Concordia Theological Monthly

Volume 5 Article 91

10-1-1934

Theological Observer. - Kirchlich-Zeitgeschichtliches

Wm. Arndt
Concordia Seminary, St. Louis

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholar.csl.edu/ctm

 Part of the Practical Theology Commons

Recommended Citation

Arndt, Wm. (1934) "Theological Observer. - Kirchlich-Zeitgeschichtliches," *Concordia Theological Monthly*: Vol. 5 , Article 91.
Available at: https://scholar.csl.edu/ctm/vol5/iss1/91

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Print Publications at Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. It has been accepted for inclusion in Concordia Theological Monthly by an authorized editor of Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. For more information, please contact seitzw@csl.edu.

Arndt: Theological Observer. - Kirchlich-Zeitgeschichtliches

Theological Observer. — Kirchlich-Zeitgeschichtliches.

I. Amerika.

Did the Lutheran Church Ever Teach This? — The *Lutheran Standard* of late has been publishing various articles on the question whether it is right for Christians to take part in warfare. In the issue of August 18 the Rev. H. Boening, writing under the caption "Conscience and War," upholds two views: 1. If a foreign army invades the continental United States, one ought to sanction a war of defense and participate as an armed combatant if possible. 2. Participation in any other kind of war is wrong. In enlarging on this position, he says: "If these statements reflected only my personal opinions, there would be no reason for publishing them here. I would live by them and hope that my sons will some day live by them, but I would not attempt to propagandize for them. They are opinions, however, which to me seem inevitably, unescapably, implied in all Christian thinking. I am willing to go so far as to say that I cannot see how any one can refuse to share them and still call himself a follower of the Prince of Peace. To my way of thinking our Church remains woefully remiss in an essential duty till it begins to embody them in its teachings. Consider what is involved in any other position: blind obedience to a government which may err, nothing less, — and till recently our Church taught just that. It is not four years since a young pastor asked one of our Districts, in convention assembled, to discuss the moral issues raised by pacifism. The District decided that it had no time for such a discussion. Mention of the subject was dismissed when the ranking official simply laid down the dictum: 'When war comes, we Christians obey and ask no questions. The responsibility is not ours.'"

We cannot help asking, When did the Lutheran Church ever teach blind obedience to a government which may err? That certain officials have blundered now and then in discussions of the questions involved we do not doubt; but to say that the Lutheran Church as such in past years placed in its ethical code a principle calling for blind obedience to the government is certainly an egregious misstatement. What our Church has always insisted on is that "we ought to obey God rather than men," Acts 5, 29. In the *Augsburg Confession* our fathers draw attention to this very passage, saying in Art. XVI: "Therefore Christians are necessarily bound to obey their own magistrates and laws, save only when commanded to sin; for then they ought to obey God rather than men, Acts 5, 29." This position certainly implies that, if any citizen is able to prove that a certain war in which his goverment engages is one of sheer aggression and hence sinful, he is in duty bound to refrain from participation in it. The difficulty lies in obtaining sufficient information to decide whether a certain war is just or unjust. When a citizen is in doubt as to the justice of a war which his government is carrying on, he ought to give his government the benefit of the doubt. This is putting into a few brief words just about everything that can be said on this subject. While searching discussions of all angles of the question of war and peace in

Published by Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary, 1934

Concordia Theological Monthly, Vol. 5 [1934], Art. 91

their relation to us Christians are perfectly legitimate, why must the Lutheran Church be misrepresented by her own sons while these discussions are in progress? A.

An Ominous Questionnaire of the "Lutheran Standard." — As we see from the number of July 7, the *Lutheran Standard* submitted five questions to its readers. They ran thus: "1. Do you favor substantial reductions in armaments even if the United States is compelled to take the initiative and make a proportionately greater reduction than other nations are yet willing to do? 2. Do you believe that the churches of America should now go on record as refusing to sanction or support any future war? 3. Are you prepared personally to state that it is your present purpose not to sanction any future war or participate as an armed combatant? 4. Do you favor a drastic limitation through the income tax and the removal of tax-exempt sources of the annual income that may be legally retained by an individual? 5. Which economic system appears to you to be the less antagonistic and more consistent with the ideals and methods of Jesus, capitalism or a cooperative commonwealth?"

Giving the history of this questionnaire, the editor of the *Standard*, Dr. Edward W. Schramm, writes: "I selected five of the fifteen questions used by Kirby Page, editor of the *World To-morrow*, in a questionnaire that was sent to the American clergy and to which about twenty-one thousand clergymen, including no small number of Lutherans, responded. The answers show that of all denominations the Lutheran clergy was the most conservative. When I studied the report of the Page questionnaire, I thought it would be worth while to try to ascertain the convictions of our Lutheran laymen on some of these issues. I was the more inclined to do so because I am deeply convinced of the need of our Lutheran Church *studying* the vital economic, social, and political issues of the day and offering its constituency sane, Scriptural guidance in the face of all the 'words without wisdom' that are being bandied about. Hence the questionnaire."

What are we to think of the course on which the *Standard* has launched? If the editor were propounding the above questions to a friend with whom he happens to be chatting in the shade of some spreading oak- or chestnut-tree, we should not object to it; since, however, in this matter he is not acting in the capacity of a private individual, but as the editor of a church-paper and the representative of a large Lutheran church-body, we cannot treat his questionnaire as a private matter in which he merely exercises his prerogative as an American citizen of the Lutheran Church. These questions very sharply bring before us the old issue whether the Church is to concern itself with political and social matters or not, whether it is to preach the present-day social gospel, whether it is to become the advocate of special "politico-social" tendencies, or whether it is simply to continue the old, time-honored work of preaching the Gospel of Jesus Christ. The *Standard* evidently feels that in the past the Lutheran Church has kept too much aloof from the discussion of social, economic, and political problems. In support of his course Dr. Schramm says: "I admit that it is most painful to lose sight of the distinction between Church and State or for one to lord it over the other. But I submit that Church and State cannot be kept in air-tight compartments

Arndt: Theological Observer. - Kirchlich-Zeitgeschichtliches

and completely isolated. Rendering unto God the things that are God's has something to do with rendering unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and unless we study some of the things that Caesar is doing and that our newspapers may be advocating and appraise these things in the light of God's Word and put to them the test question, 'What would Jesus have me do?' we may inadvertently be guilty of obeying men rather than God. Now the question: In the late World War we followed the principle of rendering unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's and sanctioned and espoused that war as a just war. Since our Government had declared war, and since our Confessions teach that Christians may engage in a just war, we gave the war our blessing. In the light of what we know about the justice of that war, did we do the will of God in taking part in that carnage, or was it only those we fought against who sinned? You know in every war, as in every divorce, there is sin on at least one side — usually both. In the last war, which was the just side and which the unjust? If we could repeat the experiences of recent years and were to-day to pass judgment on entering the World War, what would your decision be? Are munitions-makers, selfish, materialistic interests of one kind and another, to furnish all the information about war to our American people — and about the kind of economic system we should have? Are we Lutherans to leave the spiritual aspect of these things to the Modernists? Is it our God-given duty to keep so strictly to our last that we discuss the social order of Jesus' day, possibly of the time of the Reformation, but leave the discussion of the injustices and sins of our own day to our posterity two thousand years hence? Has the Gospel a message for the individual and absolutely nothing beyond that sphere? I know we must start with the individual, but does Jesus authorize us to stop there?"

There is much to say in reply. We are confident that Dr. Schramm is absolutely wrong when he intimates that the Lutheran Church gave the war that was waged in 1917—18 its blessing. It may be that some Lutheran synod at the time declared that our entrance into the war was right and God-pleasing, but we know that the Missouri Synod did not make any such declaration, and we are persuaded the Ohio Synod did not do it either. The last-named synods, it is true, did not brand the war as wicked and urge their members not to participate as combatants or in any other rôle, but neither did they espouse it as a worthy undertaking. There were ever so many individuals in these church-bodies who endorsed President Wilson's declaration of war; but let us be careful not to charge our church-bodies with having made such an endorsement.

In the second place, the editor entirely overlooks what the Church is able to do in the economic and political sphere. It has one source of wisdom on which it may and must draw — the Holy Scriptures. Where they speak, it also speaks; where they are silent, it must be silent, too. The Scriptures nowhere declare that it is wrong for Christians to engage in warfare. If we wish to continue as the Bible Church, such opposition to war as the modernistic pulpit and press are now manifesting cannot be participated in by our church-bodies. Does the Bible say that capitalism is an evil and must be supplanted by some brand of Socialism? Does it say which is the most equitable way of raising the money which

Published by Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary, 1934

Concordia Theological Monthly, Vol. 5 [1934], Art. 91

the Government requires for its work? Does it pronounce in favor of long or short working-hours? It lays down general principles which the Church is to teach and which, if followed, will ameliorate harassing conditions in this vale of tears; but the individual questions mentioned it does not decide. Could the Church conscientiously go on record as being opposed to the participation of its members in war? The Mennonites do because they say the Bible teaches such an attitude; but the Lutheran Church has always declared that such Bible-proof as the Mennonites advance for their position is a figment of their own manufacture. The Modernists can well say that as church-bodies they are opposed to all wars because they do not at all pretend to follow the Scriptures strictly and loyally. The Reformed church-bodies may with a show of right enter the political arena and declare against participation in war because, while they avow allegiance to the Scriptures, they definitely state that in their religious pronouncements they are also guided by reason. But how the Lutheran Church, with its profession of being a Bible Church, can consistently and conscientiously declare in favor of the attitude mentioned and thus authoritatively decide a moot politico-social question we are unable to grasp.

In the third place, the questionnaire of the *Standard* is a step in the direction of thisworldliness. What Jesus would have replied if a person had asked Him whether He might become a soldier we can easily see. He would have told him and his associates: "Seek ye first the kingdom of God and His righteousness. Whether you take part in a war or not is a comparatively small matter. What really counts is that you should be a child of the Father in heaven." What Paul would have replied to such a question we may see from 1 Cor. 7, 29 ff.: "But this I say, brethren, the time is short. It remaineth that both they that have wives be as though they had none; they that weep as though they wept not; and they that rejoice as though they rejoiced not; and they that buy as though they possessed not; and they that use this world as not abusing it; for the fashion of this world passeth away."

Finally, when the editor of the *Standard* asks, "Are we Lutherans to leave the spiritual aspect of these things to the Modernists?" we shall of course reply that what the Bible has to say on the questions under discussion must be taught by us, but that as churches we should not hesitate to leave to the Modernists the propaganda for the extra-Scriptural and (when participation in war is branded as sinful *per se*) anti-Scriptural politico-social theories. "Let the dead bury their dead; but go thou and preach the kingdom of God." Burying the dead is an important temporal service. It is one thing the spiritually dead are fit for; let them attend to it. Since the Modernists do not lead people to Christ and to eternal salvation, let us not grudge them such little service as they can render here on earth. At any rate, if we see that they as a quasi-political organization are apparently doing some good, let us not think that our churches also must become politico-social bodies. The *Lutheran Standard* in the past adhered to the great historic principles of the Lutheran Church in this realm. Let us hope that the present defection will prove to be momentary only. A.

Arndt: Theological Observer. - Kirchlich-Zeitgeschichtliches

The Evangelical-Reformed Union Hailed by the "Lutheran." So spoke the *Lutheran* in an editorial published July 5, 1934: "The *Lutheran* extends the good wishes of the United Lutheran Church to the newly formed Evangelical and Reformed Church. The union between these two Christian bodies has followed sincere prayer and patient study of conditions. The objective is more effective service to our Lord and the firmer establishment of His kingdom on earth. The advantages of union in economy and thoroughness of combined administration justify coalition where agreements have been reached. The fact of merging indicates that agreements have been reached. Good results should, and no doubt will, follow. We cordially greet our new neighbors." Are comments needed?

A.

The Character of the Evangelical Synod and the "Lutheran's" Greetings. — In the *Lutheran* of August 9 a valuable letter is published, which not only embodies important information on the character of the Evangelical Synod, but likewise is evidence that there are people left in the U. L. C. who are not willing to board the ship of unionism. The letter is sufficiently self-explanatory to be reprinted by us without further comments.

"In the issue of July 5, 1934, the *Lutheran* extends the good wishes of the United Lutheran Church in America to the newly formed Evangelical and Reformed Church. It is pointed out that this union has followed sincere prayer.

"Also in the *Lutheran* of July 12, 1934, there is an article, 'A Sister's Marriage,' emphasizing the fact that there are three hundred congregations which worship in the same church with the Reformed whose theology, admitted in this article, is liberal and modernistic.

"As a pastor of the United Lutheran Church in America, I cannot understand the attitude of the *Lutheran* regarding this merger. If it is true of the Reformed Church, *'Ihr habt einen andern Geist!'* then this expression of Dr. Luther is even more fitting for the Evangelical and Reformed Church.

"Considering the fact that the Evangelical Synod in its majority consists of pastors and members formerly Lutherans, who often were enticed to leave the Lutheran Church, claiming that the Evangelical Synod is just as Lutheran, I am at a loss to understand how any Lutheran Church can extend good wishes to a body which consistently drew her membership from Lutheran bodies.

"A member whom we took into our congregation recently told me that the Evangelical minister made the following statement to him when he tried to get this family into his congregation: 'I am just as Lutheran as the Lutheran pastor,' and this is not an exception. By this policy the Evangelical Synod and her congregations grew, hurting always Lutheran congregations and depriving Lutheran people of the pure doctrine.

"In the article 'A Sister's Marriage' wrong statements are made regarding the Evangelical Synod. She does not represent the old State Church of Prussia, though the Evangelical Synod always made this claim.

"In the State Church of Prussia a Lutheran pastor or congregation retained the Lutheran doctrine only; in the Evangelical Synod both the Lutheran and the Reformed have to be accepted.

Published by Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary, 1934

Concordia Theological Monthly, Vol. 5 [1934], Art. 91

"In the State Church of Prussia the Reformed congregation could be served only by a Reformed pastor and used the Heidelberg Catechism, while the Lutheran congregation could be served only by a Lutheran pastor and used Luther's Catechism, partaking in the Sacraments accordingly. In the Evangelical Synod the pastor is compelled to use the makeshift of the Evangelical Catechism. The Lutheran Catechism is forbidden!

"The Prussian State Church is a confederate union.

"The Evangelical Synod is an absorptive union.

"When this article claims that in the State Church of Prussia the two confessions existed side by side, it is correct for the State Church of Prussia, but absolutely wrong when applied to the Evangelical Synod.

"A hint is made that in the new Church a pastor may teach Luther's Small Catechism. That will be impossible, as this Catechism is used only in the creedal statement as a catch for Lutherans, but the Church is forbidden to teach it.

"The doctrinal basis of the Evangelical Synod as given in this article is correct as far as the old constitution goes. In 1927 this unchangeable creedal basis, in spite of constitutional fixation, was amended in order to join a merger with the United Brethren and the Reformed.

"Not to get too lengthy, let me just make a few statements which show why a Lutheran cannot extend good wishes to this new Church: —

"It is not sincere prayer that did it, but the Calvinistic-modernistic elements, with the sentiment: 'It does not matter what you believe.' An article in our daily newspaper, very likely inspired by Evangelical ministers, makes this statement: 'Without creed or constitution, except a simple plan of union, the new Church was formed.

"A Lutheran should have nothing to do with churches which are infested and ruled by Modernists, because they are enemies of the Triune God.

"If we believe that the Lutheran Church is the true Church, we cannot extend good wishes to any so-called Church which works against us and tears down what we build up.

"The attitude of the *Lutheran* hurts the prevailing sentiment of Lutherans for a united Lutheran Church.

"The *Lutheran* should discourage the prevailing tendency among some of the pastors of the United Lutheran Church in America to make common cause and express their sympathy with Calvinistic and modernistic groups. Either we are with our Lord, or we are against Him.

"The *Lutherischer Herold* brought a very short and a very fitting remark about this union: 'A strange name and a strange doctrinal basis for a union' (*Ein seltsamer Name und ein seltsames Bekenntnis fuer eine Vereinigung*).

"The writer knows what he is talking about. For more than twenty years he was pastor of the Evangelical Synod. Insisting on Luther's Catechism, he was persecuted, and finally, when he and his congregation of more than 750 souls unanimously did not accept the plan of union of four years ago (which did not contain any of the Lutheran or Reformed creeds, not even the Apostolic Creed), the congregation was split by Evangelical ministers. They deceived some of the members, induced them to go to court, and (by very questionable means) succeeded in taking

Arndt: Theological Observer. - Kirchlich-Zeitgeschichtliches

a beautiful church property away from a two-thirds majority which stuck to the Lutheran creeds as guaranteed by the constitution of the congregation.

"In spite of adverse times, hatred and slander, we succeeded by the grace of God in building a Lutheran church." A.

A Compliment, Though Hardly Meant As Such. — Among recent books which are discussed widely the work by H. Paul Douglass of the Institute of Social and Religious Research entitled *The Church Unity Movements in the United States* occupies a conspicuous place. The *Literary Digest* informs us that, according to this book, no one is so much opposed to unionism as Missouri Synod Lutherans. The book is based on information solicited from twenty thousand persons. Reviewing it, W. E. Garrison, literary editor of the *Christian Century*, writes: "Two hindrances to important and radical steps toward union are statistically demonstrable. One is that most denominations have so wide a spread between their pro- and antiunionists that precipitate action would simply pull them in two. Again, the 'sense of distance' between two denominations is often widely different, dependent on which way the measurement is taken. For example, Disciples feel very little sense of distance from Baptists, while Baptists feel a considerable sense of distance from Disciples; Quakers feel closer to other denominations than other denominations feel to them; everybody feels more cooperative toward Lutherans than Lutherans feel toward anybody. Practical steps toward union must wait for greater agreement within each denomination and a more balanced mutuality among them all." In the last sentence there is more wisdom than, we believe, the writer himself was aware. That union may divide instead of unite is shown by the example of the United Church of Canada. A.

Church Mergers during the Last Twenty-eight Years. — Dr. Samuel McCrea Cavert, executive secretary of the Federal Council, has drawn up this list of mergers of Protestant churches which occurred since 1906: —

"1906 — Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. and the Cumberland Presbyterian Church.

"1911 — Northern Baptist and the Free Baptist Church.

"1917 — Three Lutheran groups form the Norwegian Church in America.

"1918 — Three other Lutheran bodies form the United Lutheran Church.

"1920 — Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. and the Welsh Calvinistic Methodist Church.

"1922 — Evangelical Association and the United Evangelical Church.

"1924 — Reformed Church in the United States and the Hungarian Reformed Church.

"1924 — Congregational and the Evangelical Protestant churches.

"1931 — Congregational and Christian churches.

"1931 — Three Lutheran bodies merge into the American Lutheran Church.

"1934 — Evangelical Synod and the Reformed Church in the United States."

The world evidently has become union-minded. Let all followers of Jesus beware lest they desire to have bigness rather than the truth. A.

Published by Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary, 1934

Concordia Theological Monthly, Vol. 5 [1934], Art. 91

The Controversy on Chaplaincies in the Army. — In sectarian circles there is some excitement just now about the question whether it is right for Christian churches to furnish chaplains for the Army and Navy. It is argued that, since war is an ungodly matter and the army is an agency of war, Christian denominations that are opposed to war cannot consistently let their pastors serve this agency and receive pay for such service. You cannot, so runs the reasoning, be against an institution or tendency and at the same time support it. The Northern Presbyterians on this account have declared in favor of "a complete break with the whole war system." The Congregationalists, in their recent meeting at Oberlin, passed resolutions sternly condemning all war and considered the question whether they should not ask every one of their members to sign a pledge not to participate in any war that might arise. Going to such lengths, many of these people feel that the Federal Council of Churches should no longer have any hand in supplying the Army with chaplains. When Dr. Cavert, the general secretary of the Federal Council of Churches, in answer to criticisms, stated that the Federal Council was interested in chaplaincies in the Army because the spiritual needs of the soldiers had to be looked after and that, if chaplaincies were abolished, the churches would have to raise many thousands of dollars to provide other means of caring for the spiritual welfare of the enlisted men, the *Christian Century* made this hot rejoinder: "Surely Dr. Cavert can see that the ethical question of the chaplaincy is one thing and the Church's responsibility for the religious life of the soldiers is another. One is not a 'substitute' for the other. One is evil; the other is good. Even assuming that the churches would not provide religious guidance for soldiers and sailors, — an assumption in which we cannot concur, — it has no bearing whatever upon the duty of the Church to get out of the chaplaincy business. We know of no law of Christ which justifies the continuance of a course known to be evil because, forsooth, one is not willing to adopt a course known to be good. But the issue is not a matter of ethical dialectics. The highest ministry which the Christian Church can offer the souls of soldiers and sailors is just to let them know that, whatever may be said in condonation of war, the Christian Church cannot condone it or bless it or have any share in it."

We are alluding to this matter, not only for its own sake, but in order to point out what the social-gospel people, who are unionists of the deepest dye, consider proper and honorable in questions where their most-cherished sentiments and deepest convictions are involved. Here they will not endorse compromising and temporizing measures; on the contrary, they urge firmness and loyalty to what one conceives to be the truth. But in matters of doctrine, revealed to us in the Scriptures, they tell us we must take an altogether different course and not hesitate to look upon those as brethren who differ with us. Why be so strong and valiant in temporal things and so lukewarm in what is highest, in spiritual matters?

A.

The Congregationalists in Session. — In the latter part of June the Congregationalists, who after their merger with the Christian Church designate themselves "The General Council of the Congregational and Christian Churches," were in session in Oberlin, O. The outstanding feature

Arndt: Theological Observer. - Kirchlich-Zeitgeschichtliches

of the convention was the adoption of a resolution creating a new board, which is to be known as "The Council for Social Action." Evidently this is but another name for the "social gospel." According to the press reports the Congregationalists themselves describe the aims and motives which actuated them in establishing this new agency as follows: "In launching this Council for Social Action, we envisage a new kind of churchmanship, which, enlisting the volunteer services of a group of eighteen outstanding men and women of social vision, wisdom, and Christian purpose and commanding the services of five or six strong leaders in the fields of international relations, race relations, and economic statesmanship, will carry the campaign of education and action, based on careful research, out among our entire constituency at home and abroad. Believing that the Church will find itself as it loses itself in the struggle to achieve a warless, just, and brotherly world, we launch this venture, dedicating ourselves to unremitting work for the day in which all men will find peace, security, and abundant life." To make effective the propaganda against war, which at present is such a prominent topic in ecclesiastical circles, it was resolved to let the adult membership of the Church ballot on the question whether war may ever be considered justified and whether the individual should ever consent to render military service to his Government (the exact wording of the ballot, of course, has not yet been determined). Evidently these people are not willing to let much grass grow under their feet while they are furthering the interests of the social gospel. The great dictum of St. Paul "The kingdom of God is not meat and drink, but righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Ghost" is quietly put on the shelf as antiquated. — The well-known liberal Dr. S. Parkes Cadman was elected Honorary Moderator of the denomination, a position which was accorded only one man before him — Calvin Coolidge. A.

The Proposed Epworth League Pledge. — To what an extent the antimilitarism sentiment is sweeping our country may be seen from the new pledge which the Epworth Leagues of Southern California voted to submit to the Epworth League Council at its next meeting. It will be remembered that the Epworth League is the young people's organization of the Methodists. This is what these young Southern California Methodists think should be the pledge to be taken by every one who joins their ranks: "I pledge myself to put first in my life the building of God's cooperative community. I believe that this task demands of me the living of the highest New Testament ideals through the identification of myself with the disinherited and the workers of the world, whose struggle for justice leads to a classless society. I pledge myself to live Jesus' mandate of service by working for a social and economic order where power will be transferred from those who own to those who serve, where the basis of production will be for the use of the masses of mankind rather than the profit of the privileged few. I pledge myself to Jesus' mandate of brotherhood by permitting no barriers of race or social condition to limit my friendship with those who are the dispossessed of the present system. I pledge myself to the fulfilment of the true missionary spirit by refusing to take up arms against my brothers of other lands at the command of national rulers. In struggling against the oppressor, I pledge myself to avoid vindictiveness and hate, recognizing in my own

Published by Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary, 1934

Concordia Theological Monthly, Vol. 5 [1934], Art. 91

soul the element of greed and self-assertion which I condemn in him. I pledge my income, my talents, my time, and my life to bring to fulfilment a Christian world of equality, of service, of brotherhood and plenty. Only so can I adequately obey the command to feed the hungry and clothe the naked; only so can I help to bring to reality Jesus' prayer for His fellow-workers: 'Give us this day our daily bread.' Only through such living can I obey the command: 'Go ye into all the world and preach the Gospel.' Only so will I truly confess Jesus before God and man."

This is the social gospel, pure and simple. The real significance of Jesus is disregarded, but the ethics He taught is exalted, with an admixture of modern humanitarian philosophy. Conditions in the world are desperate, it is true; but to try to change them by letting the Church do the work of the State is as futile as calling on the aldermen instead of on the firemen to fight a fire in the city. A.

Debate on the Existence of God. — The *Christliche Apologete*, published in Cincinnati, reports that on March 17 and 18 Mrs. Amy Semple-McPherson-Hutton debated with Dr. Charles Lee Schmidt on the question whether there is a God. While in other cities the debate which these two people staged was attended by five to seven thousand people, in Cincinnati merely 2,500 came. The *Apologete* says that Dr. Schmidt played a rather lamentable rôle, relying chiefly on sarcasm and on abuse of religion and the Church. Mrs. Hutton, on the other hand, showed herself far better informed than her opponent and in wit, eloquence, and ready repartee easily surpassed him. It seems that for the two principals the affair was largely one of making money; for those who wished to hear them had to pay an admission charge. The writer in the *Apologete* confesses he cannot understand why anybody would give an unbeliever and mocker like Dr. Schmidt the opportunity of mouthing his blasphemies before an audience largely composed of Christians. And that is a point of view which certainly should be carefully considered. With respect to Mrs. Hutton he states that he is nonplused. Endowed with many talents, splendid oratorical gifts, indefatigable industry, and a magnetic personality, she at the same time through her personal life has brought shame upon the name of her exalted Savior. This is a case where we may apply "By their fruits ye shall know them." A.

A Tempest in Masonic Waters. — A little editorial in the *Christian Century* brings information on events in Masonic circles which makes interesting reading: —

"Christian churches are not the only bodies which have their troubles in trying to bring their principles with regard to racial distinctions into line with their practises. Newspaper reports from the Far East indicate that the Masonic lodges also at times find it hard to deal with the problem of the color-line. In commenting on recent developments in Masonic circles in China, the *China Weekly Review* begins by quoting from the article on Freemasonry in the eleventh edition of the *Encyclopedia Britannica*. This asserts that 'for many years the craft has been conducted without respect to clime, color, caste, or creed.' Then the *Review* goes on to tell of the trouble which has befallen the Masons in China, apparently because of the organization in Shanghai of a lodge containing both foreign and Chinese members. This lodge applied to the Grand Lodge of Massachusetts

Arndt: Theological Observer. - Kirchlich-Zeitgeschichtliches

for a charter and was denied it. Thereupon it applied to the Grand Lodge of the Philippines, where Masonry has had a rapid growth since the American occupation, and that application was granted. Subsequently lodges with mixed Occidental and Oriental membership were organized in Nanking and Canton, and these, too, were recognized by the Grand Lodge of the Philippines. Whereupon the jurisdictions in America, Scotland, and England debarred the Philippine Grand Lodge as well as the three new lodges in China. Because the entire affair has developed behind the veil of the order, it is impossible for outsiders to do more than guess at the causes. There have been Masonic lodges in China for ninety years. There is one lodge in Shanghai containing Chinese members. So there is apparently no effort to draw the color-line officially. But the Far Eastern press surmises that individual Occidental Masons in the East, belonging to the white 'die-hard' group to be found in any treaty port, have become alarmed at the possibility that, with the attainment of Filipino independence, the judicatory in the Philippines might place itself at the head of a movement to make Masonry in the Orient genuinely Oriental."

Rome the Originator of Religious Liberty in the United States? — When recently the founding of Maryland was celebrated, the Roman Catholic press of this country was quite energetic and emphatic in praising the founder of the Colony of Maryland, Lord Baltimore, a Roman Catholic, as the first great champion of religious liberty in our country. Adverting to these claims, Dr. C. B. Gohdes, writing in the *Lutheran Standard*, quite well says: —

"Whether the attempt to play the Roman Catholics up as the pioneers of religious tolerance when they founded the Colony of Maryland is based on infinite gall or on ignorance of history matters not. The fact is that the Calverts, when they founded Maryland, had no choice in the matter of tolerance. England had disposed of the Pope over a hundred years before Maryland was founded; Virginia in the South was the home of uncompromising Episcopalians; all the colonies to the north of it — Connecticut, Rhode Island, New Plymouth, Massachusetts — were Puritan to the core. With the Catholic founders of Maryland it was a question of themselves being tolerated; the practise of intolerance against Protestants would have been the end of the Calverts and their fellow-Catholics in the colony. We have no doubt that the founders of Maryland were better than their Church. On the other hand, there is no doubt that Rome would have had its intolerant way in Maryland as elsewhere had its hands not been tied by the fact that Popery was outnumbered and outlawed in England three centuries ago. The Catholics, when they tolerated others in the Maryland Colony, were tolerant not from choice, but from necessity." A.

"Friends" of the Public Schools. — A perfectly well-intended movement has been launched under the name of "Friends of the Public Schools" which seems to have in it the seeds of more embarrassment than help to the schools. The ostensible motive of this enterprise is to bring about "a fellowship, a spiritual understanding, a loose union, among those who believe in the ideals and principles on which this nation and the States were established." Its ultimate objectives are the separation of Church and State (which is already pretty well established), the defense of the

Published by Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary, 1934

Concordia Theological Monthly, Vol. 5 [1934], Art. 91

proposition that education is the function of the State (which is false if it means the function of the State exclusively), and the withdrawal of public funds from sectarian schools (which is, in general, a very good thing). The immediate objective is to secure the signatures of a large number of persons to a pledge "to select as representatives in government those who have been educated in the public schools particularly during their early years." It requires scarcely a second glance to discern that this is not really a proposal for a "spiritual understanding," but for a boycott at the polls against all who have been educated in parochial schools. The last phrase of the pledge, "particularly during their early years," makes it clear that graduates of denominational colleges need not fear any discrimination if they are otherwise unobjectionable. It is the parochial schools that the organizers are after. There are a good many things, not all complimentary, that may be said about parochial schools as seen from the Protestant point of view, but whatever defects they may have, this is not the way to cure them. Happily, it is as certain as anything can well be that no great number of voters will join in any such boycott. — *Christian Century.*

II. Ausland.

Trauriger Unglaube. Die „Freireligiöse (deutsch-katholische) Gemeinde Dresden" hatte für Palmsonntag 1934 zur „Konfirmation" in den großen Saal der Dresdner Kaufmannschaft eingeladen. Berechtigt zum Eintritt waren nur die Inhaber von Einladungskarten. Was sich dort unter den Hakenkreuz- und schwarzweißroten Fahnen links und rechts vom Podium vor einem „altgermanischen Flammenbecken" unter den 500 Teilnehmern vollzog, stand den früheren marxistischen „Jugendweihen" an Nachäffung kirchlicher Zeremonien und Gebräuche in nichts nach: braungetarntes Freidenkertum! Es fehlte nicht die bei uns Evangelischen übliche „Konfirmationsrede", die als die drei Säulen eines freireligiösen Lebens Freiheit, Wahrheit und Kraft pries. Der Leiter dieses im Bunde mit der „Arbeitsgemeinschaft der Deutschen Glaubensbewegung" stehenden Kreises richtete an die erschienenen 46 „Konfirmanden" auch die drei Konfirmationsfragen der Kirche, deren Inhalt natürlich mit Christentum nichts zu tun hatte. Diese Fragen wurden, wieder unter Nachahmung des evangelischen Brauches, mit „Ja, das wollen wir" beantwortet. Darauf wurden die Kinder auch durch Handschlag verpflichtet, und der Leiter gab ihnen im Gegensatz zum religiös-kirchlichen einen weltlichen Spruch mit auf den Lebensweg. Die Nachahmung der feierlichen Konfirmation erreichte aber ihren Höhepunkt in der Aufnahme der „Konfirmanden" in die „Freireligiöse Gemeinde" mit der jedes christliche Empfinden verletzenden Formel: „So nehme ich euch auf in die ‚Freireligiöse Gemeinde' im Namen des Vorstandes und der Gemeinde." — Arme, irregeleitete Eltern! Noch ärmere Kinder!

(Ev.-Luth. Freikirche aus Heimatglocken.)

Dr. Gustav Adolf Warneck Centenary. — Protestant Christians the world over may well pause for a few minutes in their regular activities to recall that one of the greatest missionary leaders the Church has produced was born one hundred years ago. The outward life of Warneck, who was a Lutheran of the mediating type, offers no aspects that are startling. Coming from a humble home and having been trained

Arndt: Theological Observer. - Kirchlich-Zeitgeschichtliches

for the ministry in Halle, where he largely procured his daily bread by his own labor, he first served as pastor for nine years and then spent a triennium in the employ of the Rhenish Mission Society of Barmen, a work which was cut short by ill health. Next there followed twenty-two years of pastoral labors near Eisleben, where he began a marvelous literary activity in behalf of missions, which soon placed him in the front ranks of authorities in this field. When in 1891 he retired from the active ministry and removed to Halle, he was made honorary professor of the Department of Missions, a position which he occupied for twelve years. For thirty-seven years he was the editor of the important journal *Allgemeine Missionszeitschrift*, which he had founded. His writings, which deal with the various phases of mission endeavor, are very numerous. Among the best-known are *Missions in the Light of the Bible; Missions in the Schools; The Doctrine of Missions*, a work comprising three volumes; *Outline History of Protestant Missions, from the Time of the Reformation to the Present*. He died in 1910. We are not asserting too much when we say that in the last century there have been few, if any, men who have had such a stimulating influence on all aspects of mission endeavors as this devout minister. A.

The Theosophical Society Has a New Head. — *The Hindu*, printed in Madras, India, a copy of which was kindly sent us by Missionary E. H. Meinzen, enables us to submit some information pertaining to the Theosophical Society. Last June an election was held in Madras for president of the society, at which Dr. George Sydney Arundale received 15,604 votes as against 4,825 cast for the other candidate, Mr. Ernest Wood. Dr. Arundale thus becomes the successor of the late Mrs. Besant. In his first message the new president says among other things: "What have you the right to expect, perhaps the duty to expect, from your president? First, that he will keep wide open the doors of the Theosophical Society to all who accept the principle of brotherhood in the terms of the First Object and who are prepared to do their best to live it. The society is in no way concerned with the beliefs or opinions of those who seek membership, any more than it is concerned with the beliefs and opinions of those who are already members. These, whether private or public, are their own affair exclusively. But the society is surely concerned that each member shall be a source of good will, understanding, and solidarity and not a source of constant discord. In the interests of its own self-preservation the society has the duty to expect that members will so live that all outer differences of belief and opinion and mode of living which naturally and rightly separate them shall tend to strengthen, and not to weaken, the inner and indissoluble tie of the One Life which all share and which is the very heart itself both of theosophy and of the Theosophical Society. May I in this connection venture to suggest that in *The Golden Stairs* of H. P. Blavatsky we have a perfect description of that solidarity amidst difference which members of the society should ever seek to maintain." Continuing, he promises that he will "encourage in all possible ways the youth of the world to perceive in theosophy a highroad to truth, to freedom, and to happiness."

That the teachings of the Theosophical Society are just as antichristian as they are vague has often been pointed out and is confirmed

Published by Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary, 1934

Concordia Theological Monthly, Vol. 5 [1934], Art. 91

by the above quotations. Our readers may be interested in knowing that the new president of the Theosophical Society was born in Surrey, England, in 1878, and was educated largely in Wiesbaden, Germany. He likewise studied in Cambridge and Paris. In 1895 he joined the Theosophical Society and by and by gave himself over to educational endeavors in India. In 1913 he accompanied Mr. Krishnamurti (once hailed as the Messiah) and his brother to Europe to help them in their education. In 1925, strange to say, he became a priest and bishop in the Liberal Catholic Church. Thus the basis on which he stands is wide enough to accept everybody without change of belief and, we add with a sad heart, to save nobody. A.

An Interesting Archeological Find in Rome. — Under the caption "The First Church?" the *Commonweal* reports as follows on some remarkable work done by archeologists in Rome: "Another archeological romance was brought to a successful conclusion when a workman's pick, digging at one of the supporting crypts now under construction at St. John Lateran, struck an adjoining fourth-century wall. Scholarly persons then identified this masonry as part of what is termed 'the first church.' This remark does not mean that edifices had not been used earlier for ecclesiastical services. Indeed, it is more than likely that in certain eastern regions the Christian community had actually built and decorated 'churches' of its own. But owing to the Roman persecutions religious worship was largely driven underground; and it was not until 319 that building, abetted by the Emperor Constantine and the Empress Helena, was possible on a larger scale. Seven churches were erected under Constantine, one for each of the Roman hills. Of these only St. John Lateran can be identified as belonging to the period. Originally the basilica was known as San Salvatore, the present name dating back to the ninth century. Sacked by Genseric the Vandal, the church was later ruined also by an earthquake and several fires. Little that is visible remains of the era of Constantine, far less than can be seen from the same period at Trier [Treves] for example. It is reported that the newly discovered masonry will be carefully disinterred and preserved." A.

Anglican Bishops Decide against the Admission of Unitarians to Anglican Pulpits. — When Dr. L. P. Jacks, the well-known editor of the *Hibbert Journal*, a Unitarian, was permitted to speak in an Anglican church in Birmingham, England, a storm was caused, many of the Anglican clergy and laity expressing their dissatisfaction with the ultraliberal attitude exhibited in Birmingham. Since this city belongs to the territory which is under the jurisdiction of the convocation of York, the matter was discussed by the bishops who are under the supervision of the Archbishop of York (Dr. Temple). The bishops declared the admission of Unitarian preachers into Anglican pulpits a step which weakens the testimony of their Church to the deity of Christ, and hence they refused to give it their sanction. — While we rejoice to hear that these Anglican leaders wish to adhere to the fundamental doctrine of the deity of Jesus Christ, the question arises in our mind why they tolerate in their own midst many a teacher who in his theology hardly differs from Dr. Jacks. The report does not say that they paid any attention to this aspect of the situation. A.

Arndt: Theological Observer. - Kirchlich-Zeitgeschichtliches

Primitive Denkweise. Dr. phil. et jur. Sutan G. Mulia, ein christlicher Batak, gebürtig aus Sumatra, Mitglied des Parlaments von Niederländisch-Indien und der Unterrichtsabteilung in Batavia, hat in einer umfangreichen Doktordissertation (1933, Universität Leiden) sich zu der heute heiß umstrittenen Frage, ob der menschliche Geist bei den Primitiven grundsätzlich verschieden von dem Denkvermögen höherstehender Völker sei (Lévy-Bruhl), folgendermaßen geäußert: „Das Denken von weniger entwickelten Völkern zeigt im allgemeinen dieselben Merkmale wie das moderne Denken; es unterscheidet sich nur graduell von ihm. Die Ausbildung des Denkvermögens ist bei den Naturvölkern infolge gewisser Lebensumstände zurückgeblieben. Der Begriff Primitivität hat also einen relativen Charakter." Die Schlußfolgerung seiner auf den neuesten wissenschaftlichen Stand geführten Untersuchung, die auf 179 Seiten die gesamte neuere, in vier Sprachen erschienene europäische Literatur berücksichtigt, führt zur Anerkennung „der adeligen Herkunft des primitiven Denkens, weil es wie das wissenschaftliche Denken Ausdrucksform eines und desselben göttlichen Geistes ist. Wir müssen also das primitive Denken sub specie aeternitatis (im Licht der Ewigkeit) ansehen". — Dieses Zeugnis ist um so bedeutsamer, als Dr. Mulia sich ausdrücklich zu dem Volk der Batak rechnet, „das sich noch vor wenigen Jahrzehnten im Naturzustand befand und in gewissem Sinne die Primitivität heute noch nicht überwunden hat", gleichzeitig aber mehrere europäische Sprachen spricht und eingehende pädagogisch-psychologische Studien gemacht hat. (Allg. Missionsnachrichten.)

Are Anglicans Preparing to Yield? — According to Dr. Shillito, the correspondent of the *Christian Century*, who writes from London, there is a strong movement on foot in Anglican circles to recognize the Sacraments of Dissenters as valid and to admit that the episcopacy is not essential for the existence of the Church. A declaration in which views of this nature were set forth was signed by five bishops and by other representative men, such as Deans Inge, Hewlett, Johnson, and W. R. Matthews. We quote the sentences of the document which Dr. Shillito's account supplies: "We acknowledge that divine grace is imparted not only through the Sacraments of the Church of England, but also through those of the free churches. We do not recognize the distinction sometimes drawn in this connection between 'covenanted' and 'free' grace. We accept episcopacy as of the *bene esse*, and not as of the *esse*, of the Church, and we do not regard acceptance of this method of church order as implying any particular theory or interpretation of it or any view of its dominical authority. We make no exclusive claim for it as regards the grace of God. We hope that it may commend itself to the free churches as a method of church order of ancient tradition and historic value, and we believe that with the device of constitutional safeguards and the organization of synodical institutions, in which the clergy and laity would play their due part, the system of episcopacy is still the wisest and most efficient form of church order." Whether these views will be generally accepted, or whether they will remain mere private gestures, will have to be seen.

A.

The Church of Christ in Siam. — Church mergers such as we have been reading about these last months are not confined to the United States. The religious press informs us that in far-away Siam Presbyterians and

Published by Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary, 1934

Concordia Theological Monthly, Vol. 5 [1934], Art. 91

Baptists and probably other Protestants have joined hands and have established a united Church, whose basis naturally is very broad. What is prescribed for membership is merely acceptance of the constitution. "The original standards of faith and practise" of any individual church-body may be retained, provided they do not militate against the constitution. While the church policy adopted is Presbyterian, owing to the preponderance of Presbyterians among the Protestants of Siam, Baptists are expressly welcomed, as is shown by the official interpretation of the constitution to the effect that the article of membership is understood "to guarantee to such churches as practise the baptism of believers only a continuance of that practise." The majority of Protestants in Siam have joined the new body; the Anglicans and Christian and Missionary Alliance people, however, are said to remain aloof. A.

Baptist World Convention Met in Berlin. — From the daily papers most of our readers undoubtedly obtained the information that the world meeting of Baptists was held in Berlin, Germany, this summer. What happened at that convention is well summarized in an editorial of the *Christian Century*, which we herewith submit: —

"Free speech had been guaranteed to the Baptists before they decided to carry out the plan of having the meeting of their world congress in Berlin. The promise was faithfully fulfilled, and the visiting delegates took full advantage of it — not, in so far as one may judge from the press reports, in any spirit of bravado or with any desire to show discourtesy to their hosts, but to bear witness to the traditional Baptist devotion to the freedom of the Church. They listened to Dr. Mueller's exposition of Luther's desire for 'a unified and established Protestant Church for the whole *Reich* with a hierarchy of bishops headed by a primate' and his assertion that Germany's internal troubles, including presumably its religious difficulties, were no concern of outsiders and to an anti-Semitic Nazi Baptist's explanation that, while all races are equal in the sight of God, a government has to protect itself from a race that is 'destructive by nature.' Then it passed resolutions as pointed and as specific as though they had been formulated in Providence or Louisville, denouncing discrimination against the Jews and denying the right of the State to interfere in the government of the Church and demanding the universal abrogation of war and the substitution of a commonwealth of nations for unrestrained nationalist ambition. It was wholesome doctrine, which must have been heard gladly by a good many Germans who could not safely have uttered it themselves. Press reports state that the German papers printed only those speeches and parts of resolutions which were favorable to the government's policies." A.

Regarding Indulgences. — During the "grand pardon of Chaumont," which takes place in Chaumont, France, whenever the feast of the Nativity of St. John the Baptist occurs on Sunday, a plenary indulgence is accorded to those who under given conditions visit the Church of St. John. This year ninety-eight thousand pilgrims, led by His Eminence Achille Cardinal Lienart, Bishop of Lille, visited the church. Chaumont, in Champagne, General Pershing's headquarters during the war, has a population of about ten thousand. — *The Commonweal.*