It is hard to blow your nose when your chest hurts!

**God and Satan have another talk**

In the opening of the Book of Job, we find ourselves spectators of a conversation God is having with Satan, one of his created beings. God is asking Satan if he has observed the obedience of Job. Satan responds and the story continues.

Perhaps thousands of years later, Satan returned to God’s presence and presented Him with a servant of his own. Here is how the conversation may have gone: God said Satan, have you considered my servant Karl Marx? Unlike Job, Marx had no friends to come and sit with him so he would write his father sharing of his new beginnings.

“After leaving his father and mother to attend the university in Berlin he writes ‘When I left you, a new world had opened before me, the world of love, which began by being a love deprived of all hope and full of frenzied yearnings.’”

God did you see what I did there Satan would say, acknowledging his work by pointing out how he used the word love with Marx “deprived of all hope” which is not love at all. Satan goes on to explain how he had removed the “love” young Karl knew as a child and had replaced it with the selfish self-centered “love.” The remainder of Marx’ life is exemplified by this empty love. It first showed in his relationship with his father.

On November 10, 1837, Marx wrote to his father “a deep unrest has mastered me, and I shall not be able to lay the specters that haunt me until I am in your dear presence.” Job however, never left the rest of his dear Father so unrest (of Satan) could not master him. “Thus Heaven I’ve forfeited, I know it well. My soul, once true to God, is chosen for Hell.” (Karl Marx)

As the conversation continues, Satan smiles and says, “Karl has never worshipped me as a god as others have done, but he is by far my best servant. If I may use the term, for he is hands down the worst person I have not yet met. He lives in misery but wears it as a crown. I could not ask for a better representative on earth. If I could be proud of something other than myself, he may be the one!”

Karl never worked but instead mooched off his parents and friends his entire life. The family, wife and two children, lived in poverty under the threat of eviction from their rented space of living, along with unpaid bills from local marketplaces and pubs. After the death of his parents, Friedrich Engels became his source. Satan again points out that Job was wealthy because God blessed him, but my servant Karl Marx is lacking because I do not bless, I only make him look for blessings. Which produces envy, greed, jealousy, and the like of. Case and point. “Speaking of Engels, now Marx needed a new host from which to draw financial nutrients. He thus turned to his partner in crime and cash. Engels too, suckled from the teat of his parents’ inheritance, which was apparently fatter that the Marx family cow. Of course, Marx envied everyone’s wealth. Marxism and communism thrive on envy of others’ wealth.” (The Devil and Karl Marx pg. 70)

“Engels had informed Marx of the tragic news of the death of his girlfriend (a female Engel refused to marry) but Marx responded by lamenting his more important financial situation: ‘The devil knows there is nothing now but ill luck where we are,’ moaned Marx. ‘I simply don’t know any more where to turn. My attempts to rake up money in France and Germany have failed, besides the children have no shoes or clothing to go out in.’ In case the mourning Engels—whose lover was not even in the grave—did not get the hint, Marx flat-out asked his grieving pal for more money.”

 In November 1849, one year after publishing his crowning work, the Communist Manifesto. Marx’s landlord evicted the family because of communism’s founding father’s revulsion at the idea of an individual providing for himself and his family. Marx would have ached for an all-encompassing, cradle-to-the-grave, womb-to-tomb, collective-welfare state that confiscates revenue from wealthy people and redistributes it to lazy socialist academics and theorists peddling inane ideas from their messy desk piled with papers.

The landlord was also fed up with Marx’ resistance to grooming. Karl drank too much, smoked too much, never exercised, and suffered from warts and boils from the lack of washing. He stunk. “Washing, grooming, and changing his linens are things he does rarely, and he likes to get drunk,” stated a Prussian police-spy report. “He has no fixed times for going to sleep or waking up.” As for the apartment. “Everything is broken down,” busted, spilled, smashed, falling apart—toys and chairs and dishes and cups to tables and tobacco pipes and on and on. “In a word,” said the report, everything is topsy-turvy…to sit down becomes a thoroughly dangerous business.” Quite literally, the chair you chose to sit upon in the Marx household could collapse. (The Devil and Karl Marx pg. 72)

**The First Freethinker**

Freethinker by definition is “a person who thinks freely or independently: one who forms opinions on the basis of reason independently of authority especially: one who rejects or is skeptical of religious dogma.

Liberalism is defined as (a) A 19th century Protestant movement that favored free intellectual inquiry, stressed the ethical and humanitarian content of Christianity, and de-emphasized dogmatic theology.

These could both be considered “soft” definitions of the words. Both have a much deeper meaning in real life experiences. The Freethinker is an atheist, and the liberal thinker would most likely be considered an agnostic at best. They are described as soft because they have the appearance of being politically correct without threatening the person who identifies as one or the other. Given someone who does not agree with them a softer version of who they are as a person; you know an intellectual of sorts. Allowing them to agree to disagree on this intellectual matter.

When reading these soft definitions of these words it is easy to see the soft lies of communism is the present culture of America. If there is such a thing as a “soft lie.” The only other alternative is cowardice, fear of calling an atheist an atheist. A rebel is too gentle a word to be used in this environment and it has lost its effectiveness. Unlike when Mikhail Bakunin (1814-76 a Russian atheist and revolutionary socialist anarchist) wrote when describing Satan: “But here steps in Satan, the eternal rebel, the first free thinker and the emancipator of the worlds.” Bakunin and Marx were atheists as were their friends and subsequent followers. There was no agnostics, no de-emphasizing dogmatic theology and no skepticism of religious dogma. They clearly saw Satan as their hero without a need of a Savior. It was all out rejection of God, along with God language or pretense they were Freethinkers removed from stressing the ethical and humanitarian content of Christianity.

Time cannot change the definition of a Freethinker into a more user-friendly term. Satan is seen as and was/is labeled the first free thinker of all. Freethinkers just follow him, with no original thoughts. That is their free-thinking choice to make. The purpose here is to prevent anyone from finding themselves freely thinking on the broad path, while feeling as if it were leading them down the straight and narrow path. One opportunity is all that is given in a life to find the preferred destination. Satan does not have a choice but if you are reading this you still do!

**Broad or Narrow**

The Christian adheres to 2 Corinthians 10:5 “We destroy arguments and every lofty opinion raised against the knowledge of God, and take every thought captive to obey Christ.” And we cling to Romans 12: 1-2 “I appeal to you therefore, brothers (sisters) by the mercies of God, to present your bodies as a living sacrifice, holy and acceptable to God, which is your spiritual worship. Do not be conformed to this world but be **transformed** by the renewal of your mind, that by testing you may discern what is the will of God, what is good and acceptable and perfect.”

These are passages which indicate the narrowness of the path which Christians are to travel, the path with is pleasing to God. The path is intentionally narrow, and few are those who will find it; be amongst the few.

The broad path leads to destruction. Most will stay on the broad way by choice and for them it is a bad choice, but some are on that board way because they do not know about the straight and narrow path or because they have been hoodwinked, tricked, sidetracked, conned, or duped. Regardless the end is still the same; no do overs are given in eternity.

The Bible tells us each person is to examine themselves, “to see whether you are in the faith. Test yourselves. 2 Corinthians 13:5. It continues “Or do you now realize this about yourselves, that Jesus Christ is in you? —unless you fail to meet the test!”

**And the gates of hell shall not prevail against it!**

Matthew 16: 15-18 “He saith unto them, but who say ye that I am? And Simon Peter answered and said, Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God. And Jesus answered and said unto him, blessed art thou, Simon Barjona: for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven. And I say also unto thee, That thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.”

Heinrich Marx was born to a Jewish family and later converted over to Christianity. Karl was raised as a Christian by his parents. To the dismay of his father, Karl became an atheist after leaving home to attend college. As most kids who are exposed to atheism at the universities. Sadly, young Karl was taken in. It was then he sought an acquaintance with Bakunin. “When he first met Marx, Bakunin said that Marx was ‘already an atheist, an instructed materialist, and a conscious socialist.’ Bakunin said that because of their temperaments, there was no ’frank intimacy among them.’” (The Devil and Karl Marx pg. 18)

This Bakunin: “Maybe Bakunin’s worst and most well-known phrase about God and religion is this from God and the State. ‘If God really existed, it would be necessary to abolish him.’ Bakunin had a nasty, angry, cynical view of God and religion, stating that religion enslaves, debases, and corrupts, and that ‘all religions are cruel, all founded on blood.’” (The Devil and Karl Marx pgs. 18-19)

“Friedrich Engel’s upbringing was, like that of Marx, both interesting and sad. He was raised and for many years remained a committed Christian, much more than Marx. Friedrich Engels was born November 1820 in Barmen, Germany, a town known for its piety. His family was no exception to the community’s devoutness. ‘He did not acquire his revolutionary opinions in the home of his parents,’ recorded Franz Mehring, ‘His father was a well-to-do manufacturer of conservative and orthodox views, and religiously Engels had more to overcome than Marx.’” (The Devil and Karl Marx pgs. 95-96)

“I pray every day, indeed almost all day, for truth, Engels would write, and I have done so ever since I began to doubt. Like many youths, he had his questions, and he needed peers who were good men, who would help guide him to right, not to wrong -- to truth, not to evil. Unfortunately, men like Karl Marx entered instead.” (The Devil and Karl Marx pg. 96)

Karl Marx and Friedrick Engel introduced the Communist theory with a manifesto in 1835 and in this theory, they listed tenets of communism amongst those tenets was …. They never had the opportunity to test their theory, but others have, and the results never varied they have always remained the same for centuries regardless of the county.

**The Wording; weeds**

Karl Marx was what one might call “a professional student,” he never had a job but earned degrees and read many books. He loved to write plays and poetry along with other writings throughout the years. He was a words craftsmen of sorts, if you will. He sometimes poured out writings for months and years before their completion. His words always centered on the same subject in various forms of what he termed as “his dance with darkness” his atheism.

When developing and co-writing with Friedrich Engel the Communist Manifesto, they were very selective, carefully choosing the wording used to express something spectacular on the horizon. The desire was for it to be enlightening and ever evolving into a new world order. It was very important to keep the reader, follower interested and always looking forward to the future regardless of how bad things were in reality. Using the word Social as the foundation represents humanity; human existence apart from God, freedom like that of Satan who they saw as the first “Free Thinker.” Liberal was used as a descript, representing a level of rebellion against structured cultures and working norms of society. And of course, the term progressive, as it gives the movement a never-ending hope as it is always moving forward for the advancement of mankind and the human race.

That may sound good in theory as Marx and Engel proposed but in practice, “Communism committed a ‘multitude of crimes not only against individual human beings but also against world civilization and national cultures,’ wrote Stephane Courtois, editor of the classic Harvard University Press work *The Black Book of Communism.* ‘Communist regimes turned mass crime into a full-blown system of government.’” (The devil and Karl Marx pg. xvi)

“In 1999, The Black Book of Communism endeavored to attempt the impossible task of tabulating a Marxist-Leninist death toll in the twentieth century. It came up with a figure approaching 100 million. Here is the breakdown:

* USSR: 20 million deaths
* China: 65 million deaths
* Vietnam: 1 million deaths
* North Korea: 2 million deaths
* Cambodia: 2 million deaths
* Eastern Europe: 1 million deaths
* Latin America: 150,000 deaths
* Africa: 1.7 million deaths
* Afghanistan 1.5 million deaths
* The international communist movement and Communist parties not in power: about 10,000 deaths” (The Devil and Karl Marx pg. xvii)

**The Enemy came in during the Night**

Alexander Yakovlev was Mikhail Gorbachev’s chief aide and reformer. His words were “the USSR had followed a Marxist-Leninist social system that ‘preaches the demonic religion of evil.’ What Marxism-Leninist had wrought against religious faith was ‘infinitely vile.’ This demanded repentance ‘of our sins and errors and a collective kneeling ‘before the graves of the millions of people who were shot or who died of hunger.’ Communist officials should repent for the ‘gulag harvest of crosses’ produced in this ‘biggest cemetery on earth’ otherwise known as the Soviet Union.’” (The Devil and Karl Marx pg. 135)

“In November of 1846, Pope Pius IX released *Qui Pluribus*, affirming that communism is ‘absolutely contrary to the natural law itself’ and if adopted would ‘utterly destroy the rights, property, and possessions of all men, and even society itself.’” (The Devil and Karl Marx pg. 136) The Communist Manifesto was published in 1848. “In 1849, one year after the Manifesto was published, Pius IX issued another encyclical, *Nostis Et Nobiscum*, which referred to both socialism and communism as ‘wicked theories,’ perverted theories,’ perverted teachings,’ and pernicious fictions.’”

“On December 28, 1878, Pius IX’s successor, Pope Leo XIII, followed with *Quod Apostolici Muneris* (On Socialism), which defined communism as ‘the fatal plague which insinuates itself into the very marrow of human society only to bring about its ruin.’ He stated, ‘We speak of that sect of men who, under various and almost barbarous names, are called socialists, communists, or nihilists, who spread over all the world, and bound together by a wicked confederacy, no longer seek the shelter of secret meetings, but openly and boldly marching forth in the light of day, strive to bring what they have long been planning---the overthrow of all civil society.’ These men leave nothing untouched.’ These men ‘debase the natural union of man and woman, held sacred even among barbarous people; and its bond, by which the family is chiefly held together…Doctrines of socialism strive almost completely to dissolve this union.’” (The Devil and Karl Marx pg. 137)

“In *Divini Redemptoris*, the Church made clear that the notion of a “Christian Marxist” was an oxymoron. In the dialectical and historical materialism advocated by Marx, ‘there is no room for the idea of God.’ The document is unambiguous: communism was a ‘truly diabolical’ instrument of Satan and his ‘sons of darkness,’ a false promise, a ‘convulsion,’ yet one more ‘sad legacy’ of the fall of man.” (The Devil and Karl Marx pg. 139)

In the second Vatical II document “On the Care of Souls and Communism” we find the following quote:

There are a large number of people in many nations who, although they were not born into ignoble families and they were even baptized and educated in the Catholic Church, are enticed by communism, enlist in communist organizations, and vote for communists in political and administrative elections. Many of them, indeed, do not adhere to communist philosophical doctrines in their hearts, and the only basis of their merely practical support for the communis cause, or at least the principle on, is that they regard is as an effective way to bring about the perfect establishment of social justice and, in fact, for obtaining a better salary or wage for less work, for receiving part of the division and distribution of wealth and material goods, and for living a more comfortable and easier life. However, those who favor communism only for economic convenience are mistaken.

“In his 1948 book *Communism and the Conscience of West*, Bishop Fulton J. Sheen (1895-1979) wrote “The truth on the subject is that communism and atheism are intrinsically related and that one cannot be a good Communist without being an atheist and every atheist is a potential Communist,’ said Sheen. He quoted Marx: ‘Communism begins where atheism begins.’”

In his 1954 book The Church, Communism and Democracy, Sheen wrote that communism was inspired not by the spirit of Christ “but by the spirit of the serpent…. The Mystical Body of the Anti-Christ.” Sheen explained, “In order to understand the communists’ idea of truth, we have to substitute the philosophy of communism for God; in the words, the ultimate origin of truth is [found] in their party.” He added that “Marx was not first a Communist and then an atheist. He was first an atheist, then a Communist. Communism was merely the political expression of his atheism. As he hated God, so would he hate those who would own property.”

On September 30, 1962, a sermon was delivered at Ebenezer Baptist Church entitled “Can a Christian be a Communist?” While insisting that “no Christian can be a communist,” King calls on his congregation to consider communism “a necessary corrective for a Christianity that has been all too passive and a democracy that has been all too inert.” Frustrated by the church’s unwillingness to take a stand against racial discrimination, he complains, “This morning is we stand at eleven o’clock to sing ‘In Christ There is No East or West, we stand in the most segregated hour of America.” King also admonishes individuals unwilling to commit to social justice: “If you haven’t discovered something to die for, you aren’t fit to live.”

Paul Kengor authored a book in 2010 entitled: *Dupes: How America’s Adversaries Have Manipulated Progressives for a Century.* In his research, he was able to acquire testimonies from former members of the Soviet Comintern and Communist Party USA which was established in 1919. Here are his words.

Though it has been long obvious to sentient human beings that communists hate religion, they nevertheless had an almost preternatural (beyond what is normal or natural) ability to enchant liberal Christians. They cynically, contemptuously targeted the religious left. They knew that progressive Christians shared certain sympathies with them: workers’ rights, wealth redistribution, shrinking the income gap, denouncing the rich, fomenting class envy. Communists exploited that trust, often invoking the language of “social justice” to enlist liberals in their petitions, their marches, their campaigns, their objectives.

They had their best success with the mainline Protestant denominations: the Episcopal Church, Presbyterian Church USA, the United Methodist Church. Herbert Romerstein, who had long been one of America’s most astute and learned expert ex-communists, stated that communists found progressive pastors to be “the biggest suckers of them all.”

The word “suckers” is an apt choice. One can see in these testimonies ahead (particularly Bella Dodd’s) the use of explicit terms like “dupes,” “useful idiots,” and “suckers lists.” That latter phase was used by even congressmen during questioning of witnesses. It was used to describe lists of liberal individuals and organizations literally drawn up and targeted by American communists for exploitation. These lists included progressive professors, teachers, unions, journalists, and especially religious left Christians.

In my research for *Dupes*, and numerous times elsewhere before and since, I found repeatedly, dating back a century, beginning with the launch of the Soviet Comintern and Communist Party USA (CPUSA) in 1919, atheist communists clearly tapping social-justice language not because they believed in Jesus (quite the contrary) but to dupe believers in Jesus, specifically progressive Christians. As I dug into the Soviet Comintern Archives on CPUSA, it took little time to affirm what Romerstein had warned me about: the religious left truly did comprise the biggest suckers of them all. That obvious reality smacks one right upside the face. It is painful to see.

The purpose of this discussion is not to get caught up in the political investigation of the past but to show the relevance of the information found, and the obvious impact it has on many churches even today.

Harry Ward was a Methodist minister who was a founding member of the American Civil Liberties Union with an atheist named Roger Baldwin. He was also a seminary professor. He was a communist. Remember the words of Karl Marx “communism begins with atheism.”

In 1934, Earl Browder (1891-1973) became the chairman of CPUSA until 1945. In 1935, he authored a book entitled *Communism in the United States*, which summarizes his anti-religious sentiments.

In that book, particularly the final chapter, titled “Religion and Communism,” which was based on a February 15, 1935, discussion between Browder and a group of students at the “Christian progressive” Union Theological Seminary in New York, Browder was his usual slippery self. Effusive and elusive when talking about the Communist Party and religion, He tried to toe the line between his dedication to the party and to not posing to much of a threat to American believers and their constitutional freedom of religion—while trying to reel in some new suckers from his religious left audience. Still, comrade Browder unavoidably uncorked a few gems that exposed just where he and his American Communist Party stood on matters of religion. He could not avoid stating the obvious: communism and religion were implacable foes.

“It is quite clear that the Communist Party is the enemy of religion,” said Browder honestly, in a candid affirmation of the obvious. “We Communist try to do the opposite of what we hold religion does.” He noted, “The Communist Party takes the position that the social function of religion and religious institutions is to act as an opiate to keep the lower classes passive, to make them accept the bad conditions under which they have to live in the hope of a reward after death.”

Conversely, Browder understood that religion, being a matter of spirit, was a natural foe of communism, which rejected the spiritual in favor of the strictly material. “Religion does not fit into a dialectical materialist system of thought,” affirmed Browder, reaching for more belligerent, Lenin-like language: “It is the enemy of it.”

And yet, Browder did his best to try to not seem too harsh toward American religious believers—because he was looking to continue to grow his party. He was always willing to welcome new suckers. He said that the Communist Party was now up to 31,000 members, a sharp rise of 14,000 members over the past year and a half. The party was pushing hard for new recruits, whether among laborers, farmers, teachers, women, racial minorities— “the majority of the Negroes are influenced by the Communists,” said Browder, particularly amid the party’s push in the “Black Belt” (the “Negro South”)—and perhaps even possibly among the religious.

When asked what the party does with those who are religious but strangely interested in joining the party, Browder explained, “When workers come into the Party still actively religious, we accept them, not because we accept their religion, but because we know that the process of discarding religious beliefs, which are in the last analysis reactionary, is a more or less protracted one.

Recall that Vladimir Lenin had said precisely the same. Stupid “Christian Communists” might be allowed in, buy only under the pretext that their stupid Christian beliefs would soon be discarded.

On September 30, 1962, Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. preached a sermon at Ebenezer Baptist Church titled: Can a Christian Be a Communist?

Why would a Baptist minister ask such a question? He gives several reasons for the sermon; “The first reason grows out of the fact that communism is having a widespread influence in the contemporary world.” The first reason what because of the influence communism had/has on the world. Is it a negative or positive influence? The answer to this question is not as obvious as it may seem. “The second reason that I feel compelled to talk about communism this morning is that it is the only serious rival of Christianity.” And “the third reason that I feel compelled to talk about communism this morning is that it is unfair and certainly unscientific to condemn a system of thought without knowing what that system of thoughts says and without knowing why it is wrong and why it is evil. So, for these reasons, I choose to talk about this troubling issue.”

The troubling issue started in a Communist Party Central Committee Plenum meeting in December 1938, when the members of committee took note that the overwhelming majority of Catholics of all national origins were Democrats.

In 1937 CPUSA document, titled “Confidential report on work in religious and non-religious Catholic organizations,” will startle Catholics today, but will not surprise anyone familiar with the webs weaved by communists. The document begins:

Today, with the issue of Spain being in the forefront, a tremendous, organized campaign, worldwide in scope, is gaining momentum with the purpose of winning the Catholic masses for fascism. The two countries wherein this campaign is most intense is in Ireland and in the United States.

In the forefront of this campaign, and the directing force of it, is the Catholic Church as represented by the Vatican…

A real race is on as to which force will win over the Catholic people in this country—the forces of reaction and fascism as represented by the Catholic Church or the forces of progress and democracy.

Such was the stark choice posed by communists: Catholic Church “reaction and fascism” vs. enlightened “progress and democracy.” The report then noted that the recent reelection of FDR as president of the United States, and that “the Vatican, being sensitively attuned to the result, sent to this country, just before the elections, Cardinal Paccelli [spelling incorrect]. As is known, Cardinal Paccelli had an important interview with President Roosevelt.”

That Cardinal Pacelli was none other than Cardinal Eugenio Pacelli, the future Pope Pius XII. That conversation between Pacelli and FDR was especially interesting. On November 5, 1936, Pacelli, visiting America as Vatican secretary of state, met with a newly reelected FDR at the president’s Hyde Park mansion. It was a friendly get-together, despite what FDR dubbed a “mental sparring contes” with the future pontiff. Pacelli warned FDR of the “great danger of communism in America, FDR characteristically dismissed. FDR explained that he was chiefly concerned about America sliding into fascism, not Marxism. Fascism was the fear, not communism. “No” replied Pacelli. “Yes” countered FDR. This went back and forth before a bewildered Pacelli finally said, “Mr. President, you simply do not understand the terrible importance of the communist movement.” No, he did not.

American communists knew they had a chump in FDR, and they played the president like a violin.

In reading the information please do not get stuck on the Catholic Church, the aim was to reach a large mass of people and the Catholic Church had 18 million members at the time. What is more important is their reach for the Democrat Party which touched all races and spaces in the United States. They reached out to the workers unions, the C.I.O. and the A.F. of L. insisting that the Communist Party completely agreed with their grievances, higher employment, more welfare, poverty reduction, wealth redistribution, and a smaller income gap.

It was not just the Catholic Church they were after; the Catholic Church was the only organization fighting against them.

Norman Thomas was an American Socialist who ran for president of the United States six times in 1928. He was raised to be a religious person a Christian and was ordained as a presbyterian minister. He graduated from Princeton in 1908 and decided to study for theology as his father and grandfather had. “But rather than attend an orthodox Presbyterian seminary, as his father wanted, he attended Union Theological Seminary in New York. It was there that Thomas was seduced by the left’s “social gospel.” He was so liberal even then that the conservatives in the Presbyterian Church tried to introduce heresy charges against him and prevent him from being ordained, they failed.” (The Devil and Karl Marx pg. 212)

It did not end there, in 1962 Dr. King answers the question. It is found in his sermon’s title: “Now, let us begin by answering the question which our sermon topic raises: Can a Christian be a communist? I answer that question with an emphatic “no.” The two philosophies are diametrically opposed.”

Dr. King attend Crozer Theological Seminary it was a multi-denominational seminary. Where he earned his Bachelor of Divinity degree in 1951. It was here where he also became interested in Walter Rauschenbusch’s “social gospel.”

Walter Rauschenbusch was born in October 1861. He graduated from Rochester Theological Seminary of American Baptist Churches USA in 1886. While a student at the seminary his early teachings were challenged, He learned of higher criticism, which led him to comment later that his “inherited ideas about the inerrancy of the Bible became untenable.” He also began to doubt the substitutionary atonement; in his words, “it was not taught by Jesus; it makes salvation dependent upon a trinitarian transaction that is remote from human experience and implies a concept of divine justice that is repugnant to human sensitivity.” In 1917, his book *A Theology for the Social Gospel,* was published. In this book, he explains that Christians must be like the Almighty who became man in Jesus Christ, who was with everyone equally and considered people as a subject of love and service.

Social Gospel- A social movement within Protestantism that applied Christian ethics to social problems, especially issues of social justice such as economic inequality, poverty, crime, racial tensions, slums, unclean environment, child labor, lack of unionization, poor schools, and the dangers of war. It was most prominent in the early-20th-century in the United States and Canada. Theologically, the Social Gospelers sought to put into practice the Lord’s Prayer (Matthew 6:10) “Thy Kingdom come; thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven.” They typically are postmillennialist; that is, they believed the Second Coming could not happen until humankind rid itself of social evils by human effort. The Social Gospel was more popular among clergy than laity. Its leaders were predominantly associated with the liberal wing of the progressive movement, and most were theologically liberal, although a few were also conservative when it came to their views on social issues.

Now having a clearer understanding of Dr. King’s educational background and influencers along with a working definition of Social Gospel let’s read a few more exempts from Dr. King’s sermon on “Can a Christian be a Communist?” He continues explaining the tenets of communism and how the two “religions” are opposed to one another.

In the midst of his argument, he states “We must try to understand communism. We must love communist.” That is the Social Gospel according to Rauschenbusch and ascribed by Dr. King. He goes on to say “In other words, although communism can never be accepted by a Christian, it emphasizes many essential truths that must forever be challenged by us as Christians. Indeed, it may be that communism is a necessary corrective for a Christianity that has been all too passive and a democracy that has been all too inert.” Followed by: “Communism should challenge us to be more concerned about social justice.”

He then mentions Karl Marx’ grievance with religion “This is why Karl Marx one day looked out, and this is why others following him have looked out and decided to say, ‘Religion is the opiate of the people.’ It has too often been the opiate of the people. Too often the churches talk about a future good over yonder and not concerned about the present evil over here. Oh, I tell you this morning, and I believe in immortality. I believe in it firmly and absolutely. But I am tired of people telling me about the hereafter and they do not tell me about the here. You cannot say hereafter without saying here. It is all right to talk about silver slippers in a symbolic sense over in heaven but give me some shoes to wear down here. It is all right to talk about long white robes over yonder but give me some clothes to wear down here. It is all right to talk about streets flowing with milk and honey over yonder, but I want to see men living in decent homes right here in this world. It’s all right to talk about all these things in terms of a new Jerusalem, but I want to see a new Atlanta, a new New York, a new America, and a new world right here.”

I will stop here the intention is not talk against Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. it is simply to gain insight to those seeking.

Malcolm X stated the current condition better than anyone, where no one wins. His words are:

 The white liberal is the worst enemy of America, and the worst enemy to the black man…The liberal elements of whites are those who have perfected the art of selling themselves to the Negro. Getting sympathy of the Negro, getting the alliance of the Negro, and getting the mind of the Negro. Then the Negro sides with the white liberal, and the white liberal uses the Negro against the white conservative. So that anything that the Negro does is never for his own advancement, never for his own progress, he’s only a pawn I the hands of the white liberal.

**This is how the conversation ends**

At the conclusion of their talk Satan admits to God, that Job’s last days were better than his first, but such was not so with Marx. His wife died and as he puts it “he was beset with ‘chronic mental depression,’ he then died from Acute Bronchitis (Chest cold) with his last words being “Go on, get out! Last words are for fools who haven’t said enough!” Satan ends with a crooked smile of sorts saying, “Karl Marx was/is my kind of man!” One truth you forgot replied God, “Job lives with me, Karl Marx is still dead with you.”