted to the study of the issues of the renovationist schism in the Russian Orthodox Church in its dynamics (Lobanov, 2019). The work is remarkable in that it covers the entire period of the schism, from the beginning of the 20th century, when church reformism emerged, until its liquidation in the post-war years. Analyzing the background of the schism, the author substantiates the importance of the Local Council of 1917-1918 in overcoming the church turmoil. The policy of fighting the ROC initiated and managed by the Soviet government is considered as factors and reasons for the success of renovationism in 1922-1923. In general, the range of issues studied by the author allows us to understand the causes, dynamics of development and consequences of the split.

The problem of the relationship between the reformism of the Russian Orthodox Church at the beginning of the 20th century and post-revolutionary renovationism is analyzed by I.V. Vorontsova. The author relies on the narratives of the journal "Soborny Razum" and offers her point of view on the controversial issues: were reformism and post-revolutionary renovationism one single movement, and can we agree that post-revolutionary renovationism is an exclusively political phenomenon (Vorontsova, 2021: 77-109). Having studied the ideology of leftist reformism in the church movement of 1905-1907

and post-revolutionary renovationism, the author summarizes the conclusion about their continuity.

A comprehensive historiographical review of the problem of the church schism of the Russian Orthodox Church can be found in the works of V. V. Lavrinov. The scientific value of the work is that it contains conceptual provisions and theoretical conclusions about the nature and essence of the renovationist schism in the Russian Orthodox Church in the 1920s–1940s. According to the author, there is still a wide range of issues that require scientific understanding in the context of modern theories and new methodological approaches. Among such issues, the author includes the problem of internal contradictions of renovationism and the dynamics of its development, the study of portraits of religious figures whose names are associated with the history of the schism (Lavrinov, 2008:156).

The works of V.B. Zaslavsky and V.Yu. Vorontsov are devoted to the study of the regional aspect of the problem and the development of renovationism in the territory of Kazakhstan. Both authors examine the development of renovationism in the territory of the Turkestan and Tashkent diocese, established in 1872. The diocese was responsible for the Orthodox communities of Central Asia and the southern regions of Kazakhstan.

V.B. Zaslavsky analyzes the development of events and the struggle of Tikhon's supporters against the Renovationalists in the city of Tashkent, by that time the administrative center of the diocese. During the period under review, the seat of the Most Reverend was located here, having been moved from the city of Verny in 1916. The author characterizes the activities of the bishops of the diocese who supported the schism and attempted to seize church governance. He notes that the Commissariat of Internal Affairs of the Turkestan ASSR supported the Turkestan Renovationalists. Based on documentary materials, he shows the interaction of the Renovationalists with the United State Political Administration (USPA) – People's Commissariat of Internal Affairs (PCIA) bodies (Zaslavsky, 2006: 111-125).

V.Yu. Vorontsov (Hieromonk Jacob) examines the circumstances of the Renovationalist schism in the former center of the Tashkent and Turkestan Diocese – in Alma-Ata (formerly called the city of Verny), where the entire diocesan clergy converted to Renovationalism, and the Ascension Cathedral became the center of the movement (Vorontsov, 2019: 97-101). According to the author, despite the schismatic position of the clergy, the flock treated renovationism disapprovingly.

The work of M.M. Larionov (Hieromonk Justin) about the events that took place in Semipalatinsk in the 20-30s of the 20th century (Larionov, 2011) is interesting as well. The work describes in detail the circumstances of the struggle between the Tikhonites and the Renovationalists for religious objects in the city. The author's sympathies are on the side of the Tikhonites, whom he calls Orthodox. According to the Hieromonk, the renovationist churches were abandoned in the late 1920s and were among the first to be closed and destroyed by decision of the city authorities.

Main part

The ideological and administrative struggle against religion in Kazakhstan, as in the country as a whole, began in the first years of Soviet power. The first step in the anti-religious struggle in the regions was the mass renaming of settlements and villages that had religious names. There were quite a few such settlements in Kazakhstan, mostly resettlement villages and settlements in which Orthodox peasant settlers lived. By decision of local executive committees, they were massively “renamed in the revolutionary spirit”. For example, Bogoslovskoye was renamed to Krasnoarmeyskoye, Blagoveshchensky settlement was renamed to Pervomaysky settlement, Voznesensky settlement was renamed to Kommunisticheskoy settlement, Popovskoy settlement was renamed to Krasny, Troitsky settlement to the settlement named after Trotsky, Petropavlovskoy settlement to Komissarsky settlement (CDNI VKO. F. 73. Inv. 1. C. 204. L.12). The authorities explained their decision by citing “increasing cases of residents' appeals.”

The Soviet paradigm of confessional policy that emerged in the 1920s assumed the prospect of the complete destruction of religious institutions. The first steps towards its implementation were the adoption of religious legislation and legal acts that formally declared freedom of conscience, but in fact limited the activities of religious communities of all confessions. They found themselves under the strict control of Soviet state and party bodies. The life of Orthodox communities was further complicated by the aggravation of intra-confessional contradictions, the cause of which was the split of the church into two camps and the struggle between believers. Of course, the split led to a weakening of unity within the confession, weakened the influence of the Orthodox clergy. The state actively supported the schismatic movement in Orthodoxy, used it in its own interests, giving it a political coloring.

In the early 1920s, famine broke out in a number of regions of the country, including Kazakhstan, as a result of the Civil War of 1918-1920 and the economic policies of the Bolsheviks in the first years of Soviet power. Under the pretext of fighting the famine, the state began confiscating church valuables in order to use the proceeds to help the starving population. This action was initiated by the Decree on the confiscation of church valuables, issued by the All-Union Central Executive Committee on February 26, 1922. In cities and villages of the country where there were Orthodox churches and temples, special commissions were created, which included representatives of various government agencies. The task of the commissions was to make an inventory of church property, determine their value and formalize their transfer to state ownership. The highest Soviet authorities understood that this was not an easy task, and therefore local agents of the Soviet government were advised to act strictly in accordance with incoming instructions. It was recommended, "No attacks or violence against believers be allowed and that a strictly thoughtful approach be followed in order to avoid any misunderstandings and protests" (GAAO. F. 118. Inv.1. C. 10. L. 35, 39).

The reaction of believers and the Orthodox clergy to this action by the state was ambiguous and contradictory, since there was no trust in the Soviet government from the first days of its existence. Patriarch Tikhon, the spiritual leader of Orthodox believers, refused to support the calls of the Soviet government and criticized the actions of its representatives. The majority of Orthodox Christians were on Tikhon's side, they were called "Tikhonites". Dissatisfied with Tikhon's position, party officials called his supporters "reactionaries", "princes of the church", thereby emphasizing their attitude towards them. At the same time, part of the Orthodox clergy supported the state policy and called on believers to transfer church valuables to the state fund. They called themselves "renovationists", "progressive", emphasizing their separate position from the "Tikhonites". Thus, a split occurred in the Orthodox Church, dividing believers into two irreconcilable camps. Researchers write: "... the impact of the revolutionary era affected not only the relationship between the church and the state. Within the church itself, among the clergy and believers, a kind of stratification took place, so-called "progressive" tendencies emerged, groups and movements emerged that called for a "revolution in the church," for a radical and comprehensive "renewal" of church life" (Alpyspaeva, 2023: 77-78).

1922-1923 is considered to be the heyday of the renovation movement in the country. Executive committees and executive bureaus for the affairs of the Russian Orthodox Church began to emerge spontaneously on the outskirts of the country. The schism reached the regions of Kazakhstan. The form of its manifestation was the struggle of believers for churches, temples and prayer houses. Each of the parties laid claim to the objects of worship, trying to keep them for themselves. The confrontation between the communities grew every day, as evidenced by the information reports received from the departments of state and political administration, the police and the prosecutor's office. Thus, in the information report No. 5 of the OGPU for the KASSR from March 7, 1924, it was noted: "In the city of Orsk during February there was a church discord between two priests. The believers were divided into two warring camps. The reason for the discord was the uncoordinated use of the parish. The district executive committee eliminated the discord by holding one of the priests accountable" (OGASPI. F. 1. Inv. 114. C. 440. L. 9-10). The disputes between Orthodox believers and the Renovationists were not limited to polemics; there was a real struggle for churches and church property, which sometimes reached the point of assault and beatings of believers.

In the regions, the administrative departments of the police and prosecutor's offices dealt with issues of settling the aggravated relations between the Old Church members and the Renovationists. The reports of officials from these departments and the materials of the court cases between the Tikhonites and the Renovationists contain a lot of information about church confrontation.

Events in the Kazakh Orthodox world developed according to a common scenario. One of the main organizational centers of the Orthodox in Southern Kazakhstan, the Ascension Cathedral, was located in the city of Verny (later Alma-Ata). Bishop of the Verny See L. Skobeev, who permanently resided in Moscow, openly supported the Renovationists and went over to their side, thus transmitting the schism to the local Orthodox communities. Bishop S. Lavyrov, who headed the Verny See after the departure of L. Skobeev, also supported the Renovationists. The victory of the Renovationists and their influence was evidenced by the fact that the first congress of the Renovationist clergy of the Tashkent and Turkestan Diocese was held in the Ascension Cathedral in August 1923 (Vorontsov, 2019: 98).

In Semipalatinsk in July 1922, a struggle broke out between the supporters of Patriarch Tikhon,

represented by the vicar bishop of Semipalatinsk K. Komarovskiy, and the Renovatoinists, whose actions were led by Bishop Nikolai, who had specially arrived from Omsk. The Renovatoinists were supported by local agents of the Soviet government. In order to weaken the influence of the Tikhonites, the authorities resorted to tricks and, under far-fetched pretexts, arrested Bishop Komarovskiy and several other followers of Patriarch Tikhon. The Renovatoinists took advantage of this and began to seize the city's main churches. The city authorities, who decided to hand over the Znamensky Cathedral and the Alexander Nevsky Church in Semipalatinsk to the Renovatoinists, supported them. The Tikhonites resisted the court decision and hid the keys to both buildings. A group of believers from the church council of the Renovatoinist movement appealed to the Semipalatinsk provincial administrative department with a statement against the actions of the leaders of the Tikhonites community, insisting on the confiscation of the keys and their transfer to the Renovatoinists (CDNI VKO. F. 73. Inv. 1. C. 24. L. 24). After the court decision was carried out, the Tikhonites were left with two small churches that could not accommodate the majority of the patriarch's supporters. Therefore, they did not resign themselves to this situation, repeatedly appealed to the authorities with a petition to transfer the cathedral to them and achieved a positive solution to the issue. In the late 1920s, Tikhon's supporters regained the Znamensky Cathedral and the Resurrection Church. The renovatoinists retained the Nikolskaya and Vsekhsvyatskaya churches. Thus, a compromise was reached.

In the city of Pavlodar, in the summer of 1922, the clergy of the two main churches of the city, the Trinity Cathedral and the Resurrection Cemetery Church, went over to the side of the Renovatoinist movement (GAPO. F. 12. Inv. 1. C. 109. L. 85). The buildings of both churches were transferred by decision of the city council to the community of the Renovatoinists, supported by the authorities. Nevertheless, the communities of the Tikhonites, being more numerous, opposed this decision and began a struggle for the return of the religious objects (GAPO. F.12. Inv. 1. C. 74. L.112). The documents of the Pavlodar district police and district prosecutor's office contain information about the development of these events. The struggle between the two communities was of varying success, with supporters of the Renovatoinists repeatedly going over to the side of the Tikhonites. Ultimately, they came to an agreement; Trinity Cathedral was given to the Renovatoinists, and the Resurrection Church was

retained by the Tikhonites. But the Tikhonites, who were significantly more numerous, did not give up their attempts to return the Cathedral. They were able to seize it and drive out the supporters of the Renovatoinists. The latter, in turn, protested the actions of the Tikhonites by filing a complaint with the administrative department of the provincial police. In order to settle the conflict, local agents of the Soviet government decided to transfer the Trinity Cathedral to the Renovatoinists. They proposed to the members of the Tikhonite church council “to transfer the cathedral on the basis of existing legal provisions and the telegraphic order of the head of the provincial administrative department” (GAPO. F.12. Inv. 1. C. 74. L. 85-86).

In response to the authorities' proposal, the Tikhonites convened a meeting of laymen, which was attended by more than three hundred members of the community. At the meeting, a representative of the local clergy, Lugovtsev, informed the believers that the authorities wanted to use the church building for a theater, and he called on the believers to “stand up for the faith, for Christ” (GAPO. F.12. Inv. 1. C. 77. L. 349). The general meeting of the Tikhonites decided: “not to surrender the church, not to obey the demands of the authorities, and to send delegates to the center” (GAPO. F.12. Inv. 1. C. 77. L. 351). In response to this, local authorities forcibly confiscated the cathedral, handed it over to the Renovatoinists, and took into custody the activists and representatives of the church clergy who had organized the meeting.

A similar scenario unfolded in the city of Kostanay, where the Renovatoinists, led by Bishop A. Znamensky and supported by local authorities, seized the Nikolsky Orthodox Cathedral. The cathedral belonged to the Tikhonite community and was used by the laity as an organizational center for their spiritual life. Supporting the Renovatoinists, the local authorities accused Tikhon's supporters of non-payment of taxes and violation of the agreement, which became the formal pretext for the seizure of the cathedral in favor of the Renovatoinists. The Tikhonites' attempts to prove that the charges were fabricated and false were unsuccessful. Clergymen A. Rusanov and N. Rozanov, and the elder N. Soluyanov were arrested for the duration of the conflict so that the community would be left without spiritual leaders (GAKO. F. R-72. Inv. 1. C. 74. L. 16). After the cathedral was handed over to the Renovatoinists, they were released, but time had already been lost.

No less dramatic was the struggle between the Old Churchmen and the Renovatoinists for prayer

houses in the city of Petropavlovsk, where there were 12 religious communities of the Tikhonites direction and six of the Renovatist direction. In the second half of the 1920s, city authorities closed 11 prayer buildings of the Tikhonites and 3 buildings of the Renovatists. A struggle between believers unfolded for the remaining objects of worship. Old Church believers sent a complaint against the authorities' actions with the Kazakh Central Executive Committee. The response from the Kazakh Central Executive Committee was as follows: "Provide a prayer house for the use of the Old Church members of the city of Petropavlovsk." The city authorities made a compromise decision and reported to higher authorities that "the relationship between the Old Church members and the Renovatists of the city of Petropavlovsk and the Station settlement has been regulated" (GASKO. F. 55. Inv. 1. C. 539. L. 50).

The Orthodox in the city of Aktobe had two religious sites at their disposal: the Vladimir Church and the Alexander Nevsky Cathedral. Both objects were transferred to the Renovatists by decision of the Aktobe Provincial Administrative Department in July 1928 (GAAktO. F. 51. Inv. 1. C. 21. L. 17). Nevertheless, in the result of protests by the Tikhonites, in December of the same year, by the decision of the district authorities, the Vladimir Church was returned to the Old Church Tikhonites.

The political nature of the confrontation between the Tikhonites and the Renovatists did take place. This was largely facilitated by the Soviet government, which artificially incited the struggle between the Orthodox communities. It deliberately gave a political coloring to the Renovatist movement, characterizing it as a "movement in the form of a political organization" (GAAO. F. 54. Inv. 1. C. 107. L. 89). The politicization of the schismatic movement was also facilitated by the general atmosphere in the country, the harsh ideological pressure experienced by religious communities not only Orthodox, but also other communities. In the 1920s, almost all spheres of society, the economy, the social sphere, experienced the pressure of the emerging command-administrative system. Religion and the spiritual life of believers were no exception. This explains the instability of Orthodox communities and the transition of believers from one direction to another.

Archival materials support the theory that the church schism in Orthodoxy was beneficial to the Soviet state and was used by it as one of the mechanisms for fighting the Russian Orthodox Church. One instruction that provincial officials sent to cities and towns where Orthodox Christians lived com-

pactly and where unrest due to the schism occurred stated: "It is assumed that the districts will look at everything favorably, let them worry, gather, talk, get scared, the communists should not get involved in this matter. It is necessary to do it in such a way that neither the party nor the Soviet power are involved in this matter (meaning in the split – G.A.). However, at the local level, help the progressives, provide premises, printing houses, etc., and generally listen to every little thing and report it to the province for publish. This issue is very important" (GAAktO. F. 516p. Inv. 1. C. 99. L. 19-19 rev. side). "The conflict among Orthodox believers, supported by the Soviet authorities, was used to weaken the authority and influence of the church on the masses" – scientists believe (Alpyspaeva, 2023: 83). According to the researchers, the creation of an internal crisis in the Orthodox Church by attracting part of the clergy to cooperation was supposed to end in the repressive suppression of the entire church structure and hierarchy (Kiyashko, 2021: 134–149).

Archival sources testify to the centralized management of the schism process. Instructions were sent from Moscow to the regions, including Kazakhstan, indicating how to proceed when confiscating church valuables, against which category of believers the work of local authorities should be directed, and what the real objectives of the campaign to confiscate valuables were. From this regard, it is indicative that the content of the cipher telegram signed by the Secretary of the RCP (b) V.M. Molotov dated March 23, 1922, which was received in the regions in connection with the newspaper campaign that had been launched regarding the confiscation of church valuables. The text of the cipher telegram, the real author of which was L.D. Trotsky, indicated that the campaign was being conducted incorrectly, that it was directed against the clergy in general, and therefore united them, while "the political task of the present moment is not at all that, but the opposite. It is necessary to split the priests, or rather to deepen and sharpen the existing split. In St. Petersburg, in Moscow, and in the provinces many priests agree to the confiscation of valuables, but they are afraid of the higher-ups. Dissatisfaction with the higher-ups, which puts the lower ranks of the clergy in a difficult position in this matter, is very great. We must now proceed from this basic fact in our agitation. ... The task of agitation is now to support these lower classes against the upper classes and to make them understand and feel that the state will not allow the upper classes to terrorize them, since they are striving to ensure the execution of the decrees of the workers and peasants' government. The

political task is to isolate the top brass of the church, to compromise them in the specific issue of helping the starving, and then to show them the harsh hand of the workers' state" (GAAktO. F. 516p. Inv. 1. C. 99. L. 7).

The archival sources and statistical data we have identified do not allow us to reliably establish the number of Tikhonite and Renovationalist communities in Kazakhstan. The reports of officials showed a lack of understanding of the processes taking place, which is why there was often confusion and disarray in the names of communities. In the office documents, Renovationalist communities were often indicated as "religious new formations after the October Revolution" (GAYKO. F. 838. Inv. 4. C. 17. L. 7-8). Researchers believe that, "the political meaning of the schism was clear to many believers, and therefore it was perceived by them as a temporary phenomenon and not so fundamentally important in the ideological sense. For them, it was more important to preserve the community's churches and prayer buildings" (Alpyspaeva, 2023: 78). This explains the frequent transitions of Orthodox communities from one camp to another, depending on which community will retain the cathedral or church (GAPO. F. 12. Inv. 1. C. 74. L. 111-112).

According to statistical data from district executive committees in the northern regions of Kazakhstan, communities of Tikhon's supporters predominated. In the Kokchetav district of the Ak-mola province, according to data for 1927, "religious communities adhered more to the Tikhonite church" "religious communities adhere more to the Tikhonites church" (GAAO. F. 54. Inv. 1. C. 108. L. 238). We find similar information in the reports of officials from the administrative departments of the police of the Ruzayevskaya and Ak-Burlukskaya volosts: "Orthodox religious communities adhere more to the old faith" (GAAO. F. 54. Inv. 1. C. 108. L. 57, 70). In the Voroshilovsky district of the North Kazakhstan region, Orthodox communities of the Tikhonites direction functioned in all populated areas, and in the Petropavlovsky district, out of 15 communities, 8 were adherents of Patriarch Tikhon (GASKO. F. 2376. Inv. 1. C. 1. L. 16-18).

Statistics on the number of closed prayer houses also indirectly indicate the dominance of the Orthodox Tikhonite communities in the northern regions of the republic. For example, in the city of Petropavlovsk in 1931, 16 churches and prayer houses belonging to the Tikhonites and six religious sites of the Renovationalists were registered and later closed (GASKO. F. 2376. Inv. 1. C. 1. L. 37). As it is known, the patronage and support of the renovationalist pro-

gressives by the Bolsheviks was only a temporary phenomenon. However, already by the beginning of the 1930s, all temples, churches and prayer houses were subjected to confiscation and closure, regardless of the direction to which the communities of believers belonged.

The authors' data testify to how the situation developed in the southern regions and whom the majority of believers followed. Researcher V.V. Zaslavsky cites statistical data from the PCIA information department that in Kazalinsk the Renovationalists make up 75%, and "Tikhonovism has no power", in Golodnaya Steppe there are 100% Renovationalists, in Aulie-Ata – 97% (Zaslavsky, 2006: 123). The author notes that the bishops of the Turkestan Church who supported the schism closely cooperated with the USPA-PCIA, thanks to which the renovationalists of Central Asia and Kazakhstan achieved success. It can be assumed that the figures are somewhat exaggerated.

According to V.Yu. Vorontsov, the absolute majority of churches in Kazakhstan and Central Asia belonged to the Renovationalists (Vorontsov, 2019: 98), since decisions on the transfer of churches for use were made by local authorities and, as a rule, in favor of the Renovationalists. However, the Tikhonites laymen fought and often achieved the return of part of the religious buildings to them.

Research results and discussion

Having studied the problem of the development of the Renovationalist schism in the Russian Orthodox Church in Kazakhstan in the 1920s-1940s on the basis of archival sources, the author summarizes the conclusion about the ambiguity of this process in the region. The Orthodox confession was one of the many in the republic after the Muslim one. In the cities and towns of Kazakhstan, there was an irreconcilable struggle between the Orthodox communities of supporters and opponents of renovationalism for objects of worship. Most of the temples and churches in the cities were seized by the Renovationalists with the support of the Soviet government, but in the volosts and districts of the republic, Renovationalism did not find wide support.

One should agree with the point of view of the authors A.E. Levitin-Krasnov and V.M. Shavrov about the dynamic development of the schism and the fundamental differences between the pre-revolutionary movement for church reform and the post-revolutionary renovationalist schism in the Russian Orthodox Church, which, according to the author, was caused by political and ideological rea-

sons, and not by spiritual disagreement (Levitin-Krasnov, Shavrov, 1996). In this sense, the author V.V. Lobanov is right, who considers the policy of fighting against the Russian Orthodox Church, initiated and managed by the Soviet government, to be the main reason and the main factor in the success of the renovationist schism in the 1920s (Lobanov, 2019).

An analysis of the regional aspect of the schism in the Russian Orthodox Church based on materials from Kazakhstan confirms the thesis about the predominance of the political component of the process, which was beneficial, first, to the Soviet government and the state. By transferring objects of Orthodox worship from one hand to another, they ultimately achieved their complete confiscation and subsequent closure. The schism made it much easier for the agents of Soviet power to fight religion.

Conclusion

In conclusion, it is necessary to note that a discursive analysis of archival documents on the development of post-revolutionary renovationism in the Russian Orthodox Church in Kazakhstan gives grounds to assert that events unfolded according to the same scenario as in the country as a whole. The

church schism in the cities of Kazakhstan was accompanied by a confrontation between Tikhonites and Renovationist communities over religious objects and church property. Local Soviet authorities, acting in accordance with instructions “from above,” openly supported the Renovationists, handing over churches and temples to them for use, which caused mass protests by the Tikhonites. Often, local authorities, fearing unrest, made compromise decisions, returning some of the confiscated buildings to the Tikhonites. In the volosts and districts of the republic, Renovationism did not find broad support among the Orthodox population. The majority of believers remained faithful to the ideas of Patriarch Tikhon, and temporary transitions to the side of the Renovationists were connected with the transfer of objects of worship to them. It was important for believers to visit churches and prayer houses, to have the opportunity to perform religious cults.

Acknowledgments

The research was funded by the Committee of Science of the Ministry of Science and Higher Education of the Republic of Kazakhstan (Grant No. AP23486006. “Historical experience of state-confessional relations in Kazakhstan (1940-1990s)”).

References

- Alpyspaeva G., Sametova G., Jumaliyeva L. (2022) The Confessional Dimension of the Resettlement Policy of the Autocracy in the Kazakh Region at the beginning of the 20th century: the Fight against Sectarian Proselytism. *BylyeGody*. 17(2): 975–985.
- Воронцов В. Ю. (2019) Обновленческий раскол в Алма-Ате в 1922-1944 гг. XXIX Ежегодная богословская конференция Православного Свято-Тихоновского гуманитарного университета: материалы. – М.: Изд-во ПСТГУ. – 97-101.
- Воронцова И. В. (2021) Журнал «Соборный разум» как источник по истории обновленчества в 1918 году. *Вестник ПСТГУ. Серия II: История. История Русской Православной Церкви*. 102: 77–109.
- Государственный архив Костанайской области (ГАКО).
- Государственный архив Акмолинской области (ГААО).
- Государственный архив Актюбинской области (ГААктО).
- Государственный архив Павлодарской области (ГАПО).
- Государственный архив Северо-Казахстанской области (ГАСКО).
- Государственный архив Южно-Казахстанской области (ГАЮКО).
- Заславский В. Б. (2006) Пострадавшие за веру православную в Туркестанской епархии // *Вестник ПСТГУ. История. История Русской Православной Церкви*. 3 (20): 111–125.
- Княшко Н. В. (2021) «Враждебные попы не нужны»: эволюция религиозной политики советской власти в 1922 г. в свете деятельности органов ВЧК-ГПУ на Кубани. *Вестник ПСТГУ. Серия II: История. История Русской Православной Церкви*. 99: 134–149.
- Лавринов В. В. (2008) Историография обновленческого движения в Русской Православной Церкви в 1920-1940-ые годы. *Вестник ЧелГУ*. 24: 151-158.
- Ларионов М. М. (2011) Из истории православного Семипалатинска в 20-30-х гг. XX века. Обновленческий раскол. URL: [https://vko-eparhia.kz/eparhiya/history/150-from-the-history-\(дата обращения: 27 02. 2024\)](https://vko-eparhia.kz/eparhiya/history/150-from-the-history-(дата обращения: 27 02. 2024)).
- Левитин-Краснов А., Шавров В. (1996) Очерки по истории русской церковной смуты. Материалы по истории Церкви. Книга 9. – М.: Крутицкое Патриаршее подворье. – 670.
- Лобанов В. В. (2019) «Обновленческий» раскол в Русской Православной Церкви (1922-1946). – М.-СПб: Институт российской истории Российской академии наук. Петроглиф. – 268.

Обзор Акмолинской области за 1915 год. Издание Акм. Обл. стат комитета (1917). – Омск: Элект. Тип. Акмол. Обл. правления. – 87.

Обзор Семипалатинской области за 1911 год (1913). – Семипалатинск: Тип. Областного правления. – 110.

Обзор Тургайской области за 1915 год (1916). – Оренбург: Тип. Б. Бреслина. –175.

Оренбургский государственный архив социально-политической истории. Ф. 1. Оп. 1

Центр документации новейшей истории Восточно-Казахстанской области (ЦДНИ ВКО).

References

Alpyspaeva, G., Sametova, G., Jumaliyeva, L. (2022) The Confessional Dimension of the Resettlement Policy of the Autocracy in the Kazakh Region at the beginning of the 20th century: the Fight against Sectarian Proselytism. *BylyeGody*. 17(2): 975–985.

CentrdokumentaciinovejshejistoriiVostochno-Kazahstanskojoblasti (CDNI VKO) [Center for Documentation of the Contemporary History of the East Kazakhstan Region]. (in Russian)

GosudarstvennyjarhivKostanajskojoblasti (GAKO) [The State Archive of the Kostanay region].(in Russian)

GosudarstvennyjarhivAkmolinskojoblasti (GAAO) [The State archive of the Akmola region]. (in Russian)

GosudarstvennyjarhivAktjubinskojoblasti (GAAkTO) [The State Archive of the Aktyubinsk region]. (in Russian)

GosudarstvennyjarhivJuzhno-Kazahstanskojoblasti (GAYKO) [The State Archive of the South Kazakhstan region]. (in Russian)

GosudarstvennyjarhivPavlodarskojoblasti (GAPO) [The State Archive of the Pavlodar region]. (in Russian)

GosudarstvennyjarhivSevero-Kazahstanskojoblasti (GASKO) [The State Archive of the North Kazakhstan region]. (in Russian)

Kiyashko, N. V. (2021) «Vrazhdebnye popy ne nuzhny»: evoliutsiia religioznoi politiki sovetskoj vlasti v 1922 g. v svete deiatel'nosti organov VChK-GPU na Kubani [“We Don’t Need Any Hostile Priests”: the Evolution of Religious Policy of Soviet Authorities in 1922 with Security Services in Kuban’ Region as an Example]. *VestnikPSTGU. Seriya II: Istorii. IstoriiiaRusskoiPravoslavnoiTserkvi*. 99. – 134-149. (in Russian)

Larionov, M. M. (2011) IzistoriipravoslavnogoSemipalatinska v 20-30-kh gg. XX veka. Obnovlencheskiyraskol [From the history of Orthodox Semipalatinsk in the 20-30s of the XX century. The Renovationalist split]. <https://vko-eparhia.kz/eparhiya/history/150-from-the-history-> (Accessed: 27 February 2024).(in Russian)

Lavrinov, V. V. (2008) Istoriografiiaobnovlencheskogodvizheniia v RusskoiPravoslavnoiTserkvi v 1920-1940-ye gody [Historiography of the renovation movement in the Russian Orthodox Church in the 1920-1940s]. *VestnikChelGU*. 24: 151–158. (in Russian)

Levitin-Krasnov, A.,Shavrov, V. (1996) *Ocherki po istorii russkoi tserkovnoi smuty. Materialy po istorii Tserkvi* [Essays on the history of Russian church turmoil. Materials on the history of the Church]. Kniga 9. – Moscow: Krutitskoe Patriarshee podvor’e. – 670. (in Russian)

Lobanov, V. V. (2019)«Obnovlencheskiy» raskol v Russkoy Pravoslavnoy Tserkvi (1922-1946) [The “Renovationalist” schism in the Russian Orthodox Church (1922-1946)]. Moscow–S.Peterburg: Institut rossiyskoy istorii Rossiyskoy akademii nauk. Petroglif. – 268. (in Russian)

ObzorAkmolinskoioblastiza 1915 g. (1917) [Overview of the Akmolinsk region for 1915]. IzdanieAkmolinskogooblastnogostatisticheskogokomiteta. Omsk: Elektro-tip. Akml. Obl. Pravleniya. – 87. (in Russian)

ObzorSemipalatinskoioblastiza 1911 g. (1913) [Overview of the Semipalatinsk region for 1913]. Semipalatinsk: tip. Oblastnogopravleniya. – 139. (in Russian)

ObzorTurgaiskojoblastiza 1915 g. (1916) [Overview of the Turgai region for 1915]. Orenburg – 175. (in Russian)

Orenburgskijgosudarstvennyjarhivsocial’no-politicheskoiistorii (OGASPI) [The Orenburg state Archiveof the socio-political history].(in Russian)

Vorontsov, V. Yu. (2019) Obnovlencheskiy raskol v Alma-Ata v 1922-1944 gg. [The Renovationalist schism in Alma-Ata in 1922-1944]. *XXIX Ezhegodnaya bogoslovskaya konferentsiya Pravoslavnogo Svyato-Tikhonovskogo humanitarnogo universiteta: Materialy*.– Moscow: Izd-vo PSTGU. – 97-101. (in Russian)

Vorontsova, I. V. (2021) Zhurnal “Sobornyy razum”kak istochnik po istorii obnovlenchestva v 1918 godu [The journal “Sobornyy razum” as a source on the history of Renovationalism in 1918]. *Vestnik Pravoslavnogo Svyato-Tikhonovskogo humanitarnogo universiteta. Seriya II: Istorii. Istoriiia Russkoi Pravoslavnoi Tserkvi*. 102. – 77-109. (in Russian)

Zaslavsky, V. B. (2006) Postradavshiezaverupravoslavnyuy v Turkestanskoyeparkhii [Priest Martyrs in the Tashkent Diocese]. *Vestnik PSTGU. Istoriiya. IstoriiyaRusskoyPravoslavnoyTserkvi*. 3 (20). – 111-125. (in Russian)

Information about authors:

Alpyspaeva Galya Aitbaykyzy (correspondent author) – Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor of Department of the History of Kazakhstan of Saken Seifullin Kazakh Agrotechnical Research University (Astana, Kazakhstan, e-mail: galpyspaeva@mail.ru).

Aubakirova Hadisha Alkeikyzy – Candidate of Historical Sciences, Acc. Professor of Department of the History of Kazakhstan of Saken Seifullin Kazakh Agrotechnical Research University (Astana, Kazakhstan, e-mail: hadishaaubakirova@mail.ru).

Авторлар туралы мәлімет:

Алпыспаева Гәлия Айтбайқызы (корреспондент автор) – тарих ғылымдарының докторы, Сәкена Сейфуллин атындағы Қазақ агротехникалық зерттеу университеті Қазақстан тарихы кафедрасының профессоры (Астана, Қазақстан, e-mail: galpyspaeva@mail.ru).

Аубакирова Хадииша Алкейқызы – тарих ғылымдарының кандидаты, Сәкена Сейфуллин атындағы Қазақ агротехникалық зерттеу университеті Қазақстан тарихы кафедрасының асс. профессоры (Астана, Қазақстан, e-mail: hadishaaubakirova@mail.ru).

Сведения об авторах:

Алпыспаева Галья Айтпаевна (автор-корреспондент) – доктор исторических наук, профессор кафедры истории Казахстана Казахского агротехнического исследовательского университета им. Сакена Сейфуллина (Астана, Казахстан, e-mail: galpyspaeva@mail.ru).

Аубакирова Хадииша Алькеевна – кандидат исторических наук, ассоц. профессор кафедры истории Казахстана Казахского агротехнического исследовательского университета им. Сакена Сейфуллина (Астана, Казахстан, e-mail: hadishaaubakirova@mail.ru).

*Received: August 18, 2024.
Accepted: September 9, 2024.*