

he lost the trend of thought and had to have his answer read back, that he'd never recognized Metropolitan Leonty as head of the church, but retained allegiance to the Patriarch in Moscow.

He at first denied excommunicating people because they failed to adhere to his own personal wishes, but admitted two excommunications involving persons with whom he'd been in conflict.

Dziama also charged the priest had threatened parishioners in letters sent to them, warning them of possible excommunica-

tion. But, declared Rev. Burdiko, "I do not regard those (letters) as threats."

"You talk so much nothing is clear," Dziama snapped at one point.

Also on the witness stand yesterday was The Rev. Vladimir Prislopsky, head of the Ohio Deanery. He testified that Rev. Burdiko was suspended twice. Once was as the result of letters complaining of the priest's alleged misconduct; the second time for his failure to obey a transfer order, Rev. Prislopsky said.

THE VISIT OF THE RUSSIAN BAPTISTS OF MOSCOW TO CANADA IN OCTOBER, 1961,

caused a tremendous stir throughout the churches. The Gospel Witness, which presented a case against Jakov Zhidkov and his party, used a high school reference book which gave a picture of the Communist control of the churches in Russia.

Photographed from The Gospel Witness of November 2, 1961

HIGH SCHOOL REFERENCE BOOK SAYS WHAT RELIGIOUS LEADERS WILL NOT SEE

One of our teen-age girls chose to write a history essay on a certain aspect of Communism. In her research for material she came across certain paragraphs in a book entitled, DEMOCRACY VERSUS COMMUNISM by Kenneth Colegrave, which she brought to our attention. The paragraphs in question state precisely what THE GOSPEL WITNESS has endeavoured to say concerning religion in Russia and the Communist use of the churches in protesting the presence of certain Russian Baptists in Canada. The young people of our High Schools have access to the facts which our religious leaders are apparently ignoring.

We are grateful to the publisher and copyright holder D. Van Nostrand Co., Inc., for their kind permission to reproduce the following paragraphs. A new edition of the book DEMOCRACY VERSUS COMMUNISM is scheduled for publication week after next. We let the quotations speak for themselves and suggest you read them carefully.

RELIGION IN RUSSIA MUST FOLLOW THE PARTY LINE:

Earlier in this chapter you read that old Russia had an official church, the Russian Orthodox Church. But the Bolsheviks, when they seized power in 1917, decided to do away with religion. They believed, as did Marx and Engels, that "religion is the opiate (drug) of the people".

For some years, churches were closed and religious instruction of any kind was forbidden. Then came a change. The Soviet Constitution of 1936 declared in Article 124 that "Freedom of Religious worship and freedom of anti-religious propaganda is recognized for all citizens." Despite what the Constitution says, however, there are few churches and synagogues in Russia to-day, in comparison to the numbers there once were. Moreover, there is a continuous program of instruction in the Communist public schools that tends to undermine any religious ideas people may have. And clergymen who have protested have been imprisoned or banished, on the ground that they were interfering in political affairs. Their crime, of course, was refusal to follow the Party line.

(Continued on page 62)

UNDER ORDERS: THE CHURCHES AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS

The above is the title of a book by Roswell P. Barnes, executive secretary in America of the World Council of Churches, published in 1961 by Doubleday and Company, Inc. Photographed below is the section, "Across the 'Cold War' Lines," from Chapter IV, "Christian Unity and International Conflict"

Across the "Cold War" Lines

During the entire period of the consolidation of the fellowship of the churches since World War I there remained always a "vacant chair." The churches in our country had almost no association with the churches in the Soviet Union. There had been little earlier association to be restored. Even before the revolution of 1917 the Orthodox Church of Russia had been rather isolated from the West. The leadership of that period had been liquidated and a new generation was now on the scene.

The governments of the two nations had been in tension for most of this period except during World War II. But with the beginning of the Korean War, if not earlier, the psychological truce had ended and the menace of communism had become the absorbing problem of our nation's foreign policy.

It seemed to be imperative that our American churches should at least make an attempt to enter into association with the leaders of the churches in the Soviet Union. Two interrelated concerns impelled us: transcending the barriers that separated us from professing Christians living under an atheistic totalitarian regime, and building a bridge between peoples in order to start discussions in the interest of international understanding.

These concerns were so urgent as to outweigh the obvious and complex difficulties we knew we would encounter. The General Board of the National Council of Churches therefore authorized a deputation to be sent to the churches in the Soviet Union. The delegation was composed of Dr. Eugene Carson Blake (chairman), Mr. Paul B. Anderson, Dr. Franklin Clark Fry, Dr. Herbert Gezork, Bishop D. Ward Nichols, Mr. Charles C. Parlin, Rt. Rev. Henry Knox Sherrill, Dr. Walter W. Van Kirk, and Dr. Roswell P. Barnes. Mr. Donald C. Bolles was the public relations officer.

Despite discouraging initial responses from the Soviet Embassy in Washington, and after long delays, clearance was finally obtained from the two governments and direct correspondence opened with the designated officer of the Holy Orthodox Church in Moscow, Metropolitan Nicholai.

In his speeches at the meetings of the communist-denominated World Peace Conference, as they had been reported in the press and published in the journal of the Moscow Patriarchate, the Metropolitan had clearly followed the propaganda line of the Kremlin. We knew that we would have an opportunity to deal with real issues and to confront men who were in positions of effective leadership. (The use of "we" as applied to the deputation is "editorial" when it involves appraisal or judgment in the course of the narrative. I alone am responsible for the opinions expressed.)

We knew that we would face a difficult but authentic test of the principle of unity in Christ. We also knew that we would have the opportunity to learn much.

As we projected ourselves by imagination into the situation, fundamental questions began to take form in my mind as considerations to be remembered in the conversations soon to take place: At what points does loyalty to one's nation become incompatible with loyalty to Christ? Can one be loyal to his nation without being loyal to the government in power in the nation? What is one's moral responsibility for the positions he takes in the light of the only facts and interpreta-