

**THE UKRAINIAN ORTHODOX AUTOCEPHALOUS MOVEMENT
DURING THE YEARS OF GERMAN OCCUPATION**

*Andrii Smyrnov**

Abstract

The article deals with the development of the Ukrainian autocephalous movement during the German-Soviet War. The subsequent German occupation of Ukraine led to a spontaneous revival in church life. The Archbishop Oleksii Hromadskyi created the Autonomous Orthodox Church under the Moscow Patriarchate. The Metropolitan Dionisii Valedynskyi of Warsaw gave his blessing for the establishment of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church and designated Archbishop Polikarp Sikorskyi as administrator of the church. In February 1942 Sikorsky consecrated the first two bishops of the UAOC on Ukrainian territory (Nykanor Abramovych and Ihor Huba), and in May 1942 the Kyiv Council of UAOC bishops elected Dionisii as locum tenens of the Metropolitan See of Kyiv. It should be emphasized that the hierarchs of both jurisdictions were forced to sign archpastoral appeals containing obeisance towards the occupiers, to pray for the German authorities and army during worships, and to encourage young people to go and work in Germany. The UAOC of the 1940s is not a sectarian and collaboracionist group, but an independent Church with canonical bishops, which through the Warsaw Metropolitanate was in eucharistic communion with other local churches.

Key words: *the Orthodox Church, autocephaly, hierarchy, canonicity, occupation*

Introduction

Throughout the XX century, the autocephaly was a kind of apple of discord in Ukraine's Orthodox Church. This applies to autocephaly both proclaimed in 1921 by the Local Council of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church (UAOC) in Kyiv, and the Polish Autocephaly granted by the Tomos of the Ecumenical Patriarch of Constantinople to the Orthodox Church in Poland (where most of the Orthodox parishes were Ukrainian) in 1924. During the Second World War, the issue of the ways to achieve autocephaly came to the forefront in Ukraine, which also caused an institutional split within the Orthodox Church. The development of the Ukrainian movement for autocephaly during the period of German occupation remains a poorly researched page in the history of Ukrainian Orthodoxy. It is necessary to analyze more deeply the historical myths and stereotypes used to describe the Ukrainian autocephalous movement, around which clichés were formed both by Soviet propaganda ("UAOC is a true servant of fascism") and the Church ("UAOC is a non-canonical, schismatic, self-consecrated trend"), which has been circulating in public discourse up to now.

The process of constitution of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church of 1942 was closely linked to the activities of the Ukrainian intelligentsia that rejected the possibility of subjection of the Orthodox parishes of Ukraine to the Moscow

* Associate Professor, PhD, The National University of Ostroh Academy, Faculty of International Relations, Department of History, No. 2, Seminarska Street, Ostroh, Ukraine, Phone: +380961011112. Email: andrii.smyrnov@oa.edu.ua.

Patriarchate. Immediately after the establishment of the German occupation authorities, many regions of Ukraine saw self-governing social and religious organizations spontaneously arising; they were often called parochial initiative groups or church commissions. In big cities, as a rule, they used to be called *Church Councils*. By the end of 1941, there were already eight diocesan church councils in the cities of Ukraine. Former ministers and Orthodox intellectuals, who were the majority in their composition, took care of the premises for worship and everything else needed to set up a full parish life (Stokolos, 2003: 317).

In the autumn of 1941, the Ukrainian Church Council in Rivne was formed under the leadership of Ivan Karnaukhov, a lawyer and activist in the Ukrainian National Republic, whose activity was rather skeptically referred to by Yu. Mulyk-Lutsyk, an active participant in those events (Savchuk & Mulyk-Lutsyk, 1984: 498).

The idea of autocephaly of the Orthodox Church in Ukraine was also supported by the Ukrainian Council of Trust in Volhynia (UCTV). One of the main issues of particular concern at the meeting of August 31 and September 1, 1941, was the situation of Orthodoxy in Volhynia and liberated Ukrainian territories. The participants of the meeting supported the resolution which emphasized as indisputable the idea that in Ukraine the church, as a powerful factor in the national-religious and moral education of the people, should be national and Ukrainian. Such a condition can be achieved by the Orthodox Church only if it is independent, and autocephalous. Relying on the law of January 1, 1919, as a state act that established the autocephaly of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church (UOC), the UCTV argued that the center of the church authority of an independent church cannot be in the hands of a foreign hierarchy that is not of the same blood and is situated outside the national territory. That is why the Council strongly opposed the idea of UOC remaining under the jurisdiction of the Moscow Patriarchate or of the Metropolitanate of Warsaw. By the time of convocation of the All-Ukrainian Church Council, the participants of the meeting considered it necessary to elect a Provisional Administration of the UOC in the liberated territories, which would maintain records of the Church ensuring its national character and would also convene a Council in Kyiv (Smyrnov, 2009: 112-113).

There was also enthusiasm about the autocephaly among the inhabitants of the Kharkiv region. In particular, the church committee at the Kharkiv Public Committee, after discussing church policy in the occupied territory on November 20, 1941, adopted a decree, according to which "... in Ukraine there should be a single Church, autocephalous, based on the principle of territory and statehood rather than territory and ethnicity. Ukraine is a state in which there is the Ukrainian Autocephalous Church" (Voloshyn, 1997: 43).

The euphoria of the first months of the German occupation intensified national and religious processes; initiating within the Ukrainian intelligentsia a desire to create a UAOC, which would be entirely independent of any foreign religious center. However, while the supporters of autocephaly were debating for a considerable time and condemning the activities of their opponents, the most favorable time for the establishment of the UAOC was missed.

On August 18, 1941, at the regional Council in Pochaiv, archbishops Oleksii Hromadskyi, Symon Ivanovskyi, Panteleimon Rudyk and Veniamin Novytskyi

proclaimed the creation of the Autonomous Orthodox Church (AOC) as part of the Moscow Patriarchate headed by Archbishop Oleksii. They decided to base their activity on the principles of autonomy that had been sanctioned by Patriarch Tikhon and the All-Russian Bishops' Council of the Russian Orthodox Church (ROC) in 1918. According to the decision of this Council, only the election of the ruling metropolitan of Kiev and Galicia had to be approved by the Patriarch of Moscow. In everything else, the Orthodox Church in Ukraine was given complete independence. Therefore, the AOC used its canonical ties with the Moscow Patriarchy only as a nominal cover, and there were no official contacts during the occupation period. According to the Canadian historian Oleh Gerus, Archbishop Oleksii viewed his connection with Moscow as a necessary tactical formality to avoid accusations of non-canoncity (Gerus, 1985-1989: 102). In fact, the Pochaiv resolutions being recognized neither by Warsaw nor by Moscow, marked the beginning of the institutional split in Ukrainian Orthodoxy during the war years.

The relationship of the UAOC with the Warsaw Metropolitanate

Today, most researchers associate the founding of the UAOC in 1942 with the so-called decree of the Warsaw Metropolitan Dionisii Valedynskyi that was promulgated on the 24th of December, 1941. In his letter to Archbishop Polikarp Sikorskyi, he stated: "At the request of Orthodox Church Councils of Volhynia from this December 14, I decided to create the Temporary Administration of our Holy Autocephalous Orthodox Church in the liberated Ukrainian lands. I appoint your Excellency to be the Temporary Administrator, and I ask you to cooperate with His Eminence Archbishop Olexandr. I ask you to inform me immediately about all your projects and orders to provide them with the final canonical sanction" (AWMP; Smyrnov, 2009: 257–259). The creation of the Administration of Warsaw Metropolitanate during the war initiated the process of the institutionalization of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church in the Ukrainian lands. In the Ukrainian church historiography, the term "UAOC of 1942" is commonly used to define this ecclesial structure. It was often used by historian Ivan Vlasovskyi in his writings as opposed to the term "UAOC of 1921" (Vlasovsky, 1998: 365, 371).

As for the relations with the Warsaw Metropolitanate, in his opinion, the jurisdiction of Metropolitan Dionisii "was reduced to the spiritual guardianship over the Ukrainian autocephalous (de facto) Church" (Vlasovsky, 1998: 226). The official Primate of the Ukrainian Church, Metropolitan Dionisii, was not able to fulfill canonical hierarchical functions. Therefore, even though the UAOC formally remained within the Orthodox Church in the Generalgouvernement, it can be considered a self-contained ecclesiastical body with its Council of Bishops wherein Archbishop Polikarp Sikorskyi as administrator.

I. Vlasovskyi also notes that on July 28, 1942, the UAOC Administration sent the "Temporary Statute of the Orthodox Autocephalous Ukrainian Church" to the Reichskommissariat, and provides a detailed description of this document (Vlasovsky, 1998: 226-227). A copy of the Statute that guided the activities of the UAOC prior to the convening of the first Local Council can be found in the Archives of the Warsaw Metropolitanate. Certain provisions of the document which I. Vlasovskyi passed over,

are worthy of attention. First, as it stated, the Church “in its internal life enjoys the full freedom of government within the limits of the state legislation, and in particular, of this statute.” Second, the administrating Bishop “enjoys the rights of the regional Metropolitan, that is, according to Apostolic Canon 34 he is the first Bishop, its supreme governor and representative in all external and internal relations of the Church.” (AWMP). Thus, the latter gives grounds to assert that the leaders of the national religious movement saw their Church as being local and independent since without an independent Bishop there could not be autocephaly.

At the same time, from the point of view of the canonical law, the UAOC was only a brand. Legally, its canonical status was more similar to autonomy. Unlike the 1920s, autocephaly was never proclaimed in the 1940s, as Ukraine did not have its own statehood. As can be seen from the decree and other historical sources, all major events in the life of the Church, in particular the creation of the hierarchy of the UAOC, took place with the blessing of the canonical leader, the Warsaw Metropolitan Dionisii, whose name was to be mentioned by bishops in all the cathedrals of the UAOC.

The bishops realized that the vulnerability of UAOC’s canonical status required ecumenical recognition, which is why on December 18, 1942, Archbishop Nikanor Abramovych wrote to Metropolitan Dionisii Valedynskyi: “Your Excellency, would you not consider it timely and appropriate to introduce the Ukrainian Orthodox Church to other sister churches as an equal autocephalous unit. At the same time, as it is obvious, that you, as the First Hierarch and the head of our mother's church, ought to bless the Ukrainian Orthodox Church for the autocephalous life until the “red patriarch” has blessed it for our Moscow breakaway section.” (AWMP).

Back in late December 1941, Archbishop Palladii Vydybida-Rudenko stated that due to the lack of Ukrainian statehood, Fanar would not dare to grant autocephaly to the Ukrainian Church. Only Valedynskyi, having declared himself Metropolitan of Kyiv and all Ukraine, can help in this matter (CSAPOU). In his turn, the Metropolitan of Warsaw made known that the Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople is watching with great interest events in the church life of Ukraine and supports the “church-canonical policy” of Dionisii. The latter insisted that autocephaly should only be obtained in a canonical way on the basis of the patriarchal and synodal-canonical *Tomos* of the Ecumenical Patriarchate of 1924, but did not propose any model for the constitution of the Ukrainian Church, as he was waiting for the end of the war (AWMP). Furthermore, Fr. T. Minenko believed, it was the different views of the Orthodox hierarchs on the autocephaly of the Polish Church that became the center of discrepancies and the true cause of the institutional split in Ukrainian Orthodoxy. Dionisii, Hilarion and Oleksii were also inclined to accept that the different views on autocephaly led to antagonistic conceptions during the Church's revival in Ukraine.

Formation of the canonical episcopate and admission of “Lypkivtsi”

The new UAOC relied on the ideologeme of a sustainable development scenario within the Ukrainian Christian community, that recognized the priority of the traditional canonical formation of the episcopate. It renounced the modernizations of the Church in the 1920's and constantly competed with the AOC headed by

Metropolitan Oleksii Hromadskyi, who was positioned as part of the Moscow Patriarchate, but had no connections with it. This long-standing confrontation within Ukrainian Orthodoxy should be regarded as the most consistent and institutionalized conflict of identities in the search for corresponding models of a canonical system. The cardinal political transformations in the modern history of Ukraine inevitably led to the elevation of elements not assimilated by Russian Orthodoxy and the actualization of the problem of the independence of the Orthodox Church in Ukraine. This kind of process took place during the two world wars, as well as during the collapse of the USSR. It is opportune to note that the centrifugal tendencies in Orthodoxy during the Second World War were observed not only in Ukraine but also in Belarus, Georgia, Estonia, Macedonia, Finland, and Croatia (Smyrnov, 2009: 150).

One of the most serious challenges for the UAOC was a catastrophic shortage of bishops. Autocephalists were represented only by Archbishop Polikarp, and the German authorities banned the hierarchs of the Generalgouvernement from visiting Ukraine. Fr. Ilarion Brendzan, the head of the Ukrainian parish in France, was repeatedly considered as a candidate to the position of a Bishop. However, this plan was not implemented due to his illness. The situation on the ground was so critical that Kyiv's "Lypkivtsi" threatened to repeat the 1921 act of ordaining the Bishop, and the Kherson clergy was also ready to send their candidate for episcopal ordination into one of the Orthodox countries of Southeastern Europe (SAKR: 110-110zv; CSASBPGU: 26-26zv).

In this connection, in February 1942 in Pinsk, Archbishop Polikarp, with the help of Olexandr Inozemtsev, the Archbishop of Pinsk and Polissia, initiated the ordaining of bishops for the Ukrainian Church. The first to be ordained were Nykanor Abramovych and Ihor Huba. In May 1942, a new group of hierarchs were consecrated in Kyiv during the Bishops' Council of the UAOC. One of them was Stepan Skrypnyk, the Ambassador to the Polish Sejm from Volhynia in the 1930's, and the future First Hierarch of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church in the United States, the first Patriarch of Kyiv and All Ukraine Mstyslav. The Kyiv Council validated the recognition of the Metropolitan Dionisii Valedynskyi as the Locum tenens of the Kyiv Metropolitan Throne. The protocols of the hierarchical ordination were sent to the Warsaw Metropolitan, and he approved them in his letter dated June 16, 1942 (Vlasovsky, 1998: 223).

Modern Russian religious historiography continues to use the slogans of Soviet propaganda about the non-canonical and graceless nature of the UAOC's hierarchy. Back in 1972, the Moscow Patriarch Pimen in a letter to the Ecumenical Patriarch Athenagoras categorically declared: "Mstyslav Skrypnyk obtained the illegal "Episcopal ordination" in May 1942 in Kiev from "bishops" Ihor Huba and Nykanor Abramovych who were ordained in the same non-canonical way (Ap.35), as their ordination was headed by the schismatic defrocked "bishop" Polikarp Sikorskyi" (Zinkevych & Voronyn, 1987: 664). This thesis was repeatedly stressed by the highest hierarchs of the Russian Orthodox Church.

An attempt to establish the theological and historical justification for the non-canonical nature of the Episcopate of the UAOC was made by the Russian explorer Vladislav Petrushko. However, his arguments are rather tendentious and often

remindful of well-known ideological stamps, such as: “UAOC became the ideological inspirer of the atrocities of Ukrainian separatists, aimed, first of all, against their own people”. The author bases his poorly convincing arguments on the popular myth that in 1940, Bishop Polikarp together with all Orthodox bishops of Western Ukraine and Western Belarus became subordinate to the ROC (<http://archive.li/uU5P>).

Nowadays it is well known that neither Oleksandr Inozemtsev, Archbishop of Polissia and Pinsk, nor Polikarp Sikorskyi, bishop of Lutsk, went to Moscow for the execution of a “prayer-canonical union with the Mother Church of Moscow” nor to sign any written declarations about it. Due to such disloyalty, the first was dismissed, and the other was out of reach to be punished (Mironowicz, 2005: 224; Stokolos, 2003: 291).

Very often, even in the works of such serious authors as the Russian scholar M. Shkarovsky, it is possible to read that the UAOC consecrated married priests to be bishops because it allegedly did not have its own monasteries (Shkarovsky, 2007: 450). In fact, all candidates for the episcopacy without exception took monastic vows, as evidenced by their obtaining a new name. And if, for example, the bishop of Taurida, Serhii Okhotenko did not change it, that was only because on accepting monasticism in 1919, he retained his previous name. Here it is worth recalling that the monasteries of Derman and Bilivski Khutory in Volhynia belonged to the UAOC.

Thus, the analysis of historical sources does not support charges of noncanonical episcopal ordinations of hierarchs of the UAOC. It is worth remembering that after the war when in the ROC, the question arose what to do with Yurii Korenistov, who had become the Bishop of Brest at Pinsk Council, it was decided after some reflection that he was to be admitted to the Moscow Patriarchate without reordination. In 1995, all clergy of the UOC in the United States coming from Metropolitan Mstyslav, without any reservations became a part of the Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople. Therefore, the validity of their episcopal ordinations should not cause any doubts. Emigrating to the West through Warsaw, in May 1944, all the bishops of the UAOC received special certificates from Metropolitan Dionisii, which stated that they had received canonical ordination with his blessing and, being in canonical unity with him and the holy Orthodox patriarchs, they, “belong to the episcopate of the Holy Ecumenical Orthodox Church” (Dublianskyi, 1962: 46).

Russian historians also blame autocephalists for the admission of the UAOC clerics in 1921 “into their existing rank” (Pospelovsky, 1995: 212). Indeed, such a decision was made at the Council of Pinsk, but, as Bishop Nykanor mentioned, the admission of the “Lypkivtsi” clergy was made through a special procedure of chirotesy. The formal basis for the admission of “lypkivtsi” clergy was Apostolic rule 52, that is based on repentance (Zinkevych & Voronyn, 1987: 687). Archbishop Ihor Isichenko, referring to Fr. Tymofii Minenko claims that under the “existing rank” they meant a rank in which clergy or laity joined the UAOC of Metropolitan Vasyl Lypkivskyi. According to the memoirs of the then church figures and the preservation of the accession of the “Lypkivtsi”, the bishop accepted the confession, read a decisive prayer, and then spoke the formula of ordination, “Divine Grace which always heals the sick and supplies what is missing...” (UAA). Autonomists saw this as a departure from Orthodox sacramental practice, that does not permit the

combination of the sacraments of repentance and conscience, however, it was in this way that the “Lypkivtsi” clergy’s consecration “was completed.”

As for Yurii Teslenko and Mykhailo Maliarevskyi, bishops of the UAOC of 1921, we know very little about their activities during the German occupation. According to Fr. Mytrofan Yavdas, they simply refused to repeat the procedure of consecration. Mykhailo Maliarevskyi agreed to conduct worship services with the status of a priest and served as a protopriest in Vasylkiv, near Kyiv. It is also known that Yosyf Oksiuk renounced his priesthood and served punishment in Kolyma until 1945. Metropolitan Dionisii had a wary attitude towards married bishops and refused to admit them “into the existing rank.”

“Lypkivtsi” clergy as a whole were never deemed heretical. Therefore the admission of these clerics to the fold of the Orthodox Church does not seem to be anticanonical, and any succession of the two Autocephalous hierarchies is not the subject of discussion. A vivid confirmation of this is the reconsecration of the last “Lypkivtsi” bishop John Teodorovich, which on August 27, 1949, was carried out by Archbishop Mstyslav Skrypnyk and exarch of the Alexandrian Patriarchate in America, Metropolitan Christopher Contogeorgios. In this regard, it is desirable to avoid exploiting the so-called concept of the three revivals of the UAOC, since it does not correspond to historical reality.

Collaboration with Germans

The main element of the Soviet propaganda aimed against the autocephalous movement was the constant accusation of their collaboration with the Nazis. The topic of Ukrainian collaboration is reflected in the works of Ukrainian and foreign historians. At the same time, the diversity of manifestations, ambiguity and contradictory nature of the phenomenon of collaborationism make it difficult to objectively study and comprehend the socioeconomic and socio-cultural life of the population in the territories occupied by the Nazis and causes some uncertainty and politicization of the very definition of Ukrainian collaborationism. The definition delineates the limits of what behavior is considered collaboration and what is not. It remains debatable whether collaboration was undertaken in the service of the German occupation administration or only due to excessive zeal in this service. Does the collaboration include the work undertaken in assisting committees, publishing houses, church institutions, public organizations? (Motyka, 2002: 211-213).

In this context, it is worth mentioning K. Berkhoff’s advisement to refrain from using the words “collaboration” and “collaborator.” The author rightly points that these words always have the connotation of “betrayal” (Berkhoff, 2004: 4-5) However, if K. Berkhoff tends to avoid the term “collaboration” (which supposedly removes the problem of finding out the whole discourse around it), O. Melnyk seeks to interpret it historically, showing the specificity of its usage in various ideological and socio-political contexts. This approach also involves paying attention to the personality of individual “collaborators” and to the local context in which these people acted. According to O. Melnyk, “in addition to enriching our understanding of the problems of everyday life in Europe under Nazi occupation, such a perspective will help to get rid of the political unidimensionality of the politically colored terms of “resistance”

and “collaboration”, and make more apparent the inadequacy of our present conceptual apparatus” (Melnyk, 2008: 282). It needs to be made more obvious that when considering the activities of each collaborator, it should be found out whether he or she personally did or didn't commit war crimes or crimes against humanity.

Returning to the UAOC, it is worth noting that it was supported by the Germans only till the spring of 1942. Afterwards they began to carry out an equidistant policy, and gradually the Autonomous Orthodox Church became a favorite (Berkhoff, 2002: 536-540; Heyer, 1953: 212-218). It should be emphasized that the hierarchs of both jurisdictions were forced to sign archpastoral appeals containing obeisance towards the occupiers, to pray for the German authorities and army during worships, and to encourage young people to go and work in Germany. Undoubtedly, these were “forced steps” taken in the struggle for survival after being caught between “the devil and the deep blue sea.” During this time the most persecuted by Hitlerians were autocephalous bishops, in particular, Mstyslav Skrypnyk, Hryhorii Ohiichuk, and Fotii Tymoshchuk, who even had been in German custody for some time.

Ukrainian historians Y. Voloshyn and V. Pashchenko do not rule out that many UAOC clerics who were opponents of the Soviet power, either voluntarily or involuntarily actively collaborated with the Nazis (Voloshyn & Pashchenko, 1996: 21). According to H. Fireside, they were a distinct minority: “In the Ukraine they appear to have been limited to a few of the “carpetbaggers” who had been funneled into the province by Bishops Seraphim, Polikarp, and Hilarion and who had been given their marching orders by Ostministerium officials intending them to be a fifth column for the takeover of the church and initially promoted by the Reichskommissariat in aid of its divisive policies” (Fireside, 1971: 155).

The Collaborationism of UAOC

Analyzing the relationship between the autocephalous clergy and the German occupation authorities, one can hardly agree with the categorical interpretation of their collaborationism as a “treacherous step.” They had to maintain contact with the Nazis, to make favorable mention of the German government during worship services, to publish Pro-Nazi materials in the press, and to sign the pastoral addresses with obeisance towards the occupiers. In particular, we should mention the telegram from Bishops Nykanor, Ihor and Mstyslav to Hitler on June 22, 1942, in which they supported the cause of “defense of the honor of the German people and the liberation of mankind from godless Jewish-communist enslavement” (SAKR: 74; CSASBPGU. F. 4398. Op. 1. Spr. 4. Ark. 180). Back in 1941, Archbishop Polikarp blessed his parishes and urged its members to pray during the liturgy for the authorities in accordance with the following formula: “The Supreme Leader of the German people, the High Government and his Christ-loving army may be remembered by the Lord...” (AWMP). On May 16, 1942, Polikarp published an appeal to the flock, encouraging young people to go to work in Germany: “At the call of the German authorities to leave for work in Germany, the Ukrainian people must massively respond, considering it as their sacred duty and honor to give them a worker for the anti-communist front of labor. I call on my flock for this; and to all the honest clergy I also ask them to explain to their parishioners all the favorable conditions and

rewards, which will benefit not only the workers in Germany but will also enable them to provide for their families that remain in place. May the Ukrainian peasantry and workers know that with their intense work, both at home and in Germany, in these great historical times, they will contribute to a better future of the whole of Ukraine” (SAVR). Undoubtedly, these were forced steps in order to survive and support the national movement under the occupation regime.

The former Autocephalous Bishop Manuil Tarnavskiy, who moved to the jurisdiction of the Autonomous Orthodox Church, was executed by the Security Service of the Ukrainian Insurgent Army for writing denunciations to the Gestapo on Ukrainian activists in Volodymyr-Volynskiy. Deprived of his rank, Fotii Tymoshchuk, the Bishop of Zhytomyr and Vinnytsia, received support from the General Commissioner E. Leiser, who acknowledged him as “the highest representative of the Autocephalous Orthodox Church.” However, having refused to cooperate with the Gestapo, he spent nine months in Zhytomyr prison. In March 1944 he was recruited by the People's Commissariat of State Security for the operational work on priests; later he was sentenced to 10 years in labor camps (SSASSU. F. 6. Op. 1. Spr. 75682fp. Ark. 127).

The autonomists' attitude towards the occupiers

For the sake of justice, it should be noted that representatives of the AOC also cooperated with the German occupation administration. In particular, in September 1941, during the mass pilgrimage to Pochaiv, Archbishop Oleksii prayed for Hitler and the German army. In his sermon, he “demanded that they always remember in their prayers the Führer, the most brilliant leader of today, and the German people. The blood sacrifice of the German people should never be forgotten. He and all Ukrainians, he said, wanted the intentions and thoughts of the Führer to be realized in full.” (Berkhoff, 2002: 536-540). According to Bishop Pankratii Gladkov, at the end of 1941, the Pochaiiv Lavra donated the German army 100,000 kilograms of apples, honey, and other products (SSASSU. F. 6. Op. 1. Spr. 75633fp. Ark. 23). The dean of the cathedral in Zhytomir Fr. Yosyf Yakubovskiy gave the police a list of 250 to 300 Jews who wanted to be baptized. After that, they were executed (SSASSU. F. 6. Op. 1. Spr. 71152fp. Ark. 26-27, 34).

In May of 1943, Panteleimon Rudyk, the Administrator of the Kyiv Eparchy of AOC, posted a message “Against the Anarchy of the Evil Spirit” where he emphasized: “*The great German people, led by its Führer, has taken upon itself leadership in the present-day holy war against the bloody violators and enemies of all mankind. This struggle has as its aim the liberation not only of our Ukraine but of all of Europe from the Red serpent that is shedding the blood of innocent and defenseless people, bringing physical and spiritual slavery, injustice and death. It is our duty to help our liberators in any way that we can, above all with conscientious labour, honest observance of all of the authorities' orders and maintenance of order*” (SSASSU. F. 13. Spr. 376. T. 84. Ark. 10-10zv).

In the years of occupation, the priest was in a difficult situation, feeling pressured both by the occupation authorities and by the nationalist and Soviet underground. Therefore, each pastor chose his own model of behavior, which was determined by his convictions, life experiences, general culture, and so on. Newspapers of that time,

especially during the first months of occupation, were stuffed with a number of open letters, appeals, notes, in which the highest clergy expressed their sympathy with the German authorities. The question of how much they corresponded with the true views of the Orthodox hierarchs and influenced the formation of the position of the parish priesthood is rather controversial.

After registering their activities with the occupation authorities on the ground, a large part of the clergy was forced to sign the “the vow of obedience” to the new authorities. Also, the occupiers scrutinized the pastors, recruited informants among their own entourage, who monitored the accuracy of their following the government decrees. However, according to German documents, parish clergy often tried to circumvent the prescripts of the authorities or complied with them “only partially.” The occupiers considered that the main reason for such actions was the negative evaluation of certain “pro-government sermons” of the priests by their congregation. In the first place, these were appeals to help the German Army in the regions where most of the men, sons, and brothers of the parishioners had been mobilized into the Red Army, and to “voluntary consent to leave for Germany.” In such areas, Church attendance declined, and the authority of the priest drastically reduced.

It should be emphasized that often, in private conversations, the failure to obey or partial compliance with government orders was explained by the clergy with their inconsistency with Christian traditions and norms. This was particularly evident in the attitude of the Orthodox clergy towards the destruction of the Jewish population by the occupiers. Despite the prohibition, the priests continued practicing the sacrament of baptizing Jews and giving them Christian names, which greatly complicated the definition of the nationality of the baptized.

Conclusions

Thus, the UAOC of the 1940s is not a sectarian and collaboracionist group, but an independent Church with canonical bishops, which through the Warsaw Metropolitanate was in eucharistic communion with other local churches except the Moscow Patriarchate, which up to 1948, did not recognize the Polish autocephaly. The only one hierarch of the UAOC of 1942, Bishop Mstyslav Skrypnyk returned to Ukraine and was directly involved in the revival of the Autocephalous Church and its new episcopate.

The restoration of the Soviet power led to the destruction of the UAOC and the AOC and the incorporation of their institutional structures into the Moscow Patriarchate. Deprived of the spiritual guidance, isolated from the Diasporic Churches and persecuted by the punitive and repressive system, the autocephalists, unlike the Greek Catholics, were unable to preserve their Church in the underground and were doomed to disappear from the religious map of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic.

References

AWMP (Archiwum Warszawskiej Metropolii Prawosławnej). Sygn. 1151-RII-6D (Cerkiew ukraińska w latach 1939-1944).

Berkhoff, K. (2002). Was There a Religious Revival in Soviet Ukraine under the Nazi Regime? *The Slavonic and East European Review*. Vol. 78, No. 3, 536-540.

- Berkhoff, K. (2004). *Harvest of the Despair: Life and Death in the Ukraine under Nazi Rule*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- CSAPOU (Central State Archives of Public Organizations of Ukraine). F. 269. Op. 1. Spr. 341. Ark. 28–30.
- CSASBPGU (Central State Archives of Supreme Bodies of Power and Government of Ukraine). F. 3676. Op. 1. Spr. 50. 360 ark.
- CSASBPGU. F. 4398. Op. 1. Spr. 4. Ark. 180.
- Dublianskiy, A. (1962). *Thorny Path: Metropolitan Nikanor Abramovich's Life*. London: UAPC.
- Fireside, H. (1971). *Icon and swastika: The Russian Orthodox Church under Nazi and Soviet Control*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Gerus, O. (1985-1989). The Ukrainian Orthodox Church during World War II: Archbishop Ilarion Ohienko and Politics of Religion. *Faith and Culture*, 7, 83-120.
- Heyer, F. (1953). *Die Orthodoxe Kirche in der Ukraine: von 1917 bis 1945*. Köln-Braunsfeld: Müller.
- Melnyk, O. (2008). The harvest of historiography. *Ukraina Moderna*, 13, 266-289.
- Mironowicz, A. (2005). *Kościół prawosławny na ziemiach polskich w XIX i XX wieku*. Białystok: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu w Białymstoku.
- Motyka, G. (2002). Problem polskiej i ukraińskiej kolaboracji w czasie II wojny światowej. *Polska – Ukraina: trudne pytania*, 9, 211-227.
- Petrushko, V. (2009). Autocephalous divisions in Ukraine, and the problem of its overcoming: the canonical dimension. Retrieved February 16 2019, from <http://archive.li/uU5P>.
- Pospelovsky, D. (1995). *Russian Orthodox Church in the 20th century*. Moscow: Respublika.
- SAKR (State Archive of the Kyiv region). F. 2412. Op. 2. Spr. 199. 174 ark.
- Savchuk, S. & Mulyk-Lutsyk, Yu. (1984). *The History of the Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church in Canada*. Winnipeg. Vol. 1.
- SAVR (State Archive of the Volyn region). F. R-69. Op. 1. Spr. 310. Ark. 3.
- Shkarovsky, M. (2007). *Cross and swastika. Nazi Germany and the Orthodox Church*. Moscow: Veche.
- Smyrnov, A. (2009). *Mstyslav (Skrypnyk): Public, Political, and Church figure, 1930-1944*. Kyiv: Smoloskyp.
- SSASSU (Sectoral State Archive of the Security Service of Ukraine). F. 6. Op. 1. Spr. 75682fp. Ark. 127.
- SSASSU. F. 13. Spr. 376. T. 84. Ark. 10-10zv.
- SSASSU. F. 6. Op. 1. Spr. 71152fp. Ark. 26-27, 34.
- SSASSU. F. 6. Op. 1. Spr. 75633fp. Ark. 23.
- Stokolos, N. (2003). *Confessional and ethnic transformations in Ukraine, XIX – first half of the XXth c.* Rivne: Lista.
- UAA (University of Alberta Archives). Minenko Collection. Box 6. Item 234.
- Vlasovsky, I. (1998). *Outline history of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church*. Kyiv. Vol. 4. P. 2.
- Voloshyn, Yu. & Pashchenko, V. (1996). Between a rock and a hard place. *Human and the world*, 6, 18-21.
- Voloshyn, Yu. (1997). *Ukrainian Orthodox Church during Nazi occupation, 1941-1944*. Poltava: Instytut.
- Zinkevych, O. & Voronyn, O. (1987). *The martyrdom of the Ukrainian Churches*. Toronto-Baltimore. V.1. Ukrainian Orthodox Church.

