

COMMUNIST POPULISM AND THE GREEK CATHOLIC CHURCH IN SUBCARPATHIAN RUS IN THE 1920S

VIKTOR KICHERA

After the incorporation of Subcarpathian Rus into Czechoslovakia according to the Treaty of Saint-Germain-en-Laye on September 10, 1919, the rather poor region became part of the new state. However, the situation among religions has changed. If during the days of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy, Greek Catholics received tangible support from the authorities, and the Orthodox were persecuted, then with the creation of Czechoslovakia, on the contrary, the authorities supported the Orthodox by limiting the activities of the Greek Catholics. Therefore, the aim of this study is rather an attempt to study the influence of left political forces on the position of various confessions and the change in the current situation in this period. The officials of Czechoslovakia had seen in the leadership of the diocese, in particular in the bishop of the Mukachevo Greek Catholic Eparchy (MGCE) of Hungarian origin Antony Papp the greatest threat.

Bishop Antony Papp also had a principled position in the defense of his own eparchy in interfaith relations, which greatly annoyed the local and central authorities of Czechoslovakia. There is a memorandum signed by Bishop Anthony Papp dated December 1, 1920, about the persecution of the Greek Catholic Church in Subcarpathian Rus. The bishop wrote that political and religious agitators, bolsheviks, anarchists and muscophiles had been agitating against the Greek Catholic Church. Often it happened due to the passivity of local authorities, and sometimes – even with their help, the memorandum says. "Puzzled" people take Church estates and use them. 15 communities converted to another faith. The bishop appeals to the law, because in four cases the legislation has been violated. For example, the community of the village of Velyki Luchki converted to Orthodoxy, but, as the bishop pointed out, they do not have the right to use the church building. In the second point, Bishop Papp insisted that the authorities persecuted the Church. Sometimes there were cases when priests left the village due to threats of destruction of property and death and lived in poverty, because the agitators did not allow the priest to be paid. Random people, sometimes not even priests, entered the country illegally and agitated against the Greek Catholic Church. The

diocesan power without a government is powerless against terror, which threatens both property and the faithful, Bishop Anthony Papp noted in his appeal. Such phenomena as seizing churches, theft of property and expulsion of priests are not normal in the state. Therefore, according to the laws, as the bishop pointed out, we ask and demand:

- 1) Churches and estates be returned to their rightful owners;
- 2) the authorities must vigorously oppose such things;
- 3) to send Bolshevik politicians and religious agitators outside the republic.¹

It is also difficult to talk about democratic freedoms in the Czechoslovakia, considering the interpellation of deputy Yuriy Lazho on February 3, 1921, with the demand to remove Bishop Anthony Papp.² In general, local police departments informed the Police Referat (Office) on the Civil Case of Subcarpathian Rus about dozens of cases of violence by Orthodox Christians against Greek Catholics – among them agitation, threats to evict a Greek Catholic priest or teacher from the village, taking keys from Greek Catholic churches, using a cemetery etc.³ This is despite the fact that there are a large number of such archival documents (and the documents do not have a religious origin). State officials of different levels only stated the anarchy that lasted for years, and the Czechoslovakia remained responsible for the lawlessness, as it had all the power and information. In fact, it is possible to state the loyalty of the authorities to the Orthodox due to non-interference in inter-confessional anarchy, as well as taking into account the striving of the authorities to remove Bishop Anthony Papp since 1919 and the emphasis on the Magyarism of the clergy of the diocese.

In the metric of the village of Lypcha, it is recorded that the agitators who returned from Russia with bolshevik ideas directly agitated against the Greek Catholics and the parish priest: „... (*... из невѣжества хотели помститься над своим духовным отцем и тому стреляли на него. Бѣдный духовный отец уже и веком старшій изъ страха передъ товною лишивъ фѣру*).“⁴ The micro-historical episode should not be transferred to all parishes, but such facts also existed.

1 Národní archiv (NA), fond Ministerstvo školství, Praha (MŠ), kart. 796, A Rozluka, 47 I, č. 38206/1920. Memorandum o domnělém přenásledování řecko-katolické církve na P. Rusi.

2 Державний архів Закарпатської області (ДАЗО) в м. Берегові, 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.

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

4 „...out of ignorance they wanted to take revenge on their spiritual father and therefore shot him. The poor priest, who was already years older, left the rectory (fara – house for priest) out because of fear of the crowd...” See: ДАЗО в м. Ужгороді, ф. 1606, оп. 13, спр. 109. Церковна книга греко-католицька с. Липча 1903–1944, арк. 179–180.

In addition, at the beginning of March 1921, an Orthodox priest Popovych was imprisoned in Tyachev with false documents (most likely a citizen of another state), after which he was sent to Berehovo for trial. This fact had a great influence on the people. They were informed on March 10 and on the same day they handed over the key to the Greek Catholic priest.⁵ This case indicates a series of agitational measures, provocations against Greek Catholics in different regions, but occasionally the authorities and citizens, believers of different denominations (Greek Catholics and Orthodox) acted jointly and judiciously without succumbing to provocations. That is, the situation could often depend on the actions of the authorities, the local Greek-Catholic clergy, the education and prudence of the local population regardless of denomination. On the other hand, this convincingly confirms the activity of agitators against the Greek Catholic Church at that time.

In general, Oleksandr Ilnytsky provides the most accurate information about the circumstances that led to the activity of the Orthodox:

- 1) the calendar reform of the Hungarian government as an intervention in the life of the Church⁶;
- 2) Galician and Russian emigration, mainly which campaigned against the Church and the Union, using the weak education of the people;
- 3) the local Czechoslovak government by "freedom" understood the power of the majority – who has majority, has the church, school, etc.;
- 4) a game with poverty and wealth, where the target was church and parish lands, which the agitators promised to divide among the population (in particular, the payment of koblina and rokovina, which were canceled and replaced with compensation);
- 5) bolshevik agitation, which advised "... the poor Ruthenian to keep with him a similar, little-uneducated" clergyman "... who does not instruct the spiritually faithful, as it should be, but on the contrary listens to the almighty mass.⁷ It is interesting that the education of the local Ruthenian was in some places decisive, as the communist agitation began with the words "Glory to Jesus Christ", and then followed the agitation for a communist "heaven" on earth, regardless of the fact that communism is an atheistic ideology.⁸

5 ДАЗО в м. Берегові, ф. 29, оп. 3, спр. 138, арк. 31.

6 Пекар, А., ЧСВВ. Нариси історії церкви Закарпаття, т. 2, с. 322–323.

7 Ильницький, А. Положення Церкви на Подк. Руси послѣ переворота, с. 35–36. Про коблину і роковину як одну з найуспішніших агітаційних маневрів різних агітаторів, в тому числі і православних, пише і чеський дослідник, котрий безпосередньо прибув на Підкарпатську Русь того часу. Дет. див: Сінек, F. Citovaná práce, s. 276.

8 Ильницький, А. Что даетъ комунизмъ русинамъ на Подкарпатахъ, Душпастырь. Урядовый и духовный органъ епархіи Мукачевской, 1927, октобрий, рочник IV, ч. 10, с. 422–424.

Thus, František Cinek points out that the Orthodox movement in Subcarpathian Rus did not arise spontaneously on the basis of popular or anti-Hungarian motives, but rather mainly thanks to their organization "... orthodox agitators".⁹ Moreover, the researcher emphasizes that the Orthodox agitation strengthened communism in the region, which was also anti-Catholic.¹⁰

At the beginning of 1925, on the initiative of Bishop Petr Gebej, the "Central Chancellery of the Defense of the Faith" was formed and was headed by the Oleksandr Ilnytskyi, as well as: the secretary of the society – father Oleksandr Stojka, the bishop's secretary; treasurer – father Yuliy Maryna, professor of the theological seminary in Uzhhorod; advisers – professors of the seminary Viktor Shelkov and Oleksandr Khira; two editors – fathers Emilian Bokshai and Victor Zheltvai; lawyer – Ivan Yackovich. The main task of the Chancellery is to protect parishes, including through courts and various instances where lawlessness and violence against individual Greek-Catholic communities took place, to supervise compliance with the law on interfaith relations. According to the law: children inherited the faith of their parents; in the case of different religions – boys follow the faith of the father, girls follow the faith of the mother; at the age of 16, they could change their faith by informing the local authorities, not the priest, at the same time, all conversion that took place before the adoption of this law, which were carried out without observing the previous laws, were considered invalid.¹¹ The chancellery also activates the publishing of articles and brochures. This was a practical step in the struggle for the souls of believers. The result of the activity was successful, considering that as of 1931, all churches and estates were returned, including in the village of Iza, where Orthodoxy was the most widespread. After the deactivation of the Orthodox movement, the chancellery also lost its activity in the 1930s, having fulfilled its main task, but continued to be active against modern religious movements and political ideologies, in particular, communism.¹²

However, whatever the motives of the powerful officials were, the decisions of the local authorities were made in the interests of the Orthodox. In confirmation there is a document on the loyal attitude of the central authorities towards Orthodox priests, who, according to the appeal of the Ministry school and edu-

9 Cinek F.: *K náboženské otázce v prvních letech naší samostatnosti 1918–1925*. Olomouc 1926, s. 225.

10 Cinek F.: *K náboženské otázce*, s. 257; Про православний рух також див.: Gőnczi A.: *Ruszin skizmatikus mozgalom a XX. Század elején*. Ungvár-Beregszász 2007, 140 p.

11 Стойка, А. О.: *Новый Чехосл. законъ «О взаимныхъ отношеніяхъ между разными вѣроиповѣданіями»*, Душпастьрь. Урядовый и духовный органъ епархіи Мукачевской, 1925, юній, рочник II, ч. 6, с. 274–280.

12 Пекар, А. ЧСВВ. *Нариси історії церкви Закарпаття*, т. 1, с. 128–129.; його ж *Нариси історії церкви Закарпаття*, т. 2, с. 225–227.; Бендас, Д.: *Єпископ Петро Гебей. Видатний культурно-освітній діяч Мукачівської епархії*, *Благовісник*, № 9 (148), 2004, с. 5.

cation to the Ministry of Internal Affairs of Czechoslovakia dated July 9, 1924, asked the police department to give permission for the entry of Orthodox priests to the Czechoslovakia with any emigrant certificate and even an internal soviet passport.¹³ This once again shows the big loyalty to the Orthodox, in particular, to immigrants from the Soviet Union, where atheism and the fight against Christianity reached its peak. All this looked like undeniable support of Orthodox by the local authorities and the clergy, because there is no mention of other estates – teachers, scientists who also were under jurisdiction the Ministry of schools and education. The permission itself was possible with internal soviet passports, that is, they were already citizens of the USSR and not refugees from the communist regime, white emigrants, and not only them.

It is also worth paying attention to such a factor as agitation and communism, which was supported by the Orthodox priest Ivan Babych and communist agitators in general, about which there is a lot of information from the police reports of the archive in the city of Beregovo.¹⁴ Thus, from the police information from Teresva on April 18, 1924, it is known that the Orthodox priest Father Yevhen Ruzhichka campaigned for the capture of the church, which was reported to the school department in Uzhhorod. On November 8, 1924, the county government in Veliky Sevlyush informs about the deportation of father Yevhen Ruzhitska. Another Orthodox priest from Dubove, Ivan Lubarskyi, a Russian fugitive, was suspected of communist agitation. Interestingly, he worked in police structures, and should be deported according to the information of the Czechoslovak police.¹⁵ Yevhen Ruzhichka's activity is also described in the February issue of "Blagovisnyk" magazine, in particular regarding the incitement of Tereshul believers (he came to this village from Dubove). However, the local believers understood the situation and stopped Yevgeny Ruzhichka's sermon, informing about this case to the governor of Neresnytsia, Corneli Khira.¹⁶ Father Teodor Kossey also mentions Ivan Lubarsky in a letter dated January 22, 1925 to Father Stefan, as about a former Russian policeman who is wanted by the police.¹⁷ These documentary archival data clearly confirm the propaganda work of the Orthodox clergy mainly among

13 NA, MŠ, kart. 3822, sign. 47 I, inv. č. 768/1923. Prezidium politické správy, Prezidium ministerstva vnitra – náboženské poměry – spory o kostely.

14 ДАЗО в м. Берегові, ф. 29, оп. 3, спр. 354. Переписка з міністерством внутрішніх справ, поліційними і жупанськими урядами по питанню урегулювання релігійних спорів між православними і греко-католиками в с. Дубове, арк. 54.

15 ДАЗО в м. Берегові, ф. 29, оп. 3, спр. 354, арк. 124, с. 171–172.

16 Борьба за церков, Благовѣстник, №4, 15 фебруара 1924, с. 59

17 Evidently, the Ukrainian missionary from Galicia, Father Stephan Reshetylo ChSVV, is meant, since the letter of Father Teodor is in the fund of the Mukachevo Basilian Monastery in Berehovo.

the Greek-Catholic communities, which became the cause of disorganization and the conversion of people to Orthodoxy.

At the same time, according to the data of the vice-governor of Subcarpathian Rus, Antonin Rozsypal, dated February 3, 1926, many Orthodox clergy of the Savatij direction were involved in socialist and communist parties and ideas. This is known from information on priests sent to the Presidium of the Council of Ministers in Prague. In the data on the above-mentioned Ivan Babich, it is indicated that he completed 9 month courses, after which in 1923 he was ordained a priest by Bishop Savatij in Prague. Moreover, this father, as noted in the report of local officials, was a supporter of the independent communist party in the region. This document on 1926 does not mention Ivan Lyubarskyi and Yevhen Ruzhichka.¹⁸ Probably the aforementioned fathers were deported because of their open destructive activities and disturbance of inter-church peace. The report also indicates that some Orthodox priests belonged to the independent communist party in the region. Among them are Ivan Koveshligheti, Yura Bedzir, Ivan Babich, Vasyl Nemesh, Ivan Deak, Fedor Horvat and Ivan Mrochkovsky.¹⁹ Belonging the believers (who might not have understood these issues) to the communists, is one thing, but the belonging of the spiritual fathers to the communist party, which proclaimed atheism and outlawed all religions, looked at least strange.

According to the report, the Orthodox clergy of Subcarpathian Rus also belonged to the labor party²⁰, which is no less controversial. Among such priests: Alexiy Kabalyuk, Demetr Kemin, Yura Kundra, Vasyl Plyshko, Stepan Zeykan, Jan Chopyk, Simon Marushka, Andriy Racyn, Yura Rusynko, Ivan Jov, Petr Mydlyak, Vasyl Stankaninets, Georgy Grinyo. Evgeny Yakub, for example, did not recognize either Bishop Dosyphus or Savvatius, much less he was the secretary of several parties in order to get money for the campaign for conversion to Orthodoxy and for his activities in general.²¹ As of 1926, supporters of both Bishop Dositej and supporters of Bishop Savvatij sympathized with the labor party, and as for the affiliation of the Orthodox clergy to the Communists, only supporters of Savvatij belonged to this party. Like the Marxist-Leninists clergy tried to carry out their activities among the poorest population, which had nothing to lose, and therefore it was easier to mobilize it under the slogans of protection from the rich and against the masters (already obviously Czechs) and "Magyar" Greek-Catholic

18 NA, fond Předsednictvo ministerské rady (PMR), kart. 143, sign. 263, inv. č. 1559/1926. Pravoslavné hnutí na Podk. Rusi, suspense duchovních směru Savvatého.

19 Ibidem.

20 This is indicated in the text of the document, but it is probably referring to the Czechoslovak party ČSSD.

21 Ibidem.

faith (as it sounded in the propaganda of the Orthodox and Communists). That is, the goals and methods of agitation of the labor party and the communist party coincided with similar activities of the Orthodox, whose goal was to promote the conversion of Greek Catholics to Orthodoxy with the help of agitation. Although, it should be noted, this was probably not the norm everywhere in region.

The reason for such an oxymoron in the support of the Communists (who ideologically forbade Christians) by some Savvatists is an attempt to unite in certain places with the Communists for their religious agitation against the Greek Catholics, but this directly compromised not only individual clergymen, but also Orthodoxy in general. In general, belonging to and even supporting the clergy of any political force that tries to divide society is directly opposed to the Christian values of love and mutual understanding. Another of the reasons for such support of the left forces by the Orthodox clergy themselves may have been insufficient education, which they did not have at all or often had elementary schools or other educational institutions.

Only 4 Orthodox priests had a full theological education, the others were either without education, or completed a course in Bushtyno, after which they were ordained priests, mainly by Savvatij.²² And that is why it is worth dwelling on the background of these courses organized by the Orthodox. Juriy Danilets writes in detail about Ivan Chernavin and priestly courses for Orthodox priests, not hiding that ordination could be given in this "school" after three days of study and a certain amount of money, and not thanks to formation and knowledge. The Serbian jurisdiction was involved in the creation of this school, in particular Archimandrite Oleksiy Kabalyuk, but the ordination was performed by the representative of Archbishop Savvatij Veniamin (Fedchenkov) on the recommendation of Ivan Chernavin, who could receive up to 60 000 kr. cz. of illegal profit from candidates for ordination. Since 1923, he was wanted by the local authorities for such activities. Thus, it is surprising why this father stayed in the Czechoslovakia until 1926 and only then left for France and then the USA; also surprising is the positive assessment of Ivan Chernyavin's organizational abilities by the modern researcher Juriy Danylets, despite his illegal activities, but, of course, he had them, considering the performance of his work. As a result, it was the Serbian jurisdiction of the Orthodox that benefited after the schism between the Greek-Eastern (Orthodox) was eliminated, and the main agitation for Orthodoxy and against the Greek-Catholics was carried out by the "graduates" of the mentioned school who were ordained for money. In fact, everything looked like loyalty and support from the authorities of the Czechoslovakia "school" and Ivan Chernavin and, accordingly, the Savvatij jurisdiction in the region.²³ Thus, on July

22 Ibidem.

23 Данилець, Ю.: Заснування та діяльність пастирських курсів в с. Буштино на

24, 1923, the school department of the Civil Administration of Subcarpathian Rus informed the Office of the Vice-governor about the lack of any permits for the opening of priestly courses for Orthodox Christians in Bushtyno, besides, they could not be considered a seminary in any way. The issue of Ivan Chernavin's deportation, as officials noted has also not been resolved.²⁴ At the same time, a secret document from the Ministry of Schools and Public Education in Prague dated August 1, 1923, signed by Minister Rudolf Bechyně, informed the school department of Subcarpathian Rus about the allocation of 50 000 kr.cz. for the Orthodox, of which 35 000 kr.cz. – for material needs and 15 000 kr.cz. for needs – „... *náboženských obcí, nebo komitétů, jejich zřízení připravujících* ...“.²⁵ In general, this document indicates direct support of the Orthodox, because the authorities actually:

- 1) tolerated illegal courses of the Orthodox that were not agreed with the Ministry;
- 2) having information about the agitation, did not deport the guilty;
- 3) financed unregistered communities and even committees (!) that were preparing the creation of Orthodox communities, and in fact, the conversion from the Greek-Catholic denomination to the Orthodox! That is, the authorities of the Czechoslovakia supported activists who organized the conversion to another denomination, which resulted in anarchy with all its consequences – captured temples, threats, the "right" of the majority, etc.

Already on November 3, 1923, in a secret document, the authorities provided 100 000 kr. cz. for the needs of Orthodox communities or committees (!). The money should have been distributed in agreement with the office of the vice-governor of Subcarpathian Rus.²⁶ That is, the entire government vertical was involved in supporting the Orthodox, and the officials of the vice-governor's office became the executors. At the same time, on October 11, 1923, the Presidium of the Political Administration of Subcarpathian Rus informed the Ministry of Internal Affairs in Prague about unrest in various regions between Orthodox and Greek Catholics. At the same time, there was no unity even among the Orthodox themselves. Thus, the Orthodox in Bushtyno under the leadership of Ivan Chernavin (whose deportation was discussed above), Yuriy Kenyz, and others wanted to resolve their disputes with the support of Archbishop Savvatii, on the one hand, and the Autonomous Carpathian Orthodox Church, headed by Secretary Alexiy Kabalyuk, on the other. At

Підкарпатській Русі в 1923–1924 рр., Науковий вісник Ужгородського університету, серія „Історія“, 2020, вип. 1 (42), с. 43–49.

24 ДАЗО в м. Берегові, ф. 29, оп. 3., спр. 351. Переписка з Міністерством внутрішніх справ з питань організації і діяльності православної церкви на Підкарпатській Русі, арк. 150, 156.

25 ДАЗО в м. Берегові, ф. 29, оп. 3, спр. 351, арк. 161.

26 ДАЗО в м. Берегові, ф. 29, оп. 3, спр. 351, арк. 183.

the beginning of April 1923, Alexiy Kabalyuk met with Bishop Gorazd (Pavlik) in Olomouc to resolve church issues. The report for 1926 already shows the commitment of 58 Orthodox priests to one of the jurisdictions – the Serbian jurisdiction headed in the region by Dositey and the Constantinople jurisdiction headed by Savvatij. As a result, after the scandal with the "Bushtino courses" and the corresponding ordinations, a split arose among the Orthodox.

The Greek-Catholic church periodical provides interesting statistics about the absolute victory of the communists in settlements where Orthodoxy was established: Iza 726 out of 1,200 votes for the communists, Koshelvo – 818 out of 996, Berezovo – 818 out of 940 (half Greek-Catholics), Shandrovo – 404 out of 565, Keretsky – 800 out of 1000, Sukha Bronka – 538 out of 620, Krychovo – 463 out of 545, Tereblya – 983 out of 1125. Of course it is very difficult to find out how the communism and Orthodoxy are related, but statistics are a stubborn thing, although one must pay attention to the general statistics of where there were settlements with predominance of Greek Catholics where people voted for communists.²⁷ For example, in Shiroky Luh, according to the information from the report of the local authorities, the communists belonged mainly to the Orthodox. They were led by the Orthodox monk George Chopyk, who, however, was not engaged in active political activity.²⁸ There is quite a lot of information about the lack of education of the clergy that was under the authority of Bishop Savvatij – for example the above-mentioned Ivan Babich, in order to consecrate the throne before his liturgy, climbed on it and walked on it with his feet. Another case happened among the Orthodox themselves, when a Savatii's priest in Yasina knocked the miter off the head of Archimandrite Kabaluk and expelled him from Yasina.²⁹

In total, out of 58 Orthodox priests of both jurisdictions, 19 (over 32%) were in one or another way members or cooperated with left parties in Subcarpathian Rus.³⁰ This is quite a significant figure, given in the report by local officials, because as much as a third of the Orthodox clergy was involved in the political process. It was surprising that this cooperation was with the left parties, which in their program documents forbade religion. Although, on the other hand, it may have been evidence of a premature union of Orthodox and left-wing politicians in order to achieve the goals of weakening and converting Greek Catholics.

27 Дет. статистику див.: Из шизматицького раю, Благовѣстник, №10–12, 1 юнія 1924, с. 154–155.

28 NA, PMR, kart. 143, sign. 263, inv. č. 1559/1926. Pravoslavné hnutí na Podk. Rusi, suspense duchovních směru Savvatého.

29 Див.: Cinek, F.: с. d., s. 245–246.

30 NA, PMR, kart. 143, sign. 263, inv. č. 1559/1926. Pravoslavné hnutí na Podk. Rusi, suspense duchovních směru Savvatého.

The problem of marxism and socialism, unfortunately, also concerned some Greek Catholic priests who tried to go against the social doctrine of the Church. There is a whole case about Stefan Kyrál, a priest of the Mukachevo Diocese, who, fascinated by socialist ideas, even published a left-wing political newspaper, disregarding church authorities and existing prohibitions. On June 8, 1931, the Ordinariate in Uzhhorod issued a warning to Fr. Stefan Kyrál, the administrator of Nizhnia Kolochava, who published the newspaper "Christianity and Socialism" without the permission of the diocesan authorities, the publication of which was banned by the Ordinariate because: „... газета компромиттує не лемь Васъ якъ редактора, но разомъ и цѣлое духовенство”³¹. According to the canons, this meant public disobedience. And therefore, if the attempt to publish another number continues, it was emphasized, you will be „... того самого дня есте инсо факто суспендованъ аб ордине”³². Further, the episcopal board’s letter continues: „... Маєте Вы и такъ много неупорядкованныхъ дѣл предъ Ординаріятъ, не искайте таже собъ и больше”³³. Finally, in November 1931, an announcement was made in the diocesan publication "Dushpastyr" about the suspension of Stefan Kyrál, with all the consequences of a ban on divine services and exclusion from the diocesan clergy.³⁴

Thus, after the period of support in the Austro-Hungarian time the position of the Greek-Catholic Church in Subcarpathian Rus radically changes. The frequent union (however not regular) of the Orthodox clergy with left parties weakened the Greek Catholics. The government itself supported Orthodox communities and even committees that were created in Greek-Catholic communities. Accordingly, the authorities of the Czechoslovakia favored the Orthodox, whose allies were the left parties and even the communists, who often received the majority of votes in the elections in the poor region of Subcarpathian Rus. Although it was not always a regularity. Weak education, primarily of the Savvatij branch of the Orthodox, could be one of the reasons for supporting the communists in the region. Knowing the post-war union of the Orthodox Church with the communist government in 1945–1991, it is unlikely that such a union was only temporary! But this requires deeper research of archival sources, which is a prospect for further studies on this issue.

31 „...the newspaper compromises not only you as an editor, but also the entire clergy“

32 „...on the same day, you will be suspended ab ordine“

33 „...You have so many disordered things before the Ordinariate, do not seek for yourself more“.
See: Archív gréckokatolíckeho arcibiskupstva v Prešove (ďalej AGAP), Bežná agenda, Spisy, rok. 1931, inv. č. 447, sign. 2126.

34 Диспензія о. Стефана Кіраля. In: Душпастырь. Урядовый и духовный органъ епархіи Мукачевской и Пряшевской, рочник VIII (1931), новемберъ, число 11, с. 261–262. Later the dispensation was removed, but nevertheless this case became a good example for the diocesan clergy of both dioceses.

**RADIKALISMUS
V ČESKONĚMECKÉM POMEZÍ**

