“Shootin’ Preachers and “Suein’ Lawyers”

A well-known lawyer of Houston, Texas, who in his spare time also preaches and writes some for religious papers, has recently written an extravagant tirade against “shootin’ preachers.” He means, of course, those of us who support our sons in their right to enter the armed forces of our country. His theory is that they are murderers, on the road to hell, and we in supporting them are moved and controlled by the devil. On Sundays when law offices are closed and courts are not in session, he goes among the churches “shootin’” off his mouth at “shootin’ preachers” and other Christians “who become a part of the military force of the government.” On such occasions, it is reported, that one good mother who has a son in the armed forces, fainted dead away. It is quite a pity that the Christian mothers of soldiers have to suffer such at the hands of Christian lawyers when they go out to worship on the Lord’s Day. But it may be wondered what this preachin’ lawyer does during the week, during work hours when he is not preachin.’ He takes care of a list of clients. He makes them aware of their legal rights and advocates them before the courts. He preaches to ‘em on Sundays and sues ‘em through the week. He’s a preachin’ lawyer on Sundays and a suein’ lawyer through the week. Being a lawyer, he votes and takes some part in politics. As a Christian he must “love them,” “forgive them,” “pray for them” and “do good to them” but as a lawyer he must also sue some of them. And the judgment of the court is backed up by armed force. Some “shootin’ preachers” may need shootin’ at but when a suein’ lawyer pulls the trigger the gun kicks as hard as it shoots. In fact this one took one shot and threw the rest of his cartridges away in these words:

“There is no conflict whatever between Civil Government and the kingdom of Christ, they are complementary to each other. A Christian can go to hell for violating the laws of the Civil Government just as he would for violating the laws of the kingdom of Christ. God ordained both governments. Each operates in its orbit just as does the Solar System, which was also ordained of Gad.”

Now there you have it. If “Civil Government” is ordained of God, its legitimate functions are right and a Christian may participate in them. He does not have to be, but he may even be a lawyer. He does not have to be, but he may be a soldier. It is bordering on the ridiculous when a Christian lawyer pokes out his tongue at a Christian soldier. The lawyer stays at home, votes, pays taxes and buys bonds to pay for what the soldier shoots with, just like some of us preachers do. It would be more becoming for this particular lawyer to keep his tongue in his cheek.

Mr. Fosdick To “The Unknown Soldier”

It will be recalled that recently the editor of the Gospel Advocate inserted on his editorial page some utterances of Harry Emerson Fosdick on war. Mr. Fosdick is quite famous as a modernist. His sentiments against war were expressed a number of years ago when the country was at peace. They are reputed to have found their way into the Congressional Record. Mr. Fosdick vividly described the horrors of war, and perfervidly and dramatically pledged “the unknown soldier” that he would never, never, directly or indirectly lend a mite of his influence to another. Mr. Fosdick has doubtless changed his mind. He did not know at the time of the sinister plans of Germany and Japan to brutalize the world, including our own nation, by force of arms. Nor did he know that German and Japanese agents were at that time fostering societies in this country to preach the very sentiments Mr. Fosdick expressed. They went a long way in keeping our country unprepared for a period that was almost fatal. Our own Texas Senator, Tom Connally, is reputed to have declared that he would never vote to send a single American soldier to foreign soil. He changed his mind in a crisis and very properly so. When faced with his former sentiments he honestly declared that he was developing a voracious appetite for eating some of his former words. This nation has a right to defend itself. What defense could it have against Germany and Japan except war—with all its horrors? Simply none at all. The sentiments Mr. Fosdick expressed years ago, are obviously the sentiments the editor of the Advocate still entertains; else why insert those words on the editorial page of the Gospel Advocate at this time? The logic of them would be that the government should disband its army and demilitarize its navy. The issue the Advocate has raised by its use of Mr. Fosdick goes far beyond the mere question of a Christian’s relation to his government. Nothing would suit the purposes of Hitler and Hirohito better than for this country to adopt the principles expressed by Mr. Fosdick years ago and held by the editor of the Gospel Advocate now. It is not expected that the editor will change, or eat any of his words. He is blindly headstrong in that respect, but fortunately he is too small a potato to count in this situation. This country is being defended in the only way it can be and God is not marching with Hitler.
A Piece of Prophetic Wisdom

A brother from Harding College gets off this piece of prophetic and speculative wisdom in a recent issue of the Firm Foundation:

“Now just what does this passage mean? The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ. Just what it says, no more, no less. The subjects of all earthly kingdoms have changed their allegiance. They have become converted by the gospel and are citizens of the kingdom of God. And there remains no territory-people, to make up an earthly kingdom. Those who practice the golden rule do not need jails, police, armies, prisons or even laws of men. When these things are taken away from, out of, earthly kingdoms, what is left of them if anything?”

It is a fanciful and also a fantastic idea that if all the people of the earth were Christians there would be no need for civil government. Christians as we know them now are somewhat human and far from perfect. Even the best of us need some civil regulation. I take it that when the time comes the brother envisages, there will be no need of stop signs and traffic lights. The New Testament is a perfect law to govern the church, but when the time comes that jails, police, armies and prisons are no longer needed, what about transportation, commerce and communications? Shall we have church ownership and direction of railroads, highways and post offices? Or shall we dispense with all such? Or shall we run them according to the New Testament? I am under the impression that Brother Armstrong believes that Christ will be on earth in person to set up this heavenly government. If I am mistaken in this I am willing to be corrected. It ought to be obvious that as long as men are men and Christ is in heaven, we must have both church and state and they should be kept separate in their functions, even if all members of the state are also members of the church. If the good brother really thinks the passage he quotes means “just what it says, no more, no less” he should let it remain that way and not go gallivanting into the fields of speculative phantasy. The text certainly does not say anything like near all that the brother says it means.

Response To Personal

Los Angeles, California
Oct. 14, 1943

Dear Brother Wallace:

With deep emotion I read the statement of your appreciation of me, in Bible Banner of September 1943. As I read there trooped out of memory’s store-house remembrances pleasant, as well as hallowed, of days in our lives.

I think you know there has not been a moment since I met your father that I have not stood ready to render any service I could to him, or his family.

Because of my personal attachment for you I was deeply wounded when you allowed the personal, discrepable, reflection to me made on my character in your paper, the Bible Banner.

I cannot recall when I have not believed the right will ultimately prevail; and not for a moment has there been in my heart other than the view that in time you would see the article was a gross injustice to me, and that you were in the wrong in permitting your paper to be used for such a pur-pose; and that you would have the courage to say you made a mistake, in publishing the attack on my character, without mincing words, expressing your regrets.

Foy, you will find the same welcome in my home, the Christian hospitality and congenial fellowship we have enjoyed together in the past-days we each treasure. You will command me for any service I can lend you.

Whatever wrong you may have done me, though unintentional, or whatever wrong I have imagined you have done me, in allowing the article appearing in your paper, it is all dismissed from my heart-gone like the “sped arrow.”

May your days be many, your ability increased, and your opportunities for doing good multiplied, as we together labor to advance the Cause we love.

Yours in The Christ, C. R. Nichol.

A Christian Church Preacher Obeys The Gospel

R. L. Colley

On Sunday night the 3rd of October R. H. Askew resigned as Pastor of the Highland Street Christian church, with a statement to them that he was leaving the Christian church to come to the church of Christ because that he had been convinced that the Christian church was not pleasing to the Lord and not in harmony with the New Testament.

Brother Douglas H. Perkins, had taught Brother Askew, pointing out the errors of his way, and helped him to reach this conclusion. Brother Askew thought his baptism was all right and told Brother Perkins and the brethren at the Coleman church that he was “satisfied that it was all right.” I had quite a talk with Brother Askew on Friday night afterward, and he told me that he was baptized by a Baptist preacher when he was fourteen years old, then joined the Presbyterian church, preached for them about eight years, later joined the Christian church, and preached some years for them—but had never been “re-baptized.” He said that he immersed people while he was a Presbyterian preacher, and had always taught immersion.

I called his attention to the fact that Baptists do not baptize “for the remission of sins,” and told him the best I could the difference between what he had done and the Lord’s teaching upon the subject, and asked him to consider these truths. He said he would, and said that he might call me the next day (Saturday) and get either Brother Perkins or me to baptize him. He called me Saturday and asked me to call Brother Perkins and tell him that he had decided to be baptized by one of us and at the place that we would decide upon. I called Brother Perkins, and we decided to baptize him in the Normal Avenue church building; and for me to baptize him. A few brethren met us there at one o’clock, and I baptized him into Christ.

Brother Askew is well prepared educationally, and in my judgment, in faith. It is my conviction after talking to him freely of his past and his present plans that he is morally good, doctrinally sound and financially honest. He is well trained and learned, and a fluent speaker. I believe that he not only has saved himself in obeying the truth but that he will be a great power in teaching and leading others to the truth. I hope the brethren will use him; and turn his great ability into the Lord’s service. His address is: R. H. Askew, 3415 Prescott Circle South, Memphis, Tenn. You will do him a brotherly kindness to write him and encourage him in this noble step.
THE LIPSCOMB THEORY OF CIVIL GOVERNMENT

We have received the following material from Brother 0. C. Lambert, who is widely known among us as an able preacher and Bible scholar. Brother Lambert has made an exhaustive study of the errors of various modern cults, including Russellism and Rutherfordism, and is as well prepared to expose their seditions as any man among us.

Like many others, as a young man Brother Lambert “sat at the feet” of David Lipscomb, and he accepted the Lipscomb theory of Civil Government. Brother R. L. Whiteside, who is not a whit behind David Lipscomb himself as a thinker and scholar, recently related a similar experience in an article which appeared in the Bible Banner under the caption “Concerning War.” Brother Whiteside also “sat at the feet” of Brother Lipscomb and like many others accepted Lipscomb’s views on Civil Government. But later, upon investigation, Brother Whiteside changed his mind on the matters involved and listed the arguments that convinced him in the article that the Gospel Advocate did not publish.

In relating his experience with these matters, Brother Lambert reveals in the following summary of “Civil Government” by Lipscomb that his theory differs little, and in some phases not at all, from the teachings of Russell and Rutherford — and is just as bad.

Much has been said pro and con of the Lipscomb theory of Civil Government, and his book bearing that title has been brought again into the spotlight, but not many readers today know enough about its contents to understand, what the reference to it means. In my opinion brethren all over this country will evince surprise to learn that any leader in the churches of Christ ever taught what that particular book contains, and I am passing Brother Lambert’s outline of the Lipscomb book on to the readers of the Bible Banner, the number of which runs high into the thousands, for their personal information.

I think I know that the churches of Christ have never accepted the subversive doctrine, nor have any great number of the members accepted such a theory. When it becomes known what “the David Lipscomb theory of Civil Government” really is, my conviction is that the members of the churches of Christ generally, including most of the preachers, both east and west of the Mississippi river, and north and south of the Mason-Dixon line, will repudiate it. We submit herewith Brother Lambert’s report.

Tee Lipscomb Book

Dear Brother Wallace:

When I was a boy, even before I began to preach, I read Brother Lipscomb’s book CIVIL GOVERNMENT. Being a boy and having such regard for Brother Lipscomb as a Bible student, I made the common blunder of accepting ideas predigested. For years I never voted, believing that it would be wrong. It was probably fifteen years ago that I began to think on that subject for myself and was compelled to modify my ideas. Since this question has come to the fore in recent months and having a hazy remembrance of the contents of Brother Lipscomb’s book, I decided to read it again. I was amazed. It is the same thing as Charles T. Russell and “Judge” Rutherford taught. I am really glad that the government does not know of the book and how many of our preachers feel that way toward the government. For my part, rather than give the book to the Russellites and therefore encourage them, I suggest that we call all of them in and burn them.

I am enclosing a proposition based on statements in Brother Lipscomb’s book, which ought to clarify, somewhat, the question of propositions. I just wonder if Brother Boles will accept them. They, at least, ought to come out and say they agree with Brother Lipscomb, or that they disagree with him. If they disagree, they ought to say just what they cannot subscribe to.

I am enclosing the quotations which I have made from the book so you may see, without taking the trouble to examine the book, that every word of the proposition is taken from the book.

Fraternally,

0. C. Lambert

INDEX TO CONTENTS

“All civil governments are alike (76) (85) (12) (14) (18) (25) (90) (92) (78) (137) (41) (73) in that they are all of the devil (54) (73) (88) entirely (79). They are the enemies of God (79) (102) (137) (144), and a Christian must oppose them, fight against them (79), resist them (82), because the devil is the head of them (Corn. on Romans, p. 229), until the Lord exterminates them all, (25) (28). This is why Christ came to the earth (46), and that is the special (Corn.) mission of the church (28) (12). A Christian, therefore, cannot support (28) or sustain (85) them with his means (83-84) or otherwise, affiliate with them (13), claim the protection of (114), appeal to, (41), or seek the help of (22). They are the beast of Rev. 17 (103), and they occupy the same relation to hell that the church does to heaven (73), and any friendship or affiliation with them is treason against God (89). “Be subject to” and “submit to” means to “be antagonistic to” (78), and there can be no hope for the conversion of the world until these two kingdoms be recognized in their true, antagonistic spirit, mission and destiny (92).”

“God never ordained one of his true, obedient and spiritual children as an avenger to execute wrath (30) (70) (78) (137). Bloody work demands bloody and cruel characters to perform it. All executions by government authority is murder. Christ cannot execute vengeance (74).”

“Christians will always be miraculously kept from harm if they do nothing to help themselves. Any effort to help themselves is to distrust God (36) (137) (148) (41), and reject the Divine.”
“Christians can build houses or teach school for the government (141) (142) but cannot be a postmaster (141-142).”

A SUMMARY OF THE CONTENTS

All Alike:
“The human governments of the New Testament dispensation were but a continuation of those of the Old Testament, and of precisely the same nature.” —p. 76.

“If a man identifies himself with an earthly kingdom, sustains and upholds it, he must share its destiny.” —p. 85.

“The mission of the church is to rescue and redeem the earth from the rule and dominion of the human kingdom.” —p. 12.

Exterminate Them:
“The mission imposed upon the Jews after the deliverance of them was perpetual enmity, the work to which they were called was a work of extermination against all people maintaining a human government.” Since governments are same as ever, Christians should exterminate. —p.14.

“The subjects of God’s government were forbidden all affiliation or alliance with the human governments.” —p. 18.

“The lesson taught is that the human governments must, one and all, be destroyed.” —p. 25.

“None can doubt that the final end will be the destruction of all earthly kingdoms, that they may give place to the reign of the divine kingdom.” —p. 90.

“There can be no hope for the conversion of the world, until these two kingdoms are recognized in their true, antagonistic spirit, mission and destiny.” —p. 92.

Non-participation:
“When Babylon was overthrown by the Medo-Persian, he (Daniel) submitted to Darius, and served him with equal fidelity. This submission to the human was always modified and limited by the highest obligation to obey God, hence Daniel, trustworthy as a slave in all things that did not conflict with duty to God, went into the lion’s den rather than disobey him. So with Christ, so with Peter, James and John, and all true Christians. But they are to submit to-not participate in the governments under which they live.” —p. 78.

Non-Christian:
“Then again Christian men, as has been heretofore presented, cannot be governed by Christian principles in civil government. Civil government rests on force as its foundation. The weapons of a Christian are not carnal, but spiritual. A ruler or an officer in civil government cannot carry into execution of these laws, the principles of the religion of Christ.” —p. 137.

Rebellion against God:
“Man in the spirit of rebellion against God and with the view of living free from the control of God, and independent of his authority, instituted governments of his own, and these governments in their changing forms have existed from the days of Nimrod to the present time.

“God, from its beginning, recognized this human government as rebellion against him, and as organized effort to throw off his authority to conduct the affairs of the earth free from God’s rule and dominion.” —p. 41.

Cannot Give to or Receive Aid From:
“Regarding them thus, God always forbade that his subjects should join affinity or affiliate with the subjects of the human government, or that they should make any alliance with, enter into, support, maintain and defend, or appeal to, or depend upon these human governments for aid or help.

“That alliance with these human governments or their supporters arose from distrust of, and were sins against God, and without exceptions were punished.” —p. 41.

All Of The Devil:
“The other human governments, the embodied effort of man to rule the world without God, ruled over by ‘the prince of the world’, the devil.” —p. 73.

“The result of this treason and transfer was, God ceased to be the ruler and the devil became the God of this world.” —p. 54.

“Christ recognized the kingdoms of the earth as the kingdoms of the devil, and that they should all be rooted up, that all the institutions of earth, save the kingdom of heaven, should be prevailed against by the gates of hell.” —p. 86.

“Here the human governments are placed among the powers of the wicked one, and their entire work was against the church, and the Christian must needs clothe himself with the whole armor of God, that he might withstand them and fight against them as enemies of God.” —p. 79.

Enemy of God:
“The remainder of the book of Revelation (from 17th chapter) is taken up with final triumph of the church or government of God after the destruction of the government of man that has been the enemy of God and his government from the beginning.” —p. 102.

“This proclaims everything that exercises rule, authority or power in the world, save as it is exercised in the kingdom of God, under his rule, or for his glory and honor, as an enemy or God, and that Jesus Christ must reign in and through his own divine kingdom until all these things shall be destroyed.” —p. 137.

Moral Laws of the Devil:
“It is strongly denied in such cases (horse racing law) (prohibition etc.) that the government that restricts and prohibits sin can be of the devil, and hence it is claimed that a Christian should vote on all questions of morality.” —p. 144.

Must Resist:
“Deliverance can come to the world only as man chooses to resist the devil and obey God.” (Lipscomb says resist; withstand and fight; make war upon; destroy. God says submit; exterminate.) —p. 82.

Devil the Head:
“God ordains for the people just such institutions as they deserve. If they refuse to obey God’s government, he ordains that they shall be governed by the oppressive rule of man’s own government, of which the devil is the great head.” (Corn. on Romans, Lipscomb and Shepherd, p. 229).

Christ Came To Destroy:
“The mission of the kingdom of God is to break into pieces and consume all these kingdoms, take their place, fill the whole earth, and stand forever. How could the individual citizen of the kingdom of God found, enter into, and become a part and parcel of upbuild, support, and defend, that which God’s kingdom was especially commissioned to destroy.” —p. 28.

“He has thus was recognized from before his birth as coming as the enemy of, and to make war upon the human government, and the rulers sought from his birth to kill him.” —p. 46.

Church Must Destroy:
“The mission of the church is to rescue and redeem the earth from the rule and dominion of the human kingdoms.” —p. 12.

“If a man identifies himself with an earthly kingdom, sustains and upholds it he must share its destiny.” —p. 85.

“How can the Christian enter into and serve the human, how can he divide his fealty, his love, his means and his time, his talent between the kingdom of God and the kingdom of the evil one?” —p. 83-94.
Regardless of how great it is, in fact, a "stigma" to have such a doctrine pinned his book consists of a mass of raw assertions, "amazed" but ashamed that any recognized leader has expressed himself, not and to the members of the churches — and my sole reason for publishing it is to let them see what some of us are having to fight against on the so-called "war question." It was pointed out from the beginning of this controversy that the issue is not one of war merely, but concerns the functions of government and its very right to exist. It is evident that some of the brethren connected with the Gospel Advocate, and others not connected with it, have attempted to identify the churches of Christ before our government as one of a number of religious groups in this country holding such views. The classification ought to be rejected and repudiated. It is, in fact, a "stigma" to have such a doctrine pinned on the churches in the records of our government and in the eyes of the world. That is a "real stigma" that needs to be removed.

The many bold statements in the Lipscomb book are virtually offered by its author as oracles, and have been received as such by his devotees. For them he presents no proof — his book consists of a mass of raw assertions, bald as a billiard ball, and as destitute of proof as the claims of Judge Rutherford or any other of that sort and strain. But we are asked to accept the theory because "Uncle David Lipscomb" said so! Regardless of how great Brother Lipscomb was in other respects, his book on Civil Government is about as rank with false doctrine as one book of its size could be.

Among the many "amazing" assertions in the book one of the most inconsistent and contradictory of them all is the one that refers to Paul's appeals to the government for armed protection. Ponder this assertion: "He (Paul) did not claim the protection of the government, but when the Roman authorities were used to persecute him, he used the rights and immunities guaranteed to him as a Roman Citizen." Paul "used" them. He requested it; he accepted it. This "army" virtually commissioned to destroy, break in pieces, withstand, fight against and exterminate them and thus rescue and redeem the earth.

No Exceptions:

That alliance with these human governments of their supporters arose from distrust of, and were sins against God, and without exceptions were punished. —p. 41.

CANNOT BE POSTMASTER:

Some anxious for office say, a postmaster is not a political office. Hence he may hold it, that clerkship in the executive offices are not political—but they are part of the essential elements of the civil administration, and make the holder a supporter of the government.

Yet there are employments sometimes given in carrying on government operations that a Christian it seems to me might perform. The government builds a house. House-building is no part of the administration of government. Teaching school is no part of the administration of government. -p. 141, 142.

PROPOSITION SUGGESTED

"The devil is the head of all civil governments and their entire work is against the church. Human governments occupy the same relation to hell that the church does to heaven. They are in rebellion against God and should be considered as enemies by Christians. The church must not affiliate with these governments or those who support them. They should not support them with their means or otherwise. To appeal to them or to depend upon them for help is treason against God. The church has been divinely commissioned to destroy, break in pieces, withstand, fight against and exterminate them and thus rescue and redeem the earth."

I feel as Brother Lambert has expressed himself, not only "amazed" but ashamed that any recognized leader in churches of Christ, past or present, should espouse and promote such a doctrine as set forth above. I publish it with apologies to the government and to the public — and to the members of the churches — and my sole reason for publishing it is to let them see what some of us are having to fight against on the so-called "war question." It was pointed out from the beginning of this controversy that the issue is not one of war merely, but concerns the functions of government and its very right to exist. It is evident that some of the brethren connected with the Gospel Advocate, and others not connected with it, have attempted to identify the churches of Christ before our government as one of a number of religious groups in this country holding such views. The classification ought to be rejected and repudiated. It is, in fact, a "stigma" to have such a doctrine pinned on the churches in the records of our government and in the eyes of the world. That is a "real stigma" that needs to be removed.
in Verse 25 that he was the Jailor, before his conversion, and had a sword. It is expressly stated in Verse 36 that he was still the Jailor in full performance of his official duties the day after his baptism.

When John, the baptist, preached "the baptism of repentance" to various classes, he told them how to apply it. He did not tell the soldier to desert or resign, he told the soldiers to be content with their wages and not to use their office to use personal, or unlawful violence to civilians. Surely no one thinks that John would instruct the soldiers to accept wages for duties they had no intention to perform! The New Testament does not teach such hypocrisy and Christianity is not a system of sabotage.

It is remarkable that in all the cases of the conversion of government officials, including cabinet officers, army officials, soldiers and jailors, not once were they told to resign their position and in no instance is it even hinted that they deserted their posts. To assume that they did not meet the demands of the case. The Methodists can do that well trying to find infant sprinkling in household baptisms. It is proof, not assumption, that is needed to sustain the anti-government argument. The book called "Civil Government" abounds in the latter but is destitute of the former.

**SOURCE OF MILLENNIALISM**

In looking back over the years in which this book and others like it were circulated among the brethren, it is not hard to see how the theories of Premillennialism found soil in which to grow among churches of Christ. It is not charged that David Lipscomb was a premillennialist, but his book certainly does, beyond the possibility of a reasonable denial, contain the seeds of that system. It is beginning to dawn on our minds now why the premillennialists among us have themselves so persistently claimed him for their side. Personally, I would hate to try to prove that he was not a premillennialist if I had no other evidence than his book on Civil Government. Whether he was one or not one, he has evidently helped some others to be premillennialists — for that is the logical end of his theory on government. For instance, he says, that the mission of the church is the destruction and extermination of civil government, and that all human government must be destroyed to "give place to the reign of the divine kingdom." That is premillennialism — whether he was one or not. Brother Armstrong has repeatedly stated his position that all human government must be destroyed, after which Jesus Christ will have his government, and his only, on this earth — and furthermore, that Christ will be on earth with it — after his second coming — but whether for one thousand years or two thousand years, he says he doesn't know! But that is premillennialism. It may be that Brother Armstrong got it from Brother Lipscomb along with Brother Harding!

Some of us are about to see that the source of premillennialism in some quarters is from such books as "Civil Government" — in that many who accepted the utterances of David Lipscomb as oracles went farther than he perhaps intended that they should and accepted the consequences of his theory along with the theory itself.

But the brethren as a whole, even in Tennessee, have neither believed nor practiced the Lipscomb theory. He taught that it is wrong to vote-but the vote of the brethren in Tennessee is strong enough to decide an election, even in Nashville. He taught that a member of the church cannot be a postmaster, or a clerk in the post office, but they are such all over the state, and in Nashville itself! He taught that Christians cannot appeal to the government for aid, nor receive help from it — but the college that bears his name appealed to the local government for assistance, and the papers carried the pictures of E. H. Ijams and S. H. Hall receiving a check from the governor of the state for the benefit of the school! That's a fine way to "destroy" and "exterminate" human governments!

And we are told in the Lipscomb book that the mission of the church is to do that very thing-destroy and exterminate human governments-which, if true, would make it the positive duty of every preacher of the gospel to include such in his preaching and all the churches should include such in their teaching, and the Gospel Advocate should put that doctrine in the literature series that they publish "for use in churches of Christ!"

Brother Lambert has appropriately requested the brethren of the Gospel Advocate to plainly state whether they agree or disagree with the Lipscomb book. We have done so — we disagree with it, wholly, in its premises and its conclusions. Brother Lambert requests Brother Boles and the Advocate staff to tell us what part they subscribe to and what part they do not subscribe to-if they do not accept it all.

The editor of the Advocate has boasted that a proposition for a debate written by Brother Boles for others to sign was declined. Well, Brother Lambert has suggested one for Brother Boles to consider. Brother Lambert has as much right to write a proposition for Brother Boles to sign as Brother Boles has to write one for somebody else to sign. Everybody will be waiting to see if Brother Boles decides to submit this proposition to Brother Whiteside or Brother Nichol. He should at least answer Nichol's letters.

"AFTER THE WAR"

But after the war — we are told by certain ones — after the war, we will have plenty to say! Why "after the war"? Why not now? 0, we are told, the government would not let us say it now! But why not "obey God rather than men"? That is what they tell the young men to do on the war question — that is, don't obey the government's call to arms — "obey God rather than men." Very well— why does that not apply to what a preacher should say? If there is something that they ought to say that is in disobedience to the government — why not follow the advice given to the young men — just "obey God rather than men" and say it? Are they waiting until after the war to say some things that they are afraid to say now? Yet they talk about cowardice in others! Anything they reserve until after the war to say will not deserve a hearing when the war is over-and likely will not get a hearing.

As for the Lipscomb book on "Civil Government" it is fortunate for the church that with the exception of those who "sat at the feet of David Lipscomb," very few of the brethren believe the theory, and even among those who "sat at his feet," the ones who think for themselves have cast his theory away.

We want to thank Brother Lambert for furnishing the public with the above summary and we hope that it will cause the brethren to do some sober thinking on the matters that have been presented through the Bible Banner the past few months — and we believe they are doing so. Truly, "let us think on these things."
The following article entitled “Go Tell That Fox” is taken from the Congressional Record. It was inserted in that official record at the request of Senator Alexander Wiley, of Wisconsin.

And because we believe there are many fine things in this article worthy of reflection, we are passing it on in the Bible Banner. Particularly does it reveal that there is more than one side to the claim of being “a conscientious objector.” It is generally understood that the use of that term is restricted to one whose conscience causes him to object to doing military service. But those who do military service, who are defending with their lives the liberties of men, also have a conscience — they, too, are conscientious. Moreover, they are conscientious objectors — but to what? They are conscientious objectors to a doctrine of non-resistance that aids the criminal and gives the forces of evil the full right of way in every realm of human life. They are conscientious objectors to pledging the Bible to that kind of pacifism.

In passing this exceptionally excellent article on to our readers, it is understood, of course, that the author of it is a denominationalist and it is not expected that his view of “the church” would be correct or that his use of the term would be according to New Testament usage. But we believe that his conception of the issues of this war is correct, and that his views concerning the compatibility of Christianity with the individual’s participation in it are right. The issue is not one for “the church” — but for the individual, whether a member of the church or not a member of the church — because it involves the moral rights of men in the consideration of the ethical issues of civilization.

GO TELL TEAT FOX
(By Frederick Brown Harris)

Jesus could not have hit upon a more exact label—that fox. The Herods representing Rome’s totalitarian tyranny ruled with an iron hand. Sometimes, to be sure, they rearred for their subjects impressive buildings, even temples, and fostered material advantages, but always at a price. They regimented life. They wielded a wicked, ruthless sword.

It was a Herod who is reported to have murdered many babies in an effort to slay the Babe of Bethlehem. The Herods representing Rome’s totalitarian tyranny ruled with an iron hand. Sometimes, to be sure, they reared for their subjects impressive buildings, even temples, and fostered material advantages, but always at a price. They regimented life. They wielded a wicked, ruthless sword.

The Master was warned that His life was in danger at the hand of Herod. What was Christ’s reply to Herod’s threat? Now, of Jesus, it was said ‘gracious words proceeded out of His mouth.’ But let us forget at our peril the peril of blurred moral distinctions, that that category of graciousness by no means covers all the recorded words of that One who spake as never man spake. Sometimes His words were soft and comforting as a tender lullaby.

Sometimes they were sharp as a sword and hot as molten lead. Sometimes, even in the days of His flesh, He was as John saw Him at Patmos: “His eyes a flame of fire, and out of His mouth a two-edged sword.” He who had the capacity for so great a love also had the capacity for a great wrath. Always the two go together.

No record of the Christ’s ministry is complete without the words of His moral indignation, words that bite and blister and burn, that sting and smart.

Here we have the reply of Jesus when He was warned that Herod was secretly threatening to kill Him as he had others. Listen, those who in this day of dictators’ threats against all that is high and holy are afraid lest they violate the spirit of Jesus in calling a spade a spade, a snake a snake, a fox a fox, a tyrant a tyrant—listen to Christ’s stinging reply to the threats of a ruthless ruler: “Go, tell that fox-tell that fox here I am today, doing what I came to do. I will be tomorrow, still facing my task of casting out devils and healing the sick; and I will be here the third day, until I am through.”

Nothing craven nor cringing nor pseudo-pious about that answer! It rings with defiant daring.

In the days since the swastika floated over Germany, I sat in Berlin with a noted church leader. I confronted him with the undeniable deeds of a dictator persecuting the church even as in the New Testament story. He fell back for a lame excuse on Paul’s assertion that the powers that be are ordained of God. But there was none of that moral subterfuge in Jesus’ answer. Apparently He did not see any holy ordination in Herod’s bloody sway.

Here was a creature of the prevailing political system of the time, but there was no attempt to whitewash him. With words of sweetness and light, Jesus did not begin to philosophize, saying, “we must look at all this from Herod’s point of view; we are all involved in Herod’s unfortunate attitudes; we must meet his threat with understanding; we have all sinned with him.” Jesus did not say, “Tell Herod I think there is a lot of good in him, and I am praying for him that his brutal heart may be softened by love and that we may have peace in our time in Palestine.”

Tears of a maudlin type of penitence are blinding some people today to a keen sense of moral distinctions. In the diagnosis of the author of The Keys of the Kingdom, “a vile and Pagan creed has reared its hydra-head-a creed which degrades the morals and the minds of youth, preaches only the fever and the lust of conquest, suppresses all religion, murders the ministers of God, desecrates churches, hangs, shoots, beheads, and burns alive innocent captives, children and old women; in wanton savagery cuts tolerance and liberality from the lives and hearts of men. It is to destroy this horror that we have joined ourselves in battle.” The only thing some have to offer to a threat of that kind is a mourner’s bench where those attacked can weep their eyes out-not at this foul monstrosity, but at their own part in the world’s iniquity. We are asked to repent of the dictator’s sins.

We humbly confess we have all come short of the glory. We are all entangled in the world’s sin. We all ought to repent. But true penitence does not paralyze, it purges. There are some among us so busy counting the mistakes and faults of the yesterdays that they are oblivious to the Frankenstein whose hot breath is withering the bright and beautiful flowers of today.

When Britain was holding our own front line of defense there were some so busy counting the bungles of Britain that they lost sight of bundles for Britain. Out of historical causes these folks constructed a wash basin in which to
cleanse their hands of any moral responsibility for the grim realities of today. But even imperfect men are not called to spend all their time or strength at a wailing wall. Even men and women whose record contains many blotted pages have a right to fight for God’s truth against the devil’s falsehood.

John, whom Herod killed, preached repentance. So did Jesus, the Holy One at whose life this dictator without pity or conscience was clouting. But even so, when Jesus framed His reply it was a barbed arrow of utter defiance; in it Herod’s sins were vividly epitomized by an apt phrase. “Tell that fox.”

That brings Jesus of the flashing eye very near to us in these times. The Herods of today are threatening all the sacred things we hold nearest our hearts. They are warring against the garnered treasures of the centuries, bought with a crimson cost. We cannot discount nor minimize the resourcefulness of those running rampant and roughshod over the cherished rights of man. They have the treacherous cunning of a fox. With diabolical ingenuity they hide not their designs, they disguise not their threats. They have spread their hellish blueprints in books for all to see. They have uttered words so brazen and blasphemous that civilized forces of decency have refused to believe the putrid pages are really the maps of an attempted new order. The ravening threats of Herod the Fox are so fantastic as to be perilously disarming.

In a jumbled, illogical book printed by the millions, one of these human foxes declares: “If nations fight, all considerations concerning humanity resolve themselves into nothing and are excluded.” Thus speaks blunt bestiality: All considerations concerning humanity are nothing, are excluded.

Faced by such a threat of Herod the Fox, the one pertinent question that looks every intelligent Christian in the face is: “What shall be the answer of the followers of Jesus to the openly avowed purpose of ruthless gangsters to raid the right of man?” When the great heritage of human freedom is attacked by fanatical, mechanized forces representing a throw-back to the barbarism of the Middle Ages, when all the flowers and fruits of the Christian centuries are trampled by regimented hordes armed with the weapons of destruction which modern science has fashioned, what shall be the answer of the followers of Jesus to this stupendous moral challenge?

For me, the cross is the eternal symbol that there are some things worth dying for. I am a conscientious objector because I still must respect but, frankly, I cannot understand.

May I say that I verily believe that the voices which are to be heard in the post-war world must speak now. Voices silent now in the presence of this abomination of abominations will not be potent later. The summons is, speak now, or else for ever hold your peace. Those who will not speak out for freedom, right, and justice will lose their voice, their right to be heard. Those who will be trusted to build for the future are those who are now in the thick of the fight to make that future possible. The beatitude of the peacemakers is upon those who through the blood and sweat and tears of today are making possible any peace worth while living for, or dying for.

It is one of the most inconsistent phenomena of today that so many people who will have nothing to do with the war-because, they say, it is an utterly evil thing-who seem to feel that they are upon a higher level of ethical conduct than those who are in the thick of the fight and who, unspotted from the warring world, thank God they are not as other men, nevertheless talk glibly about the post-war plans for peace. They even offer themselves as the architects of a just and durable peace which would never come if the majority accepted their attitude.

This century will be dominated either by the ideals of free men or by the pitiless bayonets of tyrants. As Dr. Robert A. Milliken, the great scientist, has put it: “Our children are going to live either under the Atlantic Charter or else under the Gestapo and the brutalities of Mein Kampf.” Unless we win this war there will be no peace to make-only debasing servitude to accept. Like our Master, we must form some reply in our hearts to Herod the Fox.

May I present certain convictions which color my reply as an individual Christian, as a minister of the gospel, and as a shepherd of the flock of Christ, in this age on ages telling?

“I AM A CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTOR”

I am a conscientious objector. Because of those objections, facing the threats of Herod the Fox, I am compelled to say, Here I stand. God helping me, I can do no other. For anyone who follows his conscience, no matter what the verdict, I have profound respect that is, for his conscience, not always for his intellectual processes and his moral eye-sight. However, while I can understand how one can face the results of nonresistance so far as he himself is concerned, how he can face the consequences of such a choice in the lives of others I cannot understand. The human misery and tragedy to others for which such an attitude gives the green light would make that decision, however conscientious, haunt me forever. A conscience that preserves its own integrity while humanity is being butchered, I still must respect but, frankly, I cannot understand.

First, I am a conscientious objector to any interpretation of the teaching of Jesus which makes the cross of Calvary an instrument in the hands of the enemies of that cross.

For me, the cross is the eternal symbol that there are some things worth dying for. I am a conscientious objector to turning the cross of Jesus into an opening in the moral dikes of the universe. I object to making the holy cross a place of abject surrender.

Second, I am a conscientious objector to the theory that war is the supreme evil.

War is horrible; it is un-Christian; it is all the dreadful things which have been charged against it. You may pile the accusing adjectives as high as the Washington Monument, and I will agree. But a world with the pattern
of the swastika stamped upon it is worse than war, infinitely worse. A return to barbarism and slavery is worse than war. Better the earth be desolated and decimated than for the Nazi stamp to be put upon human life for centuries to come.

Third, I am a conscientious objector to the doctrine that nonviolent protest will prove the salvation of anything which is now threatened. On the contrary it hands over everything to the pagan usurper.

Two conscientious friends of mine call themselves pacifists. They oppose physical force. They favored appeasement, a negotiated peace—anything to avoid war. They considered those who saw the coming danger and sounded the alarm warmongers. One of these, who still says his country made the wrong decision in going to war, remarked to a friend as they walked near a riverside discussing the horrible implications of armed conflict, “I would be willing to jump into the river to bring this war to a close or even to shorten it by 1 hour.” One who heard of that remark appropriately replied: “Well, if he and all who share his attitude were to jump into the river it would create a serious problem for the department of sanitation but do little to stop the frenzied conquerors.”

Idealism can go mad. It is dangerous to love an ideal more than humanity. A conscience can become so abnormally sensitive that it may insist on preserving its own integrity even while humanity is being nailed to a cross of torture.

Another pacifist friend, in reply to the question, “With what would you meet the threat of an invasion by these pagan hordes?” said, “I would meet it with a vigorous protest against invasion and tyranny. I would meet it with a courageous refusal to harbor the invader, refusal to turn over to them commerce and industry and the machinery of government. Instead of an attempt to kill, I would meet them with an attempt to conciliate and to convert, an appeal to their better nature.” Then he added, “An aggressor, because he is a human being, cannot go on killing people who are not harming him.”

Now I have a conscientious objection against such fabulous illusion. Hold that statement up before the record of Hitler’s Gestapo. What protection is that attitude against such subhuman fiends as they have proved themselves to be? One might just as well try to appease a viper with a violet.

Think of facing with a protest against invasion a foe who murders by the hundreds innocent hostages even in a country which surrenders without a fight; a foe who in savagery revenge for the killing of an arch-killer boasts to the world that all the men in the town of Lidice were shot, all the women placed in institutions, and the ancient town leveled to the ground! Think of meeting with a protest against invasion and tyranny. I would meet it with a courageous refusal to harbor the invader, refusal to turn over to them commerce and industry and the machinery of government. Instead of an attempt to kill, I would meet them with an attempt to conciliate and to convert, an appeal to their better nature.” Then he added, “An aggressor, because he is a human being, cannot go on killing people who are not harming him.”

If the democratic forces of the world had maintained their military strength the present war would never have occurred. There are some local and international danger spots from which you remove the police at your own peril.

And so I am a conscientious objector to the doctrine that there is no force in Christianity with which to confront recalcitrant evil.

That calloused deviltry is to be allowed at will to trample righteousness into the dust whenever it is powerful enough, while the forces of goodness stand impotently by, is to me a tragic travesty of the whole teaching of the New Testament. You have emasculated the Gospel, you have taken the moral backbone out of its justice and out of its judgment, when you deny that in the divine scheme of things there is no place for physical force. There is a sword bathed in heaven; there is the severity as well as the goodness of God.

This is my creed, because I am an humble follower of the Christ who so blazed with indignation at the mere thought of harm coming to one person from the brutal aggression of another that He said solemnly that it were better for such an aggressor to have a millstone tied around his neck and be cast into the midst of the sea than that one
Of course, war is but the surgeon's knife to cut away some malignant growth which, if not removed, dooms the organism to death. A knife is never a cure. Force is never the last word; it but clears the way for the constructive forces to do their healing work. War can halt some external work of evil, but its function is negative, eliminative. Just as the recuperative powers of the body must assert themselves after an operation has removed the rebellious cells which threaten death, so good will, friendship, cooperation, are the ultimate attitudes which must be relied upon at last for international health and strength. That is the heart of Gen. Douglas MacArthur's Father's Day message, sent by cable to the United States from Australia. Says the general:

"I am a soldier, and take pride in the fact. But I am prouder, infinitely prouder, to be a father. A soldier destroys in order to build. A father builds, never destroys. The one has the potentialities of death, the other embodies creation and life. And, while the hordes of death are mighty, the battalions of life are mightier still."

Not waiting for his country to definitely enter the crusade for humanity, early in the summer of 1941, John G. Magee, Jr., an American boy, joined the battalions of death—the defenders of life; he enlisted to destroy in order that a new world might be built. Turning his back upon a brilliant academic career at Yale, he returned to his home in Washington. He had thought through certain fundamental questions with regard to his own religious faith and as to what his action and attitude must be in the world crisis. He had decided on his own answer to the Fox and his threat to freedom.

In the great decision he had made as to what to do with his life he found himself in full agreement with that other airman, a member of the Royal Air Force, whose letter was delivered to his mother after he himself had kept the rendezvous with death. Instead of the face of her boy, the mother found herself looking at these words which were his valedictory for her:

"Today we are faced with the greatest organized challenge to Christianity and civilization that the world has ever seen. And I count myself lucky and honored to be the right age and fully trained to throw my full weight into the scale. The universe is so vast and so ageless that the life of one man can only be justified by the measure of his sacrifice. You will live in peace and freedom, and I shall have directly contributed to that. So my life will not have been in vain."

That was exactly the attitude of Pilot Magee, as he joined the crusade for democracy and humanity. There are beautiful memories cherished in his family circle of the communion taken in the church of which his father is one of the pastors and of prayers in the home circle the night before he left for his training in Canada as an air pilot.

With that training behind him the fall found him in England, ready for the fray. Reports of those who saw him suggest the buoyant lift of his spirit, even his boyish laughter as he soared high with his answer to the Fox, in the exultant freedom of the trackless air. In full flight, 30,000 feet above England's green and pleasant land, a poem etched itself in a perfect pattern of words upon his mind. This valiant young knight scribbled the verses on the back of a pocketbook. Within four days after he heard Harbor he fell with crippled wings and broken body. But those last lines of his which reached the parents, proud even in their grief, have been compared to Flanders Field and other deathless lines of the First World War. Now that he has forever slipped the surly bonds of earth, listen to his soaring lines:

HIGH FLIGHT

Oh, I have slipped the surly bonds of earth
And danced the skies on laughter-silvered wings;
Sunward I've climbed, and joined the tumbling mirth
Of sun-split clouds—and done a hundred things
You have not dreamed of: Wheeled and soared and swung
High in the sun-lit silence. Hov'ring there,
I've chased the shouting wind along, and flung
My eager craft through the footless halls of air.

Up, up the long delirious, burning blue
I've topped the wind-swept heights with easy grace
Where never lark or even eagle flew—
And while with silent lifting mind I've trod
The high untrampled sanctity of space,
Put out my hand and touched the face of God.

With these words ringing in our hearts, a precious legacy left by those who so recently have paid the last full measure of devotion, and who speak not just for themselves but for the hosts of dauntless youth who have failed not God nor man, let us solemnly make our answer to the world menace presented by the dictators' threats.

"TELL THAT FOX WE KNOW WHAT HE IS FIGHTING FOR!"

Of course, we realize that there were many contributory factors to this global war, such as the pressure of dense populations, the necessity for raw materials, resentment at the power and prestige of neighbors. We know that in the record there are penalties and handicaps exacted by victors which enflamed nationalism and lowered self-respect. We know that fear led those who had the power to adopt policies that planted the grapes of wrath which a fanatic promising everything could explode with the matches of a suppressed fury. But all that added together does not touch the heart of this conflict. A knowledge of some of the ingredients does not make any less hellish the explosive blast the dictators have mixed.

The Axis Powers for a decade have held a drawn sword over the rights of the individual, against human personality, against all the freedoms. Fascist leaders have rightly said that Christianity cannot live in their new order. As this stupendous conflict has unfolded we see it in all its sadistic and satanic horror as an attempt to turn the moving hosts of humanity back to barbarism, back to servitude, back to mental, spiritual, and physical thralldom.

The record of the past 150 years, which is only about 15 minutes on the clock of the centuries, makes the direction of humanity unmistakable. Even selfish imperialism yielding to the climate of the new day has been training subject peoples for self-rule, and giving it to them in increasing measure. America and the British Empire had been sowing the good seed of democracy around the world. Then came the aggressors with the cunning of foxes. Under the specious plea that the have-nots were demanding a new world from the haves, they launched an attack on the moving columns of humanity. With the chronic fixation of the Prussian virus which has poisoned the blood of humanity for centuries, Herod the Fox promised the righting of all wrongs by a subtle technique of savage hates, false hopes, perverted ideas, and with myths of a superrace and of a world destiny. No wonder DeSais in his great book yields that "Germanism in its most positive manifestation is one of the most dangerous forces of human destruction that history has known." A fanatical and strengthened Germanism sprang from its lair while other countries slept.
and dreamed of peace. It seized upon a growing universal protest of the peoples of the earth against want and scarcity and a determination to find plenty. The Fox grasped the steering wheel of that protest, the ominous mutter of millions of common people who were dissatisfied with their lot. The crafty dictators promised the good things of life for their own people with the virtual subservience and servility of the rest of the world. To all who bowed down in servile idolatry to the Nazi Baaal they offered the comforts and security of a more sanitary prison. These good things of life for which all yearn were to be obtained by murder, lies, plunder, and loot, by deriding and denying what tyrants call the slave virtues of Christianity. Truth was to be exiled, for the truth always makes free. In this attempt to lead humanity back to the pit out of which it has emerged, truth is what the Fox says it is.

Here is one page in a thousand of that black record in the book of lies. A German professor of biology confided to an English friend that he knows, as a scientist, that the basic dogma of Aryan superiority is utterly false; yet with anguish of mind and heart he declared he had been ordered to teach it to his students on pain of being thrown into a concentration camp with unspeakable horrors awaiting his wife and children. And thus education becomes just the tool of the state to compel its citizens to surrender body, mind, and soul to the absolute sway of the leader. That legalized perversion of truth destroys the very foundation of the good life and corrodes and corrupts the accumulated riches of man's long climb from clod to cloud.

What Herod the Fox is endeavoring to do to the churches which in the name of Christ are continuing to say, not “son of man, fall down before a dictator, but Son of man, stand upon thy feet,” is written on the vivid skies by the brave protest of the Niemullers and by the courageous defiance of the Catholic and Protestant bishops of Germany and Norway. For them the furnace has been heated seven times hotter than ever before; but still they reply, “We will not bend down.”

And so from the free shores of America we give our answer:

Tell that fox we know that the fundamental issue is whether humanity is to march on or to go back.

Tell that fox we know that the common people of the world are contending for freedom, decency, and justice; that they are defending the crown of jewels of humanity; that they are fighting for a chance to build a better world for all men. They have glimpsed the glittering towers of the earth of a redeemed humanity whose “alabaster cities gleam undimmed by human tears.”

Tell the fox we know of a hundred things rooted in the past that are now irrelevant, because this is a fight between a slave world and a free world.

Go, tell that fox we know that the flags of the crooked cross and of the rising sun are signals that where that cross flies liberty dies and where that sun rises freedom sets. Czechoslovakia and France cry aloud as to the blighting torture of that cross. Korea and China attest the scourching terror of that rising sun.

Tell that fox that the attempt to lead a retreat back to slavery and darkness will dismally fail. We are told why it will fail in The Moon Is Down. John Steinbeck puts immortal words into the mouth of the mayor, that little man who knows he is to die because he refuses to bow down. The mayor turns to the conqueror who can never conquer the souls of freemen and says, “You see, sir, nothing can change it. You will be destroyed and driven out. The people don’t like it but they will not be destroyed. Sir, and so they will not be. Freemen cannot start a war, but once it is started they can fight on in defeat. Herdmen, followers of a leader, cannot do that. So it is always the herdmen who win battles and the free-men who win wars." That is what we say to the threatening fox—we refuse to be herdmen.

And we tell that fox also, in the ringing and defiant words of Vice President Wallace, that “Here in the United States are 130,000,000 men, women, and children, who are in this war to the finish. Our American people are utterly resolved that no one go on until we can strike relentless blows that will assure a complete victory and with it win a new day for the lovers of freedom everywhere on the earth.”

Go, tell that fox who has dared to “spit straight into the eyes of God and man, we will fight with a relentless fury which will drive the ancient Teutonic gods back covering to their caves.”

And we turn to that dauntless leader called for these times, the volcanic wrath of whose speech resounds like echoes, of the ancient Hebrew prophets, whose words as was said of Job’s “have kept men on their feet,” even when Dunkirk’s black night caused trembling knees to sag— we turn to that intrepid world statesman who, with our great President sat in this sanctuary in that historic pew, as he reverently worshiped with us last Christmas morning-for* the dictators would be complete without the voice of Winston Churchill whose phrases march and charge and smite:

Tell that fox, thunders Churchill, “These gangs of bandits have sought to darken the Light of the World, have sought to stand between the common people of all the lands and thence march forward into their inheritance. They shall themselves be cast into the pit of death and shame, and only when the earth has been cleansed and purged of their crime and of their villainy will we turn from the task which they have forced upon us. Whatever the cost and the suffering, we will do our duty. God helping us to the end.”

Tell that fox that both his boast and his doom are found recorded in ancient words of Sacred Writ:

“We have made a covenant with death and with hell are we in agreement. We have made lies our refuge, and under falsehoods have we hid ourselves. But thus saith the Lord God, ‘Your covenant with death shall be disannulled, your agreement with hell shall not stand. The hail shall sweep away the refuge of lies and the waters shall overflow your hiding place.’ The mouth of the Lord hath spoken it.”

“TELL THAT FOX THAT WE KNOW WHAT WE ARE FIGHTING FOR”

We want nothing for ourselves that we do not want for all the world. The war aims as they are emerging are more and more sharply focused on the screen of the future. We join the peoples of the world in fighting for the rights of individuals and for the conquest of new rights as members of the universal brotherhood. The attack on the democratic revolution can only be met by accelerating the democratic processes, by democratic professions made into programs. Those who in this epic day have eyes to see and hearts to feel and moral courage to fight will be sons and daughters of the final revolution. America is mobilizing her might to fulfill the prophecy engraved on her own Independence Hall Liberty Bell:

“Proclaim liberty unto all the land and to all the inhabitants thereof.”

Democracy has the final answer to the world’s struggle of ordinary people for a better way of life. Our own democracy mending its obvious flaws must go on from political freedom to economic freedom. That is the only kind of an America God can bless. There has been something dreadfully wrong in a prosperous democracy where one-third of its people are ill-fed, ill-housed, ill-clothed. This is a battle
for the souls and bodies of men. Back of the bombs and airplanes, submarines and battleships, back of the soldiers of freedom lying in foxholes in fetid jungles and infested swamps, back of the men fighting on, around, and above the seven seas against overwhelming odds, gaunt-cheeked and tight-lipped, back of those in deadly peril on the sea, on the land, in the air, dying that freedom may live, is the battle of ideas and ideals. The armies locked in deadly struggle stand for different conceptions of the way in which human life shall be ordered and conducted. There face each other two different conceptions of the nature of man and of God. The real conflict is between the powers of darkness and the hosts of light. Humanity is fighting for its life. It is literally we or they.

The outcome of this struggle will have vast effect upon the next period of human history. The decision as it molds the future is of importance so stupendous that in comparison all other considerations pale into insignificance. We fight for a democratic wage which offers gains without chains. The dictators offer material things with the acceptance of mental and spiritual fetters. The democratic heart and the democratic world spurn such an offer even from a benevolent and efficient dictator.

This is a total war, for total democracy, for total humanity. Pearl Buck flashes a red light to embattled democracies with the oil of Asia in her lamp, as she warns: "Democracy, if it is to prevail at this solemn moment in human history, can do so only if it purges itself of all that which denies democracy—if it dares to act as it believes." Of course, the bright new world of our dreams cannot be brought into being at the mere waving of any peace wand. But ancient and accepted attitudes can and must change at once if a new world of equality is to be built. Every creed, and color demand that they be treated as equals. That is the revolution which is on. The four freedoms are not just to be set to music, they must be set to work. By its fruits is any economic system to be known from now on.

President Roosevelt, in inspiring words, has sounded forth a trumpet that shall never know retreat, as he declared to Congress and to the world:

"In the future days which we seek to make secure we look forward to a world founded upon four essential human freedoms. The first is freedom of speech and expression—everywhere in the world. The second is freedom of every person to worship God in his own way—everywhere in the world. The third is freedom from want, which, translated into world terms, means economic understanding which will secure every nation a healthy, peacetime life for its inhabitants—everywhere in the world. The fourth is freedom from fear, which, translated into world terms, means a world-wide reduction of armaments to such a point and in such a thorough fashion that no nation will be in a position to commit an act of physical aggression against any neighbor—anywhere in the world."

That means that if any system leaves human beings, who are willing to work and able to work, without food and without shelter, without opportunity for development, that system is built on sand; and the storm is on the way which will send it crashing to the ground, and great will be the fall of it.

Here is mirrored God's plan for the entire world. If we are for that, we are on God's side. It is vain to debate whether or not this is a holy war. If we are fighting for mankind everywhere we are fighting for holy objectives, we are fighting for the men and women and children of Germany and of Japan as well as for ourselves.

The new spirit which is to change the face of the world is manifested in a recent statement by the mayors of several English cities. As one reads those words, utterly devoid of any suggestion of hate or of vengeance—the voice not of church leaders but of political servants, elected heads of England's devastated cities—it makes one realize why an American dreaming fondly of the white cliffs of Dover wrote those poignant lines:

"I am American bred. I have seen much to hate here (in England), much to forgive; but in a world where England is finished and dead I do not wish to live."

But here is the declaration of the English mayors:

"To restrain aggression is a Christian obligation; to take revenge, never. Today many of our homes, our cathedrals, our schools, and our factories are damaged or destroyed by war, but the spirit of our people has never been higher. The destruction which we see around us presents an obligation to plan and build a noble, civic, national, and international life. In the hearts of our people that rebuilding has already begun. War is teaching us that the whole world is a unit in which the needs of each can be met only by taking into consideration the needs of all.

Here is revealed a Christianity which judges us and our causes as well as our enemies. The world braked by science is now one room where voices carry. No nation aileth to itself. An open sore anywhere poisons the arterial blood of the world. Ignorance, superstition, blighting poverty anywhere is a peril everywhere. No one is safe until all are safe. Selfish isolation but builds vaults which will prove to be sepulchers where the very privileges meant to be guarded are smothered and strangled. All discrimination based on race, color, or creed, in the end proves to be a boomerang. These are axioms of the new order which gleams through the tribulations of today. God the Father of all mankind is for it. If God is for us, who can be against us? This is the faith humbly, yet exultantly, in which we must keep step as one great brotherhood marching with undivided ranks toward the dawn.

The call of today gilds with a new glory every church spire, hallows with a new splendor every church altar, lifts every Christian pulpit. It is a challenge which dynamites the calm conventions of complacent Christianity. But we must beware lest we assume that the vital proclamation of the Christian Church is simply right views. It is not that. It is good news.

The church has the secret of how good men can be made for the good order. Blue prints for Utopia are futile unless matched with white characters. Outer altitudes depend on inner attitudes. Reformation never gets far without regeneration. There must be new creatures for the new creation, new minds, and new hearts for the new world.

Knowing that this is the victory—even our faith in God, in our cause, in the better world, and in better men—we send our reply to the tyrant's threats.

Tell that fox we know what he is fighting for.
Tell that fox we know what we are fighting for.

Tell that fox we know what the final issue of this fight will be, because the dictators are fighting the universe; they are fighting the stars; they are fighting God.

* * *

In the name of the Lord our God we set up our banners as we fight for individual freedom and against autocratic authority; as we fight for responsible self-expression and against servile submission; as we fight for enlightenment and truth and against ignorance and sophistry; as we fight for the state as the servant of man's material and spiritual well-being and against the state which degrades man into a regimental robot; as we fight for that which exalts the individual as a child of God with an eternal destiny and against that which debases personality into a mere cog in a dictator's totalitarian machine.