

Political visions and historical scores

Political transformations
in the European Union by 2025

German response to reform
in the euro area

Crisis or a search for a new formula
for the Humboldtian university

The end of the Great War and Stanisław
Hubert's concept of *postliminum*

American press reports on anti-Jewish
incidents in reborn Poland

Anthony J. Drexel Biddle on Poland's
situation in 1937-1939

Memoirs *Nasza Podróż (Our Journey)*
by Ewelina Zaleska

On the dispute over the status
of the camp in occupied Konstantynów

The beginnings of the Polish
administration in the Kłodzko region

The US Consulate in Poznań (1946-1951)

The issue of compensation for victims
of Nazi crimes living in Poland

The Orthodox Church in Ukraine
and Russia after 2013

Polish sport under the shadow
of the swastika

A propagandised image of Polish sport
in the Polish Film Chronicle

Polish candidates for and members
of the International Olympic Committee

2019
Special Issue



Journal of the Institute
for Western Affairs
in Poznań

PRZEGLĄD
ZACHODNI

**Journal of the Institute
for Western Affairs
in Poznań**

Quarterly



Institute for
Western Affairs

PRZEGLĄD
ZACHODNI

2019
Special Issue

KATARZYNA JĘDRASZCZYK
Poznań

**THE ORTHODOX CHURCH IN UKRAINE AND RUSSIA
AFTER 2013 IN THE FACE OF POLITICAL CHALLENGES,
THE RUSSIAN–UKRAINIAN CONFLICT AND QUESTIONS ABOUT
THE LIMITS OF SOVEREIGNTY**

The years 2013 and 2014 were important dates in the history of the Orthodox Church in Eastern Europe. The Revolution of Dignity and the Russian–Ukrainian conflict showed how great a trap was the concept of *russkij mir* for the Orthodox circles that had direct ties to the Moscow hierarchy. The annexation of Crimea and the armed conflict in Ukraine put the Orthodox Church with institutional links to Moscow in a particularly difficult position.¹

STATE AND RELIGION

Modern forms of state–church relations can generally be represented by three models.² The first, the so-called separation model, seeks to completely separate state and religion in all spheres of social life. The second – the cooperationist (partner) model – provides for cooperation between the church and the state in matters of culture, education or social programmes (this applies to both organisational issues and the financing of certain activities). The third model is referred to as paternalistic (protectionist): according to this model the church, as a culture-forming and nation-forming entity, comes clearly under the patronage of the state. In this case, the church often becomes an instrument in the hands of politicians.

After the dissolution of the Soviet Union, there took place a theological and sociological reflection on the complementarity of Orthodoxy and democracy. Analysing a social model based on Christian values, Thomas Hopko stated that reli-

¹ This is an extended and updated version of an article published in Polish in „Przeгляд Zachodni” [*Western Review*] no. 1/2018 (366). The text was submitted for printing on 25 June 2019.

² For more on different models of state–church relations see: J. Krukowski, *Kościół i państwo. Podstawy regulacji prawnych*, Lublin 2000, pp. 22–43; M. Marczevska-Rytko, *Religia i polityka w globalizującym się świecie*, Lublin 2000, pp. 69–79; cf. also: *Kościół w Unii Europejskiej*, <http://www.opoka.org.pl/biblioteka/X/XU/kosciolwobecue.html> (11 December 2011).

gious pluralism and moral liberalism resulting in the “privatisation”³ of the religious world view cannot be combined with the values of Orthodoxy.⁴ The problem lies not so much in the approach to democracy (the idea of *sobornost* and decentralisation of church structures in Orthodoxy may be closer to democracy than the “monarchist” and centralised system of the Catholic Church) as in the attitude towards religious pluralism. However, what the Orthodox Church does is not at odds with the functioning of civic society. There is potential here in the tradition of elective hierarchs, work ethos, and the strength of the Orthodox Church’s actions in the social, educational and cultural spheres. However, the Moscow Patriarchate treats liberal democracy cautiously, usually identifying it with Western imperialism. The Russian Orthodox Church opposes the absolutisation of human rights and freedoms, indicating that there are values which rank “not lower” than those rights and freedoms: faith, morality and the homeland.⁵

The Church can influence state policy in an institutional sense through the actions performed by the church structures and clergy. The universality of the ideas that it preaches means that it often claims the right to comment on many aspects of state functioning and citizens’ activity. In the context of foreign policy, the foreign activity of churches (as non-territorial and transnational units) is a challenge for every country. Such church activities can reinforce or weaken foreign policy depending on the relationships between the secular and church authorities.⁶

From the perspective of the state viewed as an actor in international relations, the identification function of the Church is important.⁷ In the case of co-creation of an “internal identity”, religion performs the function of integrating the society. At the same time, it creates the image of the state to the outside world, thus determining an “external identity”. If religion is a component of national (state) identity, it may serve as a source of legitimisation of foreign policy or as a mobilising factor. In addition, various operational tasks of religious institutions (mediation, conciliation or organisation) should be mentioned here.⁸ In the case of the Orthodox Churches in Ukraine,

³ The term was introduced by Thomas Luckmann, who claimed that religions were not disappearing despite the progress of technology and globalisation. Two contradictory processes can be observed – the shrinking of religion and its simultaneous expansion in other parts of the world. In post-industrial societies, the *sacrum* moves from the public to the “private” and non-institutionalised dimension. See T. Luckmann, *The Invisible Religion. The Problem of Religion in Modern Society*, 1967.

⁴ T. Hopko, Orthodoxy In Post-Modern Pluralistic Societies, *The Ecumenical Review*, 1999, vol. 51, no. 4.

⁵ *Основы учения Русской Православной Церкви о достоинстве, свободе и правах человека*, 26 June 2008, for the full text see: <http://pravoslavie.ru/27021.html> (30 January 2018).

⁶ A. Curbanović, *Czynnik religijny w polityce zagranicznej Federacji Rosyjskiej*, Warsaw 2010, p. 41; A. Curbanović, *Religia jako czynnik Soft Power Federacji Rosyjskiej*, in: *Religia we współczesnym świecie*, B. Bednarczyk, Z. Pasek, P. Stawiński (eds.), Kraków 2010, pp. 195–206.

⁷ Sociology also distinguishes many other functions of the church: ideological, communicative, regulatory, legitimising and culture-forming.

⁸ A. Curbanović, *Czynnik religijny...*, pp. 42–43. The socio-political situation in Russia and also Ukraine at different times allows us to reflect on the politicisation of religion and the involvement of

most of these functions were particularly noticeable at the time of the political-social crisis at the turn of 2013 and 2014, after the annexation of Crimea by Russia and during the armed conflict in eastern Ukraine.

THE PATH TO DIVISION OF THE ORTHODOX CHURCH IN UKRAINE

A feature of the religious situation in Ukraine is the coexistence of four Eastern Churches within one state: the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the Moscow Patriarchate (UOC-MP), the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the Kiev Patriarchate (UOC-KP), the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church (UAOC) and the Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church (UGCC).⁹

Based on numbers of parishes (*hromada*), religious orders and clergy, the UOC-MP is institutionally the strongest, followed by the UOC-KP, the Greek Catholic Church and the UAOC.¹⁰ Comparing the statistics for 2005 and 2007, it is found that the UOC-KP is the fastest growing in terms of the number of parishes. The institutional division of the Orthodox Church took place in the early 1990s.

In the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, only the Russian Orthodox Church of the Eastern Churches was tolerated by the authorities. The last patriarchal exarch and metropolitan of Kiev in Soviet times was Archbishop Filaret (Mykhailo Denysenko).¹¹ For the Russian Orthodox Church, most of whose parishes were in Ukraine (ca. 65%) and most of whose clergy came from that Republic, the Ukrainian exarchate was the primary source of income.¹²

religion in politics. Considering these trends, Sergey Filatov points to the religious component of Russian identity. С.Филатов, *Традиционные религии, «русская цивилизация» и суверенная демократия*, [in:] *Религия и конфликт*, А. Малащенко, С. Филатов (eds.), Москва 2007.

⁹ A. Szeptycki, *Ukraina wobec Rosji. Studium zależności*, Warsaw 2013, pp. 250–360; K. Jędraszczyk, *Cerkiew w życiu społeczno-politycznym Ukrainy w latach 1991-2010*, *Studia Europaea Gnesnansia*, 3/2011, pp. 55–77.

¹⁰ According to data for 1 January 2005, numbers of religious communities (*hromada*) in Ukraine were as follows: UOC-MP 10,566, UOC-KP 3484, UAOC 1172, Greek Catholics 3386. Religious orders: UOC-MP 158, UOC-KP 36, UAOC 5, Greek Catholics 93. Numbers of clergy: UOC-MP 8936, UOC-KP 2693, UAOC 702, Greek Catholics 2103. See website of the Religious Information Service of Ukraine, <http://www.risu.org.ua/ukr/resourses/statistics/ukr2005/> (12 April 2005.) According to data for 1 January 2017, numbers of *hromada* were: UOC-MP 12,328, UOC-KP 5114, UAOC 1195, Greek Catholics 3394. Religious orders: UOC-MP 208, UOC-KP 60, UAOC 13, Greek Catholics 102. Numbers of clergy: UOC-MP 10,289, UOC-KP 3479, UAOC 709, Greek Catholics 2755. Звіт про мережу церков і релігійних організацій в Україні станом на 01.01.2017 р., Дані Департаменту у справах релігій та національності Міністерства культури України, <https://risu.org.ua/ua/index/resourses/statistics/ukr2017/67269/>.

¹¹ Later the main initiator of the creation of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the Kiev Patriarchate. A controversial figure (he was suspected of embezzling property of the former Orthodox Church, financing UNA-UNSO nationalist militias, and cooperating with the KGB).

¹² Wyznania religijne na Ukrainie, *Biuletyn Ukraiński*, no. 8–9, August–September 1994.

In January 1990, the Russian Orthodox Church adopted a resolution on the self-governance of the church in Ukraine.¹³ In October 1990, the Ukrainian branch of the Russian Orthodox Church was renamed the Ukrainian Orthodox Church. In early 1991, the Council of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church in Kiev adopted a resolution on full canonical autonomy (autocephaly)¹⁴ and asked the Russian Orthodox Church for consent in this matter, following the rule that the “Mother Church” must agree to such a move. Given the great importance of the Ukrainian Church, the Russian Orthodox Church objected to this decision.¹⁵ The head of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church was then Metropolitan Filaret.

The situation was further complicated by President Leonid Kravchuk himself and democratic politicians who favoured the creation of a “national church”. President Kravchuk supported the idea that the Orthodox Church should be “nationalised” and then merge with the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church. Such a church was to be a useful tool facilitating the faster Ukrainisation of society and contributing to its consolidation. This approach was favoured by Metropolitan Filaret.

Another request for the granting of autocephaly to the Ukrainian Orthodox Church, made at the beginning of 1992, led to a schism in that Church. Some bishops exercised their right to renounce their allegiance to Filaret. Opponents of Filaret and of the Church’s independence from Moscow held a meeting in Zhytomyr in April 1992 and won the support of the Russian Orthodox Church. In May 1992, the Council of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church met in Kharkiv. It removed Metropolitan Filaret from his position as the head of the Church and appointed Metropolitan Volodymyr (Sabodan) of Rostov and Novocherkassk in his place.¹⁶ Filaret was deprived of all his privileges and holy orders, but he still enjoyed the support of the state authorities.

In June 1992, another council was held with the aim of uniting the supporters of autocephaly associated with Filaret and the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church. However, complete unification of the Orthodox Church of the Kiev Patriar-

¹³ Autocephaly (canonical autonomy) of the Orthodox Church has been a tradition in Ukraine. Introduced under the inspiration of clergy and lay activists in 1919, it survived until 1934, when the Holy Synod decided to remove the Ukrainian autocephaly and incorporate its parishes into the Russian Orthodox Church. Autocephaly was restored during World War II. The hierarchs of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church became involved in supporting the Nazi occupiers and had to leave Ukraine after the war. The autocephalous branch survived only among the Ukrainian diaspora (mainly in Canada and the USA).

¹⁴ In the case of Ukraine, the status of an autocephalous Orthodox Church should be attained via a defined procedure: announcement of the fact by the Council of the Russian Orthodox Church, and recognition by all autocephalous Orthodox churches, with the Patriarchates of Constantinople and Moscow at the forefront. See: W. Sereda, W poszukiwaniu pojednania, *Biuletyn Ukraiński*, no. 7/8 (19/20) 1995, pp. 13–15. The statute of the Orthodox Church stated that it was independent and self-governing.

¹⁵ Besides the loss of sources of income and the reduction in “canonical territory”, the loss of the Kiev Metropolis amounts to a loss of prestige (associated, for example, with the right of succession to the Church of Kievan Rus’ and the authority of the oldest Orthodox church in the Slavic world).

¹⁶ W. Pawluczuk, *Ukraina. Polityka i mistyka*, Kraków 1998, pp. 131–132; T. Szyszlak, Trony i ołtarze. Religia i polityka na Ukrainie, *Więź* 2007, no. 7 (585), pp. 81–95.

chate and the Autocephalous Orthodox Church was not achieved. Some of the clergy and their parishes took the side of Filaret, while others, including Patriarch Mstyslav (head of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church), did not accept a union forced by Archbishop Filaret and the secular authorities. A significant number of “autocephalists” recognised the authority of Patriarch Mstyslav and aimed to preserve the autonomy of their church. The Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the Kiev Patriarchate, independent from the Moscow Patriarchate, was created in 1992. As a result, instead of one “national” Orthodox Church, there are still three Orthodox denominations, which continue to have difficulty reaching agreement.¹⁷

Myroslav Marynovych made a systematic analysis of the divisions within the Eastern Churches in Ukraine.¹⁸ He identified three lines of conflict:

1) The Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the Moscow Patriarchate vs. the Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church, the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church and the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the Kiev Patriarchate. The conflict is politically motivated, and rests on a division into “national” and “foreign” Orthodox Churches. The “national” Churches believe the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the Moscow Patriarchate to be tied to Russian interests and imperial ambitions. This accusation is countered by the argument of the “universality and trans-ethnicity of the Orthodox Church”. On this basis, the Moscow Patriarchate argues that the creation of a separate Church in Ukraine is harmful.

2) The Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church vs. the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the Moscow Patriarchate, the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church and the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the Kiev Patriarchate. The underlying cause of these tensions may be said to be one of tradition: it is linked to the Orthodox Church’s interpretation of the Brest Union of 1596 as an act that destroyed Orthodox unity and represented the aggressive proselytism of the Roman Catholic Church. A “pseudo-council”, as it is called by the Greek Catholics, organised by the NKVD in 1946 took a decision on the “self-dissolution” of the Greek Catholic Church and the transfer of its property to the Russian Orthodox Church.¹⁹

3) The Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the Moscow Patriarchate and the Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church vs. the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church and the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the Kiev Patriarchate. This division is related to canonicity. The Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the Moscow Patriarchate and the Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church are canonical churches. The Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church and the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the Kiev Patriarchate declare their independent status, but have not yet been formally recognised by the Moscow Patriarchate.

¹⁷ A. Wilson, *Ukraincy*, Warsaw 2002, p. 249.

¹⁸ М. Мариневич, Роль Церков у будівництві посткомуністичного суспільства в Україні, ”Г”, 22/2001.

¹⁹ In the early 1990s, due to the re-legalisation of the Greek Catholic Church, the problem of the return of goods became the main source of religious tensions in Ukraine.

THE UKRAINIAN ORTHODOX CHURCHES IN 2013–2017

After Vladimir Putin returned as president and Kirill ascended to the patriarchal throne in Moscow, the state (geopolitical) and church concepts of *russkij mir* overlapped, becoming a tool in the hands of the secular authorities. The proximity of the “throne and the altar”, and thus relations concerning both image and finances, reduced the Russian Orthodox Church to the role of a structure seen as subordinate to and opportunistic with regard to the authority of the president of the Russian Federation.

2013 and 2014 were important years in the history of the Orthodox Church in Eastern Europe. The Revolution of Dignity and the Russian–Ukrainian conflict showed how great a trap is the concept of *russkij mir* for the Orthodox Church, especially when it has direct ties to the Moscow hierarchy. The annexation of Crimea and the armed conflict in Ukraine put the Moscow-linked Ukrainian Orthodox Church in a particularly difficult position.

During the Revolution of Dignity, the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the Kiev Patriarchate and the Greek Catholic Church entered some kind of revival phase. The public equated them with “national” Churches and made them respond to political and social problems. The Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the Moscow Patriarchate, which had to prove its solidarity with those fighting for the dignity and sovereignty of the country, faced the most difficult task. The boundaries between “secularity” and “sanctity” were broken, and the presence of clergymen from various churches in the Maidan, the hospital in St. Michael’s Golden-Domed Monastery, and the calls of the All-Ukrainian Council of Churches and Religious Organisations for the parties of the conflict to sit at one table and reach an agreement became symbols of the process. At that time, the Orthodox Churches did not operate as institutions taking the side of the authorities, but participated in the process along with the public, showing that they were a part of civic society. Providing social assistance and collecting donations in aid of troops active in the so-called ATO (Anti-Terrorist Operation)²⁰ were important activities of the churches, especially the Greek Catholic Church and the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the Kiev Patriarchate.

The Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the Kiev Patriarchate supported the demands of the Maidan, as symbolised by the opening of the St. Michael’s Monastery, which belonged to that Church, and the admission on 30 November 2014 of a group of about 350 participants of the Euromaidan seeking shelter from Berkut hit squads. From that time on the monastery became the temporary headquarters of the protesters, organising vigils and round-the-clock prayers and distributing hot drinks and overcoats. Young clergymen from the Kiev Orthodox Theological Academy also actively

²⁰ The parish of Dymitrij Solunsky, which raised funds to equip six ambulances, was a prime example of that kind of activity. A church community associated with the main military hospital raised over 0.5 million hryvnias. There were dozens of similar cases. In November 2014, Filaret initiated an unprecedented declaration in the Orthodox Church on the recognition of corruption as a social evil and the prevention of those guilty of it from receiving the Holy Communion (*до святого причастя*).

helped the protesters. In the following days, other surrounding buildings, including the nearby Roman Catholic church, were adapted for use as places of refuge.²¹ The night of 10 December 2013 passed into legend when the warning bells pealed for the first time since the Tatar invasion of 1240. The storming of the Maidan and its final dispersion were supposed to take place on that day. At the sound of the bells, people gathered in the Maidan.

In the spring of 2014, the Orthodox Church had a unique opportunity to reverse the split. Patriarch Filaret even planned to join parishes of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the Moscow Patriarchate (around 14,000 parishes) to the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the Kiev Patriarchate (around 4500 parishes); however, this did not happen. It was estimated that between 100 and 300 parishes could be transferred from the Church of the Moscow Patriarchate to the Church of the Kiev Patriarchate, but in fact the latter had formally succeeded in taking over only three parishes by December 2014, with another fourteen still subject to dispute. Even the planned incorporation of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church, which was ideologically “closer”, was not successful. The witnessed religious revival simultaneously with the revival of the idea of national unity in the face of a common external enemy inspired the hierarchs of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the Kiev Patriarchate and the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church to begin talks on unification on 8 March 2015. However, on 9 July 2015, the Council of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church declined to give its consent to unification. The unsuccessful outcome of the talks is believed to have been related to pressure from Moscow and a proposal for talks between the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the Moscow Patriarchate and the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church (UOC-MP + UAOC).²²

The Greek Catholic Church also displayed increased social activity. That Church was particularly vulnerable to criticism from Moscow, which called it the “Church of nationalists”. Meanwhile, from the start, the Greek Catholic hierarchs made efforts to ensure that the Maidan ended peacefully. The remonstrances of the Russian Orthodox Church against the Greek Catholics were not effective. Metropolitan Hilarion (Alfeyev)²³ offered an apology to the Greek Catholics at the opening ceremony of

²¹ Protoiereus Alexander Trofymljuk (a protoiereus in the Orthodox Church is a superior of cathedral clergy or head of a larger parish, possibly equivalent to a dean or prelate of a cathedral or collegiate chapter) told Halina Tytysh about the events related to the giving of shelter to students and reporters on 30 November 2013. Г. Титиш, *Рятивник з Михайлівського собору: Автобус з “беркутівцями” в 10 метрах від церкви сів паніку серед людей*, 4 December 2013, <http://life.pravda.com.ua/society/2013/12/4/143967/>. For similar reports see: <http://www.pravda.com.ua/news/2013/11/30/7003742/> (12 March 2017).

²² *В УАПЦ назвали винних у зриві процесу об’єднання*, 14 July 2015, https://risu.org.ua/ua/index/all_news/confessional/orthodox_relations/60543/ (12 September 2017).

²³ Metropolitan Hilarion (Alfeyev) chairs the Department for External Church Relations of the Moscow Patriarchate, and on 24 December 2015, by decision of the Council, was appointed representative of the Russian Orthodox Church on the Interreligious Council of Russia. *Журнали засідання Священного Синода от 24 декабря 2015 года*, Журнал № 98, <http://www.patriarchia.ru/db/text/4304773.html> (23 January 2018).

the General Council of the Greek Catholic Church. This caused consternation among Greek Catholic priests, as it was an unprecedented event.²⁴

In February 2017, Sviatoslav Shevchuk, Greek Catholic archbishop, went to Rome to inform Pope Francis in person about the situation in Ukraine. He also invited the Pope to visit Ukraine to “give the faithful hope for peace.” The archbishop told Vatican Radio: “We know that the conflict in Ukraine will not be solved by military means. Therefore, I am calling for the international community to continue its diplomatic efforts to appease the aggressor so that fighting can be stopped”.²⁵ On 14–15 February 2017, Archbishop Claudio Gugerotti (along with Jan Sobilo, auxiliary bishop of the Roman Catholic Diocese of Kharkiv-Zaporizhia, coordinator of the humanitarian “Pope for Ukraine” project) went to eastern Ukraine. The hierarchs visited the city of Avdiivka, which had been under fire from pro-Russian separatists for several weeks, and the children evacuated to Sviatohirsk. After returning from eastern Ukraine, the apostolic nuncio in Kiev stated that “the first martyrdom of the local people is the international silence about their situation”.²⁶

After its annexation in 2014, Crimea was not brought under the canonical jurisdiction of the Russian Orthodox Church, but remained under the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the Moscow Patriarchate. This put the Crimean parishes of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the Kiev Patriarchate in a particularly difficult position. By the beginning of 2016, nine of the 41 parishes of the Kiev Patriarchate had been dissolved. That Church faces difficulties associated with the “besieged fortress syndrome” and its believers’ fears of being persecuted because of their religion or language.

Churches in the territories occupied by separatists are in an even more difficult position. In 2014, the Religious Freedom Institute carried out monitoring in the Luhansk People’s Republic and the Donetsk People’s Republic. The report revealed cases of plundering of church property belonging to Protestants, Greek Catholics or Catholic and Orthodox parishes, about forty cases of beatings of clergymen, one murder of the whole family of a clergyman, and the taking over of buildings, office equipment, furniture, cars or documents for the “needs of separatists”. Alexander Zakharchenko, self-appointed leader of the so-called Donetsk People’s Republic, announced that only four confessions – Orthodox, Roman Catholic, Muslim and Jewish – were considered legitimate in the republic. He warned that he would “fight tooth and nail with sectarianism”, i.e. other denominations.²⁷

²⁴ Ю. Чорноморець, *Про два типи православ’я: християнський і язичницько-геополітичний*, <https://day.kyiv.ua/uk/blog/suspilstvo/ukrayinski-cerkvy-2014-go> (14 April 2017).

²⁵ Archbishop Szewczuk, *Nie zapomnijcie o Ukrainie, powstrzymajcie agresora*, http://pl.radiovaticana.va/news/2017/02/23/abp_szewczuk_nie_zapominajcie_o_ukrainie,_powstrzymajcie_ag/1294644 (15 April 2017).

²⁶ *Nuncjusz w Kijowie: męczeństwo we wschodniej Ukrainie*, http://pl.radiovaticana.va/news/2017/02/20/nuncjusz_w_kijowie_m%C4%99cze%C5%84stwo_na_wschodniej_ukrainie/1293732 (16 April 2017).

²⁷ М.Басин, *Итоги 2014 года. Донбасс и Крым: новые вызовы для религиозной свободы*, 13 January 2015, http://www.irs.in.ua/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=1496:1&catid=37:art&Itemid=64 (12 September 2017).

THE RUSSIAN ORTHODOX CHURCH AND THE UKRAINIAN ORTHODOX CHURCH
OF THE MOSCOW PATRIARCHATE

The 2004 election showed the Church's pro-Moscow stance to be no asset in its efforts to gain social influence in Ukraine. After the Orange Revolution, the "Ukrainisation" of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the Moscow Patriarchate has clearly progressed.²⁸ A sign of this was given by the Church's council in 2007, when it condemned "political Orthodoxy". This was interpreted as official condemnation of organisations with Orthodox links that promoted neo-imperialist ideas.

A few days before the Vilnius summit of 2013, during which the issue of Ukraine's association with the European Union was to be settled, the hierarchs of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the Moscow Patriarchate and the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the Kiev Patriarchate signed a joint statement, one that might have been of particular significance for the former, as it contradicted the idea of *russkij mir* with which it was identified. The message of the declaration was that Ukraine has European roots, especially when it comes to the system of values, education and the quality of social life. The hierarchs of the different Churches emphasised that the country had to choose which path to follow, in accordance with its aspirations to be part of the circle of "free European nations".²⁹ This clearly undermined the essence of the *russkij mir* concept. In the face of President Yanukovich's refusal to sign the Association Agreement and the further bloody events, this declaration did not have great political significance subsequently. However, for astute observers of the church institutions, it was an indicator of emancipatory tendencies in the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the Moscow Patriarchate.

The Maidan events, the annexation of Crimea and separatism in the Donbas placed the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the Moscow Patriarchate in a difficult position. During the riots in the Maidan, Onufriy (Berezovsky) – from 24 February 2014 *locum tenens*³⁰ bishop of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the Moscow Patriarchate – called upon priests to take care of those who came to churches and explicitly asked to be taken care of.³¹ Priests were to limit themselves to providing social assistance

²⁸ For more on the Orthodox Church during the Orange Revolution see: T. Szyszlak, *Religijny wujtar rotarajczowej rewolucji, Religijnyj faktor pomarančewoї rewoluciji*, [in:] Історія релігій в Україні 2007, Науковий щорічник. Книга II, З. Білик, Я. Дашкевич, Л. Моравська (eds.), Lviv 2007, pp. 443–449.

²⁹ *Звернення Церков і релігійних організацій до українського народу щодо дискусії про європейські цінності в Україні*, http://ugcc.ua/official/official-documents/zvernennya/zvernennya_2013/zvernennya_tserkov_%D1%96_rel%D1%96g%D1%96ynih_organ%D1%96zats%D1%96y_do_ukrainskogo_narodu_67584.html (30 November 2017); see also: M. Wawrzonek, *Prawosławie jako element kultury politycznej na współczesnej Ukrainie*, *Studia Politologica Ucraino-Polona*, 2015, vol. 5, p. 215.

³⁰ On 13 August 2014, the Holy Synod of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the Moscow Patriarchate elected Onufriy as the new Metropolitan of Kiev and all Ukraine.

³¹ Churches advocating pacifism (Protestant ones), and also the UOC-MP, focused on helping civilians who had suffered as a result of the conflict. An example of such action is the UOC-MP mission "Mercy without Borders".

during crises. The Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the Moscow Patriarchate was often unfairly perceived by the public as the Kremlin's political tool, and the apparent lack of initiative on the part of the hierarchs was viewed as anti-national and corresponding to the attitudes of Moscow and Kirill and the idea of *russkij mir*.

The Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the Moscow Patriarchate is dominant in eastern Ukraine. Some of its clergy supported the actions taken by Russia and the separatists, although their number decreased as the conflict escalated. The Russian-language media published statements made by several UOC-MP clergymen who had fled to Russia and were criticising the new authorities in Kiev from there.³² Publicity was given to acts of support for pro-Russian rebels and blessing of the flags of the separatist republics in Donetsk and Luhansk by priests. These incidents did significant harm to the reputation of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the Moscow Patriarchate, although in fact the hierarchs of that Church and of the Church of the Kiev Patriarchate responded to the Revolution of Dignity and the annexation of Crimea in quite similar ways, and their statements differed not so much in their content as in their emotional overtones.

However, it became increasingly difficult for the Orthodox bishops of Ukraine subordinate to the Moscow Patriarchate to remain loyal to both the Ukrainian state and the church authorities in Moscow. In the spring and summer of 2014, the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the Moscow Patriarchate took an official stance on Russia's policy. The threats that Russian troops could enter Ukraine were sharply criticised, and demands were made for Patriarch Kirill to intervene in this matter.³³ In addition, Georgi Kovalenko, press secretary of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the Moscow Patriarchate, announced that by deciding to launch its intervention in Ukraine, the Russian authorities were violating the Ten Commandments. He also warned the head of the Russian Orthodox Church that if he supported Russia's aggression against Ukraine, the Ukrainian Church would turn away from him. He stressed that the clergy of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the Moscow Patriarchate were first and foremost Ukrainian citizens.

Onufriy, the acting administrator of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the Moscow Patriarchate and Metropolitan of Chernivtsi and Bukovyna,³⁴ called on those tak-

³² K. Chawryło, *Ukraińska gra patriarchy Cyryla*, 14 August 2014, OSW (Centre for Eastern Studies) Commentaries, https://www.osw.waw.pl/pl/publikacje/komentarze-osw/2014-08-14/ukraińska-gra-patriarchy-cyryla#_ftn31.

³³ Metropolitan Onufriy's letter to Patriarch Kirill of Moscow, 1 March 2014, <http://www.pravmir.ru/mitropolit-chernovickij-onufrij-prosit-patriarxa-kirilla-ne-dopustit-krovoprolitiya-v-ukraine/>.

³⁴ He performed this role after Metropolitan Volodymyr's death (5 July 2014). While Metropolitan Volodymyr was still alive, Onufriy had already performed the duties of head of the UOC-MP, and he was elected to that position on 13 August 2014. From the start, Onufriy was considered Volodymyr's most likely successor and viewed as a continuator of his balanced stance, which on the one hand envisaged a deepening of the UOC-MP's autonomy, while on the other maintaining canonical relations with the Moscow Patriarchate. See: K. Chawryło, *Ukraińska gra patriarchy Cyryla*, 14 August 2014, OSW (Centre for Eastern Studies) Commentaries, https://www.osw.waw.pl/pl/publikacje/komentarze-osw/2014-08-14/ukraińska-gra-patriarchy-cyryla#_ftn31 (15 March 2017).

ing part in military action against the central authorities to lay down their weapons: “The situation in eastern Ukraine is still tense. In connection with the recent incidents in the region, we call upon all those who illegally carry weapons to lay down their arms and stop the bloodshed” – said the statement by Onufriy on behalf of the All-Ukrainian Council of Churches and Religious Organisations, which he chaired.³⁵ The Council of Churches also called for the release of all hostages, including clergy, and for comprehensive assistance to the victims of the armed conflict. The document reaffirmed the Council’s position on the preservation of Ukraine’s territorial integrity. This was called the fundamental value for the Ukrainian people. The appeal emphasised that the division of the country must be prevented, because it would be a sin against God and future generations.³⁶

In October 2014, Georgi Kovalenko, a close associate of Volodymyr who acted as the Metropolitan’s spokesman, made official comments on the participation of the faithful of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the Moscow Patriarchate in the Revolution of Dignity: “The Moscow Patriarchate was absent in the Maidan. The Ukrainian Orthodox Church was there. Because it is the Ukrainian Orthodox Church that is the church of the nation of Ukraine, while the Moscow Patriarchate remains the church of the Soviet Union”.³⁷ It can be assumed that the priest was thus expressing the aspirations of some younger elites of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the Moscow Patriarchate, whose representatives did not feel that they were “Moscow’s people”.³⁸

Such declarations gave the appearance of uniting the Ukrainian Orthodox Churches. However, the public paid great attention to symbolic behaviours of their hierarchs which contradicted their declarations. During a special session of the Ukrainian parliament (the Verkhovna Rada) on 8 May 2015, Metropolitan Onufriy and the bishops accompanying him did not stand for the reading of the names of 21 soldiers fighting in the east who had been awarded the title Hero of Ukraine, ten of them posthumously. The incident was widely criticised not only by the Ukrainian media, but also by followers of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the Moscow Patriarchate. Later, the Metropolitan explained that with this gesture he had wanted to express his opposition to any kind of war. The refusal of entry to Ukraine to Metropolitan Hilarion on 9 May 2014 gave a certain measure of the attitude of the state authorities towards the Russian Orthodox Church and the concept of *russkij mir*. He had flown to the airport in Dnipropetrovsk (now Dnipro) to celebrate the 75th birthday of Iryney, Metropolitan

³⁵ Митрополит Черновицкий Онуфрий: *Обращаемся ко всем, кто незаконно держит в руках оружие, сложить его и прекратить кровопролитие*, 14 July 2014, <http://www.klikovo.ru/news/5753.html> (12 November 2017).

³⁶ *Prawosławny metropolita do separatystów: złożcie broń 11 lipca 2014*, <http://www.tvn24.pl/wiadomosci-ze-swiate,2/prawoslawny-metropolita-do-separatystow-zlozcie-bron,448875.html> (12 April 2017).

³⁷ After: M. Wawrzonek, *Prawosławie jako element kultury politycznej na współczesnej Ukrainie*, *Studia Politologica Ucraino-Polona*, 2015, vol. 5, p. 215.

³⁸ M. Wawrzonek, *Prawosławie jako element kultury politycznej na współczesnej Ukrainie*, *Studia Politologica Ucraino-Polona*, 2015, vol. 5, p. 215.

of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the Moscow Patriarchate in that city. At passport control he was informed in writing that he was prohibited from entering Ukraine. This prompted protests from Russia's Ministry of Foreign Affairs.³⁹

Patriarch Kirill responded to the Ukrainian crisis relatively late, confining himself to calling for reconciliation. In a second statement, Kirill recognised Ukraine's right to national self-determination, although he did not acknowledge the imperial ambitions of which Moscow is usually accused by Ukrainian nationalists. In his sermon in Christ the Saviour Cathedral on 14 March 2014, Patriarch Kirill said: "At least 400 years ago, attempts were made to split and divide the Russian world. When we say *russkij*, we should not treat it the way our opponents do, referring to the Russian Empire and the Soviet Union. What we are referring to is the *russkij mir*, the great Russian civilisation that came from the Kievan baptismal font and spread across the huge expanse of Eurasia. (...) Today, there are independent states in this world and we respect their sovereignty, their readiness and desire to build independently their own national lives. But this does not mean that the realisation of this sovereignty should be accompanied by the destruction of a common, united spiritual space."⁴⁰

The absence of Patriarch Kirill during the signing ceremony of the agreement on the annexation of Crimea and Sevastopol to Russia on 18 March 2014 was a significant gesture, as was his declaration of 19 March stating that the Orthodox Church should resist all kinds of misunderstandings and external parties and that "the Church's borders are not determined by political preferences, ethnic differences or even state borders". As has already been mentioned, the Holy Synod of the Russian Orthodox Church did not take any decisions regarding the parishes in Crimea, leaving them formally under the guidance of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the Moscow Patriarchate.⁴¹

The Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the Moscow Patriarchate understands that the increasing destabilisation of Ukraine and Russia's aggressive policy contribute to a growing dislike of the Orthodox Church which is associated with hierarchical dependence on Moscow, and that the idea of *russkij mir* as a geopolitical strategy of the Russian authorities will lead to disputes and the deepening of religious divisions. The Kremlin's policy is clearly detrimental to the image and interests of the Orthodox Church, and the only thing that the Russian Orthodox Church and the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the Moscow Patriarchate can do in this situation is try to soften their image. The Russian–Ukrainian conflict probably led to a drop in the number of people declaring their affiliation with the UOC-MP, or at least, this is what can be concluded from the answers given by respondents to a sociological study conducted by the Ra-

³⁹ МИД РФ требует от Киева объяснений из-за провокации в отношении митрополита Илариона, <http://www.mk.ru/politics/2014/05/12/mid-rf-trebuuet-ot-kieva-obyasneniy-izza-provokatsii-v-otnoshenii-mitropolita-ilariona.html> (12 April 2017).

⁴⁰ Р. Лункин, *Украинская революция и христианские церкви (СМИ)*, 31 July 2014, <http://www.invictory.com/news/story-52360>.

⁴¹ Ibidem.

zumkov Centre (compare the figures for 2013 and 2016 given in the table). On the other hand, the survey shows that in the same period the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the Kiev Patriarchate recorded an increase in the number of its declared followers.⁴²

Table 1

Which Orthodox church do you identify with? (% of respondents declaring themselves to be Orthodox Christians)

	UOC-MP	UOC-KP	UAOC	Simply Orthodox	Don't know
2000	9.2	12.1	1.3	38.6	4.6
2005	10.6	14	0.8	33.4	1.9
2010	23.6	15.1	0.9	25.9	1.6
2013	19.6	18.3	0.8	28.8	2.5
2014	17.4	22.4	0.7	28.1	1.4
2016	15	25	1.8	21.2	2

Source: Survey by the Razumkov Centre, http://www.razumkov.org.ua/ukr/poll.php?poll_id=1122

Russia has been losing its formal and informal influence in Ukraine. Representatives of the Russian Orthodox Church are not readily welcomed even by the followers of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the Moscow Patriarchate.⁴³ The Russian Orthodox Church ought to show that it is a neutral institution with regard to the conflict in Ukraine, and that its aim is the good of the religious community. Roman Lunkin, however, points to the major changes that have taken place in the Russian Orthodox Church in the wake of the Revolution of Dignity in Ukraine. Bearing in mind that all of the Orthodox churches in Ukraine declared their readiness to defend sovereignty and civic values⁴⁴ and that the dynamics of political change may lead to a gradual emancipation of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the Moscow Patriarchate,⁴⁵ the

⁴² There was no question on religious affiliation in the 2001 census. Therefore, the number of followers of particular denominations can be estimated only on the basis of surveys. The Razumkov Centre research (http://www.razumkov.org.ua/ukr/poll.php?poll_id=1122) has been conducted for several years. This kind of survey must serve in place of official lists. The Orthodox Church in Ukraine does not carry out similar research. However, churches submit annual reports on numbers of parishes, religious orders, seminaries and clergy. Дані Департаменту у справах релігій та національностей Міністерства культури України, <https://risu.org.ua/ua/index/resourses/statistics/ukr2017/6726>.

⁴³ For example, Kirill did not attend the funeral of UOC-MP Metropolitan Volodymyr in July 2014 for fear of protests of its followers; Patriarch Kirill also did not attend the anniversary celebration of the Baptism of Rus'; Metropolitan Hilarion was not allowed to enter Ukraine. Cases of whole parishes accepting the jurisdiction of the UOC-KP were also reported.

⁴⁴ Р. Лункин, *Крушение русского мира. Взгляд из Москвы*, 21 May 2014 (30 January 2018), <http://www.internetsobor.org/index.php/stati/roman-lunkin-krushenie-russkogo-mira-vzglyad-iz-moskvy>.

⁴⁵ K. Jarzyńska, *Ukraińska gra patriarchy Cyryla*, OSW (Centre for Eastern Studies) Commentaries, no. 144, 14 August 2014, <http://www.osw.waw.pl/pl/publikacje/komentarze-osw/2014-08-14/ukrainska-gra-patriarchy-cyryla>.

Orthodox Church in Moscow is gradually revising its attitude towards *rususkij mir*. These changes are difficult for observers to grasp, as the Ukrainian and Russian media – albeit for different reasons – portray the Russian Orthodox Church as an institution which supports the Russian President and whose voice accords with the political decisions of the state authorities. According to Lunkin, the Orthodox Church in Russia was forced to distance itself from the policy of *rususkij mir* in “Putin’s form”. The reason for this was the annexation of Crimea and the conflict in eastern Ukraine, which destroyed *rususkij mir* in the form originally understood by Kirill (fraternal nations). Since 2014, the idea of *rususkij mir* in its new form has been mainly confined to Russia. In his dealings with Ukraine, Kirill has avoided the rhetoric of the unity of civilisation, the danger of the ideas of Western liberalism, and the like.

At the end of 2017, a separate chapter on the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the Moscow Patriarchate was added to the Statute of the Russian Orthodox Church by the Bishops’ Council of that Church. This section of the document states that the centre of control of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the Moscow Patriarchate is in Kiev.⁴⁶ The Ukrainian media present the action taken by the Orthodox Church in Russia in a negative light, painting it as another attempt by the Russian Orthodox Church to gain formal control over the increasingly emancipated Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the Moscow Patriarchate. Questions of trust have arisen since the 2014 crisis. Before the Revolution of Dignity, three churches – the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the Kiev Patriarchate, the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church and the Greek Catholic Church – were identified with the national idea. Today, the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the Kiev Patriarchate has particularly strengthened its position, and Patriarch Filaret, its head, takes advantage of the presence of his Church in the Maidan and the emotional speeches made by the hierarchs associated with him or the help provided for the army. According to research by the Rating Sociological Group (30 April 2016), Patriarch Filaret (UOC-KP) is considered by Ukrainians to be the most trusted religious leader, with a rating of 40%, followed by Pope Francis on 35%.⁴⁷ When asked who they trusted the least, 39% of respondents indicated Kirill (ROC) and 25% chose Metropolitan Onufriy (UOC-MP).⁴⁸

⁴⁶ In Ukraine, mention of the name of the head of the UOC-MP (in this case Metropolitan Onufriy) after the name of the Patriarch of Moscow and All Russia Kirill sometimes aroused controversy. Theoretically, this is generally accepted church law, but after 2014 many priests deliberately omitted mention of Patriarch Kirill so as not to irritate their parishioners with the words “Moscow” and “Kirill”. Р. Лункин, „Українська глава” в уставі РПЦ, 5 December 2017, <http://polit.ru/article/2017/12/05/upc/>.

⁴⁷ It should be remembered that the Pope is also the head of the Greek Catholic Church, which is identified with the national idea.

⁴⁸ According to data from the Rating Sociological Group, 30 April 2016, after: М. Коваленко, Ю. Каздобіна, *Актуальний стан православних церков України в умовах війни: надії на об’єднання, утиски на Донбасі та суспільно-політична позиція*, УНЦПД, №14/739, 28 July 2015, http://www.ucipr.org.ua/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=81:aktualniy-stan-pravoslavnihcerkov-ukra-ni-v-umovah-v-yni-nad-na-ob-dnannya-utiski-na-donbas-ta-susp-lno-pol-tichna-pozic-ya&catid=8&lang=ua&Itemid=201 (30 April 2016).

PLACES OF WORSHIP AND POLITICS

In the last year of his rule, President Yanukovich and his parliamentary majority backed the attempts of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the Moscow Patriarchate to take over buildings of key importance for Orthodoxy. One example was the Pochayiv Lavra. The Lavra lies within a “sea of Ukrainian-ness”, being the westernmost large religious centre of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the Moscow Patriarchate. It was even described as “*rususkij mir* in the centre of Banderism”.⁴⁹ The symbolic significance of the Lavra is also related to the fact that it was a functioning church throughout the entire Soviet period. Monks of non-Ukrainian descent used to be sent there, which caused the church to be perceived as a bastion of the conservative Orthodox clergy and a guarantor of the pro-Moscow policy of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the Moscow Patriarchate. From the point of view of the geography of religion, this region is the place where all the Orthodox churches meet. The Lavra is of paramount importance as a pilgrimage site, a place of life and ministry for over 100 monks, and an important point on the map of seminaries. Every year the school for clergy produces another generation educated in line with a particular vision.

In 2003, the Yanukovich government issued Regulation No. 438-p “On the Exclusion of the Buildings of the Holy Dormition Pochayiv Lavra from the Kremenchuk-Pochayiv State Historical-Architectural Reserve”,⁵⁰ under which the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the Moscow Patriarchate could use the Lavra free of charge for 49 years. The general opinion was that it was equivalent to the state transferring the buildings and monuments of the Lavra to that Church. This was strongly opposed by the authorities of the Ternopil region, and this opposition gained momentum especially after Viktor Yanukovich became president. During the Revolution of Dignity, the Lavra was a place of protests, and there were even attempts by members of other churches to take it over. It was believed that Yanukovich might have taken refuge within the Lavra walls, and that the monks were printing anti-Ukrainian publications for the separatists and for the purposes of the hybrid war. Following the Revolution of Dignity in 2014, steps were taken to annul the Regulation. Members of the Ternopil Oblast Council unanimously approved a document requesting the Council of Ministers to restore the Lavra’s status of a national historical museum.⁵¹

The most important place of worship for Ukrainian Orthodoxy is the Pechersk Lavra in Kiev, classified as a national monument of the highest class. In mid-2013, the Ukrainian government handed over about 75 structures and buildings of the Pechersk Lavra to the monastery of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the Moscow Patriarchate for use free of charge. A relevant draft regulation of the Council of Ministers was

⁴⁹ Г. Терещук, *Почайівська лавра – «русский мир» посеред «бандерівців»*, 7 July 2014, <http://www.radiosvoboda.org/a/25448715.html> (12 March 2017).

⁵⁰ *Про виключення зі складу Кременецько-Почайівського державного історико-архітектурного заповідника споруд Почайівської Свято-Успенської лаври*, www.zakon.gov.ua.

⁵¹ *Тернопільські депутати вимагають в Яценюка повернути Почайівську Лавру державі*, <http://zz.te.ua/ternopilski-deputaty-vymahayut-povernuty-pochajivsku-lavru-derzhavi/>.

adopted by the government at its meeting on 11 July 2013. Culture minister Leonid Novochatko gave an assurance that the permission for use concerned only the Lower Lavra, with no transfer of ownership, and the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the Moscow Patriarchate would bear the maintenance costs of the facilities.

THE RUSSIAN ORTHODOX CHURCH AND ITS RELATIONSHIPS WITH OTHER CHURCHES

On 12 February 2016, Patriarch Kirill and Pope Francis met at the airport in Havana. The outcomes of the meeting, according to Sergey Chapnin, are difficult to predict, and the media impact was too short-lived to satisfy Kirill. Paragraph 26 of the Joint Declaration of Pope Francis and Patriarch Kirill states that the heads of the two Churches deplore the hostility in Ukraine, express grief for the victims of the conflict, and call for reconciliation and ending of the humanitarian crisis. Both parties said that they hoped the schism between Orthodox churches in Ukraine might be overcome through existing canonical norms.

Opinions on how to interpret this document are sharply divided. Criticism was made that Greek Catholics were not directly mentioned, and the declaration is very cautious about identifying the parties to the conflict. According to Archbishop Sviatoslav, the document echoes the Russian propaganda claiming that the conflict in eastern Ukraine was of an internal nature.⁵² Emphasising the importance of canon law in overcoming the divisions undermines churches other than the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the Moscow Patriarchate.

The meeting between the Pope and the Patriarch was prepared in secret, with only five people, those most faithful to the Patriarch, taking part in the negotiations. The Patriarch had not said a word about it, even during the Bishops' Council that had met the week before the meeting in Havana. Thus, he showed his Episcopate that he was ready to disregard canon law and, acting on behalf of the whole Orthodox Church, did not have to respect the decisions of the Bishops' Council. According to Chapnin, none of the bishops dared to voice their opinion in public, but privately they criticised the Patriarch's attitude. Kirill's actions reinforced the model of governance of the Russian Orthodox Church that resembles an "archaic form of papacy". The Patriarch met with the Pope almost exclusively to demonstrate his position as the "world leader" of Eastern Christianity, which is indeed a role that the head of the Russian Orthodox Church claims. At the same time, he diminished the role of Constantinople.⁵³ This strategy was underpinned by Kirill's absence from the Holy and Great Council of the Orthodox Church held in Crete from 19 to 26 June 2016. The Council sat with-

⁵² М. Коваленко, Ю. Каздобіна, *Актуальний стан православних церков України в умовах війни: надії на об'єднання, утиски на Донбасі та суспільно-політична позиція*, УНЦПД, №14/739, 28 July 2015, http://www.ucipr.org.ua/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=81:aktualniy-stand-pravoslavnih-cerkov-ukra-ni-v-umovah-v-yni-nad-na-ob-dnannya-utiski-na-donbas-ta-susp-lno-pol-tichna-pozic-ya&catid=8&lang=ua&Itemid=201 (30 April 2016).

⁵³ *Jakie rezultaty po ubieglorocznym spotkaniu Franciszka z Cyrylem?*, <https://ekai.pl/jakie-rezultaty-po-ubieglorocznym-spotkaniu-franciszka-z-cyrylem/> (23 November 2017).

out Russia, Bulgaria and Georgia, which ruled out the chance of working out a way to proclaim autocephaly for Ukraine and once again discredited the Patriarchate in Constantinople.

A few days before the Council in June 2016, the Ukrainian parliament (the Verkhovna Rada) appealed to the Ecumenical Patriarch of Constantinople to grant autocephaly to the Ukrainian Orthodox Church. The deputies said that due to the conflict with Russia, Ukrainian Orthodox Christians had rejected the religious sovereignty of Moscow. They asked the Patriarch of Constantinople to pronounce the act of 1686 invalid because it was adopted in breach of the Orthodox Church's holy canons. By that act, jurisdiction over the Metropolis of Kiev, which was part of the Patriarchate of Constantinople, was passed to Moscow. The appeal was supported by 245 deputies in the 450-member Verkhovna Rada. The Rada also appealed to Patriarch Bartholomew to convene, under his aegis, a Ukrainian unifying council which would unify all Orthodox Churches in Ukraine.

In the face of the events of the Revolution of Dignity, followed by the annexation of Crimea and the conflict in eastern Ukraine, Patriarch Kirill, under whose sovereignty the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the Moscow Patriarchate in Ukraine remains, had difficulty in defining his position. On the one hand, direct support for the actions of the government in Kiev was conducive to breaking ties with the authorities in the Kremlin (which could have had further economic and prestige consequences for both the Russian authorities and the Orthodox Church itself); on the other hand, open condemnation or admission that Russia was the cause of the conflict could result in the further intensification of emancipation processes making the Ukrainian Orthodox Church into an independent "national" Church. Both options might have resulted in the loss of significant influence. Patriarch Kirill recognised the post-Maidan authorities in Ukraine and extended his congratulations to Petro Poroshenko after his presidential election victory.⁵⁴ This was seen as having certain undertones and reflecting a hope at least for Poroshenko's neutrality with respect to the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the Moscow Patriarchate.⁵⁵

The situation in Ukraine has clearly shown how important an instrument of power is the Russian Orthodox Church in the so-called *russkij mir*. From Kirill's point of view, passivity or neutrality, expected by both the Russian Orthodox Church and indeed by the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the Moscow Patriarchate, was the most sensible position. Such a stance was perceived negatively by a large part of Ukrainian society. In the face of increased civic activity among society as a whole and among

⁵⁴ Poroshenko did not conceal his strong attachment to the UOC-MP. His religiousness is seen as authentic and not – as in the case of Yanukovych, who favoured the UOC-MP – as opportunistic. He is believed to have played a role in the designation of Onufriy as Metropolitan of Kiev. Poroshenko spent his youth in the Moldavian Soviet Socialist Republic. Nowadays, however, Moldovans and Romanians associate not only with the UOC-MP, but also with the UOC-KP. For more see: П. Кралюк, *Церква Порошенка*, "Волинські новини", 28 травня 2014, after: Religious Information Service of Ukraine, http://risu.org.ua/ua/index/monitoring/society_digest/56595.

⁵⁵ П. Кралюк, *Церква Порошенка*, "Волинські новини", 28 травня 2014, after: Religious Information Service of Ukraine, http://risu.org.ua/ua/index/monitoring/society_digest/565956 (17 April 2017).

other Churches, this attitude was sometimes judged to be behaviour unworthy of the clergy.

The Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the Moscow Patriarchate is internally diverse, and generational differences are also noticeable. Part of the older generation has strong ties with the hierarchs in Russia, and displays openly hostile attitudes towards the Ukrainian Church's full autocephaly. The younger generation, often not remembering the Soviet era, sees in formal independence from Moscow an opportunity for its own development and that of the Orthodox Church as an institution. These trends have become particularly vivid in the last three years.

As it seems, internal divisions are not strong enough to cause a split in the canonical Orthodox Church, but they have an effect on its image and weaken its structures. Currently, the "autocephalists" represent a more pragmatic and progressive option. A manifestation of the centrifugal tendencies was the convening in February 2014 by the Holy Synod of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the Moscow Patriarchate of a special commission for dialogue with other Ukrainian Orthodox Churches, which was to consider the prospects for unifying the Orthodox Churches of different jurisdictions and creating a national Church, independent of the Moscow Patriarchate. These prospects, however, seemed quite distant.

In spite of attempts to bring order to the mosaic of Ukrainian Churches, overcoming the divisions will undoubtedly be a difficult and lengthy process. The prospect of creating a "national church" seems distant. Although the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the Kiev Patriarchate, which aspires to this title, became canonical on being granted the *tomos*, though remaining only a metropolis, it still has organisational and image problems in the Orthodox world. The Ukrainian Autocephalous Church has entirely lost its identity. The Greek Catholic Church, though local in character, also aspires to be a national church.

The religious factor plays a unique role in Ukraine; the Churches are directly involved in politics, and the religious affiliation of public figures is discussed during elections. Euromaidan and the Revolution of Dignity, the overthrow of Yanukovich, the annexation of Crimea and the war in the Donbass made the Church a focal point of political processes. Today's world view of the Ukrainian religious communities has been shaped by the "Maidan theology" shared by all,⁵⁶ which grew out of the Revolution of Freedom and Dignity. During the Maidan, various Churches consolidated their positions, which was reflected in the statements of the All-Ukrainian Council of Churches and Religious Organisations.⁵⁷ Council members are in agreement with regard to Ukraine's European integration, the need to protect the country's sovereignty and integrity, acknowledgement of Russia's aggression, and the importance of demo-

⁵⁶ A term used by R. Lunkin. С. Солодовник, *Україна: православие против православия*, 16 June 2015, https://www.religion.in.ua/zmi/foreign_zmi/29456-ukraina-pravoslavie-protiv-pravoslaviya.html.

⁵⁷ The Council was established in 1996, and became more active during Yushchenko's presidency. The Council includes all Orthodox jurisdictions, Greek Catholics, Roman Catholics and a number of Protestant structures (Lutherans, Baptists, Pentecostals, Adventists).

cratic values for the country. The Churches recognise the right of the people to oppose authorities that resort to violence.

In the vast majority of cases, Ukrainian clergy representing both the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the Moscow Patriarchate and the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the Kiev Patriarchate display a patriotic attitude towards the Ukrainian state. There were, of course, numerous cases where the Orthodox Church supported the separatists, but a negative moral evaluation of the policy of the Russian authorities and appeals to stop further escalation of the conflict prevailed. Despite its relatively high and stable level of trust, the Orthodox Church in Ukraine is still not exploiting its potential to build civic society. The Revolution of Dignity revealed the existence of this potential, but now the Church is again on the defensive.

Roman Lunkin described the changes in Russian society and its mindset using the metaphor of Shakespearian theatre, which is full of scenery and props, but all put on the stage at the same time, so that each troupe is forced to play in front of its own scenery as well as that left by previous actors. The props of the Third Rome, the USSR, *rususkij mir*, landed gentry, “Ruthenian Orthodox civilisation”, Komsomol songs and liturgical songs appear simultaneously and side by side. “Finding the truth underneath the layers of decoration and make-up is difficult, but it is possible.”⁵⁸

THE TOMOS AND THE ORTHODOX CHURCH OF UKRAINE

The Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople paid no regard to the existence of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the Kiev Patriarchate and the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church as schismatic structures within the Ukrainian Orthodox Church. At the same time, it did not accept the term “canonical territory”, as used by the Russian Orthodox Church, according to which the area of former Russia and the Soviet Union is to remain under the jurisdiction of the Moscow patriarchs. A turning point came in April 2018, when the Phanar⁵⁹ accepted the petition for autocephaly filed by both non-canonical Ukrainian Orthodox Churches, and declared that it would examine it “as the true Mother Church”. The source of the change in the attitude of Patriarch Bartholomew I can most probably be seen in Moscow’s thwarting of an undertaking that was of great importance to him – the Pan-Orthodox Council in Crete in 2016, convened for the first time in a thousand years. The boycott of the Council by Russian, Georgian and Bulgarian delegations and the Patriarchate of Antioch⁶⁰ deprived it of its universality and made it an ordinary conference.⁶¹ The Orthodox

⁵⁸ Р. Лункин, *Крушение русского мира. Взгляд из Москвы*, 21 May 2014, <http://www.internet-sobor.org/index.php/stati/roman-lunkin-krushenie-russkogo-mira-vzglyad-iz-moskvy> (31 January 2018).

⁵⁹ Phanar, a district of Istanbul, common name for the seat of the Ecumenical Patriarch of Constantinople.

⁶⁰ One of the four ancient patriarchates, today based in Damascus, and therefore closely dependent on the Syrian authorities, which in turn are strongly dependent on the Kremlin.

⁶¹ T. Olszański, *Kijów czeka na autokefalię*, 18 June 2018, <https://www.tygodnikpowszechny.pl/kijow-czeka-na-autokefalie-153467>

Church in Moscow, with the participation of the state authorities, increased its efforts to form a coalition against Ukrainian attempts to be granted autocephaly. However, in procedural terms, the opinion of other Orthodox Churches is not binding on Patriarch Bartholomew I – it was he, as head of the Mother Church, who could take a sovereign decision.

On 19 April 2018, at the request of President Petro Poroshenko, the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine supported the petition of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the Kiev Patriarchate and the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church to the Patriarch of Constantinople for the granting of autocephaly to Ukrainian Orthodoxy. This decision raised many concerns in Ukraine, as the successful completion of the process was seen as inevitable, and at the same time the proclamation of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Particular Orthodox Church (*Ukrainska Pomisna Avtokefalna Pravoslavna Tserkva*) might lead to another wave of religious conflicts. Once again, it was the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the Moscow Patriarchate that was to find itself in a difficult situation. It was expected that some of the faithful and priests would remain loyal to Moscow, the Moscow Patriarchate would support that group, while the Ukrainian authorities would strongly promote the development of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Particular Orthodox Church.

The efforts of the Ukrainian authorities to have autocephaly granted by the Patriarch of Constantinople Bartholomew I, and the anticipated religious conflicts, were of great political significance as they were expected to increase, at least in theory, President Poroshenko's chances of re-election in 2019. His power base counted on a rise in popularity among the patriotic electorate, whereas the opponents of autocephaly were expected to support pro-Russian parties, which would help to put a pro-Russian politician (Yurij Boyko, as then anticipated) into the run-off vote. Such an arrangement would favour the current president.⁶² The establishment of a Kiev Patriarchate, recognised by the Orthodox world (except for Moscow and its satellites) as canonical, was supposed to be a success that would secure another term in office. Poroshenko assumed that it would allow him to portray himself as the “unifier and patron of the nation” and that other competitors from the patriotic camp, with Yulia Tymoshenko at the forefront, would not be able to challenge his role and determination in the process of gaining independence for the Ukrainian Orthodox Church. In his election campaign, Poroshenko used the slogan “Army, language and faith!” which emphasised the need for patriotic unity and a united identity, and the granting of the *tomos*⁶³ became one of the priorities in the last year or so of his presidency.

The reasoning underlying the decision of the Patriarch of Constantinople to grant *tomos* was made public in April 2018. When Kievan Rus', the forerunner of Ukraine, Belarus and north-western Russia, adopted Christianity, the Kiev metropolis was es-

⁶² The elections in March/April 2019 produced a surprise result – Volodymyr Zelensky won a place in the run-off vote, in which he defeated Petro Poroshenko.

⁶³ A *tomos* is a decree of particular importance for the system and structure of the Orthodox Church, issued by the patriarch.

tablished and quickly received autocephaly (canonical self-governance). From 1299 to 1458, metropolitans of Kiev and all Rus' resided in Vladimir on the Klyazma River and then in Moscow. In 1458, the Moscow metropolis announced its separation from Kiev, and in 1589 the Moscow metropolitans were made patriarchs. A hundred years later, against the will of the Ecumenical Patriarch (he was made to give his consent *ex post*; it was revoked in 1924), the patriarchs of Moscow took control over the metropolis of Kiev, and this state of affairs persisted until our times. The Ecumenical Patriarch had no doubt that from the canonical point of view the Orthodox Church in Constantinople and not that in Moscow was the Mother Church for Kiev.⁶⁴

In its decision of 11 October 2018, the Council of the Ecumenical Patriarchate restored the Kiev Metropolis to the jurisdiction of Constantinople, but at that time did not grant it autocephaly. This had to be preceded by the unification of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the Kiev Patriarchate and the Ukrainian Autocephalous Church. The Synod also lifted the anathema (excommunication) imposed on the heads of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the Kiev Patriarchate and the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church, and by confirming the canonical nature of these two communities, also confirmed, among other things, the validity of the sacraments administered by them.⁶⁵ The Council meeting was attended by representatives of all three Orthodox Churches (42 from the UOC-KP and 12 from the UAOC, namely all of the bishops) and two bishops from the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the Moscow Patriarchate (out of 73 currently active). The Council approved the metropolitan statute and elected the superior, whose title would be Metropolitan of Kiev and All Ukraine.

The establishment of a new Orthodox Church of Ukraine, independent from Russia and yet fully recognised, was announced on 15 December 2018 at Saint Sophia Cathedral in Kiev. Representatives of the previously unrecognised Ukrainian Orthodox Churches who gathered there elected 39-year-old Epiphanius (Dumenko)⁶⁶ as the primate of an independent autocephalous church.

⁶⁴ The Synod's announcement of April 2018, <http://www.ec-patr.org/docdisplay.php?lang=gr&id=2475&tla=gr>. See: T. A. Olszański, *Walka o kanoniczną samodzielność ukraińskiego prawosławia*, <https://www.osw.waw.pl/pl/publikacje/komentarze-osw/2018-06-13/walka-o-samodzielosc-kanoniczna-ukraińskiego-prawosławia>; <https://hromadske.radio/v-odyn-klik/tomos-dlya-ukrayiny-istoriya-perebig-podiy-i-struktura-ukrayinskoyi-pomisnoyi-cerkvy>.

⁶⁵ T. A. Olszański, *Konstantynopol: autokefalia dla Ukrainy*, 17 October 2018, <https://www.osw.waw.pl/pl/publikacje/analizy/2018-10-12/uznanie-przez-patriarchat-ekumeniczny-niezaleznosci-prawoslawnej>; <https://hromadske.radio/v-odyn-klik/tomos-dlya-ukrayiny-istoriya-perebig-podiy-i-struktura-ukrayinskoyi-pomisnoyi-cerkvy>.

⁶⁶ Serhij Dumenko was born on 3 February 1979 in the district of Odessa, but he moved in his early childhood to Chernivtsi. In 1996 he joined the theological academy of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the Kiev Patriarchate in Kiev. In 2003 he defended his PhD thesis in theology, and he studied philosophy at the University of Athens in 2006–2007. He was a lecturer at the Kiev Theological Academy. He took religious vows in 2007 and was ordained a priest a year later; in 2009 he was made a bishop. At that time he also became secretary to Patriarch Filaret, and in 2010 he was appointed Dean of the Kiev Theological Academy. In 2012, he was appointed Metropolitan of Pereyaslav-Khmelnitsky and Boryspil, and in June 2013 governor and guardian of the throne of Patriarch Filaret with the right of succession. He is a rep-

Metropolitan Onufriy, as the head of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the Moscow Patriarchate, unambiguously declared his loyalty to Moscow. Both the Kremlin and the Moscow Orthodox Church responded in very strong terms to the autocephaly of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church, warning of the most serious split in Eastern Christianity since the Great Schism of 1054. Until that time, the only Orthodox Church in Ukraine considered canonical had been the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the Moscow Patriarchate. By granting the *tomos* of autocephaly to the unified uncanonical Orthodox churches, the Ecumenical Patriarch of Constantinople had questioned the historical and legal foundations of Moscow's religious sovereignty as the Mother Church over Ukraine. On 12 October, two months before the Council, Bartholomew I sent a letter to Onufriy, informing him that the moment the Ukrainian Orthodox Church was unified, he would no longer be the Metropolitan of Kiev. Should he insist on retaining that title, his actions would be considered uncanonical.⁶⁷ After the election of Epiphanius, Vladimir Legoyda, spokesman for the Moscow Patriarchate, stated that "the authority of Metropolitan Onufriy remains in force; today there is one metropolitan in Ukraine, as it should be according to the canons of the Church."⁶⁸ The Russian Orthodox Church stated that the decisions of the unification council held in Ukraine were not binding. Also, the Orthodox Churches in Poland,⁶⁹ Serbia and Syria officially sided with Russia.

On 31 December 2018, Kirill, head of the Russian Orthodox Church, called on the Patriarch of Constantinople to abandon his efforts towards canonical recognition of the new Orthodox Church in Ukraine. "Retreat now from communion with the schismatics and refrain from participating in the political gamble of their legalisation", he wrote in a letter to Bartholomew I.⁷⁰ Foreign Minister Sergei Lavrov condemned the "Constantinople provocation" and Washington for "directly and publicly backing it." On the same day the matter became the subject of a special meeting of the Security Council of the Russian Federation, and Dmitry Peskov, press secretary for the Russian President, announced that Russia would "defend the interests of the Orthodox", which, however, bearing in mind the importance of the Patriarch of Constantinople in the Orthodox world, would not be an easy matter for Russian politicians.⁷¹

Despite the formal independence of the Orthodox Church from the state, Petro Poroshenko actively participated in mediation, decision-making and the Council itself. When the proceedings were concluded, he and the new Metropolitan Epipha-

representative of the new generation, not tarnished by cooperation with the KGB, educated in independent Ukraine, and at the same time a continuator of Filaret's work.

⁶⁷ B. Bodalska, *Tomos dla Cerkwi Prawosławnej Ukrainy*, 7 January 2019, <https://www.euractiv.pl/section/polityka-zagraniczna/news/tomos-dla-cerkwi-prawoslawnej-ukrainy/>

⁶⁸ Ibidem.

⁶⁹ Interview with Metropolitan Sawa of Poland, W. Romanowski, *Autokefalia tak, ale zgodna z prawem*, *Polityka*, 6 January 2019, <https://www.polityka.pl/tygodnikpolityka/kraj/1777214,1,autokefalia-tak-ale-zgodna-z-prawem.read>.

⁷⁰ B. Bodalska, *Tomos dla Cerkwi ...*

⁷¹ Ibidem.

nius came out on to the square in front of Saint Sophia Cathedral, where he attended a rally chaired by culture minister Yevhen Nyshchuk. Once the Minister had formally presented Metropolitan Epiphanius, President Poroshenko gave a speech in which he declared the end of religious subordination to Moscow and the existence of a “Putin-free church”.⁷²

The *tomos* granting autocephaly to the Kiev Metropolis was presented in Constantinople on 6 January 2019, on Christmas Eve (according to the Julian calendar). Since unification and the granting of the *tomos*, the new church has been named the Orthodox Church of Ukraine (*Pravoslavna Tserkva Ukrainy*), which is intended to emphasise its universality for all those living in Ukraine. Avoidance of the adjective “Ukrainian” is supposed to stress the inclusive, unifying and supra-ethnic nature of the Church.

Contrary to widespread expectations in Ukraine, the unified Orthodox Church of Ukraine was not given the status of patriarchate, but only that of metropolis. It is not clear when and whether it will be elevated to the status of patriarchate. Modern Orthodoxy does not create new patriarchates. Moreover, the Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople will probably not wish to further antagonise the Orthodox world. The *tomos* issue is also complicated by the ambitions of Filaret, incumbent patriarch of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the Kiev Patriarchate, who elevated Kiev to the status of patriarchate himself without the consent of Moscow or Constantinople. Bartholomew I probably did not approve of him as a candidate for Metropolitan. Filaret became an “honorary patriarch” and has openly protested against the downgrading of the Orthodox Church. The convening of a “local council” in St. Volodymyr’s Cathedral in Kiev on 20 June 2019 was an indication of his ambitions.⁷³ Only two bishops out of the forty invited attended the council. Filaret announced that he did not recognise the subordination of the Ukrainian church to Constantinople, and that the Kiev Patriarchate established by him had not been dissolved and all its assets were still held within the existing structure.⁷⁴ Filaret believes that the hierarchs were deceived and Constantinople did not reveal the details of the *tomos*, for example, those concerning the creation of a Kiev metropolis. In Filaret’s view, Ukraine deserves the status of patriarchate, but in the current situation the prospects of its creation are very doubtful.

⁷² T. Olszański, *Historyczne zjednoczenie Kościołów prawosławnych Ukrainy*, OSW (Centre for Eastern Studies) Commentaries, 17 December 2019, <https://www.osw.waw.pl/pl/publikacje/komentarze-osw/2018-12-17/historyczne-zjednoczenie-kosciolow-prawoslawnych-ukrainy>.

⁷³ Почесний Патріарх Філарет розсилає священнослужителям запрошення на свій Собор, 17 June 2019, https://risu.org.ua/ua/index/all_news/orthodox/uoc_kp/76174/; «Якби знав про домовленості між Філаретом та Епіфанієм – не пішов би на Собор»: інтерв’ю з митрополитом Драбинком, <https://hromadske.ua/posts/domovlenosti-mizh-filaretom-epifaniyem-ta-poroshenkom-mogli-buti-ale-pro-nih-niht-to-ne-znae-mitropolit-drabinko>.

⁷⁴ Собор Филарета восстановил УПЦ КП со всеми ее структурами и собственностью и раскритиковал текст Томоса, 20 June 2019; https://risu.org.ua/ru/index/all_news/orthodox/uoc_kp/76218/.

In response to Filaret's actions, the Holy Synod of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church convened on 24 June 2019, distanced itself from the actions of its Honorary Patriarch, who, as a matter of fact, had not attended the synod ("for no valid reason"), deprived Filaret of the opportunity to run parishes and monasteries, denied him the right to manage the revenues of the former Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the Kiev Patriarchate and excluded the clergy participating in the synod convened by Filaret from the episcopate of the Orthodox Church of Ukraine. Thus, all parishes and property related to the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the Kiev Patriarchate came under the management of the Orthodox Church of Ukraine. The synod decided that the meeting convened by Filaret five days earlier had not been a synod and that its provisions had no legal force. It was confirmed that only the Orthodox Church of Ukraine is the legitimate, canonical and historical successor of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the Kiev Patriarchate and the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church, and Honorary Patriarch Filaret can clear his doubts by asking the synod through Metropolitan Epiphanius⁷⁵.

The new structure is suffering damage to its reputation, and a potential conflict and schism most certainly encourage criticism, especially from Russia. Even if Filaret is supported by certain circles, the *tomos* cannot be formally withdrawn.⁷⁶

Despite the obvious influence of the state on the new Orthodox Church, Metropolitan Epiphanius tried to keep his distance during the election campaign, deliberately avoiding associations with the term "Poroshenko's Church". In the last weeks before the election, Epiphanius stressed that there was no question of interference by the authorities in Church matters, and no desire to make it a national Church. The hierarchy tried to encourage participation in the election, but he refrained from supporting any particular candidate.

In Ukraine there is a large group of believers who describe themselves as "simply Orthodox", who either ignore the rift between the Orthodox Churches or do not understand its causes and consequences. There is also a large group of "cultural Orthodox believers", that is, those for whom confessional affiliation is primarily or solely a part of social identity. They pay little attention to regular practices and sacraments. The most important task for the Orthodox Church of Ukraine will be to win over the parishes remaining under the jurisdiction of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the Moscow Patriarchate.⁷⁷ In the first six months, around 500 such parishes moved to the

⁷⁵ Press- release on the results of the session of the Holy Synod of the UOC (OCU), <https://www.pomisna.info/uk/vsi-novyny/press-release-on-the-results-of-the-session-of-the-holy-synod-of-the-uoc-ocu/24.06.2019>.

⁷⁶ Почесний Патріарх Філарет розсилає священнослужителям запрошення на свій Собор, 17 June 2019, https://risu.org.ua/ua/index/all_news/orthodox/uoc_kp/76174/.

⁷⁷ Statistics for March 2019 show that up to 500 pastoral institutions previously linked to Moscow had moved to the Orthodox Church of Ukraine. A. Szczupak, Kandydatów wielu, wyzwań również. Religijne dylematy kampanii wyborczej Petra Poroszenki, *Nowa Europa Wschodnia*, 30 March 2019, <http://www.new.org.pl/6005-kandydatow-wielu-wyznan-rowniez-religijne-dylematy-kampanii-wyborczej-petra-poroszenki>.

Orthodox Church of Ukraine.⁷⁸ Although it is a simplification and generalisation to say so, those of the faithful with national and patriotic preferences will probably join the new Church (or possibly the Greek Catholic Church), while others – those with anti-patriotic (anti-Kiev) attitudes – are more likely to remain within their existing Church.

At the turn of 2018 and 2019, by the decision of Patriarch Bartholomew I and with the support of the Ukrainian political authorities, a new reality became fact in Ukrainian Orthodoxy, which does not mean that the split has been overcome. This is only the beginning of a long process which may cause many conflicts related to the building of camps within the structures of the world's Orthodoxy, conflicts within Ukraine and in Ukrainian–Russian relations. There will be two hostile, equal and comparably strong structures in Ukraine, politically backed by Ukraine and Russia, and this will draw those countries into conflicts over their religious structures and the wealth that their communities possess. Thus, instead of a gradual move of the faithful of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the Moscow Patriarchate to a new structure, one can expect an increase in instability and a gradual loss of the Church's authority. The individual ambitions of hierarchs and different visions of the Church's future do not further unification. At this stage, the Orthodox Church of Ukraine will rely primarily on the potential of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the Kiev Patriarchate, and this fact in turn will hinder the transfer of bishops and priests associated with the Moscow Patriarchate.

The future of the unification process is also dependent on finding a solution to disputes concerning the use of sacred buildings, especially in those places where there is only one temple, and also in the case of buildings of key historical and religious significance (such as the Kiev Pechersk Lavra and the Pochayiv Lavra). It is to be expected that there will be conflicts in which significant roles will be played both by the Ukrainian Orthodox communities, by political circles wishing to maintain a relationship with the Moscow Patriarchate, and by groups centred around monasteries, Metropolitan Agatangel of Odessa, or the Orthodox laity.

Dr Katarzyna Jędraszczyk, Instytut Kultury Europejskiej, Uniwersytet im. A. Mickiewicza (jedra@amu.edu.pl)

Keywords: Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the Kiev Patriarchate, Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the Moscow Patriarchate, political culture, Ukraine, church–state relations, national church, *tomos* of autonomy

⁷⁸ Detailed data are collected and plotted on an interactive map: https://www.google.com/maps/d/u/0/viewer?mid=1XQR0sfHFFiiXyGiVYq11mNylJ9fFPdnh&ll=49.4742385410442%2C28.04668874999993&z=7&fbclid=IwAR0tZD7PJmR8Fz4pQJG_EZtiz1E_md2nc6dOanWsURfdlejLCH512LJu-o. See: <https://risu.org.ua/ua/index/exclusive/review/74069/>.

ABSTRACT

The aim of the article is to analyse the place and importance of the Orthodox Church in the society and political culture of Ukraine after 2013. The new political realities following the Revolution of Dignity, the annexation of Crimea and the war in Donbas created new challenges for the Orthodox Church in Ukraine. Particularly important is the influence of the Russian Orthodox Church's authority over the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the Moscow Patriarchate.

At the turn of 2018 and 2019, by a decision of Patriarch Bartholomew I and with the support of the Ukrainian political authorities, a new reality became fact in Ukrainian Orthodoxy. However, the creation of the Orthodox Church of Ukraine (as a metropolis) does not mean that the split has been overcome. There will be two hostile, equal and comparably strong structures in Ukraine, politically backed by Ukraine and Russia, and this will draw those countries into conflicts over their religious structures and the wealth that their communities possess. At this stage, the Orthodox Church of Ukraine will rely primarily on the potential of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the Kiev Patriarchate, and this fact in turn will hinder the transfer of bishops and priests associated with the Moscow Patriarchate. The rift will be difficult to repair.