

The Fundamentalist Utopia of Gennady Shimanov from the 1960s–1980s

MIKHAIL D. SUSLOV

Abstract: This article explores ideas of right-wing Soviet dissidents, using the example of writer and theorist Gennady Shimanov. The author interprets the evolution of Shimanov's ideas during the 1960s–1980s within the framework of fundamentalism studies. With the tacit agreement of Soviet officials, Shimanov set forth a utopian concept of the ideal state, drawing from Orthodox religion and the structures of Soviet imperialism.

Keywords: Communism, conservatism, dissident movement, fundamentalism, nationalism

During the leadership of Leonid Brezhnev between 1964 and 1982, Soviet cultural ideology underwent barely visible yet crucially important ideological changes. The staunch Marxist-Leninist paradigm succumbed to a more pragmatic orientation. Self-sustaining existence at “cold peace” with society became a principal objective of the ruling elite. Evaporation of an official ideology prompted a compromise with the upper levels of society, and drove the regime toward a reluctant recognition of some new ideological schemes, combining Leninism and nationalistic populism.¹

There are various points of comparison between late Imperial Russia, modern Russia after 2000, and the advent of nationalism during the Brezhnev era. In the late nineteenth century, when the model of the “enlightened monarchy” was exhausted in Imperial Russia, the tsar and his camarilla were impelled to increasingly employ populist rhetoric and promote an ideological model of the “people’s monarchy,” exemplified by Slavophiles and their followers.² The decrepit Soviet Empire reflected a similar intellectual context in its final decades. In both cases, a tangible opposition from the right appeared, painfully observing what it saw as “pernicious changes” and large-scale societal decline. The “revolutionaries from the right,”³ both in late Imperial Russia and in Brezhnev’s USSR, manifested a blend of conservatism, xenophobia and Orthodox pietism under the

Mikhail D. Suslov is a researcher in the department of History and Civilization at the European University Institute (Florence), and at the Russian Institute for Cultural Research (Moscow). In the summer of 2009 he was a visiting scholar at the Kennan Institute of the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars in Washington, D.C. This paper has been written with the kind assistance of the Open Society Archives at Central European University in Budapest. Copyright © 2009 Heldref Publications

ideological umbrella of Slavophilism. The latter served as a referent ideology and a guiding star for many dissidents.⁴

In Russia today, the agreement between the *siloviki* (security and military) group, certain oligarchs, church hierarchy, and radical right-wing ideologists is obvious.⁵ The Eurasian Movement, headed by Aleksandr Dugin, has been especially influential among top political leadership, and is becoming popular in Russian academia and the mass media.⁶ The most recent resurgence of modern Slavophilism can be seen Mikhail Iur'ev's provocative text *The Fortress Russia* (2004), which suggests economic and political isolationism, closure of cultural and academic ties with the West, introduction of an old Russian non-metric system of measure, rejection of the principle of separation of powers, implantation of a military perspective and rigorous Orthodoxy, and promotion of the concept of Moscow as the "Third Rome."⁷ Iur'ev is no political outsider, but the President of Eurofinance Group, one of the richest Russians, former Deputy Speaker of the State Duma, and an active member of Dugin's Eurasian Movement.

All different tendencies of modern Russian traditionalism, Slavophilism and religious fundamentalism can be grouped together under the banner of the "Russian idea,"⁸ or, more specifically, the "Russian Doctrine," as formulated in 2005 and supported by conservative intellectuals of Orthodox background such as Egor Kholmogorov, Mikhail Leont'ev, Dmitri Rogozin, and Natalia Narochnitskaia.⁹ This ideology is based on the revised fundamentals of Russian Messianism: Russian uniqueness, the spirituality of the Russian people in contrast to the character of the West, the need for a strong state, economic autonomy, Orthodoxy as the spiritual core of the Russian people, and Russia as the "Northern"—the Eurasian—civilization, challenging the corrupt Atlantic civilization. The Russian Doctrine movement, having amassed considerable economic and political capital and provided itself with the quasi-academic "school of studies on conservatism," is a serious political player, which gives another chance to Soviet underground fundamentalists.¹⁰ Since 2000, former conservative dissidents like Gennady Shimanov, Leonid Borodin and Vladimir Osipov have become noticeably more active in political journalism and politics and have published memoirs and collections of articles.¹¹ This present study concerns the ideological stirrings of this movement during the Soviet period.

The Setting for Fundamentalist Revival

Slavophilism and nostalgia for old rural Russia were espoused by Soviet intellectuals shortly after Nikita Khrushchev's dismissal from power in 1964. Extreme popularity of "village prose," Orthodox revivalism, and a fast-growing concern for Russian national culture provided the intellectual context for Soviet opposition from the right. The advent of the so-called Russian Party during the mid-1960s gave way to the Rodina club, an organization supporting the preservation of Russian architectural monuments, which largely propagandized Russian traditions. Together with Komsomol (The Communist Union of Youth), the Russian branch of the Union of Writers, and a number of "thick journals"—*tolstyj zhurnal*, lengthy works of more than 200 pages, such as *Molodaia gvardiia*, *Nash sovremennik* and *Sever*—it formed the institutional center of the Russian Party.¹² In the 1970s and 1980s, themes and variations of Russian moral superiority were widely rehashed in the official press by Iuri Davydov, Fiodor Nesterov, Iuri Seleznev, Vladimir Naumov, Arseni Gulyga, and many others.¹³

One, however, should not overestimate the importance of this new trend. The traditional strategy of the state was *divide et impera*, and the Brezhnev regime used the Russian Party to counter the influence of liberal dissidents, not to give them pass. It is not by chance that after the regime rebounded from its struggles of the 1960s and had recovered from internal uprisings and riots in Eastern Europe,¹⁴ it vehemently attacked the Russian Party in 1972.¹⁵ Even Mikhail A. Suslov, who was considered to be the chief supporter of the patriotic movement, expressed fear for the dissident Right as a force, potentially able to galvanize the popular movement in the USSR.¹⁶ Thus, underground conservatives were often detained in mental hospitals (Shimanov, Valery Emel'yanov, and Anatoly Ivanov-Skuratov are all examples) and even in labor camps (such as Feliks Karelin, Igor Ogurtsov, Mikhail Sado, Evgeny Vagin, Borodin and Osipov).

There is vast literature dedicated to Russian nationalism under the Soviet regime. The first tendency in historiography, embodied by Aleksandr Ianov, emphasizes the perils of theocracy that are connected with such a revival.¹⁷ Ianov correctly noted similarities between Islamic fundamentalism and the dissident Right.¹⁸ The other trend sees the religious and nationalist revival of the Soviet Union as agreeable, or even desirable, because the nation-state model was considered to be better than Marxist ideology from the point of view of the West's key interests.¹⁹ Russian nationalism was supposedly able to facilitate the mild transformation of the Soviet Empire to an authoritarian state.²⁰ The underlying reason was fairly clear; as John Dunlop put it, "Any attempt to apply the White Army slogan of a 'single, indivisible Russia' would result in the disintegration of the Soviet Empire."²¹

It seems, however, that Sovietologists—meaning sponsors of Soviet nationalism among Western intellectuals—miscalculated, not in the final outcome of encouraging nationalism, but in understanding the essence of the movement that they supported. Figuratively speaking, they rode the wrong horse, not because it failed but because it was not a horse at all. My intention is to prove that the most relevant intellectual context for interpreting Soviet underground neo-Slavophilism is not nationalism as an alternative to Marxism, but fundamentalism as a counterblast against modernity at large. Fundamentalism generally "represents a mobilized, radicalized traditionalism," attempting to "restore an idealized or imagined social order" of the past.²² It moves away from the complexity of modern life, from urban life, from a modernized society of alienation, from the "permanent revolution" of industrialism; it imagines the community as based on simplicity in lifestyle, on personal relationships, religious values and a traditional economy.²³

The discursive universe of Russians, even admitting the term "nation" and its derivations, in fact imbued it with a different meaning, more relevant to a Messianic worldview,²⁴ traditionalist implications and anti-Westernist sentiments. The most pronounced tension was not between Russians and non-Russians (though this juxtaposition also took place), but between the concept of the "good old days" and corrupt modernity. Anti-Semitism, which increasingly took hold of underground dissidents; anti-Westernism (in particular anti-Americanism); and elements of xenophobia are not necessarily characteristic of nationalism—one could be a xenophobe but not a nationalist.

Shimanov and the Seeds of Fundamentalism

The most relevant and visible figure of fundamentalist tenor was Gennady Shimanov. While there is limited literature devoted entirely to him, his ideology was viewed as quite

paradigmatic in the realm of Soviet right-wing dissidents.²⁵ He is typically identified as a National-Bolshevik,²⁶ but, as John B. Dunlop remarked, he in fact was heavily involved in the resurgence of revivalism (the *vozhzdentsy* movement, which fortified the role of the Orthodox Church), and nationalism, promoting xenophobia and the notion that “Russia is for the Russians.”²⁷ It would also be one-sided to equate Shimanov exclusively with Orthodox Messianism, as is done in the work of Jane Ellis.²⁸ Nikolai Mitrokhin, in his groundbreaking study on the dissent Right, compares Shimanov to the “epigones of the Russian Party”—the well-established circles of nationalists and Communists who supported Komsomol leaders and were often involved in the publication of “thick journals.”²⁹ This thesis is hardly credible, because Shimanov’s ideology considerably differs from what had been suggested in *Molodaia gvardiia* or *Nash sovremennik*, which supported a more moderate version of Russian nationalism.³⁰ Moreover, despite his political position as an outsider, Shimanov gained popularity among both underground rightists and foreign analysts of the Soviet Union.

Shimanov was born in 1937 in Idritsa, a village in Russia’s Velikie Luki region. His parents were peasants; his father had been killed on the Eastern Front in World War II, and his mother supported the family as a teacher. He grew up in Moscow, where his parents had moved before the war. He became an excellent student and a Komsomol activist, but in his autobiographical essay he describes feelings of the senselessness and falsehood of everyday life, which haunted him.³¹ He despondently observed the gap between lofty Communist ideals and the struggles faced by the majority of the Soviet people.³² On the eve of his final exams, he quit school and signed a contract for a timber-cutting job in Siberia, where disillusioned Russian youth often traveled for work.³³ What he found there, in addition, were inveterate criminals and corrupt bureaucrats. The former routinely stole his warm clothes; the latter delayed paying his wages for months. Finally, he decided to move southward. He vagabonded for a year around Tashkent (now the capital of Uzbekistan), and after receiving notification of his mother’s serious illness, made his way back to Moscow. There, he was drafted into the Soviet army, where he began to acquire a deep-rooted aversion to military service and a love for the work of Fyodor Dostoevsky, whose books he read in abundance. After his release from military service in 1957, Shimanov devoted himself to self-education at the Historical Library of Moscow, and, especially, in the smoking room of the library, where a sort of debate-society had formed among similar enthusiasts of traditional ideals. Shimanov studied Russian classical literature, philosophy and mysticism. The writings of Friedrich Nietzsche and Nikolai Berdiaev made especially strong impressions on him; Berdiaev greatly contributed to Shimanov’s association with Christianity and his dislike of material decadence.³⁴ But his preference for old philosophers came into contradiction with the relatively low social status of an unskilled part-time laborer, rendering him critical of his own social surroundings.

Religious Overtones

Shimanov’s conversion to religious faith constituted another factor of his intellectual evolution toward fundamentalism. His enthusiasm for religion began around 1962, when he befriended Father Dmitry Dudko, one of the most influential religious dissidents of the time,³⁵ who became Shimanov’s confessor.³⁶ Shimanov’s religious experience was so intense that he gave up work, and for two months subsisted on bread and tea, gradually pawning his belongings. He became malnourished and ill, recollecting later that “it

was psychologically unbearable for me to care for anything earthly;³⁷ indeed, the local police force became aware of his derelict state, threatening to arrest him for the crime of “parasitism.” In order to avoid criminal prosecution, Shimanov feigned having a mental disorder, and in 1962 he was admitted to Moscow’s Gannushkin Psychiatric Hospital, where he spent two and a half months being treated for his “belief in God” via insulin shock-therapy.³⁸

When he was finally released, he was still not yet fully Orthodox, vacillating between Baptist theology and Orthodoxy. In 1963, he visited one Moscow church and felt an overwhelming urge to receive Communion. He recollected, “It straightened my life. I perceived its influence as tangible as people feel food, drinking, warmth and cold.”³⁹ Official religious persecutions pushed Shimanov further toward a dissident mindset; he began to publish articles on religion and politics and put them into circulation in *samizdat* (contraband literature printed and passed between readers at an underground level).⁴⁰

His essay *Pushkinskaia Ploshchad*, devoted to the concept of the jural state, struck a positive chord with liberal dissidents, including writer and human-rights activist Pavel Litvinov. Shimanov became acquainted with Vladimir Bukovsky and Aleksei Dobrovolsky, recognized leaders in the dissident movement. Dobrovolsky, who later became involved in the activities of the National Alliance of Russian Solidarists, occultism, paganism and anti-Semitism, probably impressed Shimanov most of all.

After having been accused of disseminating religious propaganda, Shimanov was again placed in a mental asylum in 1969, but this time under protest. He tried to attract public attention to his detention, went on a hunger strike, and openly blamed doctors for carrying out the instructions of the KGB. Potentially as a result of this more-publicized incarceration, he spent only a couple of weeks there for a “medical checkup,” and was released.⁴¹ Soon afterward, he put his notes *Zapiski iz Krasnogo doma (Notes from a Red House)*⁴²—modeled after Dostoyevsky’s novel *Notes from a Dead House*—into illegal circulation. Here, Shimanov caustically berated the methods of his psychiatrists, again accusing them of being directed by the KGB.

In the early winter of 1969, another attempt was made to arrest Shimanov on the trumped-up charge of “breach of labor discipline”; police officers came to his workplace, but he was able to escape before they could arrest him. For several months, Shimanov was on the run, hiding in his friends’ homes. As a guest at one of these homes, he met with Vladimir Osipov, a renowned monarchist and a religious guru of the right-wing dissident movement. In 1971, Osipov launched the journal *Veche*, the only periodical of the underground conservatives, which was printed and disseminated in *samizdat* form. Shimanov became a regular contributor to the journal and a participant in this circle.

Osipov, along with Father Dmitry Dudko, had a decisive influence on Shimanov, who was already prone to religious universalism and cosmopolitanism.⁴³ His first article, published in 1971 in *Veche*, expressed pronounced Orthodox ecumenism.⁴⁴ This collaboration,

“Shimanov’s conversion to religious faith constituted another factor of his intellectual evolution toward fundamentalism.”

however, did not last long, as Shimanov soon moved more actively to the right, glorified the Soviet state and the Communist Party as “instruments of the divine intent,”⁴⁵ and accused religious dissidents of not being good Christians because they were not sufficiently loyal to the government. This ideological turn occurred in 1972; later, Shimanov actively collaborated with such right-wing figures as Anatoly Ivanov-Skuratov, Vladimir Prilutsky, and Feliks Karelin. He edited *Moskovskii sbornik* (*Moscow collection*), the literary miscellany *Mnogaia leta* (*Many Years*), and the periodical *Nepriadva*. He wrote a number of articles and full-fledged treatises, such as *Traktat o liubvi* (*A Treatise on Love*), *Pis'ma o Rossii* (*Letters on Russia*), *Protiv techeniia* (*Against the Current*) and others. By the mid-1970s he was already well known in Moscow as a dissident leader.

Promoting Anti-Westernism

Although Shimanov saw the root of all evil in the West, he also subsisted on Western humanitarian aid—in the form of food and clothing—that was distributed among Soviet religious propagators by some Christian organizations.⁴⁶ He also relied on spreading his views via *tamizdat*—literature smuggled and published abroad. In so doing, he guaranteed his security inside the USSR; international publicity in many cases prevented repression by the KGB. Thus, his *Notes from a Red House* was recorded and broadcasted by some Western radio stations in 1969, sparing him from more determined prosecution and from another incarceration.

However, from the late 1970s onward, as his vision of the Soviet state became more tolerant in proportion to fast-growing hatred of the West, Shimanov seemed to enter into a kind of brittle alliance with the state institutions. There is an assumption that Shimanov's underground almanac *Mnogaia leta*, published in 1980 and 1981, came into being with the direct permission of Mikhail A. Suslov, the Communist Party's main ideologist, whose influence often surpassed that of Brezhnev.⁴⁷ Some scholars believe that this semi-underground journal was bolstered by the KGB as an attempt to discredit so-called “religious revival” in the Soviet Union.⁴⁸ It is more likely that the KGB turned a blind eye to Shimanov's activity, considering it a counterbalance to the actions of liberal dissidents. *Veche* was also tolerated—in spite of a critical report issued by Gavlit, the Chief Directorate on Literature and Publishing—well until October 1972, when Communist Party member Aleksandr Yakovlev published strong anti-nationalist sentiments.⁴⁹

Ten years later, continuous stagnation in the economy, a prevalent agricultural crisis, and the ongoing war in Afghanistan again pressed the regime to appeal to the patriotic feelings of the Russian people. Vladimir Soloukhin, Vadim Kozhinov and Sergei Semanov published overtly nationalistic and religious essays in the journal *Nash sovremennik*. Shimanov's writings flourished in this atmosphere. However, soon after Suslov died in 1982, the security service decided to put an end to “flirting with the little god” (“*zaigryvaniia s bozhen'koi*”): Shimanov was summoned by the KGB and instructed to stop editing *Mnogaia leta*.

A similar fate befell other patriotic undertakings: immediately after Suslov's death, *Kommunist* and *Pravda*, official Soviet publications, attacked Soloukhin, *Nash sovremennik*, and the nationalist intelligentsia at large.⁵⁰ In 1983, the court heard the case of dissemination of *samizdat* documents by Borodin, and Shimanov was summoned as a witness against him. Shimanov, according to one source, confirmed that he had helped disseminate the documents, but later claimed that he was irresponsible when he had done so, citing his

time in mental wards.⁵¹ Another source, however, claimed that Shimanov testified against Borodin but then partially renounced his testimony.⁵²

When Mikhail Gorbachev's Perestroika reforms were introduced in 1987, Shimanov's voice was muffled by the louder propaganda of "legal nationalists" at the Nineteenth Party Conference (such as Valentin Rasputin and Vasily Belov), and by statements made by the nationalistic groups Pamiat and VOOPK (the All-Russian Society for the Preservation of Historical and Cultural Monuments), with which he was reported to be in close collaboration.⁵³ In the twilight of Perestroika, two influential right-wing dissidents published their manifestos. In 1989, Igor Shafarevich, a leading Russian mathematician and a well-known dissident, published his controversial text *Russophobia*, which had been circulated in *samizdat* form since 1982.⁵⁴ Shafarevich warned against copying Western models, exploiting openly anti-Semitic arguments in order to save the Soviet state.⁵⁵ Within the next year, Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn published *Rebuilding Russia*, in which he restated many of the ideas of pre-revolutionary conservatives who criticized Western democracy and advocated a model of "people's monarchy" based on a system of local self-government.⁵⁶ A key impulse behind both *Russophobia* and *Rebuilding Russia* was the prevention of letting the Soviet Union become similar to Western democracies; Shimanov reacted to the challenges of Perestroika in his own specific ways, but his underlying mantra of anti-Westernism was much the same.

In 1987, Shimanov launched the journal *Nepriadva*, and had released 19 issues of it by 1991, when photocopying costs became high to continue printing it. By that time, Shimanov had become a political outsider, vigorously promoting anti-Semitism and conspiracy theories, and had broken off from more moderate followers of the "Russian idea."⁵⁷ His article entitled *On the Secret Nature of Capitalism* (1990) presents typical conspiracy theory, citing the unwanted encroachment of the "Israelites and Masons" on the Soviet state.⁵⁸ (As a note: Shimanov currently lives in Moscow, and since 2000 has regularly published articles—mostly on the problems of religion and the family—in which he has taken an even more Orthodox fundamentalist stance, further denouncing the Soviet state as a construct of secret sects of Jews and Masons.⁵⁹)

Shimanov and Cultural Identity

The intellectual evolution of Shimanov from a Komsomol activist to an underground fundamentalist can be attributed to a profound crisis of identity. The underground fundamentalists usually were of simple origins, born in the 1930s, who did not witness Stalin's purges and grew up after World War II. Normally they came from the ranks of the most deprived and dispossessed "new Soviet intelligentsia."⁶⁰ Lowering of social status and threats to the social identity of certain groups triggered mechanisms of adaptation⁶¹—a symbolic escapism that favored religion and the past, interpreted as repository of everything good.⁶² The present, by contrast, was considered corrupt and in decline. Radicalized traditionalism became characteristic of fundamentalist undertakings,⁶³ and was powered by the intense feeling of impending social crisis. In this context, Osipov wrote, "The land impoverished: fish became scarce in rivers, mountains lost forests, and fields beget no longer corn . . . The land became poor of love."⁶⁴ Vladimir Poresh and Aleksandr Ogorodnikov echoed this sentiment, citing "Awful moral decline, alcoholism, debauchery, tidal wave of barbarous hooliganism,"⁶⁵ and observing that "We live in the epoch of global ideological crisis . . . We witness the decline of the great period of late Enlightenment . . .

which had led the world to the verge of collapse.”⁶⁶ Shimanov himself observed industrialized modernity with no less skepticism, pointing to a “dreary uniformity of life,” feelings of “endless orphanage,” and “vague recollections of something else.”⁶⁷ Not only the underground fundamentalists, but also working-class rural citizens, were susceptible to such pessimistic and apocalyptic moods, especially in the decade before the collapse of the USSR.⁶⁸

Anthropological pessimism greatly augmented Shimanov’s apocalyptic vision of modernity. He contemptuously noted, objecting to the famous saying of writer Maxim Gorky, “A man is not a word of pride . . . he can be easily squeezed to complete nonentity. Sometimes

“Radicalized traditionalism became characteristic of fundamentalist undertakings, and was powered by the intense feeling of impending social crisis.”

it is even tempting to assume that the human nature is worth anything but a spit.”⁶⁹ In another text, he wrote that “A man is a worm, made of dust, writhing with pain of envy and resentment.”⁷⁰ The leaders of the Christian Seminar on Russia’s Spiritual Regeneration, a group of Orthodox dissidents established by Aleksandr Ogorodnikov and Vladimir Poresh in 1974, later arrived at the same conclusions, stating that

“A man, this sounds pitifully and sometimes disgusting.”⁷¹ Shimanov interpreted the disruption of natural allegiances, moral degradation, alienation, terrorism, insecurity and consumerism of the contemporary world as symptoms of humans’ emancipation. To him, this was the way in which one’s malevolent core, not restricted by the regulations of a traditional society, manifested itself.⁷²

The West, taking pride in personal liberty, was, by this analysis, a hotbed of corruption. Like Islamic fundamentalists, troubled by the relaxation of moral standards, Shimanov attacked the West for poisoning the whole world with atheism, drugs, sexual permissiveness and “moral anomie.”⁷³ He proclaimed that the Western world was rotting away, indulging “the devouring spirit of mercantilism.”⁷⁴ He had, however, rather nebulous notions of the Western world—where he had never been—and borrowed much of his argument from official propaganda.

Very indicative in this context is Shimanov’s misunderstanding of Vassily Shulgin. The latter, a pre-revolutionary conservative and the deputy of the State Duma, who had survived wars, revolutions, emigration, Stalin’s labor camps and exile to the countryside, hosted Shimanov at his residence in August 1975. There, the following curious conversation took place:

Shulgin: How many times there have been spoken of the “rotting West”! But it is always rotting and rotting, and never ever rots away.

Shimanov: Is the sexual revolution not telling of decay? Families fall apart because of this sexual revolution. . . Europe is the pesthole of debauchery.

Shulgin: Why debauchery? I lived in Europe for many years but I noticed no debauchery at all!

Shimanov: I see that we are more conservative than you.⁷⁵

Shimanov recognized the soundness of Western civilization’s fundamental aims and the

inherent willingness of its people to try to do good.⁷⁶ But his goal was to prevent the Soviet Union from following the same, purportedly pernicious, path, along which he believed America had already been trotting toward global crisis.

Shimanov continued to sharpen his anthropological pessimism, railing against Western precepts of liberalism and democracy. “Freedom,” he said, was too abstract a term to be practically used. It stood for nothing, and was a mere formality, able to be analyzed as either good or evil. The concept of freedom was therefore less important than the true substance of a society—its moral core. Freedom, according to Shimanov, should simply denote that “good husbands and wives” act benevolently and usefully within society, countering the ability of villains and plutocrats to exploit honest people.⁷⁷ The other limitation for the liberal notion of freedom, he said, was a feeling of obligation. If understood as a negation of responsibility, “freedom” could mean merely the perpetual capitulation to one’s petty pleasures and passions.⁷⁸

In Shimanov’s opinion, Western political institutions, infused with this wrongly understood concept of freedom, were not able to bestow true independence upon people. In fact, democracy was nothing more than a deceptive mirage, covering up the power of money and the dominance of capital and avarice with the sumptuous sheen of representative institutions.⁷⁹ His other argument was that democracy was indifferent to morality and unable to recognize and reward spirituality, thus persistently confusing the best societal elements for the worst.⁸⁰

That democracy became repulsive in Shimanov’s view is no surprise—conservatives routinely mocked democracy for being “a tyranny of the basest majority.”⁸¹ To Russian conservatives, democracy posed a deadly threat to the country’s uniqueness. But Shimanov and his colleagues employed two additional arguments: first, the class approach of Marxism-Leninism, disclosing economic interest behind democratic procedures; second, conspiracy theory, hinting at the vague forces that stand behind Western plutocrats. In this vein, Shimanov combined the enormous critical potential of official anti-Western propaganda with Masonic-plot theories.

Shimanov proceeded with his criticism of Western democracy, also attacking freedom of speech. He instructed his readers that this was nothing but a fictitious construct, noting that a pluralistic and capitalistic system gives priority not to a truthful speaker, but to a well-paid one. Cultivating a plurality of opinions, he stated, only obfuscated truth and consolidated the power of a plutocracy.⁸² In his vision, the mass media swallowed any attempt at honest criticism of the existing social order. To win an election, in most cases, meant investing money in the media, so that it became nothing more than another plutocratic instrument of influence. Moreover, “election fever” disguised the fact that there was no real choice—to Shimanov, candidates were always essentially the same, just packaged differently.⁸³

Going further, he disavowed the notions of liberty of conscience and religious liberty, advocating only a rigorist Christian worldview—which, he asserted, was under enormous pressure from a “godless society.” There was no persecution of religious faith in the West, but there was also no faith, he stressed, because “religion dies under the onslaught of [a] godless style of life.”⁸⁴ What had instead taken precedence in the West was the “religion” of “pan-legalism.” Shimanov suspected that this fake super-ideology was backed by some suspicious forces, writing that there was “a striking resemblance between mildness and hypocritical ambivalence of pan-legalism and Masonry.”⁸⁵ He saw this situation of

“veiled” godlessness as even worse than that of overt atheism in the Soviet Union.⁸⁶ Thus, Shimanov adopted elements of the official philosophy with a certain intellectual finesse; the Marxist concept of consciousness as dependent on social context is employed here in order to prove that the political order has been adjusted to meet the needs of believers. In the long run, stated Shimanov, this demand can reach the point of theocracy—the only regime conforming to the consciousness of ardent Christians.

The official ideology, to a large extent, coincided with the ideas of many right-wing dissidents like Shimanov, especially in regard to the maintenance of discipline, the strengthening of morality, the promulgation of sobriety and the enhancement of labor-productivity. But what primarily brought together these two former foes was an explicit repugnance for the West.⁸⁷ Thus, the high-rank nomenclature of the patriotic persuasion, such as “Pavlov’s group”—a collective of nationalists in the Central Committee of Komsomol, led by Komsomol leader Sergei Pavlov—carried on a campaign against Western clubs and dances and promoted youth gatherings based on Russian folklore traditions.⁸⁸ Armed with Marxist argumentation, Shimanov offered cogent criticism of the West and modernity, more consistently than that of pre-revolutionary conservatives. The latter, rejecting the parliamentary system, capitalism and liberal rights, did not prejudice the Enlightenment paradigm as such, not maligning freedom of speech, principles of self-government and, certainly, the importance of human individuality. If the late-Imperial Rightists idealized not traditional society, but a certain stage of its transformation—be it Muscovy Rus’ or the period of Catherine the Great—the underground conservatives of the 1970s-80s doubted the whole of the “modernity project.”

There are similarities to fundamentalism in the right-wing dissidents’ perspectives on nationalism and religiosity. In principle, nationalism was unacceptable to the fundamentalists because it undermined the supra-natural character of the Soviet Union and contradicted universalistic and messianic Orthodoxy. However, fundamentalists such as those who came to power in Libya and Iran often adopted nationalist rhetoric in order to ethnically and spatially enhance their visions of a “land of purity.”⁸⁹ So the Soviet underground fundamentalists referred to the Russian nation as “Holy Russia”; as is stressed in the pages of *Veche*, Holy Russia does not reside within each individual Russian, but the quintessence of “Russianness” dwells in three or five utterly righteous men (*pravedniki*), who must be living in Russia at the present time.⁹⁰ Leonid Borodin interpreted the nation as a medium between people and divine harmony, as a “means for the striving for God” (*Bogoiskanie*).⁹¹ And Osipov’s other work *Zemlia*, also a *samizdat* journal, purports that “Nationalism is unthinkable in separation from Christianity. Any form of pagan or atheistic nationalism is devilry. . . . The principal aim of the nationalists at the moment is to revive people’s good morals and national culture.”⁹² In this way, integrity and the restoration of traditional mores were matters of greater consequence, in the view of right-wing dissidents, than the well-being of ethnic Russians. The Manifesto of Pores’h’s Christian Seminar notes that the quintessence of Russia is that it houses “Christ’s people.”⁹³ Shimanov echoed these ideas, noting that only an orthodox believer could be true patriot;⁹⁴ he also coined the principle: “Love your Motherland, [but do] not idolize it. Love it as far as it is not disgusting to God.”⁹⁵

Thus, nationalism was of secondary importance for Shimanov and his circle, though it coalesced with his strong anti-liberalism. Like other underground religious revivalists of that time (for example, the Christian Seminar),⁹⁶ Shimanov believed that Orthodoxy

indissolubly bonded with the Russian people; Russia, in this sense, had housed “Christ’s people” from the earliest period in the country’s history. As distinct from Poresh and his circle, Shimanov accentuated the close ties between Christianity and the Russian state.

Shimanov’s utopian formula of combining the Soviet state and Orthodoxy was altogether devoid of nationalist elements. Instead of nationalism, Shimanov proposed universalistic Messianism. In an open letter to Liah Abramson, a dissident who wrote for the *samizdat* journal *Evrei v SSSR (Jews in the USSR)*, Shimanov wrote that at the moment there remained the two cultures in the world that were still capable of spiritual renovation and global leadership—the Russians and the Jews. They were both infatuated with Messianism and highly cultured, he noted, but the Jews, seduced by Zionist nationalism and liberalism, had forfeited the right to claim a leadership role. The Arab-Israeli conflict, in Shimanov’s understanding, had manifested the fallaciousness of Jewish contemporary policy. Therefore, there remained the only Russian people, who could still possess a leadership role in a forthcoming spiritual renaissance.⁹⁷ In this sense, Shimanov called for the “spiritual Russification and Orthodoxing of the whole universe.”⁹⁸ Many other underground Rightists drew a parallel between the Orthodox believers in the Soviet Union and early Christians, concluding that Russia’s calling was to redeem humankind.⁹⁹

By no means, though, was this akin to a declaration of Russian nationalism. But this does not mean that there were no purely nationalistic and quasi-fascist tendencies within the right-wing dissident milieu. Those who opposed ideas of Russian uniqueness and exclusivity were also prone to downplay the role of Christianity and to praise paganism and the prowess of ancient Slavic tribes.¹⁰⁰ This Russophilism, pertaining to a different extent to Valery Emel’ianov, Valery Skurlatov, Anatoly Ivanov-Skuratov and others, had little in common with pre-revolutionary Slavophilism, and visibly differed from the Soviet Slavophiles in its acceptance of the Soviet regime.

Shimanov did not criticize the Soviet Union as ferociously as did the leaders of VSKhSON (The All-Russian Social-Christian Union for the Liberation of the People), who compared the communist regime to fascism,¹⁰¹ nor did he equate the government with the Antichrist, as did some religious extremists. But, nonetheless, he was not altogether loyal to the state. During the early 1970s, he opposed Anti-Semitic tendencies, furthered by some state figures and institutions; he also fairly boldly demanded that the state stop “the cold war against believers,” having published in *Veche* an address to the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR.¹⁰² In this article, Shimanov openly criticized the regime, referring to it as “inhuman.”¹⁰³ And he rallied against the abuse of psychiatric treatment for political repression, disputing Christian Seminar activist Aleksandr Argentov’s forced institutionalization in 1976.¹⁰⁴

From the mid-1980s on, as the regime visibly yielded to what Shimanov perceived to be the main evil of Americanization, he became more censorious of the Soviet state, especially of the ruling bureaucracy. He blamed it for cosmopolitanism and Zionism, and even for Masonic conspiracy, stating that “parasitic nomenclature” might be the “natural ally” to the “mercenary Jewry.”¹⁰⁵ He also attacked the Soviet mass media for instilling Western values and trends within the population. In the late 1980s, Shimanov vehemently wrote of a “Zionist and Masonic plot” that was poisoning the Soviet people via the mass media.¹⁰⁶ Even popular heroes of Soviet cartoon films seemed suspicious to him; the benevolent boa, the bear-like Cheburashka, and the crocodile Gena were both fingered as Masonic symbols. One of Shimanov’s articles denounced the newly released animated cartoon Kolobok (a round loaf of bread, a character of the Russian popular fairy tale of

the same name). The story's happy ending, claimed Shimanov, merely "enfeebles children, lulls and disarms them, suggesting that there is no evil in the world . . . it sows the seeds of cosmopolitanism in children's souls."¹⁰⁷

The other deficiency of the Soviet regime was, according to Shimanov, its mildness—that is, governmental condoning of consumerism, urbanism and the material aims of labor, which rendered the state akin to the Western world.¹⁰⁸ But, on Shimanov's account, the main source of evil lay in the godlessness, or rather in the pseudo-religiousness, of the Soviet regime. He extensively, and not particularly ingeniously, wrote of the parallels between Marxist theory and Christian doctrine. His conclusion was that the "Socialist caricature" had gravely distorted the "Christian original," and that the Bolsheviks, having established the most perfect state, thus failed to organize a society that could have been more well-off than the bourgeois regime.¹⁰⁹ The Soviet Union, then, possessed the ideal form but the wrong content. It was neither democracy nor hegemony of the proletariat, as had been officially proclaimed, but pure "ideocracy"—the power of ideology, similar to what must have been ideal Christian theocracy.¹¹⁰ This could be, he purported, the Soviet type of individualism that could herald the future transformation of the country into the preeminent Christian realm.

Shimanov did not emphasize the mystical aspects of Christianity; for him, as is typical in a fundamentalist outlook, religion was but an instrument of proper social organization and a code of behavior.¹¹¹ In Shimanov's view, religion was designed to be a substitute for the Marxist ideology as a method of better organizing of the society. Like other fundamentalists, Shimanov believed that God had a decisive influence on politics and that the Soviet state had been predetermined to accomplish some universal mission; it was nothing less than "the instrument for making the millenary kingdom on the earth."¹¹² On the one hand, Soviet communism revealed the fallacy of "old Christianity," unable to realize its principles in practical life and therefore consigned to oblivion. On the other hand, the USSR brought a principally new type of the "ideocratic state" to the world; this was the state that perfectly met—at least in theory—the requirements of a society of true believers. The core of the Soviet system was the omnipotent Communist Party, permeating every single cell of the society, and therefore capable of carrying out an independent policy, free of self-interests and the "rabble's whims." In principle, this provided an opportunity to transform the Communist Party into the "Orthodox Party of the Soviet Union," and, consequently, to create a "truly Christian community."¹¹³ In this way, Shimanov actually tried to justify the Soviet regime, claiming that it was "God's instrument."¹¹⁴

Promoting Traditional Codes of Conduct

Religious fundamentalism, understood as a protest movement against the liberalization and secularization of society, generally maintains a patriarchal social model and old-world ethical standards of family life and gender relations.¹¹⁵ This is namely how Shimanov perceived the role of the "Orthodox Party of the Soviet Union." He particularly praised the policy of interference in private life, such as prosecuting homosexuality and prostitution.¹¹⁶ In addition, he insisted on severe punishment for fornication.¹¹⁷ Similar ideas were pronounced by Valery Skurlatov in his *Code of Morals* (1965), which advocated capital punishment for women who had sexual intercourse with foreigners; the latter were to be stigmatized and castrated.¹¹⁸ But on the whole, the religious leaders of Soviet dissidents were skeptical about the prospect of making an Orthodox theocracy out of the Soviet

Union. Anatoly Levitin-Krasnov, for example, mocked this idea, suggesting that it would have led to the same suppression of human rights as in the USSR: “a despotic state, having proclaimed itself Christian, would not become Christian.”¹¹⁹

Shimanov had arrived at these ideas as far back as the early 1970s, perhaps first under the influence of Mikhail Antonov, Father Dmitry Dudko, and the priests Varsonofy (Khaibullin) and Georgy Petukhov, who at that time collaborated with him on *Veche*.¹²⁰ Dudko, for example, insisted that the Soviet state was unique because it was “from God.”¹²¹ These ideas were in the air at the time; some colleagues of Osipov overtly professed an amalgamated ideology of Marxism and nationalism or of Marxism and Christianity. The first tendency was embodied by Anatoly Ivanov-Skuratov,¹²² the second by Feliks Karelin.¹²³ For them, hatred of the West was a stronger incentive than love for the pre-revolutionary monarchy, and Marxism provided them with an intellectual weapon.

In 1972, Shimanov became involved in another controversy, this time with the editing office of *Veche*, having pronounced Soviet state “benign” due to there being no real power but that of God.¹²⁴ Later, he acknowledged his somewhat excessive views of that time, which had succeeded in abruptly disassociating him from the credo of Osipov and his circle. Osipov supported the claim to be loyal, but did not advocate ultra-loyalty to the point of negating basic personal rights declared by the Soviet state itself. The editor of *Veche* responded to Shimanov’s statements, instructing that the regime must “obey its own constitution.”¹²⁵ If Osipov censured bellicose liberal dissidents, who were not always “loyal,” but sided with them on the issue of human rights,¹²⁶ Shimanov decidedly positioned himself in opposition to the human rights movement.

Following the theories of nineteenth-century philosopher Nikolai Danilevsky, tremendously popular among semi-underground and underground circles of Russian patriots, Shimanov sketched out Russian history as having been totally dominated by confrontation with the West. In 1974, he penned a response to Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn’s *A Letter to the Leaders of the Soviet Union*, reviewing the key points of Russian history. Shimanov argued that it would be imprudent to reject Soviet ideology outright. His ultimate conclusion coincides with that of the so-called “Eurasianists” of the 1920s, who claimed that Russia was preordained to a global mission. The Russian Empire of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, however, did not achieve its lofty mission, and was thereby destined to fall. First, it succumbed to Western influences that polluted Russia with anarchy and atheism; the monarchy witnessed how the society was rotting away and did not lift a finger to stop it. Second, the tsar made a grave mistake in subordinating the views of the Orthodox Church to his own interests. Third, the tsar separated himself from his people, and the gentry, having severed relations with peasants and indulged in liberalism and capitalism, could not mediate between the two. Pre-revolutionary conservatives leveled similar criticism at the Tsarist regime, but Shimanov also placed blame on the conservatives, who could not expunge social prejudices and insisted on watching over the interests of landlords to the detriment of the rest of population. In addition, the Russian rightists had tried to redeem the tsar’s responsibility in moving the country toward revolution. From Shimanov’s viewpoint, pre-revolutionary rightists were too liberal to exemplify truly Russian thought.

Also by Shimanov’s account, the Bolshevik revolution, though self-destructive, was largely preferable to the mild democratic transformation of the tsarist regime. “It would have been irreparable collapse of the whole Christian world,” wrote Shimanov.¹²⁷ He interpreted the revolution of 1917 as a desperate but salutary action—it was the way in which

the “Russian soul railed against Westernization.¹²⁸ In this vein, Shimanov also highlighted the importance of isolationism, insisting on the prohibition of marriages with foreigners,¹²⁹ of migration within the Soviet Union, and of international tourism.¹³⁰ These ideas were comparable to what was suggested by Ivanov-Skuratov, an author of *Slovo natsii* (*A Nation Speaks*), written in collaboration with Dudko, Osipov and other leaders of the underground Right who were close to Shimanov.¹³¹ In this document, Ivanov-Skuratov infers the necessity to “purify” and consolidate the Russian nation and the “white race” as a whole in view of the growing strength of Asian and African nations. In practice, Ivanov-Skuratov set forth ideas of making the Soviet state more centralized and powerful—bolstering the economy, increasing military production, keeping check on separatist movements within the USSR, developing agriculture, encouraging volunteerism in the auxiliary police (*narodnaia družina*), and advancing other forms of public support for the state.¹³²

Anti-Semitism

The anti-Semitic pronouncements of Shimanov deserve special attention. In the 1970s, Shimanov was more of an isolationist persuasion than an anti-Semitic one. In an interview with the periodical *Vestnik RKhD*, published in 1977, he pointed at the fact that the Jews could not be assimilated, referring to them as “foreign tissue” in the Soviet organism.¹³³ Instead, he suggested allotting Jews territory within the Soviet Union, the Crimean Peninsula, or the Kaliningrad region, where the “Jews must live autonomous life, not interfering to the life of the other nations.”¹³⁴ But in the 1980s, especially during Perestroika, his ideas drifted more to the right, and he ironically mocked his own previous kindheartedness regarding Jews. From 1988–1990, he published several issues of his periodical *Nepriadva* with the slogan “Today it is impossible to be a true Russian, not being a militant anti-Zionist.”¹³⁵ He blamed the Jews for discrediting communism and for transforming the Soviet state apparatus into a “cosmopolite bureaucracy.” By his account, the Jews and socialism were irreconcilable, as “socialism is possible only on the basis of patriotism.”¹³⁶ His extreme anti-Semitism was manifested by the assertion that the Jews did not constitute a nation, but a social “cancer”; following this logic, he noted that there could be “surgical” methods of curing it.¹³⁷

Observing the triumph of Western-style values in the Soviet Union during the period of Perestroika, Shimanov and other rightist dissidents sought out scapegoats for these principles.¹³⁸ Anti-Semitism was, however, not part of a nationalist project, because the value of an empire was, to Shimanov, always more important than that of nation-state. He insisted that the Soviet Union was not a “mechanical conglomeration of ethnically and religiously different nations,” but rather a “mystical organism of complementary nations.”¹³⁹

Anti-Modernism

This “mystical organism,” as depicted by Shimanov, was essentially more traditional and patriarchal than nationalistic. These features are characteristic of a fundamentalist worldview. Traditionalism is designed in order to withstand the pressure of modernity and large-scale social change. Patriarchalism opposes the alienating institutions of the modern world such as formalism of the written law, an exploitative bourgeois system, and the complexities of urban life. Instead of this, fundamentalists like Shimanov proposed to revive a traditional society with strong familial and communal ties, personal economic relationships, and agrarian-centered cycles of labor.

Shimanov, Feliks Karelin and some other dissidents of conservative persuasion seconded this type of back-to-land movement and promoted ideas of de-industrialization and de-urbanization. Writer Mikhail Agursky remarked that the patriotic dissident movement grew mainly out of “the opposition to the newly constructed Soviet industrial society.”¹⁴⁰ A coterie of underground conservatives diagnosed deep crisis of the “Renaissance paradigm,” and observed symptoms of the advent of a “New Middle Ages,” manifested by an “inclination to archaism, to *domostroi* [domestic order], to the countryside, to nature, silence and chastity.”¹⁴¹

Anti-modernist tendencies became especially palpable during Perestroika. Shimanov’s periodical *Nepriadva* maintained the necessity of returning to an aesthetic of “sails, wind-mills, camels and horses.”¹⁴² There were also appeals to increase the share of manual labor in comparison to mechanized labor, to “liberate” Soviet agriculture from industry and to bring the horse back as a mode of work and transit.¹⁴³ Iury Aver’ianov, who collaborated on *Nepriadva*, called for abandoning cars, citing them as the “main instrument for [the] Americanizing of the Soviet economy.”¹⁴⁴ However, Shimanov noted that until the whole world renounced industry, the Soviet Union could not undermine its defense capabilities in such a way—that is, the war industry should remain strong.¹⁴⁵ Karelin specified that ancient Russian towns must be free from factories, while new industrial centers should play the role of “military and economical advanced posts of the Soviet power”; the outcome would be a “defensive and developing (*oboronno-blagoustroitel’naia*) empire,” able to monitor Western encroachments and support citizens’ well-being.¹⁴⁶ In this sense, the ideas of these dissidents did not conflict with the aspirations of the Soviet establishment; many of their views had been uttered by the ideologists of the Russian Party in the 1970s. Osipov, for example, spoke of the idea to curtail the entirety of the automotive industry in the Soviet Union, excepting only the construction of taxis, buses, and ambulances.¹⁴⁷ Solzhenitsyn’s plan for transmitting all Soviet industry to Siberia also had deep resonance,¹⁴⁸ though it was probably borrowed from the ideas of the so-called “Fetisov’s circle,” a 1960s-era underground group similar to the National-Bolsheviks that was headed by Moscow researcher Aleksandr Fetisov.¹⁴⁹

Ideas of a Traditional Economy

The economic projects of Karelin are also of special interest. His ideas, epitomized in the work *Bibleiskie osnovy politekonomii* (*Biblical Bases of Political Economy*), voiced the views of Shimanov’s circle, with the single reservation that Karelin advocated a more risky alliance of Marxism and Orthodoxy while Shimanov excluded Marxism from his theories. Karelin spoke of capitalism, which was, by his account, exactly the same as what had been described about the Apocalypse—capitalism “requires sin” and draws the world toward the end of the days.¹⁵⁰ A socialist economy, conversely, could bring about ideal conditions—it is the only type of economy that is concerned with virtues, altruism and enthusiasm.¹⁵¹ During Perestroika, these proposals sounded like an appeal to revitalize the Soviet system, blended with eschatology and the notion of a moral economy; such an extreme mixture of fundamentalist elements was intended to provide solace for those living in a time of disorder and instability.¹⁵² Conservatives of late Imperial Russia had also entertained the idea of forging an economic system based on moral precepts, but unlike their Soviet counterparts they did not allow for state interference in fiduciary relations.

It would not, however, be correct to assume that the underground conservatives pinned all their hopes on the state. Like other fundamentalists, they were more concerned with personal economic relations than with defending the state's economic monopoly. In a certain sense, justifying the Soviet state, with its alienating economic practices, contradicted their views on the ideal society. As a rule, the Soviet underground conservatives spoke in support of partial admittance of private property in the Soviet Union.¹⁵³ But the state provided a necessary backdrop for this view, simply because these conservatives had never experienced any other social reality. In fact, their political views were fairly uncertain; unlike the leaders of VSKhSON, or the pre-revolutionary conservatives, they never laid out a description of the structure and function of their desired state, perhaps because they were too far from the political center to have an objective view of it.

Communal Life, Family Life and the Return to Clan Society

Shimanov and his contemporaries indulged in lengthy treatises on domestic and communal life, reconstructing an ideal society according to “the letter and the law of the ancient community.”¹⁵⁴ Shimanov advocated for a patriarchal and clan-based society in his voluminous work *Traktat o Lyubvi* and in a series of articles that appeared in *samizdat* in the 1970s.

Strict behavioral control, as suggested by Shimanov, is characteristic of any kind of fundamentalism, but in the case of Soviet underground conservatism this control pertained more to the restoration of the patriarchal order than to religious ritual. Shimanov did not reference obligatory prayers or collective religious meetings, as is common in Protestant or Muslim fundamentalism,¹⁵⁵ though this was certainly implied. He exhorted his readers to stand behind—both legally and practically—a husband's powers over his wife and children.¹⁵⁶ He conceived his plan in moralistic as well as patriarchal terms; in his opinion, a husband possessed all rights and powers because this state was “natural” and traditional and because it conformed to divine laws.¹⁵⁷ From Shimanov's perspective, given an innate inequality between spouses, any attempt to equate them would have led to disharmony and the disintegration of the family unit. Equality between men and women, he postulated, was therefore disadvantageous principally to women, who would consequently become dispossessed of familial happiness and of everything that constitutes specifically feminine behavior in gender relations. As Shimanov put it, “equal rights ruin [the] spiritual peculiarity of women.”¹⁵⁸ There is feminist literature that claims that fundamentalism a reaction against women's emancipation. In this vein, Shimanov's speeches can perhaps be interpreted as a patriarchal attack against the women's movement.¹⁵⁹ It is worth noting, however, that female underground conservatives largely agreed with Shimanov's proposals. The almanac *Zhenshchina i Rossiia* (*A Woman and Russia*), the single female-run *samizdat* journal in the USSR, held to these principles, rejecting formal equality between men and women in the Soviet Union. Tatiana Goricheva, an activist in Russian Orthodox movement, spelled out that “it was not women who were emancipated in the Soviet society, but men who had been feminized.”¹⁶⁰

In practice, Shimanov proposed introducing ancient family rituals such as, for example, one from the medieval state Kievan Rus' wherein a bride took the shoes off her bridegroom, signifying her new husband's assumption of power over her and the whole household. Shimanov touted the dominance of the husband, and suggested providing only rudimentary education to women, noting that this would be sufficient for them to perform their “natural” roles as mothers and wives.¹⁶¹

Shimanov also devoted many of his works to ideas of the family, and expressed support for the corporal punishment of disobedient children. He postulated that the most important element in education was obedience, saying that “it is necessary to teach children obedience at the first or at least at the second word,” and that “knowledge perfectly enters [children’s] minds from the bottom,” while maintaining that beating should never become too extreme.¹⁶² The idea of corporal punishment greatly fascinated many conservative dissidents of the time. Valery Skurlatov, whose proposals were closely aligned to Puritanism in education, was sponsored by Shimanov; he spoke of introducing corporal punishment at school, in the military and at the university level.¹⁶³

Ascetic behavior was largely propagated in conservative *samizdat*. Shimanov held, for example, that girls and young women should not dress more elegantly than elderly ladies; that modesty in dress must be deeply instilled in people from childhood; that play should be scarce and simple; that the abundance of toys corrupted children, making them capricious and fastidious; and that any allowable toys should be made from natural materials and should resemble traditional wooden or clay dolls, the interactions with which would teach children imaginative thinking and modesty. He also grimly joked that factories, the producers of electrical and mechanical toys made from plastic and metal, should be blown up and their designers shot. Nutrition, he said, should be similarly simple; children should be fed by coarse, raw and vegetarian food. Any confectionary should be absolutely excluded from everyday life so that holiday sweets would hold more meaning. The most important ingredients of Shimanov’s “future cuisine” were “hunger and work on the fresh wind.”¹⁶⁴

Shimanov also prescribed rituals for communal dining. In particular, he emphasized that elderly people should take the most honorable places at the family dinner table, and that children should not be allowed at the table of the adults. In a picture sketched by Shimanov, a family solemnly eats; each member has brought his or her own personal spoon, cup and plate—all preferably homemade, as non-assembly-line-manufactured items “eradicate things from impersonality.”¹⁶⁵ Another group of advised rituals pertained to sport and health, and closely connected the warrior tradition with religious ceremonies. He also wrote of reintroducing the custom of dueling.¹⁶⁶

Shimanov’s circle touted a specific program for reforming the educational system, to be modeled after pre-revolutionary schools (or, rather, his vision of what they had looked like). He vehemently attacked Dr. Benjamin Spock’s childcare methods, insisting that “lessons should be hard”—severe discipline and respect for seniors should reign at school.¹⁶⁷ He stated that education should aim primarily to teach students practical skills and prepare them for future roles as farmers, artisans, mothers and fathers. Secondary education was to be religiously centered, based on the study of scripture and other Christian doctrine. Very few universities, which Shimanov reluctantly consented to retain, should be closely connected with the Church in order to foster scholarship produced by monks or by a monastery’s novices.¹⁶⁸

The underground fundamentalists of Shimanov’s group circulated appeals to carefully restore ancestral mores and ways of life, purged of Western influence; these could serve as a latent force for instilling patriotism and piety and for making people accustomed to Russian traditions. Thus, Shimanov maintained, Russian dress, ancient Slavic calligraphy, and the use of the samovar were “more important for the Russian future, than all writings of Vladimir Solov’ev, Nikolai Berdiaev and Lev Shestov, even put together.”¹⁶⁹

Shimanov's proposed utopia of a patriarchal clan society conceives of family life as involving numerous rituals such as coming-of-age and marriage ceremonies. Engagements, Shimanov noted, should be arranged early-on so as to prepare teenagers for an adult life full of responsibilities. Lasting for many years, engagements could reveal weaknesses of the future spouses and "remove boys' morbid romanticism" of that age.¹⁷⁰ Later, at the age of 25, a boy should celebrate reaching manhood; from that point on he would have a personal rifle—to be used only under specific conditions—and may be allowed to drink light wine. Then, between the ages of 40 and 60, men would possess the status of "fathers" and have the right to drink spirits. From age 60 on, "patriarchs" would be the most respected and powerful figures in a clan, who would wear the most sumptuous clothes and drink the most elegant drinks.¹⁷¹ Shimanov was not alone in suggesting the restoration of the ancient peasants' commune; "Fetisov's group" and Ivanov-Skuratov were, in many respects, predecessors of Shimanov's utopian theories.¹⁷²

In other words, Shimanov espoused only "natural" hierarchies—such as those determined by gender and age—and rejected the more complicated structures of the modern world that had been produced by modern education and the industrial economy. His ideal was extremely archaic—even more archaic than what had been suggested by pre-revolutionary conservatives. It has been mentioned in the literature that religious fundamentalists have two "golden ages": the founding period of their religion and a recent period in which the pressures of modernity had not yet become so explicit.¹⁷³ In this sense, Shimanov's first "golden age" was positioned during the time of the tribal system. He explicitly stated that the most urgent task of the modern age would be the revival of ancient peasant communes;¹⁷⁴ this was necessary because a communal system would facilitate the preservation and transmission of traditions from generation to generation.¹⁷⁵

This articulated form of traditionalism, common in both fundamentalism and utopianism, was especially tangible in the milieu of the Soviet underground conservatives. Unlike religious fundamentalists, however, they rendered it more state- and nation-focused. For conservatives, traditional clans could further the defense capabilities of the Soviet Union, making the society more militant and disciplined with respect to the West.¹⁷⁶ It is important to note that Shimanov and other dissidents had rather loose notions of what this clan culture should be, conflating it with the peasants' communes of late Imperial Russia, with the parochial system, or with the Soviet *kolkhoz* (collective farming).¹⁷⁷

Conclusion

In the 1970s, after the detention of Osipov, Shimanov exemplified the ideals of underground conservatism, but by the 1980s, when his views moved closer to nationalism and anti-Semitism, his voice had been muffled by those of many other right-wing ideologists. After the collapse of the Soviet Union, he became a sheer outsider, a legend but not a relevant political figure. His utopian fundamentalism was not able to compete with the liberal and democratic model due to several reasons. First, his statist propensity pushed him toward collaboration with the Soviet elite, and, therefore, discredited him and weakened his arguments. Second, his loyalty to the state made him less noticeable both within and outside of the Soviet Union. Third, his consistent fundamentalism had little appeal, both to the political establishment and to the people, because of its unabashed archaism, undermining the achievements of modernity in Russia. Fourth, the eschatological bent of Shimanov's thoughts, designed for better influencing mass consciousness, was not effective

in a secularist country. Fifth, there remained unsolvable contradictions between the Marxist methodology and Christian ontology in Shimanov's ideological constructions; that is, between positivist optimism and religious anthropological pessimism, between social activism and contemplative Christianity, and between historical determinism and visionary eschatology. The most important misreading of reality was, however, Shimanov's paradoxical etatism. The state remained the sole agent of modernization during the Communist period, and was therefore responsible for all evils from the traditionalist viewpoint. But at the same time, the underground fundamentalists pinned all their hopes on the state, which alone may have undone the wrong. Slightly revising Aleksandr Ianov's saying, the conservative utopia of the fundamentalist dissidents combined political infantilism and Messianism.¹⁷⁸

The utopian fundamentalism of Soviet dissidents was one of several responses to the challenges faced by Brezhnev-era society. Notwithstanding its inner contradictions, this fundamentalism was an attempt to control the situation of growing nationalism inside and outside of the Soviet Union; to work for the dissolution of the world's colonial empires; and to spark global religious revival, neo-conservatism and the environmental movement. The Soviet version of fundamentalism was less religious and more social and statist than other fundamentalist movements that were developing in the West and in the Third World at the time. It purported to save the spirit of the USSR—a socialist economy, the one-party system and “ideocracy”—by reinvigorating it with the elements of the archaic past, such as patriarchal clans and the dominance of religion. Soviet fundamentalists saw their “golden ages” in the medieval Muscovy Rus' and the idealized Soviet system of the 1950s. Everything in between, from liberal rights to industrialization, had been skipped over in the name of “new feudalism.”

NOTES

1. Simon Cosgrove, *Russian Nationalism and the Politics of Soviet Literature: The Case of Nash Sovremennik, 1981-1991* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004), 11-12.

2. On this, see Richard Wortman, *Scenarios of Power: Myth and Ceremony in Russian Monarchy*, Vol. 2 (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1995-2000), 393-401, 409-421. The striking similarities between pre-revolutionary neo-Slavophilism and the ideals of right-wing Soviet dissidents were noted in Dmitry Pospelovsky, “A Comparative Enquiry into Neo-Slavophilism and its Antecedents in the Russian History of Ideas,” *Soviet Studies* 31, no. 3 (1979): 322-323. It is however, ill-considered to attribute Slavophile ideology to the Soviet underground thinkers, who belonged to an absolutely different intellectual and historical context. Slavophilism as pertained to such figures as Shimanov and Osipov might be merely a metaphor.

3. Sometimes the term is used literally: the leaders of the VSKhSON (All-Soviet Christian Union of Liberation of the People) prepared a military putsch and an overthrow of Soviet powers. They were shattered by the KGB in 1967 and their leaders barely escaped capital punishment, being detained for maximum of 25 years in labor camps. On this, see John Dunlop, *The New Russian Revolutionaries* (Belmont, Mass.: Nordland Publishing Co. 1976).

4. This phrase is taken from Vladimir Osipov, “K zemle!,” *Iz zhurnala ‘Zemlia’: Vol'noe slovo. Samizdat. Izbrannoe* 20, no. 5, Frankfurt am Main, 1975.

5. Ian Bremmer and Samuel Charap, “The Siloviki in Putin's Russia: Who They Are and What Do They Want,” *The Washington Quarterly* 20, no. 1 (2006-07), 89.

6. Andreas Umland, “Formirovanie fashistskogo ‘neoevraziiskogo’ intellektual'nogo dvizheniia v Rossii,” *Ab Imperio* 3 (2003), 299-302.

7. Mikhail Iur'ev, “‘Krepost' Rossiia: Kontseptsiiia dlia prezidenta,” *Novaya Gazeta*, 17 (2004). See an abridged English version: Mikhail Iur'ev, “Fortress Russia,” *Russia in Global Affairs*,

3 (July–September 2005), <http://eng.globalaffairs.ru/numbers/12/937.html> (accessed March 19, 2009).

8. On the variety of “Russian idea” movements, see Stanisław Biele, “Identity Problems in the New Russia,” *The Polish Foreign Affairs Digest*, Vol. 5, No. 1 (2005), 117–126.

9. The “Russian Doctrine” is also known as the “Sergius Project,” named after St. Sergius of Radonezh. The main source here is <http://www.rusdoctrina.ru/> (accessed March 19, 2009). See also Grigorijus Potašenko, “‘Russian Doctrine’–Nationalist Ideas of the Right-Wing Conservatives of Russia,” *Lithuanian Foreign Policy Review*, 18 (2006): 95–116.

10. This school apologetically conceives of pre-revolutionary conservatives. See the latest books in this “genre”: Stanislav Khatuntsev and Konstantin Leont’ev, *Intellektual’naia biografiia 1850–1874* (Moscow: Aleteia, 2007); Roman Gogolev, “‘Angel’skii doctor’ russkoi istorii: Filosofiia istorii K.N. Leont’eva” (Moscow: Airo–XXI, 2003).

11. Vladimir Osipov, “Dubrovlag,” *Nash sovremennik*, (Moscow: 2003); Anatoly Ivanov, *Golos v pustyne*, (Moscow, 2003); Leonid Borodin, “Bez vybora: Avtobiograficheskoe povestovanie,” *Molodaia gvardiia*, (Moscow: 2003); Gennady Shimanov, *Spor o Rossii* (Moscow, 2003); G. Shimanov, *Nuzhen li nam sotsializm?* (Moscow, 2004); G. Shimanov, *Da vozrodit’sia russkaia obshchina!* (Moscow, 2005); and G. Shimanov, *Zapiski iz krasnogo doma*, (Moscow, 2006). A number of Shimanov’s recent articles can be found in <http://www.shimanov.narod.ru/> (accessed March 19, 2009).

12. The term comes from Nikolai Mitrokhin, *Russkaia partiia: Dvizhenie russkikh natsionalistov v SSSR, 1953–1985* (Moscow, 2003).

13. Vladimir Shlapentokh, *Soviet Intellectuals and Political Power: The Post-Stalin Era*, (London, 1990), 205–206.

14. On this topic, see Vladimir Kozlov, *Mass Uprisings in the USSR. Protest and Rebellion in the Post-Stalin Years* (Armonk, New York: M.E. Sharpe, 2002).

15. Kevin O’Connor, *Intellectuals and Apparatchiks: Russian Nationalism and the Gorbachev Revolution* (Lanham, Md.: Lexington Books, 2006), 53–63. It might be said with certainty that the Soviet regime retained its generally imperialist and universalistic character until the end; this was the only prudent policy in respect to cultural, ethnic and economic differences among the population. See, for example: Geoffrey Hosking, *A History of the Soviet Union* (London: Fontana Press/Collins, 1990), 422.

16. There is a published memorandum of the KGB, sent to the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union in 1981. See *Istochnik* 6 (1994): 108.

17. Aleksandr Ianov, *The Russian New Right: Right-Wing Ideologies in the Contemporary USSR* (Berkeley: Institute of International Studies, University of California, 1978); Geoffrey Hosking, “The Voice of VSKhSON,” *Times Literary Supplement*, December 3, 1976; M. Ortov (a pseudonym), “Pravoslavnoe gosudarstvo i khristianstvo,” *Poiski i razmyshleniia* 8, No. 16 (1981): 32–42; Mikhail Meerson-Aksenov and Boris Shragin, eds., *The Political and Religious Thought of Russian “Samizdat”* (Belmont, Mass.: Nordland Publishing Co., 1977), 418; L. Bek (also a pseudonym), “Spor o slavianofilakh i natsional’nom patriotizme,” *Radio Liberty*, July 30, 1969.

18. Anatoly Ianov, *Russkaya ideya i 2000-y god* (New York: Liberty, 1988), 15.

19. John Dunlop, *The New Russian Nationalism* (New York: Praeger, 1985), 4–5; J. Dunlop, *The Faces of Contemporary Russian Nationalism*, (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1983); Stephen Cohen, “Wrong Thinking on Soviet Dissidents,” *The Los Angeles Times*, February 7, 1983.

20. *Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty*, Paris, April 5, 1988: 5.

21. J. Dunlop, *The New Russian Nationalism*, 5.

22. Martin Riesebrodt, “Fundamentalism and the Resurgence of Religion,” *Numen* 47, no. 3 (2000): 271, 272.

23. Martin Marty, “Fundamentalism as a Social Phenomenon,” *Bulletin of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences* 42, no. 2 (November, 1988): 17. On the broader context for the fundamentalist and back-to-land movements, see Leo Marx, *The Machine in the Garden: Technology and the Pastoral Ideal in America* (New York, 1967), 9, 29–100.

24. “Until well after the Second World War, Russian political and intellectual elites organized

their understanding of the world according to a conceptual apparatus that had more in common with the universal, absolute religious categories of medieval Christendom, than with the particularist, relative and secular categories of modern Europe.” See David Rowley, “Imperial versus National Discourse: The Case of Russia,” *Nations and Nationalism* 6, no. 1 (January 2000): 24.

25. On his biography and ideas, see Aleksei Kozhevnikov, *Natsional’no-patrioticheskie techeniia russkoi intelligentsia 1950-kh—pervoi poloviny 80-kh gg.* Ph.D. Thesis (Moscow, 2004).

26. The term “national-Bolshevism” is incorrect in this context, because it accentuates “democratic centralism” and disavows religion, which was uncharacteristic for Shimanov. See Nikolai Ustrialov, *Natsional-bol’shevizm* (Moscow, 2003), 247.

27. J. Dunlop, *The New Russian Nationalism*, 92. Dunlop figures out some similarities between Shimanov’s ideology and fascism, but this is hardly prudent in regard to absolutely different historical situation.

28. Jane Ellis, *Russkaia pravoslavnaia tserkov’: Soglasie i inakomyslie* (London, 1990): 91-101.

29. N. Mitrokhin, *Russkaia partiia*, 521.

30. He expressed his aversion to semi-official “patriots,” saying that they had substituted the real problems for a desire for power. See G. Shimanov, “Fundament,” *Zapiski iz krasnogo doma* (1990): 546-575.

31. G. Shimanov, “Pered smert’iu’ [1969],” *Zapiski iz krasnogo doma* (Moscow, 2006), 9.

32. G. Shimanov, “Iunost,” *Zapiski iz krasnogo doma* (1969): 7-24.

33. This typically escapist reaction to the challenges of the outside world later acquired symbolic forms; all his writings represented this movement away from the complexities of the present to the simplicity of traditional, agrarian, religious and patriarchal society. See Ezhi Shatsky [Jerzy Szacki], *Utopiia i traditsiia*, (Moscow, 1990): 53.

34. Shimanov wrote that “Berdiaev led me out of the darkness of decadence and brought close to the infinite truth of Christianity.” G. Shimanov, *Iunost’*, 10-13. Berdiaev was a seminal writer for the Soviet right-wing dissidents. He served as a mediator between them and the Russian religious tradition. For example, he played a decisive role in building up the ideology of the VSKhSON. See also Evgeny Vagin, *Moie znakomstvo s Berdiaevym, Russkaia mysl’*, March 23, 1977; J. Dunlop, *The New Russian Revolutionaries*, 39.

35. His topical sermons brought him fame as a “shadow patriarch.” See S. P. de Boer et. al (eds.), *Biographical Dictionary of Dissidents in the Soviet Union, 1956–1975* (The Hague, Netherlands: 1982).

36. G. Shimanov, “Za dveriami ‘Russkogo kluba’,” *Nash sovremennik* 5 (1992): 159.

37. G. Shimanov, “V sumashedshem dome razmyshliaiu o razume,” *Zapiski iz krasnogo doma* (1969): 42-46.

38. G. Shimanov, “V sumashedshem dome razmyshliaiu o razume,” 43.

39. G. Shimanov, “Otnoshenie k TSerkvi,” *Zapiski iz krasnogo doma*, 47-51.

40. He wrote such articles as “Absurdnost’ istiny,” “Khristos voskres,” “Na sobstvennykh pokhronakh,” etc. See G. Shimanov, “Za dveriami ‘Russkogo kluba’,” *Nash sovremennik* 5 (1992): 159.

41. G. Shimanov, “Zapiski iz Krasnogo Doma,” *Zapiski iz krasnogo doma*, 52–92.

42. *Archive of Samizdat (AS)*, no. 567, 1969. From Albert Boiter (ed.), *Polnyi spisok dokumentov s podrobnym nomernym ukazatelem* (Munich: Obshchestvo “Arkhiv Samizdata”, 1977).

43. G. Shimanov, *Za dveriami ‘Russkogo kluba’*, 158.

44. *Veche* 1 (1971): 49 (AS no. 1013).

45. G. Shimanov, *Kak nam ponimat’ nashu istoriiu i k chemu v nei stermit’sia (V sviazi s pis’mom Solzhenitsyna)*, (1974): 5

46. N. Mitrokhin, *Russkaia partiia*, 449.

47. J. Dunlop, *The New Russian Nationalism*, 13. Suslov as the orchestrator of the union with the “Russian party” appears also in the study: Christian Schmidt-Hauer, *Gorbachev: The Path to Power* (Topsfield, Mass.: Salem House, 1986): 74-75.

48. *Nasha strana*, February 25, 1982, 4. In some cases, collaboration of the right dissidents with the security services is beyond doubt. Thus, ex-general of the KGB O. D. Kalugin confirmed communication with V. I. Skurlatov, the author of notorious neo-fascist memorandum *Ustav nravov*. See *Leninskaia Pravda*, November 18, 1990.

49. Yitzhak Brudny, *Reinventing Russia: Russian Nationalism and the Soviet State, 1953-1991* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1998): 97, footnote 10.
50. Stephen K. Carter, *Russian Nationalism: Yesterday, Today, Tomorrow* (London: Pinter Publishers, 1990): 86-87.
51. AS no. 5079.
52. *Posev* 7 (1983): 2. To judge from Borodin's memoirs, he did not change his favorable opinion about Shimanov after his conviction of 1982. See Leonid Borodin, *Bez vybora: Aftobiograficheskoe povestvovanie* (Moscow, 2003).
53. Stephen K. Carter, *Russian Nationalism: Yesterday, Today, Tomorrow* (London: Pinter Publishers, 1990): 109.
54. Igor' Shafarevich, "O rusofobii," *Nash sovremennik* 6 (1989).
55. Robert Horvath, *The Legacy of Soviet Dissent: Dissidents, Democratization and Radical Nationalism in Russia* (New York: RoutledgeCurzon, 2005): 150.
56. Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn, *Kak nam obustroit' Rossiuu: Posil'nye soobrazheniia*, (Leningrad: Sovetskii pisatel, 1990).
57. See Vladimir Sadovnikov, "Zapiski shestidesiatnika," *The Third Way*, <http://thethirdway.narod.ru/memoryword.doc> (accessed March 19, 2009).
58. G. Shimanov, "O tainoi prirode kapitalizma," *Zapiski iz krasnogo doma*, 193-218.
59. For example, see G. Shimanov, "O sovetskom sotsializme," http://www.shimanov.narod.ru/sh_o_sovetskom_socializme.htm/ (accessed March 19, 2009).
60. Vladimir Osipov, for example, was born in 1938 in a village in Pskov Oblast. His parents were village schoolteachers. See Darrell Hammer, "Vladimir Osipov and the Veche Group (1971-1974): A Page from the History of Political Dissent," *Russian Review* 43, no. 4 (1984): 358. Leonid Borodin was born in Irkutsk in 1938, also into the family of a schoolteacher. Valery Skurlatov, also born in that province in 1938, comes from a family of an administrator and an accountant.
61. M. Riesebrodt, "Fundamentalism and the Resurgence of Religion," *Numen* 47, no. 3 (2000): 271.
62. See: Thaddeus Coreno, "Fundamentalism as a Class Culture," *Sociology of Religion* 63, no. 3 (2002): 340.
63. M. Riesebrodt, *Fundamentalism and the Resurgence of Religion*, 275.
64. V. Osipov, "Pred Bogom zemli," *Iz zhurnala "Zemlia": Vol'noe slovo* (Frankfurt, 1975): 27.
65. A. Ogorodnikov, "Istoki i nadezhdy," *Khristianskii seminar: Vol'noe slovo* (Frankfurt, 1980): 60.
66. V. Posh, A. Ogorodnikov, "Preambula," in *Khristianskii seminar. Vol'noe slovo*, 53.
67. G. Shimanov, "Lie Abramson," *Mnogaia leta* (1981): 161.
68. David Gillespie, "Village Prose and the Death of Russia," *The Modern Language Review* 87, no. 2 (April, 1992): 416.
69. G. Shimanov, "Vstuplenie v brak," *Mnogaia Leta* (1981): 108.
70. G. Shimanov, "O ravenstve i neravenstve v brake," *Iz zhurnala "Zemlia": Vol'noe slovo*, 38.
71. A. Ogorodnikov, *Istoki i nadezhdy*, 61.
72. G. Shimanov, "Demokraticeskoe pravosoznanie," *Mnogaia leta* (1980): 65-66.
73. David Zeidan, *The Resurgence of Religion: A Comparative Study of Selected Themes in Christian and Islamic Fundamentalist Discourses* (Boston, Mass.: Brill, 2003): 47.
74. G. Shimanov, "Lie Abramson," 148.
75. *Nepryadva* 11 (1990): 52.
76. G. Shimanov, "Otryvki iz dnevnika," *Protiv techeniia* (Moscow, 1975): 25 (AS no. 2086); and G. Shimanov, *Demokraticeskoe pravosoznanie*, 67-68.
77. G. Shimanov, *Traktat o liubvi* (1976), AS no. 2599, 39.
78. G. Shimanov, *Otryvki iz dnevnika*, 16.
79. G. Shimanov, *Ideal'noe gosudarstvo* (1979), AS no. 2218, 4.
80. G. Shimanov, *O ravenstve i neravenstve v brake*, 48.
81. This is a byword in Russian conservatism. See, for example: Konstantin P. Pobedonostsev, "Novaia demokratiia," in Sergei Firsov (ed.), *K. P. Pobedonostsev: pro et contra* (St. Petersburg, 1996): 96-97.

82. G. Shimanov, *Demokraticeskoe pravosoznanie*, 68.
83. G. Shimanov, *Demokraticeskoe pravosoznanie*, 70, 72, 73.
84. G. Shimanov, *Demokraticeskoe pravosoznanie*, 75.
85. *Ibid.*, 74.
86. G. Shimanov, "Lie Abramson," 161.
87. As Yitzhak Brudny wrote, "Because of their [underground conservatives'] anti-Western nature, these ideas indirectly legitimized the Soviet regime." See Y. Brudny, *Reinventing Russia: Russian Nationalism and the Soviet State, 1953-1991* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1998).
88. Komsomol leaders promoted such patriotic dances by means of the ensemble "Lebedushka" (The She-Swan). See N. Mitrokhin, *Op. cit.*, 247-249.
89. M. Marty and R. S. Appleby, "Conclusion: Remaking the State: The Limits of the Fundamentalist Imagination," in M. E. Marty and R. Scott Appleby (eds.), *Fundamentalisms and the State* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1993): 621.
90. Valentina Mashkova, "Kto dolzhen kariat'sia?," *Zemlia* 2 (1975): 9.
91. Leonid Borodin, "Opyt teleologicheskogo opravdaniia natsii," *Veche* 9 (1973): 167. The title of this paper is also telling: "Essay on the theoleological vindication of the nation."
92. V. Osipov, "K zemle," *Iz zhurnala "Zemlia": Vol'noe slovo*. Osipov also wrote that "Russian nationalists are first and foremost Orthodox Christians, and therefore they cannot cherish any animosity towards other nations and their national cultures." See V. Osipov, "Ot redaktsii," *Iz zhurnala "Zemlia": Vol'noe slovo* 20, 44.
93. "Obrashchenie po povodu repressii protiv osnovatelei Seminara A. Ogorodnikova i V. Poresha," *Khristianskii seminar po problemam religioznogo vozrozhdeniia*, 1979.
94. G. Shimanov, "Razumnaia uzost'," *AS* no. 1736 (1973).
95. G. Shimanov, "Otryvki iz dnevnika," *Protiv techeniia* (Moscow, 1975).
96. See, for example, *AS* no. 3905, 2.
97. G. Shimanov, "Lie Abramson," 141-150.
98. G. Shimanov, "Moskva-Tretii Rim," *Protiv techeniia* (1975): 111.
99. Dmitry Dudko, "O nashem upovanii," *Besedy* 66 (Moscow, 1974); A. Ogorodnikov, *Istoki i nadezhdy* 66. Ogorodnikov and other members of the Christian Seminar did not justify the Soviet state, like other underground fundamentalists. See T. Goricheva, "Khristianstvo, kul'tura, politika," in *Khristianskii seminar: Vol'noe slovo* (Frankfurt, 1980): 14-18.
100. V. Shlapentokh, *Op. cit.*, 204. The author correctly distinguishes pro-fascist Russophiles with religiously informed intellectuals, whom he for some reason calls "traditionalists." See V. Shlapentokh, *Op. cit.*, 213.
101. Igor Ogurtsov and Mikhail Sado, "Ustav VSKhSON," *Posev* 1 (1971): 2.
102. *Veche* 8 (1973): 104 (*AS* no. 1665).
103. G. Shimanov, "Diversiia protiv pravdy," *Posev* 2 (1978): 54.
104. G. Shimanov, "Pis'mo G. M. Shimanova general'nomu sekretariu KPSS L. I. Brezhnevu," *Vestnik PKhD* (1976): 199.
105. G. Shimanov, "Zapretnaia tema," *Nepriadva* 3 (1988): 29.
106. Feliks Karelin, "Kampaniia protiv Pamiati," *Nepriadva* 2 (1987): 52.
107. *Nepriadva* 11 (1989): 11.
108. G. Shimanov, *Osnovaniia dlia nadezhdy*, 3.
109. G. Shimanov, *Ideal'noe gosudarstvo*, 6.
110. G. Shimanov, "Psevdokommunisticheskoe pravosoznaniie," *Nepriadva* 16 (1990): 36-40.
111. The practical nature of religious fundamentalism is discussed in John H. Garvey, "Introduction: Fundamentalism and Politics," in Martin E. Marty and R. Scott Appleby (eds.), *Fundamentalism and the State*, 17.
112. G. Shimanov, *Ideal'noe gosudarstvo*, 5.
113. G. Shimanov, *Ideal'noe gosudarstvo*, 5-8.
114. G. Shimanov, *Kak nam ponimat' nashu istoriiu*, 9.
115. Steve Bruce, *Fundamentalism* (Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 2000): 21, 32; M. E. Marty and R. S. Appleby (eds.), *Fundamentalism and Society*, (Chicago: University

of Chicago Press, 1993): 11-16.

116. G. Shimanov, *Traktat o liubvi*, 35.

117. *Nepriadva* 8 (1989): 35.

118. Valery Skurlatov, "Code of Morals," in A. Yanov, *The New Russian Right. Right-Wing Ideologies in the Contemporary USSR* (Berkeley, Calif.: Institute of International Studies, 1978): 171.

119. Anatoly Emmanuilovich Levitin-Krasnov, *Rodnoi proctor. Vospominaniia, Chast' 4* (Frankfurt, 1981): 159-160.

120. N. Mitrokhin, Op. cit., 519.

121. See the later account of his ideas: D. Dudko, "K priezdu A. Solzhenitsyna v Rossiiu," *Zavrtva* 23 (June, 1994): 8. Our sources suggest that he backed these ideas long before.

122. He called for combining a "Marxist and Leninist worldview with Russian patriotism." See A. Ivanov-Skuratov, "O russkom natsional'nom mirovozzrenii," *Veche* 5 (1972): 149.

123. J. Dunlop, *The New Russian Nationalism*, 80.

124. G. Shimanov, "Pis'mo Natal'e Sergeevne," *Protiv techeniia* (Moscow, 1975), 32. Dudko preached the similar things. See D. Dudko, *O nashem upovanii*, 64.

125. V. Osipov, "Otkrytoe pis'mo Gennadiiu Shimanovu," *Iz zhurnala "Veche": Vol'noe slovo* (Frankfurt, 1975):13-19.

126. D. Hammer, Op. cit., 365-366.

127. G. Shimanov, *Ideal'noe gosudarstvo*, 3.

128. Shimanov, *Kak nam ponimat' nashu istoriiu i k chemu v nei stremit'sia*, 7.

129. G. Shimanov, "Tri otkrytykh pis'ma N. A. Struve, redaktoru zhurnala 'Vestnik RSKhD'," *Protiv techeniia* (1975): 16.

130. *Nepriadva* 8 (1989): 35.

131. N. Mitrokhin, Op. cit., 451.

132. A. Ivanov-Skuratov, *Slovo natsii*, in AS no. 590 (1970), 5-6.

133. *Vestnik RKhD* 121 (1977): 120.

134. G. Shimanov, "Za dveriami 'Russkogo kluba'," *Nash sovremennik* 5 (1992): 161.

135. *Nepriadva* 16 (1990): 1. J. Dunlop wittily noted a glaring contradiction: Shimanov believed that the revolution of 1917 saved Russia from the Jewish and Masonic "yoke," but at the same time he and his coauthors observed the revolution as made primarily by "an internationalist clique, heavily infiltrated by Jews." See: J. Dunlop, *The New Russian Nationalism*, 79.

136. G. Shimanov, *Zapretnaia tema*, 34-43.

137. G. Shimanov, "Predislovie k stat'e 'Lie Abramson'," *Nepriadva* 17 (1990): 69.

138. Heinz-Dietrich Löwe, *The Tsars and the Jews: Reform, Reaction and Anti-Semitism in Imperial Russia, 1772-1917* (Chur, Switzerland and Langhorne, Pa.: Harwood Academic Publishers, 1992): 8.

139. G. Shimanov, *Kak ponimat' nashu istoriiu*, 14.

140. Mikhail Agursky, *Contemporary Russian nationalism: History Revised*, Research paper, no. 45 (Jerusalem: Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 1982): 1-2.

141. G. Shimanov, *O tserkvi v sovremennoi Rossii (Iz pis'ma)*, in AS no. 1735 (1973).

142. *Nepriadva* 8 (1989): 45.

143. *Nepriadva* 10 (1990): 26.

144. Iu. Aver'ianov, "A zachem nam nuzhen lichnyi avtomobil'?" *Nepriadva* 3 (1988): 69.

145. G. Shimanov, *Kak ponimat' nashu istoriiu*, 14-15.

146. *Nepriadva* 11 (1989): 72.

147. *Veche* 3 (1971): 3.

148. Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn, *Pis'mo vozhdiam Sovetskogo Soiuzna*, in AS no. 1600 (1974): 18.

149. Liudmila Alexeyeva, *Istoriia inakomyслиia v SSSR. Noveishii period* (Moscow, 1992), 325.

150. F. Karelin, "Otvēt na otzyv (Apologiia 'Teologicheskogo manifesta')," *Nepriadva* 4 (1988): 42. Some years earlier, he wrote that "the tendency of one or another people to participate in capitalist development was in strict reverse proportion to its participation in the Eucharistic Meal." See F. Karelin, "Teologicheskii manifest," *Mnogaia leta* (1981): 23.

151. F. Karelin, "Trinitarnaia eskhatologiia i blizhaishie sud'by chelovechestva," *Nepriadva* 17

(1990): 17; F. Karelin, "Bibleiskie osnovy politekonomii i problemy perestroiki," *Nepriadva* 10 (1989): 18.

152. See, for example, Brenda Brasher (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Fundamentalism* (New York: Routledge, 2001): 34. Karelin was especially known for anticipating doomsday. In 1967, he organized a tour for some Moscow religious fanatics to the cloister of New Aphon in order to meet the end of the world. See N. Mitrokhin, *Op. cit.*, 511.

153. G. Balashov, "O plusakh i minusakh gosudarstvennoi sobstvennosti," *Iz zhurnala "Zemlia": Vol'noe slovo*, 58.

154. M. Riesebrodt, "Fundamentalism and the Resurgence of Religion," 272.

155. See, for example, Rebecca Frey, *Fundamentalism* (New York: Facts On File, 2007): 26-27.

156. G. Shimanov, *Traktat o liubvi*, 45.

157. G. Shimanov, *O ravenstve i neravenstve v brake*, 40-42. His recent article, which appeared online in 2004, repeats his idea in more explicit way: "Husbands have powers over their wives not for the sake of their ambitions but for the sake of the God's truth on the earth." See G. Shimanov, "Kraeugol'nye kamni sovremennogo braka," in http://shimanov.narod.ru/kraeugolnie_kamni.htm (last accessed September 23, 2009).

158. G. Shimanov, *O ravenstve i neravenstve v brake*, 41. It is very likely that Shimanov modeled his views on family life according to his own experience. He had a wife and a child, and this was evidently a happy marriage. See G. Shimanov, "Zapiski iz krasnogo doma [1969]" *Zapiski iz krasnogo doma*, (Moscow, 2006): 52.

159. See, for example, Margaret Bendroth, *Fundamentalism and Gender: 1875 to the Present* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1993).

160. T. Goricheva, "Raduisia, slez nevinnykh izbavlen'e," *Zhenshchina i Rossiia, Al'manakh zhenshchinam o zhenshchinakh* 1 (1979): 17.

161. G. Shimanov, *Traktat o liubvi*, 70, 120.

162. *Ibid.*: 100-120.

163. Valery Skurlatov, "Code of Morals," A. Yanov (ed.) *The New Russian Right. Right-Wing Ideologies in the Contemporary USSR* (Berkeley, California: Institute of International Studies, 1978): 171.

164. G. Shimanov, *Traktat o liubvi*, 83, 90-91, 94.

165. *Ibid.*: 96, 98.

166. *Ibid.*: 93, 111.

167. *Nepriadva* 12 (1989): 32.

168. G. Shimanov, *Traktat o liubvi*, 120.

169. *Ibid.*: 63.

170. G. Shimanov, *Traktat o liubvi*, 67-68.

171. *Ibid.*, 63, 67-68, 96-112.

172. L. Alekseeva, *Op. cit.*, 326.

173. D. Zeidan, *The Resurgency of Religion*, 205.

174. G. Shimanov, "Vstuplenie v brak," *Mnogaia leta* (1981): 110.

175. G. Shimanov, *Traktat o liubvi*, 115.

176. *Ibid.*: 116.

177. For example, the members of the "Christian seminar" interpreted commune as parish. See *Obshchina*, in *AS* no. 3452, 17; see also Ianov, *Russkaia ideia*, 215.

178. Aleksandr Ianov, *Russkaia ideia i 2000-i god* (New York, 1988): 215.

UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE® (All Periodicals Publications Except Requester Publications)				13. Publication Title	14. Issue Date for Circulation Data Below
1. Publication Title DEMOKRATIZATSIYA				DEMOKRATIZATSIYA	Summer 2009
2. Publication Number		3. Filing Date		4. Issue Frequency	
1 0 7 4 - 6 8 4 6		October 1, 2009		Quarterly	
5. Number of Issues Published Annually				6. Annual Subscription Price	
4				\$60.00	
7. Complete Mailing Address of Known Office of Publication (Not printer) (Street, city, county, state, and ZIP+4®)				Contact Person	
1319 Eighteenth Street, NW Washington, DC 20036				Christine Polcino	
8. Complete Mailing Address of Headquarters or General Business Office of Publisher (Not printer)				Telephone (include area code)	
1319 Eighteenth Street, NW Washington, DC 20036				202-296-6267	
9. Full Names and Complete Mailing Addresses of Publisher, Editor, and Managing Editor (Do not leave blank)					
Publisher (Name and complete mailing address)					
James S. Denton 1319 Eighteenth Street, NW, Washington, DC 20036					
Editor (Name and complete mailing address)					
Rachel Adams 1319 Eighteenth Street, NW, Washington, DC 20036					
Managing Editor (Name and complete mailing address)					
N/A					
10. Owner (Do not leave blank. If the publication is owned by a corporation, give the name and address of the corporation immediately followed by the names and addresses of all stockholders owning or holding 1 percent or more of the total amount of stock. If not owned by a corporation, give the names and addresses of the individual owners. If owned by a partnership or other unincorporated firm, give its name and address as well as those of each individual owner. If the publication is published by a nonprofit organization, give its name and address.)					
Full Name		Complete Mailing Address			
Helen Dwight Reid Educational Foundation		1319 Eighteenth Street, NW, Washington, DC 20036			
11. Known Bondholders, Mortgagees, and Other Security Holders Owning or Holding 1 Percent or More of Total Amount of Bonds, Mortgages, or Other Securities. If none, check box <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> None					
Full Name		Complete Mailing Address			
12. Tax Status (For completion by nonprofit organizations authorized to mail at nonprofit rates) (Check one) The purpose, function, and nonprofit status of this organization and the exempt status for federal income tax purposes: <input type="checkbox"/> Has Not Changed During Preceding 12 Months <input type="checkbox"/> Has Changed During Preceding 12 Months (Publisher must submit explanation of change with this statement)					
PS Form 3526, September 2008 (Page 1 of 3 (Instructions Page 3)) PSN 7530-01-000-9931 PRIVACY NOTICE: See our privacy policy on www.usps.com					
15. Extent and Nature of Circulation				Average No. Copies Each Issue During Preceding 12 Months	
a. Total Number of Copies (Net press run)				582	
b. Paid Circulation (By Mail and Outside the Mail)				No. Copies of Single Issue Published Nearest to Filing Date	
(1) Mailed Outside-County Paid Subscriptions Stated on PS Form 3841 (Include paid distribution above nominal rate, advertiser's proof copies, and exchange copies)				146	
(2) Mailed In-County Paid Subscriptions Stated on PS Form 3541 (Include paid distribution above nominal rate, advertiser's proof copies, and exchange copies)				0	
(3) Paid Distribution Outside the Mails Including Sales Through Dealers and Carriers, Street Vendors, Counter Sales, and Other Paid Distribution Outside USPS®				278	
(4) Paid Distribution by Other Classes of Mail Through the USPS (e.g. First-Class Mail®)				0	
c. Total Paid Distribution (Sum of 15b (1), (2), (3), and (4))				424	
d. Free or Nominal Rate Distribution (By Mail and Outside the Mail)				398	
(1) Free or Nominal Rate Outside-County Copies Included on PS Form 3841				0	
(2) Free or Nominal Rate In-County Copies Included on PS Form 3541				0	
(3) Free or Nominal Rate Copies Mailed at Other Classes Through the USPS (e.g. First-Class Mail)				52	
(4) Free or Nominal Rate Distribution Outside the Mail (Carriers or other means)				0	
e. Total Free or Nominal Rate Distribution (Sum of 15d (1), (2), (3), and (4))				52	
f. Total Distribution (Sum of 15c and 15e)				476	
g. Copies not Distributed (See Instructions to Publishers #4 (page #3))				106	
h. Total (Sum of 15f and g)				582	
i. Percent Paid (15c divided by 15f times 100)				89%	
16. Publication of Statement of Ownership				90%	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> If the publication is a general publication, publication of this statement is required. Will be printed in the <u>Fall 2009</u> issue of this publication. <input type="checkbox"/> Publication not required.					
17. Signature and Title of Editor, Publisher, Business Manager, or Owner				Date	
				10/1/2009	
I certify that all information furnished on this form is true and complete. I understand that anyone who furnishes false or misleading information on this form or who omits material or information requested on the form may be subject to criminal sanctions (including fines and imprisonment) and/or civil sanctions (including civil penalties).					
PS Form 3526, September 2008 (Page 2 of 3)					