

The essence of the "common to all mankind" should not be associated with the category of "all-human", i.e. it should not create a social "illusion" of dominating of the "magical state of permissiveness and all-property for "everybody" and to "everyone" right. "Common to all mankind" upbringing is directed mostly to "inculcation" of such moral, spiritual, educational "talents" to this "everything" (i.e. to the majority), to conscious leadership of which the "social mass" has never yielded to. The latter ("mass") often has not even suspected of existing of such positive trends or didn't have such desire, because "assimilation" of their content promised considerable difficulties, and in the first place from the point of view of overcoming of "oneself", one's own weaknesses and "affects", which come from the depths of the "beyond conscious I" and yet with which it has to "reward" oneself.

"Common to all mankind" – is not that rude and mercenary "all-ownership" (as property or power) and not a logical result of the process of "acquirement" by everyone and for everyone; it's special "individual", "secret" Great which only comes to everyone, when they have lost their last hope for something, when they don't have anything but their "willpower". This is something that a person as a human being had to win and defend in front of his own nature with great effort throughout the history. "Common to all mankind" upbringing is not something that should be brought closer in history. It has always been and is still acting today, but it is always focused on the amount of qualities and actions which once again is hard to obtain and, moreover, to accomplish, because they have often called "contrary", which demanded an achievement from a person and "embodied" in him, "by force" and "over I can't". And of course it has not been at a "service" of the government, one or another political system, but rather "common to all mankind" upbringing guided and guides "whole peoples", forming a political "sense" and social "tastes" for the countries, which don't allow them to stagnate in one place.

I.I. KAPRITSYN

ORTHODOX CHURCH: PROBLEMS OF RENAISSANCE

More than two hundred years ago the epoch of absolute prevalence of religious world view came to its end in Europe. Its secularization activated. Rational-scientific consciousness overgrew from knowledge of individuals and gradually assumed public status, forcing Christian-religious world view out of its traditional spheres.

Consciousness secular "objectifying" was preceded by social processes directed differently, which resulted in the crisis of Christianity the qualitative expression of which was "misrepresentation of Christ's image" made by the Church of Christ. The church "sullied" itself by money-grabbing, by justification of unfair social relations, by freedom repression, etc. [10,33]. Falling of spiritual authority of the Church facilitated setting science apart from religion and its taking the leading positions in world outlook, and, as a result, in world view.

Scientism in its positive form reached the unreserved negation of religion as obsolete, rudimentary form of public conscience that had no reason for its existing. Nevertheless, despite centuries of "proscription" religion "survived", still being a part of ritualistic and moral sphere of human life. Moreover, in XX- XXI centuries the dialectical process called "religious renaissance" (I. Vallerstain), "second christening of Europe" (S. Hantington) became the phenomenon of social life that drew social scientist's attention. It reflects increasing of influence of religious component on life of modern European society that has secular education and thinks pragmatically.

Among reasons of religiousness expansion and science crisis scientists name disappointment of the results of scientific and technical civilization, which wasn't able to carry out its promises concerning nature subjugation. Other reasons named are: aggravating such problems as individualism which leads to society atomization, rationalism as trampling of moral norms in order to make gains, etc.

Risks of life destruction appeared to be so great, that positivistic science had to renounce its recent claims to truth. Today religion and science are considered to be different, but equivalent and complementary methods of cognition (P. Feyerabend). Statement of proximity of advanced fields of science (atomic, molecular physics) and religious doctrines (F. Capra) is becoming fashionable. Some representatives of "fourth estate" are going further. They think that "religion and science are divided only by politics" [6,1]. But aspiring to idyllic indemnity of scientific and technical civilization defects on account of returning to religious

spirituality "bares" not only the problems of scientism but undecided, deferred, in some ways "eternal" problems of the Christian Church too.

Meantime, the growth of religion role on post-soviet territory, tendencies of its taking the position of society ideological base, along with suppressing its urgent problems can be fraught with aggravating of these problems. For example, a professor of the Moscow ecclesiastical academy A. Osipov, mentioning early atheistic criticism of the Orthodoxy, considers that it was directed not against religion itself, "which people didn't even take the trouble to cognize, but against religion abuses which were conditioned by time and were overcome [10,34]. On the background of severe social reality such redundant optimism does not look especially convincing, but it reveals one of methodological mode of "taking" the church from under society criticism. They say it is possible to cognize religion only by personal immersion in it. And this levels objectivity as methodological base of scientific analysis. The uniqueness of church (that is the stronghold of religion) is in the invisible being of Christ (purgative commencement) in it, therefore possible "deformations" of church parts do not affect its as a whole. But "religion abuses", considered as dialectical opposite to the patristic deeds, are the engine of its development, therefore they are insurmountable and will always be with the Church. If considered in a different way, they are the result of antichrist's activity who is hardly "defeated" too. He is still subtle and active, and his deeds can be a wonderful "background" of Church piety. "The devil in extremes" (father John Ohlobystin) [15,2].

Thus, the Christian Church and the Orthodoxy in particular need secular criticism extremely. Such criticism is not always perfect in doctrine subtleties, but it reproduces the social reflection of the Church character and the correlation between seeming and visible accurately. Secular (philosophical, scientific) criticism can not prejudice the Church. Moreover, as it can be seen in history, nobody is able to prejudice the Church, except the Church itself, because nobody damaged it more than the Church itself did. In this connection, our leading motivation is not to "drive another nail" into the Body of Christ, but to admit the social activity and the effectiveness of the Orthodox Church and to express our thoughts about its institutional and church problems which "reduce" its authority and "steal" its humanistic potential.

The analysis of tendencies of Church progress as the organ that regulates the vital activity of a certain social structure faces some features which are rooted in the specificity of religious form of consciousness. Understanding of "religion" as the fundamental concept in orthodox spiritual tradition as well as in our research in the interpretation of authorities of the Church relies on three basic principles: 1. Confession of personal, spiritual, perfect overworld commencement – God who is accepted as really existing, unchanging ideal of good, truth, beauty and who is the ultimate goal of spiritual aspirations of the human. 2. The belief that the human can communicate and unify with God and live eternal life with Him. 3. Doctrine that the human first and foremost is a spiritual being, who has an immortal soul, which is the bearer of personality, his or her mind, heart (organ that is associated with feelings), will. Other elements of the religion (the doctrine about Revelation, the inner world, the prayer, etc.) are organically and logically related to the elements mentioned above. It is noted that "any doctrine not containing the basic verities named is not religious one" [10,9-10].

The wording of basic determination demonstrates the place of Orthodoxy in consciousness of its followers and raises a range of problems of external interrelations with other religious phenomena.

If the definition concerns exceptionally the Orthodoxy, then everything is clear. But, since the concept "religion" does not have more precise definition "Orthodox", etc., then such a concrete definition that automatically moves the great number of the acknowledged religions "to nowhere" causes systematic criticism from their side, and this criticism seems not to be interesting for the authors of The Catechism (1991). This "firmness" might be caused by the problem of self-identification of the Orthodoxy, and accordingly by fear of losing its identity, especially in the golden age of ecumenism which advances the ideas of "one faith", "one Church" for all religions. Ecumenism "pouring" out the "projections of Christ" in non-Christian religions considers "the Holy Spirit" to be independent of Christ and his Church. This makes it a common denominator for all religions. Such innovation is justly interpreted by the Orthodoxy as an attempt of undermining and annihilation of the whole idea and existence of the Church of Christ. But the process of ecumenization is objective, and fear of identity loss is instinctive. On the one hand, the Orthodoxy can take advantage of experience of Catholicism and other subjects of this process; on the other hand, nobody except for the representatives of Orthodoxy draws the Orthodoxy in ecumenic movement.

While examining Orthodox Christianity in categories of common and special, we consider a creed of deep disorder of human nature ("original sin") and complete concentrating on the salvation of the human

from this all-embracing illness to be distinctively-christian features [10.10-11]. Historically Christianity has a judaistic origin. Christian heresy of judaism distorted the fundamental principle in its two fundamental points: prohibitions to portray the Lord and worship these images.

There is a complex of reasons at the heart of the Christian Church schism into Catholic and Orthodox ones. One of the reasons was the clash of prelacy's needs. On a theoretical level that manifested in opposing of judaistic and platonic doctrine tendencies. Not paying attention to details, Orthodoxy and Catholicism share only the attitude to the Papacy and the Roman Bishop authority, i.e. the basic question here is one of power. The centuries of schism "shaded" and "made several layers" of basic disagreement by means of debatable dogmas, formal differences in ritualism and mutual reproaches for apostasy.

These reasonings makes socio-philosophical understanding of the term "religion" wider; it is thought now to be a socially organized (and organizing) part of culture, the result of human communities activity, which is founded and develops on the basis of specific faith in existence of the real, terrestrial world (which is perceived by sense organs) as well as of supernatural refuge of higher power, deserving worships [5,53]. Thus, we consider religion to be a form of culture, conditioned by faith in existence of supernatural experience sphere, that in the social practice is presented as cooperation of its structural components of the first (believers and deity) the second (the clergy, dogma and cult [5,67]) and the third (physical: the real estate, property, means) levels.

Orthodox theologians think the Church to be the foundation of religion; on the other hand, in secular language "the Church" in Orthodoxy is interpreted as something indefinable. It means that theologians refuse to give a satisfactory and exhaustive definition of this concept on the intellectual level. In their opinion, the Church can be cognized only through experience, through participation in its life. "The church is a theanthropical union, it belongs to the divine world, it exists in God, and that's why it exists in the world and in human history. But, if we see it only in its historical becoming as one of terrestrial societies, then we pass by its originality, its nature in which the eternal reveals in the transient, uncreated reveals in created" [10,239]. Moreover, "interpreters" from Russian Orthodox Church suggest not to "turn the Church into the clergy" [7,2]. Who then is responsible for the Church from the human side of "theanthropical" union?!

Such a "poly-conceptual" approach "obscures" the borders of the phenomenon, but does not deprive it of "social tracks". When analysing the problems of the Orthodox Church, it is necessary to take into account that they have interpenetrating (theanthropical) nature and are divided only gnosiologically. We must begin with the problem of inconsistency which is discernible practically in each existing problem. For example, the Church figures often draw attention to doctrine and structural firmness of the Orthodoxy. Meantime, historical reduction of Christian doctrine is traced from prevailing of the Church as the salvation place (eclesiocentrism), through the image of Jesus who is a mediator in salvation (christocentrism) to the Supreme Being, i.e. - to salvation proper (theocentrism). It seems that "almost at once discourse on God, abolishes itself: in the end discourse on salvation (soteriocentrism) remains. It means that concept "salvation" which is regarded as a purpose of human life is the only one to remain from Christian tradition. At the same time the basic doctrines of Christianity are put aside" [4,4]. Simplifying the process considerably, we can say, that Christianity, having experienced its intellectual rise, found itself next to its beginning that is solving the question of salvation of a concrete individual. Simplification, profanation of the Orthodox doctrine can be interpreted as a return to "biblical simplicity" which, by the way, is widely used by protestant movements (the Baptists, the Jehovah's Witnesses) who demonstrate the "early Christian" forms of social activity successfully.

Speaking about "firmness" of architectonics of the Christian Church in general, and the Orthodoxy in particular, in our opinion it is necessary to mention a loss of an important structural part of primordial Church – the institution of prophets. In "The Didache" (The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles), the source of early 150s, they say that a prophet can be easily distinguished from a traitor of Christ (Christemporos), who benefits from his belonging to Christianity. A prophet does not stay at one place more than one or two days, he eats nothing except bread along the way, he "follows the ways of God ", and propagating the truth observes it by himself [17,197-198]. So we can see that the Church – the embodiment of unity of Lord's Word and Works – has lost the structure which is functionally necessary for preserving spirit and lifestyle of a true Christian.

Examining inconsistency and functional losses of the Church it is necessary to touch the phenomena of the opposite type – anachronisms which repel active tiers of society who are searching for spirituality, but if dissatisfied by the Orthodoxy, convert to non-Orthodox confessions.

Institutionally the Christian Church was formed in the period of the Roman empire and barbarian kingdoms, the social relations of that period left traces on the forming Christianity. A hierarchical feudal structure inherited from those times appeared to have few functions in modern liberal and democratic society. Actually, the Church was initially formed as an undemocratic state structure. Now it takes into account its traditional aims and tries to cultivate feudal relations in modern society. In the conditions of the noticeable totalitarian tendencies in social processes (F. George, C. Tailor) a monarchist structure meets certain requirements, but nevertheless makes the Orthodox administrative structure rigid. Excessive concentration on traditionalism makes the Church senseless in regard to the newest social phenomena (youth subcultures, etc.)

Fusion of church and state on early stages of European history made the Church a participant of political games [2,68-70], which often were far from images of Christian moral and a participator in unpopular etatistic steps, which undermined its social image.

The Head of Russian Orthodox Church Tikhon being canonized nowadays was so "inspired" with unity of Russian Empire and the Orthodox Church in his time that anathematized soviet power (19.01.1918), ignoring a biblical commandment, that "existent authorities are from God" (to the Romans, ch. 13,1) [3,188].

Loyalty in regard to the state "returns" to the Orthodox Church in the form of immunity, which provides it with actual ideological, economic and other advantages with the declared legal equality of all religious confessions, that isn't conducive to slackening of intrasocial tension.

Contradictions between the Orthodox Church-an institute and the Church- conciliarism as forms of public activity have a few aspects. For strengthening its institutional position the Church has cultivated before and it's cultivating now the information about itself as about an exponent of interests of all society tiers. From a positions of walkthrough, taking into account polyconfessionality of Ukrainian society, this statement is not convincing. Moreover, statistics based on sociological public opinion polls, transfers it in the area of myths.

The results of the researches published show that in consciousness of the Ukrainians, the concept "an orthodox believer" (68,8% of all questioned) is wider than the concept "a believer" (62,2%). 75,8% of those citizens, who were christened originally and 31,5% of unchristened classed themselves as orthodox believers. Among the category of "orthodox believers" 50% are "baptized" – they do not refer themselves to any of orthodox confessions. Finally, the most of questioned think that today's "ideal believer" is a man or a woman who attends religious services from time to time and carries out the rites, and for whom awareness of religious bases is not obligatory. It should be noted that this conception was supported by 56,6% of orthodox believers, 46,9% of "baptized". There are only 1,7% of "true believers" in (almost) traditional sense, who know and practise religion and attend church service at least once a month [8,1-6]. Thus, there is rather weak correlation between people's classing themselves as orthodox believers, admitting the importance of confessional and ceremonial aspects for believers' life, and the measure of displaying of these aspects in real life. Meantime, the fathers of the Church are sure that the "idea of unintentional belief or accepting Christ contradicts the nature of Christianity" (hieromonk Seraphim Rose) [18,5].

On the other hand, evolution of religious processes does not allow us to agree with the theory "The Orthodoxy is a mouthpiece of common interests". The number of Roman Catholic (0,8%), Byzantine-rite Catholic (6,9%), Protestant (2,2%), Islamic (0,7%) and other spiritual organizations (Judaism, orientalist religions, neo-heathenism, 0,1% each) is growing actively [8, 2]. In Ukraine over 120 religious confessions are registered [9,1]. Only in Zaporizhzhya region there are more than forty of them. Can the Orthodox Church express the interests of all tiers of society under such conditions?! It should be noted that Russian Moslem clergy is against country's clericalisation, considering it to be the threat to the national safety of Russia. They believe that clericalisation becomes apparent through including "Bases of orthodox faith" to the compulsory school curriculum. The muftis regard compulsion to the faith as a sign of clericalism [14,1].

Christianity is known to be the world religion. Proclamation it as a state religion of the Roman Empire as well as missionary activity served this greatly. Orthodoxy became the world religion through the "exodus" of Russian emigrants after the revolution, in 1917-1922. The most powerful emigrant wave, directed westward, resulted in the largest schism in the Orthodoxy. It broke up into "soviet" and foreign one; the latter broke up into different cultures. In 1990-s the USSR was divided and the Orthodox Church went through comminuted schism. Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church (it was proclaimed in the past, in 1919 and 1942) was "re-established" in 1989. The Ukrainian Orthodox Church (Kyiv patriarchate) was founded in 1991. The initiator of its creation was a metropolitan of ROC (Russian Orthodox Church) Filaret. Having failed at the elections of Moscow patriarch, Filaret went to Kyiv, and, gathering the "The Assembly

of UOC (Ukrainian Orthodox Church) Hierarchs", proclaimed the independence of the Ukrainian orthodoxy from ROC. The Church was split into two oppositions: ROC of Moscow patriarchate and UOC of Kyiv patriarchate. The conflict was aggravated by typical political rhetoric which touches ethnic preferences, patriotism, etc. The religio-political underlying reason led to confessional opposition of Ukrainian society. The oecumenical Orthodoxy does not hurry with formal legitimation of this incident. Such an act can serve as the "start button" for the Belarussian, Moldavian and other church autonomies.

According to archpriest John Meyendorff "The Church can not be equated to any nationality: this principle is in the basis of the New Testament Teaching about the Church. Since days of St. Cyril and Methodius there was a principle of translation the Scripture into plain language... In this way national cultures were inevitably created" [12,12]. Thus, the statement of the One Christian Orthodox Church existence is denied by permanent internal discords in the form of schisms, heresies, confessions, rumours. Functioning in new terms demanded new accents in orthodox pulpitering in the western world, but the Orthodoxy did not succeed in its propagation. It is religious minority in the west, and this fact proves unextensiveness of its development.

The question of unclearness of Church Slavonic language is related to the problem of anachronisms. The problem was raised in Russia as early as 1905. "Our sublime divine service is turned into the incomprehensible flow of words because of our predilection for the dead language" (Jacob, the archbishop of Yaroslavl). The Orthodoxy remains incomprehensible to modern society.

By the beginning of the process of "religious renaissance" despite scientific "fatigue" of postsoviet territory, the Orthodoxy had got the secular world, world of disbelief and indifference. It should be mentioned that the historians of church themselves note the "enormous examples of ignorance of church history. Moreover, ... church consciousness stopped to be historical and became mythological" [13,4].

Two generations separated from Orthodoxy tradition grew up during the soviet period. The peculiarity of church orthodox Christians in Ukraine and Russia is syncretism of world view in which general Christian aspects are alternated with superstitions [11,2], neophytism, the peculiarity of which is to take life simply, to determine good and evil on their external signs and to thrust these schemes on all people.

On its socially-demographic composition the postsoviet Orthodox Church is conventionally divided into "the Church of elderly people" and "the Church of "intellectuals" [19,5-9]. Elderly people prevail in their number, but "intellectuals" are more active and more purposeful, and they become the minority which aims to lead the way. Besides "neophytism" deep knowledge, intellectuality, criticism as well as their oppositions (aspiring for elitism, pride) characterize "intelligentsia".

According to orthodox priests' evidence, a new generation wants to get the fruit of the Spirit for nothing, incidentally, without special spiritual work, dropping to the miracle-working icons, visiting the holy places. That stimulates the requirement in wonders, develops a fashion for pilgrimage, and searching for sagacious elders.

When analyzing orthodoxy problems we can hardly avoid encountering the ambiguous thesis of theologies of the past and the present. "Only the Orthodoxy is veritable Christianity. By His own account it's the Truth His incarnated only-begotten Son of God came to earth to witness.

He came to witness it in the Holy Tradition of our Orthodox catholic (i.e. Oecumenical) East Church which is the only one that has changed nothing in this teaching, and until now it is fairly named "the Orthodox Church" (Archbishop Abercius (Taushev)) [1,1]. Or: "if they (Hebrews and Moslems) know God, besides Jesus Christ, then Christ was incarnated, died and resurrected for nothing"! (Father Vasily Sakkas) [18,9]. But can pretensions to exceptionality stand test by means of practice? Does it do the Orthodoxy more functional, less problematic than other religions? The answer is "no".

Another problem of the Orthodoxy related to ones considered above is an outflow of potential parishioners to other confessions, sometimes to the "newest" spiritual "values", as it occurred with a totalitarian sect "White Fraternity". The most reflective clergymen consider this to be a sin of those who went away, "but sometimes it is our sin. And if it is ours – then ... Justice of Heaven begins with the House of God" [12,8]. Sects in some way are an internal problem of the Church, related straight to insufficiency of positive mission and active work among baptized, but "unenlightened" people. Less reflective clergymen are absorbed in a violent struggle against the objectively set subjective reality in the form of "ecumenists", "freemasons", "protestants", "orientalists", etc. [18,2-12], realizing a dialectical law which supposes the enriching and strengthening action of antagonisms. This is confirmed by history of interrelations of all religions with their opponents (Buddhism and Brahmanism, Christianity and "paganism"). The greatest rise

of philosophical comprehension of their own studies is related to the period of the most active polemic of their representatives.

In conclusion we'd like to quote the Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh. During the period of soviet irreligion the Orthodox "Church was limited in its right to propagate faith. But the Church was not limited in its right to call to the strict life purity and morality - unfortunately the Church did not do this. Baptists are cleaner in that point than we are and it pains me to think about this, to know and hear this" [16,2].

In 1300-s Russian Strigolniks' heresy in the Orthodoxy was based on the slogan "Christ does not have the Church on the earth any longer". Only repressions could be opposed to their truth by The Church. In XIX century of F. Nietzsche proclaimed "God has died". The Orthodoxy responded to his provocation by "keeping silent".

We can assume that few people living nowadays take the Christian postulates of creation and other subtleties of casuistry of the early Middle Ages seriously. In the modern world the Orthodoxy is applied and claimed, foremost, as an ethics and moral standard. It seems that for returning Jesus to his Church much more identification churchmen with the image of Christ, who was tolerant and loving, is needed.

SOURCES

1. Averky (Taushev). Istinnoye pravoslaviye i yego vragi v sovremennom mire/ <http://www.dorogadomj.com/dr63ave.html>
2. Ballestrem K.G. Tserkov i demokraticeskaya kultura: problemy adaptatsiy i konflikty / K.G. Ballestrem // Voprosy Filosofii. - 2002. - №1. - P. 67-77.
3. Bibliya: Knigi Sviashchennogo Pisaniya Vethogo i Novogo Zaveta: Kanonicheskiye v russkom perevode s parallelnymi mestami: [literatura religioznogo sodержaniya] Novaya zhizn. Campus crusade for Christ International. - 1994. - 1384 p.
4. Valdenfels B. Predstavleniye o spasenii v raznyh religiyah / Bernhard Valdenfels // Simvol. - 2003. - № 46. - P. 27-41.
5. Volovik V.I. Chto zhe takoye religiya? / Vitaly Ivanovich Volovik // Kulturologichny visnyk. Naukovo-teoretychny shchorichnyk Nyzhniroyi Naddniprianshchyny. - Vypusk 18. - Zaporizhzhia: Prosvita. - 2007. - P. 53.
6. Gevorkian E. Vremia konkordata // Agentstvo Politicheskikh Novostei. Proekt Instituta Natsionalnoi Strategii. 2009-03-19 // <http://www.apn.ru/opinions/print21459.htm>
7. Demiurin M. RPTs v sovremennoi Rossii: ot npravstvennogo voditelstva k voditelstvu duhovnomu. Po materialam kruglogo stola Instituta natsionalnoi strategii "Tserkov v sovremennoi istorii Rossii" // Agentstvo Politicheskikh Novostei. Proekt Instituta Natsionalnoi Strategii. 2008-12-29 // <http://www.apn.ru/publications/print21202.htm>
8. Dudar N. Religioznost v Ukraine: harakteristika sovremennogo sostoyaniya // Zhurnal "Ludyna i svit" (Kiev): yezhemesiachny buleten "Religiya i obshchestvo", № 23, // <http://www.atheism.ru/archive/text/967.phtml>
9. Zaytseva Y. Religioznye problemy na Ukraine. February, 2009 // <http://www.zip.org.ua/2009/02/sect-5/>
10. Katehizis. Komissiya sviashchennogo sinoda russkoi pravoslavnoi tserkvi po voprosam hristianskogo yedinstva. - K., Izdaniye ukrainskoi pravoslavnoi tserkvi. - 1991. - 416 p.
11. Intervyu Preosviashchennishego Logina, Yepiskopa Saratovskogo i Volskogo. On the basis of the site "Pravoslaviye.Ru" // <http://ricolor.org/rus/rz/psm/iskys/34/>
12. Meyendorf I. Pravoslavnoye svidetelstvo v sovremennom mire. Iz lektsy protoireya Ioanna Meyendorfa chitannyh v Belorusskom Ekzarhate Moscovskogo Patriarhata // <http://www.kiev-orthodox.org/site/churchlife/757/>
13. Mitrofanov G. Nashe tserkovnoye soznaniye perestalo byt istorichnym. Vystupleniye professora protoireya Georgiya Mitrofanova na kruglom stole SPGU, October, 24, 2005 // <http://ricolor.org/rus/rz/psm/iskys/16/>
14. Musulmanskoye duhovenstvo - protiv "klerikalizatsii Rossii" // Agentstvo Politicheskikh Novostei. Proekt Instituta Natsionalnoi Strategii. 2007-08-17 // <http://www.apn.ru/news/print17603.htm>
15. Ohlobystin J. (iyerei John Ohlobystin). Fragment from the book "Tam, gde Vostok" // <http://www.lepta-kniga.ru/ncd-0-14-454/news.html>

16. Pastyri odichavshogo stada Hristova. On the basis of the site "Pravoslaviye i sovremennost. Alfa i Omega", № 42 //http://ricolor.org/rus/rz/psm/iskris/ 4/
17. Ranovich A.B. Pervoistochniki po istorii rannego hristianstva. Antichnyye kritiki Hristianstva. – М.: Politizdat, 1990. – 479 p.
18. Seraphim (Rose). Pravoslaviye i religiya budushchego //http://www.wco.ru/biblio/books/rouz 2/Main.htm
19. Tkachenko A. My byli takimi kak vy / Kto v tserkvi glavneye? Monologi o babushkah i intelligentah. After site materials of magazine "Foma" //http://ricolor.org/rus/rz/ psm/today/37/

АННОТАЦІЯ

ПРАВОСЛАВНА ЦЕРКОВЬ: ПРОБЛЕМИ РЕНЕСАНСА

Стаття посвячена аналізу актуальних проблем православної церкви на фоні росту ролі релігійності в Україні. Тенденції вихода релігії на позиції ідеологічного базису постсоветського общества, ведуть к табуированню критики православия, как этно-идентифицирующей формы релігійності. При этом замалчиваются как старые, не разрешенные проблемы, так и современные несоответствия традиционной релігійності и социальной действительности.

Отмечается, что общая тенденция выведения проблем православия из-под светской системной критики, таит в себе вероятность их консервации и усугубления, что, в свою очередь, чревато снижением его социальной функциональности.

Казуистические маневры, предпринимаемые церковными идеологами для нейтрализации внешней критики, терминологическое «затуманивание» границ явлений, тем не менее, не лишает их «социальных следов». Мирская критика релігії не всегда искушена доктринально, но точна в социальной рефлексии деятельности церкви. Именно социальная практика рассматривается основой анализа непоследовательности «слов и дел», которая сквозит практически в каждой из рассмотренных проблем, а именно: сращивание церкви и государства, что подрывает её социальный имидж; противоречия между церковью-институтом и церковью-соборностью как формами общественной деятельности; акцентированность на традиционализме, несуразность в отношении новейших социальных явлений; анахронизмы, отталкивающие активные слои общества, ищущие духовности, обращающиеся к инославию; рассмотрение сектантства, в определенной степени, как внутренней проблемы церкви, напрямую связанной с недостаточностью положительной миссии, деятельной работы среди крещеного народа; неофитство как тенденция редуцирования духовности, ориентированное на получение плодов духа мимоходом, припадая к чудотворным иконам, посещая святые места, и, как следствие, потребность в чудесах, мода паломничества и др.

Определяя ведущие тенденции развития православия в современной Украине позволительно усомниться в большом количестве адептов всерьез воспринимающих христианские постулаты творения. Православие востребовано, прежде всего, как этический, моральный эталон. Думается, что для того, чтоб соответствовать этой роли, необходимо много большее отождествление деятелей церкви с образом Христа нестяжающего, терпимого и любящего.

О. С. МАЛІНОВСЬКА

ПРОБЛЕМА ГРОМАДЯНСЬКОСТІ В ІСТОРІЇ ВІТЧИЗНЯНОЇ СУСПІЛЬСТВОЗНАВЧОЇ ДУМКИ

Актуальність досліджуваної проблеми зумовлена складними трансформаційними процесами, які відбуваються в українській державі з часу отримання незалежності. Гальмування оновлення системи світоглядних орієнтацій і самосвідомості народу та громадянської ідентичності особистості пов'язане з численними небезпеками соціальної дезінтеграції. Зважаючи на це, актуалізується потреба в соціально-філософській рефлексії орієнтирів суспільно-державного розвитку, які відображали б історичну спадкоємність і сприяли б гармонізації взаємозв'язку особистого та суспільного у формуванні громадянина суверенної України. «Криза громадянськості» (З.Бауман), яку зараз переживають різні держави, в тому ж числі й розвинуті західні суспільства, спонукає до переосмислення проблеми формування громадянина і, передусім, передбачає критичне осмислення