

нее, цивилизационная значимость многих решений Европейского суда относительно обеспечения свободы вероисповедания представляется неоспоримой.

Література:

1. Résolution de l'Assemblée parlementaire du Conseil de l'Europe № 1928 (2013) du 24 avril 2013 «Sauvegarder les droits de l'homme en relation avec la religion et la conviction et protéger les communautés religieuses de la violence». Перевод А.И. Понкиной //Электронный ресурс. Режим доступа: <http://strasbourg-reor.org/?topicid=1047>. – П. 9.8, 9.9.
2. UN Doc. A/HRC/RES/16/3.
3. UN Doc. A/HRC/21/53 . – Para. 85.
4. Кардиа К. Европейская религиозная и культурная идентичность: вопрос о распытии: вопрос о распытии. – Центр книги Рудомино, 2011. – 158 с.
5. Вентура М. Право и религия вне национальных границ: положительное значение Европейского суда по правам человека / М. Вентура // Государство, религия, церковь в России и за рубежом. – 2013. – № 2. – С. 177–212.
6. Grand Chamber. Case of Lautsi and others v. Italy. Application no. 30814/06. Judgment. Strasbourg. 18 March 2011. – Para. 77.
7. Lautsi and others v. Italy / Judgment – Separate Opinions Concurring opinion of Judge Bonello. – Paras. 2.3 – 2.6.
8. Eweida and others v. the United Kingdom. Applications №№ 48420/10, 59842/10, 51671/10 and 36516/10. ECHR. Judgment of 15 January 2013 (Fourth Section). [Электронный ресурс]. – Режим доступа: <http://hudoc.echr.coe.int/sites/eng/pages/search.aspx?i=001-115881>.
9. Анниккино П. Между «пределами усмотрения» и нейтралитетом: дело «Лаутси» и новый баланс в сфере европейской защиты свободы вероисповедания //Государство, религия, церковь в России и за рубежом. – № 2. – 2013.

Vovk Dmytro Olexandrovych,

*PhD, Associate Professor
of the Theory of State and Law Department
Yaroslav the Wise National Law University*

ETHICS VERSUS POLITICS: UKRAINIAN CHURCHES' DOCTRINES ON FAMILY, GENDER AND SEXUALITY IN THE CONTEXT OF EUROINTEGRATION PROCESS

Democracy and same-sex marriages are, perhaps, the issues most often associated with European values in mass mind of Ukrainians (scholar and philosophical discourse is, certainly, much more sophisticated). Such vulgar jargon words as «Гейropa» (from Russian words «gey» (gay) and «Evropa» (Europe)) or «liberastia», where liberalism is mixed with homosexuality, are quite popular in ultraconservative circles as a means of mocking Western values and emphasizing moral collapse in contemporary European societies. In contrast, pro-Western intellectuals often speak, as

Austrian philosopher Boris Buden said, very «naively» about the rule of law and democratic procedures and about the need to take a step towards tolerance of sexual minorities. One may say that those questions seem to be integral indicators of ethical and political convictions of an individual, community, political party etc. If you support democracy, you are at least tolerant of sexual minorities. If you consider European democracy to be stagnating (famous formula of soviet propaganda), you are a radical opponent of same-sex marriages, positive discrimination in favor of women and so on.

Religion is a powerful actor in transitional societies (including the Ukrainian one) that, of course, cannot remain uninvolved with any important issues. Their doctrines and practices in ethical and political areas are ambivalent. On the one hand, churches and religious communities strive to establish their values. On the other, they cannot help adapting these values to social reality and their believers' expectations.

Hegel in his «Lectures on the Philosophy of Religion» wrote: «Religion, in the form of the Church, may act discreetly and be outwardly compliant, but in such a case the feeling of inconsistency enters into the mind of men». This thought seems to be wrong from historical point of view (at least if we examine the history of Christianity). The inconsistency of Christian churches in the secular space and in inter-religious dialogue (Catholic and Protestant Churches are meant here mostly), their desire to adapt to modern world through abolition of archaic dogmas or canceling old-fashion doctrines and approaches did give the churches a chance to remain in the public space. Of course, the said desire can repel some orthodox believers that are inclined to choose traditional, more conservative forms of religiosity, but not the ones that try to make concessions to secular society. However, it is rather a problem of finding a balance in renewing a religious tradition, but not an argument for rejection of such renewing.

The biggest Ukrainian churches – the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the Moscow Patriarchate (UOC-MP), the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the Kyivan Patriarchate (UOC-KP) and the Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church (UGCC) are rather conservative with regard to gender, sexuality, family ethics and so on. Briefly, those doctrines can be reduced to the following views:

- Condemnation of any sexual relations except for those people enter into while in marriage;
- Interpretation of homosexuality and any other kind of «non-traditional» sexuality as a mental illness or sexual perversion that results from moral collapse;

- Reproductive function of sexual relations and almost full rejection of any kind of contraception, abortion, in vitro fertilization (the orthodox churches and the UGCC have different views of this issue) etc.;
- Restriction of state interference with relations between parents and children and criticizing many aspects of children's rights doctrine;
- Necessity of state protection of social morality in churches' interpretation and establishment of special governmental agency in this area.

These ethical views formalized in some church inner documents and acts are not only based on and rooted in the sacral texts of Christianity that are, obviously, very far from gender equality or sexuality as a free choice, but meet the expectations of the main groups of their believers.

That is why the churches have almost no room for doctrinal or practical maneuver. Though they use human rights concept, their understanding of human dignity as a basis of human rights sufficiently differs from the secular understanding.

If secular dignity is a feature equally immanent to every human being, no matter good or evil, a criminal or a law-abiding citizen, a faithful spouse or a homewrecker. From the point of view of Christian churches dignity is manifested in yearning for God and, accordingly, following the rules established by them in His name. Rejection of these rules violates human dignity.

Freedom in terms of religion is freedom from sin, freedom, as Russian Orthodox philosopher Sergey Bulgakov wrote, to take the side of the good while choosing between the good and the evil. Choosing what the Christian religion and Christian churches consider to be the evil, individuals deprive themselves of freedom.

This is also true for the idea of legal equality, in particular, the equality of a man and a woman. The equality of people before God is post-legal (Otfried Höffe) or extra-legal (Jürgen Habermas), even now in Christian Orthodox doctrines it is not transferred directly from sacral to social dimension (though historical significance of this thesis for the development of legal equality doctrine is undoubted, which many authors wrote about, in particular, Bertrand Russell in «Marriage and Morals»).

Sexual distinctions are interpreted by churches as the differences in the nature of a man and a woman, which, as I mentioned above, results in the idea of *a priori* different social designation of the two sexes (by the way, this is one of the reasons why churches so rigidly object to ordination of women).

In practical area church dissents that are accompanied with former co-believers' accusations of «sex and homosexuality» propaganda (this argument was used by the religious community that separated from the UGCC a few years ago) clearly show the general mood of the most active

part of the flock and their readiness (or rather non-readiness) for any reforms.

The said doctrines have not been institutionalized at the level of legislation or court practice due to religious neutrality of the Ukrainian state and Ukrainian society's experience of soviet radical secularization. But the churches' doctrines are persistently looking for ways to ensure their influence in legal and political systems through different, sometimes weird, bills (e.g. the bill on prohibition of same-sex relations propaganda among the under-aged), formation of parliamentary groups declaring their devotion to Christian values and principles, protests against homosexuality, petitions to the government demanding that movies on LGBT problematic be banned (e.g. it happened to «Brüno»), support of governmental agencies, whose task is to protect public morality (the National Expert Commission of Ukraine on Protection of Public Morality, cancelled in 2015, enjoyed the churches' support during the whole period of its functioning) etc.

The churches are also important political players. Ukrainian Orthodox churches traditionally used to demonstrate maximum loyalty to the state and its bodies as well as to mighty political clans. This loyalty was exchanged for some benefits (tax, customs or utility rates privileges, selective restitution of church property nationalized during Soviet period, financial aid etc.). More distant UGCC, however, used to keep in touch with governmental institutions and local political establishment and preferred avoiding conflicts for the same reasons. Situation changed during mass protests of Ukrainians against the refusal on the part of President Victor Yanukovich's government to sign the Association Agreement between Ukraine and EU and the intention to switch to the pro-Russian vector of foreign policy instead of continuing the eurointegration process. Those protests were called «Euromaydan». They turned into a rebellion that led to the fall of Yanukovich's regime.

Euromaydan was the first serious conflict between the Ukrainian state and civil society when the churches took the side of the latter. The UOC-KP and the UGCC unequivocally backed the willingness of civil society to adhere to eurointegration policy. The UOC-MP's position was more ambiguous and caused controversy between the Russian and Ukrainian parties within the Church. Thus the churches constituted an important factor of eurointegration process going on.

At the same time the churches' support of Euromaydan resulted in an overt confrontation between their ethical teaching and political position. The Association Agreement, which Ukraine signed with the EU, requires respect for human rights, non-discrimination of people belonging to minorities and respect for diversity etc. Ukraine's progress along the European path is impossible without strengthening legislative, court and

administrative mechanisms for protection of LGBT-persons' rights and gender equality. The churches will have to respond to these processes under the pressure of believers and their own doctrines.

I believe two types of response are possible, both of them opposing these processes. The first type is the internal opposition, as I call it, where the churches as a part of the pluralistic and secular society will demand their view of family ethics, gender and sexuality issues be taken into account in public space along with all other views. The aim of inner opposition is to safeguard religious communities' autonomy in issues dealing with religious ethics in the context of human rights, and to ensure that voices of religious people can be heard. The other type is the external opposition where the churches following the Russian Orthodox Church Patriarch Kirill will qualify same-sex marriages as a symptom of the approach of the Apocalypse. The aim of external opposition is not to participate in public discourse but to fully incorporate the churches' ethics into state policy, legislation, court and administrative practices. However, the aim of external opposition, in my opinion, is no longer achievable, in particular, because of the political choice the Ukrainian churches made in the tragic winter of 2013-2014.

Лукьянов Дмитрий Васильевич,

кандидат юридических наук, доцент,

и.о. главного ученого секретаря

Национальной академии правовых наук Украины

ТЫ ВСЕ ЕЩЕ ШАРЛИ?

Цивилизационный выбор Украины после Революции достоинства и последовавшей внешней агрессией становится очевидным даже для тех, кто еще совсем недавно не мог определиться. Альтернативы европейской интеграции – политической, правовой, культурной на сегодняшний день не существует. В этой связи мы должны уже сейчас становиться частью европейского дискурса по наиболее актуальным проблемам развития, даже тем, которые еще не коснулись нас непосредственно.

Одной из наиболее обсуждаемых проблем в начале года стала трагедия во французском сатирическом журнале Шарли Эбдо, когда от выстрелов исламистов погибли 12 человек, включая ведущих журналистов и карикатуристов издания. Десятки тысяч людей по всей Европе вышли на митинги солидарности с журналистами и в поддержку свободы слова с лозунгом – «Я – Шарли».

Поводом для нападения стала неоднократная публикация на страницах издания карикатур на ислам, мусульман и Пророка Мухаммеда. Данный конфликт был далеко не единичен, он стал лишь