

THE TRINITY REVIEW

For though we walk in the flesh, we do not war according to the flesh, for the weapons of our warfare [are] not fleshly but mighty in God for pulling down strongholds, casting down arguments and every high thing that exalts itself against the knowledge of God, bringing every thought into captivity to the obedience of Christ. And they will be ready to punish all disobedience, when your obedience is fulfilled.

September, October 1980

Copyright 2003 John W. Robbins Post Office Box 68, Unicoi, Tennessee 37692

Email: Jrob1517@aol.com

Website: www.trinityfoundation.org

Telephone: 423.743.0199

Fax: 423.743.2005

The Chicken's Homecoming

John W. Whitehead

Editor's Note: For decades, professing Christians have been advocating the use of governmental power to achieve goals they desire, regardless of what the Bible says about the propriety of those goals or the proper function of government. Christians have supported public education, zoning ordinances, civil rights laws, unions, and government welfare programs. Now the chickens are coming home to roost. Churches and Christian schools are under attack from a government made powerful by the help of professing Christians. What follows is an account of the chickens' homecoming.

Over the past decade the Christian community has found itself engaged in a continuous battle, legal and otherwise, with the government. The issues involved in this struggle are varied. This paper will focus on the current key areas of Christian concern.

Abortion

On June 30, 1980, in the companion cases of *Harris v. McRae* and *Williams v. Zbaraz*, the United States Supreme Court held in a 5-4 decision that neither the states nor the federal government must fund abortions through programs which subsidize other medical procedures. Justice Potter Stewart, in writing for the majority, stated: "Abortion is inherently different from other medical procedures, because no other procedure involves the purposeful termination of a potential life." Stewart was joined in his opinion by Chief Justice Burger and Associate Justices White, Rehnquist, and Powell.

Justices Brennan, Marshall, Blackmun, and Stevens each filed dissents. In specific, the court in *Harris v. McRae* ruled:

The Medicaid Act does not oblige states to pay for abortions;

The right to choose abortion does not create a right to have abortions paid for with public funds;

The Hyde amendment⁴ does not effect an establishment of religion; and,

The Hyde amendment does not violate the equal protection clause of the Fifth Amendment.

Harris v. McRae is significant in its holding that the so-called "right" to abortion does not carry with it a collateral right to government financing of the exercise of that right. The fact that is not altered in *McRae*, however, is the Supreme Court's declaration in 1973 in *Roe v. Wade* that in effect unborn children are not "persons" protected under the Constitution. *Roe v. Wade* remains to this date the most destructive decision any judicial body has ever made. Since that decision, more than eight million abortions have been committed—that is an average of 2,700 each and every day since 1973. Today there are three abortions for each live birth in Washington, D. C.

The importance of a proper Christian response to the abortion issue cannot be underscored. One's position on abortion is in essence a statement on

one's position on the general sanctity of human life. It will also determine in many ways how the humanistic society we live in will respond to what the pre-World War II Nazis referred to as "useless eaters." Logically, since life is being destroyed before birth, why not tamper with it on the other end of the spectrum? As Francis Schaeffer and C. Everett Koop have asked:

Will a society which has assumed the right to kill infants in the womb—because they are unwanted, imperfect, or merely inconvenient—have difficulty in assuming the right to kill other human beings, especially older adults who are judged unwanted, deemed imperfect physically or mentally, or considered a possible social nuisance? The next candidates for arbitrary classification as non-persons are the elderly.... As the demand for affluence continues and the economic crunch gets greater, the amount of compassion that the legislature and the courts will have for the old does not seem likely to be significant considering the precedent of the non protection given to unborn and newborn.

Finally, a proper Christian response to this issue will determine how God judges a nation (*e.g.*, *2 Chronicles* 7:14). As of this date, the church has failed to respond effectively to this issue. The United States is presently under the judgment of God; and if the church does not act on and resist the wholesale slaughter of the innocent, then there will be little hope for a true Christian future.

Church Autonomy

The right of the church to remain free from government interference is a freedom that was guaranteed from this country's inception. It was once unthinkable that this concept could be challenged. In recent years, however, this fundamental principle has been brought into question.

Several illustrations point up this fact. First, on January 3, 1979, without prior notice or warning of any kind, an armed task force of the State of

California descended on the headquarters complex of the Worldwide Church of God in Pasadena, California. It forcibly seized possession of and took over control of the church. The task force consisted of a court-appointed receiver, representatives of the California Attorney General, state investigators, and law enforcement officers. The property and assets of the church and its related ministries were summarily taken over; the offices and records were seized and their contents rifled; cartons and files of records were taken and carried off (without receipt, inventory, or accounting) by government officials. The church's administrator was replaced with the receiver and his deputies so that the State of California technically became the head of the church. The State's actions to date have been unsuccessfully contested in court by the church. As of this writing, the church has filed several appeals before the United States Supreme Court which have been unsuccessful.

Second, on March 16, 1980, Pastor Herman Fountain was arrested while conducting the worship service at Bethel Baptist Church in Lucedale, Mississippi, by a local sheriff who was accompanied by a female agent of the state Health, Education and Welfare Department. Pastor Fountain was immediately taken to jail and booked on assault and battery charges because, as director of the church's children's home for incorrigible youth, he had spanked a fifteen-year-old resident of the church home. Several ministers who attempted to continue the worship service were arrested for disorderly conduct because of their refusal to terminate the service when ordered to do so by the sheriff. Furthermore, "[t]he Sheriff's Department also demanded the records of the Children's Home which are church records. After finding these records, they confiscated them." The charges brought in court were later dropped.

There are, of course, other cases along this line which give one cause for alarm. For example, a pastor of an independent Bible church in Texas was jailed in February 1980 by a federal district judge. The offense? The pastor refused to surrender church records to the Internal Revenue Service. The I. R. S. had demanded that the church surrender all its records and the names and addresses of church

members and contributors for an administrative examination. The church was also required to complete an extensive questionnaire. On appeal, a United States Circuit Court of Appeals, in *United States v. Holmes*, ruled in favor of the church. The court, however, in denying the I. R. S. the authority to issue a blanket summons for information from the church, held that the church, in order to retain its tax-exempt status, "must allow the government access to information."

In a case with very similar facts, *United States v. Freedom Church*, an I. R. S. summons seeking to require the pastor of a church to produce church records was held by a United States Circuit Court of Appeals to be within constitutional parameters and, therefore, not an infringement of the First Amendment. The question, therefore, of the I. R. S.' power to compel the disclosure of the private records of churches is yet undecided.

In *Walker v. First Orthodox Presbyterian Church of San Francisco*, a significant decision, church autonomy was reaffirmed. In *Walker*, a church discharged its organist when it was discovered he was a practicing homosexual. The homosexual in turn sued the church under the authority of a provision of the San Francisco Police Code which prohibits discrimination in employment based upon "sexual orientation." Having a practicing homosexual on the church staff, the church argued, was in violation of its religious beliefs (based on the Bible) and church documents. The church, therefore, urged that the Police Code be held unconstitutional as applied to it. A Superior Court in San Francisco ruled in favor of the church, stating that "[f]reedom of religion is so fundamental to American history that it must be preserved even at the expense of other rights which have become institutionalized by the democratic process."

The cases discussed illustrate very clearly the growing mentality that it takes very little to justify attempted government invasions of the church. This trend must be reversed or in the very near future government regulations will entangle themselves further into the internal operation of the church.

Private Education

The private religious school is a traditional American institution which was established in this country some years before the public education system. With the arrival of the government-controlled public education system, private education dwindled drastically. In recent years, however, religious schools—primarily fundamentalist Christian schools—have expressed growth at a phenomenal rate, and this movement has been called the Christian school "explosion." It has been predicted, if the present trend continues, that by 1990 over fifty percent of the school age children in the United States will be educated in private religious schools.¹⁴ This movement has been accompanied by a growing number of confrontations with the government.

In 1925, in upholding parents' rights to send their children to private schools, the United States Supreme Court proclaimed that the "child is not the mere creature of the state." This conclusion was subsequently buttressed by the Supreme Court's decision in *Wisconsin v. Yoder* in 1972. In *Yoder*, the Court held that a school attendance law requiring parents to send their children to school until the age of sixteen violated Amish parents' freedom of religion and infringed upon their right to direct the religious upbringing of their children.

In light of *Yoder*, one would have thought that the government would have accommodated private education. However, subsequent to *Yoder*, parents in Vermont were prosecuted criminally for truancy because their children were enrolled in a Christian school not approved by the state. In Ohio, parents, too, were prosecuted criminally for truancy for sending their children to a Christian school which refused to submit to the state's "minimum standards" for educational institutions—the school argued that the standards were violative of its religious beliefs. In *State of Michigan v. Peter and Ruth Nobel*, parents who were teaching their children in the home and refused to accept state certification for their program were prosecuted criminally for truancy. In Kentucky, parents who had enrolled their children in Christian schools "unapproved" by the government were prosecuted criminally.²¹ Although these cases were decided favorably for the parents and schools involved

(upon religious liberty grounds), it is indicative of the statist mentality concerning attempted control of private education.

Unionization and Unemployment Taxation

In *N. L. R. B. v. Catholic Bishops of Chicago*, a significant decision in 1978, the United States Supreme Court addressed the issue of the forced unionization of private religious schools by the government.²² The National Labor Relations Board asserted jurisdiction over parochial schools for the purpose of deciding labor disputes. The schools protested on constitutional grounds, and the Court upheld the right of private religious schools to be free from such government regulation. The Court noted that there was no congressional statutory intent that allowed the N. L. R. B. to assume jurisdiction over such schools, and, even if such legislative intent were present, serious constitutional questions would be raised.

In another area of conflict, various state governmental agencies have, at the urging of the United States Department of Labor, attempted to levy an unemployment compensation tax on teachers who teach in private religious schools. The schools have argued that as integral ministries of the church, they cannot be taxed because such a tax would be a direct levy on the church itself. To date, the schools have generally been successful in the courts.

The Internal Revenue Service

The Internal Revenue Service has also viewed the rising private school movement with some consternation. By 1978, the I. R. S. had decided that its procedures for identifying schools with racially discriminatory policies were inadequate and that, despite having pledged an open admissions policy, many schools allegedly still practiced racial discrimination. Thereafter, the I. R. S. announced a proposed revenue procedure designed to identify these racially discriminatory schools and to deny such schools tax exempt status.²⁴ Because eighty percent of all private schools are religious and are

integral parts of the Church,²⁵ the proposed regulation was met with substantial opposition from the religious community—primarily Christian school administrators who saw the proposed procedure as government interference with the Church.²⁶ Following this confrontation, the I. R. S. issued a revised proposed procedure in February 1979.²⁷ Opposition, however, remained unabated. Moreover, the issues raised by the religious opposition to the procedure did not concern the right of racially discriminatory schools to retain tax exemptions but concerned the method by which the I. R. S. sought to implement its policy and the fear of the growing trend toward government intervention in church affairs.²⁸

That the battle between the I. R. S. and private schools will continue is evidenced by a federal court's decision on May 5, 1980, in *Green v. Miller*.²⁹ In this case, the court held that the United States Secretary of the Treasury was enjoined from according tax-exempt status to all Mississippi private schools which have been determined to be racially discriminatory in adversary proceedings or where a present inference of discrimination against blacks exists in such schools.³⁰ Moreover, in order to ensure that the government can gather information on the schools, the court required that all schools must print newspaper notices of nondiscriminatory intent four times annually and schools that advertise over radio must notify the I. R. S. of times and dates of transmission as well as a written transcript of such announcements.³¹ Detailed information on the schools' operations, the court held, must be supplied to the I. R. S. annually for three years.³² It is interesting to note that "church-related schools" were specially mentioned and that the government must take "all reasonable steps" to determine if Christian schools are discriminatory and, if so, revoke their tax-exempt status.³³ As a consequence of *Green v. Miller*, the I. R. S. has mailed questionnaires requesting information from various private schools in Mississippi. The Christian schools to date have refused on First Amendment grounds to supply the information.

Zoning Laws

Zoning ordinances have long been a nemesis to one's enjoyment of private property. In recent years, zoning ordinances have been utilized in various instances to exclude churches or Christian schools from various areas. In *City of Concord v. New Testament Baptist Church*,³⁴ a church appealed a denial of a permit to operate a school which was an integral part of it. It was finally held that the school was a permitted use under the city's zoning ordinance and to require the school to obtain a permit separate from the church was a denial of the free exercise of religion.

An opposite result was reached in *Damascus Community Church v. Clackamas County*³⁵ where the Oregon Court of Appeals reversed a lower court's opinion that the school was an integral part of the church and, therefore, that the use permit of the church was sufficient to encompass its school ministry. The court of appeals rejected the *City of Concord* case in stating that the ordinance was worded more broadly than the Oregon ordinance. The court also rejected the church's argument that the ordinance applied to it interfered with its right to free exercise.

In a recent California case, a group of persons living communally in a residential district while operating a church were enjoined from doing so.³⁶ Although the church group argued religious liberty before the appeals court, the zoning ordinance was upheld.

It is obvious that governmental attempts to regulate Christian schools will continue for some time. The issue to be decided may rest on the right to private property itself. In any event, the right of parents to control the education of their children is fundamental, and the Christian education movement will be confronted by continuing governmental interference with its operation.

Parental Rights

Parental rights concerning their children have been called into question in recent years by a humanistic society that has forsaken the biblical absolutes upon which it was founded. In this respect, the courts have in the area of abortion rights and related issues

curtailed the rights of parents to control the destiny of their children.

Tinker and Roe v. Wade

A signal case of concern was the decision rendered by the United States Supreme Court in the 1969 decision of *Tinker v. Des Moines Independent School District*.³⁷ In *Tinker*, the Court recognized that students have rights comparable to adults and that school officials do not have absolute control and authority over students. Implications for parental rights arise from *Tinker* in that the school historically has been and should be but an extension of the family. Logically, if the student can resist and challenge school officials, then the next step would be challenges to parental authority. The great breakthrough for individual autonomy, a foundation of secular humanism,³⁸ was the Supreme Court's abortion-on-demand decision in *Roe v. Wade*.³⁹ The implications of *Roe v. Wade* have been extended to other areas, and this decision is now a foundation for weakening the traditional family structure.

The Minor's "Rights" to Abortion and Contraceptives

In *Planned Parenthood v. Danforth*,⁴⁰ the Supreme Court ruled, based upon the "right" to abortion discovered in *Roe v. Wade*, that a state statute was unconstitutional which required written consent of a parent or guardian to an abortion during the first twelve weeks of pregnancy with respect to an unmarried woman under the age of eighteen. Likewise, in *Bellotti v. Baird*,⁴¹ the Court found unconstitutional a state statute requiring parental written consent before an abortion could be performed on an unmarried minor woman but providing that an abortion could be obtained under court order upon a showing of good cause if one or both parents refused consent.

The Supreme Court has now held in *Carey v. Population Services International*⁴² that a state statute which restricts the sale of contraceptives to those over sixteen years of age, and then only by a licensed pharmacist, is contrary to the right of privacy of minors and is, therefore,

unconstitutional. Even more disturbing is the decision in *Doe v. Irwin*⁴³ where parents sought to prohibit the distribution of contraceptives to their children without notice to the parents. The federal court involved held that minors possess a right of privacy which includes the right to obtain contraceptives without having to consult their parents. Although acknowledging that parents are interested in contraceptives being distributed to their children, the court held there is no duty on the part of a family planning center to notify the parents concerned.

The Implications for Parental Rights

The concern with these decisions lies in what they are saying about parental rights as a whole. First, the rights of parents are subordinate to the rights of privacy of their children to have abortions and sex. Second, the family is no longer the basic institution for determining values for children—instead, that is the government's province in and through its various agencies. In *Wisconsin v. Yoder*, Justice William O. Douglas in his dissent remarked:

If the parents in this case are allowed a religious exemption, the inevitable effect is to impose the parents' notions of religious duty upon their children. Where the child is mature enough to express potentially conflicting desires, it would be invasion of the child's rights to permit such an imposition without canvassing his views.... As the child has no other effective forum, it is in this litigation that his rights should be considered. And, if an Amish child desires to attend high school, and is mature enough to have that desire respected, the State may well be able to override the parents' religiously motivated objections.⁴⁴

In reply to Douglas' dissent in upholding the right of the Amish to withhold their children from school, the majority of justices stated: "The dissent argues that a child who expresses a desire to attend public high school in conflict with the wishes of the

parents should not be prevented from doing so. There is no reason for the Court to consider that point since it is not an issue in the case."

Therefore, the Supreme Court has left a question mark concerning whether or not a child has a constitutional right to refuse to attend a Christian school when his parents so direct. In light of the abortion and contraceptive cases, all decided since *Yoder*, the question mark looms even larger than originally thought. In fact, Harvard law professor Lawrence Tribe argues that when the parents "threaten the autonomous growth and expression of [family] members [*i.e.*, children]..." then there is no longer any reason to continue to protect family authority.⁴⁶ Who, however, is going to exercise the authority to determine when children are threatened by the family? In the humanistic society, the government will then become the parent.

Public Education

Since the Supreme Court's decisions in the early 1960's banning state-mandated prayer and Bible reading from the public schools,⁴⁷ in one area after another the right of Christians to express themselves in public education has been challenged. This trend, however, seems to be slowing in light of several recent cases.

In *Florey v. Sioux Falls School District*,⁴⁸ a federal court of appeals held that the observance of religious holidays does not, if properly administered and construed, violate the First Amendment's establishment or free exercises clauses. The court ruled that religious themes can be presented in holiday programs, such as Christmas pageants, if such themes are presented in a "prudent and objective manner" and as a traditional part of the cultural and religious heritage of the particular holiday.

The right of Christian students to meet on state university campuses has met with resistance over the past decade.⁴⁹ The rights of students to associate in furtherance of religious expression on the university campus were recently advanced in a federal court of appeals decision in *Chess v. Widmar*.⁵⁰ The facts in *Chess* concerned a

recognized student religious group that had met on the campus of the University of Missouri at Kansas City for four years. Thereafter, the university terminated the group's practice of meeting on the campus "on the ground that [the] meetings violated regulations adopted by the Board of Curators [of the university]" which prohibited university buildings or grounds from being used for purposes of religious worship or religious teaching by either student or non-student groups.⁵¹ In voiding the university's regulation, the court stated:

UMKC has the right, as do all public universities, to recognize student groups that seek to associate for the advancement of any and all ideas. It has exercised this right and has opened certain of its facilities to recognized student groups for lectures, discussions, symposiums, meetings, events and programs. But UMKC has denied access to these facilities to one such recognized student group based solely on its conclusion that the group's meetings include either religious worship or religious teaching. This denial clearly burdens the constitutional rights of the group's members and is not justified by a compelling state interest in avoiding an establishment of religion. A neutral accommodation of the many student groups active at UMKC would not constitute an establishment of religion even though some student groups may use the University's facilities for religious worship or religious teaching. Therefore, UMKC's regulation which prohibits religious worship and religious teaching in the University's buildings or on its grounds is not required by the Establishment Clause. Because of the burden it imposes on the rights guaranteed to the appellants by the First and Fourteenth Amendments of the federal Constitution, the regulation is invalid.⁵²

The troubling aspect of *Chess v. Widmar* came from the court's discussion of the rights of high school students to meet and discuss religious topics. The court stated:

This case is also distinguishable from those that involved the requested use of classrooms for prayer or Bible study by high school student groups. See, e.g., *Brandon v. Board of Educ.*, 487 F. Supp. 1219 (N. D. N. Y. 1980); *Hunt v. Board of Educ.*, 321 F. Supp. 1263 (S. D. W. Va. 1971). First, high school students necessarily require more supervision than do young adults of college age and this supervision necessarily poses a greater risk of entangling governmental authority in religious issues. Teachers ordinarily assigned to assist and supervise high school student groups may be thrust into an untenable position when assigned to supervise a prayer group. Even their presence in the room may suggest governmental approval of the religious activities of the group. There is no evidence in the record before us, however, that Cornerstone or any other student group at UMKC receives supervision or assistance from any member of the University's faculty.⁵³

It should follow as a matter of course that students, regardless of age, should have the right to voluntarily meet and discuss their religious beliefs. If this is denied, then the most important form of knowledge is denied. To deny this knowledge is to deny reality.

Conclusion

Francis Schaeffer has aptly pointed out that contemporary society is characterized by its reliance on arbitrary absolutes: "This means that tremendous changes of direction can be made and the majority of the people tend to accept them without question—no matter how arbitrary the changes are or how big a break they make with past law or consensus." Modern society is thus ripe for control from the top—an imposed order by an authoritarian government. The time to act is now. This means that those who hold to Biblical absolutes must reinsert themselves into society and confront the humanistic culture. If not, then we can only expect authoritarian control by the government.

End notes

1. 48 L. W. 4941 (1980).
2. 48 L. W. 4957 (1980).
3. 48 L. W. at 4949.
4. The Hyde amendment states: "[N]one of the funds provided by this joint resolution shall be used to perform abortions except where the life of the mother would be endangered if the fetus were carried to term; or except for such medical procedures necessary for the victims of rape or incest when such rape or incest has been reported promptly to a law enforcement agency or public health service (P. L. No. 96-123, & 109, 93 Stat. 926).
5. 410 U.S. 113 (1973).
6. Francis Schaeffer and C. Everett Koop, *Whatever Happened to the Human Race?* (Revell, 1979) 89-90.
7. Shelton, "You Won't Believe This," *Alabama Alert* (March 1980) Vol. 5, 1.
8. ____ F. 2d 4312, 4317 (5th Cir. 1980).
9. *Id.* at 4317.
10. 613 F. 2d 316 (1st Cir. 1979).
11. 22 F. E. P. Cases 762 (1980).
12. *Id.* at 765.
13. Barton and Whitehead, *Schools on Fire* (Tyndale House, 1980) 45.
14. Kienel, ed., *The Philosophy of Christian School Education* (Western Association of Christian Schools, et al., 1977) 1.
15. *Pierce v. Society of Sisters*, 268 U. S. 510, 534 (1925).
16. 406 U. S. 205 (1972).
17. *Id.* at 214.
18. *State of Vermont v. LaBarge* 134 Vt. 276 (1976).
19. *State of Ohio v. Whisner*, 47 Ohio St. 2d 181 (176).
20. Nos. S-791-0114A, S-719-0115A (57th D. Ct. for the City of Allegan, Mich., filed Dec. 12, 1979).
21. *Hinton v. Kentucky State Board of Education, aff'd. in part, rev'd in par tsub. nom., Kentucky Board of Education for Elementary and Secondary Education, et al. v. Rudasill*, 589 S. W. 2d 877 (1979). A year earlier, however, in a similar fact situation, it was found by a court that the state's actions were not in violation of religious liberty. *North Carolina v. Columbus Christian Academy, et al.*, No. 78-CUS-1678 (Gen. Ct. of Justice, Super. Ct. Div., filed Sept. 1, 1978). Also, recently in *State of North Dakota v. Shaver & Steinwand* (N. D. S. Ct., Mem.Op., Nos. 705 and 706, June 20, 1980) the North Dakota Supreme Court held a statute which required state approval for private schools did not unconstitutionally infringe on the free exercise rights of the Christian school involved in the case.
22. 440 U. S. 490 (1978).
23. See generally Comment, "Bringing Christian Schools Within the Scope of the Unemployment Compensation Laws: Statutory and Free Exercise Issues," 25 *Villanova Law Review* 69 (1979-80).
24. *Proposed Revenue Procedure*, 43 Fed. Reg. 37, 296 (1978).
25. *Tax Exempt Status of Private Schools: Hearings Before the Subcommittee on Oversight of the House Committee on Ways and Means*, 96th Congress, 1st Sess. (1979) 252.
26. *Id.* at 294-95, 511, 912.
27. The revenue procedure—with the stated purpose to identify certain private elementary and secondary schools that are racially discriminatory—is directed to two classifications of schools: those adjudicated to be discriminatory and those found to be reviewable. If a school is in either category, the I. R. S. will commence proceedings to revoke any previously granted tax exemption or to deny any pending application for such an exemption. *Announcement* 79-38, 1979-11 I. R. B. 204. The revenue procedure requires the I. R. S. to consider a school nondiscriminatory if the school can show either of the following: (1) that the school has a significant minority enrollment, or (2) that it has endeavored in good faith "to attract minority students on a continuing basis." *Id.* at 4.01(a) and (b). However, in the latter case an adjudicated school must enroll some minority students to obtain a non-discriminatory rating from the I. R. S. *Id.* at 4.01(b).
28. Neuberger and Crumplar, "Tax Exempt Religious Schools Under Attack: Conflicting Goals of Religious Freedom and Racial Integration." 48 *Fordham Law Review* 229, 232 (1979). In response to the furor raised, Congress voted in September of 1979 to amend a Treasury Department appropriations bill to deny the I. R. S. funding to implement the proposed procedure. *Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government Appropriations Act*, 1980, Pub. L. No. 96-74, & 615, 93 Stat. 559 (1979). This may be an illusory victory, even if the measure is reinstated in 1980, in that the appropriations limitation will remain in effect for only one year, after which the I. R. S. will have the opportunity to review attempts to put the revised procedure into effect.
29. Mem. Op. (C. A. 69-1355) May 5, 1980.

The Trinity Review September, October 1980

30. *Id.* at 2.
31. *Id.* at 3.
32. *Id.*
33. *Id.* at 5.
34. 382 A. 2d 377 (1978).
35. No. 78-10-182.
36. *City of Chula Vista v. Pagard*, 159 Cal. Rptr. 29 (1979). However, in *City of Santa Barbara v. Adamson* 97 Cal. App. 3d 627 (1980), the California Supreme Court held that the city of Santa Barbara did not demonstrate a sufficient compelling state interest to warrant its restrictions on communal living in face of fundamental constitutional rights to privacy. This ruling could have a positive effect on the *Chula Vista* case which is currently on appeal.
37. 393 U. S. 503 (1969).
38. See Whitehead and Conlan, "The Establishment of the Religion of Secular Humanism and Its First Amendment Implications," 10 *Texas Tech Law Review* 1(1978).
39. 410 U. S. 113 (1973).
40. 428 U. S. 52 (1976).
41. 99 S. Ct. 3035 (1979). In *H. L. v. Matheson*, ___ P. 2d ___ (Dec. 6, 1979), prob. juris. noted, No. 79-5903, 48 U. S. L. W. 3550, 3554 (U. S. S. Ct., Feb. 26, 1980), a statute requiring doctors to notify parents before performing an abortion on a minor was held unconstitutional.
42. 431 U. S. 678 (1977).
43. No. 78-1056, ___ F. 2d ___ (6th Cir. 1900).
44. 406 U. S. 205, 242 (1972).
45. *Id.* at 230-31.
46. Tribe, "Childhood, Suspect Classifications, and Conclusion Presumptions: Three Linked Riddles," 39 *Law & Contemporary Problems* 8, 35, n. 85. See also Comment, "Adjudicating What Yoder Left Unresolved: Religious Rights For Minor Children After Danforth and Carey," 26 *University of Pennsylvania Law Review* 1135 (1978).
47. *Engel v. Vitale*, 370 U.S. 421 (1962), and *School District of Abington Township, Pa. v. Schempp*, 374 U.S. 203 (1963).
48. ___ F. 2d ___ (8th Cir. 1980).
49. Toms and Whitehead, "The Religious Student in Public Education: Resolving a Constitutional Dilemma," 27 *Emory Law Journal* 3 (1978).
50. Mem. Op. (Ct. App. 8th Cir., No. 80-1048) August 4, 1980.
51. *Id.* at 5. On the university's request form, the student group stated that its purpose was to "promote a knowledge of Jesus Christ among students" and listed the subject of the proposed meetings to be "various topics relating to Christianity and the Bible." *Id.* at 6.
52. *Id.* at 24-25.
53. *Id.* at 22-23.
54. Francis Schaeffer, *How Should We Then Live?* (Revell, 1976) 218

THE TRINITY REVIEW

For though we walk in the flesh, we do not war according to the flesh, for the weapons of our warfare [are] not fleshly but mighty in God for pulling down strongholds, casting down arguments and every high thing that exalts itself against the knowledge of God, bringing every thought into captivity to the obedience of Christ. And they will be ready to punish all disobedience, when your obedience is fulfilled.

July, August 1981

Copyright 2003 John W. Robbins Post Office Box 68, Unicoi, Tennessee 37692

Email: Jrob1517@aol.com

Website: www.trinityfoundation.org

Telephone: 423.743.0199

Fax: 423.743.2005

The Coming Caesars

John W. Whitehead

One dangerous aspect of the modern secular state has been its tendency to define what is and is not permitted in terms of religion. The early church and, in particular, Tertullian, ridiculed the Roman Empire for that very thing. The pagan state throughout history has without fail been an umbrella state; that is, everything must fit under the umbrella of the government and be subject to its laws. In such a state, there is no appeal except unto Caesar. There can be no appeal to God, since God is either subject to the whims of the state, or he is irrelevant to the basic needs of man. This principle was implicit in the United States Supreme Court decisions which ruled illegal state-required prayer and Bible reading and the posting of the Ten Commandments in the public schools: God is irrelevant to everyday life.

Defining the Church

At present the federal government, through the Internal Revenue Service (I. R. S.), is moving perilously close to defining what is and is not permitted in terms of religion, much like the Roman Empire. Although the Internal Revenue Code contains no definition of a church (because it would be unconstitutional under the First Amendment), the I. R. S. refers to the following list of characteristics in determining the tax-exempt status of an organization "claiming" to be a church:

1. A distinct legal existence;

2. A recognized creed and form of worship;
3. A definite and distinct ecclesiastical government;
4. A formal code of doctrine and discipline;
5. A distinct religious history;
6. A membership not associated with any other church or denomination;
7. A complete organization of ordained ministers ministering to their congregations;
8. Ordained ministry selected after completing prescribed courses of study;
9. A literature of its own;
10. Established places of worship;
11. Regular congregations;
12. Regular religious services;
13. Sunday schools for the religious instruction of the young; and,
14. Schools for the preparation of its ministers.

Many questions are raised on the I. R. S. guidelines, such as, "a recognized creed and form of worship"—recognized by whom? Or, what prescribed courses must ministers take to be recognized by the I. R. S.? Also unanswered is the

history behind the guidelines—what model was used in developing the guidelines? Obviously the early church, according to these guidelines, may very well have not been considered a tax-exempt entity.

According to the I. R. S., religious organizations claiming to be churches must in some fashion follow the above guidelines to receive recognition as a tax-exempt entity under the law. In the 1979 I. R. S. publication *How to Apply for and Retain Exempt Status for Your Organization*, the I. R. S. reported that although religious organizations claim to be churches, "the Internal Revenue Service does not accept any and every assertion that such an organization is a church."

To ensure that churches are complying with the guidelines, the I. R. S. has embarked on several courses. First, extensive questionnaires have been sent to various churches. Many times receiving the questionnaire means someone has complained to the I. R. S. concerning the church and its activities. This could happen to any church. Other times it simply means that the I. R. S. is conducting what I. R. S. officials call a routine audit. Second, when I. R. S. officials suspect that their guidelines are not being followed, they inform the church that an investigation of their "religious activities" is necessary. This requires an audit of all the documents of the church. Moreover, as Martin Mawyer in "When Is a Church a Church? Ask an

I. R. S. Agent" (*Religion Today*, April 1981) notes, the I. R. S. has gone so far as to employ "certain agents to sit in on church meetings" for the purpose of judging and evaluating churches.

Auditing the Church

The Christian schools' conflict over the I. R. S.'s proposed regulations that were designed to identify racially discriminatory schools was well publicized. That struggle has now shifted to the courts (see *Moody Monthly*, March 1981, 16). However, what has been little publicized is the I. R. S.'s recent move to conduct sweeping audits of churches.

The I. R. S.'s authority to conduct audits of churches is found in the Tax Reform Act of 1969.

This law, for the first time in American history, allowed the I. R. S. to audit churches suspected of carrying on unrelated business activities. In giving the I. R. S. audit authority of churches, Congress, in Section 7605(c) of the Internal Revenue Code (enacted as part of the Tax Reform Act), placed restrictions on any attempt by the I. R. S. to delve into the religious activities of these churches; that is, the I. R. S. was not to look into the religious activities any further than necessary to determine that the organization was, in fact, a church practicing its sincerely held religious beliefs; and the content of those beliefs could not be brought into question by the I. R. S.

Unfortunately, the I. R. S. has not been careful in heeding the warnings of Congress but has been demanding the records of numerous churches in order to determine whether such churches are indeed churches. Churches currently under I. R. S. audit have responded with mixed reactions. Some church officials refuse to allow the I. R. S. to investigate their records, with some pastors facing possible jail sentences. Others, even though they disagree with the audit, submit to I. R. S. investigation, hoping their cooperation will bring them into favor with the I. R. S.

The attempts by the I. R. S. at asserting its authority over the church have resulted in some court cases. For example, a pastor of an independent Bible church in Texas was jailed in February 1980 by a federal district judge. The offense? The pastor refused to surrender church records to the I. R. S. The I. R. S. had demanded that the church surrender all its records and the names and addresses of church members and contributors for an administrative examination. The church was also required to complete an extensive questionnaire. On appeal, a United States Circuit Court of Appeals ruled in favor of the church. The court, however, in denying the I. R. S. the authority to issue a blanket summons for information from the church, held that the church, in order to retain its tax-exempt status, "must allow the government access to information." In addition, in another case with very similar facts, an I. R. S. summons seeking to require the pastor of a church to produce church records was held by a different United States Circuit Court of Appeals to

be within constitutional parameters and, therefore, not an infringement of the First Amendment. This issue has not been decided uniformly by the courts. Therefore, look for more decisions in the months ahead in this area of concern.

Subduing the Church

To illustrate how pervasive the problem has become, the situation in which the Church of Christian Liberty of Brookfield, Wisconsin, has found itself deserves a close look. The I. R. S. contacted this small independent church some three years ago, demanding the records of the church's day school to confirm that the school was operating a non-discriminatory policy. The church refused on Biblical and Constitutional grounds, but invited the I. R. S. to visit the church and school. Shortly thereafter, two I. R. S. agents did visit the church and sat through a chapel service as well as observed classes and the multi-racial makeup of the small student body. At the end of the visit, the agents demanded to see the financial records of the school that are, in fact, church records. Again the church refused. The pastor went so far as to travel to the local I. R. S. offices to explain his Biblical and Constitutional reasons (based upon the separation of church and state) for not giving over the church records to the federal government.

Several months later, an I. R. S. summons was served on the church that demanded all its records. Among other things, the summons asked for the following church records:

1. All financial records;
2. All documents related to organization structure (such as Articles of Incorporation, by-laws, etc.);
3. All correspondence files;
4. All records of the names and addresses of persons who served as officers or ministers of the church;
5. All minutes of any meetings held by the church;
6. One sample of each brochure, pamphlet, handout, program or other literature pertaining to the church's ministry;

7. All records reflecting the names of any employees, associates or ministers of the church and particularly any reflecting the names of individuals who had been presented credentials of ministry (ordination, etc.);

8. All documents reflecting any sacerdotal functions performed by the church (marriages, baptisms, etc.);

9. All documents reflecting the principles, creeds, precepts, doctrines, practices and disciplines espoused by the church; and,

10. All documents reflecting membership requirements of the church.

After receiving the summons, the pastor of the church again traveled to the regional I. R. S. office in Milwaukee to explain why the church could not give the federal government complete and total access to the church records, a privilege not even members of the church enjoy. The pastor informed the agents that he had nothing to hide and that if they so desired there were certain items on the list that the I. R. S. could see in order to establish this church as a legitimate church.

Shortly thereafter, an agent from the I. R. S. visited the church and was shown, under constitutional protest, the articles of incorporation of the church that indicated that the church had enjoyed tax-exempt status with the I. R. S. for some ten years. Among other items, the agent was also shown: documentation reflecting that the pastor had performed marriages and baptisms, Sunday worship bulletins, the constitution of the church, and the *Westminster Confession of Faith*. The agent also spoke with board members as well as members of the church. This information, however, was not sufficient enough to assure the agent that the church was a legitimate church. The agent indicated that he needed all the records of the church. The church again refused.

Next, the I. R. S. took the church to court in seeking enforcement of its summons. Both a federal magistrate and a federal district court judge found in favor of the church in holding that the summons was overbroad in asking for too much information.

All the information demanded, it was held, was not necessary to determine whether or not the church was legitimate. Unfortunately, the I. R. S. did not stop there but has appealed the case to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals where a decision is pending.

God and Caesar

The intent of this article has not been to single out the I. R. S. for attack. The problem is not simply with the I. R. S. It is the whole apparatus of humanistic government in our day. However, it just so happens that much of the federal government's involvement with churches has been through the I. R. S. Moreover, this author is not alone in his criticism of this particular agency of the federal government (for example, see J. A. Schnepfer, *Inside the I. R. S.* (Stein & Day, 1978); Blake Fleetwood, "The Tax Police: Trampling Citizens' Rights," *Saturday Review* (May 1980); and Michael Satchell, "Fear The I. R. S.," *Parade* (April 12, 1981). We must also remember that the I. R. S. has been charged with the difficult task of identifying organizations that proceed under the facade of religion (that is, sham churches established for tax evasion purposes). With what the I. R. S. claims is a rise in sham religious organizations, the I. R. S. has been zealous in attempts at ferreting out such groups. The problem arises with a non-Christian entity that attempts to define what is a true church. As a consequence, many bona fide, legitimate churches have been challenged. In essence, the I. R. S. has difficulty telling legitimate from illegitimate activities of the church. Why? The I. R. S. lacks the spiritual discernment necessary to carry out such a function.

The philosophy behind the I. R. S.'s investigation of churches has been: "Prove to us that you are a church." Should it not be the other way around? In a land where criminals are presumed innocent until proven guilty, should not the same principle apply to churches under investigation by the government? This goes back to the fact that the I. R. S. assumes it has the authority to define and approve churches for tax-exempt purposes. This point brings us to the fundamental issue involved in recent I. R. S. activities. That issue concerns *authority*.

As noted above, many churches, when contacted by the I. R. S., have submitted to its authority and allowed the federal government to conduct a search for information. However, should the church allow the federal government complete and total access to all its records and activities? The answer really lies in two spheres, one Biblical and one Constitutional.

The Bible, in rather simple fashion, declares that we are to render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's. But does the church belong to Caesar? In *Ephesians* 1:22 we are instructed that Christ is the head over the church. Certainly we cannot deny that the church is Christ's. Moreover, does the church need approval of the government to function? Has not Christ, by establishing individual churches, already approved of their existence?

The Apostle Paul admonishes Christians in *1 Corinthians* 6 not to take their disagreements into the secular courts. It is not a function of the government to judge church matters. It is a function of the church itself under the leading of the Holy Spirit, and ultimately Christ, to establish how it will conduct its activities. Certainly it is no business of the state to determine such things.

In addition, opening the gates of the church to government bureaucrats may find us in the same dilemma as was Hezekiah in *2 Kings* 20. Hezekiah opened the doors of his kingdom to the king of Babylon, and "there was nothing in his house, nor in all his dominion, that Hezekiah shewed them not" (v. 13). For this the Lord pronounced a strong curse on Hezekiah (vv. 14-18).

We live in a land blessed with a Constitution that provides us with freedom and liberty. The First Amendment mandates a separation between church and state. This doctrine says that the church is not to interfere with government and the government is not to interfere with the church. Like the Bible, the Constitution also restricts the government's authority to entangle itself with the church. This vital guarantee must be jealously guarded.

Liberty or Security

After Isaiah had pronounced God's curse upon Hezekiah in *2 Kings* 20, Hezekiah responded by

saying: "Good is the word of the Lord which thou hast spoken. And he said, Is it not good, if peace and truth be in my days?" (v. 19). In other words, as long as Hezekiah could live his own life in peace and security, he didn't really concern himself about the terror that was coming upon a future generation (including his own children).

The story of Hezekiah illustrates the spirit of our age. As Francis Schaeffer has shown, it is an age characterized by two basic values: personal peace and affluence. It results in the willingness to compromise most everything in order to keep these values intact. But, as Benjamin Franklin early in our history noted, he who is willing to sacrifice liberty for security deserves neither liberty nor security. Christians must not allow the spirit of the age to dominate their thinking (*Colossians 2:8*). The church is not ours to compromise. We must protect it. Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn speaks of how the Russian people would kneel inside the door to their apartments, pressing their ears to listen when the K. G. B. came at midnight to arrest a neighbor. He says that if all the people would have come out and driven off the officers, sheer public opinion would have demoralized the effort to subdue a free people.

The church is sacred. Even the government must realize this. If not, then Christians must put their faith to the test and stand and protest invasions into the sacred realm. A real faith results in works. And we who perceive the very real threat in the present situation must work diligently and quickly if we are to be the witnesses Christ has commanded us to be.

THE TRINITY REVIEW

For though we walk in the flesh, we do not war according to the flesh, for the weapons of our warfare [are] not fleshly but mighty in God for pulling down strongholds, casting down arguments and every high thing that exalts itself against the knowledge of God, bringing every thought into captivity to the obedience of Christ. And they will be ready to punish all disobedience, when your obedience is fulfilled.

September, October 1990

Copyright 2003 John W. Robbins Post Office Box 68, Unicoi, Tennessee 37692

Email: Jrob1517@aol.com

Website: www.trinityfoundation.org

Telephone: 423.743.0199

Fax: 423.743.2005

The Messianic Character of American Foreign Policy

John W. Robbins

Since President Bush ordered 200,000 troops to the Middle East, we have heard a great deal about a Moslem jihad or "holy war" against the U.S. and its allies. But it must be pointed out that Islam is not the only religion that believes in holy war; there is a form of counterfeit Christianity that does as well. In fact, this counterfeit Christianity has been a major factor in guiding American foreign policy since the end of the 19th century.

With the apparent end of the Cold War (several nations, including the world's most populous, remain Communist), the focus of American foreign policy has shifted, but its motive has not: Our government still intends to make the world safe for democracy, and it still believes that it is doing "God's work" on Earth. Until that belief and motive change, Americans will find themselves embroiled in one conflict after another. In fact, the international situation since the "end" of the Cold War may pose a greater threat to America and Americans than the missiles of the Soviet Union did.

Political messianism was a prominent characteristic of nineteenth century philosophy. One need only recall the very influential German philosopher, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel (1770-1831), who believed that the State was God walking on Earth, to understand that the State had begun to assume the role of God in the nineteenth century, just as the Papacy and Roman State-Church had done in the Middle Ages.

Hegel was not alone in his idolatry of the State. The Frenchman, now largely forgotten, Claude-Henri de Rouvroy, Comte de Saint Simon (1760-1825), developed a system of thought he called *Nouveau Christianisme* (New Christianity) for the transformation of society. His followers declared that "the world has been waiting for a Savior... [and] Saint Simon appeared." But of all the nineteenth-century advocates of political messianism – Fourier, Fichte, Lamennais, Mazzini, Godwin, and so on – only one remains in the public consciousness: Karl Marx. Though they are now forgotten, their ideas of nationalism, racism, anarchism, Communism, imperialism, and socialism are still very much with us and influence our thinking even without our realizing it.

Kennedy and Harvard

At the Widener Library at Harvard University there are murals showing American soldiers in World War I. The soldiers are knights on a crusade, and the following inscription describes the soldiers:

Happy those who with a glowing faith

In one embrace clasped death and victory.

They crossed the sea crusaders keen to help

The nations battling in a righteous cause.

"Righteous cause" is not such a far cry from "holy war," which was the phrase used by some American clergymen – Newell Dwight Hillis, to mention one – to describe World War I.

The message of "glowing faith," "righteous cause," and the image of crusading knights was not lost on one of the sons of Harvard, President John F. Kennedy. In his Inaugural Address in January 1961, President Kennedy, whose Administration came to be known as Camelot, outlined his messianic vision of American foreign policy:

"Let every nation know, whether it wish us well or ill, that we shall pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend, oppose any foe to assure the survival and the success of liberty.

"This much we pledge to those old allies and more. To those new states...

"To those peoples in the huts and villages of half the globe struggling to break the bonds of mass misery, we pledge our best efforts to help them help themselves, for whatever period is required – not because the Communists may be doing it, not because we seek their votes, but because it is right. If the free society cannot help the many who are poor, it cannot save the few who are rich.

"To our sister republics south of our border, we offer a special pledge – to convert our good words into good deeds – to assist free men and free governments in casting off the chains of poverty. But this peaceful revolution of hope cannot become the prey of hostile powers. Let all our neighbors know that we shall join with them to oppose aggression or subversion anywhere in the Americas...

"To that world assembly of sovereign states, the United Nations, our last best hope...

"Let both sides [East and West] unite to heed in all corners of the Earth the command of Isaiah – to 'undo the heavy burdens,... [and] let the oppressed go free.'...

"Now the trumpet summons us again – not as a call to bear arms, though arms we need – not as a call to battle, though embattled we are – but a call to bear the burden of a long twilight struggle, year in and year out, 'rejoicing in hope, patient in tribulation' – a struggle against the common enemies of man: tyranny, poverty, disease, and war itself...

"Finally, whether you are citizens of America or of the world, ask of us here the same high standards of strength and sacrifice which we ask of you. With a good conscience our only sure reward, with history the final judge of our deeds, let us go forth to lead the land we love, asking His blessing and His help, but knowing that here on Earth God's work must truly be our own."

Kennedy's messianic vision, a holy war against tyranny, poverty, disease, and war itself, a vision so informed by his Roman religion, has been the driving force of American foreign policy since the beginning of the twentieth century. His misquotation of Scripture, his invocation of God's blessing on his crusade, and his dogmatic assertion of falsehoods (e.g., "here on Earth God's work must truly be our own") are permanent characteristics of the messianic character of American foreign policy. This delusion, that the State or society, particularly the American State and society, must do God's work on Earth, is the essence of political messianism.

Though President Kennedy may have been one of the most eloquent advocates of political messianism, he was certainly not the first. There has been a messianic strain in American politics almost from the beginning, but it was always a minority view, relatively uninfluential until the twentieth century.

The War for Independence

Throughout American history there has been a theme of political messianism, but it was a minor theme until the Civil War and the Spanish-American War. The most messianic of all figures were, of course, the clergymen. In 1776 the Reverend Samuel Sherwood of Connecticut declared that "God Almighty, with all the powers of Heaven, are on our side. Great numbers of Angels, no doubt, are encamping round our coast, for our defence and protection. Michael stands ready, with all the artillery of Heaven, to encounter the dragon, and to vanquish the black host."

The fundamental confusion between God's battle and the colonies' battle, between a divine cause and a human cause, between theology and politics, is characteristic of political messianism. In 1742 Jonathan Edwards had published "Some Thoughts Concerning the Revival of Religion" in which he anticipated the coming of the millennium in America. But where Edwards saw the preaching of the Gospel of Jesus Christ as the means of bringing in the millennium, just thirty years later the millennium was to be ushered in by force of arms. The Kingdom of God became confused with the State. During the Dark Ages, it had become confused with the Church. But the messianic strain of thought in early America was muted, compared to what would come later.

The War of 1812

During the War of 1812 John Stevens wrote, "Such a war God considers as His own cause, and to help in such a cause is to come to the help of the Lord."

The notion that God sides with nations or races is not a new idea; indeed, it was the error of the Jews in the time of Christ. One newspaper gloated when the war was over: "We have abundant evidence to believe it was a holy war, for the Lord has fought for us the battles, and given us the victories...."

The Civil War

One early and major display of political messianism was the Civil War. In Newport, Rhode Island, the

Episcopal Bishop of Rhode Island, Thomas March Clark, delivered a sermon to the state militia as they left for the war: "Your country has called for your service and you are ready. It is a holy and righteous cause in which you enlist.... God is with us;...the Lord of hosts is on our side."

Julia Ward Howe, the famous hymn writer, was so inspired by the sight of a Union army camp that she penned the *Battle Hymn of the Republic* in the fall of 1861. It was to become the battle hymn of the crusade against the South. Its words bear repeating, for they clearly display the mentality of political messianism:

Mine eyes have seen the glory of the coming of the
Lord;

He is trampling out the vintage where the grapes of
wrath are stored;

He hath loosed the fateful lightning of his terrible
swift sword,

His truth is marching on.

I have seen Him in the watch fires of a hundred
circling camps;

They have builded Him an altar in the evening dews
and damps;

I can read His righteous sentence by the dim and
flaring lamps.

His day is marching on.

I have read a fiery gospel, writ in burnished rows of
steel,

"As ye deal with my contemners, so with you my
grace shall deal;"

Let the Hero, born of woman, crush the serpent with
his heel,

Since God is marching on.

He has sounded forth the trumpet that shall never
call retreat;

He is sifting out the hearts of men before his
judgment seat;

O be swift, my soul, to answer Him! Be jubilant,
my feet!

Our God is marching on.

In the beauty of the lilies, Christ was born across
the sea,

With a glory in his bosom that transfigures you and
me;

As He died to make men holy, let us die to make
men free

While God is marching on.

All the elements of Biblical imagery that are applied to the work of Christ and the Gospel in the Bible are applied to the Union armies in the hymn: the crushing of the serpent's head, the swift sword, the trumpet, the judging of men. The advance of the Union armies is the "coming of the Lord." Their battles are executions of "God's righteous sentence" against the South. And for the Gospel of peace, Howe substitutes a "fiery gospel writ in burnished rows of steel." Her eloquence surpasses even that of President Kennedy, and thousands of churchgoers who have never heard or long forgotten Kennedy's speech remember Howe's song by heart.

The Civil War, to a large extent, may be blamed on the clergy of both the North and the South. The *Methodist Magazine*, published in the North, declared in 1864: "We must take the moral, the sacred, the holy right of our struggle up before the throne of God. We must accustom ourselves to dwell before the divine throne, clothed in the smoke of our battles.... We have a right to plead and to expect that God will let his angels encamp about our army; then he will make our cause his own – nay, it is his already." On both sides of the war, it seems that the most rabid pro-slavery spokesmen and the most rabid abolitionists were clergymen. In 1861 a Northern Methodist clergyman, Granville Moody, declared: "We [the clergy] are charged with having brought about the present contest. I believe it is true that we did bring it about, and I glory in it, for it is a wreath of glory around our brow." This "great cause, God's new Messiah," in the words of the poet James Russell Lowell, was the bloodiest

war in American history, with over one million casualties.

Perhaps because he was not a clergyman, Abraham Lincoln seems to have been relatively free of political messianism. In his *Proclamation Appointing a National Fast Day* on March 30, 1863, Lincoln took the view that

"Insomuch as we know that, by His divine law, nations like individuals are subjected to punishments and chastisements in this world, may we not justly fear that the awful calamity of civil war, which now desolates the land, may be but a punishment, inflicted upon us, for our presumptuous sins, to the needful end of our national reformation as a whole People? We have been the recipients of the choicest bounties of Heaven. We have been preserved, these many years, in peace and prosperity. We have grown in numbers, wealth and power, as no other nation has ever grown. But we have forgotten God. We have forgotten the gracious hand which preserved us in peace, and multiplied and enriched and strengthened us; and we have vainly imagined, in the deceitfulness of our hearts, that all these blessings were produced by some superior wisdom and virtue of our own."

In an extraordinary *Meditation on the Divine Will*, a private note that Lincoln did not intend for public consumption, written in September 1862, he put his thoughts on paper.

"The will of God prevails. In great contests each party claims to act in accordance with the will of God. Both may be, and one must be wrong. God cannot be for and against the same thing at the same time. In the present civil war it is quite possible that God's purpose is something different from the purpose of either party – and yet the human instrumentalities, working just as they do, are of the best adaptation to effect His

purpose. I am most ready to say this is probably true – that God wills this contest, and wills that it shall not end yet. By his mere quiet power, on the minds of the now contestants, He could have either saved or destroyed the Union without a human contest. Yet the contest began. And having begun He could give the final victory to either side any day. Yet the contest proceeds."

Lincoln understood the sovereignty of God in human affairs quite well. Therefore he did not claim, as the clergy did, that God was on the side of the North. He thought that at least one side (and he did not say which side) must be wrong, and both may be wrong. He regarded it as quite possible that God's purposes were quite different from the purposes of the combatants. He possessed none of the messianic fervor that had caused the war and would contribute to more wars in America's future.

The Spanish-American War

The war that first expressed America's growing messianic vision in foreign policy was the Spanish-American War of 1898. Started by President William McKinley, the war resulted in America's occupation of the Philippines and the deaths of one hundred thousand Filipinos. In late 1902 McKinley told a group of Methodist clergymen how America began its intervention in foreign affairs:

"The truth is I didn't want the Philippines, and when they came to us, as a gift from the gods, I did not know what to do with them. When the Spanish War broke out, [Commodore] Dewey was at Hong Kong, and I ordered him to go to Manila and to capture or destroy the Spanish fleet.... But that was as far as I thought then.

"...I thought first we would take only Manila; then Luzon; then other islands, perhaps, also. I walked the floor of the White House night after night until midnight; and I am not ashamed to tell you, gentlemen, that I went down on my knees and prayed Almighty God for light

and guidance more than one night. And one night it came to me this way – I don't know how it was, but it came: (1) That we could not give them [the islands] back to Spain – that would be cowardly and dishonorable; (2) that we could not turn them over to France or Germany – our commercial rivals in the Orient – that would be bad business and discreditable; (3) that we could not leave them to themselves – they were unfit for self government – and they would soon have anarchy and misrule over there worse than Spain's was; and (4) that there was nothing left for us to do but to take them all, and to educate the Filipinos, and uplift and civilize and Christianize them, and by God's grace to do the best we could by them.... And then I went to bed, and went to sleep, and slept soundly, and the next morning I sent for the chief engineer of the War Department (our mapmaker) and I told him to put the Philippines on the map of the United States...and there they are and there they will stay while I am President!"

In this candid account of the origins of modern American foreign policy we can see the factors that have shaped it for the past ninety years: (1) lack of deliberation: "that was as far as I thought then"; (2) a sense of divine destiny: "they [the islands] came to us a gift from the gods," (3) the seeking of guidance in prayer, not the Bible: "I went down on my knees and prayed Almighty God for light and guidance;" (4) the conviction that one's hunches (and in this case an alleged revelation) have divine sanction: "one night it came to me this way – I don't know how it was, but it came;" (5) national pride: "we could not give them back to Spain – that would be cowardly and dishonorable;" (6) the protection of commercial, not national, interests: "we could not turn them over to France or Germany – our commercial rivals in the Orient – that would be bad business and discreditable;" (7) the inferiority of other peoples: "they were unfit for self-government;" (8) the conviction that destiny, duty, or fate mandates our interventions abroad: "there was nothing left for us to do but to take them all;"

(9) a desire to "Christianize" or "civilize" other nations by force: "to educate the Filipinos, and uplift and civilize and Christianize them, and by God's grace to do the best we could by them;" and (10) an arrogant assurance of our own righteousness: "And then I went to bed, and went to sleep, and slept soundly... and I told him to put the Philippines on the map of the United States...and there they are and there they will stay while I am President!"

While McKinley captured all the major characteristics of our messianic foreign policy at the dawn of our imperial age, it was in January 1900, just as we became a world power, that a newly elected Member of the Senate, Albert Beveridge of Indiana, heralded the age of divine imperialism:

"The times call for candor. The Philippines are ours forever – country belonging to the United States – as the Constitution calls them, and just beyond the Philippines are China's illimitable markets. We will not retreat from either. We will not repudiate our duty in the archipelago. We will not abandon one opportunity in the Orient. We will not renounce our part in the mission of our race, trustee under God, of the civilization of the world. And we will move forward to our work, not howling out our regrets, like slaves whipped to their burdens, but with gratitude for a task worthy of our strength and thanksgiving to Almighty God that he has marked us as His chosen people to lead in the regeneration of the world.... It is God's great purpose made manifest in the instincts of our race, whose present phase is our personal profit, but whose far-off end is the redemption of the world and the Christianization of mankind....

"This question is elemental. It is racial. God has not been preparing the English-speaking and Teutonic people for a thousand years for nothing but vain and idle contemplation and self-administration. No! He has made us the master organizers of this world to establish system where

chaos reigns. He has given us the spirit of progress, to overwhelm the forces of action throughout the Earth. He has made us adept in government that we may administer government among savage and senile peoples.... And of all our race He has marked the American people as the chosen nation to finally lead in the regeneration of the world. This is the divine mission of America.... We are the trustees of the world's progress, guardians of its righteous peace. The judgment of the Master is upon us: "Ye have been faithful over few things. I will make you ruler over many things."

When Senator Beveridge completed his oration, he was greeted with "long and continued applause." Other Senators crowded around him to shake his hand. There was one dissenter, Senator George Hoar of Massachusetts, who understood, as few have done before or since, the blasphemy and perversion of Christianity that informed Beveridge's messianic vision. Senator Hoar rose to speak:

"I could hear much calculated to excite the imagination of the youth charmed by the dream of empire.... I could think as this brave young republic of ours listened to what the Senator had to say of but one sentence:

" 'And the Devil said unto Him, "All these things will I give thee if thou wilt fall down and worship me."

" 'Then Jesus saith unto him: "Get thee behind me, Satan." " "

Senator Hoar seemed to understand the wickedness of trying to "Christianize" the world in any way other than that mandated by Christ: "Go into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature." But he was in the minority. Most thought that either preaching was not enough, or the Gospel needed to be changed, or both.

Senator Beveridge's delusions, that Americans are God's chosen people, that God's purposes are made

manifest in the "instincts of our race," and that America will regenerate and redeem the world, were not his alone: Many other Members of Congress gave similar speeches. Representative Gibson of Tennessee declared that:

"Our race has a mission. No devout student of history can misread it. We are the preachers of a new evangel of government; we are the missionaries of a new and higher civilization; we are the apostles of the New World to the Old; and a part of our mission is to evangelize Asia and the islands of the sea....

"The progress of our race can never be stayed. You can never fix its bounds. No one continent can suffice it. No one ocean can satisfy it. No one zone can contain it. No one hemisphere can circumscribe its powers and activities.

"The world is its area and the lands of the world its only boundary. Its destiny is to dominate the entire face of the Earth, to include all races and all countries and all lands and all continents."

However, one member of the Senate understood quite clearly what the Philippine policy meant. 'We have now to meet a greater danger than we have encountered since the Pilgrims landed at Plymouth – the danger that we are to be transformed from a republic, founded on the Declaration of Independence, guided by the counsels of Washington, into a vulgar, commonplace empire, founded upon physical force.'

Many clergymen and religious periodicals held similar opinions at the end of the nineteenth and the beginning of the twentieth century. The millennium was at hand. In fact, some of the most ardent, if not the first, supporters of American's messianic role in the world, were missionaries. The Reverend Josiah Strong, General Secretary of the Evangelical Alliance for the United States and a prominent Congregational minister, asked: "Why should an American missionary be 'a man without a country?'" A missionary from China recently said to me: 'You will find that all American missionaries are in favor

of expansion.'" Missionaries advocated government support of evangelism. The *California Christian Advocate* declared that the war against Spain "is the Kingdom of God coming!... Coming to poor Cuba – the sunrise of a better day for the Philippines! ... Oppression, cruelty, bigotry, superstition, and ignorance must down, and give a Christian civilization the right of way." The *Nation* reported that the "fervent Methodists, at the beginning of the war, resolved that it was going to be a righteous and holy war because it would destroy 'Romish superstition' in the Spanish West Indies." The *Pacific Advocate* cheered: "The cross will follow the flag.... The clock of the ages is striking."

Though not an American, Frederic Farrar, Dean of Canterbury, published his opinion in 1900 that "imperialism is a natural evolution of vital and aggressive Christianity."

The anti-imperialist Charles Francis Adams could not endure the "expansion, world-power, inferior races, calvinization, duty-and-destiny twaddle and humbug." He wrote:

"The clergymen have all got hold of the idea of Duty; we have a Mission; it is a distinct Call of the Almighty. They want to go out, and have this Great Nation [export] the blessings of Liberty and the Gospel to other Inferior Races, who wait for us, as for their Messiah; – only we must remember to take with us lots of shot-guns to keep those other Superior Races, – all wolves in sheep's clothing, – away from our flock. They would devour them; – but we won't. Oh no! – such ideas are 'pessimistic'; you should have more faith in the American people! – Such cant! – It does make me tired."

World War I

Since the turn of the century the jargon of our messianic foreign policy has become more secular, but the policy has grown increasingly messianic. Rather than saving the world from the forces of reaction and anarchy, as President McKinley hoped to do in 1900, contemporary American foreign policy aims to save the world from poverty, tyranny, famine, underdevelopment, trade

imbalances, international debt, ignorance, illiteracy, terrorism, war, and expensive oil.

About five years before he became president, Woodrow Wilson, a liberal Presbyterian, changed his mind about the role of the church in the world. In his early days, he thought it the church's duty to preach the Gospel and save souls. The biographer and editor of his papers, Arthur Lisle, wrote, "Wilson's political thought first began to show signs of changing about 1907, and the first sign of this metamorphosis was a significant shift in his thinking about the role that Christians and the church would play in the world at large." Wilson wrote, "If men cannot lift their fellowmen in the process of saving themselves, I do not see that it is very important that they should save themselves.... Christianity came into the world to save the world as well as to save individual men, and individual men can afford in conscience to be saved only as part of the process by which the world itself is regenerated." The social Gospel had replaced the Gospel of Jesus Christ in Wilson's mind even before he had become president. His political views, his messianism, are an effect of this shift in theology.

In his war message to Congress in April 1917, President Woodrow Wilson declared that 'we are glad...to fight thus for the ultimate peace of the world and for the liberation of its peoples.... The world must be made safe for democracy." It was not simply peace that Wilson sought, but the "peace of the world." The Millennium is to be achieved, not through the preaching of the Gospel, but through war. This war, World War I, was to be "the war to end wars." Its purpose was to usher in the Millennium.

Instead, it ushered in Mussolini, Lenin, and Hitler. Instead of liberating the peoples of the Earth, it enslaved millions. In the United States, one of the nations least affected by the war, by November 1918 the federal government had taken over transportation (ocean shipping and the railroads), communications (telephone and the telegraph), and industry (manufacturing plants). It had entered the businesses of shipbuilding, wheat trading, construction, and the lending of money. It began to

regulate private securities; allocated the use of transportation facilities, foodstuffs, fuel, and raw materials; fixed prices; intervened in labor disputes and drafted 2.8 million men into the armed forces. An Act passed by Congress in August 1916, the Army Appropriations Act, contained the following paragraph placed inconspicuously between paragraphs authorizing the purchase of horses and the replacement of a bridge in Kansas:

"The President, in time of war, is empowered through the Secretary of War, to take possession and assume control of any system or systems of transportation, or any part thereof, and to utilize the same, to the exclusion as far as may be necessary of all other traffic thereon, for the transfer and transportation of troops, war materials and equipment, and for such other purposes connected with the emergency as may be needful or desirable."

The Lever Act, passed in August 1917, was entitled "An act to provide further for the national security and defense by encouraging the production, conserving the supply, and controlling the distribution of food products and fuel." By it, the president was unconstitutionally empowered by Congress to license, regulate, requisition, purchase, store, sell, take over and transport, all foods and fuels, and fix their prices. Eating schedules were published in newspapers prefaced by statements such as "Here is your schedule for eating for the next 4 weeks which must be rigidly observed, says S. C. Fundley, County Food Administrator."

Men were thrown into jail merely for questioning the constitutionality of the draft.

President Wilson believed World War I to be "the culminating and final war for human liberty." It was to be the first of a series of wars that have, so far, enslaved nearly two billion people, and slaughtered hundreds of millions.

The clergy did its best to support our First Crusade. The president of the newly formed Federal Council of Churches (which was later to be reorganized as the National Council of Churches) Frank Mason North, sounded the trumpet: "The war for

righteousness will be won! Let the Church do her part." The clergy certainly did its part. Randolph H. McKim, thundered forth from his pulpit in the nation's capital: "It is God who has summoned us to this war.... This conflict is indeed a crusade. The greatest in history – the holiest. It is in the profoundest and truest sense a Holy War.... Yes, it is Christ, the King of Righteousness, who calls us to grapple in deadly strife with this unholy and blasphemous power." Francis Greenwood Peabody declared the Germans to be "untamed barbarians." Newell Dwight Hillis, minister of Plymouth Church in Brooklyn, approved a plan for "exterminating the German people [by] the sterilization of 10,000,000 German soldiers and the segregation of the women." That was Hillis' final solution. Henry B. Wright, director of the YMCA and professor at Yale Divinity School, offered guidance to overly scrupulous American soldiers marching in the First Crusade: "In the hour of soul crisis the [YMCA] Secretary can turn and say with quiet certainty to your lad and my lad, 'I would not enter this work till I could see Jesus himself sighting down a gun barrel and running a bayonet through an enemy's body.'"

The *Lutheran Quarterly* in July 1918 opined, "It [World War I] is a contest in the world of spiritual ideas, a clash between the spirit of the German god Odin and the Christian God as revealed in the character and program of Jesus Christ. The two ideals cannot have a forever. One or the other must perish. We know, as Disraeli said, that 'we are on the side of the angels.'"

The Social Gospel theologian at Chicago Divinity School, Shailer Mathews, argued for the identity of modern religion and patriotism: "...the real expression of democracy in religious thinking is outside the field of orthodox theology.... Only where the spirit of democracy is working is there creative religious thinking. Only there is the union of patriotism and the religion of tomorrow. For in democracy alone can the immanence of God be expressed in the terms of human experience.... Our patriotism dares to glory in its outlook and its hopes because it knows that the triumph of our land is the triumph of the cause of a better humanity.... For an American to refuse to share in the present war...is

not Christian. A religion which will keep its followers from committing themselves to the support of such patriotism is either too aesthetic for humanity's actual needs, too individualistic to be social, or too disloyal to be tolerated." Mathews wanted to extend the Social Gospel to the far reaches of the planet, and the defeat of the Kaiser was the first step. After that would come the League of Nations and religious intolerance.

Lyman Abbot, editor of *The Outlook* and a Congregational clergyman, asserted that "in this cause every Christian Church should be a recruiting office for the Kingdom of God." Liberal Presbyterian minister John Henry Jarett of the Fifth Avenue Presbyterian Church in New York City promoted the sale of liberty bonds as a "consecration of our money to a sacred cause." Not to be outdone, Presbyterian clergyman John MacInnis of Syracuse called "every dollar and every service given to Uncle Sam for his army a gift to missions."

After the First Crusade, President Wilson worked tirelessly for Senate ratification of the Covenant of the League of Nations. He apparently thought that the messianic task was too great for the United States alone, and that an international organization would be needed to maintain the ultimate peace we had delivered to the world. After Wilson's efforts failed, one supporter of the League loudly lamented "the greatest tragedy since the crucifixion of the Savior of Mankind."

World War II

Twenty years later, despite or perhaps because of the obvious failure of the First Crusade, President Franklin D. Roosevelt preached another. In December 1940 he delivered his "arsenal of democracy speech." Less than a month later, in January 1941, he announced a crusade for the Four Freedoms:

"In future days, which we seek to make secure, we look forward to a world founded upon four essential 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...everywhere in the world.

"The fourth is freedom from fear...anywhere in the world.

"This is no vision of a distant millennium. It is a definite basis for a kind of world attainable in our own time and generation."

This messianic purpose became the basis for the joint statement of principles issued by President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill in August 1941, even before the United States entered World War II. A month later, the Soviet Union and fourteen other nations had endorsed the Atlantic Charter. Apparently no one except Senator Robert Taft even smiled at the idea of Josef Stalin advocating freedom of speech and religion, and freedom from want and fear. Messianism seems to blind its hosts to the painfully obvious facts of totalitarianism.

At the end of World War II, the Charter of the United Nations was signed in San Francisco. Its messianic character is evident in its opening line: "We the peoples of the United Nations, determined to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war...and to reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights,...have resolved to combine our efforts to accomplish these aims." The salvation of succeeding generations is to be accomplished through collective political and military action. What was once to be achieved by the United States or the Anglo-Saxon race alone is now to be done collectively.

The Second Crusade ended more ignominiously than the first. Rather than establishing President Roosevelt's Four Freedoms everywhere in the world, thirty million people were killed, and Communism grew from dominion over 180,000,000 to dominion over 300,000,000. But the commitment to a messianic foreign policy continued undiminished.

Containment

In 1947 two major programs were initiated: the Marshall Plan of economic aid to rebuild Europe, and the Truman Doctrine of military aid to countries threatened by Communism. In announcing his plan during a commencement address at Harvard University, Secretary of State George C. Marshall explained that "Our policy is directed not against any country or doctrine but against hunger, poverty, desperation and chaos." The two programs, financial and military aid, have been major features of American foreign policy since World War II.

That same year, 1947, George Kennan published an anonymous article in *Foreign Affairs*, the prestigious and influential journal of the Council on Foreign Relations. The article argued for what was to become our foreign policy for the next forty years: the containment of Communism.

"It would be an exaggeration," he wrote, "to say that American behavior unassisted and alone could exercise a power of life and death over the Communist movement and bring about the early fall of Soviet power in Russia. But the United States has it in its power to increase enormously the strains under which Soviet policy must operate, to force upon the Kremlin a far greater degree of moderation and circumspection than it has had to observe in recent years, and in this way to promote tendencies which must eventually find their outlet in either the breakup or the gradual mellowing of Soviet power. For no mystical, Messianic movement – and particularly not that of the Kremlin – can face frustration indefinitely without eventually adjusting itself in one way or another to the logic of that state of affairs.

"Thus the decision will really fall in large measure in this country itself. The issue of Soviet-American relations is in essence a test of the over-all worth of the United States as a nation among nations. To avoid destruction the United States need only measure up to its own best traditions and

prove itself worthy of preservation as a great nation.

"Surely, there was never a fairer test of national quality than this. In the light of these circumstances, the thoughtful observer of Russian-American relations will find no cause for complaint in the Kremlin's challenge to American society. He will rather experience a certain gratitude to a Providence which, by providing the American people with this implacable challenge, has made their entire security as a nation dependent on their pulling themselves together and accepting the responsibilities of moral and political leadership that history plainly intended them to bear."

In Kennan's mind, and in the minds of countless foreign policy planners since 1947, both liberal and conservative, the messianic role of the United States in containing messianic Communism, while at the same time eliminating hunger, disease, and ignorance, is one that "Providence" and "history" plainly intended us to bear. This is the late twentieth century version of manifest destiny, with a twist of Hegelianism thrown in for good measure. The historian Garet Garrett summed it up this way:

"It is our turn.

"Our turn to do what?

"Our turn to assume the responsibilities of moral leadership in the world.

"Our turn to maintain a balance of power against the forces of evil everywhere – in Europe and Asia and Africa, in the Atlantic and in the Pacific, by air and by sea – evil in this case being the Russian barbarian.

"Our turn to keep the peace of the world.

"Our turn to save civilization.

"Our turn to serve mankind.

"But this is the language of empire. The Roman Empire never doubted that it was the defender of civilization. Its good intentions were peace, law and order. The Spanish Empire added salvation. The British Empire added the noble myth of the white man's burden. We have added freedom and democracy. Yet the more that may be added to it the more it is the same language still. A language of power."

Conclusion

Two years after delivering his inaugural address, President Kennedy presented the commencement address at American University in Washington, D.C. He spoke the language of power, this time with a Wilsonian accent: "What kind of peace do we seek? ...not merely peace for Americans, but peace for all men and women, not merely peace in our time, but peace for all time."

His messianic vision was shared by President Reagan:

"The prophet Ezekiel spoke of a new age – when land that was desolate has become like the Garden of Eden and waste and ruined cities are now inhabited....

"Our dream, our challenge, and, yes, our mission, is to make the golden age of peace, prosperity, and brotherhood a living reality in all countries of the Middle East. Let us remember that whether we be Christian or Jew or Moslem, we are all children of Abraham, we are all children of the same God....

"If you take away the dream, you take away the power of the spirit. If you take away the belief in a greater future, you cannot explain America – that we're a people who believed there was a promised land; we were a people who believed we were chosen by God to create a greater world."

The messianic dream that the United States is a chosen nation, a nation with the mission of bringing

forth the Millennium, the golden age of peace, prosperity, and brotherhood, is a delusion of grandeur. An individual convinced that he had such a mission would either be elected Fuhrer by an equally demented populace, or confined to a rubber room. But when presidents and whole nations share the same conviction, few people see the meaning of the delusion. The mad never know they are mad.

Despite the secularization of our messianic foreign policy in the past 70 years, the recent emergence of the so-called New Right, heavily influenced by the messianic Roman State-Church, may indicate a return to the more explicit invocations of divine sanction for certain foreign policy actions. President McKinley, for example, was a novice in experiencing divine revelations compared to someone like Pat Robertson, who believes that God speaks to him and tells him what to do. Ordinarily, men who believe that God speaks to them would be humored, and perhaps confined, rather than taken seriously. But America has abandoned its Biblical moorings, and it has no way of judging the many claims of those who allege they are hearing divine voices. This appeal to revelation and guidance from sources other than the Bible is central to the whole theology of Pentecostalism, "evangelicalism," Romanism, and neo-orthodoxy. This belief in extra-biblical revelation poses a serious threat to the conduct of foreign policy and the well-being of the United States.

Recessional

God of our fathers, known of old –

Lord of our far-flung battle-line

Beneath whose awful Hand we hold

Dominion over palm and pine –

Lord God of Hosts, be with us yet

Lest we forget – lest me forget!

The tumult and the shouting dies –

The Captains and the Kings depart –

Still stands Thine ancient Sacrifice,

An humble and a contrite heart.

Lord God of Hosts, be with us yet,

Lest we forget – lest we forget!

Far-called, our navies melt away –

On dune and headland sinks the fire –

Lo, all our pomp of yesterday

Is one with Nineveh and Tyre!

Judge of the Nations, spare us yet,

Lest we forget – lest we forget!

If, drunk with sight of power, we loose

Wild tongues that have not Thee in awe –

Such boasting as the Gentiles use

Or lesser breeds without the Law –

Lord God of Hosts, be with us yet,

Lest we forget – lest we forget!

For heathen heart that puts her trust

In reeking tube and iron shard –

All valiant dust that builds on dust,

And guarding calls not Thee to guard –

For frantic boast and foolish word,

Thy mercy on Thy people, Lord!

– Rudyard Kipling, 1897

THE TRINITY REVIEW

For though we walk in the flesh, we do not war according to the flesh, for the weapons of our warfare [are] not fleshly but mighty in God for pulling down strongholds, casting down arguments and every high thing that exalts itself against the knowledge of God, bringing every thought into captivity to the obedience of Christ. And they will be ready to punish all disobedience, when your obedience is fulfilled.

March, April 1991

Copyright 2003 John W. Robbins Post Office Box 68, Unicoi, Tennessee 37692

Email: Jrob1517@aol.com

Website: www.trinityfoundation.org

Telephone: 423.743.0199

Fax: 423.743.2005

Truth and Foreign Policy

John W. Robbins

Whenever people discuss any subject – even if the discussion is only gossip over the back fence or on the telephone – the question, "How do you know?" usually arises. In gossip, it is usually answered by saying something like, "Well, I read it in the paper," or "I was talking to Mildred just the other day." But when the discussion is more serious than gossip, and as serious as foreign policy, a better answer must be given to the question, "How do you know?" One of the major sources of disorder in American foreign policy is the failure even to discuss, let alone answer, this fundamental question in any satisfactory way. Several possible answers to the problem of knowledge have been suggested, and brief notice must be taken of them here.

Experience

The first of these answers is experience. In discussions of foreign policy, experience is probably the most popular answer. Experience, we are told, is the best teacher. In her famous book, *Dictatorships and Double Standards*, the former United States Ambassador to the United Nations, Jeane Kirkpatrick, spends several pages attacking rationalism in foreign policy and praising the virtues of experience. Her experience left her totally unprepared for the events in the Communist world in the period 1989-1990. In his book, *A World Restored: Castlereagh, Metternich, and Restoration of Peace, 1812-1822*, former Secretary of State Henry Kissinger asserts flatly that "Nations learn

only by experience." Do they? Is experience the best teacher? Is it the only teacher? Is it a teacher at all?

We are also told (and usually by the same people) that we learn nothing from history, yet isn't history the recorded experience of earlier generations? If experience is the best teacher, why is history such a total failure? And when we have "experiences," what lessons are we taught? For centuries men learned from experience that human flight was impossible. They learned from experience that the Sun goes around the Earth. They learned from experience that heavier objects fall faster than lighter objects. Interpreting experience can be a very tricky experience. How do we know when we have done it correctly? Perhaps experience is not such a good teacher after all.

Common Sense

A second answer to the question is common sense – foreign policy must be guided by common sense. Yet common sense seems to have as many difficulties as experience. Some people rely on their common sense in deciding which job offers to accept. Suppose that you are looking for a job and you receive two offers from reputable companies. The work would be similar and equally interesting in each job, the fringe benefits would be the same, and each job pays a starting salary of \$20,000 per year. The only difference between the two offers is that Company A gives an automatic annual raise of

\$2,000, and Company B gives an automatic semi-annual raise of \$500. Which job should you take? Common sense unhesitatingly says to take the job with Company A and get the annual \$2,000 raise. It is obviously the better offer, is it not?

Perhaps what is obvious, though, may not be true. This can be seen quite easily by comparing the salaries received during each successive six month period.

Company A

(Starting salary: \$20,000;

annual raise: \$2,000)

Salary:

First six months: \$10,000

Second six months: \$10,000

Third six months: \$11,000

Fourth six months: \$11,000

Fifth six months: \$12,000

Sixth six months: \$12,000

Company B

(Starting salary: \$20,000;

semi-annual raise: \$500)

Salary:

First six months: \$10,000

Second six months: \$10,500

Third six months: \$11,000

Fourth six months: \$11,500

Fifth six months: \$12,000

Sixth six months: \$12,500

By now the pattern is obvious: Each year the job at Company B pays \$500 more than the job at Company A. A \$500 semi-annual raise is the equivalent of a \$2,000 annual raise, and since the raises begin six months earlier at Company B, its employees are always \$500 ahead of Company A's employees. Assuming that one stays at this job for twenty years, the common sense choice of Company A will cost one \$10,000, plus interest. It occurs to me that employers might want to offer job applicants a choice of whether they wish to receive annual raises of \$2,000 or semi-annual raises of \$500. Whatever the response, they should hire the applicant: If he prefers the annual raise, the employer is saving \$500 per year; if the applicant prefers the semiannual raise, the employer is probably getting a sharp employee who knows better than to rely on common sense, and is surely worth \$500 more per year.

In the much more complex subject of foreign policy, common sense is equally unreliable. Does common sense say, "Make the world safe for democracy," or "Stay out of foreign wars"? Does common sense suggest "no entangling alliances" or membership in political and military alliances like NATO and the United Nations? Has anyone ever drawn up a list of common sense principles that apply to daily life, let alone to foreign policy? And if they have, did they tell how they decided which principles to list? Did they take a poll to see whether they were common or not? Perhaps *common sense* is just a phrase used to support opinions for which there is no evidence: "Why, that's just common sense!"

Philosophy

Still a third answer to the question, "How do you know?" is **philosophy**. Philosophy, at least in its more rational forms, tries to produce systematic arguments. This is a big step beyond experience or common sense. Because it tries to be more systematic, philosophy can help us in thinking through problems of foreign policy. But how do we know that a particular philosophy is true? After all there are many philosophers to choose from: Plato, Aristotle, Augustine, Cicero, Thomas Aquinas, Rene Descartes, Immanuel Kant, David Hume,

G.W.F. Hegel, John Dewey, and Gordon Clark, to name a few. Which one is right? More specifically, which of the thousands of statements each of these men made are correct? How do we know?

Success

A fourth answer to the question, "How do you know?" that is very popular in America is success: A statement or principle is true if it works. So we learn by doing; we learn by trial and error. If we succeed, we must be right.

Tyrants have succeeded for thousands of years. Civilized, free societies are a rarity in human history. They have been relatively short and small. Tyrannies have been large and long. Is it true, then, that tyranny is right and freedom is wrong? Or perhaps they are both right since they both work?

Christians have usually been a tiny minority of the world's population. They have been persecuted and killed by the millions. Religions like Hinduism, Roman Catholicism, Islam, and Communism have been far more visibly successful than Christianity. Are they therefore right and Christianity wrong?

What is success anyway? History holds that all the apostles except John died violent deaths. Were they successful? Did Stalin, who died in his bed after murdering forty million people, fail? How do we define success? If we can't tell failure from success, how can we say, If it works, it's true.

There is a further problem with pragmatism: If the mark of truth is success, then one cannot know the truth until after one has acted. But the purpose of knowledge, or one of its purposes, is to permit a person to make an informed choice, and choices are always about the future, not the past. Even if pragmatism, the idea that the mark of truth is success, were true, it would offer us no guidance in foreign policy. On the pragmatic theory of knowledge, one always knows too late. If one is a pragmatist, one never knows. Pragmatism doesn't work.

Intuition

Because all these theories of knowledge have fatal defects, still another has been suggested: intuition. In his book, *A World Restored*, Henry Kissinger (with obvious debts to Immanuel Kant) wrote the following paragraph:

The statesman is therefore like one of the heroes in classical drama who has had a vision of the future but who cannot validate its "truth." Nations learn only by experience; they "know" only when it is too late to act. But statesmen must act *as if* their intuition were already experience, as if their aspiration were truth. It is for this reason that statesmen often share the fate of prophets, that they are without honour in their own country, that they always have a difficult task in legitimizing their programmes domestically, and that their greatness is usually apparent only in retrospect when their intuition has become experience.

"Intuition" is a synonym for "vision," and statesmen are visionaries. Their wisdom cannot be perceived by nations, for "nations learn only by experience." Statesmen must be creative; they must belong to a mystical elite that sees visions and dreams, dreams that others are not privileged to dream. Dr. Kissinger assures us that this aristocracy of visionaries in foreign affairs will be beneficial, but he does not say why. Nor does he say how we are to recognize these statesmen before the fact and allow them to try to implement their visions.

Intuition is not a source of truth at all; it demands blind faith on the part of a nation in its seers. And because it is blind, the faith might be placed in a Hitler as well as in a Kissinger. It is only in retrospect that statesmen can be distinguished from madmen. By then it is too late, as Germany, but not Kissinger, learned by experience in 1945.

Circumstances

Still another source of alleged guidance in foreign policy is circumstances. When President McKinley started the war with Spain, sank the Spanish fleet, and invaded the Philippines, he claimed that

circumstances required that he do all these things. "Destiny," he frequently asserted, "determines duty." Destiny, fate, providence, circumstances, the forces of history, the march of events – all allegedly make clear to us what we "must" do. Many people practice such a philosophy in their personal lives, especially if they happen to be superstitious: If their car breaks down on the way to work, it is a message from God (or the stars) that they are not supposed to go to work. If they try to telephone someone, but the line is busy, it is a sign that they ought not to call at all. The effects of such superstition practiced by individuals are confined to those individuals or to those who have the misfortune of being their acquaintances. But when the superstition is used to formulate government policy, it affects millions of people.

Alfred Thayer Mahan, the apologist of naval power at the turn of the century, thought of America's "unwilling acquisition of the Philippines" in these terms: "[T]he preparation made for us, rather than by us...is so obvious as to embolden even the least presumptuous to see in it the hand of Providence." Circumstances not only justify the action, sometimes they lend it divine authority.

Had King David been guided by Mahan's notion of the guiding hand of Providence, rather than by the Biblical idea of obedience to God's laws, Old Testament history would have been quite different. When King Saul was trying to kill David, and David was fleeing from him and his troops, Saul

"came to the sheepfolds by the road, where there was a cave; and Saul went in to attend to his needs. (David and his men were staying in the recesses of the cave.) Then the men of David said to him, 'This is the day of which the Lord said to you, "Behold, I will deliver your enemy into your hand, that you may do to him as it seems good to you."' And David arose and secretly cut off a corner of Saul's robe. Now it happened afterward that David's heart troubled him because he had cut Saul's robe. And he said to his men, 'The Lord forbid that I should do this thing to my master, the Lord's anointed, to stretch

out my hand against him, seeing he is the anointed of the Lord.' So David restrained his servants with these words, and did not allow them to rise against Saul. And Saul got up from the cave and went on his way."

Here was the "guiding hand of Providence" if ever it had displayed itself. It led Saul into the cave where David and his men were hiding. David could have killed Saul while he napped. David's men, like Alfred Mahan, urged him to seize the moment; they even quoted a prophecy to lend the sanction of God to their opinion. But David, who was truly a man after God's own heart, knew that they were wrong. His obligation was to obey God's command not to harm the king. He could not tell what God's purposes were by reading the circumstances. As it turned out, God's purpose, or one of God's purposes, was to test David to see whether he would obey God rather than leaning on his own understanding of circumstances. David passed the test; his men would have failed had David not restrained them.

The prophet Isaiah reminds us that " 'My thoughts are not your thoughts, nor are your ways My ways,' says the Lord. 'For as the Heavens are higher than the Earth, so are My ways higher than your ways, and My thoughts than your thoughts' " (*Isaiah 55*). Arrogant men, who sometimes seem very pious, frequently claim, as Mahan did, to know the will of God for their lives and for the nation. But God has not revealed this information to anyone: "The secret things belong to the Lord our God, but those things which are revealed belong to us and to our children forever, that we may do all the words of this law" (*Deuteronomy 29*). What God has revealed is his law, so that we may obey it. It is found wholly in the Bible. Those who claim otherwise err.

The notion that circumstances can be read to discern God's purposes is a major part of many religions, especially those that view the Bible as furnishing less than sufficient guidance, or which claim to offer their adherents the stamp of divine approval for their actions. This tealeaf reading form of guidance is dangerous and arrogant enough at the personal level; to elevate it to the high councils of

government has always meant and will always mean disaster. Events are mute; they offer no guidance. Circumstances can be interpreted in an indefinite number of ways. Logically, circumstances alone can never be used to justify a course of action. Guidance, ethics, must come from another source.

Nature

Another common answer to the fundamental question, "How do you know?" is nature. Natural law and natural rights, are concepts at least as old as the Stoics. We know what to do once we know the nature of things. Since man is a rational animal, he should act rationally. Nature herself teaches us that some things are right and good and some things are wrong and bad.

Although this view has had very respectable defenders, it is destroyed by two considerations. The first is an elementary principle of logic: In any valid argument, nothing can appear in the conclusion that was not contained in the premises. If one were to argue, All nations collapse; the United States is a nation; therefore the United States is three thousand miles wide, the fallaciousness of the argument would be apparent to all. Width does not appear in either of the two premises. The same rule applies to verbs: If we start with indicative sentences, such as man is a rational animal, we cannot end with imperative sentences, such as man ought to think logically. The "ought" is not contained in the premises, and therefore the argument is invalid. Nature, therefore, cannot teach us what we ought to do. This was made quite clear by the Scottish philosopher David Hume in the eighteenth century.

The second consideration, which is somewhat superfluous, since the first is decisive, is that nature "teaches" all sorts of things that natural lawyers deny. Does nature enjoin peace? Nature is red in tooth and claw. Does nature prescribe the monogamous family? Polygamy occurs in nature. In a way, we can be glad that nature teaches us nothing: If it did, we, like the Marquis de Sade, would learn all the wrong lessons. Just as David Hume demonstrated the logical problems of natural

law, so the Marquis de Sade (unwittingly) showed some of the practical problems.

The Bible Alone

All the secular answers that have been given to the question, "How do you know?" – experience, common sense, philosophy, success, intuition, nature – are not answers at all. They simply disguise our ignorance.

But there is an answer to the question that can stand up under close examination: the Bible. It may seem strange to some to suggest that the Bible talks about foreign policy. After all, is not the Bible concerned about Heaven and Hell, and angels and demons and all those other things that it is impossible for a sophisticated citizen of the twentieth century to believe in?

Now the Bible is very much concerned about Heaven, Hell, angels, demons, God the Father, Jesus Christ, the Holy Spirit, souls, and salvation. In fact, those things are its primary concern. They are far more important than foreign policy. It is only the decadence of this materialistic age which makes us think otherwise. What shall it profit a man if he make peace in the Middle East and lose his own soul? The Bible teaches nothing if it does not teach that the life to come is far more important than this life. It is only the fool who gains the whole world and yet loses his own soul.

But the Bible, in addition to teaching how God has saved his people from their sins and the fire to come, teaches us how to live peaceful and civilized lives on Earth. The laws God gave to Moses – the Ten Commandments – are not merely for the life to come, but for the present life as well. They – all ten of them, not just the last five or six – are the indispensable basis for civilized human society. Insofar as we are civilized, our laws and customs copy God's laws on worship, words, life, family, property, and envy.

The Apostle Paul, in his second letter to the young preacher Timothy, said that "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof for correction, for training in righteousness, that the man of God may be

complete, thoroughly equipped for every good work." This is an extremely important passage of Scripture, for it contains several ideas that we need to keep clearly in mind as we study foreign policy. The ideas are these:

1. The Authority of Scripture
2. The Inerrancy of Scripture
3. The Clarity of Scripture
4. The Sufficiency of Scripture
5. The Power of Scripture
6. The Meaning of Scripture

All the other possible sources of knowledge that we have mentioned are either errant, unclear, insufficient, or lack authority, or have combinations of these defects. Yet unless the source of our knowledge possesses all these characteristics – authority, inerrancy, clarity, and sufficiency – it will be, at best, an inadequate source.

Conclusion

The fundamental question in all disciplines, including foreign policy, is the question of knowledge. Should anyone assert that a certain statement is true, or that one should follow a certain course of action, the speaker must be prepared to defend his assertion with reasons. He must be able to answer the question, How do you know? If no coherent answer can be given, then there is no reason to believe that the assertion is true or that the guidance is reliable.

Over the twenty-five hundred year career of philosophy, many answers have been given to the question, How do you know? We have briefly discussed some of the more common as they apply to matters of foreign policy. None of the secular answers given has been satisfactory; none furnished the truth and guidance necessary to maintain a rational foreign policy.

Two of the most celebrated American foreign policy experts, Henry Kissinger and Jeane Kirkpatrick, both maintain that nations learn from

experience. Neither gives any argument for the assertion, nor any rebuttal to the objections that have been raised against that opinion. Dr. Kissinger goes even further. While asserting that nations learn *only* from experience, he recognizes that such knowledge comes too late: If one learns only from experience, then one must first act without knowledge. Pragmatic or empirical knowledge follows, not precedes, action. In the age of the atom, that is an exceedingly dangerous viewpoint. Dr. Kissinger therefore recommends that we rely on visionary statesmen who intuit the "truth" but cannot substantiate it. He advocates blind faith in this mystical elite of experts. How this is an improvement over the notion that we learn from experience, he does not say. How it is better than a charismatic's words of knowledge "from God" or hearing voices he does not explain. It also is a sure prescription for disaster.

The Christian response to the failure of secular philosophy to answer the epistemological question is the axiom of revelation. Scripture not only explains how we know, it gives us all the information we need for living on Earth and in Heaven; it gives us that information before we act, not after, so that there is no need to act blindly; and it explains the failure of non-Christian philosophies. It may not tell us all we would like to know, but it tells us all we need to know.

In matters of foreign policy, the guidance of Scripture is indispensable. For most of this century we have been following blind guides; we have accepted the secular view that society or the state must play the role of God on Earth. The result has been the increasing savagery and frequency of our wars, and the malignant growth of totalitarianism.

The public statements of nominal Christians have been powerless to prevent our decline into totalitarianism because they have denied the meaning of Biblical revelation. To cite but one example out of dozens that might have been chosen, Richard J. Mouw, professor of philosophy at Calvin College, wrote in *Politics and the Biblical Drama*, "we cannot derive answers to fundamental questions about society and politics by strict deduction or inference from the Bible" (12). If Mr.

Mouw had written "I" rather than "we," his statement might very well have been correct, but irrelevant. That sentence would have been a simple admission of his own incompetence. But that is an unlikely admission from a professor of philosophy. I believe Mr. Mouw means that no answers about fundamental questions of society and politics can be deduced or inferred from Scripture. That means, of course, by strict deduction, that his answers are not deduced or inferred from the Bible. Mr. Mouw is saying that he wants to advance his theories which are not deduced or inferred from the Bible, under the aegis of the Bible. His theories are not logically warranted by the statements in the Bible, but Mr. Mouw still wishes to use the honor and reverence accorded the Bible in some circles to gain a hearing for his own opinions. Unlike Mr. Mouw's views, many Christians have long recognized, "As the Bible contains the origin of civil liberty, by the Bible alone can it be sustained.... If the Bible goes, liberty follows. We can hope to be a happy nation, a free nation, only so long as we are a Christian nation."*

The world suffers now, and it will suffer in the age to come, because it has forgotten or rejected the lesson that our fathers knew so well: "The whole counsel of God, concerning all things necessary for his own glory, man's salvation, faith, and life, is either expressly set down in scripture, or by good and necessary consequence may be deduced from scripture: unto which nothing at any time is to be added, whether by new revelations of the Spirit, or traditions of men" (*The Westminster Confession of Faith*, 1647).

* J. M. Mathews, *The Bible and Civil Government*, 87, 91.

THE TRINITY REVIEW

For though we walk in the flesh, we do not war according to the flesh, for the weapons of our warfare [are] not fleshly but mighty in God for pulling down strongholds, casting down arguments and every high thing that exalts itself against the knowledge of God, bringing every thought into captivity to the obedience of Christ. And they will be ready to punish all disobedience, when your obedience is fulfilled.

July, August 2001

Copyright 2003 John W. Robbins Post Office Box 68, Unicoi, Tennessee 37692

Email: Jrob1517@aol.com

Website: www.trinityfoundation.org

Telephone: 423.743.0199

Fax: 423.743.2005

Compassionate Fascism

John W. Robbins

Last November the American people and the Electoral College elected a Methodist President. Methodism, of course, shares several theological notions with Roman Catholicism, two of which are man's free will and the necessity of doing good works in order to obtain final salvation. President Bush's favorite hymn, as he repeatedly has told us, is "A Charge to Keep I Have," the next three lines of which are: "a God to glorify/a never dying soul to save/and fit it for the sky." Perhaps even a sober Roman Catholic would demur from the implied Pelagianism of these words, but Methodists, at least devout ones, do not. They save their own souls; they fit them for the sky. And one of the indispensable ways they do this is through good works. Now, thanks to President's Bush's leadership, those good works will be federally funded.

President Bush's theology explains much about his administration's policies. For at least a year he has been meeting privately with Roman Catholic bishops, cardinals, and cardinals-to-be. John F. Kennedy himself, precisely because he was a Roman Catholic, probably could not have gotten away with the sort of private audiences President Bush has been keeping with prelates of the Roman Church-State. Besides, Kennedy seemed to prefer private meetings with floozies, for which the American people ought to be thankful. When it comes to the preferred vices of rulers, ordinary strumpets trump spiritual strumpets.

The Roman Church-State, whose social teaching and some of whose theology President Bush has adopted as his own, is described by the Holy Spirit speaking in Scripture with these words: "Come and I will show you the judgment of the great harlot who sits on many waters, with whom the kings of the Earth committed fornication, and the inhabitants of the Earth were made drunk with the wine of her fornication.... And the woman whom you saw is that great city [which sits on seven hills] which reigns over the

kings of the Earth" (*Revelation 17*). Rome reigns over our king. George W. Bush has made it clear that he endorses the social teaching of the Roman Church-State. In his May 20, 2001, commencement address at Notre Dame (Our Lady) University, President Bush said,

Notre Dame, as a Catholic university, carries forward a great tradition of social teaching. It calls on all of us, Catholic and non-Catholic, to honor family,¹ to protect life in all its stages, to serve and uplift the poor....

Karl Rove, the President's long-time adviser, speaking to the National Catholic Leadership Forum in Washington on April 25, said that President Bush's compassionate conservatism fits well with the Roman Church-State's principles of subsidiarity and solidarity. "Catholic teaching is between libertarian indifference and bureaucratic centralization," Rove said. Other speakers, including Steven Wagner, editor of *Crisis* magazine and the Republican Party's new National Chairman for Catholic Outreach, said that President Bush "talks the Catholic language."

A Holy War on Poverty

Here is more of that "Catholic language" from the President's Notre Dame address:

In 1964, the year I started college, another President from Texas delivered a commencement address talking

¹ For a more accurate view of the Roman Catholic treatment of marriage and the family, see Sheila Rauch Kennedy, *Shattered Faith: A Woman's Struggle to Stop the Catholic Church from Annuling Her Marriage*. It is outrageous that two institutions that have sinful views of marriage and the family — the Roman Church-State and the Mormon Church — now enjoy reputations as defenders of the family.

about this national commitment [to the poor].... In that speech, Lyndon Johnson advocated a War on Poverty which had noble intentions and some enduring successes. Poor families got basic health care; disadvantaged children were given a Head Start in life.... In 1966 [*sic*; correct date: 1996] welfare reform confronted the first of these problems [created by the War on Poverty].... But our work is only half done. Now we must confront the second problem: to revive the spirit of citizenship....

Welfare as we know it has ended, but poverty has not.... We do not yet know what will happen to these men and women, or to their children. But we cannot sit and watch, leaving them to their own struggles and their own fate.... Jewish prophets and Catholic teaching both speak of God's special concern for the poor. This is perhaps the most radical teaching of faith....

Mother Teresa said that what the poor often need, even more than shelter and food...is to be wanted.... This is my message today: There is no Great Society which is not a caring society. And any effective War on Poverty must deploy what Dorothy Day called "the weapons of the spirit...."

It's not sufficient to praise charities and community groups, we must support them. And this is both a public obligation and a personal responsibility.

The War on Poverty established a federal commitment to the poor. The welfare reform legislation of 1996 made that commitment more effective. For the task ahead, we must move to the third stage of combatting [*sic*] poverty in America....

Government has an important role. It will never be replaced by charities. My administration increased funding for major social welfare and poverty programs by 8 percent. Yet government must also do more....

So I have created a White House Office of Faith-based and Community Initiatives. Through that Office we are working to ensure that local community helpers and healers receive more federal dollars.... We have proposed a "Compassion Capital Fund," that will match private giving with federal dollars.

And we're in the process of implementing and expanding "Charitable Choice" – the principle, already established in federal law, that faith-based organizations should not suffer discrimination when they compete for contracts to provide social services. Government should never fund the teaching of faith, but it should support the good works of the faithful.

Some critics of this approach object to the idea of government funding going to any group motivated by faith. But they should take a look around them. Public money already goes to groups like the Center for the Homeless and, on a larger scale, Catholic Charities. Do the critics really want them cut off? Medicaid and Medicare money currently goes to religious hospitals.

Should this practice be ended? Child care vouchers for low income families are redeemed every day at houses of worship across America. Should this be prevented? Government loans send countless students to religious colleges. Should that be banned? Of course not....

Groups of this type [Habitat for Humanity] currently receive some funding from the Department of Housing and Urban Development. The budget I submit to Congress next year will propose a three-fold increase in this funding....

The federal government should do all these things; but others have responsibilities as well — including corporate America.... But if we hope to substantially reduce poverty and suffering in our country, corporate America needs to give more – and to give better. Faith-based organizations receive only a tiny percentage of overall corporate giving....

I will convene a summit this fall, asking corporate and philanthropic leaders throughout America to join me at the White House to discuss ways they can provide more support to community organizations — both secular and religious....

I leave you with this challenge: serve a neighbor in need...because the same God who endows us with individual rights also calls us to social obligations.

Now where did these ideas come from? Dr. Marvin Olasky, advisor to President Bush, Professor of Journalism at the University of Texas, Senior Fellow of the Roman Catholic Acton Institute, and editor of the pro-Roman Catholic *World* magazine, is generally credited with coining the term "compassionate conservatism"; but he is not the source of these ideas. True, Olasky was present at the White House on January 29, 2001, when President Bush signed the Executive Order creating the new Office of Faith-Based Initiatives, but many others were there too: Charles Colson, whose Prison Fellowship and Justice Fellowship hope to get more taxpayer money; Dr. James Skillen, president of the Center for Public Justice, a think tank promoting faith-based policies; Michael Joyce, president of the Bradley Foundation, a conservative foundation promoting faith-based policies; and representatives from the Association of Gospel Rescue Missions, The Salvation Army, Teen Challenge, Habitat for Humanity, the Islam Center of America, Young Life, World Vision, and so on. They all stand to gain financially from the new policy, and have found their "place at the table," or more accurately, at the trough. The love of money, as some long forgotten person once wrote, is a root of all kinds of evil.

In his Notre Dame speech President Bush cited as authorities Dorothy Day, a Roman Catholic social worker and socialist of the 1930s, and Mother Teresa, a Roman Catholic social worker of the late 20th century. Both of them echo the collectivist social teaching of the Roman Church-State, which is the source of Bush's ideas, as he suggested at

the beginning of his address. That social teaching, as I have demonstrated in detail in my book, *Ecclesiastical Megalomania: The Economic and Political Thought of the Roman Catholic Church*, is Antichristian, pagan in origin, and has spawned at various times fascism, socialism, corporativism, feudalism, and the welfare state. It is this collectivist teaching that the President thinks “our world needs to hear,” as he said in his remarks at the dedication of the Pope John Paul II Cultural Center at Catholic University in Washington, D.C., on March 22:

I’m grateful that Pope John Paul II chose Washington as the site of this Center. It brings honor and it fills a need. We are thankful for the message. We are also thankful for the messenger, for his personal warmth and prophetic strength.... Always, the Pope points us to the things that last and the love that saves. We thank God for this rare man, a servant of God and a hero....

In remarks preceding the dedication, made while receiving Roman Church-State cardinals, bishops, and other leaders in the East Room of the White House, President Bush said,

I’ve been struck by how humble the good folks [the prelates] are; how there’s a universal love for mankind and a deep concern for those who are not as fortunate as some of us. The Catholic Church is fortunate to have such strong, capable, decent leadership. And America is fortunate to have such strong leaders in our midst.... All of you are part of the humanizing mission which is part of the “Great Commission,” and the Pope John Paul II Cultural Center...will bring this message to generations of Americans in this capital of our nation. The best way to honor Pope John Paul II, truly one of the great men, is to take his teachings seriously; is to listen to his words and put his words and teachings into action here in America. This is a challenge we must accept.

As Princeton University’s McCormick Professor of Jurisprudence and Director of the James Madison Program in American Ideals and Institutions, Robert George, remarked in the *National Catholic Register*, “Bush made clear that he is not backing away from his faith-based initiative, despite criticism of some, not all, evangelical leaders and many libertarians.... What Bush is, in effect, stating is that ‘I am a John Paul II Republican....’” Professor George is, of course, a Roman Catholic. And President Bush is indeed a John Paul II Republican.²

² President Bush is not the first convert, but he seems to be more enthusiastic about the religion than some others. Last year, under pressure from the Vatican, Republican Congressional leaders dropped their opposition to a Clinton administration proposal to forgive the debts of 30 poor countries. President Clinton made the

Despite what Professor George implied, the President has met with virtually no opposition from so-called evangelical leaders. *Christianity Today*, for example, enthusiastically endorsed the Bush plan in its April 2 issue, saying, “Bush’s plan...is great.” Those most often cited as opponents — Jerry Falwell and Pat Robertson, for example — do not oppose the program in principle; they just grouse about money possibly going to “non-mainstream religions.” Pat Robertson has endorsed Bush’s plan as “an excellent idea.” The ersatz evangelicals are not only supporting the President’s plan now, they have been supporting it all along. His legislative program is being pushed in the House of Representatives by a Baptist minister, J. C. Watts of Oklahoma, and in the Senate by Joseph Lieberman, an Orthodox Jew from Connecticut, and Rick Santorum, a Roman Catholic from Pennsylvania.

Faith-Based Foolishness

Central to President Bush’s program is “faith.” This faith seems at first to be quite independent of any doctrine, for the President makes it clear that his administration will fund “Methodists, Mormons, and Muslims.” “We will help all in their work to change hearts while keeping a commitment to pluralism.”³ Obviously this sort of faith has nothing to do with Christianity; in fact, it is inimical to Christianity. Secular social reform efforts, according to the President, have failed because they cannot change hearts, but “people of faith” can change hearts, and the government will help them do so.

Some misguided and foolish Christians think that only Christ can change lives, and they therefore preach the false gospel of the changed life. They do not understand either Christianity or false religions. One of the most impressive testimony meetings I have ever attended was in the First Church of Christ, Scientist. Moslems, Mormons, Methodists, and Mariolatars can give similar testimonies: “The Koran, or Holy Mother Church, or the Queen of Heaven, or the Saints have changed my life.” The natural man can believe and does believe many varieties of false religions, some of which may indeed help him curb his drunkenness or his womanizing or his wife beating. But none of these religions is true; none can save his soul; only the finished work of

proposal a week after John Paul II called for government forgiveness of debts during 2000, a “Jubilee Year.”

³ Relativist tolerance is always disguised intolerance. When asked during the campaign if he would support federal funding of the Nation of Islam, Bush replied, “I don’t see how we can allow public dollars to fund programs where spite and hate is the core of the message.” But the Nation of Islam had produced results: It is reputed to be very effective at dealing with drug abuse and crime problems; in fact, in the early 1990s, the Department of Housing and Urban Development had contracted with the Nation of Islam to provide security in public housing projects. Under pluralism, all religions are equal, but some are more equal than others.

Christ, accepted in simple faith, can do that. And it is precisely this message of the Gospel that all these religions and government policies oppose. When fans of faith-based organizations say they want results, they are demanding results that they can observe, record, quantify, and subject to statistical analysis. They could care less about the souls of those on whom they operate. If Mohammedanism can produce sober citizens from drunks, more tax money and power to it.

Today it is common to hear that faith helps people recover from accidents and illness; faith helps them put their lives and families back together, or, as President Bush puts it, "Social scientists have documented the power of religion to protect families and change lives. Studies indicate that religious involvement reduces teen pregnancy, suicide, drug addiction, abuse, alcoholism, and crime." Ronald Sider, writing in *Christianity Today* (June 11, 2001), informs us that "a growing body of research demonstrates that religion often goes hand in hand with good citizenship and overall health." Which religion? It doesn't seem to matter for faith-based foolishness. Mormonism works as well as Christianity, and the messages of Prophet Mohammed and the Apparition Mary are as effective as the Gospel of Christ. They all work. And the President has made it clear that he wants results.

Now this exploitation of religion by government for government's purposes has been the story of humanity, from the Fall of man to the 21st century. Fascism is not a new idea, invented by Mussolini and Hitler in the 20th century. Attila, the man of force, has frequently used the Witchdoctor, the man of superstition, or formed a partnership with the Witchdoctor, in order to control the people and maintain power. Faith-based fascism is but the latest example of this religio-political partnership. Ronald Sider, writing in *Christianity Today*, unwittingly put it this way:

Scholars...cite a wide range of studies showing that "religion is strongly associated with good citizenship and improved physical and mental health." Active participation in a religious group correlates with lower suicide rates, drug use, and criminal behavior; better health; and altruistic behavior.... [While] Nonreligious funders [contributors to charitable organization] may overlook a perfunctory prayer to start the day, ...they often refuse to support holistic social programs run by Christians who think that encouraging the adoption of a specific religious faith is an essential component of their social program.

Sider makes it clear: The adoption of a specific religious faith is *a component of a social program*. This is theological paganism, a complete reversal of Christian doctrine and priorities, which teach that all social programs (if there are any at all) are secondary at best, and that the proclamation of the Gospel and the whole counsel of God is primary.

Christians are to set their minds on things above, not on earthly things. They are to fear him who can destroy both body and soul, not him who can kill only the body. They are to recognize that a person is not what he eats, but what he thinks. They are to teach that God's kingdom comes, not by might, nor by power, but by his Spirit working in the minds of men. They are to warn all men that this earthly life is brief, and the things of this world are passing away; that wrath is coming, and the life (or death) that follows the Judgment is everlasting. They are to warn everyone that what they *think* of Jesus Christ will result in their everlasting happiness or their never-ending agony.

The Great Commission is not a component of some larger social program; it is the whole program, and it is not social. Whatever charitable works are done by individuals, private organizations, and churches (not governments, whose purpose is the punishment of evildoers, not the ministry of mercy) are to be done in the furtherance of that mission. To reverse ends and means is to deny the Gospel. Christ said, contradicting Ronald Sider and all other proponents of the Social Gospel, "Seek first the kingdom of God and his righteousness, and all these things will be added to you." To make earthly things the goal, and to make the kingdom of God and his righteousness the means, is a damnable perversion of Christianity.

Writing of an earlier proposal to bastardize Christianity and make it a useful contributor to good citizenship and a component of a social program, J. Gresham Machen said,

We find proposed to us today what is called "character education" or "character building." Character, we are told, is one thing about which men of all faiths are agreed. Let us, therefore, build character in common, as good citizens, and then welcome from the various religious faiths whatever additional aid they can severally bring.... What surprises me about this program is not that its advocates propose it, for it is only too well in accord with the spirit of the age. But what really surprises me about it is that the advocates of it seem to think that a Christian can support it without ceasing at that point to be Christian.⁴

Today, the so-called evangelicals are mindlessly parroting the pious bromides of the modernists and Social Gospelers of 75 years ago. To state it more clearly, many of those we now call evangelicals are in fact modernists. They have abandoned Christianity. And what pious fascists call "social justice" are the sins of envy and theft.

Faith-based Fascism

The 16th century Cardinal Tommaso Cajetan, a determined opponent of the Reformation, explained very

⁴ "The Necessity of the Christian School," in *Education, Christianity and the State*, John W. Robbins, editor, 76.

clearly the Roman Catholic theology behind faith-based fascism:

Now what a ruler can do in virtue of his office, so that justice may be served in the matter of riches, is to take from someone who is unwilling to dispense from what is superfluous for life or state [condition], and to distribute it to the poor.... For according to the teaching of the saints, the riches that are superfluous do not belong to the rich man as his own, but rather to the one appointed by God as dispenser, so that he can have the merit of a good dispensation.⁵

The same theological and moral justification of stealing by government has been stated by many popes, councils, and theologians throughout the long and bloody history of the Roman Church-State. Using the principles of the universal destination of goods and subsidiarity, the Roman Church-State concocted the most comprehensive case for economic and political fascism the world has ever seen. It is this social teaching that President Bush praises, follows, and urges all of us to follow.

Of course, he is not the first modern political leader to do so. Amintore Fanfani, Premier of Italy in the mid-twentieth century, published a book titled *Catholicism, Protestantism and Capitalism* in 1934. Fanfani presented the Roman Church-State's social teaching and concluded that "the essence of capitalism...can only meet with the most decided repugnance on the part of Catholicism." What is that essence? Individualism, the private property order, freedom of enterprise, freedom of association, freedom of religion. Fanfani, like many Protestant-poseurs today, longed for the good old days, the feudalism of the Middle Ages:

The pre-capitalist age is the period in which definite social institutions such as, for instance, the Church, the State, the Guild, act as guardians of an economic order that is not based on criteria of individual economic utility. The Corporation or Guild is typical of the period. It is the guardian of a system of economic activity in which the purely economic interests of the individual are sacrificed either to the moral and religious interests of the individual—the attainment of which is under the control of special public institutions—or to the economic and extra-economic interests of the community. Competition was restricted; the distribution of customers, hence a minimum of work, was assured; a certain system of work was compulsory; trade with various groups [guess whom] might be forbidden for political or religious reasons; certain practices were compulsory, and working hours were limited; there were a number of compulsory feasts; prices and rates of

increase were fixed; measures were taken to prevent speculation.⁶

This fascist organization of society was a result of the social teaching of the Roman Church-State, and it has been a result of that teaching wherever the Roman Church-State has been powerful enough to impose its will on a nation.

Roman Catholic historian Christopher Dawson, writing in 1936 in *Religion and the Modern State*, acknowledged Romanism's affinity for fascism:

[Roman Catholicism] is by no means hostile to the authoritarian ideal of the State.... [T]he [Roman] Church has always maintained the principles of authority and hierarchy and a high conception of the prerogatives of the State. [Roman Catholic social ideas] have far more affinity with those of fascism than with those of either [Classical] Liberalism or Socialism. [They] correspond much more closely, at least in theory, with the fascist conception of the functions of the "leader" and the vocational hierarchy of the Fascist State than they do with the system of parliamentary democratic party government....⁷

The Joy of Fascism

Who supports this faith-based fascism? Most if not all the Religious Right, including groups such as the Family Research Council and the Christian Coalition; the Roman Church-State, of course; conservatives; a considerable army of nonprofit organizations, such as the Hudson Institute, that receive money from the government and spin out "scholarly" studies allegedly showing why government funding of faith-based organizations is the answer to social problems; wealthy foundations, such as the Pew Charitable Trusts and the Bradley Foundation, that also fund such stupid studies; Charles Colson of Prison Fellowship and Ronald Sider of Evangelicals for Social Action, as well as other advocates of the Social Gospel; and even some foolish people who call themselves Reformed Christians, of whom we shall have more to say later.

The man heading the President's Office of Faith-based and Community Initiatives, Dr. John J. DiIulio, is a former member of the board of Prison Fellowship. Calling himself a "born-again Catholic," DiIulio explains "compassionate conservatism": "Compassionate conservatism warmly welcomes godly people back into the public square.... It fosters model public/private partnerships...." Quoting a July 22, 1999, speech by Governor Bush, DiIulio says that Bush rejected the "destructive" idea that "if government would only get out of the way, all our problems would be solved." Two years later, on January 29, 2001, President Bush asserted, and he has repeated it many times since,

⁵ Cited in John W. Robbins, *Ecclesiastical Megalomania*, 36.

⁶ Cited in *Ecclesiastical Megalomania*, 74.

⁷ Cited in *Ecclesiastical Megalomania*, 161.

“Government cannot be replaced by charities or volunteers.” President Bush clearly rejects the Biblical view of limited government. Rather than restricting government to its only legitimate role, the punishment of evildoers, as Paul says in *Romans* 13, President Bush wants to involve government further in society by expanding the “government-by-proxy” fascism that already grips America. DiIulio explained the plan to the National Association of Evangelicals (NAE) on March 7:

Since the end of World War II, virtually every domestic policy program that Washington has funded in whole or in part has been administered not by federal civil servants alone (there are about 2 million of those today, roughly the same number as in 1960), but by federal workers in conjunction with state and local government employees, for-profit firms, and non-profit organizations. There are, for example, six people who work indirectly for Washington for every one federal bureaucrat who administers social programs. Certain nonprofit organizations, both religious and secular, have long been funded in whole or in part through this federal government-by-proxy system.

Catholic Charities, for example, gets 65 percent of its \$2.3 billion annual budget from government. The Jewish Board of Family and Children Services receives 75 percent of its funding from government.

Far from objecting to this fascist government-by-proxy system, with its network of public-private “partnerships” and government “coordination” (such “partnerships” and “coordination” are characteristics of fascism), DiIulio intends to extend this fascist system to include even more organizations and people, specifically religious organizations. He exults in the fact that under federal law signed by President Clinton in 1996, “sacred places that serve civic purposes can seek federal (or federal-state) funding without having to divest themselves of their religious iconography or symbols.... [N]uns in habits [can] rub shoulders with Americorps volunteers...” and so on. He finds such prospects delightful because at the present time there is anti-Catholic discrimination: “Catholics who believe and follow the Church’s official teachings on social issues ‘need not apply’ to many secular nonprofits presently funded, in whole or in part, through Washington’s government-by-proxy system.”

In his speech to the NAE, DiIulio attempted to answer objections to faith-based fascism. To those who think it would corrupt their organizations if they were to participate, his answer is simple: Don’t participate. Good advice, but worthless. Under fascism, non-participation is not an option. We are compelled to pay taxes to support fascist government-by-proxy. We are compelled to obey the government’s proxies. The freedom not to participate should be extended to the collection of taxes, not just to the

distribution of stolen property that DiIulio calls federal funding. One slogan of Italian Fascism was “Everything within the State; nothing outside the State.” Our home-grown fascists operate on the same principle, working to expand a political system that already penalizes those who oppose institutionalized and legalized theft and rewards those who favor legalized theft. Their goal is to politicize what remains of private charity.

In an interesting remark to the NAE, DiIulio disclosed his Antichristian view of the church: “Community helpers and healers need and deserve our individual and collective help. But they would need it less, much less, if the church behaved like the church, unified from city to suburb....” These sentiments are Antichristian for at least two reasons. First, the Christian church is not a social welfare organization. Anything it does to care for the physical welfare of people is incidental and subordinate to its overriding purpose, the proclamation of the Gospel of Jesus Christ. The Christian Gospel is not the Social Gospel. Paul even gives us instructions on who is not to be helped — those who will not work and widows under age 60 — to name two groups. Second, the church is not supposed to be a centralized institution. The churches in the New Testament are scattered over a wide geographical area; there is no centralized administration, no denominational apparatus, only congregations and an occasional presbytery meeting. The churches’ only visible links to each other are not organizational, but the apostles and evangelists. When the apostles die, there is no visible, structural, or organizational link between the churches. Their unity lies solely in “one Lord, one faith, one baptism”; Paul mentions nothing about one denomination. There is no common organization. Of course, the ambitious founders of DiIulio’s Church-State, the bishops of Rome (not Jesus Christ or Peter), seeking to supplant both the head of the church, Christ, and his apostles, invented and asserted apostolic succession, claimed to be the vicars of Christ walking on Earth, and imposed their control on other churches. Two thousand years after Christ the bishops of Rome are still seeking to impose their control on other churches. It is this bureaucratic and totalitarian view of the church that DiIulio favors, and it is this Antichristian view of the church that compassionate fascism will encourage, support, and if successful, impose. No wonder DiIulio says, “our hearts are joyous and light.”

The Nominally Reformed

Marvin Olasky, an adviser to President Bush pushing compassionate fascism, is a member of the Presbyterian Church in America (PCA), and a member of the board of Covenant College. Dr. Amy Sherman, who started the Abundant Life Family Center at Trinity Presbyterian Church (PCA) in Charlottesville, Virginia, is now Urban Ministries Advisor there. That church already receives government funding for its social programs, and it apparently desires more. Dr. Sherman uses her position with The Hudson

Institute to propagandize for faith-based fascism. Russ Pulliam, editor of the *Indianapolis Star* and a member of the Reformed Presbyterian Church of North America, published an essay in that denomination's magazine, *Covenanter Witness*, saying,

Bush should stand his ground in response to any legal threats to drag his proposals into court. He has the First Amendment on his side, based on a strict constructionist reading of the Constitution.... Thomas Jefferson approved federal grants to Roman Catholic missions to the Indians. Congress approved its own government-paid chaplain.... There is nothing unconstitutional about a government grant for a rescue mission that helps the homeless....

Not only does President Bush have the Constitution, Thomas Jefferson, and Congress on his side, according to Pulliam, he has Jesus Christ, the Bible, and the Apostle Paul as well:

In *Romans 13*, Paul explains how civil government is designed to be a "minister of God to thee for good." The king of civil government, after all, is Jesus Christ; so it should not be surprising that he can use that government to help in the resolution of social problems, through cooperation with ministries like Prison Fellowship.

Pulliam is not alone; the *Christian Statesman*, a periodical published by the National Reform Association, whose members are supposed to be conservative Presbyterians with Reconstructionist proclivities, has expressed similar views.

It may come as a surprise to Pulliam and his friends that there is no constitutional warrant whatsoever for federal subsidies to rescue missions. The arguments he uses — what Jefferson and Congress may or may not have done — beg the question: He ought to show that what they did was constitutional, rather than assume that the actions of Jefferson and Congress are *ipso facto* constitutional. Pulliam, for example, should have quoted James Madison's February 27, 1811, veto message to Congress:

The appropriation of funds of the United States for the use and support of religious societies [is] contrary to the article of the Constitution which declares that Congress shall make no law respecting a religious establishment.

Furthermore, there is no warrant in the Constitution for any federal welfare program, let alone a welfare program for religious societies.

Pulliam's understanding of Scripture is no better, and perhaps worse, than his understanding of the Constitution:

If Jesus Christ is king of civil government, and if it is therefore proper to use civil government to "help in the resolution of social problems," then it also follows that it is proper to use government to help in the resolution of religious problems. One good non sequitur deserves another. That is how totalitarianism comes, step by illogical step.

The separation of church and state — a phrase that has been demonized by the Religious Right for the past 20 years — is what has afforded and still affords us some religious freedom in this country. The Roman Church-State — indeed all pagan religions — has always been opposed to the separation of church and state, and it remains so today. Now it has millions of conservative dupes singing its siren song of partnership between church and state.

Conclusion

Faith-based fascism will increase the size and scope of the federal government, extending it to organizations that have hitherto been outside the state. That is the explicit goal of the policy, as expressed by the President himself. "Everything within the State; nothing outside the State."

Faith-based fascism will increase, not decrease, the constituencies of the welfare state, creating new special interest groups, government-funded religious organizations, that will pressure officials to grant them more money.

Faith-based fascism is based on a political delusion. John DiIulio and President Bush tell us that federal grants will be awarded and withdrawn on the basis of results. DiIulio asserts: "Opening competition for federal funds to all, including tiny local faith-based organizations, could usher in a new era of results-driven public administration. Scores of federal welfare programs could be cured or killed." For someone who has co-authored a textbook on American government, DiIulio shows little understanding of how government actually works. Government-grant awards and denials are decided by political clout, political cronyism, and political biases. With the addition of government grants to faith-based organizations, we must add religious clout, religious cronyism, and religious biases. Tax funds will flow to political and religious friends and be withheld from political and religious foes.

Faith-based fascism, therefore, will affect which religious societies will grow and which will not. Those with federally funded programs will attract members; those who obey the Bible and the Constitution will be pushed from the public square, marginalized, criticized, and persecuted by the "armies of compassion." Richard John Neuhaus' "naked public square" will once again be filled with praying, autodafeing fascists, just like in the good old days.

How should a Christian respond to the President's baiting questions, "Do the critics really want them [Catholic Charities] cut off [from federal funding]? Medicaid and Medicare money currently goes to religious hospitals. Should this practice be ended? Child care vouchers for low income

families are redeemed every day at houses of worship across America. Should this be prevented? Government loans send countless students to religious colleges. Should that be banned?"

The President answers, "Of course not."

The Christian answers, Yes, and the sooner the better.

End the student loans; they are funded by money stolen from taxpayers; they have driven the cost of a college education out of sight; and they are used to put young people deeply into debt at the start of their lives.

End the child care vouchers; they are funded by money stolen from taxpayers, and they are used to put children into 9-to-5 orphanages.

End the subsidies for medical care; they are funded with money stolen from taxpayers; they have raised the price of medical care to exorbitant levels; they have encouraged people not to provide for their own; and they have made government an idol.

End the subsidies to Catholic Charities and World Vision; they are funded with money stolen from taxpayers. If those charities were half as wonderful as they tell us, their efforts would attract adequate voluntary contributions. The fact that these charities must rely on funds obtained by force suggests that their programs are less than worthwhile, less than efficient, or less than beneficial.

And let's be clear about charity. Charity is not compelling someone else to give *his* money to the poor. It is giving one's *own* money away; it is *freely* contributing one's *own* time. Government charity is a contradiction in terms, for government has no money except what it collects by force from others. What President Bush proposes is not greater charity, but aggravated theft and increased compulsion. There is nothing Christian or charitable about it. It is a violation of the Ten Commandments.

This writer has heard no "Christian" leader give the correct answers to the President's questions. They have already agreed in principle with the President's faith-based fascism. Long ago they abandoned the whole counsel of God, choosing which Biblical doctrines they would believe and teach, and which they would ignore. Many of them have abandoned the Gospel of the substitutionary death of Christ for his people and justification by faith alone. Now they have denied what the Scriptures teach on private property, the role of government, and the social order.

The salt has lost its savor; it has become worthless; and it deserves to be trodden underfoot by men.

Recommended Reading

Fanfani, Amintore. *Catholicism, Protestantism, and Capitalism*.

University of Notre Dame Press [1934] 1984.

Flynn, John T. *As We Go Marching*. Free Life Editions [1944] 1973.

Laquer, Walter. *Fascism: Past, Present, Future*. Oxford University Press, 1996.

Robbins, John W. *Ecclesiastical Megalomania: The Economic and Political Thought of the Roman Catholic Church*. The Trinity Foundation, 1999.

Rummel, R. J. *Death by Government*. Transaction Publishers, 1995.

Nothing written here is to be construed as lobbying, or as endorsing or opposing any candidate for any office whatsoever. This is a religious commentary on the religious policies of the United States Government, and our commentary on them is protected by the Word of God and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States.