Mr. Roy, it must be said, has done a splendid job of seeking to explain away, rationalize, minimize, and most of all just completely ignore the most pertinent facts of Communist activity in the use of religion as revealed by the United States Government's security committees.

III. THE DETRACTORS

The treatment that Mr. Roy gives to the anti-Communists who have been exposing the Communist use and infiltration of religion is a major part of his whitewash. He must discredit "the detractors." So they are "extremists," "hatemongers," "McCarthyites." He also refers his readers to his previous book, *Apostles of Discord*. In his biographical essay at the conclusion of the book he says, "Several attacks upon Protestant church leadership have been published, such as Edgar C. Bundy's *Collectivism in the Churches* (1958) and Carl McIntire's *Servants of Apostasy* (1955) but they are irresponsible" (p. 435).

These books are not irresponsible. They are carefully documented discussions. To dismiss them in a sweeping way as being "irresponsible" is a part of the irresponsibility of Mr. Roy. Mr. Roy's handling of the question could not possibly be considered responsible, when, as we have seen above, he handles the Metropolitan Nicolai case as he does. No "scholar" is "responsible" when he leaves out the most damaging evidence to his case. He may be shrewd, cagey, misleading, but not scholarly.

The additional men to whom Roy gives the usual treatment are the same ones the NCC named at the time of the Air Force Training Manual explosion — J. B. Matthews, M. G. Lowman of the Methodist Circuit Riders, Billy James Hargis of Christian American Crusade, and Verne P. Kaub of the American Council of Christian Laymen.

The line that Roy now uses to discredit these opponents of the National Council of Churches, which he is so avidly defending, is the one that has constantly been used by the Communists and left-wing agitators.

Concerning the opposition to the coming of Metropolitan Nicolai to the United States, it was "hatred against Protestant leadership" (p. 269) that led the "professional antagonists of the World Council of Churches" to seize upon the opportunity to express this hatred by opposing Nicolai. This is the familiar line that if you oppose the leftist program you are "preaching hatred." It is a clear-cut Communist tactic, and Roy embraces it at this point.

In the chapter, "Patriots, Ex-Communists, and Congressmen," Roy says, "One organization devotes most of its time to attacks upon the churches and thus merits special attention" (p. 228). He here names the International Council of Christian Churches and the United States' affiliate, the American Council of Christian Churches, and here is the pattern:

First, he seeks to minimize and belittle. He states they are "tiny splinter factions tightly controlled by Carl McIntire of Collingswood, New Jersey."

Second, he attempts to amplify distractions that he alleges have developed in the movement of the International Council of Christian Churches: "Most persons initially attracted to his movement have withdrawn in protest." This is not true! And what has this to do with the theme of his book? There are 64 denominations comprising the ICCC at the present time; there are only three groups that have left it. A larger number than this has left the World Council, including the largest church in the Far East that was affiliated with the World Council! In the ICCC its militant testimony was too strong for some brethren who wanted a "softer approach." So they left.

Third, McIntire then is described as having "manifold" dislikes and as having denounced certain named bodies and "all of the other important religious groups, without regard to theology or political orientation." How any scholar could possibly support a blanket condemnation of that nature it is impossible to conceive! This statement is impossible of documentation by Roy. He is reckless when he moves to discredit his opposition.

Fourth, he twists again the opposition to the NCC and declares, "Any major action or statement of the National Council has been attributed by McIntire to 'Communist influence' among the clergy" (p. 230). There have been quite a few major actions of the National Council of Churches which have not been attributed to Communist influence by me and there have been some actions which the National Council of Churches has taken with which we have had no dispute. The prejudice of Mr. Roy makes him beside himself.

After devoting this "special attention," as he calls it, he concludes, "The influence of McIntire in the United States is slight and his following is miniscule." Yet, repeatedly, through the book he indicates that those who have led the battle against the National Council of Churches have had a decided effect upon its welfare. Is this "slight"? Is this "miniscule"? In his concluding paragraph, page 429, Roy insists that these "extremist elements of the Right Wing" in a curious *de facto* alliance with the Communists "have dealt a severe blow to legitimate social concern and protest in the United States." There can be no doubt but that the formation of the American Council of Christian Churches in 1941 as a council of churches to offset the National Council of Churches, and the founding of the International Council of Christian Churches in 1948, representing true Biblical cooperation, to offset the false program of ecumenism as it drives on to its one-world church as represented and promoted by the World Council of Churches—there can be no doubt that the drawing of these lines in this way has had far-reaching influences so far as a genuine Twentieth Century Reformation movement is concerned.

Those who have been engaged in this terrific conflict and have felt the effects of it on the local level will welcome Roy's treatment of those who have challenged the NCC's inclusivist, leftist program. But to accept this book as a responsible, scholarly discussion when it has all the earmarks of prejudice and personal abuse would be a travesty. Roy has already been a professional "political man" for the NCC!

Anybody who raises any questions about Communism, according to Roy, has "attacked the churches." This in itself is very significant, for in all the discussion over the Air Force Training Manual controversy the defenders of the National Council of Churches refused to deal with the merits or discuss the issues involved other than to maintain that the churches had been attacked, and this itself was a major crime! This terminology is used throughout the book and it is a part of a conditioning process which Roy is promoting.

IV. CONCLUSION

As Mr. Roy comes around to the conclusion, after his devious meanderings through a great field of information where he picks and chooses according to that which makes his whitewash, he finally says, "The manual's discussion of the churches displayed such astounding incompetence that to analyze it line by line would be to give an inane document too much serious consideration." But his entire book has been written, beginning and ending with the consideration of the Air Force Training Manual, and when we get to the end Roy has not yet gotten down to a line to line discussion of it. In fact, he cannot do it. Yet, he apparently feels this failure to do so. The facts in that Manual stand up and only by twisting, misrepresenting, or ignoring these facts is it possible for Roy to draw his unfounded conclusions.

At the very end of his writing, Mr. Roy insists that there has been "an alarming failure to understand the vast chasm that has divided genuine democrats from Communists and Communist sympathizers. Millions of Americans do not yet appreciate the basic differences between the intelligent, independent thinking of the Oxnams and the Mackays, on one hand, over and against the consistent pro-Soviet views of the Wards and the Spoffords on the other."

And then again he contradicts his "miniscule" observation by saying, "It has enabled professional malcontents to spread distrust of church leadership—a distrust that is far more widespread across America than is sometimes recognized."

Yet, when Dr. John A. Mackay calls for the recognition of Red China and "peaceful coexistence" and Bishop Oxnam joins him in these demands, they are asking for the same, identical political ends that Khrushchev himself called for when he came to the United Nations in New York City. Mr. Roy may attempt to make a distinction and a difference, but in the opinion of the rank and file of American church people, they are asking for the same thing that Khrushchev asks for — "peaceful coexistence" and "recognition of Red China"! There is no "vast chasm" on these questions!

It is significant that throughout the book Roy does not get around to a discussion of these matters as far as the Oxnams and the Mackays are concerned. The line at this point between "genuine democrats" and "Communist sympathizers" on these issues is very thin indeed!

Finally, Mr. Roy credits the Communist Party with having accomplished something good in the United States. He adds, "It is ironic that with all the deceit and arrogance and rigidity and slavishness of the Communist Party, it helped to bring to the American scene an exciting and contagious, though indeed devious, passion for justice" (p. 429). So here Roy just touches on the social dream of the Reds which is akin to the modernist Kingdom of God society!

The men who have been collaborating with the Communists, preaching "peaceful coexistence" with them, so far as the religious leadership is concerned, have turned out to be the able anti-Communists, according to Roy; while those who have been opposing the policies which the Communists themselves have been advocating turn out to be *de facto* allies of the Reds.

All of this has been developed and financed by the Fund for the Republic. It is unrealistic, and, if this is accepted by church people of the United States, it can only spell confusion and disaster for the church and the nation. Anyone who reads the book without a background of information and factual material could be led to follow Roy's conclusion. But one with a background of information and a wealth of factual material with which to evaluate the book can see that Ralph Lord Roy is doing a service not only to the cause of the church leaders who have been in difficult circumstances because of their collaboration with the Communists, but that he has also rendered the Communist cause a great service. People do not need to fear Communist infiltration and activity in religious circles, because it is now at the zero point! What more could the Communists desire as a cover and protection for their stepped-up activity in the field of religion?

The book, *Communism and the Churches,* is indeed "Operation Whitewash"!

One of the most important developments exemplifying the Communist triumph in religion occurred shortly before Mr. Roy closed his book. He does not refer to it or mention it. It has to do with the Russian Baptists and the election of Jakov Zhidkov of Moscow, a Communist agent, to be the vice-president of the Baptist World Alliance. Zhidkov spoke at the Baptist World Alliance meeting in Brazil and presented, as the fulfillment of Isaiah's prophecy and the program behind which all Christians should unite, the peace program that Nikita Khrushchev outlined before the United Nations. The conflict over Zhidkov has shaken the entire Baptist world. Roy apparently considered it best to ignore it.

The prophets of the National Council of Churches whom Roy defends correspond in a measure to those of Jeremiah's day of whom he wrote in Chapter 23, verses 16, 17, 21, 22, and 32:

"Thus saith the Lord of hosts, Hearken not unto the words of the prophets that prophesy unto you; they make you vain: they speak a vision of their own heart, and not out of the mouth of the Lord. They say still unto them that despise me, The Lord hath said, Ye shall have peace; and they say unto every one that walketh after the imagination of his own heart, No evil shall come upon you. . . . I have not sent these prophets, yet they ran: I have not spoken to them, yet they prophesied. But if they had stood in my counsel, and had caused my people to hear my words, then they should have turned them from their evil way, and from the evil of their doings. . . . Behold, I am against them that prophesy false dreams, saith the Lord, and do tell them, and cause my people to err by their lies, and by their lightness; yet I sent them not, nor commanded them: therefore they shall not profit this people at all, saith the Lord."