

Ibolya SZAMBOROVSKY-NAGY

*PhD (History), Candidate of Historical Sciences, Associate Professor
Director of the Apáczai Csere János Library
F. Rakoczi II Transcarpathian Hungarian College of Higher Education
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5978-1196>
e-mail: szamborovszkyne.nagy.ibolya@kmf.org.ua*

THE INEVITABLE PRIESTHOOD OF PEACE: BISHOP BÉLA GENCSY AS PART OF THE PEACE ADVOCATES' MOVEMENT

The study aims to illustrate through the example of Béla Gencsy, the bishop of the Transcarpathian Reformed Church (TRC), how the Soviet power forced the Protestant church leader into the movement of *peace advocates*'. Additionally, it seeks to convey how this situation affected the bishop's relationship with his congregants and the consequences for both his denomination and his personal life. The research methodology is based on the analysis of little-known and unknown archival sources from the Central State Archives of the Highest Authorities and Administration of Ukraine, the Archives and Museum of the Transcarpathian Reformed Church, as well as contemporary documents and press materials from that time.

The scientific novelty of the paper lies in the fact, that the relationship between churches and the *peace advocates*' movement is rarely the focus of Ukrainian historiography. This research is particularly relevant, as the Cold War extended beyond political, diplomatic, military, economic, and scientific spheres, interacting significantly with religion – thereby influencing ecclesiastical organizations and their leaders. Therefore, this study specifically focuses on the significant impact of the so-called *peace priest* movement on the lives and activities of religious leaders, which affected not only individuals but also communities. The study aims to provide a bottom-up perspective on the *peace advocates*' movement through the activities of Gencsy Béla, the bishop of TRC.

It has been revealed, that when Gencsy assumed leadership of the TRC in the early 1950s, he did not yet grasp the intentions and plans of the Soviet authorities. At that time, he believed that by joining the peace advocates' movement, he might gain greater personal freedom as well as that of his denomination. However, over time, as dean and later bishop, Gencsy's understanding evolved: he recognized that the expectations and pressures from state power increasingly constrained him. The space for religious practice and international relations with denominational partners did not become broader or freer. Consequently, by the early 1970^s, Gencsy had already *resigned* to the Soviet reality: he saw that his room for manoeuvre, despite the peace priest status, could not be described as free of constraints, nor independent or autonomous at all. To a certain extent, his limited room for manoeuvre was also because he did not fully submit to the state ideology, but only adhered to and – with his priests and the Reformed believers – obeyed the Soviet religious laws. From certain point of view, this state of affairs could indeed cover the *notion of straddle*, which was used to describe Genchy by the Council for the Affairs of Religious Cults official in Transcarpathia

in the early 1950^s. However, this may also serve as evidence that he was neither a KGB agent nor an embedded informant. At least, no sources have yet emerged to refute this claim.

Key words: Béla Gencsy, Cold War, peace priest, Soviet Union, Transcarpathia Oblast, Transcarpathian Reformed Church, World Council of Churches.

The problematic nature of the topic is rooted in the fact that, although the Cold War was not only confined to the political, diplomatic, military, economic as well as scientific spheres, and it exerted a profound influence on religion – including the church organization and its leaders – both in the West and the East, the churches and the *peace advocates' movement* is rarely in the focus of Ukrainian historiography.

In this regard, the study of Viktor Yelenskyi (Єленський, 1998) and, in a certain sense, of Leonyid Chernyavskiy (Чернявський, 2011) are relevant from the perspective of ukrainian historiography. The former author, commemorating the 50th anniversary of the founding of the World Council of Churches (WCC), traces its main principles and history, highlighting the attitude and role of Orthodoxy in it. The latter author writes, among other things, about the infiltration of the Soviet Union into the WCC. Among the foreign studies, the multi-authored publication edited by Philip E. Muehlenbeck (Muehlenbeck, 2012), whose studies highlight the significant intertwining of religion and the Cold War, is certainly important as a flagship volume. Another relevant volume on the subject edited by Julius Filo (Filo, 2012) was also published in 2012, however this time with focus on Central and Eastern Europe. The latter one contains a study on the international activity of the Russian Orthodox Church (ROC) during the Cold War (Beliakova-Beglov, 2012), which is relevant to our research object (Church Policy of the Soviet Union). In the context of recent research on the political orchestration of the peace movement, two studies by Gábor Lányi (Lányi, 2022, Lányi, 2023), are worth highlighting, whereas the research on the place and role of Protestants – in the period we have also studied – was based on the work of Hans Krabbendam (Krabbendam, 2017, p. 331–347).

These publications discuss the object of our research at a macro level, however do not focus on the experience and/or the significant consequences of being forced into the so-called *peace priest* movement and its impact on the lives and activities of religious leaders, which in turn affected not only individuals but also burdened communities. In our study we intend to partially present the *peace advocates' movement* from the bottom-up approach. Our aim is to illustrate through the example of Béla Gencsy, Bishop of the Transcarpathian Reformed Church (TRC), how the Soviet power *forced* the Protestant church leader into the *peace advocates' movement*. In addition, we also seek to illustrate how it affected the pastor's/bishop's relationship with the congregation, and the consequences on the denomination and his personal life.

Béla Gencsy was born on 21 December 1899, in Botfalva (8 km southwest of Uzhhorod, near the Ukrainian-Slovak border). He finished the Reformed High School of Sárospatak in 1916 (SRFÉ, p. 80), and completed his theological studies at the Faculty of Theology of the University of Debrecen, where he was ordained a priest in 1921 (Egyetértés, p. 3). In 1922, he was back to Veľké Kapušany (in Hung.: Nagykapos) (RMH, p. 6) in the then Ung County. In 1923 the parish of Siurte (in Hung.: Szürte) invited him to be its pastor, where he served until 1977. In the period between the two world wars he was active not only in his parish, but also in his diocese: he was president of the Diocesan Pastors' Association, board member of the Uzhhorod County Public Welfare Cooperative (NCS, p. 435),

vice-president (SRL-1, p. 76) and then president (SRL-3, p. 190) of the Association of Ministers and Teachers of the Uzhhorod Reformed Diocese. On 6 June 1940, the Diocesan General Assembly elected Béla Gencsy, pastor of Siurte (in Hung.: Szürte) (SRL-2, p. 177), member of the Diocesan Council. Since the dean of the Ung County Diocese left his post during the World War II, Gencsy became leader of the Ung County deanery in January 1945. On 9 June 1948 in Berehove (in Hung.: Beregszász), he – as district leader – also had to sign the so-called loyalty declaration addressed to Mihajlo Rasputyko the then Council for the Affairs of Religious Cults (CARC) plenipotentiary official in Uzhhorod. Finally, on 23 December 1949, he was elected dean (archdeacon) by the three diocesan leaders in Uzhhorod (ГАРФ-1, апк. 88). He held this position until 1956.

As the first step of the intensifying *religious* peace movement following the World War ii, is usually considered to be the first General Assembly of the World Council of Churches held in Amsterdam on 23 August 1948 (Köpeczi Bócz, 2021). In the beginning it united Protestants. This happened after the Brussels Pact was signed in March 1948, which became the basis for the Western military alliance (and led to the creation of NATO). The Soviet Union then perceived this move as a hostile act and on 6 January 1949 the Political Bureau (PB) of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (CC CPSU) adopted a resolution «About the World Congress of peace supporters». The Political Bureau (PB) considered it essential to organise a *World Peace Congress* (WPC), which, in addition to the trade unions, women's and children's organisations in the Soviet Union (Chernyavskiy 2011, s. 185), was intended to include the legally operating churches and religious communities. In this way, the *struggle for peace* and the establishment and promotion of the «movement of peace supporters» became a key focus of Soviet foreign policy. In February 1949, Aleksii, Patriarch of Moscow and all Rus' (on behalf the Orthodox Church) addressed an appeal to the leaders of all Orthodox autocephalous churches in *defence of peace* (ЖМП-1, 3). Thereafter, from 20 to 25 April 1949, the first World Peace Conference was held both in Paris and Prague, where two thousand participants from 72 countries founded the World Peace Council, with the French physicist Frédéric Joliot-Curie elected as its president (Первый Всемирный). The organisation already had a significant number of communists in its leadership, and later came increasingly under Soviet control, even though it was a major dilemma for Orthodoxy to join a Protestant-majority organisation (Еленський, 1998, с. 2).

As a result, the All-Union Peace Conference was convened in Moscow in August 1949, and the Soviet *Peace Council* was established, with the above-mentioned Alexy, Patriarch of the Russian Orthodox Church, as one of its keynote speakers (Еропова, 2016, с. 41). In March 1950, Aleksii addressed an appeal to the religious communities of the Soviet Union, in which he advocated unity for the common cause of peace (ЖМП-2, 5). Meanwhile, the Supreme Council of the USSR (SC) launched an initiative and *called for* social adherence to the Stockholm Declaration of the World Peace Council demanding a complete ban on nuclear weapons (Донцев, 2023, с. 50). This initiative could not be ignored by any church licensed to operate in the Soviet Union at the time, including the Reformed Church in Transcarpathia. Consequently, Gencsy, in a circular letter, appealed to the members of his church to defend peace: «The leader of the Transcarpathian Reformed Church, on behalf of the Reformed clergy and its believers, expresses its highest readiness to join the resolution of the Stockholm session of the Permanent Committee of the World Peace Congress, which declares the prohibition of nuclear weapons and the government which is the first to use nuclear weapons against any country a war criminal. The Transcarpathian Reformed Church

raise its voice in defence of peace and work with all its strength to preserve and safeguard it» (KRELM-1).

The above statement did not reflect the personal opinion or position of Béla Gencsy, but the determined reaction of a smaller unit within a larger system. On 19 June 1950, the SC of the USSR proposed that the *World Congress of Peace Advocates* should establish its Permanent Committee, which then became one of the decisive platforms for the public representation of the churches in the USSR, both in the country and on the international arena (Мандельштам, 1956, с. 141). The Soviet Union has definitely taken advantage of this movement to give a positive image of itself, which not only damaged the reputation of Protestant denominations (including their adherents), but also of the TRC and its leader. Therefore – as Philip E. Muehlenbeck has pointed out – although religion cannot be *made a key factor*, it has played a significant role in determining the nature and course of the global Cold War (Muehlenbeck, 2012, viii). We can already see that the exploitation of religion has resulted in considerable damage, however the extent of the damage it has caused to the churches is still unclear (Кунтер, 2017, с. 148).

In May 1952, the Soviet Peace Committee – with the assistance of the Russian Orthodox Church – convened and held the first Soviet Peace Conference in Zagorsk Monastery near Moscow, at which all the churches and religious communities of the country were represented. Transcarpathia was represented by Béla Gencsy as the head of the TRC and Miklós Stéfán, pastor of Mali Rativci (in Hung.: Kistrát), at the event (Конференция, 1952, с. 12). Gencsy addressed the meeting on the second day, 10 May. However, as he did not speak perfect Russian, he spoke in his mother tongue – Hungarian – and a translation of the text was given to the audience in writing. (Конференция, 1952, с. 202–207). This was a manifestation of loyalty to the state party, but it was and is still subject to criticism. However, it should also be seen that his participation in Zagorsk and the signing of the Final Declaration enabled him to apply to the central body of the CARC for permission to deal with issues that had been unresolved for some time. Among these, it is worth mentioning the following:

- authorisation to send pastors to the Reformed believers scattered in the mountains: Rahiv (in Hung.: Rahó), Szvaljava (in Hung.: Szolyva), Solotvino (in Hung.: Aknaszlatina), Jasina (in Hung.: Kőrösmező);
- permission for the ordination of new pastors for the TRC (the ordination was performed by the Bishop of Miskolc (Hungary);
- delegation of already licensed pastors to unregistered congregations, thus saving the latter from being abolished (Капітан, 2013а, с. 185).

Because of the latter decision, Rasputyko accused Gencsy of *straddling* and petitioned Pavlo Viljhovyi (the CARC's Kiev plenipotentiary) to withdraw the dean's operating license and to dismiss him as head of the Reformed Church organization. His superior, however, did not consider it timely to replace Gencsy and whatsmore, in January 1953, he instructed his subordinate in Transcarpathia to ensure that the registration of Reformed parishes in the cities of Uzhhorod and Mukachevo (in Hung.: Munkács) was finally carried out (Капітан, 2013b, с. 142).

The following circular of 1955, was one of the stages on the path of compulsion described above, in the last sentence of which – *to be proclaimed from the pulpit* – he most probably complied with the demands of the state office: «We all know that on 8 March the Plenum of the Soviet Peace Defence Committee accepted the Vienna Appeal of the World Peace Council and decided to begin collecting signatures in the Soviet Union on 1 April. It

aims to stop the production of nuclear weapons worldwide and calls for their prohibition. Nuclear energy must be used for peaceful purposes and should serve humanity's progress. The appeal condemns the Paris Treaty, West German's armament and war provocations from any side. I call upon my Pastor Brothers, the Presidencies of the Churches, all my Brothers and Sisters in Faith to respond to this appeal and, united in the defence and service of the cause of peace, sign the peace papers issued by the Peace Committee! I am convinced that if the peace-loving people of the world, millions of them, unite, the cause of World Peace will win! /to be proclaimed from the pulpit/» (KRELM-2).

We know from our previous research (Самборовски-Нодь, 2024) that Gencsy's 1956 position on the deportation of Hungarian freedom fighters to the Soviet Union was *not enough* to grant the bishop permission to welcome the secretary of the World Alliance of Reformed Churches (WARC) in Transcarpathia in 1957, because he would have come from a capitalist country (ГАРФ-2, арх. 298). However, when in 1958 Josef Hromádka (a theologian and university educator from Prague), a Czech vice-president of the WARC, arrived in the Soviet Union, the bishop was allowed to greet the guest from the socialist country in Uzhhorod (Révay, 1959, p. 222). Nevertheless, the following year he was not allowed to attend the Second Christian Peace Conference (CPC) in Prague. In 1958, a letter from the General Secretary of the WARC to Genchy was censored and it was not delivered to him and thus in 1960, his application to attend the Third CPC was again declined. These measures, in fact, coincided with the intensification of the Khrushchev's persecution of the Church (Szamborovszkyné Nagy, 2020, p. 31–33).

Finally, through the efforts of Hromádka, a prominent Protestant representative of friendly Czechoslovakia, the Soviet authorities granted Bishop Gencsy permission to officially travel abroad in 1961. This is how he got to the first CPC in Prague on 13–18 June 1961 – where he was very active – he became a member of the *Peace and Justice Committee* and even delivered a speech there. Moreover, he submitted a lengthy report on his trip to Prague to the CARC. Thus, we know that on behalf of the Secretary General of the WARC, they had lengthy talks with his deputy, Heinrich Hellstern, who took a specific interest in the life of the Reformed communities in Transcarpathia and offered to support the association financially. Gencsy was aware, however, that he could not reveal what the conditions were really like in the Soviet Union and exactly what the Reformed people were experiencing there. It is clear from the report that the Swiss pastor could have understood Gencsy's wording – if he wanted to or was able to, – because, for example, when the income of the pastors was discussed, the bishop indicated that it was equal to the average salary of school teachers (ЦДАБОВУ-6, арх. 84–85). Immediately after the conversation with the Deputy Secretary General, the Bishop received an official letter from the Secretary General himself, inviting him to the European Conference of the WARC to be held from 24 to 29 August 1961, in Switzerland (ЦДАБОВУ-6, арх. 84). The bishop was not even allowed to do so, because the local CARC plenipotentiary considered it unnecessary and feared that Gencsy might reveal compromising information about the situation in the Soviet Union. The reaction of the Transcarpathian plenipotentiary was similar in October 1962, when the CARC Vice-Chairman in Moscow wanted to delegate someone from the TRC to the 3rd European Conference of Churches in Denmark. However, Mihailo Salamatina, referring to the local KGB in charge of the area, claimed that unfortunately, they were unable to delegate a reliable Reformed pastor there. Thus, Genchy was not considered either loyal or a reliable person even after such a long time (ЦДАБОВУ-7, арх. 164). In 1963, for the same reason,

he was not allowed to travel to the *Peace and Justice Committee* meeting in Erfurt, despite the official invitation from Metropolitan Justin (Iasi, Romania) (ИДАБОБЫ-8, apk. 174).

The increased foreign interest in the life of Transcarpathian Reformed Church and its congregation was met with great surprise in the CARC offices. They were even more puzzled by a further request from the National Council of Christian Churches of the USA, addressed personally to Béla Gencsy in 1962, asking the bishop *to be* a member of the church delegation from the Soviet Union to the USA. However, when it became apparent that he hadn't been included on the delegation's list by the authorities, the Council's representative in New York sent Gencsy a personal invitation (ИДАБОБЫ-8, apk. 170). The bishop, according to Salamatin, would have loved to go to New York, but he had no money. The Transcarpathian CARC official was personally very irritated by the fact that the leading officials of the WARC were constantly looking for opportunities to meet and communicate with the Transcarpathian bishop and were seeking ways to engage the Transcarpathian Reformed Church in the world community (ИДАБОБЫ-8, apk. 171). He experienced it as a personal failure when, in 1963, an official delegation from Western Europe and the USA held talks with Béla Gencsy during their visit to Transcarpathia and assured him of their financial support for the TRC. Due to a series of invitations from abroad, the bishop was finally able to travel to Prague for the Christian Peace Conference in 1964, and even Reverend Miklós Stéfán of Mali Rativci (in Hung.: Kistrát) accompanied him. The third person to travel from Transcarpathia to Prague was the then Chief Presbyter of the Evangelical Christian Baptists in Transcarpathia, Mihailo Mocsarko (ИДАБОБЫ-4, apk. 204). During the six-day event, the bishop had an opportunity to hold a working dinner and to meet personally with Marcel Pradervand, the then General Secretary of the World Alliance of Reformed Churches, who reiterated the idea of the TRC becoming a member of the WARC. The Secretary General led off the discussion by saying that the organization would foot the bill for the once-a-year trips, and invited the bishop to the 1964 WARC Congress in Frankfurt. In addition to Pradervand, Gencsy had talks with several other churchmen, including Bishop Sándor Búthi of Oradea, Josef Gromádka, Dr. Zsigmond Varga, theology professor at Debrecen, Dr. Imre Varga, Bishop of the Reformed Christian Church of Slovakia (ИДАБОБЫ-5, apk. 206), who used to be a missionary assistant pastor in Mukachevo (in Hung.: Munkács) from 1929 and episcopal chaplain from 1930 (RL, p. 1). The WARC agreed to pay for the Moscow-Prague-Frankfurt round-trip airfare for the bishop, but in Frankfurt «of the Hungarian Reformed bishops who held office at that time, only Béla Gencsy, the bishop of the Transcarpathian diocese, was unable to attend, and was not allowed to leave the country» (ME, p. 3–4).

While the acceptance of invitations to a capitalist country had never been supported by the CARC office, the KGB had no objections to his travel to the WARC' Executive Committee meeting in Europe in socialist Warsaw on 10–11 May 1965 (ИДАБОБЫ-1, apk. 1). At this meeting in Warsaw, a solution was finally found for the TRC to become a member of the WARC, although the Communist Party's Transcarpathian Regional Committee refused to grant the bishop permission to apply for it's membership. On 7 July, 1965 Pradervand officially informed Bishop Béla Gencsy that at a meeting in Baguio, Philippines, the Executive Committee of the WARC made the following decision: «Since the Transcarpathian Church was a member of the world organization until 1945 and has not requested the termination of its membership since then, its membership is still active» (ИДАБОБЫ-2, apk. 26). Thus, the long desired membership in the WARC was achieved without the permission of the Soviet CARC. Consequently, the Bishop was able to attend

the meeting of the Coordination Committee of the Christian Peace Conference held in Budapest from 13 to 20 October 1965 (ЦДАБОВУ-3, арк. 35).

It is clear from the above events that the attitude of the authorities has not changed over time: they have always reacted to the bishop's foreign contacts and travel requests on a case-by-case basis, however never granted him permission to travel to a capitalist country. This unsettled attitude has not changed even after the period of active church persecution. Thus it happened that in 1967, while the Hungarian Reformed Church, scattered in twenty-eight countries on five continents, gathered to commemorate the 400th Anniversary of the Second Apostles' Creed in the Great Church of Debrecen, Bishop Béla Gencsy was not allowed to travel to *friendly* and neighbouring Hungary. As the author of the report put it very precisely, «the few steps across the border were an insurmountable barrier» for him (BN, p. 60–61). However, by this time he had already *resigned* himself to the Soviet reality. At the beginning of 1974, Béla Gencsy, «Bishop of the Carpatho-Ukrainian Reformed Church part of the Soviet Union», celebrated a double jubilee, marking the fiftieth year of his pastoral ministry and the twenty-fifth year of his episcopal ministry. The Hungarian Reformed community of the world, in addition to the motherland, paid tribute to him and welcomed him, «asking for God's rich blessing on his future life» (RSZ, p. 243; HT, p. 13). The Religious Affairs Office no longer expected his resignation, and when he finally resigned his episcopate in 1978, he was given a farewell ceremony at the end of his ministry.

In conclusion, when Béla Gencsy *embarked on* his leadership journey of the Reformed Church in Transcarpathia in the early 1950^s, he had not yet fully grasped the intentions and plans of the Soviet authorities, and believed that if he joined the *peace advocates' movement*, he might have more room for manoeuvre, not only for himself personally, but also for his denomination. As time went on – as dean and then bishop – the situation was becoming clearer for Gencsy, since the expectations and urges of the state power and its leaders put him under pressure. The scope for religious practice has not been expanded, nor has it been freed up, nor has it been made more open to foreign contacts with religious brothers and sisters. Consequently, by the early 1970^s, he had already *resigned to* the Soviet reality: he saw that his room for manoeuvre, despite the *peace priest* status, could not be described as free of constraints, nor independent or autonomous at all. To a certain extent, his limited room for manoeuvre was also due to the fact that he did not fully submit to the state ideology, but only adhered to and – with his priests and the Reformed believers – obeyed the Soviet religious laws. From certain point of view, this state of affairs could indeed cover the *notion of straddle*, which was used to describe Genchy by the Council for the Affairs of Religious Cults official in Transcarpathia in the early 1950^s. At the same time it may be proof that he was not an agent or undercover informant. To date, at least, no source has come to light to refute the latter. Nevertheless, we believe that this issue has not yet been definitively resolved, as sources may have come to light that could cast doubt on the question, including the perception of Béla Gencsy's activities as a *peace priest*.

ДЖЕРЕЛА ТА ЛІТЕРАТУРА

ГАРФ-1: Государственный архив Российской Федерации (ГАРФ), ф. 6991 (Совет по делам религий при Совете Министров СССР), оп. 3. д. 1113. арк. 88.

ГАРФ-2: ГАРФ, ф. 6991, оп. 3, д. 1114, арк. 298.

Донцев, С. (2023). Религия и церковь в советском миротворческом движении (1949–1953). В Н. В. Вологина. (гл. ред.), «Союз нерушимый ...». 100-летию образо-

вання ССРСР посвяається: матеріали Міжнародної науко-практичної конференції. Могилев, 49–52.

Егорова, Н. (2016). «Народная дипломатия» ядерного века: движение сторонников мира и проблема разоружения. 1955–1965 годы. Москва.

Сленський, В. (1998). «За мир світу, благоустрій церков і поєднання всіх...». *Людина і світ*, 8, 2–8.

ЖМП-1: Призыв Патриарха Московского и всея Руси Алексия в защиту мира. (1949). *Журнал Московской Патриархии*, 7(2).

ЖМП-2: Патриарх Алексий: Предстоятелям всех православных автокефальных церквей. (1950). *Журнал Московской Патриархии*, 8(3).

Капітан, Л. (2013a). А. Генче – очільник реформатської церкви Закарпаття. *Наукові праці історичного факультету Запорізького національного університету*, 35, 184–187.

Капітан, Л. (2013b). Процес реєстрації реформатських громад в повоєнному Закарпатті: прояв лояльності чи політична гра. *Краєзнавство*, 30, 139–145.

Конференция всех церквей и религиозных объединений в СССР, посвящённая вопросу защиты мира. Загорск, Троице-Сергиева Лавра, 9–12 мая 1952. Материалы. (1952). Москва: Издание Московской патриархии.

Кунтер, К. (2017). Был ли третий путь? Всемирный совет церквей в период холодной войны. *Государство, религия, церковь в России и за рубежом*, 35/1, 147–163.

Мандельштам, Ю. И. (ред.). (1956). *Сборник законов СССР и указов Президиума Верховного Совета СССР. 1938 г. – июль 1956 г.* Москва.

Первый Всемирный конгресс сторонников мира. Париж–Прага, 20–25 апреля 1949 года. Материалы. Москва, 1950.

Самборовські-Нодь, І. (2024). Зі свободою дій чи під примусом? Амбівалентний 1956 рік єпископа Бейли Генчі. *Наукові записки Вінницького державного педагогічного університету імені Михайла Коцюбинського. Серія: Історія*, 49, 37–43. <https://doi.org/10.31652/2411-2143-2024-49-37-43>

ЦДАВОВУ-1: Центральний державний архів вищих органів влади та управління України, м. Київ (ЦДАВО України), ф. 4648, оп. 2, спр. 457, арк. 1.

ЦДАВОВУ-2: ЦДАВО України, ф. 4648, оп. 2, спр. 457, арк. 26.

ЦДАВОВУ-3: ЦДАВО України, ф. 4648, оп. 2, спр. 457, арк. 35.

ЦДАВОВУ-4: ЦДАВО України, ф. 4648, оп. 2, спр. 457, арк. 204.

ЦДАВОВУ-5: ЦДАВО України, ф. 4648, оп. 2, спр. 457, арк. 206.

ЦДАВОВУ-6: ЦДАВО України, ф. 4648, оп. 4, од. зб. 308, арк. 84–85.

ЦДАВОВУ-7: ЦДАВО України, ф. 4648, оп. 4, од. зб. 326, арк. 164.

ЦДАВОВУ-8: ЦДАВО України, ф. 4648, оп. 4, од. зб. 343, арк. 170–171, 174.

Чернявський, Л. (2011). Протистояння профспілок у боротьбі за мир: епізоди історії «холодної війни» (1949–1960 рр.). *Вісник Харківського національного університету імені В. Н. Каразіна. Серія Історія*, 43, 180–190.

Beliakova, N., & Beglov, A. (2012). International Activity of the Russian Orthodox Church during the Cold War. The results and the future prospects of the study. In J. Filo. (Ed.), *Christian World Community and the Cold War*. Bratislava, 171–192.

BN: N. L. Második Helvétitvallás 400 éves jubileuma. (1968, Ligonier). *Bethlen Naptár*, 47, 60–61.

Egyetértés: Vasárnapi istentiszteletek. (1921, május 28). *Egyetértés*, 3.

- Filo, J. (Ed.). (2012). *Christian World Community and the Cold War*. Bratislava.
- HT:** *Hazai Tudósítások*. (1974. június). 13.
- Köpeczi Bócz, E. (2021). *Az Állami Egyházügyi Hivatal tevékenysége*. Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest. <https://doi.org/10.1556/9789634546856>
- Krabbendam, H. (2017). A transatlantic religious alliance? American and European protestant encounters, 1945–1965. *Journal of Transatlantic Studies*, (15)4, 331–347.
- KRELM-1:** Kárpátaljai Református Egyházkerület Levéltára és Múzeuma (KRELM). I.10.c. Felsőbbhatósági rendeletek, Valamennyi Református Egyház Elnökségének. 1955. március 22.
- KRELM-2:** KRELM. I.10.c. Valamennyi Ref. Egyház Elnökségének. 1950. június 2.
- Lányi, G. J. (2022). Hungarians and Koreans in the «Religious Cold War». Political Instrumentalization of the Reformed Church in Hungary's Ecumenical Activity in the Early 1950s. In Park, G. S., Kovács, Á. (Eds.), *Reformed Legacy in Korea and Hungary. Religious, Cultural and Theological Approaches*. Seoul; Debrecen, 193–234.
- Lányi, G. (2023). A vallásos hidegháború (Religious Cold War) megközelítésmódjának kialakulása és fejlődése. In Andreides, G., M. Madarász, A., Soós, V. A., Szilágyi, G., Szóts, Z. O. (Eds.), *Lehetőségek, dilemmák, kompromisszumok. Magyarország és a világ 1945 után*. Budapest, 39–65.
- ME:** Dr. Béky Zoltán püspök. Beszámoló a frankfurti világgyűlésről. *Magyar Egyház (USA)*. (1964. július 1). 3–4.
- Muehlenbeck, P. E. (Ed.). (2012). *Religion and the Cold War. A Global Perspective*. Nashville.
- NCS:** *Nép és Családvédelem*. (1942, november 1). 435.
- Révay, I. (1959). A kárpátaljai magyarság élete 1958-ban. *Katolikus Szemle (Róma)*, 11(3), 222.
- RL:** Elhunyt dr. Varga Imre püspök. *Reformátusok Lapja*. (1980. december), 50. 1.
- RMH:** Hírek. *Ruszinzkói Magyar Hírlap*. (1923. július 26). 6.
- RSZ:** *Református Szemle*. (1974. március), 243.
- SRFÉ:** *A Sárospataki Református Főiskola értesítője az 1916–1917-ik iskolai évről*. (1970). Sárospatak, 80.
- SRL-1:** Lelkeszi-tanítói értekezlet Ungváron. (1940. április 21). *Sárospataki Református Lapok*, 76.
- SRL-2:** *Sárospataki Református Lapok*. (1940. szeptember 15). 177.
- SRL-3:** *Sárospataki Református Lapok*. (1941. október 4). 190.
- Szamborovszkyné Nagy, I. (2020). Magyar reformátusok a Szovjetunióban a hrucsovi egyházüldözés időszakában. *Betekintő*, 14(3), 27–54. <https://doi.org/10.25834/BET.2020.3.2>

REFERENCES

- Gosudarstvennii arkhiv Rossiiskoi Federatsii (GARF), f. 6991 (Sovet po delam religii pri Sovete Ministrov SSSR), op. 3. d. 1113. ark. 88 (in Russian).
- GARF, f. 6991, op. 3, d. 1114, ark. 298 (in Russian).
- Dontsev, S. (2023). *Religiya i tserkov v sovetskom mirotvorcheskom dvizhenii (1949–1953)*. In N. V. Vologina. (Ed.), «Soyuz nerushimii ...». *100-letiyu obrazovaniya SSSR posvyashchaetsya: materialy Mezhdunarodnoi nauchno-prakticheskoi konferentsii*. Mogilev, 49–52 (in Russian).

Yegorova, N. (2016). «*Narodnaya diplomatiya*» yadernogo veka: dvizhenie storonnikov mira i problema razoruzheniya. 1955–1965 godi. Moscow (in Russian).

Yelenskyi, V. (1998). «*Za myr svitu, blahoustrii tserkov i poiednannia vsikh...*». *Liudyna i svit*, 8, 2–8 (in Ukrainian).

Priziv Patriarkha Moskovskogo i vseya Rusi Aleksiya v zashchitu mira. (1949). *Zhurnal Moskovskoi Patriarkhii*, 7(2) (in Russian).

Patriarkh Aleksii: Predstoyatelyam vseh pravoslavnykh avtokefalnykh tserkvei. (1950). *Zhurnal Moskovskoi Patriarkhii*, 8(3) (in Russian).

Kapitan, L. (2013a). A. Henche – ochilnyk reformataskoi tserkvy Zakarpattia. *Naukovi pratsi istorichnoho fakultetu Zaporizkoho natsionalnoho universytetu*, 35, 184–187 (in Ukrainian).

Kapitan, L. (2013b). Protse reiestratsii reformatyskykh hromad v poviennomu Zakarpatti: proiav loialnosti chy politychna hra. *Kraieznavstvo*, 30, 139–145 (in Ukrainian).

Konferentsiya vseh tserkvei i religioznikh obedinenii v SSSR, posvyashchyonnaya voprosu zashchiti mira. Zagorsk, Troitse-Sergieva Lavra, 9–12 maya 1952. *Materiali*. (1952). Moscow: Izdanie Moskovskoi patriarkhii (in Russia).

Kunter, K. (2017). Bil li tretii put? Vsemirnyi sovet tserkvei v period kholodnoi voini. *Gosudarstvo, religiya, tserkov v Rossii i za rubezhom*, 35/1, 147–163 (in Russia).

Mandelstam, Yu. I. (Ed.). (1956). *Sbornik zakonov SSSR i ukazov Prezidiuma Verkhovnogo Soveta SSSR. 1938 g. – iyul 1956 g.* Moscow (in Russia).

Pervii Vsemirnyi kongress storonnikov mira. Parizh–Praga, 20–25 aprelya 1949 goda. *Materiali*. Moscow, 1950 (in Russia).

Samborovski-Nod, I. (2024). Zi svobodoiu dii chy pid prymusom? Ambivalentnyi 1956 rik yepyskopa Beily Genchi. *Naukovi zapysky Vinnytskoho derzhavnoho pedahohichnoho universytetu imeni Mykhaila Kotsiubynskoho. Serii: Istorii*, 49, 37–43. <https://doi.org/10.31652/2411-2143-2024-49-37-43> (in Ukrainian).

Tsentrallyi derzhavnyi arkhiv vyshchykh orhaniv (TsDAVO) Ukrainy, f. 4648 (Rada v spravakh relihii pry Ministerstvi u spravakh mihratsii i natsionalnostei Ukrainy ta yii poperednyky: (obiednanyi fond)), op. 2, spr. 457, ark. 1 (in Ukrainian).

TsDAVO Ukrainy, f. 4648, op. 2, spr. 457, ark. 26 (in Ukrainian).

TsDAVO Ukrainy, f. 4648, op. 2, spr. 457, ark. 35 (in Ukrainian).

TsDAVO Ukrainy, f. 4648, op. 2, spr. 457, ark. 204 (in Ukrainian).

TsDAVO Ukrainy, f. 4648, op. 2, spr. 457, ark. 206 (in Ukrainian).

TsDAVO Ukrainy, f. 4648, op. 4, od. zb. 308, ark. 84–85 (in Ukrainian).

TsDAVO Ukrainy, f. 4648, op. 4, od. zb. 326, ark. 164 (in Ukrainian).

TsDAVO Ukrainy, f. 4648, op. 4, od. zb. 343, ark. 170–171, 174 (in Ukrainian).

Cherniavskyi, L. (2011). Protystoiannia profspilok u borotbi za myr: epizody istorii «kholodnoi viiny» (1949–1960 rr.). *Visnyk Kharkivskoho natsionalnoho universytetu imeni V. N. Karazina. Serii Istorii*, 43, 180–190 (in Ukrainian).

Beliakova, N., & Beglov, A. (2012). International Activity of the Russian Orthodox Church during the Cold War. The results and the future prospects of the study. In J. Filo. (Ed.), *Christian World Community and the Cold War*. Bratislava, 171–192 (in English).

N. L. Második Helvéthitvallás 400 éves jubileuma. (1968, Ligonier). *Bethlen Naptár*, 47, 60–61 (in Hungarian).

Egyetértés: Vasárnapi istentiszteletek. (1921, május 28). *Egyetértés*, 3 (in Hungarian).

Filo, J. (Ed.). (2012). *Christian World Community and the Cold War*. Bratislava (in English).

- HT:** *Hazai Tudósítások*. (1974. június). 13. (in Hungarian).
- Köpeczi Bócz, E. (2021). *Az Allami Egyházügyi Hivatal tevékenysége*. Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest. <https://doi.org/10.1556/9789634546856> (in Hungarian).
- Krabbendam, H. (2017). A transatlantic religious alliance? American and European protestant encounters, 1945–1965. *Journal of Transatlantic Studies*, (15)4, 331–347 (in English).
- KRELМ-1:** Kárpátaljai Református Egyházkerület Levéltára és Múzeuma (KRELМ). I.10.c. Felsőbbhatósági rendeletek, Valamennyi Református Egyház Elnökségének. 1955. március 22 (in Hungarian).
- KRELМ-2:** KRELМ. I.10.c. Valamennyi Ref. Egyház Elnökségének. 1950. június 2 (in Hungarian).
- Lányi, G. J. (2022). Hungarians and Koreans in the «Religious Cold War». Political Instrumentalization of the Reformed Church in Hungary's Ecumenical Activity in the Early 1950^s. In Park, G. S., Kovács, Á. (Eds.), *Reformed Legacy in Korea and Hungary. Religious, Cultural and Theological Approaches*. Seoul; Debrecen, 193–234 (in Hungarian).
- Lányi, G. (2023). A vallásos hidegháború (Religious Cold War) megközelítésmódjának kialakulása és fejlődése. In Andreides, G., M. Madarász, A., Soós, V. A., Szilágyi, G., Szóts, Z. O. (Eds.), *Lehetőségek, dilemmák, kompromisszumok. Magyarország és a világ 1945 után*. Budapest, 39–65 (in English).
- Dr. Béky Zoltán püspök. Beszámoló a frankfurti világgyűlésről. *Magyar Egyház (USA)*. (1964, július 1). 3–4 (in Hungarian).
- Muehlenbeck, P. E. (Ed.). (2012). *Religion and the Cold War. A Global Perspective*. Nashville (in English).
- NCS:** *Nép és Családvédelem*. (1942, november 1). 435 (in Hungarian).
- Révay, I. (1959). A kárpátaljai magyarság élete 1958-ban. *Katolikus Szemle (Róma)*, 11(3), 222 (in Hungarian).
- RL:** Elhunyt dr. Varga Imre püspök. *Reformátusok Lapja*. (1980. december), 50. 1. (in Hungarian).
- RMH:** Hírek. *Ruszinszkói Magyar Hírlap*. (1923. július 26). 6 (in Hungarian).
- RSZ:** *Református Szemle*. (1974. március), 243 (in Hungarian).
- SRFÉ:** *A Sárospataki Református Főiskola értesítője az 1916–1917-ik iskolai évről*. (1970). Sárospatak, 80 (in Hungarian).
- SRL-1:** Lelkeszi-tanítói értekezéslet Ungváron. (1940. április 21). *Sárospataki Református Lapok*, 76 (in Hungarian).
- SRL-2:** *Sárospataki Református Lapok*. (1940. szeptember 15). 177 (in Hungarian).
- SRL-3:** *Sárospataki Református Lapok*. (1941. október 4). 190 (in Hungarian).
- Szamborovszkyné Nagy, I. (2020). Magyar reformátusok a Szovjetunióban a hrucsovi egyházüldözés időszakában. *Betekintő*, 14(3), 27–54. <https://doi.org/10.25834/BET.2020.3.2> (in Hungarian).

Ібoя САМБОРОВСЬКІ-НОДЬ

PhD, доцент

*директор бібліотеки ім. Опаної Черв Яноша
Закарпатського угорського інституту ім. Ф. Ракоці II
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5978-1196>
e-mail: szamborovszkyne.nagy.ibolya@kmf.org.ua*

НЕМИНУЧИСТЬ УЧАСТІ В «МИРОТВОРЧОМУ ДУХІВНИЦТВІ»: ЄПІСКОП БЕЙЛА ГЕНЧІ В РУСІ ПРИХИЛЬНИКІВ МИРУ

На прикладі єпископа ЗРЦ Б. Генчі розкрито, як радянська влада «втиснула» керівника протестантської Церкви в рух прихильників миру. Зроблено спробу простежити, як це вплинуло на стосунки між священником (і єпископом) та його вірянами і які мало наслідки для існування конфесії та особистого життя священнослужителя. Проаналізовано маловідомі й невідомі архівні джерела Архіву та Музею Закарпатського реформатського церковного округу, Центрального державного архіву вищих органів влади та управління України, а також документи й публікації у пресі того часу.

Стверджено, що наукова новизна роботи полягає в тому, що зв'язки Церков і руху прихильників миру досить рідко потрапляють у фокус уваги української історіографії, а це дослідження дає можливість заповнити білі плями, оскільки «холодна війна» виявлялася не тільки в політичній, дипломатичній, військовій, економічній та науковій площині, а як на Заході, так і на Сході вступила у визначальну взаємодію з релігією, а отже, із церковними структурами та їхніми керівниками. Саме тому в публікації акцентовано на впливі на життя та діяльність релігійних діячів т. зв. руху миротворчого духівництва, наслідках примусу до участі в ньому не тільки для окремих осіб, а й загалом для спільнот. Через діяльність єпископа ЗРУ Б. Генчі зроблено спробу розкрити певні особливості руху прихильників миру, застосувавши підхід «знизу вгору» (bottom-up approach).

Виснувано, що коли Б. Генчі на початку 1950-х років очолив керівництво ЗРЦ, то ще не усвідомлював намірів та планів радянської влади, а вважав, що якщо доєднається до руху прихильників миру, то, можливо, матиме більший простір для маневру як для себе особисто, так і для конфесії загалом. Проте зауважено, що зі зростанням очікувань, спонукань, тиску органів влади та їхніх керівників, які переходили у примус, для Б. Генчі – декана, а згодом єпископа – з часом стало зрозуміло, що це не так, адже практикування релігії не стало ні ширшим, ні вільнішим, не з'явилося і більше можливостей для підтримання транскордонних зв'язків з іншими реформатами. Констатовано, що на початку 1970-х років наміри Б. Генчі зламалися об радянську дійсність: він бачив, що його можливості маневрувати – навіть попри участь у русі миротворчого духівництва – не уникли примусу, а тим більше на стали незалежними чи автономними. Обмеження простору його діяльності певною мірою потрактовано як наслідок того, що він не цілком підкорився державній ідеології, а лише дотримувався радянського законодавства у сфері релігії та вимагав цього від свого духовенства і вірних. Такий стан інтерпретовано як двоїстість, у чому Б. Генчі на початку 1950-х років звинувачував закарпатський обласний уповноважений Ради у справах релігійних культів. Водночас зауважено, що це може бути і підтвердженням того, що єпископ не був агентом або таємним інформатором КДБ. Принаймні до сьогодні не виявлено архівних матеріалів, які б це спростували.

Ключові слова: Бейла Генчі, рух миротворчого духівництва, історія Церкви, реформати (кальвіністи), Закарпаття, радянський режим, Закарпатська Реформатська Церква.