



REPORT FROM THE CAPITAL

MAY 1965

Research Program Announced, Peterson Named Director

An expanded program of Baptist study and research in public affairs in the Nation's Capital will begin August 1, according to C. Emanuel Carlson, executive director of the Baptist Joint Committee on Public Affairs.

In order to implement the program a research director has been employed, and new and expanded quarters for the offices of the Baptist Joint Committee will be required. The new location will be announced at a later date.

The new program brings the executive staff of the Baptist Joint Committee to four full-time men. In addition to the executive director and the research director there are already two other associates on the job.

W. Barry Garrett, associate director for information services, has been with the Baptist Joint Committee since January 1, 1958. Prior to this he was editor for 11 years of the Baptist Beacon, Baptist state paper of Arizona.

James M. Sapp, associate director for correlation services, has been with the Committee since April 1, 1964. He came to this responsibility after 12 years with the Brotherhood Commission of the Southern Baptist Convention.

The new public affairs program will begin with a small research base in the Nation's Capital. It will in effect be a miniature "research center" with desks, reference files, a reference library, and the basic facilities for independent study. This initial program may result in a full blown research center within the next few years.

In announcing the program Carlson said that "seldom, if ever, before has research had so large an importance to church life and work in general or to the churches' witness in particular as it does at the present time."

"Tensions with official and with unofficial ideologies merit careful intellectual effort," he continued. "The rapidity of change and (See Research Program, Page 7)



Walfred H. Peterson

Walfred H. Peterson of St. Paul, Minn. is the new director of research for the Baptist Joint Committee on Public Affairs. He will begin his new duties in Washington, D. C. on August 1.

In announcing the new staff member of the Baptist Joint Committee, C. Emanuel Carlson, executive director, said "Dr. Peterson is an able and well-established political scientist. Neither the issues nor the Washington scene are new to him. He previously worked with the Baptist Joint Committee in 1961 and in 1963. He has also dealt with many of the issues at the state level in contacts with the state legislature and with the mass media."

"Baptists and other friends of freedom," Carlson continued, "will find in Dr. Peterson a man of genuine scholarship and competence. He is a man of broad Christian

sympathies and general good will. He will add much to the effective work already being done by the Baptist Joint Committee."

Peterson is currently professor of political science at Bethel College, St. Paul. During 1964 and 1965 he has been visiting lecturer in the graduate school at the University of Minnesota. Previously he was an instructor in the extension school of the University of Minnesota.

A native of Moline, Ill., Peterson is a lifelong Baptist. He has been active in his own church and in the life of the Baptist General Conference.

Peterson was educated in the public schools of Moline, at Bethel College and at the University of Minnesota, from which he holds the Doctor of Philosophy degree.

The new research director has had a long standing interest in public affairs and religious liberty. He has served as chairman of the public affairs committee of the St. Paul Association of Evangelical Churches. He also was the chief draftsman for the report of the committee of the Minnesota Council of Churches on "The School Bus Issue in Minnesota."

Other teaching experience of Dr. Peterson includes: teaching fellow, University of Washington, 1950-51; summer session teaching, Lewis and Clark College, Portland, Oregon, 1958; and acting assistant professor, Washington State University, 1960.

Peterson was the first public affairs intern of the Baptist Joint Committee. The program was begun in 1961.

He has had scholarly articles published in the Western Political Quarterly, Journal of the Minnesota Academy of Science, Journal of the American Scientific Affiliation, and in other denominational and religious publications.

The Peterson family is composed of his wife, Marianne, and two children, Nils (8) and Elsa (5).

REPORT FROM THE CAPITAL—a bulletin published 10 months during the year by the Baptist Joint Committee on Public Affairs, 1628—18th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20009. A purpose of the bulletin is to set forth information and interpretation about public affairs that are relevant to Baptist principles.

The Baptist Joint Committee on Public Affairs is a denominational agency maintained by the American Baptist Convention, Baptist Federation of Canada, Baptist General Conference, National Baptist Convention, National Baptist Convention, Inc., North American Baptist General Conference, Seventh Day Baptist General Conference, and the Southern Baptist Convention.

Executive Staff of the Committee: C. Emanuel Carlson, executive director; W. Barry Garrett, associate director for information services and editor of Report From The Capital; and James M. Sapp, associate director for correlation services.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES—Individual subscription, \$1.50 per year; Club rate for 10 or more, \$1.00 each per year; Bulk distribution of 10 or more to a single address, \$.75 each per year. Write for further information about Club and Bulk distribution plans.

MAY 1965—Volume 20, Number 5



Washington Observations

News — Views — Trends

April 28, 1965



THE ADMINISTRATION'S 'WAR ON POVERTY' showed signs of "heating up" in April and May during hearings on amendments and appropriations for 1966 and '67. Adam Clayton Powell, chairman of the House Education and Labor Committee and of the subcommittee conducting the hearings, attacked Office of Economic Opportunity Director R. Sargent Shriver's administration of the program.

THE ANTI-POVERTY 'WAR' OFFERS COMMUNITIES a side effect thus far often overlooked. This is an opportunity for Protestant, Jewish, Catholic and Negro leaders in the community to get to know each other. Such cooperation in an attack on the poverty virus could uncover a "vaccine" to immunize these same groups against other diseases of human relations.

UNITED NATIONS CHARTER AMENDMENTS under consideration in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee could precipitate a general debate on the UN on the floor of the Senate when the Committee brings its report to the larger body.

THE UN CHARTER HAS NEVER BEEN AMENDED. UN membership has increased from 51 nations in 1945 to 114 at present. The two proposed amendments would increase the membership of the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council "to bring these bodies into balance with the enlarged membership of the United Nations itself."

DUAL ENROLLMENT (pupil enrollment in both a public and a private school) as a public policy is now a reality as a result of the passage of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. Church leaders need to become competent in this field in order to inform the people of the implications, opportunities and hazards of this new approach to education at the local level.

THE DIRECTOR OF EDUCATION of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, Msgr. Frederick G. Hochwalt, says: "To some Catholics, the new approach will be a perfectly shattering experience. They will think it's a retreat from glory and commitment. They will think we have thrown in the sponge." The new bill, he said, will spur "monumental changes" in the Nation's Catholic school system.

THE MONSIGNOR PREDICTED development in Catholic education along three lines: (1) continuation in the traditional way with all educational programs under the parish roof; (2) heavy involvement in "dual enrollment" in which parochial pupils take a substantial share of their courses in public schools; and (3) some schools will become religious centers, serving Catholic students released from the public schools.

PROSPECTS FOR DISCONTINUING the military draft law grow weaker with each informal report. Latest estimate is that such possibility is at least two years away.

The Legislative Process

By JAMES M. SAPP

The legislative process is more than legislation successfully passed and signed into public law.

There are at least four phases, or stages, in the process worth lifting up for examination. Each of these has a very definite relationship to our stewardship of influence in public affairs.

The first phase of the legislative process is the bill, or act, itself. Last month we outlined the steps in guiding a bill through Congress. There are opportunities during this process to witness to our Baptist heritage in religious liberty at two very specific points.

a. Public hearings held by the committee to which the bill has been referred usually allow representatives of various groups, and sometimes individual citizens, to present testimony.

b. Individual correspondence or conversation with members of the committee by constituents who give evidence of being informed and constructive in their criticism of a bill under discussion.

A fuller discussion of this kind of stewardship of influence is found in the March 1965 issue of *Report From The Capital* under the title, "Your Man on the Hill." Once the bill is approved by the committee another phase in the legislative process begins.



James M. Sapp

Committee Report

The second phase is the Committee report on the bill. This report is prepared by the committee staff on behalf of the committee under supervision of the chairman who has led in the conduct of the hearings. The report is in reality a document setting forth the legislative intent of the bill. It "editorializes" the meaning, purpose and intent of the reason for the legislation. It interprets what the sponsor, sponsors or drafters of the bill desire to accomplish with the public law drawn up by the bill. The report usually includes the following components:

a. A short summary of the bill. b. Some background and/or legislative history of the bill. c. Discussions of the provisions of the bill and the need for the programs authorized. d. Tabulations of the distribution of the funds authorized under the bill. e. A section by section analysis of each title of the bill. f. Minority views.

This phase is important for it enables those who desire to understand the language and intent of the bill to secure an interpretation which is of record. This interpretation laid alongside of the bill itself often clarifies the language of the bill which is general or controversial. This is especially true most of the time with respect to church-state issues.

Administrative Rules

The third phase is entered upon only after the bill becomes law. This phase is never complete at any one time and is open to constant revision. It is bound up in the administration of the law and can best be called a catalogue of administrative rulings.

Such rulings are of especial concern with respect to laws based on legislation which surfaces church-state tensions. For instance,

the Office of Economic Opportunity has issued seven pages of rulings with respect to Title II of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. These rulings point not only to the bill, but also to the legislative history as set forth in the committee report on the bill, to support the conditions set forth by the rulings. The rulings entitled, "Community Use of Church-Related Institutions in the War on Poverty," conclude with a set of special conditions for the church-related "school, schools or school systems." The February, 1965 issue of *Report From the Capital* contains a list of these "Special Conditions" on page two.

Non-Government Groups

Non-government organizations have an effective role to play in the Nation's Capital. Consultations with government officials can bring forth interpretations of the law which emerge later as administrative rulings or criteria for administration of the law. Sometimes a timely question or position paper submitted in response to a request from a government agency will find its way into policy adopted by an agency or department of government.

Even at the actual legislative stage, Congressmen will ask for the opinions of non-government leaders. Suggested changes in the use of specific words in consultation with a committee chairman or counsel are sometimes sought in order to avoid triggering opposition of constituent groups concerned with a particular piece of legislation.

Local Responsibilities

The fourth phase in the legislative process is implementation of the law at the local level. This phase brings the stewardship of influence for religious liberty into its sharpest focus. While your Baptist Joint Committee can communicate with government officials on the national level with respect to national policy, Baptist leaders and individual church members hold the greatest power of influence in local communities.

The Baptist Joint Committee in Washington can reflect positions which various Baptist bodies have already taken on issues and insights into religious freedom. You, however, as a citizen can speak to your position and your belief on a specific issue to a specific official without any reservation or restriction.

Most government programs meet their greatest tests, with respect to church-state tensions, in the local community. State and community leaders have a continuing opportunity to transcend a mere patriotic demand for conforming to the Constitution. Here, whether in the small town or a bustling metropolis, Baptist leaders and individual church members can make use of multiplied occasions to give testimony to their insights as Christians into the great principles of religious liberty rooted in the gospel.

What greater opportunity for the Baptist mayor of a modern American city to drive home the truth that God did not make man subject even to his will, let alone the coercion of other men in matters of conscience!

What finer occasion for the Baptist businessman to declare that government is not competent in matters of religion!

What greater sermon topic could a Baptist minister want than to speak to a local issue which is creating church-state tensions than, "Religion by Law or the Spirit?"

Judicial Review In The Elementary, Secondary Education Act

By W. Barry Garrett, Associate Director

Baptist Joint Committee on Public Affairs, Washington, D. C.

In line with the long legal tradition that "a sovereign cannot be sued in his own courts" the American courts do not attempt to press suits against the federal government except by permission. Such consent is sometimes written into legislation specifying the officials that may be sued and the courts in which suits may be brought. This is a matter of assuring just administration of a law which benefits the various States and citizens.

The recently enacted Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 grants the States (not local school districts) the right to sue the federal Commissioner of Education. This permission to sue is called "judicial review," but it refers to the judicial review of the actions of the Commissioner. This is not to be confused with "judicial review" of the constitutionality of an Act of Congress.

Some have urged that if Congress would include some indication that the Supreme Court should review the constitutionality of an Act this would assure such action by the Supreme Court. This device would really amount to a statement by the Congressmen that they cannot read the Constitution. Many Congressmen are justly proud of their own competence as constitutionalists. Whether the Supreme Court would be attracted or repelled from hearing a case under those circumstances is difficult to predict.

The courts exist to deal with real cases and real controversies. They are a separate and independent branch of government, part of a check and balance system. Hence, some have asked whether a provision for constitutional judicial review in an Act of Congress might itself be unconstitutional, since it would attempt to create a case or a controversy by legislative act.

Congress Rejected Judicial Review

Whatever the reasoning, Congress rejected several forms of judicial review designed

to test the constitutionality of parts or all of the education Act. It is not normal for Congress to include this type of judicial review in legislation.

Effort was made during the hearings in both the House of Representatives and in the Senate to include constitutional judicial review in the bill. This was renewed on the floor of both the House and the Senate. The effort was defeated in each case.

The Baptist Joint Committee on Public Affairs did not formally ask for judicial review. However, its executive director, C. Emanuel Carlson, in testimony before the Senate subcommittee on education, supported the idea. He said:

"Our constituency would be delighted to see a provision for judicial review because we have some awareness of the difficulty in getting some of these cases into a position where the Court can decide them. And if your committee can find a way of moving them forward to judicial determination, we think this would be a very helpful thing."

Other groups militantly worked for a constitutional judicial review provision. These included the American Civil Liberties Union, Americans United, several Jewish organizations, and the National Association of Evangelicals. Dean Kelley of the National Council of Churches said that the Council would not be opposed to such a provision.

The various educational organizations and agencies in the nation were silent on the question. The National Catholic Welfare Conference did not take a public position on the subject.

The arguments for and against constitutional judicial review were fully set forth in the debates on the floor of the House and the Senate.

The Smith Amendment

Three amendments were offered to include judicial review in the education bill. The first was by Rep. Howard W. Smith (D., Va.), who hastily scribbled his proposal on the back of an envelope.

The Smith amendment was: "Any portion of this Act shall be subject to judicial review in the appropriate United States District Court in the District of Columbia with respect to its constitutionality."

The Anderson Amendment

Later Rep. John B. Anderson (R., Ill.) offered a substitute for the Smith Amendment. His proposal was more specific than the one by Smith. It reads as follows:

"A suit or proceeding asserting that any provision of this Act or its application or administration is in violation of any provision of the United States Constitution or of section 605 of this Act may be brought by a State, a State educational agency, or any public or other nonprofit institution or agency which is or may be prejudicial by the order of the Commissioner making or denying a grant or authorizing the providing of services, facilities, or equipment in a particular year to another such agency or institution, in a three-judge district court, in the State where the plaintiff is situated pursuant to sections 2282 and 2284 of title 28 of the United States Code."

The Ervin Amendment

In the Senate a much more detailed amendment was offered by Sen. Sam J. Ervin (D., N. C.), and was co-sponsored by Sen. John Sherman Cooper (R., Ky.) and Sen. John Stennis (D., Miss). The proposed Ervin amendment reads as follows:

"Not less than thirty days before making any disbursement or grant under the provisions of this Act or any appropriation Act implementing it, the Commissioner shall cause to be published in the Federal Register a notice that he proposes to make such disbursement or grant on a day to be specified in such notice. At any time before the day so specified, any taxpayer of the United States suing in behalf of himself and all other taxpayers may bring a civil action in the nature of an action for a declaratory judgment against the Commissioner in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia alleging that the proposed disbursement or grant is inconsistent with the first amendment, fifth amendment, or any other provision of the Constitution of the United States. Notwithstanding any decision, statute, or rule to the contrary, the United States District Court for the District of Columbia shall have jurisdiction to entertain, try, and determine such civil action, and to enjoin the making of the proposed

(Continued on page 6)



W. Barry Garrett

disbursement or grant in case it adjudges that the proposed disbursement or grant is inconsistent with the first amendment, fifth amendment, or any other provision of the Constitution of the United States. Upon the bringing of such civil action, the Commissioner shall refrain from consummating the proposed disbursement or grant and withhold the amount of the proposed disbursement or grant until the final determination of the civil action. In the event two or more civil actions are brought under the provisions of this section challenging the constitutional validity of the same proposed disbursement or grant, the United States District Court for the District of Columbia may consolidate such civil actions for the purpose of trial and judgment."

Why These Amendments?

Why were these efforts made to include judicial review in the bill? Without trying to interpret any person's motives some answers were clear in the debate. First, some were convinced that this is the only way to get constitutional questions easily and quickly into the courts.

Second, others were using these proposals as a nuisance and obstructionist gimmick to delay, alter or defeat the bill. The more conflicting elements that could be introduced between the House and the Senate versions the more likely it would be that an impasse would be created in the conference committee.

Third, others said that the bill violated the constitution and argued that since Congress and the Administration were not paying any attention to constitutional principles, the Courts should be given the privilege of ruling on its constitutionality.

Sen. Ervin said that the reason for his amendment was "for the purpose of enabling Congress hereafter to legislate in constitutional light instead of in constitutional dark."

Arguments For Judicial Review

The arguments for constitutional judicial review used during the debate in the House and Senate can be summarized as follows:

1. Heretofore, it has been extremely difficult for a taxpayer's suit against the federal government to be adjudicated. This situation arises from a rule laid down by the Supreme Court in 1923 in the case of *Massachusetts v. Mellon*. The rule was that in the case of appropriations the Federal courts will not entertain a suit by a taxpayer who cannot show immediate special pecuniary injury as a consequence of the governmental action he seeks to challenge.

The taxpayer's interest in the funds to be expended is so small that he has no standing in the court to sue. It was the contention of the advocates of judicial review that this would overcome the handicap and would get the case before the court.

2. Others argued against the constitutionality of the dual enrollment provisions of the Act, the provisions for free textbooks for pupils and teachers in parochial schools, and the mobile services that might be available to pupils in parochial schools. Judicial review, they contended, would result in court decisions that would remove the element of doubt in these programs.

3. Rep. Smith said that judicial review was necessary "in order to allay those misgivings and in order that we may at least recognize that we do have a Constitution which is supposed to govern this country."

4. There were both charges and denials that the bill violates separation of church and state. Judicial review was proposed as a way to settle the issue.

5. On occasions conflicting answers were given to questions about the effects of certain proposals in the bill for services to parochial school pupils provided by public funds. It was argued that judicial review is the only way to get clarifying answers to what was possible and what was not possible under the bill.

6. Some believed that the bill itself was constitutional, but that it would possibly be administered in unconstitutional ways. For them, judicial review was a way to assure that constitutional principles would be followed in administering the Act.

Arguments Against Judicial Review

Now, why were others in the Congress opposed to any amendment for judicial review? Both legal and political arguments were advanced.

Sen. Wayne Morse (D., Ore.) was forthright in his reasons for opposing judicial review. He said that this would be the rock on which the bill would flounder. He was not opposed to judicial review of the constitutional questions in the bill, but he was opposed to making such provision a part of the bill. He charged that the Ervin amendment was a gimmick to defeat the bill in conference committee between the House and Senate and that it would make the entire bill inoperative if it should be passed.

In the House, Rep. Emanuel Celler (D., N. Y.) chairman of the House Judiciary Committee was selected to be the spokesman to oppose judicial review amendments. In the Senate, Sen. Jacob Javits (R., N. Y.),

a former attorney general for the State of New York, was the spokesman against such amendments.

Celler's Arguments

Here is a summary of Rep. Celler's arguments:

1. Provisions for judicial review should be avoided because they are unnecessary. Celler said that "there is no aspect of this bill which raises issues of any significance in the field of church and state that will not be subject to judicial review" under general principles of law. He said that State and Federal law already makes available judicial remedies against executive action in practically every situation where a remedy could, as a constitutional matter, be provided.

2. In many cases State taxpayers' suits will be available as a means of obtaining judicial review, eventually leading to review by the Supreme Court of the United States. Many suits, he said, involving "pocketbook issues" have originated under State law and have been reviewed by the Supreme Court. There is no reason to believe that this would not be true in this case.

3. Celler pointed out that even if the above were not true, "in recent cases the Supreme Court has very significantly relaxed what had been believed to be the standards governing standing to sue in controversies over freedom of religion and establishment of religion." This is evident in the prayer and Bible reading cases decided in recent years by the Court.

4. Judicial review provisions, according to Celler would "be tantamount to saying that we have doubts and misgivings concerning the constitutionality of our Acts." This follows the arguments that Congressmen would not vote for Acts which they believe to violate the Constitution, which by their oath of office they are sworn to uphold.

5. He said further that such amendments would be an inducement to the irresponsible, misinformed, uninformed to bring suit, thus in effect a neon sign invitation to court suits.

Javits' Arguments

On the Senate side, Sen. Javits based his arguments against judicial review amendments on the factors considered by the Senate Committee on Education and Labor before they reported the bill out of committee. There were four such factors:

1. Litigation raising analogous issues is presently pending before courts of at least one State, and could reach the U. S. Su-

(Continued on next page)

preme Court. In view of the recent Supreme Court decisions in the school prayer cases, which also arose in State courts, it would appear more likely than ever before that the issues under this Act could similarly be tested.

2. Since the determination of the Supreme Court against taxpayers' suits in *Massachusetts v. Mellon*, there have been subsequent decisions which also suggest the possibility of a test in the Federal Courts of the provisions of this Act in the absence of specific language.

3. The bill presently contains three specific and limited judicial review provisions which parallel those in other Federal education legislation. It is possible that these issues can also be raised in suits brought by States against the Commissioner of Education under those provisions, if, for instance, a State plan that provided aid to parochial schools were rejected by the Commissioner.

4. It is not the practice to insert broad judicial review clauses in Federal legislation, particularly as this might be construed as an invitation to a multiplicity of time-consuming suits which could bring to a temporary halt an enormous range of Federal activities.

The Situation As It Stands

So, here we have the arguments pro and con in the judicial review debate in Congress. We have the fact that Congress rejected all of the constitutional judicial review amendments. We have an educational Act without constitutional judicial review specifically spelled out.

In order to have the constitutional questions ultimately resolved, we must await the administrative regulations being worked out by the Office of Education, the application of the provisions of the Act by the States and local communities, and the actual court cases or controversies that must follow the traditional patterns of testing constitutionality.

RIGHT WING GROUPS—California Attorney General Thomas C. Lynch April 12 said groups such as the American Nazi party, the National States Rights party, the California Rangers, the Minutemen and the Black Muslims pose a "threat to the peace and security" of California. He said, "They embrace violent racial and political doctrines. They have lost faith in our system of government. They continually plot armed activity while skirting outright sedition."

Research Program

(Continued from page 2)

development in the world demands careful analytical work week by week."

The aim of the research program, Carlson explained, is to provide a base from which a number of persons with backgrounds and responsibilities can gain expeditious entree to independent study and observation. "A strong movement must rest on the seasoned personal convictions of as many people as possible," he said. "This comes only by means of deliberate and careful analyses of the facts, of the trends, and of the theories."

For the past several years the Baptist Joint Committee has sponsored an annual three-day Religious Liberty Conference in Washington. These will continue. "But," Carlson said, "we still need the more intensive participation of capable people who have the opportunity to study the facts carefully and to be recognized scholars and leaders in the field. These need not three days of conference but three months and more of research."

In addition to the research done by the Baptist Joint Committee staff the program envisions public affairs interns coming in for several months of research, guidance and facilities for scholars for extended periods of time, research projects and participation by pastors, denominational leaders, graduate students and others.

Carlson anticipates that the program will be of help to nearly all branches of Baptist denominational work. He foresees that the program will be a resource for most denominational agencies as they become involved in public issues that affect their interests.

SHIFTING POWER IN SENATE—The Southern bloc in the U. S. Senate was further weakened by the death of Sen. Olin D. Johnston (D., S. C.). He was chairman of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee, and second-ranked Democrat on two other Committees. Add to this the failing health of Sen. Richard B. Russell (D., Ga.) and the results of the national election last November, and the crumbling Southern power bloc is more evident.

Three Ways To Receive "Report From The Capital"

By individual subscription. Your own personal copy subscribed for by you and mailed to you at your own expense. \$1.50 per year.

By club subscription. A group subscription by ten or more persons subscribed and paid at the same time. Each member of the club subscription receives his or her own copy mailed to each person's address. \$1.00 per year each.

By bulk subscription. Ten or more copies subscribed for at the same time all mailed to one address. Excellent for distribution by a church leader to his co-workers or by a pastor to leaders of his congregation. \$0.75 per year each.

(Clip and mail this coupon)

REPORT FROM THE CAPITAL

1628—16th St., N. W.

Washington, D. C. 20009

☐ Please enter my subscription for _____ year(s) and send to the address below.

☐ Please send "Report From The Capital" to the attached list of names and addresses. This is a club subscription, and the name listed below is the treasurer of the club.

☐ Please send _____ copies of "Report From The Capital" each month to the address listed below. This is a bulk subscription as described above.

Enclosed please find \$ _____ for the above order

Name _____

Mailing Address _____

City _____ State _____ Zip Number _____

Recent Developments In Church-State Affairs

Baptists Arrested In Cuba

Religious liberty in Cuba took a turn for the worse with the arrest of 53 Baptists on spy charges. Included were two Southern Baptist missionaries, Herbert Caudill and David Fite.

Prior to this clamp-down Baptist activities had been granted relative freedom by Fidel Castro's Communist government.

Immediate protests were filed by the Home Mission Board of the Southern Baptist Convention with the Department of State of the United States. Diplomatic relations between the United States and Cuba earlier were severed. The Swiss Embassy, however, has represented the country's interests in Cuba since 1961.

The spy charges against the Southern Baptist missionaries have been denied by the Department of State. Efforts to secure their release have been made through the Swiss Embassy.

Castro later announced that the missionaries would not be shot. Following visits to the two men in prison by their wives it was reported that they were faring as well as could be expected under the circumstances.

Other Red Countries Relax

At the time Cuba was arresting missionaries, improved conditions were reported elsewhere. John D. Hughey, the Southern Baptist Foreign Mission Board's secretary for Europe and the Middle East, reported that Baptists in some Communist countries are enjoying a freer exercise of religion.

Just returned from a European trip, Hughey told the Foreign Mission Board there is "reason for encouragement" in the Communist-dominated countries of Romania, Hungary and Yugoslavia.

A measure of the Cold War's "thaw" in religion is the fact that Hughey and Roy F. Starmer, a former missionary to Romania, were the first official Southern Baptist representatives to that country since World War II.

"Communism everywhere hopes for the eventual death of religion," Hughey said, "but religion lives on. Religious leaders in Communist countries live under great tension and missionary work in the usual sense will probably not be possible for a long time to come."

Baylor Church-State Studies

Baylor University, Waco, Texas, will introduce next fall a masters degree program in study of separation of church and state.

The new program will be administered by the J. M. Dawson Studies in Church and State, an endowed research program which embraces the departments of history, political science and religion.

Work will be done under the church-state study program in all three departments, each of which has a master's degree program in the Baylor Graduate School.

James E. Wood, Jr., director of the Dawson studies and professor of comparative religion and world Christianity, will direct the new program.

A graduate assistantship in church-state studies will be available each year, providing full tuition and a stipend up to \$1,000 to a qualified candidate.

Since 1959, Baylor has published "A Journal of Church and State," now appearing three times a year with Wood as editor.

Compliance With Civil Rights Act

More than 70 per cent of junior and senior colleges related to the Southern Baptist Convention have agreed to comply with the federal Civil Rights Act of 1964.

A survey by Baptist Press, news service of the SBC, found that 38 colleges will comply with the Act. Six colleges said they will decline to comply with the Act.

The four Baptist colleges in Virginia, on church-state grounds, have refused to accept loans from federal sources, either for the college itself or for students, and indicated that the question did not affect them.

Compliance is necessary for the colleges to continue to receive funds from the government through Housing and Home Finance Agency construction loans or for student loans through the National Defense Education Act.

Vigil At Pentagon

A 22-member Interreligious Committee on Vietnam, composed of many of the Nation's leading church leaders, has called for a "vigil" before the Pentagon, May 11-12. Participants are urged to visit Congressmen and Senators to "register concern" about Vietnam.

Purpose of the vigil is to express concern "before God and men" for a peaceful solution in Vietnam, about escalation of the war, to press for unconditional discussions by the involved parties, and to support President Johnson in a program of international cooperation for human welfare and economic development in Southeast Asia.

Cover Picture

C. Emanuel Carlson has been executive director of the Baptist Joint Committee on Public Affairs since January 1, 1954. He succeeded J. M. Dawson who was the first executive director of the office.

Since coming to his post in Washington, Carlson has become recognized as one of the nation's outstanding authorities on Baptist insights and church-state affairs. He currently serves as chairman of the Commission on Religious Liberty and Human Rights of the Baptist World Alliance.

In addition he serves as consultant with a number of national and international inter-denominational organizations dealing with problems of religious liberty and church-state relations.

The son of immigrants from Sweden, Carlson is a native of Gwynne, Alberta, Canada. He migrated to the United States when he began his graduate studies at the University of Minnesota. He holds both the M.A. and Ph.D. degrees from the University.

Carlson's Baptist background is that of Swedish Baptists. He was connected with Bethel Academy, which became Bethel College, from 1927 through 1953. First he taught in the Academy, then was professor of history and social science in the college. From 1945-53 he was dean of the college. The college is affiliated with the Baptist General Conference.