

SUBJECT: Members of the Representation of the Russian Orthodox Church to the 4th Conference of the Church World Council in MONTREAL, Que., Canada in July 1963:

Bishop IVAN of New York,
Father Alexandr BUEVSKY,
Father Vitali BOROVYI.

SOURCE: R

DATE: 16 Aug 1963

DECLASSIFIED AND RELEASED BY
CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY
SOURCE METHOD EXEMPTION 3828
NAZI WAR CRIMES DISCLOSURE ACT
DATE 2007

1. Our Source met first Bishop IVAN during a coffee-break at the Conference and had a tete-a-tete talk with him. Asked whether there were any Ukrainians in the Soviet Delegation (of the Russian Orthodox Church) Bishop replied that none and added that nationality was of no relevance in Christianity. The situation of the Russian Orthodox Church in the Soviet Union he described as "complex" and commented "but we do what we can". The Ukrainian Catholic Church does not exist. According to Bishop the release of Metropolitan SLIPYI was an exclusively political affair. The Russian Orthodox Church made no intervention on its part, it had nothing to do with the case at all, the decision was taken by the Soviet government itself and was motivated by purely governmental considerations.

Bishop felt somewhat awkward when asked why the Orthodox Church in the Ukraine had no autonomy. Finally, his reply was that the title "Russian Orthodox Church" was a traditional one and they did not want to break the tradition.

2. Source also spoke tete-a-tete with Father Alexandr BUEVSKY, in civilian cloth, (Russian, graduate of Moscow Theological Academy, Secretary of the Commission of Foreign Relations of the Russian Orthodox Church. BUEVSKY stressed the important role Ukrainians played in the Russian Orthodox Church at the present. Many Ukrainians have responsible positions, thus for instance, RYZHYTSKYI, a Ukrainian is Director of the Moscow Academy, Chief-Inspector of Theology is also a Ukrainian. The Academy itself has 500 students.

BUEVSKY repeated Bishop's argument that an introduction of autonomy for individual national orthodox churches would mean the break of tradition, and

16 Aug 63

besides, "any stress of national peculiarity of a given church were tantamount with nationalism, narrowness, etc."

3. Father BUEVSKY introduced Source to Father Vitali BOROVI, Byelorussian, lecturer of Theological Academy in LENINGRAD. BOROVI began his theological studies still in Warsaw (he stemmed from Western /Polish/ Byelorussia), and was active in international relations of the Russian Orthodox Church since 1959. He ~~also~~ also took part in the Church World Council Conference in NEW DELHI, represented his church as observer at the Catholic Oecumenical Council in ROME, and visited the United States.

When talking tete-a-tete our Source asked BOROVI about the position of Ukrainian and Byelorussian churches within the Russian Orthodox Church. When he learned that Source stemmed from the Western Ukraine, he remarked: "I can't explain everything to you but I am sure we understand each other quite well because we both are from Western regions. I fully understand you and ^{what} you (Ukrainians) are aspiring to..."

Prior to that BOROVI explained that there were no Ukrainians in the Soviet Delegation "because ~~nobody~~ somehow thought of it". He also stressed the importance of Ukrainians and Byelorussians in the Russian Orthodox church: almost half of all believers lived in the Ukraine and Byelorussia. On this occasion he also mentioned the role of Ukrainian and Byelorussian element in the Russian Orthodox Church in the past, in particular in XVII C.

Next day BOROVI gave an interview in Ukrainian to our Source representing his Radio-Station in Montreal. During the interview when asked whether Ukrainians participated in international church conferences BOROVI replied: "Yes, there were, for instance, many Ukrainians in the Delegation to the United ~~States~~ States in March 1963 and here in Montreal we have Bishop Volodymyr KOTLAREV who is a Ukrainian. His name is Russian, but he was born of ~~Ukrainian~~ Ukrainian parents in Kazakhstan".

Afterwards Source tried to approach Bishop KOTLAREV but he was always "busy or otherwise prevented" to receive him.

4. In Source's opinion KOTLAREV was obviously "transformed" into a Ukrainian at the last moment on the spur of Source's asking about Ukrainian representative . The whole respective problem must have been discussed inside the Soviet group and did ^{somewhat} upset it.

The attitude of Soviet representatives , together with other generally known facts, was only an additional proof to the Source of the Russian chauvinistic reactionary nature of the Russian Orthodox Church .