

12-1-1939

## Theological Observer. - Kirchlich-Zeitgeschichtliches

F. H. Brunn

*Concordia Seminary, St. Louis*

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



Part of the [Practical Theology Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Brunn, F. H. (1939) "Theological Observer. - Kirchlich-Zeitgeschichtliches," *Concordia Theological Monthly*. Vol. 10 , Article 92.

Available at: <https://scholar.csl.edu/ctm/vol10/iss1/92>

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](mailto:seitzw@csl.edu).

---

## Theological Observer — Kirchlich-Zeitgeschichtliches

---

**The Present Status of the Discussions of the Missouri Synod with the American Lutheran Church. — Preconvention Events.** The convention of the Missouri Synod assembled at Cleveland in 1935 resolved to declare its willingness to confer with other Lutheran bodies on problems of Lutheran union with a view to effecting true unity on the basis of the Word of God and the Lutheran Confessions. The convention instructed the President of Synod to appoint a committee of five to be known as the Committee on Lutheran Union.

This committee met in conference with the Fellowship Committee of the American Lutheran Church for an analysis and a comparison of the doctrinal position of the American Lutheran Church and the Missouri Synod. The *Brief Statement* of the Missouri Synod and the *Minneapolis Theses* of the American Lutheran Church provided unquestionably reliable presentations of the doctrinal positions of the two church-bodies and made comparisons possible. In connection with these two documents also the *Intersynodical (Chicago) Theses* were discussed. It was fortunate for the commissioners of the Missouri Synod that there was no need on their part of drafting articles of agreement which might be suspected of containing compromises concurred in behind the closed doors of the conference-room. The result of these discussions was that the American Lutheran Church commissioners found themselves in agreement with the *Brief Statement* except in several minor points.

The *Brief Statement* had been tacitly approved by the Wisconsin Synod. At the drafting of the *Intersynodical (Chicago) Theses* the Wisconsin Synod had participated by sending several delegates. Participation of the Wisconsin Synod in the discussions with the A. L. C. would have been desirable, and in fact at the first meeting of our Missouri Synod Committee we spoke of asking members of the Wisconsin Synod to take part in the work that was to be done. However, we as a Committee did not feel authorized to approach members of the Wisconsin Synod in this undertaking. We hoped that, as the discussions progressed and the results so far obtained were communicated by our Synod to the Wisconsin Synod, the latter would find it possible to join us. Needless to say, we should have been happy to have members of the other Synodical Conference synods present also.

In the sixth conference of the two committees, each conference extending over two days, the commissioners of the American Lutheran Church presented a set of statements which is known as the *Declaration of the American Lutheran Church*. In this *Declaration* the American Lutheran Church declares its agreement with the doctrines presented in the *Brief Statement*, with the exception of five points, — those dealing with the visible side of the Church, Antichrist, the conversion of Israel, the thousand years, and the resurrection of the martyrs, concerning which five points the Missouri Synod officially declared that the position taken in the *Declaration* need not be divisive of church-fellowship. Besides these chiefly eschatological matters the *Declaration* also contains

paragraphs on Scripture and inspiration, universal plan of salvation, predestination and conversion, the office of the public administration of the means of grace, and the doctrine of Sunday. Regarding these doctrines the *Declaration* expressly acknowledges the correctness of the *Brief Statement*. The commissioners of the American Lutheran Church, however, were of the opinion that it would be well in part to supplement the *Brief Statement* and in part to emphasize those points that seemed essential. The supplementation consisted in stating that saving grace is not irresistible, to which we all agree, and in stressing the human element in the doctrine of inspiration, a matter which is not in controversy.

This *Declaration* declares that, with the exception of the five points noted, its authors are in full agreement with the *Brief Statement*. This *Declaration* has been attacked because to some it seemed superfluous if it really agreed with the *Brief Statement*. But, after all, is it not more satisfactory to have explicit statements on doctrines that have been in controversy than merely to have a signature to the *Brief Statement*? Others would have considered a mere signature without any explanatory words quite insufficient. Corroborating the acceptance of the *Brief Statement* by amplifying statements which supplement and emphasize certain points in doctrines that once were controversial or are of special importance is certainly not without merit. And the course of the A. L. C. commissioners in informing the Church that divergent views concerning the five points are held by some of their members was the only honorable one to pursue. The complete text of the *Declaration* may be found in the *Proceedings of the Thirty-seventh Regular Convention of the Missouri Synod* and in the January, 1939, number of the CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY.

*The Conventions of 1938.* To the convention of the Missouri Synod which met at St. Louis in June, 1938, the Committee on Lutheran Union presented its report embodying the *Declaration of the American Lutheran Church*. This report had been printed in the book of overtures and thus made accessible to the whole membership of Synod. Synod's Convention Committee No. 16 took the report under advisement, studied it thoroughly, announced several public hearings, and then presented a set of resolutions for discussion on the floor of Synod. Adopting the resolutions, Synod expressed gratitude to God for the guidance of the Holy Spirit by which the points of agreement had been reached and also implored God's further guidance toward the consummation of the efforts to bring about church-fellowship between the two bodies. Synod declared that the *Brief Statement* of the Missouri Synod together with the *Declaration* of the representatives of the American Lutheran Church and the provisions of the entire Report of Committee No. 16 be regarded as the doctrinal basis for future fellowship between the Missouri Synod and the American Lutheran Church. Synod instructed its Committee on Lutheran Union to endeavor to establish full agreement also in the five points in which agreement had not yet been reached. Synod also insisted on agreement in practice as necessary for the establishment of true unity.

Several other necessary prerequisites were included in Synod's resolutions, such as the establishment of doctrinal agreement between the other church-bodies belonging to the American Lutheran Conference and our Synod and the approval of this whole matter by the synods constituting the Synodical Conference. Synod encouraged conferences between pastors of the two church-bodies. The exact and complete wording of Synod's resolutions may be found in *Proceedings of the Thirty-seventh Regular Convention of our Synod* and in the January, 1939, issue of the *CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY*. For the convenience of the reader this summary has been inserted here.

Four months later, in the month of October, the convention of the American Lutheran Church was held in Sandusky, O. At this convention the commissioners who had conferred with the representatives of the Missouri Synod presented their report. The convention adopted the following resolutions as reported by the C. T. M. in the January issue of 1939, page 59. For the sake of new readers we once more reprint them.

**"Resolved:**

"1. That we raise our grateful hearts and voices to the Triune God, thanking His mercy for the guidance of the Holy Spirit by which the points of agreement have been reached.

"2. That we declare the *Brief Statement* of the Missouri Synod together with the *Declaration* of our commission a sufficient doctrinal basis for church-fellowship between the Missouri Synod and the American Lutheran Church.

"3. That, according to our conviction and the resolution of the Synod of Missouri passed at its convention in St. Louis, the aforementioned doctrinal agreement is the sufficient doctrinal basis for church-fellowship, and that we are firmly convinced that it is neither necessary nor possible to agree in all non-fundamental doctrines. Nevertheless we are willing to continue the negotiations concerning the points termed in our *Declaration* as 'not divisive of church-fellowship' and recognized as such by the Missouri Synod's resolutions, and instruct our Commission on Fellowship accordingly.

"4. That we understand why the Missouri Synod is for the time being not yet ready to draw the logical conclusion and immediately establish church-fellowship with our Church. We, however, expect that henceforth by both sides the erection of opposition altars shall be carefully avoided and that just coordination of mission-work shall earnestly be sought.

"5. That we believe that the *Brief Statement* viewed in the light of our *Declaration* is not in contradiction to the *Minneapolis Theses*, which are the basis of our membership in the American Lutheran Conference. We are not willing to give up this membership. However, we are ready to submit the aforementioned doctrinal agreement to the other members of the American Lutheran Conference for their official approval and acceptance.

"6. That, until church-fellowship has been officially established, we encourage the pastors of both church-bodies to meet in smaller groups

in order to discuss both the doctrinal basis for union and the question of church practice.

"7. That we humbly pray to the Lord of the Church that He might guide the course of both church-bodies so that we may be led to the establishment of full fellowship as an important contribution to the unity of our dear Lutheran Church in America.

"8. That we commend our commission for its painstaking and thorough work and hereby accept and ratify the report with sincere appreciation and thanks."

*The Developments since the Conventions.* When there resolutions of the American Lutheran Church were published, three clauses arrested general attention in the Missouri Synod and in the synods in fellowship with Missouri. They not only arrested attention, but also aroused much apprehension. These three clauses are: "It is neither necessary nor possible to agree in all non-fundamental doctrines"—"The *Brief Statement* viewed in the light of the *Declaration* is not," etc.—"We are not willing to give up this membership," i.e., in the American Lutheran Conference.

When the Committee on Lutheran Union and the Fellowship Commission of the American Lutheran Church met in January, 1939, to face the situation that had been created by the adoption of the resolutions mentioned, the representatives of the American Lutheran Church were at once confronted with inquiries about the implications of these three clauses. Answers were frankly given, but it was deemed proper to formulate the replies carefully in writing in order to make them available for quotation.

In the mean time another question had been added by some members of the Synodical Conference as to the meaning of a phrase in this sentence of the *Declaration*: "To this end He also purposes to justify those who have come to faith." Some feared that these words implied or permitted the teaching of justification *post fidem* and excluded objective, or universal, justification. It was agreed that all questions be submitted in writing and a reply be formulated by the American Lutheran Church commissioners.

This reply was received in the course of time and was thoroughly discussed in a meeting of both committees held at Chicago, September 29 and 30. While it is regrettable that this reply could not be published much sooner, it must be remembered that the members of both committees, on account of their regular work, find it difficult to arrange meetings. We hope that the publication of the reply will allay at least some of the apprehensions of the brethren.

We now present the "Reply of the Commissioners of the American Lutheran Church" together with the reaction of the Committee on Lutheran Union of the Missouri Synod.

The A. L. C. commissioners made this statement:

"With reference to the meaning of the *Declaration* of the American Lutheran Church commissioners as well as of the 'Sandusky Resolutions' of the American Lutheran Church, several questions had been raised

within the Missouri Synod. These questions were submitted to the commissioners of the American Lutheran Church by the representatives of the Missouri Synod.

"1. The first question referred to the statement in our *Declaration* (II, A): 'To this end He also purposes to justify those who have come to faith.' It was asked just when this justification takes place, whether immediately after man has come to faith or later. The answer was, of course, in the same moment in which man comes to faith."

The Committee on Lutheran Union approved of this reply. The members of the Committee are convinced from oral and printed statements that the A. L. C. commissioners teach objective, or universal, justification, the doctrine that God has already in Christ absolved all the world of its sins. While discussing this paragraph the A. L. C. commissioners once more declared formally "that we adhere to the doctrine of objective, or universal, justification."

2. The "Reply" states further:

"The second question pertained to the statement in the 'Sandusky Resolutions' (cf. *Minutes*, p. 255) in Section 3: 'We are firmly convinced that it is neither necessary nor possible to agree in all non-fundamental doctrines.' It was asked whether it was not true that all Scripture doctrines are binding, whether they are fundamental or non-fundamental. The answer was, to be sure, everything that the Scripture teaches is God's Word and therefore binding.

"This statement was included in our 'Sandusky Resolutions' because Point 3 of the St. Louis 'Resolutions' could be understood as meaning that for the time being the *Declaration* given was sufficient and disagreement in these well-known points (the visible side of the Church, Pope, thousand years, conversion of Jews, resurrection of the martyrs) was to be tolerated, but that actual establishment of church-fellowship could not take place until agreement even in these points was reached. While we are ready to continue the discussions on these points, certainly the erection of church-fellowship should not be made contingent on the result of these deliberations; church-fellowship is justifiable and can be practiced even if no agreement is reached in these points."

The Committee on Lutheran Union received with approval the statement: "Everything that Scripture teaches is God's Word and therefore binding." It was frankly stated that the assertion of the "Sandusky Resolutions" quoted above is ambiguous. Non-fundamental doctrines are just as binding as fundamental doctrines. God absolutely wants complete agreement on everything He says in His holy Word, and it ever remains our bounden duty to strive for complete agreement. To our great sorrow it is not always possible to attain such complete agreement because of human weakness. To this position the commissioners of the A. L. C. agreed, as appears from the above.

3. The "Reply" continues:

"The third question referred to the fifth statement in the 'Sandusky Resolutions' (p. 255): 'That we believe that the *Brief Statement* viewed in the light of our *Declaration* is not in contradiction to the *Minneapolis*

*Theses.* An explanation of the phrase 'viewed in the light of our *Declaration*' was asked for. The answer was: This phrase says three things: 1. In regard to the question concerning the essence of the Church, the Antichrist, the conversion of the Jews, the physical resurrection of the martyrs, and the reign of a thousand years mentioned in Rev. 20, we accept the *Brief Statement* of the doctrinal position of the Missouri Synod only with the limitations set forth in our *Declaration*. 2. In regard to the other points mentioned in our *Declaration* we accept the corresponding points of doctrine in the *Brief Statement* as they are either 'supplemented' in our *Declaration* or 'emphasized as to those points which seemed essential to us.' Thus the doctrine of the Holy Scriptures has been supplemented in our *Declaration* with reference to the human factor, and in the doctrine of Election and Conversion those points have been emphasized which seemed essential to us. 3. In regard to the *Brief Statement* in general this phrase intends to say that we are conscious of our agreement with the 'points of doctrine' contained therein, without, however, on our part, sharing the exegetical or other lines of argumentation in every individual case and without being obligated in every case to employ the same terminology."

The comment of the commissioners of the Missouri Synod on this part of the "Reply" was as follows:

"This means, of course, that the A. L. C. has accepted the *Brief Statement*, excepting what they have already excepted in the *Declaration*. Some may later abuse this statement so as to eliminate the *Brief Statement* as a part of the basis for doctrinal agreement. We are not responsible for such abuse."

4, a. The "Reply" continues:

"Perhaps the above can be further illustrated in addition to what has been said.

"With the *Brief Statement* we hold that before the Fall, Adam had a knowledge that enabled him to designate the animals with names that corresponded to their being; but we do not believe it to be a Biblical point of doctrine 'that he was endowed with a truly scientific knowledge of nature'; much less do we hold that the rejection of this sentence as an overstatement is divisive of fellowship."

The statement of the commissioners of the Missouri Synod with regard to this section of the "Reply":

"We hold that the *Brief Statement* is not in error when it says that Adam was endowed with a truly scientific knowledge of nature because the phrase means that he was endowed with a true and thorough understanding of nature. However, we agree that the non-acceptance of the word 'scientific' is not divisive of church-fellowship."

4, b. The "Reply" continues:

"We understand the sentence in Section 21 "These means of grace are the Word of the Gospel . . . and the Sacraments," etc.; and we grant of course that grace is communicated through the Gospel and not through the Law, but on our part we are accustomed to use the terminology "the Word and the Sacraments are the means of grace," while we

understand of course that the Law is merely preparatory and only the Gospel communicates grace."

This part of the "Reply" is still under discussion.

4, c. The "Reply" continues:

"With the *Brief Statement* (Section 21) we, of course, confess that the effect of the Lord's Supper is 'none other than the communication and sealing of the forgiveness of sins'; but we do not take the words 'none other than' in a sense so exclusive as to deem it disruptive of fellowship if some one felt justified on the basis of Holy Scripture to assume an additional effect beyond this primary one."

The Committee on Lutheran Union asked the A. L. C. commissioners this question:

"If the additional effect referred to is sanctification in the narrow sense, etc., it expresses a self-evident truth; if some other effect is meant, what can that be?"

In reply to this question it was stated by the A. L. C. commissioners that other effects of Holy Communion are that the Sacrament nurtures our spiritual life, unites us more intimately with Christ, confirms the oneness of the body of Christ, which is the Church, and demonstrates this oneness before the world. The question whether it is heretical to think of an indirect effect of the Sacrament on the body was also touched upon.

The discussions on this section have not been concluded.

4, d. The "Reply" continues:

"With Section 28 of the *Brief Statement* we, of course, confess our adherence to the Galesburg Rule, although we find ourselves unable to see that *all* of the Scripture-passages referred to here or otherwise quoted are applicable as proofs for this rule. Likewise with the same section we reject all unionism but call attention to the fact that we consider prayer-fellowship wider than church-fellowship and that therefore in certain cases we may occasionally pray privately with some one with whom we are not in church-fellowship."

Comment of the Committee on Lutheran Union:

"Generally speaking, prayer-fellowship involves church-fellowship. There may be cases, however, where the question whether common prayer involves fellowship belongs to the field of casuistry."—It ought to be stated that the two committees realized there is disagreement on this point.

4, e. The "Reply" continues:

"We have our doubts as to whether all the Scripture-passages cited in Section 35—40 of the *Brief Statement* actually prove what they are intended to prove; but the fact of the individual's eternal predestination to sonship (*Kindschaft*) is our firm conviction, and in our *Declaration* we have stated the points which are of primary concern to us in this doctrine. We are not so sure that Scripture actually and expressly speaks of a definite 'number' of those elected from eternity, neither is this essential to us. It is more important and in fact essential to hold



firmly to this truth, that every one who comes to faith and remains in faith and is eternally saved has been predestinated for this by God from eternity."

**Comment of the Committee on Lutheran Union:**

"We cannot understand how a person who believes that each individual believer is elected can doubt that the whole number is elected. The implication of arbitrariness which some people find in the term 'definite number' we reject."

**5. The "Reply" states finally:**

"Finally, the question was raised how the statement in our fifth 'Sandusky Resolution' is to be understood: 'We are not willing to give up this membership' (p. 256). The answer was: 'This is no absolute statement but one conditioned by the future development of the American Lutheran Conference.'"

Naturally the Committee on Lutheran Union approved this part of the "Reply."

\* \* \*

To present a more complete picture also of the postconvention events, we refer to the Racine Convention and to the Pittsburgh Agreement.

In November of 1938 the American Lutheran Conference, of which the American Lutheran Church is an integral part, met in convention at Racine, Wis. Whatever may have been the spirit of the Racine Convention and whatever may have been said on the floor of the convention regarding the proposed fellowship of one of its members with the Missouri Synod is of first concern to the American Lutheran Church, because the Missouri Synod has made the establishing of doctrinal agreement on the part of the other synods of the American Lutheran Conference with the American Lutheran Church a condition of future fellowship. To meet this condition, rests with the American Lutheran Church. Until this condition is met, there can be no fellowship with Missouri.

In February, 1939, representatives of the American Lutheran Church met with a committee of the United Lutheran Church in Pittsburgh and jointly accepted a document which purported to establish agreement between the two church-bodies on the doctrine of Inspiration. The nucleus of the document is found in the sentence, "The separate books of the Bible are related to one another and, taken together, constitute a complete, errorless, unbreakable whole, of which Christ is the center, John 10:35." By the Committee on Lutheran Union this statement was found to be "ambiguous" and to "lack the explicit, unequivocal declaration of the verbal inspiration and of the inerrancy of the Holy Scripture in all its parts which the situation demands." Other phrases in this document were censured as being open to misunderstanding. In a conference hastily summoned, two members of the American Lutheran Commission gave assurance that by accepting the Pittsburgh Agreement they did not intend to recede from the position on the doctrine of Inspiration as set forth in the *Brief Statement of the Missouri Synod* and the *Declaration of the American Lutheran Church*. The opinion of the Committee on Lutheran Union, printed in the *Lutheran*

**Witness on page 139 [1939], concludes with the remark that "official declarations from the A. L. C. authorities must now be awaited."**

While as yet no such official declarations have been made nor published, Dr. Reu, a member of the committee for the American Lutheran Church, has written rather pointedly in the *Kirchliche Zeitschrift* for September: "Wie kann man hoffen, dass unsere Pittsburgh-Erklärung in unserm Sinn von der Vereinigten Lutherischen Kirche angenommen wird, wenn Lehrer dieser Kirche schon die Baltimore-Deklaration behandeln, wie es hier geschieht?"

**Conclusion.** One purpose of this article is to acquaint our people with the developments up to date. For this reason also some details which may seem insignificant to the reader have been presented.

Another purpose of this article is to throw these matters with full detail into the lap of the readers of the *C. T. M.* and all interested persons for their thorough investigation and for their careful, prayerful, and unbiased deliberation. After all, it is the membership of Synod that must pass judgment. Our hearts are filled with gratitude and joy at the great measure of agreement which has been attained, and it is our sincere and devout prayer that also the remaining differences may be composed according to God's holy Word and to the honor of His name.

F. H. BRUNN

*Secretary of the Committee on Lutheran Union*

**How Do We Become Certain that the Bible Is God's Word? —** In the second part of his paper on "What Is Scripture and How Can We Become Certain of Its Divine Origin?" (*Kirchliche Zeitschrift*, August, 1939) Dr. Reu presents these excellent, helpful paragraphs:

"It is Scripture itself by means of which this certainty is given, or it is Christ and His Spirit working through the written or oral Word who creates it in man. We don't have to wait until our own investigations or those of others concerning the genuineness of this or that part of Scripture or concerning the history of the canon or the efforts at solving this or that exegetical problem have come to a successful end. All that is necessary is to hear and read the Word and to abide by it. We do not know when the Spirit begins His work on the individual soul (Augsburg Confession, Art. 5), but we know that He works by means of the Word, and we have the promise that He is all willingness to work faith in all who hear the Word. In His own time and place He works through the Word in such a manner that we know and experience now we are confronted with God, the Most High. To withstand the Word is to withstand God and His Spirit. As Jacob after that wonderful dream could say: 'Surely the Lord is in this place, and I knew it not. How dreadful is this place! This is none other than the house of God, and this is the gate of heaven,' so the soul knows in that hour: It is God with whom I am dealing, and the conscience confirms it in an unmistakable way. This consonance of the voice of conscience and the voice of God speaking through the Word makes it still more impossible not to recognize the divine voice. The soul, of course, can resist the voice of God and the voice of conscience, but it cannot deny that it was dealing with God. The voice of God was the voice of the

Law and possibly also of the Gospel. In case it was the spoken Word of God, as is usual, which man heard, he then finds the same Word in Scripture; and when he reads it, the message has the same effect upon him. That makes him sure, inwardly certain: It is God's Word that here speaks to me. At first, this is only a certainty of the divine character of the words which he heard and read. But now he begins to perceive that other parts of Scripture have, in spite of all differences, the same message, Law and Gospel, and exercise the same power and influence; he begins to see and experience the fact that Scripture is a living organism, in which all parts are closely connected and share in this divine life from their center out into their farthest periphery. Furthermore, as a believer, he is a member in the great communion, the Christian Church of all ages; his fellow-believers all have made this experience; and the individual does not wonder that the extent of their experience is wider than his own. His partial experience is proof to him for the authenticity of their wider experience, and so in growing measure he becomes inwardly certain here is truth, divine truth, the Bible as a whole is the Word of God.

"But our question was not, How do we become subjectively certain of the divine truth of Scripture? but, How do we become subjectively certain of the *origin*, the divine origin, of the Scriptures? And yet, the result at which we arrived is by no means without value for finding the answer to the question about the origin of Scripture. If the whole of Scripture is full of divine life, should it, then, have come into existence without the exercise of this life? But more than that. If we have become certain of the fact that Scripture is the book of divine truth, why should it not be true in that which it testifies about its own origin? If it is true and trustworthy when it says: 'Thou art the sinner and must face God's wrath and condemnation,' or: 'Here is Christ, the Risen One; in Him alone is salvation,'—and as Christians we have experienced that it is true,—why should it not be true when it says: 'The prophets were driven by the Holy Ghost and spoke ἀπὸ θεοῦ,' or: 'Paul and his coworkers have spoken in words taught by the Spirit,' or: 'All Scripture is θεόπνευστος,' or: 'The Scripture cannot be broken'? The question after the truth of the Bible is not identical with the question about its divine origin, but by proving the first we immediately prove the second; our subjective certainty about the divine origin of Scripture is based upon, and given with, our subjective certainty about the truth of the Bible. One follows the other of inner necessity." A.

**Civic Control of Religion Natural Result of So-Called Reformation.**—Under this heading *Our Sunday Visitor* tells its readers: "Believe what the civil ruler believes,' such has been from the beginning the fate, shall I say, the flexible and very accommodating policy of Protestantism in most countries where it spread; that is the subservience, or even selling out, of religion to the State. The passing over of religious authority to civil rulers started in Germany with the revolt of Luther against the Church, and it is in Germany again that, after four hundred years, the transfer of that authority reaches a sad, dramatic, but nevertheless logical climax, with which,

true to form, Protestantism must reconcile itself: '*Cuius regio, huius religio.*' So even the neopaganism of Hitler, the absolute German ruler of today, must be accepted. 'Shocking! Monstrous!' cries out the conscience of the Christian people and of some of their leaders whose faith is put to a most crucial and soul-torturing test. The test truly demands an unprecedented religious heroism; it calls for no less than martyrdom. Alas, between Christ and Hitler, between Christianity and neopaganism, many among the leaders of the flock have made their choice! Let us have Hitler; let us have his neopaganism!"

Thus and more *Our Sunday Visitor*, "popular national Catholic Action weekly," adept in misstating historical truths, laments. But its lamentation is not well taken. Even the much-maligned Hitler, though we hold for him no brief, has time and again stated that even the Roman Catholic Church, in which he still claims membership, may say and do anything within its proper sphere as a Church, as which it is to be recognized as the "voice of God." The fight between Church and State in Germany began not with Hitler nor with Luther's Reformation nor even with the ante-Luther reformers, who denounced all papal claims to temporal power; but it began when Gregory I took over earthly rule, thus clearing the way for the intolerable claims of Gregory VII (Hildebrand; d. 1085) that the papal authority is superior even to that of temporal regents. When Luther began his work of Reformation, Hildebrand's principle was recognized practically throughout Europe, so that, when Monk Martin enunciated the basic principle of separation of Church and State, this was regarded in papistic circles as an unbearable heresy. The "*cuius regio, eius religio*" principle was first sanctioned in the well-known peace treaty at Augsburg, 1555, where Romanists accepted this principle because on the other hand it was stipulated in the treaty that territories ruled by bishops must remain Catholic even though the ruler should turn Protestant. (Cf. Historical Introductions to the Symbolical Books, *Triglot*, p. 102.) Luther's teaching on this score was far different. He said: "Civil government enacts laws which should not extend any farther than over body and possessions and whatever happens to be temporal on earth." (St. L. ed., X, 395.) Or: "Wherever civil government is so presumptuous as to enact spiritual laws, it trenches on God's own rule and perverts and corrupts the souls." (*Ibid.*) Expressions like these could be multiplied a hundred-fold from the great Reformer's writings, proving that the claim of *Our Sunday Visitor* that "civil control of religion is the natural result of the so-called Reformation" is absolutely untrue. J. T. M.

**Faith Seminary Starts Third Year.** — *The Christian Beacon* (Oct. 12, 1939) reports: "Faith Theological Seminary held its third annual autumn opening exercises in the First Independent Church, Wilmington, Del., on Wednesday evening, September 27, at which time the Rev. Carl McIntire, pastor of the Bible Presbyterian Church of Collingswood, N. J., delivered the opening address on the subject 'The Greatest Cause.' He cited the deepening apostasy of our day and declared that Christian ministers need more than ever to realize that they are taking part in a great warfare between God and Satan. The divine weapon in this

warfare, Dr. McIntire said, is the 'sword of the spirit,' the Word of God. Emphasizing the necessity of thorough preparation for the Gospel ministry, he called upon the students of Faith Theological Seminary to know this weapon and to be able to use it." The enrolment in the junior class this year is ten, while the entire enrolment amounts to thirty-four, besides two special students. These figures represent a substantial increase over last year's enrolment of twenty-nine. Since the Seminary authorities feared that the enrolment this year might drop considerably, the Bible Presbyterians as a Church took the matter before God in prayer and, as the account says, now regard the ten new students as God's gifts granted them in answer to their supplication. The Bible Presbyterians have separated from the Machen group, centered in Westminster Seminary, Philadelphia; but unlike the Orthodox Presbyterians, they both teach the millennium and are strong champions of prohibition.

J. T. M.

**Pseudo-Christianity.**—Under this heading, *Christianity Today* (Vol. 10, No. 1) calls attention to the great dangers threatening present-day Christians from antichristian prophets who use the name *Christian* falsely and deceitfully to mislead the unwary. The editorial is written in view of the fact that in the current number of the periodical four books are reviewed which, while pretending to be Christian, deny the entire Christian faith. (Cf. *The Case for Evangelical Modernism*, by Cecil John Cadoux; *Revolutionary Christianity*, by Sherwood Eddy; *A Guide to Understanding the Bible*, by H. E. Fosdick; *Essential Christianity*, by Samuel Angus.) The editorial says: "Recently an article by Will Durant entitled 'The Crisis in Christianity' was given wide publicity through the *Saturday Evening Post*. Dr. Durant lays no claim to be a Christian theologian,—is not, if we are rightly informed, even a member of the Christian Church,—but while that may make his mistake more excusable it does not alter the fact that what he commends as the hope of the race is something other than Christianity to such a degree that, if it were universally embraced, it would mean that genuine Christianity had disappeared from the face of the earth. What he calls Christianity is very much like what Dr. Angus calls Christianity. He defines it as the 'sincere acceptance of the moral ideals of Christ' and pictures the Christian churches as inviting to their membership 'any person, of whatever race or theology, who is willing to receive those ideals as the test and goal of his conduct and development,' which means that he would have men accept Christ as a moral teacher and example, but not as Lord and Savior. Such a Christianity lacks all that is most distinctive of what is rightly called Christianity. The men mentioned above are not alone in advocating a pseudo-Christianity. Everywhere there are those who in the name and under the title of Christianity are teaching what is other than Christianity. As a result there are many who embrace systems of thought and life that lack what is most essential to New Testament Christianity, nay, more, that are positively hostile to all that is most distinctive to such Christianity; who despite this fact cherish the notion that they are among Christianity's purest confessors and exemplars. It is some twenty years since

Warfield asked the question 'Does the word "Christianity" any longer bear a definite meaning?' If he were living today, he might mention other men, but we may be sure that his answer would be the same. 'Men are debating on all sides of us what Christianity really is. Auguste Sabatier makes it out to be just altruism. Josiah Royce identifies it with the sentiment of loyalty. D. C. Macintosh explains it as nothing but morality. We hear of Christianity without dogma, Christianity without miracle, Christianity without Christ. Since, however, Christianity is a historical religion, an undogmatic Christianity would be an absurdity. Since it is through and through a supernatural religion, a non-miraculous Christianity would be a contradiction. Since it is Christianity, a Christ-less Christianity would be—well, let us say it lamely . . . a misnomer. . . .' How may we distinguish between genuine and counterfeit Christianity? There are not lacking touchstones by which the plain man may do this. The most important of these touchstones is what is taught (1) about the deity of Christ and (2) about His death as an atonement for sin. When Fosdick, in a previous book, spoke of the *peril of worshiping Jesus* and when Cadoux, Eddy, and Angus deny His true deity, we know without further ado that they are advocates of a pseudo-Christianity. An equally, perhaps an even more, reliable test is whether Christ is proclaimed as one who bore our sins in His own body on the tree. The object of the Christian's faith is not merely Christ; it is Christ as crucified. Hence, when Angus writes: 'It is morally impossible any longer to believe in the ancient conception of the wrath of God or to hold to a God who could not or would not forgive sins apart from a blood sacrifice or a propitiation or the action of a third party'; and when Eddy writes: 'The modern conscience utterly repudiates the idea of the death of Christ as the propitiation of an angry God through the punishment of an innocent victim,' we may see in their language something of a caricature of Christian teaching, but nevertheless we may be sure that they are teachers of a pseudo-Christianity. Modernism, Liberalism, New Thought,—call it what you will,—baptized with the name of Christianity, is not thereby made Christianity. It may be true that a rose by any other name would smell as sweet. It does not follow, however, that whatever we may choose to call a rose will thereby exude a rose's fragrance." Two facts in this report may be of interest to us, namely, in the first place, that all modernistic pseudoprophets agree in defining Christianity as morality or as definite good works which "Christians" must do for their salvation in imitation of Christ and, secondly, that all true Christians find it not very difficult to define Christianity in a correct, Scriptural way. As one reads the editorial, one almost is led to believe that the author studied the *Prolegomena* to Dr. Pieper's *Christliche Dogmatik*.

J. T. M.

**The Breakdown of Evolution.**—Douglas Dewar, Fellow of the Zoological Society of Great Britain, has recently added a sequel to his earlier book *Difficulties of the Evolution Theory*, entitling his new book *More Difficulties of the Evolution*. The book may be secured from the

Sunday-school Times Book Service, 1721 Spring Garden St., Philadelphia, Pa. (\$2.85, postpaid.) It contains many important antievolution statements, such as the one by the French paleontologist Prof. Paul Lemoine, who is quoted as having said: "It is impossible! Really, in spite of appearances no one believes in it any more. It is a kind of dogma which the priests have abandoned, but which they uphold for the sake of the populace." With regard to the great stability of the species, another French professor, M. Caullery, is quoted: "The greatest difficulty at the present time is to reconcile this stability with the mutability that the very notion of evolution presupposes." Prof. J. B. S. Haldane declares, as quoted in the volume: "The barrier of interspecies sterility is the most serious argument against Darwin's organic evolution." Prof. Max Westenhofer is quoted as saying: "I am more and more convinced that the Darwin-Haeckel theory of the ascent of man from the ape cannot be supported. Missing links exist neither in the history of man nor in that of animals and plants. All the larger groups of animals, as fishes, amphibians, reptiles, mammals, seem to have appeared suddenly on the earth, spreading themselves, so to speak, in an explosive manner in their various shapes and forms. Nowhere is one able to observe or prove the transition of one species into another, variation being possible only within the species themselves." Westenhofer is then quoted as saying that his view approaches "the old idea of Linnaeus, namely, that there exist as many species as the Infinite Being has created." To show that certain habits and instincts, as that of intricate nest-building among birds, could not have been gradually evolved, Mr. Dewar writes: "The shape and position of the organs of the butterfly which is to be, are already stamped on the caterpillar pupa. These marks are on the outside, though there is nothing yet formed inside to correspond to them. Though within the pupa there is nothing but a green watery pulp, all the places in its organism which are later to be occupied by legs, wings, antennae, etc., are now definitely marked. The newly formed portions seem to have no direct filiation with the destroyed parts of the larval organism. The creature has, in fact, died in so far as it has lost its form, organs, and habits, and is entering into a new form of life." Again: "The transformation of mouth-parts of the caterpillar type to those of the butterfly type involves a period during which the possessor of the mouth had either to go without food or subsist on its own tissues. It is impossible that such transformation was effected in the past by a gradual process, extending over a period of thousands of years." From Dr. W. R. Thompson's *Science and Common Sense* the author finally quotes: "The fundamental difficulties about the theory of evolution are not theological but rational and experimental. For many it is an object of religious devotion, because they deem it a supreme integrative principle. This is probably the reason why the severe methodological criticism employed in other departments of biology has not yet been brought to bear against evolutionary speculation. They are indications, however, that this criticism will not now be long delayed."

J. T. M.

**Religion in Russia.**—Religion is not dying out in Soviet Russia fast enough to suit the Communists, according to a recent statement in *Pravda*, government-controlled newspaper. Although "tens of millions have got rid of their superstitions," according to the editorial, "even in cities and among workers there still exist people who have not broken with religion." This is an interesting admission after more than twenty years of persecution of the Christian Church. For it must not be forgotten, when the spot-light is turned on the troubles of the Church in other countries, that Russia has the longest and bloodiest record of persecution of all countries in modern times.

Sooner or later the time will come for Christianity to reenter Russia in triumph. Over in Paris a reformed and reinvigorated Russian Orthodox Church is keeping alight the torch of scholarship against that day through the maintenance of the seminary of St. Sergius. Our own Church through the gifts of thousands of loyal Churchmen has had, and continues to have, a part in this hopeful work. It may be many years, perhaps even centuries, before the glad tidings of Christ can again be carried openly into what was once Holy Russia; but some day, when the pagan philosophy of Marxism has broken on the rocks of its own materialism, Christianity will rise again in that land, and the real soul of the Russian people will be liberated. Then, and then only, will the world know how large a remnant has been faithful to our Lord in spite of every attempt to root religion out of an entire people.

*Living Church (Prot. Episc.)*

**A Predicament of Unionism.**—A writer in the *Christian Century* reports on the first world conference of Christian youth, which in the last days of July met in Amsterdam, Holland. He informs us that nearly 1,400 young men and women, their average age being about twenty-five, attended the conference sessions. Naturally the venture was entirely unionistic. We reprint here the description of the difficulty with respect to joint Communion services.

"Another bone of contention was the observance of the Holy Communion. The first meal the delegates took together buzzed with the news that the conference members were to be divided for the observance of the highest symbol of their community. Between Tuesday and Saturday night a few of the delegates devoted most of their efforts to opposing the division and attempting to have the program changed. Some Anglicans and Lutherans joined with free-church delegates in regretting the division.

"Saturday evening arrived, however, and with it a service of preparation for the Holy Communion on Sunday. It was announced that there would be four administrations of the Sacrament: (1) a free-church rite in the Dutch Reformed style for 'all who are in full communion with the Church of our Lord Jesus in any of its branches'; (2) an Anglican rite for 'all who are members of churches which are in communion with the churches of the Anglican communion'; (3) a Lutheran rite for 'all who are baptized in the name of the Holy Trinity, who are entitled to receive the Holy Communion in their own churches, and who are aware of what the Lutheran churches teach concerning the nature of the



Sacrament'; and (4) an Eastern Orthodox rite at the Monday morning plenary session of the conference to be observed by all. All delegates were invited to witness each of the ceremonies, but they were not all invited to the tables.

"The official answer to the questioning of this four-way division at the Lord's Table was somewhat difficult to understand. It recognized the sin of separation, but it admitted no change in the program, even with all the sentiment of the delegates on the side of that change.

"There was some indication that the effort to hold common Communion service was checked not in the conference office but in the high places of the churches involved." A.

**New Leader of Buddhism in Tibet.** — "A five-year search has finally located in the home of a Chinese peasant the new Dalai Lhama, spiritual head of Tibetan Buddhism. According to the belief of this great branch of Buddhism, based on the dogma of transmigration, the new head of the Church is to be found in the child of pious parents born at the precise instant of the death of the former Dalai Lhama. The new Dalai Lhama has been enthroned with great pomp at Lhasa." So reports the *Christian Century*. What a terrible superstition we are dealing with here! A.

**Two Judgments of Buchmanism.** — Since Buchmanism is still given much space in the daily press, the following two judgments of this erratic movement may be of service to pastors in giving their parishioners the necessary information with regard to it. The first, published in the *Lutheran Sentinel*, is very moderate but nevertheless to the point. We read: "There is in this movement no clear-cut statement of the deity of Christ and His atonement on the Cross. It accepts on equal terms into its fellowship those who believe in Jesus as the Son of God and the Savior of the world and those who regard Him merely as the matchless teacher and dauntless martyr. And while the Scriptures certainly demand of us that we confess to the brother the sins we have committed against him, it gives no such directions as are involved in the practise of 'sharing.' This is nothing new. It was in vogue in protracted meetings in the eighties and earlier in our country. The practise of 'seeking guidance' or 'direct revelations' from the Holy Ghost regarding matters of belief, attitude, or conduct sets aside the cardinal principle of the sole authority and sufficiency of the written Word of God. Hence 'avoid them,' Rom. 16:17." The second judgment is given in *Time* (Aug. 21, 1939) by a reader, who writes: "I cannot but send a word of thanks for your courage in reporting the recent goings on of the Buchmanites ('Oxford Groupers') on the Pacific Coast with such insight and accuracy (*Time*, July 31). I know I speak the minds of many plain, ordinary church-members, who hesitate to sound anything like a harsh note, when I say that the ballyhoo of these spiritual high-pressurists fills them with something akin to nervous suspicion and mistrust. During recent years I have talked to many ministers about Buchmanism, and without one exception they had reached the conclusion that the worthy and helpful values in this manifestation were painfully outweighed by its negative and unconstructive aspects. One minister,

a very eminent man, whose books are best sellers, told me that he had to take two members of his congregation to an asylum; so grievously had they 'gone off at the deep end' through jettisoning orderly processes of judgment, mental discipline, and sound common sense and substituting therefor the capricious thaumaturgical foibles of these doctrinaires. Several friends of mine became 'Groupers' (they like to add the erudite 'Oxford' to the label) some time back; but beyond a lopsided fanaticism, a persistent proclaiming how terrifically bad they were before and how 'absolutely honest, absolutely unselfish, absolutely pure, and absolutely loving' they are now, one fails to detect any particular difference. At any rate, not pragmatically, although I could not venture to appraise the mystical transformation. There is nothing particularly new about religious high-pressurism, and I think one of the most perfect rejoinders to all that sort of thing was that made by St. Hilary of Poitiers many centuries ago when he spoke of a contemporary Buchmanite, so to speak, as having 'an irreligious solicitude for God.' St. Hilary went on to explain that an observer of the cosmic processes soon learns that the Almighty has His own spacious way of doing things, and that often He plans to take many thousands of years to accomplish some far-reaching purposes. Cannot one venture to conclude, accordingly, that even Herr Buchman and his projected 100,000,000 adherents are not likely to stampede Jehovah into a general upset of His vast cosmic processes?" We doubted whether we should add the last, almost blasphemous, sentence of this, in many respects, very apt criticism of Buchmanism. But we risked it, since the statement proves that Buchmanism with its fanatic, unscriptural claims is doing its bit to make it all the harder for Christian ministers to do their work as Gospel-preachers. Buchmanism indeed belongs to the many *skandala* which God's Word asks us to avoid, Rom. 16:17.

J. T. M.

**Anglicanism No Longer Adheres to the Nicene Creed.**—"The revival of religion," writes the *Australian Lutheran*, "under Wesley, which led also to a revival within the Established Church, the Church of England, appears now to have lost its force both within the national Church and without. Open denial of fundamental articles of faith is not rare. There are, however, also those who still uphold the Christian faith. The Bishop of Ely deplors the fact that, when the bishops were asked to affirm 'that the Church of England holds and teaches the Nicene Creed in that sense only in which it has been held throughout the history of the Church and that her ministers cannot rightly claim a liberty to set aside by private interpretation the historic meaning of those clauses which state the events of the incarnate life of our Lord Jesus Christ,' only three of them voted in favor. In plain words, the bishops refused to declare that the clergy are required to teach that Christ was born of a virgin and that He rose again on the third day as stated in the Nicene Creed. Says the Bishop of Ely, Dr. Haywood: 'The upshot of all this is that the House of Bishops prefers not to declare that the historical clauses of the creed mean what they say, and it has no word of reproof for those clergy who lead their congregations in these confessions of faith and then explicitly deny some

of these truths (e. g., the virgin birth and the resurrection of Christ on the third day), which with their lips they have affirmed. I do not deny that the situation thus created seems to me to be very serious."

To this the *Australian Lutheran* remarks: "Yes, such a situation indeed is very serious — serious for those who will allow themselves to be misled by wolves in sheep's clothing, more serious for those who shall finally have to give account of their ministry before the Great Bishop of the Church, when the blood of those who lost their faith through their rationalistic preaching shall be required of their hands."

This reproof of the modernistic element in the Anglican Church by our brethren is well in place; for, while these self-sufficient rationalists reject the basic teachings of the Christian Church, they insult their hearers with such puerilities as: "I think the kingdom of God as our Lord intended it for us is the condition of living in which love really gets busy and wins through, as, for instance, it almost does for twenty-four hours on Christmas Day in this gray old world of ours." Says the *Australian Lutheran*: "Thus men try to establish the kingdom of God by making people more humanitarian; but that would be simply a kingdom of the world, while Christ says: 'My kingdom is not of this world.'" Rightly the *Australian Lutheran* then adds: "The kingdom of God is the whole number of all true believers, in other words, the holy Christian Church, here the Kingdom of Grace, yonder the Kingdom of Glory."

While Anglicans thus surrender fundamental Biblical doctrines, they strangely insist upon such man-made anti-Scriptural teachings as "The succession of the ministry is a continuing visible sign of the continuous life of the Church, and the laying on of hands is the apostolic method of continuing that succession." Both teachings betray their utter ignorance of Biblical theology. J. T. M.

**Antiunionism in the Interest of Greater Syncretism.** — The proposed plan to effect an organic union between the Episcopalian and the Presbyterian churches received an additional setback, when Bishop Manning in the *Living Church*, October 4, 1939, warned against the union. He joins the many voices which have protested against the union on the ground that the union committee's concordat compromises and undermines the Episcopalian doctrine of the apostolic succession, that it satisfies neither the Episcopalians nor the Presbyterians on the doctrine of ordination, and that it will result in dissension within the Episcopalian Church and thus instead of resulting in a large union the concordat will end only in disunion. But we are unable to follow his line of argumentation when he mentions as the chief reason for his opposition to the proposed union the fear of forfeiting the possibility of a pan-Christian union. Bishop Manning believes that the Episcopalian (and Anglican) Church occupies the strategic position of middle ground between Rome and Protestantism and that the only hope of a union embracing all Christian churches lies in the Episcopalian Church. By uniting with only one group of the Protestant world the Anglican Church would jeopardize this advantageous position. This is only wishful thinking, for if two communions, which have so much in common racially, culturally, his-

torically, and theologically, lose themselves in hopeless bickering over the theories of apostolic succession and episcopal ordination, how dare they hope for a pan-Christian union on such ambiguous formulae as have been adopted by the World Council of Faith and Order? The syncretist closes his eyes to the truth and to — plain facts. Keen observers of the forces behind the World Council are not ready to grant to the Anglican Church the position which Manning claims. W. M. Horton states: "It might fairly be claimed that the Church of Sweden, since Soederblom, has begun to supersede the Church of England as the real bridge church between Catholicism and Protestantism. The very success of the Anglicans' drive for unity with the (Eastern) Orthodox churches has tended to tie their hands in all negotiations with Protestants. If the Protestant churches are to draw any closer to the England-Sweden-Orient bloc, it will be on Swedish initiative, I believe, rather than upon Anglican or Orthodox initiative." (*Contemporary Continental Theology*, 1938, p. 153.)

F. E. M.

Ein lutherisches Urteil über Tambaram. Über die dritte Weltmissionskonferenz, die in Tambaram, bei Madras, Indien, vom 12. bis zum 30. Dezember 1938 stattfand, geht noch viel schreiben zu wollen, möchte dem Leser fast als unpassend erscheinen. Doch sind ja die sogenannten Weltmissionskonferenzen nicht vorübergehende Erscheinungen in der Aktivitätswelt der äußeren Christenheit, sondern bleibende Institute, deren Beschlüsse von weittragender Bedeutung für die beteiligten Kirchenkreise sind. Wenigstens werden hier die Missionsprinzipien festgelegt, und die beeinflussen ja zum großen Teil die ganze andere kirchliche Tätigkeit. Die erste Weltmissionskonferenz tagte, wie bekannt, im Jahre 1912 in Edinburgh, die zweite im Jahre 1928 in Jerusalem. Tambaram ist deswegen bedeutend, nicht nur weil die Frequenz hier sehr hoch war (464 Delegierte), sondern auch weil man sich unter der Leitung des „vielgewandten amerikanischen Weltmissionsunionisten Dr. John Rott“ bedeutend sicherer bewegte und sich in bezug auf die Arbeitsziele bewußter fühlte. Doch nun zu dem lutherischen Urteil über Tambaram. Es findet sich in der „Freikirche“, dem bekannten Blatt unserer Brüder in Deutschland, dem wir es in verkürzter Form entnehmen.

Wir lesen: „Wir haben keinen Anlaß, die langatmigen Beschlüsse von Tambaram allzu ernst zu nehmen. Der Konferenzbericht soll nach vorliegender Ankündigung ungefähr zehn Bände umfassen; schon darum kann man wohl sagen, daß er „unter Ausschluß der Öffentlichkeit“ erscheint. Dazu haben diese Entschlüsse eine allzu verzweifelte Ähnlichkeit mit den Erklärungen sattem bekannter sonstiger kirchlicher Weltverbünderkonferenzen, wie Stockholm oder Oxford. Immerhin dürfte es vielleicht für unsere Leser nicht ohne Wert sein, durch einige Beispiele aus diesen Entschlüssen sich wieder einmal das bestätigen zu lassen, was sie schon vorher gewußt haben oder wissen konnten, nämlich welche trostlose Vermischung der geistlichen Aufgabe des Reiches unsers Herrn Jesu Christi mit rein irdischen Bestrebungen und Geschäften bei solchen Gelegenheiten immer wieder herauskommt und welche klägliche Versuche dabei immer wieder unternommen werden, die widerstrebenden Meinungen in eine nichtsagende Kompromißformel zu zwingen und damit eine „Einigkeit im Geiste“ vorzutäuschen, die in Wirklichkeit an keinem einzigen Punkt vorhanden ist.“ Wir

übergehen das „Glaubensbekenntnis“, „das nicht bekennt, sondern nur verschleiert“, und teilen nur einige Beschlüsse über die Kirche und ihre Aufgabe in der Welt mit. Wir lesen: „Die Kirche soll nach einer volleren Ausprägung der christlichen Einheit streben und gegen die Übel der Zeit, wie wirtschaftliche Ausbeutung, soziale Ungerechtigkeit, Rassenscheidung und Krieg, ein einheitliches, geschlossenes Zeugnis ablegen. Dieser Dienst der Christen ist nicht ganz christlich, wenn nicht die heutigen Bedürfnisse und Fragen, die Wirklichkeiten des sozialen, wirtschaftlichen und nationalen Lebens dem Licht des Heiligen Geistes unterbreitet werden zu Fürbitte, Führung und Durchgeistigung. Der Gesundheitsdienst gehört zum Wesen des Evangeliums [von uns gesperrt] und ist deshalb ein unveräußerlicher Teil des Dienstes, zu dem Christus seine Kirche berufen hat. So muß die Kirche mutig auch unter Widerspruch in den öffentlichen Kampf zum Beispiel gegen Rauschgifte, den internationalen Mädchenhandel und ähnliche Krebschäden des öffentlichen Lebens eintreten, und sie wird auch mit den Regierungen und nichtchristlichen philanthropischen Bestrebungen zu ihrer Bekämpfung in Arbeitsgemeinschaft treten, ohne dabei ihre hohen christlichen Ideale aus den Augen zu verlieren. Wir appellieren deshalb mit aller Glut, die wir besitzen, an die Missionsgesellschaften, Missionsbehörden und die verantwortlichen Autoritäten der ‚alten‘ Kirchen, daß sie diese Frage ernstlich zu Herzen nehmen, mit den Kirchen auf dem Missionsfeld daran zu arbeiten, daß und wie die Vereinigung in die Wege geleitet werde, und uns in allen Bemühungen zu ermutigen, welche die ärgernisvollen Wirkungen unserer Spaltungen beseitigen.“

Sierzu bemerkt die „Freikirche“: „Wo Kirchen von der Wahrheit abfallen, wie das mehr oder weniger bei allen Weltkirchen unserer Tage der Fall ist, wird das daran offenbar, daß sie an die Stelle der Wahrheit die äußere Einheit setzen. Die größte aller kirchlichen Sünden ist für sie nicht mehr die Verleugnung der Wahrheit, sondern die doch meist um der Wahrheit willen notwendig gewordene, durch den Abfall von der Wahrheit verursachte äußere Zerrissenheit der Kirche. Die Sorge dieser Kirchen ist darum auch nicht mehr die, wie der Wahrheit wieder zu ihrem Recht in der Kirche verholfen werde und so die Einigkeit im Geist wachse und zunehme, sondern nur die, wie die um der Wahrheit willen auch heute noch, und heute mehr denn je, unvermeidbare Trennung in der äußeren Christenheit auf Kosten der Wahrheit wieder in eine scheinbare Einheit zurückverwandelt werden kann. Dazu kommt dann, weil man zwar noch als ‚Kirche‘ da ist, aber nichts mehr vernimmt vom Geist Gottes und geistliche Dinge nicht mehr geistlich zu richten vermag, die immer weiter um sich greifende Weltlichung der kirchlichen Aufgaben. Das ‚Nur selig‘ der Väter wird zum social gospel, zu einer reinen Diesseitigkeitslehre, die sich damit bolschewistischen und edellkommunistischen Bestrebungen bedenklich nähert.“ Zum Schluß urteilt die „Freikirche“: „Unsere Kirche und mit ihr die ganze treulutherische Kirche in der Welt hat recht gehabt, wenn sie sich von allen derartigen Weltkonferenzen, und darum auch von der Weltmissionskonferenz von Tambaram, von vorn herein und mit aller nur wünschenswerten Entschiedenheit abgesetzt hat. Möchte sie auch in Zukunft damit unverworren bleiben!“ Diesem Urteil muß jeder bekennnistreue Christ, der die wahre Aufgabe und das Wesen der

Kirche aus Gottes Wort erkannt hat, bestimmen. Die Kirche ist die Gemeinschaft der Gläubigen (*congregatio sanctorum et vere credentium*, A. N., Art. VIII), und ihre eigentliche Aufgabe besteht darin, durch die Predigt des lauterer Evangeliums Sünder zu gläubigen Kindern Gottes zu machen. Alle Ungläubigen innerhalb der sichtbaren Kirche sind nur „Dred am Wagen“, und was sie aus ihrem Unglauben heraus der Kirche als Aufgabe zudiktieren wollen, ist nichts anderes als den Starren in den Dred fahren. J. T. M.

Die Krisis der Religionen. Unter dieser Überschrift, mit der weiteren Erklärung „Eine Schau der religiösen Welt- und Zeitlage vom Missionsfeld aus“, bietet in der „A. E. L. N.“ (25. August 1939, Jahrg. 72, Nr. 12) Dr. Hans Hofer, Leiter und erster theologischer Dozent des Ev.-Luth. Missionsseminars in Leipzig, eine im allgemeinen durchaus wahre und wertvolle Darstellung der verschiedenen Religionsströmungen in gegenwärtiger Zeit in den Hauptländern der Welt. über Nordamerika schreibt er: „Die religiöse Zeitlage in Nordamerika zeigt ähnliche Züge wie die in Europa. Beide Erdteile stehen ja unter der Einwirkung der gleichen rationalen Kultur, die weithin einseitig rationalistisch geworden ist. Nur ist in Nordamerika, zumal in den Vereinigten Staaten, der rationale Einfluß im Sinn einer einseitigen Verstandes- und Nützlichkeitskultur noch viel stärker als in Europa. Bezeichnend für die Rationalisierung und Mechanisierung der Lebensauffassung ist in hervorragendem Maß der *Behaviorismus*, jene amerikanische Psychologie, die die Seele als Mechanismus ohne Seelisches darstellt. Der amerikanische Pragmatismus und Utilitarismus mit einem Fortschrittsoptimismus ist auch in das Denken gewisser Kirchen eingebracht. Bekannt ist deren Auffassung des Reiches Gottes als eines schon in dieser Zeit zu verwirklichenden Reiches sozialen und rationalen Fortschritts auf religiöser, allgemeinchristlicher, mehr ethischer als dogmatischer Grundlage (*social gospel*). Eine romantische Gegenwirkung, besonders innerhalb der Kirchen, ist in Nordamerika noch kaum zu bemerken. [?] Der christliche, theologische Fundamentalismus ist rationalen Ursprungs trotz seiner Ablehnung der rationalen Bibelkritik und der rationalistischen Theologie überhaupt. Darum ist der Fundamentalismus kaum fähig, die aus der einseitig rationalen Haltung entsprungene säkularistische Strömung des amerikanischen Lebens zu überwinden. . . . Ein verheißungsvolles Zeichen ist dagegen die religiöse Erweckung, die einen großen Teil der nordamerikanischen Jugend in den letzten Jahren ergriffen hat.“

Wir bringen diesen Artikel nicht sowohl, weil er wegen seiner allgemeinen kritischen Beurteilung der religiösen Sachlage in Amerika an sich wertvoll ist, als deshalb, weil er zeigt, wie schwer es einem Beobachter in der Ferne wird, ein vollständiges Bild von der kirchlichen Gestaltung in einem Land zu gewinnen. Denn mit dem, was Dr. Hofer über den Fundamentalismus schreibt, ist doch nicht alles gesagt, was über diesen Punkt gesagt werden sollte, und mit der „religiösen Erweckung der nordamerikanischen Jugend“ hat es offenbar viel weniger auf sich, als der Autor meint. Sollte aber die „Schau der religiösen Zeitlage vom Missionsfeld aus“, soweit sie unser Land betrifft, wirklich vollständig sein, so sollte sie auch das wirklich großartige Wirken der lutherischen Kirche (mit ihren fast fünf Millionen Seelen)

gerade auf dem Missionsgebiet in sich schließen. Eine Berücksichtigung der lutherischen Kirche und ihres Missionsaktivismus hätte man gerade in einer Kirchenzeitung erwartet, die sich ausdrücklich evangelisch-lutherisch nennt. Vorbeigehen darf man doch sicherlich nicht an der großen Missionsarbeit der lutherischen Kirche in Amerika.

J. L. M.

Leiden unserer Brüder in Brasilien. Unter der Überschrift „Und das nennt sich ‚lutherisch‘!“ hat, wie „Wacht und Weide“ (3. Jahrg., Heft 5 u. 6) mitteilt, das „Schwarze Korps“, ein nationalsozialistisches Parteiblatt, einen überaus wütigen Angriff auf unser „Ev.-Luth. Kirchenblatt“ und dessen Redakteure gemacht. Den Anlaß dazu gab ihm Prof. Schelp's mächtig gehaltene, gerechte Bitte an seine Mittlutheraner, sich dem neuen Schulgesetz zu fügen, wonach nur die portugiesische Sprache in der Schule gebraucht werden sollte. Hierauf antwortet das „Schwarze Korps“ (im Auszug wiedergegeben): „Es ist wohl nicht sehr abwegig, anzunehmen, daß das ‚Ev.-Luth. Kirchenblatt‘ aus reichsdeutschen Quellen gespeist wird und daß auch der ehrenwerte ‚Professor‘, der das Blättchen vollschreibt, sein Einkommen nicht gerade vom Völkerbund oder der brasilianischen Regierung bezieht. Fest scheint jedenfalls zu stehen, daß die sogenannte Missionsynode, in deren Auftrag das Blättchen erscheint, recht fruchtbare finanzielle Beziehungen zu reichsdeutschen Kirchenbehörden unterhält. Und da ja diese wiederum ihr Geld vom deutschen Staat erhalten, bezahlen wir also, wenn auch auf manigfachen Umwegen, den eifrigen Gottesdiener Paul Schelp, der sich zum Dank dafür in der Dezemberausgabe seines Blättchens einige Gedanken über ‚Deutschtum und Kirche‘ von der Seele gerissen hat.“ (Der Schreiber geht dann auf das neue Schulgesetz und Prof. Schelp's Artikel darüber ein.) „Hier spricht also ein ‚lieber Christ‘, fernab von der Reichweite der deutschen Gerechtigkeit, wenn auch nicht der deutschen Geldquellen, seine geheimen Meinungen und Wünsche aus: Das Deutschtum kann und soll der Teufel holen! Hauptsache: Die Kinder werden in biblischer Geschichte und im Katechismus unterrichtet — feinetwegen auf hottentottisch! Da haben wir dann die konfessionelle Schule in ihrer reinsten Form. Herr Schelp, der in Brasilien sein Antifaschismus treibt, enthüllt sich jedenfalls nicht nur als eine Seele, die für das Deutschtum verloren ist, sondern als ein böswilliger Feind alles Deutschen, der Bibelprüchlein über Blut und Volkstum stellt. Sein Hassausbruch unterscheidet sich nicht von dem unserer bekennenden Volksverräter hierzulande. Er darf, da er so weit vom Schuß ist, nur etwas deutlicher werden. Und so etwas nennt sich ‚lutherisch‘! So etwas führt den Namen eines deutschen Mannes wohl täglich im Munde, der ein deutscher Revolutionär und ein deutscher Nationalist reinsten Wassers war. Man kann sich denken, was ein Luther solch einem verräterischen Lumpenpaß wohl erwidert hätte, das seinen Namen schändet und in seinem Namen deutschen Müttern die Seelen ihrer deutschen Kinder raubt. Pfui Teufel! Und nun warten wir mit Spannung darauf, ob die ‚Deutsche Evangelische Kirche‘ in diesen herzhaften Konstruierungen einstimmen wird und ob sie darüber hinaus auch ihre finanziellen Konsequenzen zieht.“

„Wacht und Weide“ teilt dann weiter mit: „Die Ausführungen im ‚Schwarzen Korps‘ riefen eine ziemliche Bewegung in landeskirchlichen Kreisen wach. Es sind uns wohl an die zehn Artikel aus landeskirchlichen Zeitschriften zugegangen, und alle beeilen sich zu beteuern, daß sie mit den Mis-

southern nichts zu tun haben." Zum Schluß drückt „Wacht und Weide“ die feine, sachliche Erklärung von D. Willkomm über die Missionsynode und deren Arbeit wie auch über Prof. Schelp selbst ab, die er in der „Freikirche“ publiziert hat, die wir aber wegen Raummangels hier nicht bringen können. Nur eins wollen wir betonen: Jetzt, da unsere Brüder in aller Welt unter den Wirren der Zeit doppelt zu leiden haben, gilt es um so mehr, daß wir alle wie aus einem Herzen Gott täglich die Not der Kirche aufs ernsteste vortragen. Auch jetzt noch vermag unser Christengebet viel, wenn es wirklich ernstlich ist.

J. L. W.

**Brief Items.**—Portland, home of the famous Reed College, will have another school of college rank, Portland Bible Institute having become Cascade College and offering degrees in the arts, music, and theology. The school is intended to be distinctly Christian. The announcement, however, that it will be “premillennial, Arminian in theology and holding to the Wesleyan interpretation in regard to the doctrine of the Holy Spirit,” shows that not the unadulterated Word of God will be taught there.

In an English Roman Catholic paper a Policeman's Prayer was published which is hardly meant as persiflage because *America*, Roman Catholic weekly, reprints it. The opening sentence is typical: “Dear St. Michael, Heaven's glorious Commissioner of Police, who once so neatly and successfully cleared God's premises of all its undesirables, look with kindly and professional eye on our earthly Force.” Superstition is still firmly entrenched in the Roman camp.

The Dutch Reformed Mission in Japan lost through death the services of Dr. Albert Oltmans, who was particularly interested in work in behalf of lepers. Japan now has 16 leprosaria, of which six are Christian and one is Buddhist, while the rest are operated by the government or public non-religious organizations. Of the 7,606 inmates in these institutions 1,616 are Christians.

The Protestant Episcopal St. Andrew's Church in Washington, D. C., was sold to the Mission Board of the Augustana Synod for \$48,000. All of the expensive furnishings of the church are included in the purchase.

It is reported that the World Council of Churches now has 54 members. Among recent additions are the United Presbyterian Church of North America and the Seventh Day Baptist churches of the U. S. A. Differences in doctrine do not matter.

The Press reports on a movement called the Christian Front. Its headquarters are in New York. Its great patrons are General Moseley and Father Coughlin. Its “statement of purpose” announces that it is engaged in a “crusade against the antichristian forces of Red revolution.” The Jews constitute one of its pet aversions. We here seem to have another case where people attempt to drive out one devil with the help of another.

Writing in the *Christian Century* of August 23, Albert C. Dieffenbach, for a long time editor of the *Christian Register*, has this to say about the attitude toward Modernism: “I am a liberal Christian. It is impossible for me to be a Modernist; it would be easier for me to be a Funda-



mentalist. Modernism is the half-and-half religion. It is half revelation and half science, half under authority and half free, half theism and half humanism. That is, it was so until the conservative half took over everything for the time being. But I cannot be halved or hyphenated. It is abhorrent for me to straddle or muddle. It seems to me Modernism gets nowhere but backward, that it does not arrive even there." This is hard language, coming, as it does, from an avowed disciple of progress.

On the shift in church-membership in Brooklyn, the city of churches, a reporter says that in the last fifteen years there has been a drop of 20 per cent. in church-membership for the Baptists, Congregationalists, Episcopalians, and Presbyterians, and 39 per cent. for the Reformed. He states that the Lutherans gained to the extent of 28 per cent., the Methodists 5 per cent.; Negroes, however, gained 148 per cent. If this accentuates the need of unceasing mission-work in our large cities it has served its purpose.

Macalester College, St. Paul, Minn., mourns the death of Dr. James Wallace, its president emeritus, who died at the age of 90. He was a scholar of prominence and held the chair of Biblical literature.

The newspaper reported that on September 2 Dr. William E. Biedewolf, a well-known evangelist, died at his home in Monticello, Ind. He was a Presbyterian and belonged to the group that founded the Summer Bible-school Conferences at Winona Lake, Ind. He reached the age of 72.

At their recent convention in San Francisco members of the World's Christian Fundamentalist Association adopted a resolution opposing a third term for President Roosevelt, because it "would constitute a menace to the cause of Christianity on this continent."

#### *Christian Century*

Writing about himself ("How My Mind has Changed in This Decade") in the *Christian Century*, Karl Barth says: "In particular I have never been ready to call good that ominous Lutheran doctrine according to which there belongs to the State a 'right of self-determination' (*Eigengesetzlichkeit*) independent of the proclamation of the Gospel and not to be touched by it." Barth here speaks as a Calvinist, who cannot understand why there must be a separation of Church and State.

In the Garrett Biblical Institute, Evanston, Ill., Miss Georgia Harkness, until now professor of philosophy and religion in Mount Holyoke College, has been given the chair of applied theology. This is said to be the first time a woman was appointed to a professorship in theology in America, perhaps in the world. This may be true, and our comment is, It has happened once too often.

New York Lutheranism. The latest available metropolitan figures for Greater New York gathered by the Lutheran Welfare Council show the total baptized membership of 376 congregations as 225,651; 189 United Lutheran congregations, 138,823; 110 Missouri Synod, 65,779; 34 Augustana, 10,170; 26 Norwegian, 6,307; 7 American, 2,720; 6 Danish, 1,100; 2 Finnish, 277; and 2 Slovak, 475.

Twenty-nine Lutheran welfare agencies in this area served 77,481 clients last year at a total expense of \$1,217,922. The cost of free service of the three Lutheran hospitals was \$92,598.35. The annual welfare campaign for funds conducted by the Lutheran Laymen's Committee is to open September 29.

"The Chinese have just celebrated (August 27) the two thousand four hundred ninety-first birthday of Confucius. The day received official recognition, and special services were held everywhere and with great pomp in many memorial temples." So writes Charles F. Seebach in the *Lutheran* of September 20. Bestowing high praise on Confucius (in the words following those quoted), he forgets that this leader of the Chinese was an idolater groping in darkness.

An outline of a reunion scheme for the Church of England and the Evangelical Free Churches of England was presented to the Methodist conference by the Rev. R. Newton Flew. The conference remitted the report of the committee which had been considering the outline to the Archbishop of Canterbury and expressed the hope that conversations on reunion would continue.

Mr. Flew said the question was still in the discussion stage, and the committee concerned felt it was undesirable to enter into a detailed criticism of the particulars of the scheme.—*Living Church*.

The Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. (Northern Presbyterians) according to recently published statistics now numbers 1,978,095 communicant members, a total which is by 24,361 higher than that of last year. The Sunday-schools, with a total of 1,495,038, report an increase of 11,847 members.

Circuit Court Judge Theodore T. Jacobs of Centerville, Mich., has ruled that recent Methodist unification is legal and binding on members and clergy of the three churches involved. The case is believed to provide the first court test and grew out of the refusal of the Rev. Lester L. Case to relinquish the parsonage or pulpit of the Ninth Street Methodist Protestant Church of Three Rivers, Mich. Mr. Case is one of the eighteen ministers of the Michigan Methodist Protestant Conference who have refused to join the new Church or recognize its authority.—*Christian Century*.

The attempt of the authorities of Auburn Seminary (Presbyterian) to unite their school with Union Seminary, N. Y., is opposed through legal action by the General Assembly of the Northern Presbyterian Church and the particular presbytery which sponsored the organization of this seminary. The argument of the opponents of the merger is that there is no need for this drastic step, allegedly undertaken because Auburn is near bankruptcy. It is stated that Auburn is not supported because of its leanings toward Modernism and the social gospel.

The Salvation Army has a new commanding general, George L. Carpenter, who takes the place of Evangeline Booth. Mr. Carpenter hails from Australia and has served the Salvation Army, besides in his native country, in London, South America, and Canada. Much of his work was of an editorial nature. He is 67 years old. A.