

# Bolshevik Persecution of the Catholic Church

*by Donia Byrnes*

The Roman Catholic Church struggled to survive the aftermath of the Bolshevik Revolution from 1917 to 1924 - seven years of persecution and martyrdom of the clergy and laity that destroyed the main hierarchy of the Church. The tyranny of the government inhibited any further growth of the church and effectively eliminated the Roman Catholic Church as a religious force in Russia.

In 1905, the Czarist regime of Russia and the Holy See in Rome entered into an agreement which resulted in the Edict of Toleration, which was promulgated on April 17 of that year. This law allowed the Orthodox to leave their religion without penalties and loss of rights, permitted the organization of a Russian Catholic Church and allowed the reopening of closed churches. However, this edict did not provide for free communication between the bishops and Rome, a bishop's right to educate his clergy, or diocesan rule according to canon law. Therefore, the Catholic Church in Russia took an optimistic view of the Provisional Government, which came into power after the February 1917 revolution, because it eliminated restrictions formerly imposed on the Roman Catholic Church and laity in Russia <1>

Under the Provisional Government, Bishop Ropp was returned from his 10 year exile, imposed by the czarist regime. Further, Benedict XV nominated him Archbishop of Mohylew and Metropolitan of the Roman Catholic Church in Russia. Bishop John B. Cieplak, who had administered the archdiocese in the archbishop's absence, was made his assistant and titular bishop of Ochrid. It was at this time that Benedict XV named Father Leonid Fedorov, a native Russian, exarch of the Russian Eastern Rite Catholic Church. Prior to his appointment, this church had been under the direction of Latin bishops. <2>

The new government also enacted a comprehensive law of freedom of association, which corrected many existing inequities, and further, it provided for new dioceses, new churches and schools, as well as appointments of new bishops. <3> However, this freedom came to an abrupt end with the Bolshevik Revolution in October 1917.

The Bolshevik aim was to replace religion with materialistic atheism. In October 1917, they issued a decree abolishing private ownership of all landed estates and transferred all church property to the people. At this time, the Roman Catholic Church of Russia had on deposit with the Ecclesiastical College of the regime a total of 11,381,009 rubles, which was seized by the Soviet government. These funds had been accumulated over centuries in the Polish-Lithuanian commonwealth and in more than a century and a half of the Czarist Empire. The loss of these funds was a financial disaster to the Church. <4>

In the Decree of Separation of Church and State, and of School and Church in January 1918, the Soviet government established the separation of Church and State, transferred the registration of births, marriages and deaths to civil authority, prohibited instruction of religion in any school -- private or state, and forbade the ownership of private property by

churches or religious associations because they did not possess the rights of juridical persons. <5>

Further clarification of the execution of this decree, referred to as the instruction, was published in *Izvestia* in August 1918. The instruction included the following:

1. The management of all ecclesiastical property would be transferred to the local Soviets of Workmen-Peasants Deputies.

2. Representatives of the religious creed, who managed the church and other property, were required to submit, in triplicate, a list of all property intended for use in religious services to the local Soviet of Workmen-Peasants Deputies.

3. The deputies would take over the property and give it to the inhabitants of the same religious creed, who wanted to use the property. This group would be composed of at least 20 citizens, who must sign the agreement. The agreement provided that these 20 citizens were to maintain the "National Property" and to use it solely for satisfying religious needs. Further, they must prohibit in these buildings political meetings hostile to the Soviet government, the spreading or selling of literature hostile to the Soviet government, and sermons hostile to the Soviet Government. Maintenance of the Church required that the 20 citizens must see to the payment of taxes, insurance, repairs, etc. Additionally, they could not refuse any citizen, who was a co-religionist, the right to sign the agreement after the date of the agreement. Moreover, they must allow all citizens to be buried in church cemeteries. If all conditions were not fulfilled, the 20 citizens would be held criminally liable.

4. If the persons who managed the ecclesiastical property refused to do the above, the local Soviet of Workmen-Peasants Deputies would compile a list of the property in front of witnesses and turn it over to the group of 20 citizens of the religious creed; churches of historic, artistic and archaeological value would be transferred to the Museum Section of the Commissariat of Education; local citizens of the religious creed could sign the agreement, after the transfer, to participate in the administration of the ritual property.

5. If there were no local applicants to take over the building, the Commissariat of Education would determine the purpose for the use of the building; so called sacred items, not utilized in religious services, would be turned over to citizens responsible for religious items.

6. All other property of churches and religious associations, and abolished departments, such as schools and charitable institutions, would be immediately confiscated. This included all landed property, funds and profit-making investments.

7. Failure to turn over monies by the holder would result in a charge of civil and criminal embezzlement, and the illicit use of the property of the Republic would be a criminal offense.

8. The buildings of spiritual, educational and training establishments of any creed, as well as the building of the parish church schools should, as national property, be turned over to the local Soviets of Workmen-Peasants Deputies.

9. This decree prohibits the instruction in any creed in state, public and private educational institutions. <6>

Although the Church suffered a severe economic set-back with the seizure of its funds, the banning of religious teaching in all schools was a greater loss because the Catholic clergy valued the teaching of the young and the teaching of the seminarians as their highest priority in fulfilling the Mission of the Church.

Moreover, the seizure of the libraries of the higher institutions of learning resulted in the loss of irreplaceable religious books and histories. Father Braun, who was chaplain to Catholics in the American Diplomatic Corps, and also pastor of the Church of Saint-Louis-des-Francais from 1943 through 1946, saw pages from these precious volumes used as wrapping paper by stores and produce stands in Moscow. <7>

Soon after the August 1918 Decree was promulgated, Archbishop Ropp met with the clergy of St. Petersburg and they decided that they could not sign the agreement, involving the 20 citizens, because it was against canon law. Therefore, Archbishop Ropp, with Exarch Fedorov and the Orthodox bishops lodged a protest with the Commissariat of justice. Their response was an order to send a representative to Moscow to work out the details. <8> Monsignor Constantine Budkiewicz, who was acting intermediary between the archbishop and the Soviet regime, was chosen as their delegate to Moscow. The Soviet Government informed him that the three areas in which the government was interested were the churches and church property, the parochial registers of births, marriages and deaths, and the control of the administration and income from cemeteries. Although Monsignor Budkiewicz could agree to the transfer of the registers, he informed the Soviets that any transfer of property would have to be between the Soviet government and the Holy See. <9>

Following this unsatisfactory meeting, the Catholic clergy realized the Soviet government would use force, if necessary, to put the instruction into effect. Many consultations were held among the clergy between December 1918 and April 1920. At one of the meetings in March 1919, it was decided that Archbishop Ropp would publish a circular letter, which would permit the clergy to organize parish committees, which would take over church property and safeguard it. Further, they were given permission to sign the agreement. Additionally, the Archbishop decided to form central committees, composed of two members from each parish committee, to assist these local committees and to find a way to support the ecclesiastical government. <10>

Before the arrangements were firmly in place, Archbishop Ropp was arrested on April 19, 1919. The Vatican had heard rumors of his arrest earlier in the month and Cardinal Peter Gasparri, the papal secretary of state, sent the following telegram on April 2, 1919:

April 2, 1919

Lenin

Moscow

Pope Benedict XV has learned with boundless grief that Monsignor Ropp, Archbishop of Mogilev [Mohylew] has been taken as a hostage in Petrograd by the Bolsheviks. He earnestly asks Mr. Lenin to give orders which will set him free at once.

Cardinal Gasparri. <[11](#)>

However, at this time, Lenin was able to reply that the archbishop had not been arrested. <[12](#)>

In the meantime, following Archbishop Ropp's instructions to the clergy, Archbishop John Cieplak assumed leadership and authority. He immediately sent a telegram to Moscow to the Council of People's Commissars requesting the release of the archbishop, and simultaneously, sent a delegation to Moscow for the same purpose. Archbishop Cieplak was notified that the arrest had been changed to house arrest. Upon the intercession of the nuncio in Warsaw, Monsignor Archille Ratti, through the Polish Red Cross, to the Soviet government, he was able to have the archbishop recognized as a subject of the Pope, and have him released to the nuncio in exchange for the Communist leader, Karl Radek. <[13](#)>

Following the exile of the archbishop, there were many reports of other arrests of priests, executions and seizures of church property in other parts of the Russian State. At Perm, 25 Catholic priests had been shot and the bishop buried alive, while at Osa, 30 Orthodox priests had been massacred. As the priests decreased, there was no way to replace them because all seminaries had been seized by the Bolsheviks. Furthermore, it was at this time that the Soviet government removed many children and adolescents from the influence of religion. <[14](#)>

Although many of the St. Petersburg clergy had felt that the Bolshevik government would be short-lived, they were now convinced that it would be permanent. Therefore, they reexamined their policy toward the Soviet government. Monsignor Budkiewicz, who had opposed the signing of the agreement when it was judged to be short term, now suggested that permanent settlements be made by negotiation between the Soviet Government and the Vatican. Archbishop Cieplak shared these views and he issued a circular letter, in which he affirmed that nationalization of the Church and seizure of its property was against the spirit and the letter of canon law. In this letter, he also urged the central committees of the parishes to strive to prevent persecution of the Church, so as to secure religious instruction in school buildings. The Monsignor supported this by a document on the signing of the agreement, which he declared against the law of the church. <[15](#)>

Following this meeting, the clergy refused to sign the agreement. Archbishop Cieplak set up secret schools of religion for children and Monsignor Malecki helped to organize a secret seminary. Further, Exarch Fedorov and Monsignor Budkiewicz held meetings with the Orthodox clergy in an effort to promote more cooperation between the Roman Catholic clergy and the Orthodox clergy. <[16](#)> Monsignor Budkiewicz was of the

opinion that if all religions were joined in a common purpose, supported by the majority of the people, the Soviet government would be forced to accommodate them. What the monsignor failed to take into account was the militant atheism of the Soviet government, whose objective was to exterminate all religion. <17>

The new strategy of the Catholic Church in Russia brought about more intense persecution of the clergy and laity in 1919 and 1920. There were massacres of Poles and Ruthenians with many of them being buried alive. <18>

These internal affairs were worsened by international events. Civil War in Russia (1918-1920) between the Red and White Armies, and the Polish-Soviet War (1919-1920) often found the Catholic clergy on the side of the Soviet opponents. In addition to their sympathies being with the foes of the Soviets, they were also geographically situated near the battle lines. Moreover many were liberated for a short time by the Polish Catholic forces. <19>

On the diplomatic scene, there were further complications. The Pope received the Ukrainian ambassador, Count Michael Tyskiewicz, in an official audience in April 1919. The Count's mission included a request to the Pope for establishment of a Church in the Ukraine and a request for aid in gaining state recognition at the Peace Conference in Paris. To the Soviets, this was viewed as a political union between the Church, the Ukraine and Poland. <20>

However, in 1921 and 1922, the Soviet government faced economic disaster in both industry and agriculture, and it was the Catholic Church who came to its aid. Two successive years of low agricultural production, in combination with two years of drought, produced famine conditions. The threat of starvation hung over millions of Russian citizens. In August 1921, Archbishop Cieplak appealed to all Roman Catholics to lend aid to the famine stricken in Russia. Further, Benedict XV sent a papal representative to the International Relief Association, which was being organized in Geneva. At the same time, he sent a million lire for relief to Russia. This was to be distributed by Archbishops Ropp and Cieplak, who were recognized as subjects of the Pope by the Soviets. Moreover, by December 1921, the Pope had sent 50 train cars of papal relief to Russia. When Benedict XV died in January 1922, his successor, Pius XI continued the papal relief program and actively supported the International Relief Association. <21>

Despite all the famine relief sent to Russia, the Soviet government used the famine as an excuse to seize all church valuables. A government decree was announced in *Izvestia* on February 24, 1922, which ordered the local Soviets to remove from all churches, treasures which were to be sold for famine relief. <22> At this same time, Colonel William Haskell, director of the American Relief Association in Russia, affirmed that all Russian ports and rail lines were crammed with food and supplies, awaiting Soviet transportation into Russia. <23>

Notwithstanding this, Pius XI continued to work with the Soviet government, and with their permission, he arranged to send Father Edmund Walsh, a Jesuit, to head the Papal Relief Mission in Russia. Further, the Pope set aside 10 million lire for Russian relief and ordered the mission to distribute aid to all religions and nationalities. <24>

While the Holy See was assisting Russia with famine relief, the seizure of church valuables and the closure and sealing of Roman Catholic Churches in Russia went forward. On September 2, 1922, the Moscow Bednota published an order from the People's Commissariat of Finance, at the completion of the collections, instructing all financial organs to deliver all church valuables to the State Fund. <25>

In the meantime, the Vatican had sent the following proposals to the Soviet government:

The Vatican  
Secretariat of State of His Holiness  
May 14, 1922 (No. 3605)

To His Excellency, M. Chicherin, Russian Delegation, Genoa Excellency,  
... In this connection, I have the honour to inform you that, according to a telegram from Mgr. Cieplak to the Holy Father, the State authorities of Petrograd insist on the surrender of the sacred and valuable articles of worship in order that the money from the sale of them may be devoted to famine relief. On this subject I hasten to inform Your Excellency that the Holy Father is ready to buy these sacred and valuable objects, and to deposit them with Archbishop Cieplak. The price agreed on will be immediately paid to Your Excellency or to any other person whom the government may nominate.

I beg Your Excellency kindly to favour me with a reply to this request as soon as possible, and to be good enough to transmit the necessary orders to Petrograd.

Accept, Excellency, the assurance of my very high esteem.

Joseph Pizzardo (For the Secretary of State of His Holiness)

And the reply from the Soviet Commissar of Foreign Affairs on May 17:

... In what concerns the very interesting proposal contained in the second part of your letter, they were immediately transmitted by me to Moscow, where they will certainly be examined with all the good-will such proposals deserve.

When no answer had been received by June 10, the following telegram was sent to Lenin:

His Excellency, M. Lenin, Moscow

... Besides, I should be very grateful to know what reception has been accorded to the proposal of the Holy See to buy the valuables conformable with the letter addressed to M. Chicherin on May 14.

Cardinal Gasparri <26>

However, the Soviet government ignored both of these communications. To have accepted the Vatican's offer would have defeated the Soviet objective, which was the



destruction of the Church. On the other hand, they could not reject it, because they were appealing to the world community for assistance. Father Walsh, who was in the Soviet state at this time, affirms that the crown jewels, with a minimum value of \$250 million, were not sold for famine relief. Further, he states that while the Soviets were confiscating church property for the famine, this same government was exporting wheat from its southern ports to Hamburg. <27>

In the meantime, Monsignor Budkiewicz prepared three documents for the nuncio in Warsaw. This communication was a treatise, which justified the legality of the actions of the Roman Catholic Church in Russia. Further, he implored the nuncio to seek advice from the Holy Father on the signing of the agreement, so that the Churches might be reopened. <28>

When the closing of the churches failed to bring about the signing of the agreement, the Soviet government took drastic action. In November 1922, Archbishop Cieplak was served with a list of charges, "anti-government propaganda, inciting Catholics to work for the overthrow of the Bolshevik government, and using religious prejudice to arouse counter-revolution." The trial was originally set for November 17, 1922, but was postponed to March 5, 1923, in order to include all the clergy of Petrograd. <29>

In December 1922, Archbishop Cieplak managed to send a letter to the Papal Secretary of State, Cardinal Gasparri. The archbishop informed him that the government had seized all church goods and property, even the cemeteries. Further, the Soviets had insisted on the surrender of the sacred articles of worship, so that money realized from their sale might be used for famine relief. Additionally, Archbishop Cieplak stated that he had ordered his clergy not to sign the agreement until advice was received from the Holy See. However, he continued, on December 5, 1922, the Soviet government had closed the churches of Petrograd and the Catholic clergy were holding church services in private homes. <30>

As his trial date neared, the archbishop wrote to Father Walsh concerning the signing of the agreement and the opening of the churches. On February 12, he received a telegram from Father Walsh which authorized the clergy and laity to sign the agreement. Because the archbishop was eager to settle this matter before the trial, he immediately sent a delegation to Smolny to arrange for the reopening of the churches. <31>

Although there were many speculations as to the reason for the trial of the Roman Catholic clergy, Monsignor Budkiewicz seems to have understood the Soviet reasoning better than most people. In two of his last letters to the nuncio in Warsaw, he states:

Although the Ministry of Foreign Affairs has informed you that the Soviet Government has given up its decision to proceed to trial, you are not to believe their words, but you must demand that whatever is arrived at in discussion, and decided or promised, must be put in writing, because in their conduct of affairs Soviet officials operate with falsehood and delay. <32>

In order to justify in a certain measure the illegal closing of the churches of Petrograd and to inspire fear in the clergy, the Soviet Government has organized a political process and placed Archbishop Cieplak and 13 priests under the threat of an accusation for crimes ... Thus the desire to justify its acts in public opinion and to terrorize unite in one another. <33>

Despite the statement of the Soviet Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the archbishop and clergy were going to stand trial on March 14, 1923. Further, the Soviet judicial procedure in effect at this time had abolished all courts and the office of public prosecutor. In 1917, the Bolsheviks established local courts and Worker's and Peasant's Revolutionary Tribunals, which were used to dispense revolutionary justice through 1924. These tribunals were like the feared Cheka, except that they were public. <34> Furthermore, they were "free to use any measures to combat counter revolution and sabotage; they were also free to summon witnesses or to admit counsel if they chose to, and they were not bound by any form of judicial procedure. <35>

According to a report by F. W. B. Coleman of the American Legation in Riga, N. V. Krylenko, the prosecutor in the trial of the Catholic clergy, affirmed that the courts were designed to protect the rights of the workers, and if it was necessary to crush the rights of other classes to achieve this, the courts would not refrain from doing so. Thus, it was under this system of justice that 15 members of the Roman Catholic clergy and one layman were brought to trial. They included Archbishop Cieplak, Exarch Fedorov, Monsignor Malecki and Budkiewicz, and Fathers Wasilewski, Janukowicz, Ejsmont, Juniewicz, Matulanis, Chwiecko, Troiga, Chodniewicz, Ivanov, Rutkowski and Pronckietis. The one layman was James Sharnov, who was a music student at the Petrograd Conservatory. <36>

Fathers Rutkowski and Pronckietis were charged with resisting the seizure of church valuables and James Sharnov was indicted as a nonleader in the activities. However, the archbishop and other members of the clergy were charged with conspiracy to found a counterrevolutionary organization to revolt against the laws of the Soviet government pertaining to the relations of Church and State. <37>

Throughout the trial, Krylenko ignored the defense offered by the clergy and he refused to admit evidence of the agreement of the signing of contracts between the Vatican and the Commissariat of Justice. Further, he told the defendants that the object of the trial was not to study canon law, but to determine violations of the laws of the Soviet government. <38> Father Walsh, who was present during this five-day trial, affirms the final question put to the clergy, their response, and the public prosecutor's disparagement of their response:

'Will you stop teaching the Christian religion?'

'We cannot,' came the uniform reply. 'It is the law of God.'

'That law does not exist on Soviet Territory,' replied Krylenko.

'You must choose . . . As for your religion, I spit on it, as I spit on all religions.' <39>



And it was on this statement, the Soviet definition of religion, that the clergy were judged and sentenced.

On Palm Sunday, March 25, 1923, at midnight, Judge Nemsiv read the sentences imposed by the court: Archbishop Cieplak and Monsignor Budkiewicz were found guilty of being the leaders of counterrevolutionary conspiracy and were sentenced to be shot; Fathers Ejsmont, Juniewicz, Chwietko, Chadiewics and Exarch Fedorov were found guilty of being members of this conspiracy and were sentenced to 10 years solitary confinement in prison; Monsignor Malecki and Fathers Wasilewski, Janukowicz, Matulanis, Troigo, Ivanov, Rutkowski and Pronkietis were sentenced to imprisonment for three years as accomplices of the leaders; and James Sharnov received a six-months imprisonment for insulting behaviors toward Soviet authorities. However, the sentences of Archbishop Cieplak and Monsignor Budkiewicz were delayed pending a review by the Central Executive Committee. <40>

Following these verdicts, there were diplomatic exchanges between the Holy See and Vladimir Vovorskii, the Russian representative to the papacy, who convinced Cardinal Gasparri that the prisoners were in no danger. Further, the Cardinal sent a telegram to President Kalinin and Foreign Minister Chicherine requesting "the commutation of the death sentence for Archbishop Cieplak and Monsignor Budkiewicz, the freeing of the prisoners and sending them to Rome." <41> In addition, the Polish government offered an exchange of prisoners, the English government pointed out that the execution of the archbishop would cause the world community to question economic dealings with Russia, and the United States revoked an entrance visa for Madame Catherine Kalinin, wife of the president of the Soviet government. She had planned a tour in the interests of Russian relief for the famine. <42>

However, all pleas were ignored by the Russian government. On March 30, 1923, the Moscow Izvestia reported that the All-Russian Central Executive Committee had commuted the sentence of Archbishop Cieplak from death to 10 years solitary confinement, but they had rejected Monsignor Budkiewicz's appeal for clemency. <43> The following notice appeared in Izvestia on April 3, 1923:

The sentence of the Supreme Court of the republic with respect to Budkiewicz, that he be shot, has been executed, his plea for pardon having been denied by the All-Russian Central Executive Committee. <44>

It was later learned that the monsignor had been executed on Holy Saturday night, March 31, 1923.

The execution of the sentence succeeded in destroying the hierarchical organization of both the Roman Catholic and the Russian Catholic churches in Russia. Archbishop Cieplak and Exarch Fedorov were imprisoned, Monsignor Budkiewicz had been shot and 13 other Roman Catholic priests, nuns and laity were either in prison or exile. This article also affirmed that there were only three Polish priests in Moscow who were still free. <45>

However, the Vatican continued to work for the release of Archbishop Cieplak and on March 22, 1924 the All-Russian Central Committee voted to release him and to expel him from Russia. Although it was a secret meeting, Cardinal Gasparri was unofficially notified of this decision on March 24, 1924. On April 9, 1924, the archbishop was escorted to the Latvian border and made his way to Riga and Warsaw, eventually arriving in Rome on May 8, 1924. <46>

The significance of the religious persecution of the Roman Catholics of Russia, between 1917 and 1924, may be judged by a comparison of the Catholic hierarchy and laity in the archdiocese of Mohylew in these years. In 1917, Archbishop Ropp was assisted by Bishop Cieplak as the head of the hierarchical organization of the Church, but by 1924 both bishops were in exile and the Church lacked leadership and authority. Before the revolution, the archdiocese had 1,600,000 laity, 119 parishes and 88 priests. <47> Many of the people had fled and many had been martyred, churches had been seized and converted for Soviet use and the clergy had been imprisoned or exiled. In addition, there was no source of new priests because all seminaries had been closed by the Soviet government.

Therefore, between 1917 and 1924 the Soviet government had ruthlessly reduced the Catholic population in Russia, had destroyed its hierarchy, had instilled fear into the laity, had taught its children atheism, and had completed one of the most savage attacks on religion in the modern world.

### Notes

1 James J. Zatko, *Descent Into Darkness* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1965), pp. 24-39

2 Zatko, pp. 45-58.

3 Zatko, pp. 47-48.

4 Zatko, pp. 63-68.

5 Boleslaw Szczensniak, ed. and trans., *The Russian Revolution and Religion* (A Collection of Official Documents, Official Correspondence, and Newspaper Articles, 1917-1925), (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1959), pp. 343-5.

6 Szczensniak, pp. 40-46.

7 Leopold L. S. Braun, A.A., *Religion in Russia: An Uncensored Account* (New Jersey: St. Anthony Guild Press, 1959), p. 35.

8 Zatko, pp. 73-74.

- 9 Francis McCullach, *The Bolshevik Persecution of Christianity*. (New York: E. P. Dutton and Co., 1924), p. 161.
- 10 McCullach, pp. 156-59.
- 11 Szczensniak, p. 49.
- 12 McCullach, p. 158.
- 13 Zatkan, pp. 77-80.
- 14 Zatkan, pp. 79-80.
- 15 McCullach, pp. 202-03.
- 16 McCullach, p. 159.
- 17 N. S. Timacheff, *Religion in Soviet Russia* (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1942), pp. 1-2.
- 18 Zatkan, p. 87.
- 19 Zatkan, pp. 91-92, 95-97.
- 20 Zatkan, pp. 93-94.
- 21 Zatkan, pp. 108-09.
- 22 Zatkan, p. 104.
- 23 McCullach, pp. 8, 14-15.
- 24 McCullach, p. 99.
- 25 Szczensniak, p. 94.
- 26 Edmund A. Walsh, S.J., *The Catholic Church in Present Day Russia*., a report delivered before the American Catholic Historical Association, December 29, 1931 in Minneapolis, p. 12.
- 27 Walsh, pp. 11-13.
- 28 Zatkan, pp. 129-30.
- 29 McCullach, p. 112.

30 Zatko, pp. 123-127.

31 McCullach, pp. 113-14.

32 Zatko, pp. 135-36.

33 Zatko, p. 137.

34 McCullach, pp. 172-73.

35 Zatko, p. 139.

36 McCullach, pp. 169, 172.

37 McCullach, p. 170.

38 McCullach, pp. 215-17.

39 Walsh, p. 13.

40 McCullach, pp. 364-65.

41 Zatko, p. 158.

42 Zatko, pp. 158, 164, 166.

43 Szczensniak, p. 136.

44 Szczensniak, p. 144.

45 "Soviet War on Religion," from Riga Correspondent, *The Times* (London), November 26, 1923.

46 Zatko, pp. 175-76.

47 Zatko, pp. 171-72.

[Return to 1987-8 Table of Contents](#)