
4-2020

Confrontation of Orthodox Churches in Modern Ukraine: Reasons, Trends and Prospects of Reconciliation

Nataliia Ishchuk
Bogomolets National Medical University

Oleksandr Sagan
National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.georgefox.edu/ree>



Part of the [Christianity Commons](#), and the [Eastern European Studies Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Ishchuk, Nataliia and Sagan, Oleksandr (2020) "Confrontation of Orthodox Churches in Modern Ukraine: Reasons, Trends and Prospects of Reconciliation," *Occasional Papers on Religion in Eastern Europe*: Vol. 40 : Iss. 3 , Article 4.

Available at: <https://digitalcommons.georgefox.edu/ree/vol40/iss3/4>

This Peer-Reviewed Article is brought to you for free and open access by Digital Commons @ George Fox University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Occasional Papers on Religion in Eastern Europe by an authorized editor of Digital Commons @ George Fox University. For more information, please contact arolfe@georgefox.edu.

CONFRONTATION OF ORTHODOX CHURCHES IN MODERN UKRAINE: REASONS, TRENDS AND PROSPECTS OF RECONCILIATION

By Nataliia Ishchuk and Oleksandr Sagan

Nataliia Ishchuk, Doctor of Philosophical Sciences, Professor, Department of Philosophy, Bioethics and History of Medicine, Bogomolets National Medical University, Kyiv, Ukraine. Research interests: social doctrine of Christianity, political theology, processes of adaptation of religious systems to modern society, dialogue, communication and processes of alienation of people from each other.
E-Mail: ishchuknb@gmail.com

Oleksandr Sagan, Doctor of Philosophical Sciences, Professor, Leading Researcher in the Institute of Philosophy, National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine. Research interests: freedom of conscience (legislative support, practical implementation), state-church relations, political science of religion, ethno-politics, inter-ethnic relations.
E-Mail: ol.sagan@gmail.com

Abstract

The current canonical and social statuses as well as the relationship of the largest Orthodox churches in Ukraine are considered: the Orthodox Church of Ukraine and the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the Moscow Patriarchate. The Orthodox Church of Ukraine emerged on December 15, 2018, as a result of the unification of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the Kyiv Patriarchate, the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church, and a small number of representatives of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the Moscow Patriarchate. On January 6, 2019, the Ecumenical Patriarch Bartholomew, in accordance with the decision of the Synod of the Constantinopolitan Patriarchate, together with the Synodals, signed the *Tomos* on the autocephaly of the Orthodox Church of Ukraine. This Church identifies itself with World Orthodoxy, admits the Constantinopolitan church as its mother church and is recognized by it. The Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the Moscow Patriarchate was formally proclaimed on the eve of the collapse of the Soviet Union on October 25-27, 1990, on the basis of the Ukrainian Exarchate of the Moscow Patriarchate, which existed before. It has the status of a self-governing church within the Russian Orthodox Church, which it recognizes as the mother church, and within which it has been part of various state institutions since the 17th century and up to the present. The civilizational nature of the confrontation between these churches in Ukraine is substantiated. This confrontation goes beyond modern history and concerns the interpretation of almost every event (often ecclesiastical) from the individual or common past of Ukraine and Russia. The confrontation has intensified in connection with efforts by the current Russian authorities to impose a common civilizational future on Ukraine, using and including for this purpose a religious factor. The newly established Orthodox Church of

Ukraine supports the Orthodox-Ukrainophile and European integrational aspirations of the overwhelming majority of the Ukrainian citizens. The Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the Moscow Patriarchate is focused on cooperation with Russia and upholds the idea of “Eastern European Orthodoxy” as part of the “Orthodox-Moscow civilization component.” Among the causes concerning the current stage of confrontation are the following: the fundamentally different attitudes regarding the events of the Revolution of Dignity, the occupation of the Crimea and the war in the eastern part of Ukraine, and Ukraine’s geopolitical future. It is reasonable to expect that in the near future, the internal Orthodox confrontation in Ukraine will continue because of the severity of the conflict situation and the unpreparedness for the dialogue of these churches. However, in the long run, the independence of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the Moscow Patriarchate and the development of the Orthodox Church of Ukraine and also changing generations of priesthood and believers of these churches, cooperation and, as a result, reconciliation between them are inevitable.

Keywords: Orthodox Church of Ukraine, Ukrainian Orthodox Church of Moscow Patriarchate, Tomos, canonical status, civilizational identity, confrontation, reconciliation.

Introduction

Since the beginning of Ukraine’s independence, one of the aspects of escalation of tension in the Ukrainian society has been manifested through the line of an intra-Orthodox confrontation. Over the last three decades, this tendency has not disappeared, and unfortunately, the level of tension has not been reduced. It is natural that the peaks of these crises accounted for the fateful moments, times of change associated with civilizational, geopolitical choices made by the country. These include such important periods as the collapse of the Soviet Union and attainment of Ukraine’s independence (1991), the Orange Revolution (2004), the Revolution of Dignity (late 2013 to early 2014), Russia’s annexation of the Crimea, and Russia’s military aggression in the East (from 2014 up to the present moment). The latest extremely tangible crisis in relations within the Orthodox environment is associated with the formation of the Orthodox Church of Ukraine (the authentic transliterated abbreviation is PCU (ПЦУ); OCU is the international abbreviation that we will use hereafter), which has been growing since 2019. What is the survivability of this confrontation between co-religionists? Why does the persistent desire of the citizens of poly-denominational Ukraine (according to different data, from 43%¹ to 54%²), to have their own local Orthodox Church rather than to

¹ “Майже половина українців підтримує створення в Україні помісної автокефальної церкви. Дослідження проведене соціологічною службою Центру Разумкова спільно з Фондом “Демократичні ініціативи” імені Ілька Кучеріва з 19 по 25 грудня 2018 р.”

² “Ставлення українців до створення єдиної помісної церкви. Згідно з результатами дослідження, проведеного Соціологічною групою “Рейтинг” з 27 вересня по 4 жовтня 2018 р.”

belong to another country's Orthodox Church cause such resistance in the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the Moscow Patriarchate (hereinafter the UOC MP)? Is the claim of the UOC MP justified? Why have not even the recognition of the OCU autocephaly in the Orthodox world and the establishment of the Orthodox Church of Ukraine reconciled the Orthodox Ukrainians with each other? What are the consequences and prospects of resolving this conflict?

Current Canonical and Social Status of the Largest Orthodox Churches in Ukraine

Orthodoxy in Ukraine is represented by the following churches: Orthodox Church of Ukraine (about 7,000 communities); the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the Moscow Patriarchate (about 12,000 communities); the Russian Orthodox Old Believers Church (Belokrynitsky Consent) (54 communities); the Russian True Orthodox Church (36 communities); the Russian Orthodox Church Abroad (30 communities); and different factions of the Russian Orthodox Old Believers Church (about 30 communities).³ The last four churches are fundamentalist, small, and non-influential. The major confrontations about values of significance for the destiny of Ukraine, Europe and, to some extent, the world are centered on the ideological confrontation between the two largest Orthodox churches—the OCU and the UOC MP.

The Orthodox Church of Ukraine (the OCU) was recognized as independent and equal to all other sister-church more than a year ago. It arose on December 15, 2018 as a result of the merger of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the Kyiv Patriarchate (the UOC KP), the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church (the UAOC) and a small number of representatives of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the Moscow Patriarchate (the UOC MP). On January 6, 2019, in accordance with the decision of the Synod of the Patriarchate of Constantinople, the Ecumenical Patriarch Bartholomew together with the Synodals, signed the *Tomos* on the autocephaly of the OCU.⁴ These events, as well as the internalization of Metropolitan Epiphany (in the text of the *Tomos* -- Ἐπιφανίω (in Greek), Epifanios (in English)) as the Primate of the church, were the final stages of this church's long and difficult journey to autocephaly. The OCU identifies itself with World Orthodoxy, recognizes the Church of Constantinople as its mother-church and is also recognized by it.

³ “Дані Департаменту у справах релігій та національностей Міністерства культури України. Форма 1. Звіт про мережу церков і релігійних організацій в Україні станом на 01.01.2019 р.” *PICU*.

⁴ “Patriarchal and Synodal *Tomos* for the Bestowal of the Ecclesiastical Status of Autocephaly to the Orthodox Church in Ukraine.” *Ecumenical Patriarchate*.

In addition to the historical right of the Orthodox Church of Ukraine to autocephaly, the reason for its granting was the need to unite the Orthodox communities in Ukraine. Patriarch Bartholomew of Constantinople explained his decision on the necessity of giving the *Tomos* to the OCU in the following way: “When our brother is considered a schismatic or a heretic, and even more so when the whole nation, millions of people are outside the canonical Church under the pretext of a split, then we are called immediately, without delay, to a spiritual and apostolic vigilance, because “when one member suffers, all members suffer together with him.”⁵ According to the plan of the Patriarchate of Constantinople, after the formation of the united Orthodox Church of Ukraine, all other Orthodox churches in the territory of Ukraine should either enter into its membership or legitimize their true canonical status. In particular, the UOC MP, as part of the Russian Orthodox Church, should formalize this status and be officially called the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the Moscow Patriarchate (this was the name the Church had until 2007), or the Russian Orthodox Church in Ukraine (which is more in line with its essence). By the same token, it is also required by the amendments made in 2018 of the Law on Freedom of Conscience and Religious Organizations (part 7, article 12).⁶ However, the case of renaming is now being delayed due to the opposition, namely lawsuits to the state body responsible for state-church relations by the UOC MP hierarchs.

The OCU supports Orthodox-Ukrainophile and European integration aspirations of the overwhelming majority of the Ukrainian citizens. It is currently in the process of establishing and developing its structure, determining the priorities of its domestic and foreign policies. As of early 2020, the OCU was recognized by the Alexandrian Patriarchate and the Hellenic Orthodox Church together with the Constantinople Orthodox Church, taking into consideration the fact that neither the Ecumenical Patriarchate break the Eucharistic relationship with the Moscow Patriarchate, nor did the Orthodox Church of Ukraine. Its head, Metropolitan Epiphanius, has repeatedly expressed his readiness for dialogue and regulation of relations between Orthodox churches in Ukraine for the benefit of the Ukrainian society.

⁵ Варфоломій, патріарх. “Я – не «Східний Папа. Інтерв’ю із Константинопольським патріархом Варфоломієм.” *РІСУ*. 28.02.2019.

⁶ “A religious organization (association) which, directly or as an integral part of another religious organization (association), belongs to a structure (is part of) a religious organization (association) whose guidance centre (management) is located outside Ukraine in the state, which is recognized by law as having engaged in military aggression against Ukraine and/or temporarily occupying part of the territory of Ukraine, obliged in its full title, specified in its charter (statute) to display affiliation with a religious organization (association) outside Ukraine and to which it belongs (part of which it is), by obligatory mentioning in its name of the full statutory name of such religious organization (association) with the possible addition of the words “in Ukraine” and / or designation of its place in the structure of a foreign religious organization.”

It is no coincidence that the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the Moscow Patriarchate has been preserved in Ukraine. This church expresses other social demands and sentiments of that part of the Ukrainian citizens, who profess conservatism, or, having the Russian or Soviet identity, are nostalgic for their homeland, with which they identify themselves, and that, of course, does not exclude other vital motives, according to which the faithful choose that confession.

The UOC MP was formally formed on the eve of the collapse of the Soviet Union on October 25-27, 1990, on the basis of the Ukrainian Exarchate of the Moscow Patriarchate, which existed here before. It has a status of a self-governing church within the Russian Orthodox Church, which is recognized as the mother-church by it, and within which it has been part of various state institutions since the 17th century and up to the present. Metropolitan Onufrius is the head of this church. The UOC MP has significant human and material resources, an extensive community system, and strong political connections established over the time, thus influencing the Ukrainian society. In view of the subordinated position of the UOC MP to the Moscow Patriarchate and the decision of the governing bodies of the Russian Orthodox Church,⁷ the UOC MP is forced to comply with the decision of the Synod of the Russian Orthodox Church of October 15, 2018, to break the Eucharistic communion with the Patriarchate of Constantinople, and it does not recognize the legitimacy of the Orthodox Church of Ukraine any more.⁸ The leader of the UOC MP, Metropolitan Onufriy (Onuphrius), following Moscow's church propagandists, is trying to characterize the *Tomos* for the OCU as a political project.⁹ However, in Ukraine, the position of the Primate of the UOC MP has been significantly shaken from the canonical view point. In the new annual edition of the Patriarchate of Constantinople issued in 2019 with the listing of hierarchies of all diptychial Orthodox churches, the former "Metropolitan of Kyiv and All Ukraine" Onufriy (Berezovsky) was no longer mentioned with such a title. All bishopric of the UOC MP was named with reference to the hierarch's residence. The most vivid example was the following: "Onuphrius, Metropolitan in Kiev." This deprivation of the episcopal title deprives him of the priestly office in the territory of another church, because, according to the Orthodox canons, there can be only one bishop in one diocese and not two or more. It should be noted that before the Unification

⁷ "Устав Русской Православной Церкви. Глава X. Украинская Православная Церковь." *Русская Православная Церковь*. *Официальный сайт*. 02.12.2017.

⁸ "Журнал № 71 заседания Священного Синода от 15 октября 2018 года. *Русская Православная Церковь*." *Официальный сайт*.

⁹ See: "Пресс-конференция предстоятеля УПЦ: о церкви, собрании в Аммане и раскольнической ПЦУ." *Православная жизнь*. 28.02.2020.

Council of 2018, at which the OCU was created, the Ecumenical Patriarch Bartholomew I sent a letter to Metropolitan Onuphrius, in which it was stated that after the Unification Council he would not be able to bear the title “Metropolitan of Kyiv and All Ukraine” because this title would be given to the newly elected Primate of the Church.¹⁰

As of 2019, the UOC MP has about 12,000 communities; the OCU in total about 7,000 communities.¹¹ Although the OCU MP communities are still transitioning to the OCU, the UOC MP will remain the largest church in Ukraine for the short term. Due to the number of communities, the OCU is inferior to the OCU MP. However, the assessment of the size of churches by this criterion is very conditional. Only 10 adults are required to register a community. Therefore, a community of 10 people and a community of thousands have the same position in statistics. All over the world, the number of believers is determined by sociologists. Taking this criterion into consideration, according to the All-Ukrainian poll, as of January 2020, 34% of them consider themselves as members of the OCU, whereas only 13.8% (2.5 times less) as the faithful of the UOC of the Moscow Patriarchate. A significant percentage of those who are Orthodox, but do not refer to any of these churches are 27.6%,¹² which requires a separate analysis. According to another poll, also conducted in January 2020 by another sociological company, 38.6% of the Ukrainian citizens attributed themselves to the parishes of the Orthodox Church of Ukraine, headed by Metropolitan Epiphaniy. And only 20.7% to the parishioners of the UOC Moscow Patriarchate, headed by Metropolitan Onufriy.¹³ It should be noted that in both the first and second cases, polls were conducted throughout Ukraine except the occupied territories of the Crimea and parts of Donbas.

The situation described above only outlines the urgency of the issue and the need to analyze the socio-historical and meaningful context of the development of Orthodoxy in independent Ukraine. This requires at least a brief excursion into history, which will help to understand the specifics of the “Orthodox issue” in Ukraine.

¹⁰ “Щорічне видання Вселенського патріархату не визнає титулів єпископів МП в Україні.” 23.01.2020.

¹¹ “Дані Департаменту у справах релігій та національностей Міністерства культури України. Форма 1. Звіт про мережу церков і релігійних організацій в Україні станом на 01.01.2019 р.” *РІСУ*.

¹² “Конфесійна та церковна належність громадян України, (січень 2020 р.). Дослідження проведене соціологічною службою Центру Разумкова з 17 по 21 січня 2020 року.” *Разумков Центр*.

¹³ “Парафіянами ПЦУ називають себе 38,6% українців, парафіянами УПЦ (МП) 20,7%. Дані опитування, проведеного “Центром соціального моніторингу” і Українським інститутом соціальних досліджень ім. О. Яременка. 24-28.01.2020.”

The Civilizational Basis of Internal Confrontation of Orthodox Churches in Ukraine

The collapse of the Soviet Union and the independence of Ukraine became catalytic agents for a radical transformation of the spiritual space of the Ukrainian society. In the early 1990s, the return of religion to the sphere of cultural and spiritual life of independent Ukraine took place against the background of a so-called religious “explosion” (a rapid increase in the number of religious communities). These processes were also accompanied by certain unexpected (as for believers) consequences; it was a matter of physical violence (blocking the change of jurisdictions, raider seizure of temples, theft of documents, etc.). Such destructive actions almost always took place on all sides of the conflict. But the main confrontation was at the level of ideologies. The Russian messianic idea of “Moscow—the Third Rome” (and its current modified version, the concept of the “*Russkiy Mir*” (The Russian World)) has come into a fierce struggle with the attempts of the Ukrainians to restore their own cultural and civilizational paradigm (the idea of the autocephaly of Orthodoxy in Ukraine).

These patterns were first discovered in the late 20th century, following the restoration of the structures of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church (hereinafter referred to as the UAOC) in the country. In the 1990s, Metropolitan Filaret, the head of the exarchate of the Moscow Patriarchate in Ukraine, who headed the Metropolitanate of the Moscow Patriarchate in Ukraine since 1966, opposed this process. In 1992, Metropolitan Filaret was personally persecuted by the leadership of his church (the Moscow Patriarchate), which prompted him to ally himself with the then UAOC, which became the basis for the creation of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the Kiev Patriarchate (hereinafter referred to as the UOC KP). In fact, with the restoration of the UAOC structures in Ukraine, and later with the formation of institutions of the UOC KP, one can speak of the beginning of the revival of the Orthodox-Ukrainophile identity.

Since the declaration of independence, the question of the religious affiliation of the Ukrainians has been gradually moving from the zone of a personal ideological choice to the area of certain social orientations. First and foremost, it is a matter of a general-cultural and civic identity, when the denominational affiliation “actually takes on the function of a civilizational and political marker; and this is reflected in many events and rhetoric involving religious institutions.”¹⁴ It is the Orthodox-Ukrainophile identity that began to actively oppose the so-called “Eastern European Orthodox civilization,” about which many people, such as M.

¹⁴ See: И. Яковенко. “Украина: религиозно-цивилизационная составляющая политических конфликтов.” *Религия и конфликт*. (Москва: Центр Карнеги, 2007), p. 48.

Danilevsky, A. Toynbee, S. Huntington, O. Spengler and others in due time wrote. However, all the authors, except for S. Huntington, did not actually single out the “Ukrainian factor” in the mentioned civilization. Instead, the political theorist of the 20th century, S. Huntington warned about the existence of internally divided states—relatively-culturally homogeneous, but which did not agree on what civilization they belonged to.¹⁵ By a number of criteria, he referred to Ukraine as such. “Internal divisiveness” means that citizens with different civilizational identities live in Ukraine, which hinders the formation of a single consolidated political nation because of their vulnerability to multi-vector civilizational influences.

There is quite a number of markers of these cultural and civic identities: promoting/counteracting European integration efforts; attitude towards Ukraine’s accession to NATO; evaluation and interpretation of Ukrainian history and its heroes; efforts to restore the Ukrainian language and traditions in the churches (including the restoration of the Ukrainian pronunciation in the Old Church Slavonic language); evaluation by the Orthodox clerics and institutions of the Orange Maidan and the Revolution of Dignity; assessment of the phenomenon and pastoral work in the zones of military aggression against Ukraine (the annexed Crimea, the controlled or captured areas of Donbas); intensity and orientation of social work; participation in volunteer work, product gathering and other necessary military supplies; and cooperation with the Ukrainian security, defence and law enforcement agencies (chaplains, moral support, educational work, etc.).

The reasons for this situation are rooted in the history of Ukraine and need to be thoroughly considered separately. Let us note the main thing—the territories that belong to modern Ukraine have been within the boundaries of different state entities for several centuries. In addition, the mass destruction of the Ukrainians took place over several centuries: they were killed in wars, died of several waves of famine (the Holodomor) purposely caused by the authorities of the former Soviet state, died in rebellions against different regimes, suffered repression, and the like. The country was constantly losing its elite. In the Soviet Union, there was a clear political strategy for the assimilation of ethnic groups and the formation of a new community (the “Soviet people”). The formation of the Soviet people as a historical, social and international community of people was officially proclaimed in 1971, at the 24th CPSU Congress,¹⁶ but in fact it continued throughout the history of the Soviet Union. This ideology

¹⁵ С. Хантингтон. *Столкновение цивилизаций*. (М: ООО Издательство АСТ, 2003), p. 34

¹⁶ “Советский народ.” *Российские универсальные энциклопедии. Энциклопедии Брокгауз-Ефрон и Большая Советская Энциклопедия объединенный словарь*.

was based on the manipulation and substitution of concepts. Among the “fifteen Soviet republics-sisters” (as they were then called), Russia was considered an “older” one, which led to the total Russification of the entire Soviet space. The identity of the Russian ethnic group—the most numerous in the territory of the former Soviet Union—was recognized as an instrument of unification that affected all spheres of social life. Taking into consideration that the Soviet Union existed for quite a long period of time (1922-1991), for almost 70 years, a generation of people, who really considered themselves the Soviet people, has grown. After the collapse of the Soviet Union, such people, being within the boundaries of the restored nation-states, did not lose their Russian-Soviet identity, which was a strange fusion of ethnocentrism and cosmopolitanism.

The Moscow Patriarchate at all times of its history acted in harmony with the power structures of Russia (earlier name - Muscovy), which, incidentally, did not contradict the so-called symphony of secular and ecclesiastical powers. This should contribute to the unity of the church, state, and community. However, in historical retrospect, it has often led to negative transformations: from the symphony of the authorities to the caesaropapism; from Orthodox patriotism to etatism.¹⁷ Nor was it an exception after the collapse of the Soviet Union, when the Moscow Patriarchate in fact declared its doctrine “to protect the interests of the Russians and their compatriots abroad.” One of the organizational forms of such activity was the creation of the World Russian People’s Council (hereinafter referred to as the (ARNS) by the Moscow Patriarchate. According to the statute of the ARNS, the head of the Council is the Patriarch of Moscow, with the blessing and under whose chair the annual council meetings are held.¹⁸ These meetings are funded by the Russian government and are held on the basis of church institutions. A peculiar credo of such activity is the “gathering of the “Russkiy Mir” (the Russian World), which, according to the then Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation I. Ivanov, “is a joint affair (common cause) of the Russian state and the Russian Orthodox Church.”¹⁹ This demonstrates the undisguised efforts of the secular authorities of the Russian Federation to use the powerful tool of the Russian Orthodox Church to keep Ukraine in the Moscow-Russian civilization zone (in the realm of its identity).

¹⁷ Н. В. Іщук. *Соціальна адаптація православ'я: філософський аналіз*. (Київ: КНУШ, 2007), р. 13.

¹⁸ “Всемирный Русский Народный Собор (ВРНС).” *Русская Православная Церковь. Официальный сайт Московского патриархата*.

¹⁹ “Выступление Министра иностранных дел России И.С.Иванова на VIII Всемирном Русском Народном Соборе, Сергиев Посад, 3 февраля 2004 г.” *Русская Православная Церковь. Архив официального сайта Московского Патриархата (1997-2009)*.

How did this mechanism work (is working)? First of all, it is about the alogical extension of the area of activity/influence of the Moscow Patriarchate in Ukraine with the help of the UOC MP subordinated to the Moscow Patriarchate and the emergence of the interests of its supporters into the political space (body politic). Thus, such phenomenon was formed, which in the decisions of the Bishops' Council of the UOC MP, held on December 21, 2007 in the Kyiv-Pechersk Lavra, was designated and condemned as "political Orthodoxy"²⁰ (the essence of this phenomenon was quite fully enlightened in the research made by archimandrite Cyril Hovorun²¹).

It is worth paying tribute to Metropolitan Volodymyr Sabodan, who headed the UOC MP from 1992 to 2014. He tried to keep the church out of politics and repeatedly warned that "political Orthodoxy," in terms of which "some churchgoers often speak out, is a very dangerous phenomenon that takes people away from Orthodoxy, as transmitted to us by the Fathers of the Church. "It ignites political passions, provokes disobedience to the hierarchy, and sows seeds of discord in the Church. I emphasize that our Church is out of politics."²² It should be added that Metropolitan Volodymyr showed a rather constructive stance in conflict with the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the Kiev Patriarchate and the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church, calling for an understanding of the possibilities of overcoming the conflict in the framework of meetings, dialogue and specific matters, which would melt the ice between the churches.²³ There were even negotiations held on unification with the UAOC in due time. Unfortunately, these attempts were almost completely offset by his successor, Metropolitan Onufriy, who has been heading the church since 2014.

The majority of researchers see the indicators of Ukraine's civilizational choice also assessing the events in the Orange Maidan (2004-2005) and the Revolution of Dignity (2013-2014). After all, the main idea of both Ukrainian Maidans was the struggle against the Soviet-Russian identity, which has now taken on a distinct imperial form, and the struggle against the Russian Federation's attempt to restore the Soviet Union in the newest version. Therefore, it is not surprising that the UOC MP supported every refusal of Ukraine's accession to the European Union.²⁴ The clerics of this church also tried to focus their faithful church members on disadvantages of the European choice. The theme of "Sodomites of Europe" was especially

²⁰ "Звернення Собору єпископів Української Православної Церкви до її вірних чад." *Українська Православна Церква. Офіційний сайт*.

²¹ Кирило Говорун, архімандрит. *Політичне православ'я*. (Київ: Дух і Літера, 2019).

²² "Виступ Блаженнішого Митрополита Київського і всієї України Володимира на Архієрейському Соборі Української Православної Церкви, 21 грудня 2007 р." *Українська Православна Церква. Офіційний сайт*.

²³ *Ibid.*

²⁴ "Януковича порівняли з Христом." *ВолиньPost*, 2014. 23 січня.

frequently emphasized, trying to prove that Europeans had chosen the anti-Christian path of spiritual development and that the movement to the EU and NATO was the path to destruction.²⁵ In advance, let us note that that campaign was not successful—now over 68% of the Ukrainians are supporting the movement to the European Union and over 51% of them want to join NATO).²⁶

At that time, the clergy and believers of the UOC KP and UAOC were opposed by the representatives of the UOC MP against the European perspective of Ukraine. They were not alone in their position, but they came out and spoke with the Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church, the All-Ukrainian Union of Pentecostal Evangelical Churches, and many other churches. The reasoning of that camp concerned the issues of statehood (and the possibility of its loss upon rapprochement with Russia), moral responsibility to posterity for the loss of language and culture, etc. Therefore, at first it was not “about the religious aspect, but socio-political, and the religious leaders in this case acted as citizens of Ukraine.”²⁷

The position of the Orthodox churches was particularly clear during the Revolution of Dignity. It was the night of November 30, 2013, which dramatically changed the situation when the police officers of Berkut (golden eagle) beat students who were protesting in the Maidan and then were hiding in St. Michael’s Orthodox Monastery (the structure of the UOC KP). In fact, the “religious” component of the protest was “turned on.” According to some religious leaders, the events in the Maidan went beyond confrontation between politicians and “became a clash of truth with falsehood.”²⁸ At the same time, “the active involvement of believers and religious activists in the protest was developing, and prayer tents were emerging.”²⁹ In that situation, the UOC MP demonstrated a different position, as if calling for reconciliation, but was in fact protecting the existing regime. In the tragic moments of confrontation, they chose the path of staying in “symphony” with the authorities, not with their people.

The dependence of the UOC MP on the Moscow Patriarchate was critically threatening during the direct aggression of Russia against Ukraine. Since December 2017 (after introducing some amendments to the Statute of the Moscow Patriarchate), the clergy of the UOC MP are obliged (according to the Statute of the Church and Church Discipline) to implement in Ukraine

²⁵ “Глава УПЦ МП виступив проти інтеграції України в Євросоюз.” *Одна Родина. Інформаційно-аналитическе издание.* (2013).

²⁶ “За вступлення України в ЕС готови проголосувати 68,1% українців, в НАТО - 51,1%.” *Європейська правда.* 14.06.2019.

²⁷ See: Д. Брильов. “Церкви постали перед вибором: йти за Майданом чи намагатись його вести за собою.” *РІСУ.* 26.12.2013.

²⁸ “Михайло Паночко про Євромайдан: ‘Це не протистояння між політиками, а сутичка правди з неправдою’” *Релігія в Україні.* 08.01.2014.

²⁹ Т. А. Калениченко. “Від учора на Майдані діє молитовний міжконфесійний намет.” *РІСУ.* 06.12.2013.

the doctrine of the “Russkiy Mir” (the Russian World), which is now being implemented by the current authorities of the Russian Federation jointly with Orthodox Church. That is, the Ukrainian clerics of the UOC MP, hierarchically subordinate to the patriarch, who proclaims through both sermons and activities the Russian national idea, Russian patriotism and ideology of the “Russkiy Mir,” thus objectively implementing the Russian civilization idea in Ukraine.

The Moscow Patriarchate cooperates closely not only with the state structures of the Russian Federation, but also with the political and public organizations of the nationalist movement. It is about the Russian National Council, the Black Hundred organizations and movements like the “Sorok Sorokov” and so on. This tradition of cooperation has a long history—both in tsarist and Soviet times, the Orthodox Church was brutally used by the authorities to impose chauvinist ideas on the local population. For this, in almost all regions of Ukraine, except for the direct propaganda in sermons and activities, many Ukrainophobic ecclesiastical and non-ecclesiastical media were printed (“Triyednaya Rus”, “Novorossiyskiy Vestnik,” “Pochayevskiy Listok,” “Spasite Nashi Dushi,” etc.), which contained articles that brought into question the existence of the Ukrainian people, told about the artificial nature of the Ukrainian language, denied the expediency of the existence of the Ukrainian state, etc.

Particularly dangerous for the Ukrainian realities is the fact that the Moscow Patriarchate has signed agreements with all power (and not power) ministries and agencies of Russia³⁰ regarding the “spiritual and moral enlightenment” of employees, their patriotic upbringing, etc. A special Synodal Department for cooperation with the Armed Forces and human rights bodies of the Russian Federation³¹ was created in 1995 to implement these agreements. Prior to the annexation of the Crimea and the hostilities in the Donbas region, this situation for some reasons did not cause much concern in Ukraine. Therefore, the chaplains of the UOC MP were in key positions in the Ukrainian security forces. However, the involvement of the Moscow Patriarchate in cooperation with the Russian power ministries is acquiring new significance and weight after the events of February-March 2014, when the Russian troops invaded the Crimea and then the Donbas. A certain natural result of this is the fact that practically all the UOC MP clerics in the occupied territories have supported anti-Ukrainian

³⁰ “Доклад Святейшего Патриарха Кирилла на Архиерейском совещании 2 февраля 2010 года”; “Соглашение о сотрудничестве между Министерством Российской Федерации по делам гражданской обороны, чрезвычайным ситуациям и ликвидации последствий стихийных бедствий и Русской Православной Церковью»; «Соглашение о взаимодействии Русской Православной Церкви и Федеральной миграционной службы России»; “Соглашение о сотрудничестве между Русской Православной Церковью и Федеральной таможенной службой России.”

³¹ “Синодальный отдел по взаимодействию с Вооруженными Силами и правоохранительными органами.” *Русская Православная Церковь.*» *Официальный сайт Московского патриархата.*

actions and are actively cooperating with the occupiers.³² In this respect, it is not surprising that there is an actual compliance of the actions and statements of the leadership and clergy of the UOC MP in the Ukrainian-controlled territories with the actions and statements of politicians from the Russian Federation.³³

It should be noted that the UOC MP is not the only Orthodox Church in Ukraine based on non-Ukrainian cultural and civilizational foundations. For example, during the “Russian Spring” 2014, the Russian Orthodox Old Believers Church (hereinafter referred to as the ROOBC) in Ukraine much more actively supported the occupation actions of the Russian authorities in the Crimea and the Donbas than the UOC MP. Few Crimean parishes of the Russian Orthodox Church were immediately transferred from the Kyivan Diocese to the Moscow Diocese, and special prayers were introduced at worship services about the “Russian soldiery” and the “conquest of enemies and adversary.”³⁴ And now the Kremlin is developing plans to finance church and commercial projects of the Russian Orthodox Church in order to use the foreign policy potential of Old Believers, or even to transform them into one of the ideological platforms of the “Russkiy Mir”³⁵ together with the Moscow Patriarchate. However, in Ukraine, the ROC is rather a marginal structure (not numerous, only about 100 and divided between communities of different movements). Therefore, Old Believers in Ukraine are virtually not visible in public or political life.

Recently, a number of conflicts between the Ukrainian Orthodox churches have been associated with transitions—changing the jurisdiction of church communities. It is about the transition of the UOC MP communities to the jurisdiction of the UOC. The order of transitions is regulated by the current law of Ukraine “On Freedom of Conscience and Religious

³² See: O. Sagan. “Orthodoxy in Ukraine: Current State and Problems.” *In Traditional religion and political power: Examining the role of the church in Georgia, Armenia, Ukraine and Moldova*. London: The Foreign Policy Centre or the Open Society Foundations, (2015): 16-22; Т. А. Калениченко. *Релігійна складова суспільно-політичного конфлікту кінця 2013-2017 рр. в Україні*. Дис. на здобуття наук. ступ. к.філос.н. Нац. пед. ун-т ім. М.П.Драгоманова. (Київ, 2018); “Московська патріархія стала на сторону агресора – Віктор Єленський.” *Релігія в Україні*. 05.02.2015; “На Донбасі воює ‘Русская православная армия.’” *Релігія в Україні*. 13.05.2014; М. Васін, “Донбас і Крим: нові виклики для релігійної свободи. Підсумки року.” *РІСЦУ*. 24.12.2014.

³³ This is a situation that arose during a solemn sitting of the Ukrainian Parliament, when President Poroshenko was reading out the names of the heroes of Ukraine who had received that title during an anti-terrorist operation in the east of Ukraine. All the present MPs and guests, including foreign diplomats, stood by honoring the heroes. The representatives of the UOC MP, headed by Onufriy, did not do so. See: “Представители УПЦ МП не встали при зачитывании имен бойцов АТО - героев Украины. Онуфрий остался сидеть, несмотря на то, что встали даже иностранцы.” *LB.ua*. 09.05.2015; Б. Костюк. “Ми перейшли до Київського патріархату через антиукраїнську позицію багатьох священників УПЦ (МП) – протоієрей Сергій Дмитрієв.” *Радіо Свобода*. 08.01.2017.

³⁴ See: А. Солдатов. “После нас хоть протопоп. Зачем Кремлю старообрядцы и как они проявили себя в Крыму и на Украине.” *Новая газета*. 21.10.2019.

³⁵ *Ibid.*

Organizations.”³⁶ In particular, Article 8 declares the right of each community to freely change its subordination “by amending the statutes (regulations) of the religious community.” Decisions on such a change of subordination are made at an authorized general meeting of a religious community (this requires two-thirds of the votes present at the meeting). Those in the community who do not agree with the decision on change of subordination have the right to form a new religious community and to enter into an agreement on the procedure of using the buildings for public worship and property with their owner (user). The decision to change subordination and to amend the statute accordingly, shall be certified by the signatures of the members of the respective religious community who supported the decision and shall be subject to registration in accordance with the procedure established by Article 14 of the same Law.

Unfortunately, despite the transparent regulation of the problem, in practice, these legislative provisions do not always work properly and then tend to create conflicts. This is inevitable in conditions where Orthodox communities lack a fixed membership. This also gives room for some intrigues on both sides. In particular, the adherents of the UOC MP accuse the supporters of the OCU that they substitute the term “religious community” with the term “territorial community.”

Indeed, in some settlements, it is almost impossible to differentiate these concepts. For example, all the villagers consider themselves to be parishioners of the village temple and therefore donate money to the temple,³⁷ perform the necessary rituals and sacraments there, etc. However, not all of them regularly attend Sunday worships or holiday services. This enables the priests of the UOC MP, who do not support the desire of the community to change jurisdiction, to gather alternative meetings of the religious community (a limited number of persons who support the position of the priest) and to decide on the inviolability of their jurisdictional rights. A striking example could be given concerning the events in the village of Morozivka (Kyiv region) when, after the general meeting and the community decision, the priest held an alternative meeting.³⁸ It should be noted that there are practically no such abuses by the clerics of the OCU. After all, there is no notice of any reverse movement—the transition of communities from the OCU to the UOC MP, except cases when a community withdrew from the UOC MP, but failed to defend its choice in court.

³⁶ “Закон України ‘Про свободу совісті та релігійні організації,’” *Законодавство України*.

³⁷ The Slavic word *hram* refers to the church building and is often translated as temple.

³⁸ Believers of the religious community of Holy Assumption Parish of Morozivka village, Baryshevsky district in the Kyiv region, whose priest decided to “return” to the ROC in Ukraine, stated their desire to be part of the OCU). See: “Громада на Київщині не погодилася зі священником, який ‘повернувся’ до РПЦвУ, і опечатала храм.” *Релігійна правда*. 07.11.2019.

No less difficult is the process of introducing amendments to the Charter of the community when Orthodox communities emerge from the jurisdiction of the UOC MP. On the one hand, “the standard community charter of the UOC MP is spelled out in such a way that any changes are possible only with the consent of the local bishop,”³⁹ (in fact, it makes changes impossible, since such an agreement will never be given by a hierarchy), and therefore a conflict becomes inevitable.⁴⁰ It should be noted that these and some other norms (concerning church property, etc.) in the Statutes are illegal and have been appealed not only by the communities, but also by the state department for religious affairs.⁴¹ On the other hand, the ruling bishops often collect community charters and keep them in the residence of their diocesan government. Taking into account the fact that the original statute is required in order to amend, such activity by bishops and priests, who agree to give the original statute, can be a significant obstacle to the documentation of the will of the faithful.

However, opposition to community transitions is now more restrained, but it does not prevent community transitions—about 600 of them have already changed (or are in the process of changing) their jurisdiction.⁴² Not all transitions are accompanied by conflict situations. There are religious communities where this problem has been solved constructively, with the establishment of either regular worship services, or in a way of building new temples for the part of the faithful who disagreed with the majority.⁴³ Metropolitan Epiphanius, the head of the OCU, formally endorsed the idea of consecutive religious services in temples, where there is a division into two communities of different jurisdictions,⁴⁴ although such an initiative does not always find understanding in the UOC MP.⁴⁵

Therefore, an analysis of the causes of the confrontation within the Orthodox community of Ukraine requires understanding that its grounds are civilizational, not institutional. This confrontation goes beyond modern history and concerns the interpretation of almost every event (often ecclesiastical) from the separate or shared past of Ukraine and Russia,

³⁹ “Храм навпіл: як жителі Тернопільщини міняють Московський патріархат на Київський.” *Hromadske*. 20.01.2018.

⁴⁰ A classic example of this is the Community Charter of the UOC MP in the village of Popilnya, of the Popilnyansky district of Zhytomyr region, the text of which became the cause of lawsuits. See: “Житомир, село Попільня. Предупреждение о захвате храма со стороны представителей ‘Киевского патриархата.’” *Православіє в Україні*. 01.03.2014.

⁴¹ “УПЦ (МП) пише свої статuti за зразками РПЦ, - Юраш.” *PICV*. 24.05.2017.

⁴² “Перелік громад, що змінили церковну юрисдикцію з УПЦ (МП) на ПЦУ.” *uk.wikipedia.org*.

⁴³ “Почергове богослужіння чи будівництво нового храму: на Рівненщині розплутують церковний конфлікт.” *ЧаРівне*. 23.04.2018; “Знайдено порозуміння в с. Стрільчинця.” *Немирівська районна державна адміністрація. Офіційний веб-сайт*. 19. 04. 2019. and others.

⁴⁴ “ПЦУ готова до почергового служіння у храмах громадами різних церков – Епіфаній.” *5-й канал ТБ*. 01.03.2019.

⁴⁵ “Митрополит Онуфрій забороняє почергове богослужіння – не дозволяють канони.” *PICV*. 21.01.2016.

the “appropriation” by Russia of some church figures from other cultures, or even church territories, imposing on Ukraine the paradigm of a common future within some union state. According to the plan of the Russian authorities, Russia, Ukraine, and Belarus belong to the “*Russkiy Mir*” (the Russian world) and should make the nucleus of this state. Therefore, the position of the Moscow Patriarch Kirill (Cyril) who, while meeting with the primate (Patriarch) of Constantinople in Istanbul on August 31, 2018, demanded from the Ecumenical Patriarch to abandon the idea of giving the *Tomos* to the Ukrainians. The ground for such a demand was the thesis that “the Ukrainians are not an independent people” (at the same time, the same thesis is constantly voiced by Putin⁴⁶), but is only part of the “great Russian people.” According to the canons, “one nation cannot be given two Tomoses.”⁴⁷ It becomes clear afterwards what kind of attitudes the priesthood of the UOC MP has concerning the formation of respect for the Ukrainian culture, traditions, and statehood in their church members.

In fact, without Ukraine, Russia seems to lose five centuries of its own history and apostolic birthright,⁴⁸ which means the deepest layers of its own culture.⁴⁹ This perspective is perceived by the Russian secular and ecclesiastical authorities as a tragedy.⁵⁰ However, Russia’s efforts to join the “Kyiv civilization” have an illogical basis for a number of reasons of chronological and value nature. Let us note the most important: Kyivan Rus’ had its own civilizational paradigm from the very beginning (9th century), radically different from the one by which the Grand Duchy of Moscow began to emerge. The latter appeared much later, in the 15th century. The motives of the Russian establishment are clear: by keeping Ukraine in the field of its influence, Russia not only strengthens its geopolitical weight, but also resolves the issue of its own civilizational identity, trying at least in part to remain a European state. But do

⁴⁶ “Путин назвал русских и украинцев одним народом. Историки объясняют, так ли это.” *BBC*. 21.02.2020.

⁴⁷ “Эксклюзив: Диалог Варфоломея – Кирилла по украинскому вопросу.” *Orthodoxia.info*. 28.09.2018.

⁴⁸ It is about the blessing of Kyiv by the apostle Andrew the First-Called. The ancient Russian Chronicle “the Story of the Passing Years” authored by Nestor the Chronicler describes the journey of the apostle Andrew from Korsun’ to Rome through the Russian land and tells how he put a cross on the Dnieper cliffs and heralded the appearance of Kyiv lit up with God’s blessed grace.

⁴⁹ In this respect, the characteristic efforts of the Russians, for example, in France to present Queen Anna Yaroslavna as “Anna Russka, read - Russian”, are typical. Or the numerous attempts by Russian “journalists” or officials to buy out the remains of Yaroslav the Wise (which are now in the Holy Trinity Church in Brooklyn, USA) from 2016 to 2019. See: “Неля Куковальська: Таємниці саркофагу князя Ярослава Мудрого.” *youtube.com*. 23.04.2016.

⁵⁰ “Патриарх Кирилл: Попытки оторвать Украинскую церковь от Москвы грозят катастрофой!” *Комсомольская правда*, 27.07.2018; “Святейший Патриарх Кирилл: Единство Святой Руси основано прежде всего на единстве Русской Православной Церкви.” *Пресс-служба Патриарха Московского и всея Руси*. 07.10.2019; “Правительство России утвердило на 2016 г. план мероприятий по празднованию 1000-летия русского монашества на Афоне.” *Pravoslavie.ru*. 03.01.2016.; “Послание Президента В.Путина Федеральному Собранию РФ.” *kremlin.ru*. 04.12.2014.

the Ukrainian citizens want to have an alliance with Russia? The events of the Revolution of Dignity and the ongoing war in the East proved that the answer is “No”.

Prospects for Reconciliation

Prospects for reconciliation between the Orthodox Church of Ukraine and the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the Moscow Patriarchate depend on two factors. First is what kind of development strategy these churches will choose. Will this strategy be past-oriented or forward-looking? Second is how they will be supported in the Ukrainian society.

As for the last factor, the results of an all-Ukrainian public opinion poll aimed at revealing the attitude of the Ukrainians to individual churches of Ukraine, conducted at the end of February 2020, are quite informative. According to the voiced data, among the two largest Orthodox churches in Ukraine, the best attitude is observed in the case of the Orthodox Church of Ukraine, to which 60.6% of the Ukrainians have a positive attitude. Only 5.4% of them have negative (the balance of positive-negative attitude is +55.2%). Moreover, in all regions of the country, the Orthodox Church of Ukraine has the highest positive attitudes. Instead, in the case of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the Moscow Patriarchate, a negative balance is observed, and it is -2.2%. About 25.7% of those polled are positive about this Church and 28% are negative.⁵¹ From this study, it follows that the Orthodox Church of Ukraine is gaining, and the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the Moscow Patriarchate, on the contrary, is losing its influence in society.

Obviously, the main task of the newly created Orthodox Church of Ukraine is to justify the enormous amount of trust it has today among the Ukrainian people, while remaining the bearer of “warm sociality”—a source of “We-feeling.”⁵² In order to do so, it needs to avoid the faults of the churches, on the basis of which it has been established: the UOC of the Kyiv Patriarchate, the Ukrainian Autocephalous Church, and partly the UOC of the Moscow Patriarchate. The hereditary disadvantages of these churches were the dominance in their inner life of such phenomena as: backstabbing talk; a large number of errors in solving personnel issues; actual closeness to social and public influence (participation of seculars in church councils was predominantly symbolic); attraction to the Moscow cultural heritage (traditions,

⁵¹ “Ставлення до окремих церков України і очікування від діяльності Православної Церкви України. Дослідження проведене Київським міжнародним інститутом соціології з 15 до 27 лютого 2020 року.” *КМІС*.

⁵² Н.В. Ішук. *Сучасна православна теологія діалогу: філософсько-релігієзнавчий аналіз*. (Київ: НПУ ім. М. П. Драгоманова, 2019), р. 339.

ceremonies, etc.), diminishing the role of the laity in church life, etc. Finally, neither the UAOC, nor the UOC KP was able to go beyond the Moscow tradition of forming the educational process and be engaged in the qualitative preparation of theologians. The UOC KP and the UAOC have not acquired the skills to carry out educational work in the environment not only among the parishioners of the Moscow Patriarchate, but even among their own supporters. It is important that both Ukrainian-centered churches (the UAOC and the UOC KP) were formed as leadership “church projects” by ex-Patriarch Filaret or the leaders of the UAOC (Patriarch Demetrius Yarema, Metropolitan Methodius Kudriakov and Makariy Meletych). Therefore, it is no coincidence that the current efforts of Filaret, the former Patriarch of the UOC KP, are aimed at the restoration of this structure, which reveals authoritarian tendencies in the management of the former UOC KP. However, these attempts are doomed to failure. This conclusion is based on the fact that Patriarch Filaret: a) has actually lost support in society (does not fit into any ratings); b) lacks human resources (the support of priests and believers), and therefore the consecration of new bishops does not lead to any church growth; c) as an institution, it does not differ from the OCU, and therefore this church grouping will most likely be moved to the margins of the Ukrainian society.

In fact, only now, with the constitution of the Local Orthodox Church of Ukraine, the pro-Ukrainian Orthodoxy is gradually exiting from the Moscow cultural-civilizational paradigm. Civil society structures of Ukraine are actively assisting this process. Among them we will particularly note: the initiators of the “10 Theses for the OCU”⁵³ movement, the activists of the “Institute of Church and Society” of the Kyiv Orthodox Theological Academy, the Kyiv Epiphany Stauropagic Brotherhood, and other public projects.

The future of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the Moscow Patriarchate also depends on the willingness to become more open to other Orthodox churches and civil society. This church is losing its influence on the Ukrainian society due to its misunderstanding of the Ukrainians’ aspirations and unwillingness to adapt to the Ukrainian reality. Refusing to recognize the autocephaly of the OCU is just one example of this misunderstanding. The rejection of the Ukrainian identity demonstrated by the UOC MP throughout the history of Independent Ukraine has been disastrous for itself during the dramatic social shifts and difficult trials for the country: the Revolution of Dignity, the annexation of the Crimea, and the war in

⁵³ See: “10 тез для Православної Церкви України.” *РІСУ*. 31.01. 2019 ; “10 тез для Православної Церкви України.” О. Н. Сагань, *Православна Церква України: конституювання та перспективи розвитку*. (Київ, 2019), pp. 92-97.

Eastern Ukraine. It is important to understand that among the priesthood and believers of this church, there are many people who consider Ukraine their homeland, love and even defend it with weapons in their hands in the Donbas region. Also, the representatives of these two churches are often brought together by friendships and even family relationships. However, the UOC MP is organizationally and ideologically dependent on the Moscow Patriarchate, forced to uphold another position imposed on it by the Russian Church and the Russian authorities. For this Church, the way out of the current crisis of public confidence could be to take a more autonomous position on its metropolis. But this requires extraordinary courage, willpower and a pro-Ukrainian civic position of its leadership, which has not yet been observed.

Why are we so pessimistic about the ability to overcome the conflict in Orthodoxy in Ukraine? The fact is that this confrontation has been constantly inspired from the outside, by the Russian secular authorities. The problem is that the ideological work of Moscow secular and religious organizations is based on counteracting the return of Ukraine to the European civilizational and cultural paradigm. Moreover, it is currently concentrated on the sphere of development and activity of the Orthodox institutions in the territory of Ukraine. The restoration of the power of the Russian political empire is known to be the declared purpose of the current Russian political leadership, the basis for modeling the country's future, its civilizational component.⁵⁴ The Orthodox identity of the Moscow Orthodox believer is closely linked to the formation of the so-called "Eastern Orthodox civilization" ("Eastern European Orthodoxy"). However, this civilization gets its key meanings only with the existence of the Metropolitanate of Kyiv within the jurisdiction of the Moscow Patriarchate. The rupture of this link will destroy the empire-imposed "unity of cultural and civilizational identity of the Ukrainians and the Russians."

Perhaps in the future (and this depends on the success of the development of the OCU), the scale of this confrontation will decrease. Experts are expecting a natural decrease in the number of the UOC MP communities through their flow into the OCU. The reason for this conclusion is the fact that over the last four to five years, sociologists have shown a steady and significant excess of the number of adherents of the Ukrainian model of Orthodoxy (believers of the UOC KP, UAOC, and now the OCU) over the Moscow model. However, we believe that in a more distant perspective (with the change of generations of priesthood and believers) reconciliation and cooperation between the Orthodox Church of Ukraine and the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the Moscow Patriarchate will possibly happen. "Viewed from a religious

⁵⁴ See: Т. Бремер, *Церква та імперія. Нариси історії російського православ'я*. (Київ: Дух літера, 2019).

perspective it is important, regardless of pessimism or optimism, to have hope. These are human problems for which there are human solutions.”⁵⁵ The Churches, the doctrine of which calls to love not only the heavenly Fatherland, but also the earthly, united by this same common earthly Motherland, cannot forever remain in antagonism with each other.

Conclusions

Summarizing the analysis of the causes of opposition of the Orthodox churches in modern Ukraine, tendencies of their development and prospects of reconciliation, let us note that the deep causes of this opposition do not lie in the realm of institutional (organizational division), personal (interpersonal conflict that led to separation) or even ecclesiastical. There were no violations of canons by the opponents of the Moscow Patriarchate in Ukraine. The nature of this confrontation is civilizational. Therefore, there is no easy possibility to overcome it, at least not in the near future.

The current situation in Orthodoxy in Ukraine is fundamentally different even from the beginning of the country's independence. The acquisition of the *Tomos* and the constitution of the Orthodox Church of Ukraine completed the process of establishing Ukraine's political independence, which began in 1991. Thus, the process of exiting (and passing the point of no return) of the Ukrainian Orthodox component from the so-called “Eastern European Orthodoxy” as part of the “Orthodox-Moscow civilization component” finally started.

Unfortunately, in the future we are doomed to face a further confrontation of Orthodox identities in Ukraine. The effectiveness of this confrontation depends both on the activity of the civil society of Ukraine and on the ability of the OCU to reorganize and drift apart from the Moscow heritage (which is still sufficiently tangible in the now self-liquidating UOC KP and UAOC). The latter will also affect the perception of the OCU in the community of independent local Orthodox churches. In view of the current organizational and ideological dependence of the UOC MP on the Moscow Patriarchate, it is premature and unjustified to expect a constructive dialogic position from this Church. However, in the long run, the UOC MP will have to reduce its dependence on the Moscow Center; the alternative is its marginalization in Ukraine. The process of individualization of the UOC MP, together with the change of generations in the Orthodox churches, will inevitably lead to dialogue, cooperation, and, as a consequence, reconciliation between currently antagonistic churches.

⁵⁵ Paul B. Mojzes, "Religion in Eastern Europe After the Fall of Communism: From Euphoria to Anxiety," *Occasional Papers on Religion in Eastern Europe*: Vol. 40: Iss. 1. (2020). Article 3.

References

Бремер Т. *Церква та імперія. Нариси історії російського православ'я*. (Київ: Дух і літера, 2019).

Брильов Д. “Церкви постали перед вибором: йти за Майданом чи намагатись його вести за собою.” *РІСУ. Релігійно-інформаційна служба України*. 26.12.2013. http://risu.org.ua/ua/index/expert_thought/comments/54758/

Варфоломій, патріарх. “Я – не Східний Папа. Інтерв'ю із Константинопольським патріархом Варфоломієм.” *РІСУ. Релігійно-інформаційна служба України*. 28.02.2019 / https://risu.org.ua/ua/index/monitoring/society_digest/74893/

Васін М. “Донбас і Крим: нові виклики для релігійної свободи. Підсумки року.” *РІСУ. Релігійно-інформаційна служба України*. 24.12.2014. https://risu.org.ua/ua/index/expert_thought/analytic/58577/

“Виступ Блаженнішого Митрополита Київського і всієї України Володимира на Архієрейському Соборі Української Православної Церкви.” 21.12.2007. *Українська Православна Церква. Офіційний сайт*. <http://orthodox.org.ua/article/vistup-blazhenn%D1%96shogo-mitropolita-ki%D1%97vsko%D1%96-vs%D1%96%D1%94%D1%97-ukra%D1%97ni-volodimira-0>

“Выступление Министра иностранных дел России И.С.Иванова на VIII Всемирном Русском Народном Соборе.” *Русская Православная Церковь. Архив официального сайта Московского патриархата (1997- 2009)*. <https://mospat.ru/archive/2004/02/6352/>

“Всемирный Русский Народный Собор (ВРНС).” *Русская Православная Церковь. Официальный сайт Московского патриархата*. <http://www.patriarchia.ru/db/text/77467.html>

“Глава УПЦ МП выступил против интеграции Украины в Евросоюз.” *Одна Родина. Информационно-аналитическое издание*. <https://odnarodyna.org/content/glava-upc-mp-vystupil-protiv-integracii-ukrainy-v-evrosoyuz>

Говорун Кирило, архімандрит. *Політичне православ'я*. (Київ: Дух і Літера, 2019).

“Громада на Київщині не погодилася зі священником, який 'повернувся' до РПЦвУ, і опечатала храм.” *Релігійна правда*. 07.11.2019. <http://religionpravda.com.ua/2019/07/11/Громада-на-Київщині-не-погодилась-зі-с/>

“Дані Департаменту у справах релігій та національностей Міністерства культури України. Форма 1. Звіт про мережу церков і релігійних організацій в Україні станом на 01.01.2019 р.” *РІСУ. Релігійно-інформаційна служба України*. https://risu.org.ua/ua/index/resources/statistics/ukr_2019/75410/

“Доклад Святейшего Патриарха Кирилла на Архиерейском совещании 2 февраля 2010 года.” *Русская Православная Церковь. Официальный Сайт Московского Патриархата*. <http://www.patriarchia.ru/db/text/1061651.html>

“Житомир, село Попильня. Предупреждение о захвате храма со стороны представителей ‘Киевского патриархата’.” *Православие в Україні.* 01.03.2014.
<http://orthodoxy.org.ua/data/fakty-mezhkonfessionalnyh-stolknoveniy.html>

“Журнал № 71 заседания Священного Синода от 15 октября 2018 года.” *Русская Православная Церковь. Официальный сайт.*
<http://www.patriarchia.ru/db/text/5283687.html>

“За вступление Украины в ЕС готовы проголосовать 68,1% украинцев, в НАТО - 51,1%.” *Європейська правда.* 14.06.2019.
<https://www.eurointegration.com.ua/rus/news/2019/06/14/7097340>

“Закон України ‘Про свободу совісті та релігійні організації’.” *Законодавство України.*
<https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/987-12>

“Звернення Собору єпископів Української Православної Церкви до її вірних чад.” *Українська Православна Церква. Офіційний сайт.* (2007).
<http://orthodox.org.ua/article/zvernennya-soboru-%D1%94piskop%D1%96v-ukra%D1%97nsko%D1%97-pravoslavno%D1%97-tserkvi-do-%D1%97%D1%97-v%D1%96rnikh-chad-0>

“Знайдено порозуміння в с. Стрільчинцях.” *Немирівська районна державна адміністрація. Офіційний веб-сайт.* 19. 04. 2019. <https://www.nemyriv-rda.gov.ua/index.php/3834-znaideno-porozuminnia-v-sstrilchyntsiakh/>

Іщук Н. В. *Соціальна адаптація православ'я: філософський аналіз. Автореферат дисертації на здобуття наукового ступеня кандидата філософських наук. Спеціальність 09.00.03 - соціальна філософія та філософія історії.* (Київ: Київський національний університет імені Тараса Шевченка, 2007).

Іщук Н.В. *Сучасна православна теологія діалогу: філософсько-релігієзнавчий аналіз. Дисертація на здобуття наукового ступеня доктора філософських наук за спеціальністю 09.00.11 – релігієзнавство.* (Київ: НПУ імені М. П. Драгоманова МОН України, 2019).

Калениченко Т.А. “Від учора на Майдані діє молитовний міжконфесійний намет.” *РІСУ. Релігійно-інформаційна служба України.* 06.12.2013.
<http://risu.org.ua/ua/index/exclusive/reportage/54520/>

Калениченко Т.А. *Релігійна складова суспільно-політичного конфлікту кінця 2013-2017 рр. в Україні. Дисертація на здобуття наукового ступеня кандидата філософських наук за спеціальністю 09.00.11 – релігієзнавство.* (Київ: НПУ імені М. П. Драгоманова МОН України, 2018).

“Конфесійна та церковна належність громадян України (січень 2020 року). Дослідження проведене соціологічною службою Центру Разумкова з 17 по 21 січня 2020 року.” *Разумков Центр.* <http://razumkov.org.ua/napriamky/sotsiologichni-doslidzhennia/konfesii-na-ta-tserkovna-nalezhnist-gromadian-ukrainy-sichen-2020r>

Костюк Б. “Ми перейшли до Київського патріархату через антиукраїнську позицію багатьох священників УПЦ (МП) – протоієрей Сергій Дмитрієв.” *Радіо Свобода*. 08.01.2017. <https://www.radiosvoboda.org/a/28215816.html>

“Майже половина українців підтримує створення в Україні помісної автокефальної церкви. Дослідження проведене соціологічною службою Центру Разумкова спільно з Фондом “Демократичні ініціативи” імені Ілька Кучеріва з 19 по 25 грудня 2018 р.” <https://www.unian.ua/society/10403154-mayzhe-polvina-ukrajinci-v-pidtrimuye-stvorennya-v-ukrajini-pomisnoji-avtokefalnoji-cerkvi-opituvannya.html>

“Митрополит Онуфрій забороняє почергове богослужіння – не дозволяють канони.” *РІСУ. Релігійно-інформаційна служба України*. 21.01.2016. https://risu.org.ua/ua/index/all_news/confessional/orthodox_relations/62245/

“Московська патріархія стала на сторону агресора – Віктор Єленський.” *Релігія в Україні*. 05.02.2015. https://www.religion.in.ua/zmi/ukrainian_zmi/28181-moskovska-patriarxiya-stala-na-storonu-agresora-viktor-yelenskij.html

“На Донбасі воює ‘Русская православная армия’” *Релігія в Україні*. 13.05.2014. https://www.religion.in.ua/news/ukrainian_news/25775-na-donbasse-vouet-russkaya-pravoslavnaia-armiya.html

Неля Куковальська. “Таємниці саркофагу князя Ярослава Мудрого”. 23.04.2016. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=91_3iTWsMrc

“Паночко Михайло про Євромайдан: Це не протистояння між політиками, а сутичка правди з неправдою”. *Релігія в Україні*. 08.01.2014. https://www.religion.in.ua/zmi/ukrainian_zmi/24464-mixajlo-panochko-pro-yeвромайдан-ce-ne-protistoyannya-mizh-politikami-a-sutichka-pravdi-z-nepravdoyu.html

“Парафіянами ПЦУ називають себе 38,6% українців, парафіянами УПЦ (МП) 20,7%. Дані опитування, проведеного “Центром соціального моніторингу” і Українським інститутом соціальних досліджень ім. О. Яременка. 24-28.01.2020”. <https://ua.interfax.com.ua/news/general/638963.html>

“Патриарх Кирилл: Попытки оторвать Украинскую церковь от Москвы грозят катастрофой!” *Комсомольская правда*. 27.07.2018. <https://www.vladimir.kp.ru/daily/26861.7/3903392/>

“Перелік громад, що змінили церковну юрисдикцію з УПЦ (МП) на ПЦУ.” [https://uk.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D0%9F%D0%B5%D1%80%D0%B5%D0%BB%D1%96%D0%BA_%D0%B3%D1%80%D0%BE%D0%BC%D0%B0%D0%B4_%D1%89%D0%BE_%D0%B7%D0%BC%D1%96%D0%BD%D0%B8%D0%BB%D0%B8_%D1%86%D0%B5%D1%80%D0%BA%D0%BE%D0%B2%D0%BD%D1%83_%D1%8E%D1%80%D0%B8%D1%81%D0%B4%D0%B8%D0%BA%D1%86%D1%96%D1%8E_%D0%B7_%D0%A3%D0%9F%D0%A6_\(%D0%9C%D0%9F\)_%D0%BD%D0%B0_%D0%9F%D0%A6%D0%A3](https://uk.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D0%9F%D0%B5%D1%80%D0%B5%D0%BB%D1%96%D0%BA_%D0%B3%D1%80%D0%BE%D0%BC%D0%B0%D0%B4_%D1%89%D0%BE_%D0%B7%D0%BC%D1%96%D0%BD%D0%B8%D0%BB%D0%B8_%D1%86%D0%B5%D1%80%D0%BA%D0%BE%D0%B2%D0%BD%D1%83_%D1%8E%D1%80%D0%B8%D1%81%D0%B4%D0%B8%D0%BA%D1%86%D1%96%D1%8E_%D0%B7_%D0%A3%D0%9F%D0%A6_(%D0%9C%D0%9F)_%D0%BD%D0%B0_%D0%9F%D0%A6%D0%A3)

“Послание Президента В.Путина Федеральному Собранию РФ. 04.12.2014”. <http://kremlin.ru/events/president/news/47173>

“Почергове богослужіння чи будівництво нового храму: на Рівненщині розплутують церковний конфлікт.” *ЧаРівн.* 23.04.2018. <http://charivne.info/news/33195-pochoerhove-bohosluzhinnya-chy-budivnytstvo-novo-ho-khramu-na-rivnenshchyni-rozplutuyut-tserkovnyj-konflikt>

“Правительство России утвердило на 2016 г. план мероприятий по празднованию 1000-летия русского монашества на Афоне.” *Pravoslavie.ru.* 03.01.2016. <https://pravoslavie.ru/89375.html>

“Представители УПЦ МП не встали при зачитывании имен бойцов АТО - героев Украины. Онуфрий остался сидеть, несмотря на то, что встали даже иностранцы.” *LB.ua.* 09.05.2015. https://lb.ua/society/2015/05/08/304358_predstaviteli_upts_mp_vstali.html

“Представители УПЦ МП не поднялись со стульев при зачитывании в Раде имен бойцов АТО-героев Украины.” *Українські новини.* 08.05.2015. <https://ukrnews.com/news/329546-predstavytely-upc-mp-ne-podnyalys-so-stulev-pry-zachytyvanyu-v-rade-ymen-boycov-ato-geroev-ukrainy>

“Пресс-конференция предстоятеля УПЦ: о церкви, собрании в Аммане и раскольнической ПЦУ.” *Православная жизнь.* 28.02.2020. https://pravlife.org/ru/content/press-konferenciya-predstoyatelya-upc-o-cerkvi-sobranii-v-ammane-i-raskolnicheskoj-pcu?fbclid=IwAR0fqtMmLZPNjKDjrLBxgZ2B94r_H-y0SeYpkZ5A-ghiqRaW9UWtVGnFzCU

“Путин назвал русских и украинцев одним народом. Историки объясняют, так ли это.” *BBC.* 21.02.2020. <https://www.bbc.com/russian/features-51590880>

“ПЦУ готова до почергового служіння у храмах громадами різних церков – Епіфаній.” *5-й канал ТБ.* 01.03.2019. <https://www.5.ua/suspilstvo/ptsu-hotova-do-pochoerhovo-ho-sluzhinnia-u-khramakh-hromadamy-riznykh-tserkov-epifanii-187613.html>

“Святейший Патриарх Кирилл: Единство Святой Руси основано прежде всего на единстве Русской Православной Церкви.” *Пресс-служба Патриарха Московского и всея Руси.* 07.10.2019. <http://www.patriarchia.ru/db/text/5508869.html>

“Синодальный отдел по взаимодействию с Вооруженными Силами и правоохранительными органами.” *Русская Православна Церковь. Официальный сайт Московского патриархата.* <http://www.patriarchia.ru/db/text/65957.html>

“Советский народ.” *Российские универсальные энциклопедии. Энциклопедии Брокгауз-Ефрон и Большая Советская Энциклопедия объединенный словарь.* <http://gatchina3000.ru/great-soviet-encyclopedia/bse/103/879.htm>

“Соглашение о взаимодействии Русской Православной Церкви и Федеральной миграционной службы России.” *Русская Православна Церковь. Официальный Сайт Московского Патриархата.* 19.04.2013. <http://www.patriarchia.ru/db/text/2917828.html>

“Соглашение о сотрудничестве между Министерством Российской Федерации по делам гражданской обороны, чрезвычайным ситуациям и ликвидации последствий стихийных бедствий и Русской Православной Церковью.” *Русская Православная Церковь. Официальный Сайт Московского Патриархата.* 05.07.2017. <http://www.patriarchia.ru/db/text/4949134.html>

“Соглашение о сотрудничестве между Русской Православной Церковью и Федеральной таможенной службой России.” *Русская Православная Церковь. Официальный сайт Московского патриархата.* 23.08.2011. <http://www.patriarchia.ru/db/text/1603477.html>

Солдатов А. “После нас хоть протопоп. Зачем Кремлю старообрядцы и как они проявили себя в Крыму и на Украине.” *Новая газета.* 21.10.2019. <https://www.novayagazeta.ru/articles/2019/10/21/82443-posle-nas-hot-protopop?fbclid=IwAR1JILWuifU03nIeiN4tXq6Fvj7DWvf8yAtZfvPmSmKERnpoWDOKEr8eo>

“Ставлення до окремих церков України і очікування від діяльності Православної Церкви України (лютий 2020 р.) Дослідження проведене Київським міжнародним інститутом соціології з 15 до 27 лютого 2020 року.” *КМІС.* <https://www.kiis.com.ua/?lang=ukr&cat=reports&id=921&page=1>

Ставлення українців до створення єдиної помісної церкви (2018). Згідно з результатами дослідження, проведеного Соціологічною групою “Рейтинг” з 27 вересня по 4 жовтня 2018 р. http://ratinggroup.ua/files/ratinggroup/reg_files/rg_church_102018_press.pdf

Українська Православна Церква. Офіційний сайт. <http://orthodox.org.ua/article/vistup-blazhennishogo-mitropolita-kiiivskogo-i-vsie-i-ukraini-volodimira-0>

“УПЦ (МП) пише свої статuti за зразками РПЦ, - Юраш.” *РІСУ. Релігійно-інформаційна служба України.* 24.05.2017. https://risu.org.ua/ua/index/all_news/state/church_state_relations/67084/

“Устав Русской Православной Церкви. Глава X. Украинская Православная Церковь.” *Русская Православная Церковь. Официальный сайт.* 02.12.2017. <http://www.patriarchia.ru/db/text/5082273.html>

Хантингтон С. *Столкновение цивилизаций.* (М: ООО “Издательство АСТ”, 2003).

“Храм навпiл: як жителі Тернопільщини мiняють Московський патріархат на Київський.” *Нromadske.* 20.01.2018. <https://hromadske.ua/posts/perehid-z-moskovskoho-patriarhatu-v-kiiivskii>

“Щорічне видання Вселенського патріархату не визнає титулів єпископів МП в Україні.” *Духовний фронт України.* 23.01.2020. <https://duhovnyfront.com.ua/2020/01/23/shchorichne-vydannia-vselensko-ho-patriarkhatu-ne-vyznaie-tytuliv-epyskopiv-mp-v-ukraini/>

Яковенко И. “Украина: религиозно-цивилизационная составляющая политических конфликтов.” *Религия и конфликт.* (Москва: Центр Карнеги, 2007): 47-84.

“Януковича порівняли з Христом.” *ВолиньPost*. 23.01.2014.
<http://www.volynpost.com/news/26137-ianukovycha-porivnialy-z-hrystom>

“10 тез для Православної Церкви України.” *РІСУ. Релігійно-інформаційна служба України*. 31.01. 2019. https://risu.org.ua/ua/index/all_news/orthodox/osu/74547/

“10 тез для Православної Церкви України.” // Саган О.Н. *Православна Церква України: конституювання та перспективи розвитку*. (Київ: Відділення релігієзнавства інституту ім. Г.С. Сковороди НАН України; Київське Богоявленське Ставропігійне Братство, 2019): 92-97.

“Эксклюзив: Диалог Варфоломея – Кирилла по украинскому вопросу.” *Orthodoxia.info*. 28.09.2018.

<https://orthodoxia.info/news/%d1%8d%d0%ba%d1%81%d0%ba%d0%bb%d1%8e%d0%b7%d0%b8%d0%b2-%d0%b4%d0%b8%d0%b0%d0%bb%d0%be%d0%b3-%d0%b2%d0%b0%d1%80%d1%84%d0%be%d0%bb%d0%be%d0%bc%d0%b5%d1%8f-%d0%ba%d0%b8%d1%80%d0%b8%d0%bb%d0%bb%d0%b0/>

Mojzes, Paul B. “Religion in Eastern Europe After the Fall of Communism: From Euphoria to Anxiety.” *Occasional Papers on Religion in Eastern Europe*: Vol. 40: Iss. 1, Article 3. (2020). Available at: <https://digitalcommons.georgefox.edu/ree/vol40/iss1/3>

“Patriarchal and Synodal Tomos for the Bestowal of the Ecclesiastical Status of Autocephaly to the Orthodox Church in Ukraine.” *Ecumenical Patriarchate*. 14.01.2019. <https://www.patriarchate.org/-/patriarchikos-kai-synodikos-tomos-choregeseos-autokephalou-ekklesiastikou-kathestotos-eis-ten-en-oukrania-orthodoxon-ekklesian>

Sagan O. “Orthodoxy in Ukraine: Current State and Problems.” In *Traditional religion and political power: Examining the role of the church in Georgia, Armenia, Ukraine and Moldova*. (London: The Foreign Policy Centre or the Open Society Foundations): 16-22.