



SPAS T. RAIKIN
Professor Emeritus (717) 421-7233

RR 1, Box 1051
Stroudsburg, PA 18360, USA

May 19, 1993

Mr. Edgar F. Tatro
51 Edgemont Rd.
Braintree, Mass. 02184

Dear Mr. Tatro:

I apologize for the long delay in answering your letter. About the time I received it I was hospitalized for a while, then in recuperation, then trying to catch up with accumulated work, and finishing a piece for publication in a book on Eastern Europe.

I am a historian and appreciate your preference to go to the sources. Otherwise people spin stories that have nothing to do with reality. Such is the case with many writings on the Kennedy assassination where my name comes up. Years ago a film was made based on Mrak Lane's Rush to Judgement. My name was somehow garbled there, with the reference "A CIA agent who is now stationed in Guam." The film was shown in my university, I was sitting in the middle of the audience, supposedly stationed in Guam.

Now to your questions:

1. The circumstances of my meeting Oswald are stated in the Warren report word for word. I have nothing to add and nothing to subtract from there.

2. I have never had any relations with J. Edgar Hoover, or any of his agents, or CIA and any of their agents, except in occasional inquiries by them with our office in Travelers Aid Society on routine matters - on one or two occasions. My letters to Hoover and CIA were nothing more than covering letters in transmitting to them public documents of the organizations which I was involved with, knowing that they would be interested and instead of using agents to spy on us and get misinformation, I preferred to directly inform them. I have never been involved in anything that could not be told openly to the whole world.

The blacked out spots are entries made by the FBI and I would not know what had been written there.

3. I have never written anything, anywhere on the Kennedy Assassination and my involvement with Oswald, simply because there was nothing more to write in addition to my routine report in the Travelers Aid Record. But now, it seems to me I have to write something, to be published in some national magazine, if accepted, in order to clear all the fog that is accumulating around the AF ABN.

I read the xeroxed pages from Dick Russell's book which you have sent me. Recently I received the book of Weberman-Canfield. It is all legends and fantasies. I have never been a CIA agent, or any other agent. I was a poor exile devil who fell in the hands of people who apparently knew more and used me for their purposes, until I realized what was going on and quit them.

I still have the archives of AF ABN of that time. AF ABN was nothing but a group of amateurs from half a dozen nationalities who sought to carry joint public activities against the Communist regimes in Eastern Europe. The organization was set up by Ukrainians, immigrants from Europe who apparently had been members of the ABN. Personally I did not know anything what ABN was, who its leaders were and what their politics was. The first meeting which I attended was held in the Ukrainian Home on 2nd Avenue and 8th Street in New York, in a room which did not appear to have been painted since World War One, with rickety table and a few broken chairs. The various nationality representatives were recent arrivals, refugees and few if any spoke some English. I was the only one speaking and writing decently English and was designated as General Secretary. In the course of time I gradually learned more about the organizations represented in the Executive Committee, but the only theme that held us together was to oppose communism.

Our biggest achievement was the spectacular demonstrations during Khrushchev's visit in New York. I take all the credit for this. When we met to discuss plans in Hotel New Yorker, and the discussions was under way, I got the impression that forces outside of our organization were trying to divert us from our objectives. There were proposals to hold a ethnic festival in Manhattan Center, others suggested to hold public meeting demonstration at the Unuon Square. I rose then, and blasted all proposals as nonsense and suggested that we bring ten thousand people and lead a demonstration against the Soviet Mission on 68th Street. I prevailed. I still suspect that CIA or FBI agents were present at this meeting and that it was they who tried to push us in dead end street. They apparently tried the same thing during the demonstration, diverting it away from Soviet Mission three blocks bellow. I ran to the front and redirected them to the Mission. The Ukrainians may have had contacts with the CIA and FBI, but not the other nationalities.

IN the course of time I came to realize that serious accusations of anti-semitism against the ABN existed, and probably I embarrassed the Stettskos and the Slovak Dvorchansky when they held press conferences and I asked pointed questions on anti-semitism. I would not tolerate such charges to fall on the AFABN. As a matter of fact I discovered in the archives a resolution, prepared by me for consideration of the Executive Committee of the AFABN. I do not remember whether it was acted upon or not. I resented the persistent references to Russian and Communist as identical. I supported the national aspirations for independence of the nations under Russian control, but I considered the Russians equally victims of communism as the other nations. Personally, as Bulgarian, I have always been and I am now a Russophile. It is for these reasons, when I realized in what kind of organizations I had fallen, that I dropped out of the Bulgarian National Front and the AF ABN. Well, these are complex matters and could not be explained in one letter, but I felt that I had to clear them a little bit. I have written a lot in the Bulgarian press and these matters are well known to the Bulgarian public. I am not very proud of the early early years of my politics in exile, but if I found myself in the same circumstances, I probably would not have acted differently.

I am curious to know how one goes about to obtain his file from the FBI and CIA under the Freedom of Information Act. I will appreciate it if you could acquaint me with the procedures. You apparently are familiar with these procedures. I am curious to know what they have on me. Of course they would black it all out, but it is worth making an attempt. I do not want to go through lawyers. They skin you alive.

Sometimes I think of taking all these writers who refer to me as a CIA agent to the courts for defamation of character, but never had time for that. If you know any lawyer to take my case, it will make quite an interesting story.

The root of this invention is in a brief announcement in the Organ of the Asian Anti-Communist League that they had received correspondence from me. Someone in the AF ABN urged me to send them a copy of our resolution on the National Council of Churches, which I did. This was my first and my last correspondence with them. Then the spin-artists made the rest of it as a CIA and Anti-Semitic connections.

I hope I have answered most of your questions. My answer may not be to your satisfaction, but in this mysterious affairs there are many questions which will remain unanswered. The Warren report, as unbelievable as it may be for some, has not yet been shaken by any author in its basic assumptions. I doubt it if it will ever be, unless some smoking gun is still hiding somewhere in the subterranean world of politics and crime.

Sincerely yours,



Spas T. Raikin

ALBANIA
BULGARIA
BYELORUSSIA
CZECHIA
ESTONIA
GEORGIA
HUNGARY

American Friends
of the

Anti-Bolshevik Bloc of Nations, inc.

P.O. Box 2131, Grand Central Station, New York 17, N. Y.

LATVIA
LITHUANIA
POLAND
ROUMANIA
SERBIA
SLOVAKIA
SLOVENIA
TURKESTAN
UKRAINE

S T A T E M E N T

The Executive Council of the AF ABN, having discussed the current outbreak of anti-Semitism, widely reported by press, radio and television, finds it necessary to stress the political implications of this affair and to take a stand on the issue:

I. Anti-Semitism, as well as any other ideology based on racial or religious hatred and discrimination, is contrary to the fundamental principles of the AF ABN which stands for equality of rights, for the right to national selfdetermination to all nations and the right to freedom for each human individual.

II. The recent anti-Semitic incidents in Germany, in Europe and in the other parts of the world, were overplayed by a sensations seeking press which regretfully failed to recognize a calculated plan devised and instigated by Moscow to discredit West Germany and to shake her position in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

III. The present wave of anti-Semitism serves vividly the cause of communism and the Communist fifth column in the free world will spare no effort to resurrect the apparition of nazism as a diversionist strategy to undermine the unity of the anti-Communist forces

IV. A wave of propaganda directed by Moscow is trying to link a number of refugee anti-Communist organizations to anti-Semitism and thus to discredit the anti-Communist forces.

V. The AF ABN will oppose any ideology and any political action which is based on racial or religious discrimination.

This Statement may be printed, quoted and referred to without previous authorization.

Spas T. Raikin,
Secretary General

ALBANIA
BULGARIA
BYELORUSSIA
COSSAKIA
CROATIA
CHIA
ESTONIA
GEORGIA
HUNGARY

American Friends

of the

Anti-Bolshevik Bloc of Nations, inc.

P. O. Box 2131, Grand Central Station, New York 17, N. Y.

Dr. Nestor Procyk

Chairman of the Executive Council

Spas T. Raikin

Secretary-General

Charles Andreanszky

Charles Thomas

Frank Alexis

Vice Chairman

LATVIA
LITHUANIA
POLAND
ROUMANIA
SERBIA
SLOVAKIA
SLOVENIA
TURKESTAN
UKRAINE

February 21, 1959

Rev. Dr. Edwin T. Dahlberg, President
National Council of Churches of Christ
c/o Stuller Hilton Hotel
Hartford, Conn.

Dear Dr. Dahlberg:

It is a most unpleasant duty that after a long association with the National Council of Churches of Christ and with the World Council of Churches I should have brought to your attention the findings of the Executive Council of our multi-national organization on the questions raised by the Cleveland China Statement. However, the issues at stake are much greater than our personal feelings and I have no choice but to stand for my responsibilities as best as I understand them.

We learned from the press that the General Board of the NCCC is going to hold its next meeting February 25 and 26 and that the main topic for discussion will be the above mentioned statement. The Executive Council of the American Friends of the Anti-Bolshevik Bloc of Nations, Inc. decided that before this meeting is held, the views of our association should be referred to you and be revealed to the press as well as to any other person who is interested of these matters.

The Executive Council found it a most unfortunate and distressful sign of our times that one of the most respectable and influential ecclesiastical bodies in this country, The National Council of Churches of Christ, should have been implicated in the Cleveland "China Statement". This Statement, by no means, expressed the dominant trend of political thinking in the NCCC under which sponsorship the Conference was held. The Executive Council found that the said Statement is but one link in the long chain of policy statements and actions of the NCCC and the WCC. These policies and these statements, formulated in Geneva, are faithfully carried by the NCCC and its agencies. One should place those policies under close examination in order to grasp the entire fellow-traveler's political concept behind them. It suffices to mention a few of the undertakings of those agencies, in order to reveal their line of po-

litical inclinations. The visit of the Russian clergymen in this country in 1956, sponsored by the National Council of Churches, the inclusion of Iron Curtain Churchmen in the Central and the Executive Committees of the World Council of Churches, in spite of the overwhelming opposition of their members and the current negotiations between the World Council of Churches and the Russian Church for its inclusion in the World Council of Churches are but a few examples. These facts are closely watched by all those who are interested in Ecumenical affairs. These facts testify of a dangerous road of pro-communist bias taken by the World Council of Churches and the National Council of Churches. The "China Statement" is only a logical sequence of a well understood and well defined policy calculated to promote the cause of Communism against the cause of the enslaved nations.

The Executive Council found that the Cleveland "China Statement" stressed that we should find ways to live with the Communists: that the nations under Russian and Chinese domination are, no more and no less, Communists who compete with us with their "way of life"; that it condemned the idea of making opposition to communism the touchstone of our domestic and international policy; that it predicted, by seeing a "real hope" the coming of a new Communist generation, pre-occupied more with the problems of freedom than with ideological fanaticism; that the people of China are deprived, by the policy of non-recognition, of the possibility of forming a true image of the United States, assuming that the United States Government is fighting the people of China - not the Communist illegal government of China: that this policy holds the American people in "ignorance" of what is now taking place in China.

The Executive Council finds that human imagination, shortsightedness, misrepresentation, misinterpretation, blind defeatism and total ignorance of well known facts could not find a better expression than this statement. The members of the Executive Council found no comparison between the courageous stand of the pre-war Ecumenists who did not hesitate to condemn the barbariansystem of nazism and the open advocacy of outright atheism and communist terrorism preached by the Cleveland theologians.

The Executive Council would have left without consideration this statement if it were not the names of the National Council of Churches of Christ and the World Council of Churches that are involved. The leaders of these organizations have persistently emphasized the number of Protestant and Orthodox Churches behind them. It found that it should be most embarrassing for every honest and sincere Protestant in this country who happened to have a more realistic understanding of the issues treated by the Statement on China. More embarrassing was found to be the position of the representatives of the Eastern Orthodox

Churches in these Ecumenical bodies. It is understandable that no Orthodox clergyman, unless he is a paid agent of red propaganda could tolerate a statement like that and will take the necessary steps, if he cares for principles, honor and dignity, to reconsider his association with the National Council of Churches of Christ, the World Council of Churches or the Commission of the Churches on International Affairs.

It should be taken as excess of courage to mislead the press in this country with statements to the effect that the NCCC or the WCC are speaking for more than 160 Protestant and Orthodox Churches when the policies of these bodies on matters of the sort of Cleveland Statement are condemned and rejected by every single Christian believer from this or the other side of the Iron Curtain.

The Executive Council found it also difficult to understand why the leaders of the Ecumenical Movement in America had to abandon the prophetic mission of the Church and to take the road to partisan politics of questionable value. Was it so difficult for them to distinguish between the small clique of the ruling "NEW CLASS" in the Communist world and the millions of oppressed and doomed people, and was it so necessary for those five hundred delegates to step behind the "NEW CLASS" against the ordeal of those millions put on trial for the sake of Christ? Was it also absolutely necessary that instead of prayerful compassion the Crucified Church behind the Iron Curtain should have been offered a kiss of betrayal by the brother Christians in America?

The members of the Executive Council interpreted the policies recommended by the Cleveland Conference as a repetition of the New Testament drama of the trial of Jesus Christ. Choosing to support the Communist cause against the cause of the enslaved nations is a repetition of the choice made by the mobs and the official religion of Baraba the criminal against Jesus Christ, the Son of God. This choice is, indeed, dishonoring Christianity and the Executive Council gave its unqualified endorsement of the declaration of one hundred clergymen signed in Chicago calling your attention to this aspect of the China statement.

The Executive Council was especially concerned in considering the Ecumenical stand on the matters of communism in the light of the latest call of Pope John XXIII for Church unity. It was pointed out that the policies of indulgence towards the Communist regimes will discourage the supporters of the Ecumenical idea and will disillusion the Christians behind the Curtain.

Taking into consideration these implications of the China Statement the members of the Executive Council of AF ABN urge you to exercise your influence with the General Board of the NCCC for the unconditional rejection of the said Statement.

Most respectfully yours,

Spas T. Raikin, Secretary-General.

ALBANIA
BULGARIA
BYELORUSSIA
COSSAKIA
JATIA
CZECHIA
ESTONIA
GEORGIA
HUNGARY

American Friends
of the
Anti-Bolshevik Bloc of Nations, inc.

P. O. Box 2131, Grand Central Station, New York 17, N. Y.

Dr. Nestor Procyk
Chairman of the Executive Council

Spas T. Raikin
Secretary-General

Charles Andreanszky

Charles Thomas

Frank Alexis

Vice Chairmen

LATVIA
LITHUANIA
POLAND
ROUMANIA
SERBIA
SLOVAKIA
SLOVENIA
TURKESTAN
UKRAINE

S T A T E M E N T

THE CLEVELAND FIFTH WORLD ORDER STUDY CONFERENCE
AND THE NATIONAL COUNCIL OF CHURCHES
OF CHRIST

The Executive Council of the American Friends of the Anti-Bolshevik Bloc of Nations, having heard the report of the Secretary-General Mr. S.T. Raikin, Chairman of the Committee on Religious Affairs, on the current controversy over the political statements of the Cleveland Fifth World Order Study Conference, called and sponsored by the National Council of Churches of Christ, and having carefully examined:

1. The letter of the Associate General Secretary of the National Council, Rev. R.H. Edwin Espy, in reply to the letter of Mr. Raikin of February 21, addressed to Dr. Edwin T. Dahlberg, President of the NCCC;
2. The Message to the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A., adopted by the Fifth World Order Study Conference (WOSC), Cleveland, Ohio, November 18-21, 1958;
3. The "Fifth World Order Study Conference" - resolution adopted by the General Board of the NCCC on December 3-4, 1958;
4. "The Hartford Appeal";
5. The informal remarks of the Honorable Ernest A. Gross, New York, Chairman of the Fifth WOSC at Cleveland, Ohio, and Chairman of the Council's Department of International Affairs, made at the session of the General Board in Hartford on February 25, 1959;
6. A "Sino-American Relations" statement made by the same at the Cleveland Conference;
7. "Christian Responsibility on a Changing Planet" by Geraldine Sartain, an article reprinted from NC Outlook, December, 1958;

- 2 -

8. "Change was the Key-Word," an article reprinted from the same magazine, by Kenneth L. Maxwell, Executive Director, Department of International Affairs;

found the following:

I

1. The NCCC seems to be gratified of the widespread attention given to the Fifth WOSC which is said to have been the purpose of the NCCC. The NCCC seems to have overlooked or is purposely overlooking the negative reaction of public opinion to the statements produced by the said conference and persists in stressing the legitimacy of those statements, ignoring the regrettable fact that the NCCC was singled out as advocate of condemned pro-Communist policies. The Executive Council of the American Friends of the Anti-Bolshevik Bloc of Nations finds that there is nothing gratifying for the NCCC, having focused the attention of the public in this country and in the world on itself as an exponent of policies advocated by Communists all over the world.

2. The NCCC seems to be reluctant to take the responsibility for the conference which was called, sponsored and directed by its executive officer in the Department of International Affairs and which statements and general lines have been prepared in advance and defended by the same officers, which are, otherwise, in broad lines, the policies of the NCCC implemented in its actions on current international issues. It sounds strange, illogical and not at all convincing that the conference "spoke only for itself". The only plausible explanation of the present attitude of the NCCC is that its General Board, challenged by the unexpectedly violent negative reaction to the statements of the Cleveland Conference, found it necessary to disclaim responsibility for the recommended policies. Yet this responsibility cannot be denied and the members of the Executive Council of the AF ABN found it difficult to accept the explanations of the Associate General Secretary of the NCCC.

3. It is assumed that the Department of International Affairs is a body within the NCCC and not a separate institution and that, ultimately, it is the NCCC which is responsible for its policy pronouncements and actions. It is assumed that the Department of International Affairs carries out the policies of the NCCC and not vice-versa - the NCCC to follow the policies of the Department of International Affairs. Therefore, the way of thinking prevailing in this Department, expressed in the Cleveland Statements, should be taken as reflection of the general course of the policies of the NCCC. It is, therefore, necessary, that the General Board of the NCCC clarify its stand on these issues and state its position which was compromised by the Executive Officers of its Department of International Affairs.

4. It seems that the magnitude of the public reaction against the Cleveland Statements have led the leadership of the NCCC to seek means and ways to divert public attention

from the basic issues involved and to direct it to hardly significant or non-existent procedural rules which are said to be the facts, in distinction with the "distorted versions" of the entire affair. These facts are said to be as follows:

a. The delegates at the Cleveland Conference were named by the member denominations and the cooperating councils.

b. What the conference said did not constitute the official position of the NCCC which is determined by action of the General Board.

c. The General Board voted "to receive" the report of the Cleveland Conference and transmit it to the Department of International Affairs for further action.

It is in the interpretation of those facts, an interpretation expressed in the materials sent to the Executive Council of the AF ABN for consideration, where the NCCC fails to dissociate itself from the responsibility for the kind of policies recommended by the Cleveland Conference.

5. The Chairman of the Fifth WOSC, Dr. Ernest A. Gross, assured the members of the General Board of the NCCC on the behalf of the Department of International Affairs that "any charge that delegates were hand-picked for some pre-determined conclusions is groundless". In the same time the Executive Director of the same Department, Kenneth L. Maxwell, wrote in OUTLOOK that "the delegates of the Churches were carefully selected by the responsible officers or official bodies in the 33 denominations constituting the NCCC". "Hand-picked" and "carefully selected" are expressions which mean one and the same thing and one will be at pain if trying to deny the fact that the Conference of Cleveland was called by the Department of International Affairs to endorse its own policies which, in their turn, are the policies of the Church Commission on International Affairs of the World Council of Churches under the direction of Dr. Nolde. These policies, even before the Conference of Cleveland endorsed them, were well known and the question whether the delegates were hand-picked or carefully selected by anybody, in the light of the subsequent events, is really of no importance.

6. The resolution adopted by the General Board of the NCCC on December 3-4, 1958, stressed that the members of the Cleveland Conference have been a "highly representative cross-section of the member churches of the National Council" and that "in their own persons broadly representative of the interests and competence of the national Protestant community in foreign affairs." Yet, it was stated that "they spoke for no one but themselves". It is hereby implied that the Cleveland statement represents the consensus of the competent Protestant leadership, that the Protestants competent in Foreign Affairs, could have no other but the stand of the Cleveland Conference. If they spoke in Cleveland "for no one but themselves" it is only a matter of formality. Therefore, whether or not the General Board of the NCCC, adopted and endorsed the policies recommended by the Conference, is of no impor-

tance because the entire Protestant community, represented by its competent on foreign affairs delegates, have adopted and endorsed them. That the Protestant community may have not been aware of the kind of policies it was being committed to, without having been consulted, was a matter which has not been taken into consideration.

7. The dispute over the representative character of the Cleveland Conference has two alternative solutions: either this conference was representative, that is, the delegates spoke not for themselves only but for their Churches who selected, appointed and sent them to Cleveland or it was not representative, that is, the "delegates" were hand-picked or carefully selected by the department of International Affairs through its organs on local level to endorse pre-determined conclusions. In the first case the decision of the General Board of the National Council to "receive" the Cleveland Statement is an outright disregard of the will of its constituent member churches by failing to give it a formal approval. In the second case the General Board allowed itself to be taken in by the executive officers of the Department of International Affairs who were interested to promote the kind of policies recommended by the Cleveland Conference and who seems to have called this conference explicitly for this purpose.

8. Instead of rejecting the policies recommended by the Cleveland Conference the General Board voted "to receive" the document and transmit it to the Department of International Affairs where it originally came from, being worked out by the leadership of this department. The members of the Executive Council of the AF ABN felt that the NCCC was determined to follow the recommendations of the Cleveland Conference and the various explanations regarding its representativeness and its procedures are meant only as devices to disclaim the responsibility for the conference and for the kind of policies recommended by it. The main point, the promotion of those policies, imposed on the public mind as policies backed by the entire Protestant community, is achieved. "Receiving" the document instead of approving it, or rejecting it, is an easy escape but it reveals a great deal of inconsistency and in no way it could be interpreted as shelving it.

9. In recent times, since the Conference of Cleveland more than any other time before, the public opinion in this country is led to believe that the NCCC is composed by the Protestant and the Eastern Orthodox Churches. The leadership of the NCCC is in sore need of representing itself as an ecumenical body, constituted by reform and catholic traditions, by Protestants and Eastern Orthodox Churches. There were references in the press that the six Orthodox Churches represented in the NCCC have opposed the Cleveland Statement. Yet, the official documents of the Conference do not reveal this discension of the Orthodox Churches. It is not revealed whether there was any opposition to the statements under consideration and the support of all the member Churches is summarily implied, the minority views, including the Orthodox point of view, being disregarded. It is only in the editorial of Kenneth L.

Maxwell where it is clearly stated that Dr. Gross had read a formal statement of Bishop John of San Francisco, of the Russian Orthodox Church in the U.S.A., by which he disassociated himself and the other Orthodox delegates in principle from any action of the conference which might be considered controversial political nature. Yet, the public of the U.S.A. was led to believe that the Orthodox Churches are committed, by being associated with the National Council, to support the policies adopted at Cleveland. This is, at least, an dishonorable misrepresentation, since no Orthodox Christian, mindful of the plight of his Church behind the Iron Curtain, would, under any circumstances, advocate pro-Communist policies of the kind recommended in Cleveland.

10. Kenneth L. Maxwell states in the editorial "Change was the Key-Word" that "the message, resolutions and findings of the working sections of the conference contribute background materials for a Nation-Wide Program of Education and Action for Peace from June 1959 through June 1960". The Hartford Appeal states: "The National Council of Churches reminds the churches that its pronouncements, policy statements, and findings of Study Conferences are designed to help our members in the free process of finding the truth and acting upon it...". The message of the Cleveland Conference, being "received" therefore, by the General Board, is going to be used as background material by the Churches and could not be considered as "shelved". Is this message, however, the kind of background material for a nation-wide program of education, sponsored by the National Council, the best contribution of the Churches to American life? Are the pulpits of the churches going to be turned into pro-Communist tribunes for dissemination of policies propounded by the international Communist agencies? Are the Christian Churches going to be converted into mouthpieces of international communism? The substance of the Cleveland Statement, when it boils down, is nothing else but outright support of the policies of Moscow. The members of the Executive Council of the AF ABN felt that the General Board of the NCCC, by "receiving" the Cleveland Statement and sending it to the Department of International Affairs to be submitted to the churches as background material, has committed the NCCC for a policy of indoctrination in the direction recommended by the Cleveland theologians. And this is not the kind of policy which the Executive Council of the AF ABN would be prepared to endorse or to feel happy about it. This is not the kind of policy which will credit very much the NCCC.

11. The Hartford Appeal suggested that the public criticism against the Cleveland Statement is an encroachment on the freedom and the right of the churches "to discuss freely and to express judgments, without exposure to attacks upon motive or integrity for daring to exercise the right to do so", and stressed that "such a right is especially vital to the Church, which owes a duty to lead and to inform, so that its members may be aided in reaching morally valid judgments in the light of their common faith". The appeal concludes with a four-point statement upholding this right of the churches. The members of the Executive Council

of the AF ABN felt that this Appeal is unsuccessful attempt of the NCCC to divert public attention from the kind of policies suggested in Cleveland by insinuating that the major issue at stake is the freedom of the churches to express their opinion. The Appeal is totally uncomprehensible unless it is taken as a diversionist step. The right and the duty of the churches to lead the nations to morally valid judgments are universally accepted as imperative obligation and undisputed honor. It was not this right and this duty of the churches that was challenged and it was not this right and this duty which was the major issue at stake. It was the kind of leadership offered by the American churches gathered at Cleveland, the kind of judgments reached at Cleveland, which were challenged and were found by the general public to be morally invalid and, in fact, disgraceful.

12. The Hartford Appeal suggested, strangely enough, some kind of persecution of the Churches, which makes it to sound like a Communist document insinuating persecution where it does not exist. This suggestion, if sincere, could be explained only as an imaginary reflection of crypto-Communist thinking and, if intended as diversionist strategy, has no chance to convince anybody that the American churches are subjected to persecution for their views on political matters. It is interesting to note that the criticism against the pro-Communist policies recommended by the Cleveland Statement was interpreted as persecution of the churches and encroachment of their freedom to discuss political issues and provoked such a strong defense as the Hartford Appeal while the real persecution of religion behind the Iron Curtain is referred to, in the Cleveland Statement, as uncertain, as "reported," and is limited only to Moslems and Jews, the persecution of the Orthodox, the Catholics and the Protestants being completely ignored. Evidently, the current flirtation of the NCCC leadership with the Communist imposed leadership of the Churches behind the Iron Curtain has played its role.

13. The entire Message of the Cleveland Conference reveals a state of mind totally overwhelmed by the spirit of psychological warfare where the basic arguments of a defeatist policy, suggested and promoted by international Communist propaganda, are brought to the extreme and the prophetic Message of the Gospel has sunk into a cloudy controversy over the administration's current foreign policy. Taken as devastating criticism of this policy, which have assured the peace and the prosperity of this country and the world, the Cleveland Message outlined a new course, which, if followed, will inevitably lead not only to adjustment with communism but also, most certainly, to voluntary surrender to Communist totalitarianism, which ultimate triumph is implied. The Cleveland Theologians seems to prefer a meek surrender to Communism rather than a resistance to slavery at any price. The free play of NCCC leaders with bombastic words like "peaceful changes," "revolutionary forces", "world revolution", "dynamic changes", "rapid social shifts", "imperatives of progressive developments", etc., has made them captives of their own ideas and victims of international Communist propaganda.

14. The Cleveland Statement, together with a series of political pronouncements and actions sponsored directly by the NCCC or indirectly, through the World Council of Churches, clearly indicate that the dominant political trend in the leadership of the Ecumenical Movement favors a policy of appeasement and of co-existence, which is said to be even less than what the real need of cooperation with communism is. Speaking for the Christians behind the Iron Curtain, the Executive Council of the AF ABN deeply regrets and deprecates this line of political thinking of the leaders of the NCCC and the WCC. Instead of taking up and vigorously defending the fundamental moral principles of Christianity, so arrogantly violated in the Communist world, the NCCC has taken upon itself the ungrateful task of promoting the legitimacy of Communist tyranny.

15. The current historical events - the Hungarian drama, the risings in Berlin and Poland, the desperate efforts of the people of Tibet, the presence of Dalai Lama in the Free World and the imprisonment of Cardinal Mindszenty, living symbols of the persecuted religion under Communist rule - are undisputed vindication of the position taken by the Executive Council of AF ABN. No honest man in our time will have the courage to deny these realities. Yet, the NCCC, for some unexplained reasons, ignores and disregards them. Moreover, some of the leaders of the NCCC are specially pleased to call genuine concern for the fate of the Christians under communism "hysterical anti-communism" and take a special pride of signing petitions for the release of convicted Communist spies in this country.

16. Finally, the Executive Council of the AF ABN feels it necessary to state its hopes that the NCCC, taking into account the public reaction to the Cleveland Statement and to its policies favoring communism, will review and will reconsider its position and will uphold the fundamental principles of the Gospel, to which it is committed being a Church institution, and which it has failed to interpret as imperative obligation in the tragic events of contemporary history.

EXECUTIVE COUNCIL OF THE
AMERICAN FRIENDS OF THE ANTI-BOLSHEVIK BLOC
OF NATIONS, Inc.