world revolution, communism sees itself as a universal movement destined inevitably to embrace all peoples. Its methods are myriad. By trade or aid, by sabotage or subterfuge, by bullets or ballots, it grasps for power. Within three years of the Bolshevik Revolution of 1917, communist parties mushroomed forth in most major countries: the United States, France, Italy, China, India. With his international vision, Lenin prophesied that the road to Paris leads through Peking and Delhi. This indicates something of the consistency of the plan, something of the seriousness of the Chinese surrender to communism in 1949, something of the importance of supporting India today in her democratic resistance to communist threats and aggression.

Yet a word of caution is in order. It would be misleading, if not wholly inaccurate, to accept the oft-quoted theory that communism has *only* come to power through military coups, that it has never been chosen voluntarily by any people. In Kerala, which has the greatest population density, the highest literacy, and the largest Christian minority of any state in India, a communist government was twice voted into office. Even after the central government had taken over the administration because of mismanagement and civil disorder, the elections of February, 1960, installed a coalition cabinet, no single party of which won as large a vote as the communists. (Let us be clear that this is only one state of India, and the whole country seems in no danger of becoming communist as long as the democratic government now in office succeeds—with large-scale foreign aid—in making slow but sure economic progress.)

But even in those lands where the communists have had no popular mandate at the ballot box, they have not necessarily represented a minority, *un*-popular rule. In China, for example, where no government has ever been "elected" in our Western sense, the ease and speed of a mighty movement across an entire nation certainly indicated public apathy or tacit acceptance, not opposition.

Whatever the general feeling may be now, it is clear that in Cuba and parts of Eastern Europe, the government in power was originally welcomed as an imperfect but limited alternative to tyranny, injustice, corruption, inflation, and so forth. The "deviationism" of Marshal Tito in Yugoslavia—or even the Hungarian revolt—did not represent a basic, overwhelming rejection of communism as such, but only of Russian "imperialism" and intervention. Communists have proved themselves alarmingly adept at infiltration, subversion, threats, plots, and coups. No plan of resistance can ignore the various instruments of force which may be used.

But these methods rely for success on indifference, resignation, uncertainty, confusion, lack of leadership. These conditions, in turn, may depend on prior failure to achieve by other means the elementary justice, freedom, and social reform, to which all human beings are entitled.

Freedom Versus Security

Here in our own country we have been hesitant about the best methods of curbing communist infiltration, not because we are blind to its threat, but because we are alert to the ultimate values at stake. On one hand, we cannot allow our enemies to use democratic freedoms to destroy democracy. On the other hand, we must not destroy democracy ourselves by abandoning those "inalienable rights" on which and for which our country was founded.

displeased that the long-awaited Revolution took place in Russia." On page 26 we have a further build-up of Russia: "This phenomenal progress is what the underdeveloped nations see as real and possible — more possible than the fabulous luxuries of America."

If the Methodist Church and all the churches of the United States had been fighting Communism, not as a Christian heresy but as a total evil, and the evils of Communism had been presented on the mission field instead of the talk of social justice paralleling that of Marx and Lenin, the nations of the world would not consider what has happened in Russia as "phenomenal progress."

At this point you find that the Methodists are still looking to Kerala. Last February, when I was in Kerala, I learned that the only reason the Communists were able to come to power was that they were able to deceive the people and that they had the co-operation of some church leaders. Even a president of the World Council of Churches was responsible in a way for the coming of the Communists to power. He is reported to have said, "Give them a chance." But they could not stay in power. It was impossible for them to bring order. But it should be frankly said that this kind of teaching as here presented by the Methodists encourages the short cut to their "social justice" which was taken by the Chinese quoted in the first lesson. It has wrecked mainland China!

Attack on Anti-anti-Communists

Of course, a series like this would not be complete without the usual attack upon the anti-Communists and the "extremists." Here is the anti-anti-Communist line: "Convinced that the government has been too lax, that communists are hiding behind every liberal bush, certain factions in this country have adopted the very tactics they deplore." Thus the anti-Communists are using the tactics of the Communists — that has been the line.

The anti-Communists are exposing the Communists and demanding that they be stopped, that we refuse to do business with the Reds, that we would "rather be dead than Red." But notice the next sentence: "Hate literature denounces every movement for racial integration as Red. The United Nations, the World Council of Churches, or any other organization which works for international understanding, brotherhood, and peace is condemned." But the United Nations with the Communists helping to run its every agency is not working for international understanding; it is an institution where the Communists are able to promote their conspiracy and they are doing an effective job of it while we talk about "understanding." The World Council of Churches, with Communist-controlled churches operating inside it, and with its promoting "peaceful coexistence," collaboration, understanding, with those who masquerade as clergymen but are the agents of the secret police, must be condemned and exposed fully if there is to be a free United States preserved. It is an easy tactic to take some statement of some individual and blow it up and make it appear that all anti-Communists think that Dwight Eisenhower was a "conscious agent." There is no question but that Dwight Eisenhower rendered the cause of Communism as great an assist as any man ever did when he invited Nikita Khrushchev to this country as the honored guest of the United States. That tyrant, the "beast of Budapest," the "hangman of the Ukraine," should never, never have been a guest in the White House.

EPHESIANS 5

11 And have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness, but rather reprove *them*.