

Fractured Orthodoxy in Ukraine and Politics: The Impact of Patriarch Kyrill’s “Russian World”¹

Nicholas E. Denysenko

Abstract

(Українське резюме на ст. 67)

This article analyzes the intersection of “church” and “state” in Ukraine and the many complexities of a situation involving a multiplicity of both ecclesial and political actors: in the latter category, both Russia and Ukraine itself, in the context of a globalized world; in the former category the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the Moscow Patriarchate; the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church (in both pre- and post-war iterations); the Ukrainian Greco-Catholic Church; and the Ukrainian Orthodox Church-Kyiv Patriarchate. Adding to the complexity of these relations among these churches and between these states is a new theopolitical ideology being sponsored by the current Patriarch Kiril of Moscow under the heading of a “Russian world,” which is supposed to unite at least East-Slavic Orthodoxy (if not other Orthodox Churches) and their host countries against the perceived threats of “Western” globalization. This “Russian world” is analyzed here for what it says, what reactions it has evoked among the four major churches in Ukraine; and for what it might portend for Orthodox Christians in Ukraine and well as relations between Moscow and Constantinople in the ongoing struggle for understanding of global primacy among Orthodox hierarchs.



¹ All translations from Ukrainian and Russian are by Nicholas Denysenko unless otherwise noted.

Introduction

Historically, Ukraine is a cradle of Orthodox Christianity, the center of the baptism of Rus' in 988 during the rule of Grand Prince Vladimir. Pilgrims throughout the world travel to Ukraine to visit its famous monasteries, the Kyivo-Pecherska Lavra and the Pochaivska Lavra in particular. Today, Ukraine boasts a large canonical Orthodox Church (the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the Moscow Patriarchate, "UOC-MP" hereafter) with over 12,000 parishes, 65 bishops (44 ruling and 21 vicar), 10,500 priests and deacons, and 220 monasteries.² This description of a healthy, robust, vibrant Orthodox Church stands in contradistinction to the political turbulence Ukraine has experienced throughout its history.³ As a borderland surrounded by its more powerful neighbors Poland, Lithuania, and Russia, Ukraine's national, cultural, and religious identity has been influenced by each of its neighbors. The political influences of strong and established nation-states inevitably had an impact on Ukraine's religious landscape, resulting in religious tensions and schisms within Ukraine. The first ecclesial schism occurred after the Orthodox bishops in the Kyiv metropolia, who were under the omophorion of the patriarchate of Constantinople, joined the eucharistic communion and jurisdiction of the bishop of Rome in the Union of Brest-Litovsk in

² Statistics taken from the lecture delivered by the head of the UOC-MP, Metropolitan Volodymyr (Sabodan) at the conference in Kharkiv commemorating the twentieth anniversary of the Kharkiv Hierarchical Council where the bishops of the UOC-MP elected him as their leader: "Українська Православна Церква на межі тисячоліть: здобутки та виклики," ("The Ukrainian Orthodox Church at the turn of the millennium: achievements and challenges"), UOC-MP Web site <http://orthodox.org.ua/article/ukra%D1%97nska-pravoslavna-tserkva-na-mezh%D1%96-tisyachol%D1%96t-zdobutki-ta-vikliki> (accessed June 12, 2012).

³ At the macro-level, I treat Ukraine as a nation tracing its origins to the tenth-century period of Grand Princes in Rus' whose national and cultural identity evolved and developed concurrently with the other city-states of Rus', eventually distinguishing itself in language and culture by the seventeenth century. I do not view Ukraine as a national entity that was invented in the early twentieth century, and there is no scholarly consensus on this issue.

1596.⁴ Many Orthodox in Ukraine rejected the union under the leadership of lay brotherhoods and an Orthodox hierarchy was restored in Kyiv in 1620 when Jerusalem Patriarch Theophanes consecrated new bishops for the Kyiv metropolia.⁵ Political tensions and polemical exchanges between the Orthodox and Greco-Catholic bishops commenced then, permanently permeating the fabric of Ukrainian religious identity and remaining in force today.

The religious landscape for Ukraine began to shift again in the seventeenth century, again concurrent with political realignments. Ukraine was influenced by organized groups of Cossacks (the Zaporizhian Host), and in 1648, the Zaporizhian Host achieved an important victory over Poland under the leadership of Cossack Hetman Bohdan Khmelnytsky.⁶ In 1654, the Zaporizhian (Cossack) Host of Ukraine agreed to the Treaty of Pereiaslav, which amounted to annexation to the Russian monarchy and was rationalized by Ukraine's need for border protection and the Orthodox faith they shared with Russia.⁷ Soon after, in 1686, the Orthodox Kyiv metropolia, which had been under the omophorion of Constantinople for its entire existence, came under the sacramental and juridical

⁴ The literature covering the history of the Union of Brest-Litovsk in 1596 is deep and varied. From the Ukrainian Orthodox perspective, select older historical works represent a common interpretation of the historical context, such as Ivan Wlasowsky, *Outline History of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church*, vol. 1 (South Bound Brook, NJ: Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the USA, 1956), 156–265; idem, *Outline History of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church*, vol. 2, ed. Ivan Korowytsky, trans. Mykola Haydak and Frank Estocin (South Bound Brook, NJ: Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the USA, 1979), 13–24. For a Russian perspective, see Dmitry Pospelovsky, *The Orthodox Church in the History of Russia* (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1998), 90–100. Also see Borys Gudziak, *Crisis and Reform: The Kyivan Metropolitanate, the Patriarchate of Constantinople, and the Genesis of the Union of Brest*, Harvard Series in Ukrainian Studies (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2001); B. Groen, ed., *Four Hundred Years Union of Brest (1596–1996): A Critical Re-Evaluation, acta of the congress held at Hernen Castle, the Netherlands, in March 1996* (Leuven: Peeters, 1998); and, J.C. Roberti, *Les Uniates* (Paris, Cerf, 1992).

⁵ Pospelovsky, *The Orthodox Church in the History of Russia*, 96.

⁶ Orest Subtelny, *Ukraine: A History* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1988), 125–29.

⁷ *Ibid.*, 134–38.

omophorion of Moscow.⁸ The seventeenth century is thus a crucial historical period during which ecclesial schisms and shifts were direct products of Poland's and Russia's political influences on Ukraine.

The pattern of politics shaping the religious landscape of Ukraine continued in the twentieth century. In a period of four years (1917–1921), the political and religious landscape of Ukraine was completely overhauled as part of the impact wrought by the Bolshevik revolution and constitution of the Soviet Union. First, the Orthodox Church reestablished the patriarchate of Moscow at its council in 1917, and a series of schisms occurred, ignited by the powerful influence of the ruling Communist Party. The most notorious schismatic group was the Renovationist Church, closely followed by the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church (UAOC-1).⁹ While the Renovationist Church eventually dissolved, the UAOC-1 persisted until approximately 1936, when Stalin liquidated it in his program of dekulakization and collectivization. The UAOC persisted in the diaspora, as a bishop, John Theodorovich, was sent to serve Orthodox Ukrainians in the United States and Canada.

The second incarnation of the UAOC (UAOC-2) occurred in February 1942, as new hopes for the Ukrainianization of the Orthodox Church emerged during a period of German administration of portions of Western Ukraine during World War

⁸ Ibid., 156–57, and Pospelovsky, *The Orthodox Church*, 100–01.

⁹ Modern historical scholarship presenting the UAOC-1 is lacking, particularly in English. Pospelovsky briefly covers the history of the UAOC-1 in *The Russian Church Under the Soviet Regime 1917–1982*, vol. 1 (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1984), 73–76, and also in *The Orthodox Church in the History of Russia*, 211–215. The history of the UAOC-1 is presented in great detail, including several reproductions of official UAOC-1 documents, appeals, and letters from individual clergy in Osyf Zinkevych and Olexander Voronyn, eds., *Мартирологія Українських Церков*, vol. 1 (Baltimore: Smoloskyp Publishers, 1987). The UAOC-1 was remarkably different from the Moscow Patriarchate for the following reasons: first, the UAOC-1's bishops were consecrated by priests, not canonical bishops, thereby lacking the criterion of apostolic succession required by the Orthodox Church. Second, its official liturgical language was Ukrainian, not Church Slavonic. Third, its bishops could be married, not limited by monastic tonsure and celibate status.

II.¹⁰ Temporarily liberated from the cruel oppression of the Soviet regime, a new hope for political, cultural, and religious freedom was born, and Orthodox Ukrainians began to energetically organize ecclesial life.¹¹ The UAOC-2 emerged when an attempt to establish an independent Ukrainian Church with Metropolitan Dionysij of the autocephalous Polish Orthodox Church failed. One Ukrainian Orthodox group, headed by Archbishop Alexis, the senior bishop in Ukraine at the time, decided to remain under Moscow's omophorion as an autonomous church.¹² A second Orthodox group proclaimed autocephaly in 1942 under the leadership of Archbishop Policarp, constituting the UAOC-2. Adherents of the autonomist church generally regarded people of the UAOC-2 with disdain, and there was fierce tension between the parallel ecclesial structures in Ukraine.¹³ The two church groups attempted to negotiate union on several occasions, but unity never transpired, and the head and chief negotiator for the autonomous Church, Archbishop Alexis, was tragically killed in 1943.¹⁴ The UAOC-2 remained in Ukraine until early 1944, when the

¹⁰ Zinkewych and Voronyn, eds., *Мартирологія Українських Церков*, vol. 1, 669–670. For a less detailed presentation, see Pospelovsky, *The Orthodox Church in the History of Russia*, 282–284.

¹¹ Zinkewych and Voronyn, eds., *Мартирологія Українських Церков*, vol. 1, 669.

¹² Ibid.

¹³ “The autonomists disgraced the Ukrainian language in the liturgy, hurled on the UAOC-2 epithets “without grace,” “self-ordained,” heretical,” and created confusion among the people on Baptisms, marriages, and the celebration of other rites,” in Dmytro Stepovyk, *Патріарх Мстислав: Життя і Архіпастирська Діяльність* (“Patriarch Mstyslav: Life and Arch-pastoral Activities”) (Київ: Мистецтво, 2007), 77. Pospelovsky also mentions the tensions between the two groups in *The Orthodox Church in the History of Russia*, 283.

¹⁴ Disparate accounts on the content and nature of these negotiations have been published. Pospelovsky states that the autonomists would not suffer the presence of clergy from the UAOC-1, and deplored the political orientation of the UAOC-2 in *The Orthodox Church in the History of Russia*, 283. Stepovyk, referencing an interview with Metropolitan Mstyslav (Skrypnyk), asserts that the autonomist Archbishop Alexis signed an Act of Unification with the UAOC-2 on October 8, 1942, in the Pochaivska Lavra, and celebrated Vespers with the UAOC-2's Archbishop Nikanor and Bishop Mstyslav, but then denied such an act when pressed by the German authorities, in *Патріарх Мстислав*, 77–8.

imminent return of the Soviet Army hastened the departure of many of the UAOC-2's hierarchy and clergy to the West.¹⁵ Thus, the UAOC-2 followed the pattern of the UAOC-1, as many of its faithful abandoned Ukraine when the Soviet army defeated the Germans and reestablished their sovereign borders. The faithful of UAOC-2 were either absorbed into the Moscow Patriarchate or escaped to Western Europe. Thousands of the faithful of the UAOC-2 eventually immigrated to the United States and Canada and joined the existing UAOC-1 churches in those countries.¹⁶

This brief introduction to the history of ecclesial divisions in Ukraine reveals a repetitive pattern that establishes the theme for this article. In the history of Ukraine, significant political events cause societal paradigm shifts that result in ecclesial schism and realignment. From a historical perspective, the newly emerging churches become permanent structures in both Ukraine and throughout the world. To date, there are two crucial issues of ecclesial tension in need of permanent resolution within the Orthodox communion that are the surviving offspring of the ecclesial fractures briefly reviewed here. First is the question of the place and contribution of the Ukrainian Greco-Catholic Church, which is now over 400 years old. Second is the continuing existence of ecclesial groups that claim autocephaly and seek legitimate canonical standing with the global Orthodox communion. Each issue deserves rigorous examination and I will treat the relationship between the movement for an autocephalous church in Ukraine and politics in this paper, particularly attending to the pattern of politics shaping ecclesial realignment.

The Autocephalist Movement in Ukraine and Politics

Since the early twentieth century, five autocephalous Orthodox churches have appeared in Ukraine. While both the UAOC-1 and UAOC-2 dissolved in Ukraine in 1936 and 1944

¹⁵ Zinkewych and Voronyn, eds., *Мартирологія Українських Церков*, vol. 1, 672.

¹⁶ The UAOC-2 followed traditional Orthodox ecclesial structures with celibate and monastic bishops ordained according to apostolic succession.

respectively, many of their clergy and people immigrated to Europe, Australia, and North and South America.¹⁷ A third incarnation of the UAOC (UAOC-3) appeared in Ukraine in 1989–90, immediately following the millennial celebration of the baptism of Rus'. The UAOC-3 developed in Western Ukraine in the context of the USSR's policies of *glasnost* and *perestroika*. In 1989, the pastor of Saints Peter and Paul Orthodox parish in L'viv, Fr. Volodymyr Yarema, announced the parish's decision to leave the Ukrainian Exarchate of the Moscow Patriarchate and join the UAOC-3 led by Metropolitan Mstyslav Skrypnyk in the United States. Bishop Ioann Bodnarchuk also abandoned the Moscow Patriarchate for the UAOC-3 in 1990, and the UAOC-3 convoked a local council in 1990, electing Metropolitan Mstyslav, who was the primate of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the USA and resided in New Jersey, as its patriarch; he was enthroned in St. Sophia Cathedral in Kyiv in 1991.

The fourth and fifth branches of Ukrainian autocephalous churches came into existence via a sequence of bizarre events in 1992. When the UAOC-3 was born in 1989–90 and became more firmly grounded by electing Mstyslav as patriarch in 1991, the notorious Metropolitan Filaret (Denysenko) of Kyiv was the exarch of the Moscow Patriarchate in Ukraine.¹⁸ Filaret had a reputation for rabid anti-Ukrainian activities and later admitted to having a secret position within the KGB, but the reappearance of the UAOC-3 in Ukraine must have alarmed him, because on behalf of the exarchate in Ukraine, he requested that the hierarchical council of the Moscow patriarchate grant autocephaly to the exarchate. The Moscow patriarchate made several changes to the canonical status of its Ukrainian exarchate, two of which are particularly notable. First, the official title was changed to Ukrainian Orthodox Church-Moscow

¹⁷ Zinkewych and Voronyn, eds., *Мартирологія Українських Церков*, vol. 1, 416–7.

¹⁸ For an example of a critique of Filaret while he was still the Exarch of the Moscow Patriarchate in Ukraine, see Frank E. Sysyn, "The Ukrainian Orthodox Question in the USSR," *The Millennium Series* (Cambridge: Harvard University Ukrainian Studies Fund, 1987), 15. Also see Pospelovsky, *The Orthodox Church in the History of Russia*, 369–70.

Patriarchate (UOC-MP), and second, the Moscow Patriarchate granted it a new canonical status called “autonomous and independent in governance and affairs.”¹⁹ Filaret, apparently unsatisfied with the breadth of the changes, again requested autocephaly from Moscow’s synod of bishops, but the bishops persuaded Filaret to voluntarily retire due to rumors that he kept a wife and family in secret. However, upon returning to Kyiv, he claimed that he was coerced into retirement under duress, refused to retire, and attempted to join the UAOC-3 in 1992.

While Filaret’s allies referred to his sudden reversal of course in favor of autocephaly as a type of conversion following the phenomenon of the Apostle Paul, Mstyslav did not receive him into the UAOC-3 and encouraged him to submit to the orders of his superiors. The UAOC-3 then divided, with supporters of Filaret constituting the newly-named “Ukrainian Orthodox Church – Kyiv Patriarchate” (UOC-KP). Several bishops of the UAOC-3 remained faithful to Mstyslav and did not recognize the new UOC-KP largely due to the presence of the notorious Filaret. This smaller group is largely centered in Western Ukraine and remains active today.

In summary, Gorbachev’s policy of *glasnost* and *perestroika* was the catalyst for yet another series of ecclesial realignments in the Orthodox Church of Ukraine. While the end of the Soviet era witnessed to the third incarnation of the UAOC in Ukraine, the Soviet Union’s collapse and Ukraine’s emergence from the aftermath as independent but fledgling nation ripened the environment for independent Orthodox structures mirroring the nation’s government. In 1992, there were three Orthodox churches in Ukraine, namely the UOC-MP, UOC-KP, and UAOC-3, and these three remain today. Notably, the same pattern of political events shaping Ukrainian ecclesial realignment in 1596, 1921, and 1942 recurred in 1989

¹⁹ Pospelovsky, *The Orthodox Church in the History of Russia*, 369. For the official statute of the UOC-MP, see “Статут про управління Української Православної Церкви” (“Statute on the Administration of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church”) UOC-MP Web site, <http://orthodox.org.ua/page/statut-upts> (accessed July 2, 2012). I will analyze the unique canonical status of the UOC-MP later in the article.

and afterwards. After 1993, each group has attempted to establish a claim of being the legitimate Orthodox Church of Ukraine in both Ukraine and global Orthodoxy, leading to several instances where tensions have erupted between adherents of the respective groups.

Recently, the competitive positioning among Orthodox Churches in Ukraine has been complicated by the iteration of a new agenda for the Moscow Patriarchate represented by Patriarch Kyrill's ideology of the "Русский мир" (*Russian World* hereafter). His Russian Church's need to address the increasing influence of globalization on the Orthodox Church grounds Kyrill's rationale for the creation of the *Russian World*. The *Russian World* depends on active and voluntary propagation of the agenda by Orthodox in Ukraine, and the hypothetical implementation of this agenda would reset the relationships between the UOC-MP and the Moscow Patriarchate, and also between the Ecumenical and Moscow Patriarchates. Leaders of the Orthodox and Greco-Catholic churches in Ukraine have recently issued statements that illuminate the current tensions between these Churches and the Moscow Patriarchate. The incompatibility of the articulated missions of the UOC-KP, UGCC, and UOC-MP with Kyrill's *Russian World* constitutes a contemporary occurrence of the pattern of ecclesial realignment in Ukraine, strongly influenced by the growth of globalization and the differing pastoral approaches the churches have adopted to address it. The remainder of this article will analyze the collision of political agendas and ecclesiologies by examining Kyrill's *Russian World* and its reception in Ukraine, with particular emphasis on the current pastoral agenda of the largest Orthodox Church in Ukraine, the UOC-MP.

Patriarch Kyrill and the Russian World

Patriarch Kyrill delivered two speeches that defined his initiative for a *Russian World* in the context of globalization. Kyrill delivered both speeches to the Assembly of the Fund "Russian World" in 2009–10, where Kyrill outlined how the Moscow Patriarchate could promote the preservation and cul-

tivation of Rus' as a regional family.²⁰ Ukrainian responses to Kyrill's notion of a *Russian World* are sharply critical and suspicious of his motives.

Kyrill identifies two overarching points from the beginning of his teaching. First, the rationale for his articulating a vision of a *Russian World* is the question of preserving and sustaining Russian culture in the context of globalization. Kyrill specifically uses the noun "Rus'" instead of Russia, making it clear that this teaching concerns the traditional peoples whose provenance is Rus', namely Russia, Ukraine, Belarus, and Moldova. He also makes it clear that the strategy of sustaining the culture of Rus' will occur through spiritual means, not political, and he attempts to defuse any accusation that his motivations are actually political in his second speech.²¹ Kyrill outlines bold objectives, including an assertion that only a strong *Russian World* is able to become a "strong subject of global international politics, stronger than all political alliances."²² Kyrill's teaching seeks to galvanize and solidify the unity of the peoples of Rus' through the ministries proposed by the Moscow Patriarchate, which would hypothetically result in an alliance founded upon Orthodox spirituality, stronger than worldly political alliances. Ironically, Kyrill justifies the Moscow Patriarchate's role in facilitating and ga-

²⁰ The first speech occurred on November 18, 2009, and is titled "Выступление Святейшего Патриарха Кирилла на торжественном открытии III Ассамблеи Русского мира" ("His Holiness Patriarch Kyrill's address at the grand opening of the Assembly of the Russian World Fund," "Russian World-1" hereafter), Moscow Patriarchate Web site, <http://www.patriarchia.ru/db/text/928446.html> (accessed March 6, 2013). The second speech occurred on November 3, 2010, and is titled "Выступление Святейшего Патриарха Кирилла на открытии IV Ассамблеи Русского мира," ("His Holiness Patriarch Kyrill's address at the opening of the Fourth Assembly of the Russian World Fund," "Russian World-2" hereafter), Moscow Patriarchate Web site <http://www.patriarchia.ru/db/text/1310952.html> (accessed May 19, 2012).

²¹ "Рассуждения Русской Церкви о Русском мире не зависят от политической конъюнктуры" ("The arguments of the Russian Church on the Russian world do not depend on political conditions"), Patriarch Kyrill, Russian World-2.

²² "Сильным субъектом глобальной международной политики, сильнее всяких политических альянсов," Patriarch Kyrill, Russian World-1.

thering prospective citizens of the *Russian World* by referring to the ecumenical character of Orthodoxy, with the Church of Rus' as the largest multinational Church in the Orthodox world. His reference to the pleasure of hearing so many languages spoken at the most recent local council of the Russian Orthodox Church was designed to confirm the previous point.²³

Aspects of the "Russian World"

Several aspects of Kyrill's *Russian World* have implications for both world and Ukrainian Orthodoxy. At the macro-level, Kyrill envisions a *Russian World* that would be international in character, including people who belong to the diaspora. The key agent gathering these people would be the Russian Orthodox Church. Kyrill states that the Moscow Patriarchate is actively opening parishes in various countries of the world for the purpose of providing pastoral ministry, but also as a way to gather people who identify themselves as aligned with traditional Rus' civilization.²⁴ Kyrill's teaching

²³ "На прошедшем Поместном Соборе нашей Церкви было отраднo слышать, как его деятели и участники общались между собой на японском, немецком, английском, французском, украинском, молдавском языках" ("At the previous local council of our Church, it was pleasant to hear figures and participants discussing amongst themselves in the Japanese, German, English, French, Ukrainian, and Moldovan languages"), Patriarch Kyrill, *Russian World-1*.

²⁴ "Московский Патриархат, так же как и некоторые другие Православные Церкви, открывает свои приходы в различных странах мира для своих верующих. Общин Московского Патриархата в диаспоре насчитывается сегодня несколько сотен. Таким образом, в пространство пастырской ответственности Русской Церкви входят не только отдельные страны исторической Руси, но и те общины и сообщества людей, которые связывают свою идентичность с русской цивилизационной традицией, но живут за пределами ее канонической территории и за пределами канонической территории других Поместных Церквей" ("The Moscow Patriarchate, along with some other Orthodox Churches, is opening its parishes in various countries for its faithful. There are a few hundred communities of the Moscow Patriarchate in the diaspora. Thus, not only do the distinct countries of historical Rus' come under the space of the pastoral responsibility of the Russian Church, but also the communities of people who align their identities with the tradition of the Rus'")

illustrates a clear connection between the parishes of the Moscow Patriarchate diffused throughout the world and functioning as the vehicle by which people might be gathered into his hypothetical *Russian World*, again, as a strategy of consolidation in the context of globalization.

Strategies for Shaping the Russian World

Kyryll draws upon both traditional and non-traditional strategies of unity and consolidation for the *Russian World*. The traditional strategy of consolidating the unity of peoples is through the use of language, and here Kyryll identifies Russian as the language of communication not limited to the function of international relations, but also with the capacity to develop “the culture of Rus’, and ... also retain ... the combined historical memory and united values of a societal foundation.”²⁵ Interestingly, in his second speech, Kyryll refers to the Russian language which “is developed and develops as the common property of all the peoples of the Russian World.”²⁶ Kyryll distinguishes Russian from Church Slavonic, which is the “common language for the entire Church of Rus’, and it is important to preserve, develop, and teach it.”²⁷ Kyryll then identifies the city of Kyiv and contemporary Ukraine as key agents in the *Russian World* strategy, equal to Moscow in the propagation of his *Russian World*. Kyryll refers to Kyiv as the “mother of Rus’ cities” (“матерь городов русских”) that is

civilization, but live outside the borders of her canonical territory and outside the borders of the canonical territory of other Local Churches”), Patriarch Kyryll, *Russian World-2*.

²⁵ “используется русский язык как язык межнационального общения, развивается русская культура, а также хранится общеисторическая память и единые ценности общественного строительства” (“The Russian language functions as the language of international communication, it develops the culture of Rus’, and it also retains the combined historical memory and united values of a societal foundation”), Patriarch Kyryll, *Russian World-1*.

²⁶ “Который сложился и развивается как общее достояние всех народов Русского мира,” Patriarch Kyryll, *Russian World-2*.

²⁷ “[А в церковной жизни таким языком является] церковно-славянский. Это общий язык для всей Русской Церкви, и его важно сохранять, развивать и изучать,” Patriarch Kyryll, *Russian World-2*.

now poised to become “one of the most important political and public centers of the Russian World.”²⁸ The role of Kyiv and Ukraine is to vivify the ideal of ecumenical Orthodoxy by contributing to the development of Rus’ civilization. Kyrill clearly establishes the active agency of Kyiv and Ukraine in building the *Russian World* as opposed to being “locked in its nationalist cell.”²⁹ Kyrill envisions Ukraine’s role by presenting a contradistinction between embracing all peoples through a *Russian World* and choosing isolation in nationalism through Orthodox ecclesiological vocabulary, as Ukraine is to “preserve Holy Orthodoxy and manifest in its life its all-peoples or ecumenical character – to be a home for many peoples.”³⁰ Kyrill’s strategy of promoting a *Russian World* with specific reference to the Russian language, strategic agency of Kyiv and Ukraine, and ecumenical character of the Orthodox Church points to his objective, which concludes his second speech in 2010: “The globality of a multinational Rus’ civilization has support in the ecumenical character of Orthodoxy, lying on the basis of the outlook of most of those people who see themselves as part of the Russian World.”³¹

Ukrainian Responses

A survey of Ukrainian responses to Kyrill’s *Russian World* reveals sharp criticism and the collision of two political theologies in Ukraine. We begin with Kyrill’s most obvious antagonist, Patriarch Filaret of the UOC-KP. Filaret stated that

²⁸ “Теперь же исторические условия благоприятствуют тому, чтобы Киев вновь стал одним из важнейших политических и общественных центров Русского мира” (“Now historical conditions are favorable for Kyiv to become again one of the most important political and public centers of the Russian world”), Patriarch Kyrill, *Russian World-2*.

²⁹ “а не замыкаться в своей национальной келье,” Patriarch Kyrill, *Russian World-2*.

³⁰ “защищать Святое Православие и являть в своей жизни его всечеловеческий, то есть вселенский характер – быть домом для многих народов,” Patriarch Kyrill, *Russian World-2*.

³¹ “Глобальность многонациональной русской цивилизации, прежде всего, имеет опору во вселенском характере Православия, лежащего в основе мировоззрения большинства из тех людей, которые осознают себя частью Русского мира,” Patriarch Kyrill, *Russian World-2*.

Ukraine is unable to embrace the *Russian World* initiative because of Kyrill's insistence on the Russian language and Orthodox Church as vehicle and agent of its development.³² Filaret interprets Kyrill's strategy for the *Russian World* as the attempt to reincarnate a territorial Russian empire. Perhaps more significantly, Filaret asserts that Kyrill's solution of a *Russian World* does not address the real challenges posed by globalization: "Humankind cannot return to the times of slavery or feudalism, or socialism, because this is all in the past. We are entering a globalizing world, where empires exist, though not territorial ones – financial, informational, military-industrial, transnational [empires]."³³ Filaret's dismissal of Kyrill's *Russian World* is not surprising, given the strong pro-Ukrainian orientation of the UOC-KP. Filaret establishes two distinctions that are useful for our analysis. First, he views the *Russian World* as an attempt to reconstruct Russia's imperial past, and second, he offers a precise iteration of the challenges globalization poses to Ukraine and (presumably) Russia, issues Kyrill's *Russian World* does not address.

The reaction of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church in Canada (UOCC) illuminates the transnational scope of Kyrill's *Russian World* initiative. In September 2010, the UOCC's newly-elected Metropolitan Yuriy issued a rather urgent letter to the UOCC faithful instructing them to refrain from participating in the liturgical gatherings celebrating the pilgrimage of the relics of St. Volodymyr to Canada from the UOC-MP.³⁴ In a sharp critique of the Moscow Patriarchate and UOC-MP, Yuriy complains about the failure of the Russian Church to

³² "В ідеї Русского Мура закладено засилля – Патріарх Філарет," ("The idea of the Russian World conveys dominance – Patriarch Filaret") Religious Information Service of Ukraine Web site, http://risu.org.ua/ua/index/all_news/orthodox/uoc_kp/48178/ (accessed May 24, 2012).

³³ "Людство не може повернутися в часи рабства чи феодалізму, соціалізму, тому що все вже в минулому... Ми вступаємо в глобалізований світ, де існують імперії, але не територіальні – фінансові, інформаційні, військово-промислові, транснаціональні," Patriarch Filaret, *ibid.*

³⁴ Metropolitan Yuriy, "On the Presence of the Holy Relics of the Great Knyaz' Volodymyr of Kyiv in Canada," disseminated via e-mail, published online and in print in the UOCC's official publication *Visnyk/The Herald* (November 2010), 2–3.

disassociate itself from the “policy and persecution and repression of Ukraine by the Tsarist and Soviet regimes.”³⁵ He then referred to Kyrill’s propagation of the *Russian World* as “the absurd attempt to recreate the old Russian Empire through the determined and consistent propagation of a delusional and misled ideology of a ‘Russkiy mir’ or Russian World. It is not for us!”³⁶ Yuriy’s letter unveils a perceived attempt by the Moscow Patriarchate to implement the *Russian World* agenda by sending the relics of St. Volodymyr to the West with accompanying literature (including liturgical texts) that clearly associates St. Volodymyr and the entire heritage of the Church of Rus’ with contemporary Russia.³⁷ Clearly, the UOCC interpreted the pilgrimage of the relics as a tactic of the *Russian World* strategy; whether or not this was the actual intent of the organizers of the event is unknown. Yuriy interpreted the *Russian World* in the same vein as Filaret, as an attempt to recruit Orthodox in the diaspora, including Ukrainians, to join the transnational *Russian World* movement.

The leader of the Ukrainian-Greek Catholic Church (UGCC), Archbishop Sviatoslav Shevchuk, has offered a simple analysis of Kyrill’s *Russian World* initiative, relevant because of the stature of the UGCC in Ukraine. In an interview with Radio Svoboda, Sviatoslav offered the following response to a question on the danger the *Russian World* poses to Ukraine:³⁸

³⁵ Ibid.

³⁶ Ibid.

³⁷ At the end of this section of the letter, Yuriy invites historians to examine the literature accompanying the relics of St. Volodymyr to Canada.

³⁸ “Русский мир – це політичний проект, який не має нічого спільного ні з історією, ні з сьогочасними суспільними рухами, які відбуваються в Україні. Сьогодні в Україні про російський мир в контексті суспільного життя говориться як про певний геополітичний проект, який зазнав невдачі. Очевидно, буде тиск політичний, можливо теж і економічний, але я думаю, що ми повинні не так боятися російського міра, як ми повинні будувати український світ. А ми його будемо тоді, коли всі українці, де б вони не знаходилися, чи то в Україні, чи то за її межами, відчували єдність нашої української громади і не піддавалися асиміляції. Тоді, я думаю, що там де ми є, ми лишимося собою і ніякі чужі світи нам не загрожуватимуть. Не йдеться про протипагу російському миру, та якщо ми не будуватимемо свій світ, то за нас хтось це обов’яз-

The Russian world – this is a political project that has nothing in common with history, nor with the contemporary societal movements in Ukraine. In Ukraine today, the Russian world is discussed as a certain geopolitical project in the context of societal life. It is clear that there will be political pressure and perhaps also economic, but I think that we do not need to fear the Russian world, but rather need to build a Ukrainian world. And we will build it when all Ukrainians, regardless of where they live, whether in Ukraine or outside her borders, sense the unity of our Ukrainian community and do not succumb to assimilation. I think, then, that wherever we are, we will remain ourselves and no foreign worlds will threaten us. This is not about a contrast to the Russian world, because if we do not build our world, then someone will certainly be compelled to do this for us.

Sviatoslav's analysis adds another voice to the chorus of analysts who view Kyrill's initiative as a geopolitical strategy, though he does not contextualize this strategy in ecclesial terms. His own view addresses the question of what Ukraine will do and does not engage the Church's role in consolidating and uniting societal constituencies. Sviatoslav's briefly stated solution shares one similarity with Kyrill's strategy by calling upon Ukrainians outside of Ukraine to join the cause in building a uniquely Ukrainian world. One cannot apply a rigorous analysis to Sviatoslav's response, as his idea, articulated in the context of a response to an interview question, is not elaborate, evidenced by the absence of references to globalization and sectarianism. However, Sviatoslav clearly views Ukraine as independently building her own future without undue influence from any outside source, including Russia.

ково змушений буде зробити,” Archbishop Sviatoslav Shevchuk, interview with Yuriy Savitskij of Radio Svoboda, “Не біймося ‘русского міра’, будуймо український світ,” (“Let us not be afraid of a ‘Russian World’, let us build a Ukrainian World”) Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church, Web Site <http://www.ugcc.org.ua/2340.0.html> (accessed June 12, 2012).

Perhaps the most elaborate analysis of the relevance and significance of the *Russian World* initiative is presented by Yuriy Chernomoretz.³⁹ Chernomoretz explains the current factions within the UOC-MP by identifying Metropolitan Agathangel of Odessa as a proponent of a movement to restore the UOC-MP to its earlier canonical status as being an exarchate of the Moscow Patriarchate. Chernomoretz introduces an agenda executed by a group of influential oligarchs from Donetsk who are actively seeking to impose the *Russian World* ideology on Orthodox faithful of the UOC-MP in cooperation with Agathangel. The political ramifications of their agenda are alarming: “They believed that the Patriarch would appear one time on [the television network] ‘Interi’ and immediately all would become supporters of the Patriarch, and would be in the world of Putin, and in general, Ukraine would return to Russia.”⁴⁰ In other words, the *Russian World* ideology bears the political agenda of Russian President Vladimir Putin, who has allegedly been an active contributor to the creation and strategic implementation of the ideology.⁴¹

Chernomoretz’s analysis of the *Russian World* also elucidates the emerging anti-globalist alliances formed among various Orthodox parties in Ukraine, along with their political

³⁹ Taken from Chernomoretz’s interview with Taras Antoshevsky, “Експерт: “Канонічна Автокефалія – це спосіб не відділення, а існування церкви в традиційно православній країні, якою є Україна,” (“Expert: ‘Canonical Autocephaly’ – not a means of separation, but the existence of a church in a traditional Orthodox country, which Ukraine is”), Religious Information Service of Ukraine Web site, http://risu.org.ua/ua/index/expert_thought/interview/43824/ (accessed May 24, 2012).

⁴⁰ “Вони думали, що один раз Патріарх виступить на «Інтері» – і вже всі стануть прихильниками Патріарха, і будуть в «мире» Путіна, і взагалі Україна приєднається до Росії,” in *ibid.* Chernomoretz’s assertion is echoed by Hlib Kovalenko in “Геополітична війна в Православній Церкві?” (“A Geopolitical War in the Orthodox Church?”) Релігія в Україні Web site, <http://www.religion.in.ua/main/analitica/9715-geopolitichna-vijna-v-pravoslavnij-cerkvi.html> (accessed June 6, 2012).

⁴¹ Oleksander Sagan asserts that the reunification of ROCOR with the Moscow patriarchate was actively supported and controlled by Putin in “Православна ідеологія: нові аспекти ХХІ століття,” (“Orthodox ideology: new aspects of the 21st century”) Релігія в Україні Web site, <http://www.religion.in.ua/main/analitica/7298-pravoslavna-ideologiya-novi-aspekti-xxi-stolittya.html> (accessed June 6, 2012).

agendas. Chernomoretz's analysis concerns the question of canonical autocephaly for the Orthodox Church in Ukraine, and he discusses, for example, the position of the most vocal opponents of autocephaly for the Ukrainian Orthodox Church. These opponents include the aforementioned Metropolitan Agathangel and a notorious grassroots organization, Единое Отечество ("United Fatherland"), a large and influential lay group located in Odessa headed by a layman, Valery Kaurov, and associated with a larger umbrella group called the Union of Orthodox Brotherhoods of Ukraine. Единое Отечество has a multifaceted political and ecclesial agenda. The organization promotes patriotism, especially the unity of holy Rus' and the Slavic peoples, and the unity of the Church under the Moscow Patriarchate.⁴² The group strongly opposes "schismatics," especially those affiliated with the UOC-KP's Patriarch Filaret, and also condemns Ukrainian nationalists, particularly those associated with the orange movement. Единое Отечество openly condemns globalization and proposals for the creation of an autocephalous Church for Ukraine and views Odessa's Metropolitan Agathangel as their hierarchical patron, as Agathangel awarded a "gramota" to 45 of their members.⁴³

Единое Отечество's history of confrontation with the UOC-MP manifests a recurring pattern of the collision of politics and Church in Ukraine. A resolution by the hierarchical synod of the UOC-MP in 2007 demonstrates the Church's stated desire to retreat from political Orthodoxy, and is worth quoting in its entirety here:⁴⁴

⁴² Единое Отечество Web site, "About Us," <http://www.otchestvo.org.ua/Links/eo.htm> (accessed July 9, 2012). The remainder of this section draws from material self-published by this organization on this Web page.

⁴³ A "gramota" is an official certificate of recognition frequently given by the bishop as an award to people of the Church.

⁴⁴ "Резолюція Архієрейського Собору УПЦ від 21 грудня 2007 року з приводу діяльності пана Валерія Каурова: Від повноти Української Православної Церкви ми свідчимо, що діяльність громадської організації «Союз православних громадян України» не має відношення до Української Православної Церкви. Голова цієї організації, пан Валерій Кауров, не має права представляти позицію Української Православної Церкви та висловлюватись від її імені з будь-якого питання. Більш того, ми свідчимо, що окремі його дії та висловлювання спрямовані проти Української Православної Церкви та шкодять її спасительній місії в

Resolution of the Hierarchical Synod of the UOC from December 21, 2007, on the occasion of the activity of Mr. Valery Kaurov. On behalf of the whole Ukrainian Orthodox Church we testify that the activity of the public organization “Union of Orthodox Peoples of Ukraine” has no relationship with the Ukrainian Orthodox Church. The head of this organization, Mr. Valery Kaurov, does not have the right to represent the position of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church and to address various questions in her name. Besides this, we testify that his other acts and declarations are against the Ukrainian Orthodox Church and damage her salvific mission in society. We also condemn the so-called “political Orthodoxy” which foresees the entrance of political slogans into the Church’s enclosure, to the degree this does not cohere with the Spirit of Christian proclamation. We regard the interference of political and pseudo-ecclesial political organizations in the life of the Church in Ukraine as destructive, including foreign [organizations] that support the anti-Church activity of Mr. Valery Kaurov and his supporters.

суспільстві. Ми також засуджуємо так зване «політичне православ'я», яке передбачає внесення в церковну огорожу політичних гасел, оскільки це не відповідає духу Христової проповіді. Ми вважаємо деструктивним втручання в церковне життя України політичних та навколоцерковних громадсько-політичних організацій, в тому числі закордонних, які підтримують антицерковну діяльність пана Валерія Каурова та його прибічників,” quoted in “Діяльність громадської організації «Союз православних громадян України» не має відношення до Української Православної Церкви” (“The activities of the community organization ‘Union of Orthodox communities of Ukraine’ has no relationship with the Ukrainian Orthodox Church”) which includes the entire text of the UOC-MP’s Hierarchical Sobor “Резолюція Архієрейського Собору УПЦ від 21 грудня 2007 року з приводу діяльності пана Валерія Каурова” (“Resolution of the Hierarchical Council of the UOC on December 21, 2007, concerning the activity of Mr. Valery Kaurov”), UOC-MP Web site, http://arhiv.orthodoxy.org.ua/po_eparhiyah/kiivska/2007/12/22/13064.html (accessed June 20, 2012).

Kaurov is one of the most visible proponents of solidifying Ukrainian relations with Russia, and his work has vehemently and defiantly opposed anything promoting Ukrainian independence from Russia, which he sees most evident in the attempt to create an autocephalous Ukrainian Orthodox Church.⁴⁵ Kaurov has been accused of inciting violent attacks against vocal proponents of Ukrainian patriotism in Odessa, including an ugly incident in September of 2007 when thugs allegedly recruited by Kaurov and his group viciously beat several Ukrainian demonstrators protesting the unveiling of a monument honoring Russian Empress Catherine II.⁴⁶

Globalization and Sectarianism

If globalization is a polarizing issue in the Ukrainian ecclesial milieu, it is also a critical pastoral issue for Kyrill, who defines the *Russian World* as a necessary initiative to build the civilization of Rus' in the context of globalization. Globalization will have a significant impact on Ukraine, as Ukraine remains a borderland with historical ties to both the West and East. Kyrill's *Russian World* places immense pressure on the fragile foundation of Orthodoxy in Ukraine due to the intensity of internal disagreement on whether to embrace or reject globalization. Chernomoretz's description of the important role played by Agathangel is supported by the study on Russian Orthodoxy and politics by Irina Papkova.⁴⁷ In defining fundamentalist approaches, Papkova observes that several influential groups have identified globalism as the chief ideological enemy of the Russian Orthodox Church. Her analysis of this anti-global sentiment within Russian Orthodoxy is particularly

⁴⁵ Kaurov openly defines his position and agenda in an interview granted to Interfax in 2008, "Ukrainian state wishes to slyly impose puppet national churches on the people in line with West's ideology," Interfax Web site, <http://www.interfax-religion.com/?act=interview&div=48> (accessed June 4, 2012).

⁴⁶ Zenon Zawada, "Thugs Attack Ukrainian Patriots Protesting against Odessa Monument to Russian Empress," *The Ukrainian Weekly* 36 (9 September 2007): 1, 3.

⁴⁷ Irina Papkova, *The Orthodox Church and Russian Politics* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011), 60–67.

pertinent because of her identification of one of its chief proponents: Agathangel. Agathangel opposes globalism because he interprets it as a product of the West. Papkova allows his “fundamentalist” voice to speak for itself.⁴⁸

We all understand that globalization is being conducted at the behest of the West, which has never wished us good.... The West has, not for just one year, conducted spiritual aggression against Russia.... Their longtime dream is the destruction of our statehood, our Church, in order that Satan may enter the land of Russia.

Victor Yelensky also observes the polarizing views of globalization playing themselves out in the Orthodox Churches of Ukraine, and he confirms Chernomoretz’s and Papkova’s identification of Agathangel as a key figure in the ideological battle.⁴⁹ Yelensky compares Agathangel’s condemnation of globalization to the favorable view held by Archbishop Ihor Isichenko of the UAOC-3, who envisions “open borders for the dissemination of ideas, the spread of information, and new possibilities for the evangelization of the world.”⁵⁰ In contrast, Agathangel sees globalization as a threat bearing evil. Yelensky explains Agathangel’s position: “Only Russia, a powerful Orthodox state and the legal successor of genuine truth and real statehood, has the potential to frustrate the plans of global evil,” with the Russian Orthodox Church actively resisting globalization.⁵¹ Agathangel’s disdain for globalization has support

⁴⁸ Metropolitan Agathangel of Odessa, quoted in Papkova, 66.

⁴⁹ Victor Yelensky, “Globalization, Nationalism, and Orthodoxy: The Case of Ukrainian Nation Building,” in eds. V. Roudometof, A. Agadjanian, and J. Pankhurst, *Eastern Orthodoxy in a Global Age: Tradition Faces the Twenty-First Century* (Walnut Creek: AltaMira Press., 2005), 160–61.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, 160. Yelensky also includes the following description of globalization by Archbishop Ihor Isichenko: “The age of globalization reinforces the Church’s role as the historic repository of nationhood, national values, and cultural identities ... globalization offers to every Orthodox culture and every local Church an unprecedented opportunity to testify about itself to the entire world,” in *Ibid.*, 160.

⁵¹ “The Russian Orthodox Church is the only structure that unites almost all former Russian geopolitical space, including Ukraine, Belarus, Central Asia,

among Russian politicians and Church leaders who envision globalism as a movement constituting a “planetary state with a single transnational governing center.”⁵² Alexander Agadjanian and Kathy Rousselet assert that Russian Orthodox leaders employ a typical tactic to thwart globalization by creating a space of domination in traditional ecclesial “canonical territories” that are usually beyond Russia’s borders.⁵³ Such canonical territories can be transnational, which Agadjanian and Rousselet describe as “creating protective symbolic barriers.”⁵⁴ Given its transnational quality, Kyrill’s *Russian World* initiative appears to be an example of Agadjanian and Rousselet’s description of creating ecclesial spaces outside of one’s borders as a defense against globalization, with Ukraine playing a crucial role as Russia’s closest neighbor to the West.

The anti-globalist agenda has recently had an impact on the leadership of the UOC-MP in particular. Agathangel’s position as an avid protagonist of an anti-globalist agenda within the Orthodox Church became heightened when the leader of the UOC-MP, Metropolitan Volodymyr, was hospitalized due to illness in 2011–2012, with Agathangel assuming the duties of convening and leading sessions of the UOC’s synod in Volodymyr’s absence, as the senior hierarch in Ukraine. His role as a senior hierarch of the UOC-MP and vocal influence on the Church illuminates the permeation of a type of Russian ecclesial defense against globalization into Ukrainian Church politics.

The fierce collision of political agendas symbolized by the confrontation in Odessa elucidates Ukraine’s precarious situation as a country that can choose one of two alternatives, without any apparent compromise: embrace globalization and the inevitable permeation of diverse peoples, culture, and thinking

and the Baltic states. Moreover, the ROC could and should contribute to the unification of these states (as well as other nations) with Russia. Later, Greece and the Balkan states could join in this bloc,” in *ibid.*, 161.

⁵² Alexander Agadjanian and Kathy Rousselet, “Globalization and Identity Discourse in Russian Orthodoxy,” in eds. V. Roudometof, A. Agadjanian, and J. Pankhurst, *Eastern Orthodoxy in a Global Age*, 34.

⁵³ *Ibid.*, 40.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, 41. Agadjanian and Rousselet note that this kind of transnational marking of borders is not equivalent to a “globalizing vector.”

into Ukraine, or forge stronger relations with Russia in the attempt to preserve an Eastern Slavic society that is deeply suspicious of globalization and is sponsored by “canonical” Orthodoxy. This description of the political intricacies Ukraine faces is perhaps oversimplified, but it aptly depicts the polarized and politically-motivated forces that vocalize their positions from within the Church. In this instance, Orthodox who favor autocephaly are viewed as people who desire separation from Russia, which by definition makes them globalists, whereas opponents of autocephaly obviously see themselves as belonging to the larger family of Russian civilization. The unenviable task of the Orthodox Churches is to shepherd people on the narrow path to Christ through this hazardous maze of political-ecclesial alliances and their perceived globalist or anti-globalist agendas.

The Position of the UOC-MP

The enormity of the UOC-MP’s pastoral task is evidenced by recent decisions and statements issued by the UOC-MP, the Orthodox Church in Ukraine with the closest relationship to the Moscow Patriarchate. The UOC-MP’s synodal condemnation of and disassociation from Kaurov just a few months following the Odessa beating incident indicates its synod’s desire, at the time, to position itself as disavowing particular political positions, as evidenced by an appeal of the synod to the Ukrainian people in November 2011, calling upon all to accept the Church as an institution that remains outside of politics, and for all members of this Church to “approach all, not with political slogans or discourses, but bearing a word of truth, love, and peace.”⁵⁵

In reality, the UOC-MP finds itself in an untenable situation as the officially recognized canonical Orthodox Church in Ukraine that has been unable to date to effectively resolve the schism in Ukraine. Kovalenko’s article provides a detailed

⁵⁵ “Звернення Священного Синоду Української Православної Церкви до народу України” (“Appeal of the Holy Synod of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church to the Ukrainian People,” November 22, 2011), UOC-MP Web site, <http://orthodox.org.ua/category/1115/list> (accessed May 24, 2012).

report on the ongoing quest of the small UAOC-3 to seek through the Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople almost any legitimate and viable ecclesial variant to accepting the *Russian World* initiative of the Moscow Patriarchate, while Filaret recently stated that the UOC-KP has an ongoing dialogue with the Ecumenical Patriarchate.⁵⁶ Sagan interprets statements by Metropolitan Volodymyr at the UOC-MP's Hierarchical Council in 2008 as manifesting Volodymyr's reluctance to view Ukraine as a buffer between Western and Eastern political orbits. Volodymyr's call for open discussion on the differences between East and West and Ukraine's role in negotiating such pluralism appears to evidence the impact of the *Russian World* ideology on the UOC-MP.⁵⁷

⁵⁶ Kovalenko, "Геополітична війна в Православній Церкві?" Релігія в Україні Web site, <http://www.religion.in.ua/main/analitica/9715-geopolitichna-vijna-v-pravoslavnij-cerkvi.html> (accessed June 6, 2012). "Patriarch Filaret: Contacts with Ecumenical Patriarchate have become more Complicated," Religious Information Service of Ukraine Web site, http://risu.org.ua/en/index/all_news/confessional/orthodox_relations/48161/ (accessed July 5, 2012).

⁵⁷ "Наче передчуваючи можливість швидкого проникнення ідеї «руського міра» у церкву (до 2009 р. Московська патріархія підтримувала її неофіційно), Блаженніший митрополит Київський та всієї України Володимир у своєму виступі на Архирейському Соборі Руської ПЦ (2008 р.) зазначив, що «Українська ПЦ зобов'язана враховувати соціокультурні особливості нашої країни» і «сьогодні ми змушені говорити про два полюси української культури, дві різні цивілізаційні орбіти – «східну» та «західну».[15] А відтак: «Місія України аж ніяк не вичерпується функцією буферної зони між Сходом і Заходом. Україна – це самодостатній соціокультурний простір, перед яким стоїть завдання віднайдення власної внутрішньої цілісності через синтез спадщини Сходу та Заходу» ("As if anticipating the possibility of the rapid penetration of the 'Russian World' idea in the Church (which the Moscow Patriarchate unofficially supported up until the year 2009), His Beatitude Metropolitan Volodymyr of Kyiv and all Ukraine in his speech at the Hierarchical Council of the Russian Orthodox Church (2008) indicated that 'the Ukrainian Orthodox Church must take into account the socio-cultural peculiarities of our country' and 'today we must speak about two poles of Ukrainian culture, two different orbits of civilization – 'eastern' and 'western'. And then: 'Ukraine's mission is by no means reducible to a buffering zone between East and West. Ukraine is a self-contained sociocultural space, which has the task of discovering its own internal integrity through a synthesis of the heritages of East and West,'" Sagan, "Православна ідеологія: нові аспекти XXI століття," Релігія в Україні Web site, <http://www.reli>

Practically speaking, the UOC-MP's attempt to negotiate the collision of two Orthodox ideologies in Ukraine has progressed with dramatic intensity throughout 2012. The current crisis concerns an attempt to change the statute of the UOC-MP, which would lessen the degree of freedom exercised in their own self-governance. The crisis accelerated with the lecture given by Metropolitan Volodymyr on the occasion of the twentieth anniversary of the hierarchical council in Kharkiv (1992), at which he was elected to lead the UOC-MP to replace the disgraced Filaret. Volodymyr suggested that an attempt to change the UOC-MP's statute could create more disruptions in its life, and he also called for renewed attempts to dialogue with the UAOC-3 and UOC-KP.⁵⁸ He later issued a private letter requesting feedback from the bishops of the UOC-MP on the proposed change to the UOC-MP's statute.⁵⁹ Agathangel responded to Volodymyr almost immediately, in a letter published on the web site of the Odessa Eparchy, stating that no one, not even the synod of bishops of the UOC-MP, has the authority to overturn the commission's work, which is designed to update and align and UOC-MP's status with the statute of its mother church, the Russian Orthodox Church.⁶⁰ These most recent events (as of June 2012) manifest the colli-

gion.in.ua/main/analitica/7298-pravoslavna-ideologiya-novi-aspekti-xxi-stolittya.html (accessed June 6, 2012).

⁵⁸ Митрополит Володимир: низка програмних заяв ("Metropolitan Volodymyr: A Series of programmatic declarations"), Релігія в Україні Web site, <http://www.religion.in.ua/main/daycomment/16542-mitropolit-volodimir-nizka-programnix-zayav.html> (accessed June 6, 2012).

⁵⁹ "Митрополит Володимир Закликав Єпископат УПЦ Визначитися чи потрібна комісія на чолі з Митрополитом Донецьким, яка хоче змінити 'Статут про Управління УПЦ'" ("Metropolitan Volodymyr Called the Bishops of the UOC[-MP] to ascertain the need for the committee headed by the Metropolitan of Donetsk, which desires to change the 'Statute on the governance of the UOC[-MP]"), Religious Information Service of Ukraine, Web site, http://risu.org.ua/ua/index/all_news/orthodox/uoc/48351/ (accessed June 6, 2012).

⁶⁰ "Митрополит Агафангел (Савін) написав гнівну відповідь Предстоятелю УПЦ з Приводу Статутної комісії" ("Metropolitan Agathangel (Savin) wrote an angry response to the Primate of the UOC[-MP] about the Statute Committee"), Religious Information Service of Ukraine, Web site, http://risu.org.ua/ua/index/all_news/orthodox/uoc/48355/ (accessed June 6, 2012).

sion of political ideologies in Orthodoxy in Ukraine, with the attempt to impose a political ideology upon the actual ecclesial canonical structure. In the case of the UOC-MP, only time will tell if Volodymyr's emphasis of the peace enjoyed by the UOC-MP under its current canonical status will be disrupted by a change.⁶¹

The Conference on the 1992 Council of the UOC-MP in Kharkiv

1992 was a pivotal year for Orthodoxy in Ukraine. Filaret, having been forced out of the UOC-MP, joined the UAOC and formed the UOC-KP. Mstyslav rejected Filaret's presence resulting in the failed merger of the UAOC with Filaret and the few clergy of the UOC-MP who joined him. As the senior hierarch in Ukraine, the late Metropolitan Nikodym of Kharkiv convened a hierarchical council to elect a new metropolitan for the UOC-MP, the current first hierarch, Volodymyr. The UOC-MP hosted a conference commemorating the twentieth anniversary of the Kharkiv council in May 2012, and Volodymyr's comprehensive remarks illustrate the collision of Kyrill's *Russian World* ideology with Volodymyr's program for building the life of the UOC-MP in the context of Ukraine's new independence and the political, economical, and ecclesial turbulence accompanying the seismic impact of

⁶¹ “Если Украинская Православная Церковь с 2007 года мирно живет, руководствуясь принятым и утвержденным Уставом, то целесообразна деятельность Комиссии, которая намерена кардинально изменить основные пункты и положения нашего Устава?” “If the Ukrainian Orthodox Church has lived in peace since the year 2007, guided by the accepted and approved charter, then are the activities of the Committee which intends to fundamentally change the basic points and provisions of our Charter expedient?” from Volodymyr's letter to Agathangel, May 31, 2012, published in “Митрополит Володимир закликав єпископат УПЦ визначитися, чи потрібна Комісія на чолі з Митрополитом Донецьким, яка хоче змінити «Статут про управління УПЦ,” (“Metropolitan Volodymyr Called the Bishops of the UOC[-MP] to ascertain the need for a committee headed by the Metropolitan of Donetsk, which desires to change the ‘Statute on the governance of the UOC[-MP]”), Religious Information Service of Ukraine, Web site, http://risu.org.ua/ua/index/all_news/orthodox/uoc/48351/ (accessed June 6, 2012).

the Soviet Union's collapse.⁶² Select comments from Volodymyr's lecture elucidate the incompatibility of his pastoral program for the UOC-MP with Kyrill's *Russian World* initiative.

Volodymyr's remarks begin with a detailed and erudite review of the history of conciliarity within the Orthodox Church in Ukraine, with the pivotal events of the late 1980's and early 1990's posing a test to the UOC-MP's conciliarity. Volodymyr dispassionately details the Ukrainian bishops' response to Filaret's insistence on petitioning the Moscow Patriarchate for complete ecclesial autocephaly, followed by Filaret's alienation from his fellow bishops and rank and file clergy, and the decision to convene the Kharkiv Hierarchical Council. After an honest assessment of the Church's relations with the state, Volodymyr addresses the question of the canonical status of the UOC-MP. He emphasizes the broad autonomy enjoyed by the UOC-MP evidenced by the updating of its statute in 1990: this official canonical status is unusual, as the Statute defines the UOC as "Українська Православна Церква є самостійною і незалежною у своєму управлінні та устрої" ("the Ukrainian Orthodox Church is autonomous and independent in its governance and affairs"). Volodymyr's emphasis is evidenced by his references to the repetitive confirmation of this unique canonical status in a 1990 patriarchal *gramota* (granted by Moscow) and the act of the 2009 All-Russian Local Council which confirmed all of the hierarchical councils of the UOC-MP from 1990 to 2008. Volodymyr then translates the official canonical language of the UOC-MP into colloquial terms: "the UOC-MP is self-governing with the privileges of broad autonomy," which he also described as "optimal for today."⁶³ What remains undefined and perhaps unprecedented in Orthodox ecclesiology is the distinction between the canoni-

⁶² Metropolitan Volodymyr (Sabodan), "Українська Православна Церква на межі тисячоліть: здобутки та виклики," ("The Ukrainian Orthodox Church at the turn of the millennium: achievements and challenges"), UOC-MP Web site, <http://orthodox.org.ua/article/ukra%D1%97nska-pravoslavna-tserkva-na-mezh%D1%96-tisyachol%D1%96t-zdobutki-ta-vikliki> (accessed June 12, 2012).

⁶³ Ibid.

cal statuses of autonomous churches and the UOC-MP, which is “self-governing with the privileges of broad autonomy.” This section is particularly relevant to our discussion given the background of internal struggle within the UOC-MP over the hypothetical separation of the UOC-MP from the Moscow Patriarchate.

Volodymyr’s explanation of the future of the Ukrainian language in the life of the UOC-MP conflicts with Kyrill’s *Russian World*, which privileges Russian as the language of communication and Church Slavonic as the liturgical language.⁶⁴

The question of translating the Holy Scripture and liturgical texts into Ukrainian has particular relevance for the mission of our Church in contemporary Ukrainian society. The problem of Ukrainianizing church life is not new for us. This has been frequently discussed, beginning already from the 1920’s. Also, the celebration of the liturgy in the Ukrainian language was sanctioned by a decision of the Synod of Bishops in Ukraine from June 6 of 1921. At the time, the synod

⁶⁴ “Особливу актуальність в контексті місії нашої Церкви в сучасному українському суспільстві має питання українського перекладу Святого Письма та богослужбових текстів. Проблема українізації церковного життя для нас не нова. Вона активно обговорювалась в Україні, починаючи ще з 1920-х років. Зокрема, звершення богослужіння українською мовою в нашій Церкві було санкціоновано рішенням Синоду єпископів України від 6 червня 1921 року... Тоді Синод «визнав можливим допустити звершення богослужіння українською мовою там, де цього бажають парафіяни більшістю у дві третини голосів». Святитель Тихон, Патріарх Московський визнав, що це рішення повністю відповідає «духу Православної Церкви». Рішення про дозвіл парафіянам обирати богослужбову мову було підтверджено і Київською нарадою єпископів, духовенства і мирян у вересні 1922 року. Цю норму підтвердив і Собор Української Православної Церкви в листопаді 1991 року. Сьогодні певна перекладацька робота здійснюється Видавничим відділом Української Православної Церкви. Зокрема, 2011 року з друку вийшов Новий Заповіт та богослужбове Євангеліє українською мовою. Але нам слід приділити перекладацькій діяльності значно більше уваги. Ми маємо надати нашим парафіянам, а також тим, хто цікавиться історією, вченням та традицією Східної Церкви, змогу читати церковну літературу рідною мовою,” *ibid.*

recognized the possibility of permitting the celebration of the liturgy in the Ukrainian language in places where more than two-thirds of the parishioners desire it. The Holy Tikhon, Patriarch of Moscow, recognized that this decision in its entirety responds to the spirit of the Orthodox Church. The decision of permitting parishioners to choose their liturgical language was confirmed by the gathering of bishops, clergy, and laity of Kyiv in September of 1922. The Council of the UOC affirmed this norm in November of 1991. Today the publishing organ of the UOC performs the translating work. In 2011, the New Testament and liturgical gospel book were published in the Ukrainian language. However, we should give greater attention to translation projects. We must give our parishioners, and also those who are interested in the history, teaching and tradition of the Eastern Church an opportunity to read ecclesial literature in their native language.

The context and timing of Volodymyr's comments give us insight into his pastoral agenda for the UOC-MP. Kyrill's *Russian World* initiative was well-known by the opening of the Kharkiv conference. The Moscow Patriarchate had also initiated the process of implementation, especially with the active patronage of Agathangel and Metropolitan Ilarion of Donetsk. Volodymyr was caught in the midst of internal conflicts with Agathangel and Ilarion, and the Ukrainian religious media noted Agathangel's absence from the Kharkiv conference, significant because of his stature as the senior hierarch of the UOC-MP after Volodymyr. Under Volodymyr's leadership, one can note his emphasis on permitting the Ukrainian language for both liturgical and catechetical ministries. Volodymyr does not mention Church Slavonic or Russian in his speech, but acknowledges the urgency of furthering the mission of the UOC-MP in Ukraine through the Ukrainian language. The contradistinction of Volodymyr's pastoral initiative with Kyrill's vision of Ukraine as a vehicle for furthering the *Russian World* initiative is stark and shows that resistance to Kyrill's *Russian World* is present in all branches of Ukrainian

Orthodoxy, regardless of their perceived degree of canonical legitimacy.

Ecclesiological Implications of the Russian World

Here is a summary of the complex politico-religious situation of Orthodoxy in post-Soviet Ukraine.

1. The collapse of the Soviet Union created both ecclesial opportunity and chaos in Ukraine. Proponents of an autocephalous Church seized the opportunity, while all of Ukraine's ecclesial organizations had to adjust to the new situation, which resulted in chaos.
2. Divisions within Orthodoxy in Ukraine have become deeper and more polarized. The main division occurs in two distinct politico-religious lines within Orthodoxy:
 - a. The pro-autocephalist movement, with contributions from Ukrainians who had lived in the diaspora, such as Mstyslav, and frequently aligned with a pro-democratic and pro-global agenda of the Orange revolution.
 - b. The sectarian Orthodox, who are pro-Russian, anti-autocephalous, and perceive globalization as a movement cloaked by Western tendencies that threaten Russian Orthodoxy and the unity of holy Rus' and Slavic nations.
 - c. A third group also exists, one that discourages the commixture of political agendas and ecclesial ministry, though this group is perhaps the most difficult to define due to a lack of a single identifiable agenda. Volodymyr of the UOC-MP would appear to be in this group.
3. The political collision of pro- and anti-global positions has a significant impact on the ideologies and activities of Orthodox Church institutions in Ukraine, so these collisions reverberate within the Church and, to date, have deepened the existing ecclesial divisions.

4. Patriarch Kyrill's *Russian World* initiative extensively broadens the reach and influence of the Moscow Patriarchate throughout the world, and is modeled on the Orthodox notion of "universal Orthodoxy," which elevates the question of authoritative mechanisms traditionally exercised by the ecumenical Patriarchate. I have focused on the impact of the *Russian World* initiative in Ukraine given its historical significance as a borderland, but the *Russian World* has also had an impact on ecclesial life in the diaspora. The recently retired Metropolitan Jonah of the Orthodox Church in America (OCA) is alleged to have voluntarily supported the *Russian World* by proposing a dismissal of the OCA's autocephaly to return to the Moscow Patriarchate with a canonical status of "broad autonomy," similar to that of the UOC-MP.⁶⁵

Analysis

In Ukraine, the attempt to achieve Orthodox unity through the proclamation of autocephaly without affirmation from the sister Orthodox churches of the world has failed. The UOC-MP continues to publicly lament the schisms within Orthodox Ukraine since 1992, and while Volodymyr's call for renewed unification discussions is admirable, the consistent references to 1992 are inaccurate and even problematic. The movement for Ukrainian autocephaly started in 1921, and continued to emerge whenever the political climate permitted it to percolate. An honest, rigorous, and dispassionate examination of the history of the Ukrainian autocephalist movement is desperately needed to promote a more robust understanding of its place in

⁶⁵ Mark Grinby, "Во чреве китове... Американский Митрополит Иона пал жертвой московской церковной дипломатии, которой доверили важную часть проекта "Русский мир" ("In the belly of the whale... American Metropolitan Jonah fell victim to Moscow's ecclesial diplomacy, which is entrusted with an important portion of the 'Russian World' project"), Релігія в Україні Web site, http://www.religion.in.ua/zmi/foreign_zmi/8760-vo-chreve-kitove-amerikanskij-mitropolit-iona-pal-zhertvoj-moskovskoj-cerkovnoj-diplomatii-kotoroj-doverili-vazhnuyu-chast-proektarusskij-mir.html (accessed July 10, 2012).

the Ukrainian religious milieu, and its potential future trajectory. If history is informative, the autocephalist movement is here to stay, regardless of attempts to delegitimize it.

That said, it seems unlikely that the attempt to recruit Ukraine as a major proponent of the *Russian World* campaign will succeed, due simply to the established opposing positions of the UAOC and UOC-KP along with the current internal strife of the UOC-MP. For example, the UOC-MP would have to adopt a drastic shift in policy to engage two of Kyrill's most important tactics, namely openly endorsing the Russian language as the key mode of communication within the *Russian World*, and also retaining Church Slavonic as the only legitimate liturgical language. In his Kharkiv speech, Volodymyr reiterated the UOC-MP's permission for parishes to use Ukrainian as their liturgical language and called for the active translation and distribution of catechetical literature in Ukrainian. Volodymyr also reiterated the UOC-MP's condemnation of "political Orthodoxy," and called upon all clergy to refrain from using the pulpit as a place to propagate political agendas.⁶⁶ Thus, Kyrill's attempt to implement the *Russian World* initiative through Ukraine meets resistance at all fronts, despite the active presence of his proponents in various positions of the UOC-MP.

For our purposes, it is probably too early to draw final conclusions on the collision between Ukrainian autocephaly and its relationship with the West on the one hand, and the *Russian World* initiative on the other. With regards to the former, only a rigorous historical study of the development of Ukrainian autocephaly and its aspirations can sufficiently inform theologians to develop ideas on how to address the issue in the present and future. As for the *Russian World*, the attempt to develop and implement a strategy that cultivates Orthodoxy in the context of globalization is, at minimum, creative. The *Russian World* initiative occasions a new direction for Orthodox theology that demands an understanding of the influence of pluralism through globalization and assessment of strategies that capacitate optimal pastoral direction in

⁶⁶ Ibid.

the Church (such strategies include sectarianism on the one hand, and a policy of open engagement with the world on the other). Concerning globalization, Kyrill's *Russian World* should function as an invitation for Orthodox to attend to the issues of pluralism and culture with the same enthusiasm with which they address the canonical problems now belonging to the previous century.⁶⁷

This leads to the question of whether or not it is possible to utilize an ecclesiological mechanism within Orthodoxy that has the capacity to address both the Ukrainian issue and, perhaps more important, the larger questions of globalization and culture. The current ecclesiological system has failed to address the Ukrainian issue because of conflicts between the Ecumenical and Moscow Patriarchates. Kyrill's mobilization of a trans- and multi-national *Russian World* consolidated through the Moscow Patriarchate serves as a sober reminder that in practice, global Orthodoxy has two competing "ecumenical patriarchates" in Constantinople and Moscow. Both embrace autonomous churches outside of their territorial borders, and both patriarchates reserve the right to assess and grant requests for autocephaly from "daughter" churches.⁶⁸ Kyrill's ambition to extend the juridical reach and influence of the Moscow Patriarchate simply illuminates the absence of an ecclesial mechanism within Orthodoxy to resolve issues, with the ecclesial and ideological fractures in Ukraine serving as a primary example of this problem. The questions of Ukrainian or even American ecclesial autocephaly are not the only problems; Orthodoxy also needs to find creative ways to address the imminent expansion and impact of globalization without further polarization of ideological groups within the Church, and this is an area of great opportunity for creative theological discourse within the Orthodox academy.

⁶⁷ Agadjanian and Rousselet assessed Kyrill's teachings, particularly in his "Bases of the Social Concept Document," as a "clearly expressed will to interact with the secular and liberal world," in "Globalization and Identity Discourse in Russian Orthodoxy," in eds. V. Roudometof, A. Agadjanian, and J. Pankhurst, *Eastern Orthodoxy in a Global Age*, 48.

⁶⁸ The absence of mutual recognition of the validity of such churches, such as Constantinople's not recognizing the autocephaly of the OCA, does not eliminate the existential reality of such churches.

As a final reflection, I would like to suggest that the ecclesiastical fractures within Ukraine create an opportunity for global Orthodoxy to develop a new theology of autocephaly that preserves the best of Orthodox tradition and has the capacity to address the pressing issues of post-modernity. Current discourse on and application of autocephaly is grounded in the juridical categorizations of territorial borders and the elusive assessment of the need for dependence of smaller regional structures on larger metropolises. The current ecclesiological machinery is still run by an engine created in antiquity. A proof of the deficiency in the juridical foundation of autocephaly is the failed attempt to create a new canonical status for the UOC-MP in 1990. In recent statements, Metropolitan Volodymyr has repeatedly emphasized the “broad autonomy” enjoyed by the UOC-MP, which firmly establishes it within the family tree of local Orthodox Churches. One might view the Moscow Patriarchate’s granting of such a special status as an innovative attempt to guarantee the unity of the UOC-MP with the Church of Russia while simultaneously granting her special freedoms to minister to the people within her borders. To be fair, an assessment of the effectiveness of this broad autonomy is probably premature after only twenty years, and an evaluation along these lines is outside the scope of this paper. Measurable progress is evidenced by the UOC-MP’s canonization of local saints, permitting the use of liturgical Ukrainian, establishing a solid presence in print and electronic media in Ukrainian, and the convening of its own local hierarchical councils. At the macro-level, the special canonical status has failed to end the schism among the Orthodox, and has not drawn the millions of Ukrainian Greco-Catholics back to Orthodoxy. Ecclesiologically, it is fair to ask if there is a discernable difference between autonomous, autocephalous, and “broad autonomy” in terms of the most optimal benefit for the life of the local and universal Churches.

Orthodoxy today faces a geopolitical landscape that has drastically changed and continues to rapidly evolve, and the machines of the past are ill-equipped to effectively and pastorally address the contemporary situation of the Church’s life. Consequently, I would like to suggest that a new foundation be

laid for autocephaly that is rooted in the eucharistic ecclesiology of the local Church. In such a system, autocephaly would hypothetically provide the local Church the freedom required to pastorally address the issues it confronts while being confirmed by its eucharistic union with its sister churches in the Orthodox communion. This revised model would be better equipped, in my opinion, to address the serious issues confronting Orthodoxy today as exposed by the tragic ecclesial fractures in Ukraine.



Резюме

У статті аналізується перетин „церкви” та „держави” в Україні та труднощі ситуації, в якій задіяні як церковні, так і політичні діячі. Серед основних питань: Росія та Україна в контексті глобалізації; Українська Православна Церква Московського Патріархату; Українська Автокефальна Православна Церква (перед- та повоєнні розколи); Українська Греко-Католицька Церква та Українська Православна Церква Київського Патріархату. Ускладнення відносин між цими церквами, а також між самими державами є новою богословсько-політичною ідеологією під назвою „Російський світ,” яку підтримує теперішній Московський Патріарх Кирил. Ця ідеологія має на меті об’єднати принаймні східнослов’янське Православ’я (а бажано й інші Православні Церкви) і їхні країни проти загроз із боку „західної” глобалізації. Цей „Російський світ” аналізується тут на основі того, що він говорить, які реакції він викликає у чотирьох найбільших Церков України, що він може знаменувати для православних християн в Україні, оскільки відносини між Москвою та Константинополем відзначаються безперервною боротьбою за розуміння глобальної першості серед православних ієрархів.