

CZECHOSLOVAKIA AND THE INTERFAITH CONFLICT BETWEEN GREEK CATHOLICS AND ORTHODOX IN SUBCARPATHIAN RUS

AN OVERVIEW OF THE CAUSES AND THE BEGINNING OF THE CRISIS

VIKTOR KICHERA

It should be noted that the Catholic Church in Czechoslovakia, according to Pavel Marek, perceived the Orthodox movement as the emergence of a new denomination in Czechoslovakia, and the mission of the Serbian bishop Dosyfei (Vasich) was perceived prejudiced and even negatively considering him as a “dissenter and Serbian emissary”.¹ At the same time, Pavel Marek identifies two ways of the appearance of the Orthodox in Czechoslovakia – those who convert before the First World War and organized themselves into the Church under the auspices of Savvatii (Vrabet) and the second – actually those who convert directly from the Catholic Church. Unfortunately, researchers have paid little attention to the eastern territories of the republic, including regional archives, as some researchers point out². In Subcarpathian Rus, it was even more difficult with the Orthodox Church, about what Yurii Danylets writes in more detail, allocating Orthodox priests of Constantinople jurisdiction – 25 priests and Serbian (about 40 priests) under the leadership of Archimandrite Oleksii Kabaliuk, which laid since 1923 the so-called “Savvatiivskyi schism” among the Orthodox.³ In general, Yurii Danylets,

-
- 1 Marek, Pavel: “Italská domácnost”. K vzájemným vztahům mezi křesťanskými církvemi na počátku první Československé republiky. In: Наукові Записки Богословсько-історичного науково-дослідного центру імені архімандрита Василя (Проніна), № 5. Ужгород 2018, s. 125–127.
 - 2 Місюк, Михайло – Вискварко, Сергій: Відродження Православної Церкви в 20–30-х рр XX століття (за документами фондів Державного архіву Закарпатської області). In: Наукові Записки Богословсько-історичного науково-дослідного центру імені архімандрита Василя (Проніна), № 2. Ужгород 2013, с. 65–66 с.
 - 3 Данилець, Юрій: Преподобний Алексій (Кабалюк) Карпаторуський сповідник (1. 9. 1877–2. 12. 1947). In: Сповідники та подвижники Православної Церкви на Закарпатті в XX ст. Авт. кол.: Ю. Данилець – голова авт. кол. та ін. Мукачево 2011, с. 20–21.

following Pavel Marek, presents the confrontation between Orthodox and Greek-Catholics as a “religious war.”⁴ But, before accepting this concept of “war,” this requires a deeper study of the documents of local archives – the actual causes and the process of confrontation itself.

The Bishop of the Mukachevo Greek-Catholic Diocese Anthony Papp took a principled position in protecting his own Church in interfaith relations, which greatly irritated the local and central authorities of the Czechoslovak Republic. On December 1, 1920, was received a memorandum signed by Bishop Anthony Papp on the persecution of the Greek-Catholic Church in Subcarpathian Rus. The bishop pointed out that political and religious agitators – bolsheviks, anarchists and moskvophiles agitate against the Greek-Catholic Church. This often happens with the passivity of local authorities and sometimes even with its help, is written in a memorandum. “Befuddled” people captured the estates of the Church and use them. 15 communities moved to another religious group. The bishop appeals to the law, because in 4 cases the law has been violated. For example, the community of village Velyki Luchky converted to Orthodoxy, but the building, the bishop pointed out, was not allowed to use. In the second paragraph, Bishop Papp insisted that the persecution of the Church is done by the current authorities. Sometimes priests left the village due to threats of destruction of property and death and live in poverty, because agitators did not allow giving salaries to the priest. Random people, sometimes are not even priests, illegally come to the state and begin to agitate against the Greek-Catholic Church. Diocesan authorities without a government is toothless against terror, which threatens the property of believers, noted the bishop Anthony Papp in his appeal. It is not normal in the state to capture churches, steal property and expel priests. According to the laws, the bishop pointed out, we ask and demand: 1. The churches and estates shall be returned to their rightful owners; 2. That the authorities vigorously counteract such things; 3. that bolshevik politicians and religious agitators expelled from the republic.⁵ Of course, the of Bishop Papp’s memorandum had a sharp shape, recalling more than once the involvement of the Orthodox, but in fact, the authorities in these cases did not administratively intervene in interfaith changes, which took place in the republic, however, in other directions it tried in every possible way to limit the Greek-Catholic hierarchy, not to mention the chaos in property issues. Thus in the village Iza, where almost every-

4 Данилець, Юрій: Релігійна війна на Підкарпатській Русі в 1920 рр. In: Наукові записки Ужгородського університету. Серія: Історично-релігійні студії, Вип. 5. Ужгород 2016, с. 231; Marek, Pavel – Danilec, Jurij: Contribution to the Knowledge of Archbishop Sawatij’s Activities in Subcarpathian Rutheniain the First Half of the 20th Century In: Kultúrne dejiny / Cultural History, volume 5, pp. 58–79.

5 Národní archiv (NA), fond Ministerstvo školství, presidium (dále Presidium MŠANO), kart. 796, čj. 38206/1920.

one was considered Orthodox, the Hungarian authorities in the reply from January 5, 1919 allowed the Orthodox to use the vicarage in conditions if a Greek-Catholic priest does not live in the parish house, and the transfer of ownership took place in accordance with the law and with the consent of the Greek-Catholic bishop (!).⁶ Of course, there was neither the consent of the bishop, who could not arbitrarily dispose the property of the diocese, nor there wasn't any compliance with the law, instead, the Orthodox recaptured and used not only churches, but also other property that did not really belong to them.

In the metric of village Lypcha is recorded how agitators who returned from Russia with bolshevik ideas directly campaigned against Greek-Catholics and the priest: «...из невѣжества хотели помститься над своим духовным отцем и тому стреляли на него. Бѣдный духовный отец уже и веком старший изъ страху перед товпою лишив фару»⁷ (They desperately wanted revenge on their spiritual father and therefore shot at him. The poor spiritual father afraid the crowd and left the vicarage). A microhistorical episode should not be concerned to all parishes, but there were such facts.

Over time, relations with the Orthodox become more complicated. Thus in village Horonda on March 21, 1921, the Orthodox captured the Greek-Catholic church, as reported by the police authorities of Zhupanskyi government in Uzhhorod. Active Orthodox priests were Hryhorii Varkhol, american citizen pastor in Becher (Slovakia)⁸ and another American, Yurii Barani, who came to Horonda on March 21, 1921, in the morning came into the temple and consecrated it, having the Service. At the same time, surprisingly, 5 000 people from Strabychevo and Velyki Luchky gathered in a fairly organized manner and therefore nothing could be done, because this would lead to bloodshed, police officials wrote to local government. Criminal proceedings were subsequently instituted against both priests for creating concern between religious confessions. The continuation was that the community took away the estates of the Greek-Catholic community and handed them over to the Orthodox, resulting in a conflict with the Greek-Catholic priest.⁹ This document clearly indicates the organizational preparation of such seizures by

6 Висіцька, Таміла: Християнство на Закарпатті: документальне дослідження становлення та розвитку (XIV–XVI ст.). Ужгород 2012, с. 490.

7 Державний архів Закарпатської області (ДАЗО), ф. 1606, оп. 13, спр. 109. Церковна книга греко-католицька с. Липча 1903–1944, арк. 179–180.

8 About interfaith relations in the village see: Мидлик, Николая, ЧСВВ: Сторінки мого життя. Пряшів 2011, с. 10–11.

9 ДАЗО, ф. 29. Президія цивільної управи Підкарпатської Русі в Ужгороді, оп. 1, спр. 327. Донесення жандармської станції в Великих Лучках про використання православною церковною громадою в с. Горонда церковної будівлі без дозволу і конфлікт уніатського священика з селянами, арк. 4–7.

Orthodox activists, and on the other hand, the “toothlessness” of the police system in the region, because the authorities are obliged to observe law and order, bearing responsibility for the consequences.

On February 1, 1921 there was information from officials of the Civil Affairs of Subcarpathian Rus to the Presidium about the demand of Yevhenii Podhaietskyi, a referent of the school department, to hand over the keys of the church from the Orthodox to the Greek-Catholics in the village Uhlia, however, the latter replied that they did not want the local Greek-Catholic priest Emilian A. Shtefan and the keys will be taken away from them only by force. Moreover, after that the Orthodox priest Aleksii Kabaliuk consecrated the church and thereby violated the law.¹⁰ Interestingly, the Zhupnyi government of Maramor Solotvyno informs on March 21, 1921 about the investigation on February 11 by an official of the situation in Uhlia. Previously, it was reported that in Berehovo began legal proceedings against the guilty and, in particular, against Aleksii Kabaliuk. That is, the Orthodox movement was gaining a revolutionary character rather than a “religious war”, when the right of the majority prevails over the law, and there was no resistance from the Greek-Catholics, that is, there were in fact no two sides in the conflict. At the same time, it was probably difficult to distinguish in the crowd who really belonged to agitators and provocateurs, and who, as a zealous Christian, really fought for his Orthodox faith, which should not be excluded, and therefore the fault lay entirely on the authorities due to the lack of law and order. In addition, in early March 1921 in Tiachevo, the Orthodox priest Popovych was imprisoned with false documents and most likely a citizen of another state, and he was also sent to Berehovo. This greatly affected the community, which was informed on March 10, and on the same day they handed the key to the Greek-Catholic priest.¹¹ That is, this case indicates a series of agitation events, provocations against Greek-Catholics in various regions, but occasionally, the authorities and citizens, priests and believers of already different confessions (Greek-Catholics and Orthodox) acted together and wisely without succumbing to provocations. That is, often, this could depend on the operational actions of the authorities, the local Greek-Catholic clergy and the education and prudence of the local population despite the confession. On the other hand, this convincingly confirms the activities of agitators against the Greek-Catholic Church at that time.

10 ДАЗО, ф. 29, оп. 3, спр. 138. Переписка з єпископом Мукачівської єпархії по питанню агітації православних священиків (восточників) між греко-католицьким населенням, щоби останні переходили на православну віру в Марамороському і Хустському округах в 1921 р., арк. 28–30.

11 ДАЗО, ф. 29, оп. 3, спр. 138, арк. 31.

But the whole complexity of the situation was supplemented by the attitude of the central government in Prague towards the Orthodox Church. Thus, in the protocol of the Congregation for Extraordinary Church Affairs from Rome of December 1921, it was stated that the Prague authorities and in particular Edvard Benesh contacted with the Serbian Orthodox Church, with the terms of jurisdiction, but that there was no spread of Russian influence. But the bishop of Mukachevo Anthony Papp informed, that exactly the Orthodox of Serbian jurisdiction restricts the rights of the Greek-Catholic Church with the support of the authorities of the republic and, moreover, the authorities allowed the use of Greek-Catholics' property without the consent of the owners, which was also against the Greek-Catholics with the assistance of the authorities.¹² The government's support for Orthodox of Serbian jurisdiction looked at first glance like support and counterweight to Greek-Catholics, however, the Czechoslovak government itself could not control the Orthodox movement in its territory (or rather deliberately did not do so) about what there is relevant data, and the Orthodox accordingly used it.

A completely different situation occurs on July 1, 1921 in Chumalovo, where broken the windows on the vicarage, a crowd of people stole 5 000 CZK, destroying property, as stated by the parishioner Victor Krichfaluvshii, wrote Anthony Papp to the vice-governor.¹³ Again, this situation did not allow to identify those responsible for the destruction and loss of property, which rather resembled outright crime and revolutionism with its right to a majority than even interfaith conflict, not to mention the war, about which there are numerous data in governmental correspondence between officials. And the Greek-Catholics did not do mass resistance, and in wars there must be at least two warring sides, not mentioning the policy of the Prague authorities.

It is also difficult to talk about democratic freedoms in the Czechoslovak Republic, despite the interpellation of deputy Yurii Lazho on February 3, 1921 with a demand to eliminate Bishop Anthony Papp.¹⁴ In general, local police management informed the Police department of the Civil Case of Subcarpathian Rus about dozens of cases of Orthodox violence against Greek-Catholics – among them agitation, threats of eviction of a Greek-Catholic priest or teacher from the village, confiscation of keys from Greek-Catholic churches, use of the cemetery

12 Československo a Svatý stolec. II/1. Kongregace pro mimořádné církevní záležitosti (1919–1925): výběrová edice dokumentů, ed. Pavel Helan a Jaroslav Šebek. Praha 2013, s. 147–148.

13 ДАЗО, ф. 29, оп. 3., спр. 138, арк. 55.

14 ДАЗО, ф. 29, оп. 1., спр. 5. Інтерпеляції сенаторів та депутатів парламенту і листування з Міністром в справах Словаччини про антидержавну діяльність Пряшівського і Мукачівського єпископів, арк. 24.

etc.¹⁵ This is despite the fact that there are a large number of such archival documents (and documents do not have confessional origin), state officials of various levels only stated anarchy, which lasted for years, and the Czechoslovak Republic for lawlessness remained responsible, as it had all the power and information. In fact, we state not only loyalty, but also financial and political support of the Prague authorities to the Orthodox, due to non-interference in interfaith anarchy, despite the desire of the authorities since 1919 to eliminate Bishop Anthony Papp and emphasize on the Hungarian clergy of the diocese.

At the micro level, interfaith confrontation was little reminiscent of war or conflict, and in tidy Prague offices of that time they were not very concerned exclusively about criminal actions in the territory of Subcarpathian Rus against Greek-Catholics. On June 7, 1921, Victor Khira the son of Cornelius Khira from Neresnytsa was attacked, informs the Zupan government in Maramorosh Solotvyno. The attack was carried out by three unidentified men, knocking him to the ground, making 73 incisions on the body in the form of an Orthodox cross. According to police information, no suspects were found in this case.¹⁶ Therefore, the church in Neresnytsa was returned to the Greek-Catholics only under the guidance of the school department headed by Joseph Peshek on March 8, 1922. At the same time, there were believers, priest Cornelius Khira and his son, young priest Olexander Khira, who declared a sermon on the need to forgive each other, despite all the harm.¹⁷ Despite the tragedy, priest Olexander Khira not only showed Christian love, but also understood, probably, there are attempts to intervene with various forces in the confrontation between Christians of different confessions.

The revolutionary nature of the Orthodox movement can also be traced in the documents of local authorities. Thus, on July 19, 1923, the Presidium of the Political Council of Subcarpathian Rus informs the office of the vice-governor about that the activity of the Orthodox movement in Irshava district, as well as in whole Subcarpathian Rus, associated with the maintenance of Greek-Catholic churches, and therefore some leaders were warned, that in the case of conversion to Orthodoxy, the right to a Greek-Catholic church will remain with the legal owners. And on July 24 of the same year, the school department of the Civil Administration of Subcarpathian Rus informed the Office of the Vice-Governor about the lack of any

15 ДАЗО, ф. 29, оп. 3, спр. 211. Переписка з поліційними урядами про агітацію і насильство православних на Підкарпатській Русі, арк. 1–64.

16 ДАЗО, ф. 29, оп. 3, спр. 281. Переписка з Міністерством внутрішніх справ, мукачівським єпископом та жупанськими урядами по питанню релігійної боротьби між православними і греко-католиками на Підкарпатті, т. 3, арк. 56.

17 Новости. Нересницькї греко-католики побїдили схизматиковъ Іп: Благовѣстник, рочник ІV, май №5, 1922, с. 11–12.

permits to open priestly courses for the Orthodox in Bushtyno and this could not be considered a seminary; the issue of the deportation of Ivan Chernavin has also not been resolved, officials noted.¹⁸ At the same time, the secret document of the Ministry of Schools and Public Education in Prague dated August 1, 1923, signed by Minister R. Bekhinie, reported the school department of Subcarpathian Rus about the allocation of 50 thousand CZK for the Orthodox, of which: 35 000 CZK – for material needs and 15 000 CZK for other needs – «...náboženských obcí, nebo komitétů, jejich zřízení připravujících...»¹⁹. This document generally indicates direct support of the Orthodox, because the authorities were actually tolerant to: 1) illegal Orthodox courses not agreed with the Ministry of Schools and Public Education; 2) having information about the agitation, did not deport the perpetrators; 3) the authority itself financed unregistered communities and even committees (!), that prepared the creation of Orthodox communities, but in fact the conversion from the Greek-Catholic denomination to the Orthodox!!! That is, from this it followed – the Czechoslovak authorities secretly financed preparatory committees, actually supported activists, who organized a conversion to another denomination, the result of which was subsequent anarchy with all its consequences captured temples, threats, the “right” of the majority, etc. On November 3, 1923, the authorities in a secret document provided 100 000 CZK for the needs of Orthodox communities or committees (!), that prepared them, which were to be distributed by agreement with the office of the vice-governor of Subcarpathian Rus.²⁰ That is, the entire government vertical was involved, and the executors were officials of the vice-governor’s office. At the same time, on October 11, 1923, the presidium of the Political Affairs of Subcarpathian Rus informs the Ministry of Internal Affairs in Prague about the unrest in various regions of Subcarpathian Rus between Orthodox and Greek-Catholics. Even despite the split of the Orthodox: in Bushtyno under the leadership of Ivan Chernavin (the deportation of which was discussed above), Yurii Kenyz and others who wanted to resolve their disputes with the support of Archbishop Savvatii, on the one hand, – and the Autonomous Carpatho-Russian Orthodox Church, headed by Secretary Oleksii Kabaliuk, who at the beginning of April 1923 met with Bishop Horazd (Pavlik) in Olomouc to resolve church issues, on the other hand, – the activity of the Orthodox grew. In Maramorosh, for example, the

18 ДАЗО, ф. 29, оп. 3, спр. 351. Переписка з міністерством внутрішніх справ по питанню організації і діяльності православної церкви на Підкарпатській Русі, арк. 150, 156. More see.: Данилець Ю.: Заснування та діяльність пастирських курсів в с. Буштино на Підкарпатській Русі в 1923–1924 рр. / Науковий вісник Ужгородського університету, серія «Історія», вип. 1 (42), 2020, с. 43–49.

19 ДАЗО, ф. 29, оп. 3, спр. 351, арк. 161.

20 ДАЗО, ф. 29, оп. 3, спр. 351, арк. 183.

greatest disputes over the temples and their seizure from the Greek-Catholics existed in Bedevlia, where the Orthodox entered the Greek-Catholic church and Orthodox priest Herkunik Boholep conducted the service there. Dr. Aleksii Herovskyi actively campaigned for Orthodoxy; the greatest concern and capture of temples took place in Vilkhivka, Bushtyno, Dubove, Tereblia, Kopashnevo, Torun, Nizhnia Kolochava. Exactly Iza, where Aleksii Kabaliuk was active, became the center of the development of Orthodoxy, where Dr. Aleksii Herovskyi returned on May 29, 1923, together with the above-mentioned bishop of Nis Dosytei (Vasich). There, on June 5, at a secret meeting, the spiritual consistory of the Autonomous Carpathian Orthodox Church was created. In Mukachevo zhupa, in particular, in Irshava district activity is noticed, as stated, fanatical priests Atanasii Hubiak from Bilky and Luka Olkhovyi from Zadnie, and their activities, as officials reported, were revolutionary in nature and went beyond legal relations. For example, on July 15 in the village Osii Orthodox priest Atanasii Hubiak was arrested by the police and imprisoned for disruption and damage to the Greek-Catholic community during the consecration of the bells, but soon released. In general, the demands of Orthodox activists to hand over the church or already seized churches were in Dubrivka, Chorny Potik, Ilnytsia, Dusyno, Rakoshyno, and in Voloske again appears above-mentioned Atanasii Hubiak demanding to hand over the Greek-Catholic church to the Orthodox.²¹ That is, to this was added a rather strange impunity from the authorities for Orthodox priests, or rather loyalty. As soon as the spiritual Consistory of the Orthodox was created, its financing by the authorities began in a secret regime. This is despite the fact that the Orthodox statutes were officially approved by the Czechoslovak authorities only in September 1929.²² That is, archival documents clearly indicate targeted support of the Orthodox movement, the plan of which was weakening of the Greek-Catholic denomination.

Another way of restriction and entirely in favor of the Orthodox is the appeal of the local authorities to transfer “undesirable” to the population priests to other parishes. Thus, on August 20, 1923, the Civil Council of Subcarpathian Rus asks the Diocesan Board about the transfer of Avhustyn Vasovchik, priest of Nyzhnia Kolochava to another parish due to extreme rejection of the person of confessor by believers, although it is not specified by which believers. At the same time, as an argument it is stated that this would be in the interests of the Greek-Catholic Church, and indeed “...generally useful...”²³ The arguments are completely unconvincing. On the contrary, from such government “appeals”

21 ДАЗО, ф. 29, оп. 3., спр. 351, арк. 178–181.

22 Пекар, Атанасій, ЧСВВ: Нариси історії церкви Закарпаття, т. 1. Рим – Львів 1997, с. 117–118.

23 Аржевігін, Станіслав: Релігія. Історія верховинського села Колочава, т. 2. Чернівці 2007, с. 339–340.

it is necessary to conclude about the purposeful action of the local authorities against the Greek-Catholic clergy in the region and attempts to interfere in interfaith disputes.

On April 26, 1924, Bishop Anthony Papp informed the governor of Subcarpathian Rus Antonin Beskyd, that the diocesan management appealed to the Apostolic capital, having received the answer that according to the Code of Canons for the Eastern Church, the Catholic Church cannot accept the state's proposals for mediation in resolving disputes between the Greek-Catholic and Orthodox clergy.²⁴ The fact is that the Catholic Church, including the Greek-Catholic, is an independent and self-sufficient institution and no foreign affairs can be resolved through the other side, especially the state. In March 1924, there were a number of laws with an appendix, filed by the Civil Case of Subcarpathian Rus, which said that denominations should provide information on the number of believers in the appendix if they want to register their committee, indicating that there are another Greek-Catholic denomination and a church in the village²⁵. Perhaps Czechoslovak officials tried to obtain detailed statistics on the denomination in order to increase the influence and interference in their activities, judging by the above-mentioned arguments.

The office of the governor of Subcarpathian Rus from June 3, 1924 informs about very active Orthodox agitation, which has a rather sad and uncontrollable element, and therefore the local authorities reported about the need to ensure some peace in the region. The situation is such that fighters often closed the church themselves, took the keys from the temple, and sent people to prison. This situation was not useful for the authorities, officials stated, and even was harmful to the state. The main thing that can be recommended is not to offend either side, but to try to bring them closer to the dialogue. As of 1924, more than 100 thousand people converted to Orthodoxy, officials stated. It should be noted that the Czechoslovak authorities had a complete picture of the Orthodox movement, stating in the reports that the communities are run by the priests, who have no idea of public and state life, do not take this into account, that is, they had neither state nor church power. They did not even have their own bishop at that time. In order to resolve these issues, it is necessary to settle the property issues and create a diocese headed by the bishop and a theological seminary with appropriate conditions. To make some compromise, analyzed government officials, between the Greek-Catholics and the Orthodox, because the Catholic Church will not do this. However, this can be resolved authoritatively from the side of the state, according to officials. As for the Greek-Catholics, the two dioceses (Presov and Uzhhorod – Author) are in

24 NA, Presidium MŠANO, kart. 796, inv. č. 91997/1924.

25 NA, Presidium MŠANO, kart. 796, inv. č. 65190/1924.

a very unclear position. The Mukachevo diocese in Uzhhorod has Bishop Anthony Papp, who did not make a vow in favor of the state. It was about his removal from the positions, officials analyzed, but it is already necessary to know and think who will succeed the bishop, because a lot depends on the bishop, because people are very God-fearing. The new person of the bishop must bring the people together, but officials also indicate that the bishop must recognize secular authority.²⁶ All this above-mentioned documentary analytics testifies the extremely superficial attitude of Czechoslovak politicians to the Church in Subcarpathian Rus. In our opinion, they testify the attempts of gross interference of Prague and regional officials in the internal affairs of the Church, which in fact should have happened more loyally, collegially and peacefully, as it will later happen by the concordat of 1928, through the coordination of positions and compromise.

In another secret document of the Ministry of Schools and Public Education from July 7, 1924 indicates a general religious situation, that the Orthodox movement is a complete fact in Subcarpathian Rus, and therefore it is not necessary now to analyze folk, religious, political and social reasons. The main question is whether the authorities could somehow control this movement and whether it will be possible to influence it at all, as indicated in the analytics. In our opinion, the authorities itself initially contributed the development of the Orthodox movement, and then tried to control it. It is clear that the Ministry of Schools and Public Education could only observe this movement. The state authorities could interfere in religious affairs only in cases of observance of law and order, morality, but the Ministry of Schools and Public Education also has no influence, but in fact the Ministry of Internal Affairs has. Similarly, officials also pointed out the arrival in Subcarpathian Rus the Orthodox bishop Dossyfei. This is also a sign of the growth and control of this movement by the Orthodox themselves.²⁷ That is, since 1924, the authorities tried to take control and influence the Orthodox movement, and it also shows that the Orthodox Church tried to remain a separate “player” in the region, which, as in the case of Greek-Catholics, did not like the Czechoslovak authorities.

The authoritative periodicals post-factum emphasized the era of the Uzhhorod Union, when the Orthodox voluntarily signed the union and the property, which was debated for years in the days of the Czechoslovak Republic, allegedly passed to the Union Church. Plus, the Orthodox were persecuted in Hungary, and the Czechoslovak Republic eventually remained accused by both sides – on the one hand in the support of the Orthodox and communism, and on the other – in the support of the so-called kurtiakivtsi and Hungary, and the Orthodox themselves

26 NA, Presidium MŠANO, kart. 796, inv. č. 91997/1924.

27 Archiv Ministerstva zahraničních věcí České republiky (AMZV ČR), sekce III. Církevní věci. Řecko-katolická církev. Mukačevo, kart. 67, čj. 134 367/1923.

at the same time had a clear lack of qualified educated clergy.²⁸ Interestingly, that Frantisek Cinek points out that the Orthodox movement in Subcarpathian Rus did not arise spontaneously on the basis of folk or anti-Hungarian motives, but just the most thanks to its organization... «...pravoslavnými agitátory».²⁹ Moreover, the researcher emphasizes that Orthodox agitation strengthened communism in the region, which was also anti-Catholic.³⁰ That is, the Czechoslovak authorities, which would have had to put order in interfaith relations and the legal field, according to its own periodicals, positioned itself more like a victim, although archival documents clearly indicate the opposite. The Czechoslovak government purposefully supported the Orthodox movement, including financially by creating interfaith anarchy, in order to weaken the Greek-Catholic denomination, and at the diplomatic level, the Orthodox movement was developed using its consequences against Bishop Anthony Papp.

It is worth understanding the reasons of the growth of the Orthodox movement. Thus, Atanasii Pekar points the opinion of the Czech Minister F. Němec, who doubts between two opinions of the reason for the activity of the Orthodox: 1) spontaneity of movement due to Muscovite sympathies in the region and against part of the Hungarian clergy of the diocese; 2) emigration, including the Orthodox clergy and the support of the Czech circles of this movement, as a result of the bias of the Greek-Catholic clergy towards the Czechoslovak Republic.³¹ In our opinion, both reasons do not exclude each other. Atanasii Pekar somewhat simplifies the picture of the Orthodox movement, referring to Avhustyn Voloshyn, that the Orthodox movement began with an inn, then under the influence of vodka the person, and then the group began to call against the priest, and then against the Greek-Catholic Church.³² Here it is necessary to avoid condemnation of believers, but rather focus on agitation, which led to such actions of uneducated peasants, and to understand who allowed this?

In general, Oleksandr Ilnytskyi gives the most accurate information about the circumstances that led to the activity of the Orthodox: 1) the calendar reform of the Hungarian authorities as an interference in the life of the Church; 2) Galician and Russian emigration is the main one and which campaigned against the

28 Pravoslavná a uniátská cirkve na P. Rusi. In: Podkarpatské Hlasy, roč. IV, 29 prosince 1928, č. 293, s. 1.

29 Cinek, František: K náboženské otázce v prvních letech naší samostatnosti 1918–1925. Olomouc 1926, s. 225.

30 Ibid, s. 257; On the Orthodox movement, see also: Gönczi Andrea: Ruszin skizmatikus mozgalom a XX. Század elején. Ungvár–Beregszász 2007, 140 p.

31 Пекар, Атанасій, ЧСВВ: Вказана праця, т. 1., с. 112; Пекар, Атанасій, ЧСВВ: Нариси історії церкви Закарпаття, т. 2. Рим 1997, 492 с.

32 Пекар, Атанасій, ЧСВВ: Вказана праця, т. 1, с. 113.

Church and the union, using the weak education of the people, 3) local Czechoslovak authorities under the “freedom” understood the power of the majority – who has the majority will also have the church, school, etc. 4) the game with poverty and wealth, where church and parish lands became the target, agitators promised to divide between the population; 5) Bolshevik agitation, which advised «...убоному русинови держати собѣ до себе подобного мало просвѣщенного «духовника...» (to the poor Rusyn to keep to himself a little enlightened “clergyman”) who does not instruct spiritually believers as it should be, but instead listens to the omnipotent mass.³³ Interestingly, the education of the local rusyn was decisive in some ways, as the communist agitation began with the words “Glory to Jesus Christ,” and then followed agitation for a communist paradise on earth despite the fact that communism is an atheistic ideology.³⁴ To this can be added a general anti-Catholic campaign in the Czech Republic and Moravia with the seizure of temples and terror, about what the Czech researcher František Cinek writes.³⁵

In contrast to Czechoslovak anti-Catholicism, the emphasis in Subcarpathian Russia shifted to the interfaith crisis, and the “reputation” of the Orthodox Church also suffered from this conflict and agitators. The split of the Orthodox by the state does not change the situation much, because in the end the former Greek Catholic parishes were taken over by the Orthodox of the Serbian jurisdiction. The Czechoslovak authorities tried to influence religious life through the uneducated Savatian clergy and agitators; and the Hungarian factor remained an instrument of agitation against the Greek Catholics by all stakeholders. The “modern” bureaucracy of Czechoslovakia tried to pursue a general anti-Catholic policy in the region of Subcarpathian Russia, at first glance not understanding the traditions of the region – the history, national mosaic of the region and religious diversity. However, archival documents indicate the opposite – Czechoslovak officials purposefully supported one denomination against another (behind the butt Austro-Hungarian government), creating chaos in interfaith relations, whose status quo was restored only in the second half of the 1920s.

33 Ильницькій, Александр: Положення Церкви на Подк. Руси послѣ перевороту. In: Миссійный календарь на 1935, с. 35–36. Also see: Cinek, F.: c. d., s. 276.

34 Ильницькій, Александр: Что даёт коммунизм русинамъ на Подкарпатахъ. In: Душпастьрь. Урядовый и духовный органъ епархii Мукачевской, рочник IV, октобрий ч. 10, 1927, с. 422–424.

35 Cinek, F.: c. d., s. 38–39.

Czechoslovakia and the Interfaith Conflict between Greek Catholics and Orthodox in Subcarpathian Rus: an overview of the causes and the beginning of the crisis.

In contrast to Czechoslovak anti-Catholicism, the emphasis in Subcarpathian Rus shifted to the interfaith crisis, and the “reputation” of the Orthodox Church also suffered from this conflict and agitators. The split of the Orthodox by the state does not change the situation much, because in the end the former Greek Catholic parishes were taken over by the Orthodox of the Serbian jurisdiction. The Czechoslovak authorities tried to influence religious life through the uneducated Savatian clergy and agitators; and the anti-Hungarian factor remained an instrument of agitation against the Greek Catholics by all stakeholders.

Чехословакия и межконфессиональный конфликт между греко-католиками и православными на Подкарпатской Руси: обзор причин и начало кризиса.

В отличие от Чехословацкого антикатолизма акценты в Подкарпатской Руси сместились на межконфессиональный кризис, а уже от этого конфликта и агитаторов пострадала также «репутация» Православной Церкви. Раскол государством православных мало меняет ситуацию, поскольку в итоге бывшие греко-католические приходы взяли именно православные сербской юрисдикции. Власть же ЧСР пыталась влиять на религиозную жизнь через малообразованное саватиивское духовенство и агитаторов; а антивенгерский фактор оставался инструментом против греко-католиков всеми заинтересованными сторонами.