

people considering a career. This is far less true in Scotland and in Wales, and I would say that the prestige of a teacher is noticeably higher in Yorkshire and Lancashire than in any other English counties.

Now that there is to be a major expansion and reorganization of training colleges, has not the time come to banish the word 'training college' altogether? For historical reasons, it has acquired a musty smell which cannot now be removed by nervous little applications of Public Relations deodorant talk. Even when the three-year course comes into effect, the training college as it stands will still suffer from the fact that its students, unlike undergraduates, are all heading for the same career. If it were possible to establish Institutes or Colleges of Social Studies where future non-graduate teachers could share a common core of studies with future social workers of various kinds, the teachers would meet a much wider cross-section of the community during these formative years, while other social workers would be far more aware of the key position of schools.

Graduate teachers cannot afford to ignore this large body of status-hungry teachers who feel that the immense value of their work is not recognized; nor should the desire for status, rightly interpreted, be despised. Earlier generations of university men and women founded clubs and settlements, maybe in a paternalist way, but still with an overflowing desire to give away the treasure which they had received. It is the rich in mind who embrace poverty most ardently and gracefully. Generosity is a spiritual luxury; it is easier to fast than to starve. If the rank and file of teachers are to fulfil the task as the chief social workers of the country, they must not only be made rich, but be made to feel rich.

M. A. WILEMAN

### RUSSIAN OPINION

**E**IGHT years ago Pope Pius XII spoke of Rome's desire throughout the centuries for friendship with Russia. His words have been made the occasion for a book published recently in Moscow by B. R. Ramm, a member of the Soviet Academy of Sciences, entitled *The Papacy and Russia from the tenth to the fifteenth century*.

The Pope we are told retreated into 'the mists of times long past' to gather support for his claim 'beneath the cover of myth and legend'; and there Mr Ramm follows him to present his own version of the Church's attempts by force and fear to bring Russia within her power.

'The Catholic missionaries' cross led the way before the sword of foreign overlords, who ever and again burst in upon our forefathers' peaceful toil, eager for the broad rich lands of our country. From the Curia of the Pope of Rome there spread a web of military and political alliances and intrigues along a broad front between western and eastern Europe.'

Western Europe had already fallen to the Church and feudalism:

'In accordance with God's will, threats of cruel tortures and punishments not only in this life but in life everlasting and the promise of heavenly bliss as the reward for submission formed the principal means enabling the warrior class to break the resistance of the national masses, which the length and breadth of Europe strove to withstand the new onslaught, the oppression, the plunder.'

But Russia herself was saved, in part because the Church turned her interests elsewhere, although the pattern of her behaviour did not change:

'The Catholic Church went hand in hand with colonial warriors, and once again with cross and creed prepared the way for west-European greed.'

Within this framework there is much detailed history, and the serious criticism that Rome on occasion has shown too little sympathy for rites outside her own. Mr Ramm's own ideal is that the Russian Church should be:

'independent of outside forces, free from submission to Rome or Constantinople, and at the same time subjected to the Grand Prince of Moscow'.

This at least is the state of the Church which he describes as necessary for the proper development of Russia from the end of the period he is concerned with.

If for the Grand Prince of Moscow we read the Communist Party, this has in fact been the official position of the Russian Church since 1927 when Metropolitan Sergius promised his 'Church's loyalty towards the government and the existing social order'. According to a source reputedly from within the Soviet Union and reported in the emigré weekly *Posev*, published in Germany, one consequence of this 'concordat' has been the Russian Church's 'active support for certain political measures of the Government including the so-called "struggle for peace", in fact a policy directed against the Vatican'.

The writer is deeply critical of his Church's concession to the government:

'Never before has the Church renounced her primary right of moral criticism of the secular powers. Although the ecclesiastical hierarchy has deeply committed itself, this by no means applies to the rest of the Church'.

He complains further that the Church is not rewarded for her 'loyalty': she is not allowed, for example, the right to reply publicly to the attacks made on religion in the press.

Another correspondent to the same weekly claims that a 'religious nationalism' is now being encouraged by the government:

'The narrowness of vision and the degraded position of the Church in Russia, the impossibility of speaking openly or of saying everything has led popular religious feeling to take two forms, the one religious nationalism,

supported silently by the government, the other religious ceremonial, which the government tolerates.

‘The feeling for national self-preservation in face of hostile powers, a feeling which the government has made use of to strengthen its own position, has undoubtedly had its effect on the religious sections of the population. From the people’s unconsciousness burn up afresh memories of past crimes by western religious fanaticism against Russia. This lends significance to the success which the film *Alexander Pevsky* has had in the Soviet Union. Among believers and half-believers this film has undoubtedly aroused old emotions of ‘defending the faith of Orthodoxy against the “Latins”’. The Church’s task must be to repress these nationalist emotions which, now the threat of Hitlerism is passed, are not justified by the political situation and of use only to the Communist dictatorship. But the Church authorities cannot do this: on the contrary they are obliged to fan still higher the flame of nationalist feeling.’

It is possibly because of this traditional resentment towards the Latin Church that non-Catholic sects are apparently meeting with some success in the Soviet Union. According to the figures in Robert Conquest’s useful little book *Common Sense about Russia* published by Victor Gollancz early this year (12s. 6d.), the Lutheran Churches of Latvia and Estonia together number 1,300,000, while Baptists claim from over all Russia 550,000 baptized members and some 3,000,000 sympathizers. Jehovah’s Witnesses and Seventh Day Adventists have appeared for condemnation in the Soviet press, as well as a new millenarian sect, the Innokentrites, who claim among their adherents the Grand Duke Alexei, son of the last Tsar. But the membership of these sects is in number insignificant compared with the twenty to thirty million members of the Orthodox Church.

\* \* \*

The Russian Orthodox Patriarch of Moscow has not as yet made any official pronouncement concerning the forthcoming General Council: but there has been some reaction to the Papal announcement in the monthly *Journal of the Patriarchate of Moscow*, which is the only official religious organ of the press.

During 1959, three articles appeared re-stating the Russian Orthodox opinion on General Councils and Church government. They were, ‘Ecclesiastical Hierarchy and the Teaching Magisterium’, by Abbot L’Yuillye; ‘The Catholicity of the Church’, by Professor N. D. Uspensky, and ‘Catholicity and Autocephaly’, by V. I. Talyzin.

At present, the Russian Orthodox Church recognizes seven General Councils, the last of them being the second Council of Nicea in the eighth century. Later Councils have sometimes been admitted; in 1848, the Eastern Patriarchs regarded the Council of Constantinople of 879-880 as constituting a General Council.

But the powers of a Council and the conditions under which it can be summoned appear to be matters of some doubt. It is admitted that further Councils may occur, but only two criteria are advanced whereby they may

be judged: they must be international, and their doctrines must not differ from those of previous Councils. The seven recognized Councils defined the christological dogmas and those relating to salvation. But it is not clear what future Councils should do in view of Russian opposition to the concept of development of doctrine, which they regard as a heresy of the West. They do claim that a Council must only concern itself with dogma and aspects of Canon Law directly dependent on dogmas of the Church. In other respects, they claim full freedom for local Churches.

The Russian attitude is certainly coloured by their concept of Catholicity, and this for linguistic reasons: *Sobornost* ('Catholicity') suggests *Sobor* ('Council'). Hence their concept of the true Catholic Church is that of a number of different Churches locally independent which teach in common doctrines which have been conciliarly defined. The bishops who attend a Council do so to demonstrate the identity of their beliefs with those of their predecessors and with those of other bishops.

This conception emphasizes the importance of each bishop as opposed to either his flock or to any central authority. It also involves a recognition of the necessity of maintaining the Apostolic Succession.

The Apostolic Succession is admitted to be recognized in the Roman Catholic Church. Protestant orders are not recognized. There have been recent negotiations with the Old Catholics of Germany, continuing a process begun in 1896, which have as their object the establishment of a conformity of rite, which is possible in that the validity of Old Catholic orders is admitted. However, from the most recent report of these negotiations, in January, it appears that complete doctrinal agreement is not yet achieved. Nevertheless, this is the most practical example so far of a growing pre-occupation with the problem of Church unity in the Russian Orthodox Church.

\* \* \*

As to the present position of the Russian Orthodox Church, it is true that the régime remains atheist in theory, but in practice anti-religious propaganda is generally intermittent. The Church is theoretically free, but is limited by a prohibition on the public teaching of religion to the young.

The re-establishment of the Patriarchate of Moscow after the revolution has enabled the Church to remain out of direct governmental control, but for its own preservation the Church is nationalist, supporting the régime as the government of Russia. There is much emphasis on the position of the Church as an agency for spreading the campaign for peace amongst religious anti-Communist groups abroad, and the Patriarch is able to have frequent contact with foreign Churchmen—especially those of Eastern Europe. Similarly, his representatives are free to travel outside the Soviet Union on ecclesiastical business.

There are two Religious Academies (Moscow and Leningrad) and a seminary at Odessa for the education of priests. Their students are admitted on completing the ordinary high school course.

The Patriarchate has the use of a publishing-house for devotional

literature, and produces one monthly official magazine—the *Journal of the Patriarchate of Moscow*.

The Church is governed by the Patriarch with the aid of a council of bishops. A Soviet government representative is attached for liaison with the Ministry of Culture.

Where possible, points of agreement with the government are emphasized. There was a clear example of this at the end of 1959, when the governmental condemnation of the sect of Jehovah's Witnesses was echoed by an ecclesiastical condemnation both on theological and national grounds—the pacifist, anti-state nature of the sect received undue prominence, so that the loyalty of the Orthodox could be emphasized.

But it is almost impossible to get a really balanced view of the Church from printed sources because the official Soviet press in general simply ignores its existence.

DAVID BLACK and DENNIS O'BRIEN

### HEARD AND SEEN Shakespeare re-dressed

IT is usually salutary to see a Shakespeare play in modern dress; really modern dress, that is, not these whimsical Victorian or Edwardian excursions that, whatever else they may do, certainly do not add immediacy. But just as the studied infelicity of a Knox phrase in gospel or epistle may jerk one out of a Sabbath trance into an enraged examination of the real meaning, so to see doublet and hose or rapier and breastplate exchanged for dinner jacket or battledress may give an altogether new dimension to a play whose anatomy has been dissected out in lessons, or whose magic may have rubbed off through over-familiarity.

If I live to be a hundred I never hope to come home from *Hamlet* again in quite such a pitch of high fever as was induced by Tyrone Guthrie's modern dress, uncut production at the Old Vic in 1938. The twenty-four-year-old Guinness—whatever the flaws James Agate may have found in his performance—made Hamlet a creature of such contemporary concern that nothing, not even the second Gielgud Hamlet, will ever quite come up to it. In seaman's jersey and rubber boots, newly landed from the pirate ship to stumble, with André Morell, his faithful Horatio, upon Yorick's skull and Ophelia's grave, he seemed so demonstrably a young man of our day and age that the whole climax of that hysterical scene moved to a different rhythm, and the end of the play became nearly unbearable.

Or again, in 1939, with Hitler's bellows and the answering 'Sieg Heil' of the Nazi crowds for ever clamouring through our own or our neighbours' loudspeakers, *Julius Caesar* at His Majesty's became a very loaded play indeed. Blackshirted, high-booted, the conspirators brought off in the Forum a Night of the Long Knives that seemed no more bloody than one