

7-1-1940

## Theological Observer. - Kirchlich-Zeitgeschichtliches

J. T. Mueller

*Concordia Seminary, St. Louis*

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



Part of the [Practical Theology Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Mueller, J. T. (1940) "Theological Observer. - Kirchlich-Zeitgeschichtliches," *Concordia Theological Monthly*. Vol. 11 , Article 52.

Available at: <https://scholar.csl.edu/ctm/vol11/iss1/52>

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**


---

**Children's Confirmation Classes.** — In the *American Lutheran* (April, 1940) Dr. O. A. Geiseman offers two editorials which, we believe, should be studied carefully by all pastors in our Synod. The first suggests that adult-membership classes ought to be given opportunity to receive instruction on Sunday, either on Sunday mornings at the Sunday-school hour, or on Sunday afternoons. The suggestion is certainly worth considering. More important still is what Dr. Geiseman says with regard to children's confirmation classes. He writes: "With Pentecost Sunday practically all children's confirmation classes will again have concluded their work of preparation and will have been received into the communicant membership of the Church. If our observations are at all correct, then it would appear as though parents are in increasing numbers becoming worried lest their children be given too much Christian training and instruction. The average child of today finds its life almost as badly atomized as is that of its parents. It flits from one interest or activity to another. It is being rushed hither and yon by its school-work and its participation in extra-curricular activities, which embrace music, athletics, dramatic art, esthetic dancing, scouting, play, social activities, and the like. Parents realize, of course, that such a high-pressure program for their children has its defects, and they are afraid that their children will be crowded beyond endurance. They know that their boys and girls need religion, and they are eager to have them receive the necessary instruction. The mean while, however, they are also greatly troubled lest their children should lose out on something which looks like an earthly advantage or lest they should be crowded with work beyond the limits of their physical endurance. Because of this they often believe that an abbreviated course of religious instruction would prove to be at least a partial solution of the child's difficulties. If the experiences of other pastors are like unto our own, they are asked each year by anxious mothers whether their child must take two years of instruction by way of preparing for confirmation. Such a question is often not intended to show contempt for Christian training but is rather to be understood in the light of parental concern about lightening the load of the child. If parents want to know whether a child must take two years of instruction, the answer, of course, is 'No'; for the Bible nowhere says that this is the required period of time. While there is no 'must' in this matter, yet nothing ought to be left undone to bring the parents to the conviction that they ought to desire and require the very fullest and best kind of instruction which their children might be given. It is our personal view that this can be achieved much better by *counseling with the individual parents than by establishing laws and regulations.* [Italics our own.] Christian parents can and should be shown without much difficulty that they ought to be more than eager to accept not the least but the most instruction for their boys and girls, even as they would certainly prefer a two-year free scholarship in a school of music or a college to a one-year free scholar-

ship for their children in such institutions. If our Church is to be strong in the future and the children of today are not to be overwhelmed by the complexities of modern life and drawn away from the church, then it is inescapably essential that we give our children the very best training we are capable of giving them under the particular circumstances in which we may be doing our work."

What we regard as especially commendable in this editorial is the winsome approach to the often very serious problem of parental resistance to a two-year course of Christian instruction for their children, which, as Dr. Geiseman rightly says, is often motivated not by any contempt for God's Word but by honest concern about the physical endurance of the children. But if there must be any educational unloading, let it not be in the field of Bible instruction but somewhere else; and let Christian parents realize that it is not an irksome duty but a valuable prerogative for Christian children to receive a "two-year free scholarship" in Christian education. Christian education is similar to prayer, which certainly is a duty, inasmuch as God has commanded it. But, oh, what a privilege it is to carry everything to God in prayer, and what a privilege it is to sit at Jesus' feet and hear His Word! J. T. M.

**Lodge Articles Make a Deep Impression.**—Evangelist John R. Rice's articles "Lodges Examined by the Bible," published in the *Sword of the Lord* (201 E. 10th St., Dallas, Tex.) and now being printed for pamphlet use, have made a deep impression on many who read them, if we may believe a report to that effect in the issue of March 15, 1940. Dr. Rice says: "Lodge people have read the articles, sometimes with bitter resentment. Dallas lodge-members got out an anonymous circular, slandering the editor and trying to disrupt the work and organize people against any preacher who might come to Dallas and oppose the lodges. . . . But almost all the response is favorable, more than we could foresee. From many, many sources come pleas that we print in pamphlet form these messages. In two days, for example, there were eight letters from Lutheran pastors, and many others have come since from Lutherans and Christians of many other faiths. Best of all, we have received word from many who are quitting the lodges." One of these writes: "I had about the same experience as you did in the lodge. I spent good money to get in that I might make some gain, but the first night one man came to me and said, 'Now, isn't this better than church?' I was not saved at that time [he was not yet a believing Christian], but that turned me against lodges. All that you have written about lodges is true. I praise God for your courage. Keep up the good work." Another writes: "I have been reading your articles on the lodges with great interest, and I surely can see the fallacy in a Christian's belonging to a lodge. I myself am a thirty-second degree Mason and can understand what you have been talking about. The main reason I took the higher degrees in Masonry was that I was troubled in soul and therefore thought that perhaps I would find something that would give me ease of conscience. I had been doubting my salvation as to whether I had ever been saved or ever could be. I imagined I had committed the unpardonable sin and everything else imaginable. I was told that

there was greater light in taking the higher degrees. This I did. But I did not find that something for which I was yearning. Masonry does not tell any one about Jesus Christ. It does not point men to the Cross of Christ where they can find peace of soul and mind. Brother Rice, may God's richest blessing be on your ministry, yourself, and family!" Of the pamphlet Evangelist Rice says: "The article is now in the hand of publishers, and we hope it will be printed soon. It will make a pamphlet of one hundred or more pages, will be printed on good paper and with a nice colored cover. As soon as possible we will announce the publication and begin to scatter it to the thousands who are waiting for it." The article closes with the encouraging words: "God is with plain preaching. He will bless the man who risks everything just to preach exactly what the Holy Spirit lays on his heart to be true to the Bible and to win souls from Satan. You may suffer some, but if you suffer in Jesus' name, you will see good fruit for your labor. Be true to the Bible, and the God of the Bible will be true to you."

Owing to a misunderstanding of a report in the *Sword of the Spirit* the undersigned recently stated in *Der Lutheraner* that also Dr. H. A. Ironside, pastor of the Moody Memorial Church, Chicago, was a Mason. Dr. Ironside now writes: "I have never been a member of any lodge in all my life. I thought my stand against these secret oath-bound orders was well known, as I have declared myself again and again regarding the unscripturalness of a Christian's joining them. The *Christian Cynosure* has published a statement from me telling 'Why I Am Not a Lodge Member,' which has been widely circulated." We are glad to publish this letter, not only in fairness to Pastor Ironside, but also because of his clear personal witness against lodges. We are still more glad that the Moody people not only see the incongruity between lodge-membership and Christian church-membership but also have the courage to witness against secret oath-bound societies. Our own testimony against the antichristian lodges ought to be all the more emphatic.

J. T. M.

Is the Pope the Antichrist?—Let *America* answer. It publishes in the issue of April 27 an article by Father Bertrand Weaver, C. P., of St. Gabriel's Monastery, Brighton, Mass., entitled: "*By What Authority does the Pope Command?*" from which we quote the following: "Today, the Papacy is the cynosure of the world. . . . We are living at a time when a non-Catholic columnist who has a potential reading public of eight or ten millions will not hesitate to write of the first encyclical of Pius XII: 'Pius XII has brought to bear upon our age understanding born of faith. . . . His words point the way to the synthesis that the human mind is seeking everywhere between individual freedom and social discipline, between liberty and authority.' Gratifying as it is to read this forthright statement by Dorothy Thompson, it is necessary to emphasize that it is incalculably weakened by her leaving unasked and unanswered the question that alone gives the key to the encyclical, the question that the Jews proposed to our Lord: 'By what *authority* doest Thou these things?' *Who* have given Thee this authority? . . . The most unreasonable of all attitudes toward the Papacy is that of neutrality. The Pope is either the supreme head of Christendom, the infallible

teacher of infallible truth, the successor of St. Peter and the vicar of Christ on earth, or he is an impostor with whom no respectable person should have dealings. You can no more be neutral toward the Pope than you can be neutral toward Christ, although many persons who call themselves Christians are attempting this neutrality, with disastrous consequences to the Christianity that they profess. 'He that is not with Me is against Me' is as true of Christ's vicegerent as it is of Christ Himself. . . . To the Macaulays of this generation" (Macaulay "wrote his classic panegyric on the endurance of the Papacy in 1840") "we can propose the kind of dilemma that our Lord proposed to those who questioned His credentials. We can say: The Papacy, whence is it? from heaven or from men? If they answer that it is from heaven, we must ask them why they have not submitted to it. But if they say that it is from men, we find it necessary to ask them to explain the miracle by which a purely human institution has never fallen into error or contradiction on any essential question of faith and morals during nineteen centuries of turbulent history. And when they have explained that miracle, we must ask them to explain another. How does it happen that that institution which has endured ruthless and bloody persecution in almost every country, and whose extinction is ardently desired by numberless persons of every class, possesses, after these hundreds of years, the allegiance of one out of every five human beings on earth?"

One more quotation: "Furthermore, if they insist on believing that the Papacy is from men, they must hold it to be a fraud of gigantic proportions; for no merely human institution could claim without deceit the absolute spiritual authority that the Papacy claims for itself. And then they must tell us how this fraudulent thing, which works in the light of day and which for all these centuries has undergone the most careful scrutiny, has escaped detection and exposure. It is inconceivable that a fraud of world-wide proportions could endure for 2,000 years. And if some say that the Papacy has been exposed, we must reply that very few seem really convinced by the pretended exposure; for no government in the world receives from those who do not give it formal allegiance the sincere honor and respect that non-Catholics in general give the Papacy, and the number of those who are taking the road to Rome is a phenomenon to challenge the attention of the world."

Father Weaver would surely have been amazed if he had read the *News Bulletin* of Jan. 5 to find that in a pronouncement protesting against the appointment of Mr. Taylor as the personal representative of President Roosevelt to the Vatican two Lutheran leaders used the expression: "The Pope is God's servant." Father Weaver would have to tell these Lutherans that they are unreasonable. The Pope is either the supreme head of Christendom, the infallible teacher of spiritual truth, or he is an impostor with whom no respectable person should have dealings. No man who rejects the claim of the Pope that he is infallible and the ruler of the Church can call him God's servant. Lutherans, who believe that the Papacy was not instituted by God but is of men, must hold it to be a fraud of gigantic proportions. Father Weaver cannot

understand how men can call the perpetrator of this gigantic fraud God's servant.

Is the Pope the Antichrist? The Catholics cannot understand how men who sincerely believe that justification, salvation, is by grace alone can deny that. The Catholic theologian Kiefl of Germany tells them that, if Luther's fundamental doctrine, salvation by grace alone, is true, the Catholic Church must be the work of the devil and the Pope, as vicar of Christ, the Antichrist. See *Conc. Theol. Monthly*, II, p. 241.

Father Weaver wants to know how the Papacy, if it is nothing but a fraud of gigantic proportions, could endure so long and command the allegiance of so many. Luther has given him the answer long ago. See Volume XVIII, p. 1528 f. Father Weaver may not have access to this writing of Luther. But some of our readers may look it up and study it.

E.

**American Lutheran Educational Conference.**—About seventy educators and administrators representing forty Lutheran colleges, seminaries, and junior colleges of the United Lutheran Church and the American Lutheran Conference assembled in Philadelphia on January 7 for the 27th annual session of the National Lutheran Educational Conference. The general theme of the conference, which lasted until January 9, was "Vital Fronts in Christian Higher Education."

In his opening address on Monday morning, January 8, the president of the conference, Dr. E. J. Braulick of Wartburg College, treated the subject "Changing Frontiers," in which he urged that a "Christ-centered culture" be maintained at Christian higher schools. Dean Minton Kleintop of Wagner College, New York, read a paper on "The Home Front," in which he emphasized the need of a more careful selection of faculty members who would not intentionally or ignorantly snipe at fundamental Christian doctrines and ideals in their classes. This talk concluded the first discussion division entitled "The Christian Culture Front."

In his official report the secretary-treasurer of the conference, Dr. H. J. Arnold, president of Hartwick College, called upon the members "to keep the living Christ in higher education." At the opening business session the question "Should colleges and seminaries of the Missouri Synod be invited to membership?" was introduced and then referred to a special committee for study and recommendation.

At the afternoon session representatives of the publicity department of the various colleges participated in a panel discussion on "How Develop More Effective Methods of Promotion and Publicity for Our Colleges." In the evening an open forum was held on "The Christian Church and Democracy," which was led by Dr. Nathan Melhorn, editor of the *Lutheran*. This aroused considerable interest and spirited debate, but the outcome was a lack of agreement on such questions as "the definition of democracy," "whether the doctrine of separation of Church and State was really a Lutheran doctrine," "whether religious minorities were controlling the nation," "whether the failure of democracy would be a sign that Christianity had failed the people," and "whether we will pass on to the next generation as much freedom as we received."

The theme of the session on Tuesday morning was "Spiritual Welfare Front." President T. F. Gullixson, Luther Seminary, St. Paul, Minn., pre-

sided over this session. Dr. C. E. Krumholz, Secretary of Welfare of the National Lutheran Council, spoke on "College and Seminary Training in Lutheran Welfare Leadership." He stressed the importance of thorough courses in welfare leadership and institutional administration and severely criticized a hit-or-miss method in developing leaders in church social work. He said: "Seminary students should receive sufficient clinical work as to make them aware of good scientific practices in community welfare."

The Rev. Martin Schroeder of Lincoln, Nebr., then addressed the meeting on "The Need of a Faithful and Persevering Ministry to the Dispossessed in Rural Communities." He deplored the heavy losses suffered by the Lutheran Church in poor communities and said that the Pentecostal churches were profiting. He charged that many a minister cannot speak the language of the poor because he does not know the lives of the poor and that poverty and the Lutheran Church do not mix. To minister effectively to the dispossessed and the suffering poor is a matter of adjustment and sacrifice. He urged the seminaries to return more candidates to rural communities and warned that rural people do not want ministers who look upon rural charges merely as stepping-stones to something better.

Dr. Bertha Paullsen of Wagner College, an authority on welfare work in Europe, said that a recent survey revealed that there are 10,000 unchurched Lutherans in upper Manhattan. In closing the discussion, Dr. Gullixson stated that "no man can minister to another in spiritual things across an economic abyss" and urged the delegates to study the noun "poor" in Holy Scripture and pressed the question, "Who shall preach the Gospel to the Lutheran poor?"

In the closing session reports were given by the "Committee on Research on the Status of Personnel Service in the Lutheran Colleges." The convention adopted a threefold program for the next year, calling for an achievement course in every Lutheran college, giving orientation tests for achievement, accomplishment, and enrolment mortality.

In the annual election Dr. J. C. Kinard of Newberry College was chosen president of the conference, and Dr. Arnold was reelected secretary-treasurer. It was decided unanimously to extend a courteous invitation to the colleges and seminaries of the Missouri Synod.

E. H. BEHRENS

**Southern Presbyterians Still Opposing Church Union.**—According to the *Christian Beacon* (March 21, 1940, "Bible Presbyterian" periodical) there are still elders in the Southern Presbyterian Church conservative enough to demand that the "Committee on Cooperation and Church Union of the Southern Presbyterian Church be continued and that the Southern Church state its own terms of union with the North." In the plea the following two matters are emphasized: "Any form of union, organic or federal, which could properly be called union, would bring about a mingling and a fusion of the two doctrinal currents now existent in the bodies and represented in the beliefs of their ministers. The Northern Church has in it, in high places, outstanding and blatant unbelievers. This alone should deter any true Christian Church from any kind of union with such a body until the unbelievers are removed

and the sin of harboring them is confessed. Many a woman will testify that the time to reform a man is before marriage, not afterward. The real question at stake in these union discussions is: 'How serious do the men of the South consider doctrinal unsoundness in a Church?' If they do not consider it a serious impediment to union with the North, then they do not consider doctrine very essential to their own fellowship, and this only serves to make us realize the condition of the Southern Church itself. Again, union is in the air. Centralization and control from the top appear to be the order of the day in the Church. Any loose federal union which might be consummated, if such were possible, would soon result, after a few years of operation, in a strengthened, centralized authority. Notice the so-called Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America. It is supposed to be a loosely federated group, and yet, when it issues its pronouncements, it does so in the name of the millions of members which it claims to represent. But the most serious aspect of this 'union in the air' attitude is that any step of union with the South and the North is only the first step. It is merely the beginning. The cry is for a united Christian Church to fulfil, in the opinion of the leaders, the prayer of Christ 'that they may be one, even as We are one.' This interpretation of that prayer, of course, we believe is wrong. But any step toward union is only the first step, and any man who realizes the condition in Protestantism in America must recognize this, or else he is blind. Sad and tragic — Protestantism wants to imitate Rome! It feels that it must have one voice representing all the people. Union is more important than the doctrine of Christ. One man said he believed Christ was more interested in seeing churches united in one testimony than in having the ministers believe in His virgin birth." It is gratifying that the *Christian Beacon* calls attention to the fact that John 17:11 b, as here applied, is really a misinterpretation of the words of Christ. As Luther already pointed out, they refer not to any unity of mind and sentiment nor even primarily to the unity of faith, but to the *unio mystica* in Christ, which all believers possess and enjoy, and of which St. Paul speaks in 1 Cor. 10:17 and 12:12, 13. Luther writes: "Christus spricht ja nicht also, dass sie einen Willen oder Verstand haben, wie sie hineintreiben, wiewohl das auch wahr ist, dass die Christen alle eines Glaubens, Liebe, Verstands und Sinnes seien, als die einen Christum, Geist und Glauben haben. . . . Aber er redet hier nicht von der Einigkeit, die da heisst eine Gleichheit, sondern setzt die Worte also, *ut sint unum*, dass sie *ein Ding* seien und also ein Ding wie der Vater und ich, also dass es vom Wesen gesagt sei [*italics our own*] und viel weiter deute denn einerlei Mut und Sinn haben. Was aber das eine oder einerlei Ding sei, werden wir nicht sehen noch greifen, sondern muessen's glauben. Es ist aber nichts anderes, denn das Paulus 1 Kor. 10:17 und 12:12 und an mehr Orten sagt, dass wir Christen alle *ein Leib* sind; wie nun der Leib ein Ding ist und heisst, so heisst die ganze Christenheit ein Leib oder ein Kuche, nicht allein der einigen oder gleichen Gedanken, sondern vielmehr *des einigen Wesens halben*." (*Italics our own. St. L. ed., VIII, 804 ff.*) Again: "Also meint's nun Christus hier auch, dass seine Christen sollen also aneinander hangen, dass sie ganz ein einig Ding und ein unzertrennter Leib



seien und bleiben, gleichwie er und der Vater eines sind. Das ist nicht allein ein Sinn und Wille, sondern ein ganz einig, unzertrennt Wesen." (*Ibid.*) And: "Durch das Wort werden wir Christo eingeleibt, dass alles, was er hat, unser ist und wir uns sein annehmen koennen als unsers eigenen Leibes; wiederum auch er alles, was uns widerfaehrt, sich annehmen muss, dass uns weder Welt, Teufel noch kein Unglueck schaden noch ueberwaeltigen kann; denn es ist keine Gewalt auf Erden so gross, die wider diese Einigkeit etwas vermoege." Briefly expressed, it may also be said that Christ here prays that His disciples and those who shall believe on Him through their word (17:20) might through faith, by virtue of His efficacious Word, be preserved in the *communio sanctorum* (so also Luther), which is the one body of Christ, Eph. 1:23. Nowhere in the sacerdotal prayer is there any indication that Christ in this great intercession had in mind any external union of professing Christians.

J. T. M.

Die achte Tagung der Luther-Akademie in Sondershausen. In der „Theologischen Quartalschrift“ (Jahrg. 37, Nr. 2) veröffentlicht D. P. Peters, jetzt Professor am Seminar der Etriv. Synode von Wisconsin u. a. Staaten, in Thiensville, Wis., einen längeren Bericht über die achte Tagung der Luther-Akademie in Sondershausen, die er letzten Sommer vom 6.—20. August mit P. Martin Hein besuchte. Der Bericht wäre es wert, daß er hier ganz abgedruckt würde, eben weil er auf so vielerlei aus den Verhandlungen so äußerst verständnisvoll eingeht und dazu treffliche Bemerkungen liefert. Einberufen war die Akademie von Prof. D. Carl Stange aus Göttingen; zugegen waren Vertreter aus vierzehn verschiedenen Völkern, unter ihnen auch P. D. Heid und Prof. Dr. Lappert aus der U. L. C. A., die über Themata aus der Geschichte der lutherischen Kirche in Amerika redeten. Das Hauptreferat lieferte Prof. D. Nygren aus Lund, Schweden, über „die Ethik der Rechtfertigung“, ein zweites Prof. D. Nejevsky aus Finnland über „die Rechtfertigungslehre der lutherischen Dogmatiker“. Hierzu bemerkt D. Peters: „Hier war Gelegenheit gegeben zu zeigen, wie das Luthertum in Deutschland, trotzdem es sich dort um keinen Sprachenwechsel handeln kann, oft unlutherischen Strömungen weichen muß, wie aber die Fortdauer des Luthertums als rechte Lehre letzten Endes von der Gnade Gottes abhängt, ohne daß deswegen in Vergessenheit geraten darf, welsch eine Bedeutung die deutsche Sprache als Scheide für die lutherische Lehre einnimmt. So wurde man auch in diesem Zusammenhang der Bedeutung, die die Gemeindefchule in Amerika zur Weibehaltung der deutschen Sprache gehabt hat, vollends gerecht.“ Zu den weiteren Themen und Vorträgen (e. g. „Die slavische Leidensmythik und das Mysterium der christlichen Passion“, „Der leidende Christus und das Problem des Leidens“: Oberpfarrer D. V. Grüner und Prof. D. Prjö J. E. Manen, Helsinki) bemerkt D. Peters: „Unsere Erfahrung innerhalb der zwei Wochen war diese, daß uns wohl keine ökumenische Tagung eine solche Fülle von nachhaltigen Eindrücken zu geben und zu hinterlassen vermocht hätte als nun gerade die Tagung der Luther-Akademie.“ Ferner: „Die studierende Jugend will z. B. die endlosen Ausführungen der höheren Kritik über alt- und neutestamentliche Quellen nicht mehr mit anhören. Theologie will sie hören und wenigstens eine Theologie, die es ihr ermöglicht, mit den Problemen der Zeit in etwas fertig zu werden. . . . So war es ein Zeichen der Zeit, daß wir auf dieser Tagung Theologen

hörten, die sich einerseits durch gründliches Wissen hervortaten, andererseits aber auch auf die Hauptfragen der Theologie eingingen. In dieser Hinsicht zeichneten sich die deutschen Theologen durch ihre Gründlichkeit und Wissenschaftlichkeit immer noch vor den meisten ihrer ausländischen Kollegen aus."

Vor allem wichtig erschien uns aber ein anderes, nämlich: „Trotz aller Korrektur, die an der Theologie vorgenommen wird, stehen Theologen in Deutschland immer noch unter dem starken Eindruck der Leistungen von Gelehrten wie Harnack, N. Seeberg und Tröltzsch. . . .“ „Als eine sehr wichtige Vorlesung in der ganzen Reihe der Vorlesungen und Vorträge dieser Tagung ist die von Oberpfarrer Thompson, Bernau (Estland), über ‚Heilige Schrift und Offenbarung‘ gehaltene anzusehen, umso mehr, da er die ganze Frage der Inspiration aufrollte. Der Vortragende selber schwamm ganz und gar in dem Fahrwasser Barthischer Theologie und ließ überhaupt nicht eine Inspiration des geschriebenen Wortes gelten. Bei diesem Vortrag konnte man auf die Aussprache gespannt sein. In ihr wurde seitens eines deutschen Theologen besonders darauf Gewicht gelegt, daß das eigentliche Problem von dem Vortragenden nicht berührt worden sei. Dieses Problem — so wurde ausgeführt — finde seinen Ausdruck in der Tatsache, daß der einfältige Christ die Bibel Wort für Wort als Gottes Wort betrachte und den Theologen zwingt, an diese gegebene Tatsache anzuknüpfen. Leider verlief die Aussprache schon wegen Zeitmangels unbefriedigend. Sie beriet aber mehr als alles andere, daß man nicht gewillt war, die Frage nach der Inspiration der Schrift von der Schrift selber beantworten zu lassen. Dem deutschen Theologen ist die ganze Frage nach der Inspiration die nach einem Problem, das er mit seinem theologischen Denken zu meistern sucht. Oder sagen wir es so: es drängen sich seinem theologischen Denken die Schwierigkeiten auf, die die Frage nach der Inspiration hervorruft; doch kann er sich nicht einfältig unter das Wort der Schrift stellen, um dieser Frage gerecht zu werden, wie es nun einmal der einfältige Christ tut. Lange ehe es zu der Aussprache über diesen Vortrag, der gegen Ende der Tagung gehalten wurde, gekommen war, wurden schon von den Teilnehmern der Tagung in Privatgesprächen über die Inspirationsfrage Meinungen ausgetauscht. Und es soll nicht unerwähnt bleiben, daß von Professoren, Pastoren und Laien die Frage nach der Inspiration immer wieder aufgeworfen worden ist, wenn auch die Verbalinspiration, wie sie von den alten Dogmatikern gelehrt wird, für überwunden erklärt wurde [von uns unterstrichen]. Dennoch scheute man sich nicht, das Wort ‚Verbalinspiration‘ zu gebrauchen, um das ‚Problem‘ in seiner ganzen Tragweite hervorzuheben. Wir konnten den Eifer, mit dem man sich mit dieser Frage beschäftigte, um so eher kennen lernen, weil wir einigen Teilnehmern an dieser Tagung schon von vornherein als solche bekannt waren, die an der Lehre von der Verbalinspiration festhielten. . . . Wie sehr uns aber das Festhalten an dieser Lehre von denen trennt, die sie fallen gelassen haben, das wurde uns offenbar, als in einer öffentlichen Aussprache der Unterschied zwischen den lutherischen Kirchenkörpern in Amerika eben dadurch gekennzeichnet wurde, daß der eine Kirchenkörper an der Lehre der alten Dogmatiker von der Verbalinspiration festhalte, während der andere diese Lehre nicht führe. . . . Und auch in einem Gespräch, das ich mit den betreffenden Theologen über diese Frage führte, kamen mir

die Unterschiede, die die verschiedene Stellungnahme zu dieser Lehre hervorruft, wohl wie noch nie zum Bewußtsein. Wie sehr sie aber die ganze Seelsorge zu gefährden vermögen, wurde mir aus einer Bemerkung eines finnischen Theologieprofessors klar, der uns die Verhältnisse in Finnland schilderte, wo die studierende Jugend, die die Bibel nicht anders als wörtlich vom Heiligen Geist eingegebenes Buch kennt, von ihren Professoren aber weiß, daß sie alle anders stehen, von vornherein in eine nicht geringe Anfechtung gerät. Das ist in der Tat das Schwertwiegende, um nicht zu sagen das Problem, daß der einfältige Christ an der Bibel als an Gottes Wort festhält, der „gelehrte“ Theolog aber diese Lehre in Abrede stellt.“

Wichtig ist auch, was D. Peters weiter schreibt: „Diese gebrochene Stellung zur Schrift liegt einer gebrochenen Stellung zur Lehre als solcher zugrunde. Nun fragt es sich, wie weit die Einstellung des deutschen Theologen zur Heiligen Schrift dieses Prinzip bei der Erörterung der Lehre von der Rechtfertigung zur Geltung kommen läßt. Denn nirgendwo hat man eine solche Veranlassung, das Wort der Schrift nachdrücklich hervorzuheben, als wo es sich um die Rechtfertigungslehre handelt. Hier entscheidet es sich, ob ein Theolog von wissenschaftlichen Voraussetzungen an die Feststellung dieser Lehre herantritt oder ob sein Gewissen in Gottes Wort gebunden ist. Letzteres vermißten wir auf dieser Tagung. . . . Nur so erklärt es sich auch, daß sich innerhalb der evangelischen Kirche Deutschlands die verschiedensten Lehrrichtungen behaupten können und daß es nicht zur Bildung einer großen evangelischen Freikirche kommt. Die letzten Verhandlungen, denen ich in Berlin beizohnen konnte, ergaben, daß man die drei verschiedenen Lehrrichtungen innerhalb der evangelischen Kirche nicht nur dulden, sondern auch würdigen wolle.“

Zum Schluß bemerkt D. Peters: „So konnte es einem nicht entgehen, daß es bei diesen Besprechungen doch an dem einen fehlte, was unser Gewissen an die reine Lehre bindet, nämlich das Wort der Schrift [von uns unterstrichen] und daß es nicht klar an den Tag trat, daß Anfang, Mitte und Ende der Theologie nichts anderes ist als an Gottes Wort glauben.“ Und wiederum: „Das Fehlen einer Antwort auf die gestellte Frage (wie sei über die Frömmigkeit der Mysterienreligion und die evangelische Frömmigkeit zu urteilen, die Prof. Viehmann unbeantwortet ließ) verdeutlichte wohl mehr als alles andere, daß alle Theologie mit der irtumslosen Heiligen Schrift als dem principium cognoscendi steht und fällt. Deshalb aber auch das sola Scriptura.“

D. Pieper hat das, was hier zum Ausdruck gebracht worden ist, so gesagt: „Mit der Leugnung der Inspiration der Schrift [und damit meint D. Pieper die Verbalinspiration] gestaltet sich die Sachlage so: 1. Wir verzichten auf die Erkenntnis der christlichen Wahrheit . . . ; 2. auf den Glauben im christlichen Sinn . . . ; 3. auf das Gebet . . . ; 4. auf die Überwindung des Todes . . . ; 5. auf die Missionsmittel der christlichen Kirche . . . ; 6. auf die rechte christliche Einigkeit der Kirche, die im Glauben an Christi Wort besteht . . . ; 7. auf den Verkehr mit Gott. 8. Wir machen aus der christlichen Religion . . . eine Weisheit, die von unten her ist. . . . Wir brechen die göttliche Himmelsleiter ab, die Brücke und den Steg, der den Himmel mit dieser Erde verbindet. Kurz, alles, was uns zu Christen macht und uns als Christen erhält, lassen wir prinzipiell fahren, wenn wir von der Wahrheit abfallen, daß die Heilige Schrift durch die Inspiration Gottes

eigenes, unfehlbares Wort ist." (Vgl. „Christl. Dogmatik“, I, S. 369 f.) Wie wahr D. Pieper hiermit geredet hat, beweist auch gerade die Luther-Akademie mit ihren ungelösten Problemen und ihren unbeantworteten Fragen. J. T. W.

**John Eliot and His "Bay Psalm Book."**—John Eliot, "Apostle to the Indians of North America," died on May 20, 1690, at Roxbury, Mass. "Last week," reports *Time* (May 20, 1940), "the historic First [Unitarian] Church in Roxbury, Mass., celebrated the 250th anniversary of John Eliot's death and the 300th anniversary of his *Bay Psalm Book*, first book published in the United States. Brilliant classic scholar, Eliot at 28 became second minister of Roxbury's First Church; eight years later, in 1640, he was one of three editors of the *Bay Psalm Book*, then titled '*The Psalms in Metre*, faithfully translated for Use, Edification, and Comfort of the Saints in public and private, especially in New England.' Critics panned it severely, said its verse constituted 'the most unique specimen of poetical tinkering in our literature.' But for a century, as edition followed edition, the Puritans liked the *Bay Psalm Book*. To his fifty-eight-year job at the First Church, Eliot added missionary work among the neighboring Indians. He learned Algonquin, a language which abounded in words like *noovoomantammmoorkanunornash* (our loves), preached to the Indians in their own dialect, established 14 self-governing Indian communities, converted more than 1,000 savages, of whom some 25 became preachers. Eliot's Indian converts docilely kept the Sabbath, wept over their sins, tackled theology with a will, were rewarded, at times, by apples and biscuits. In 1663 appeared Eliot's masterwork: a translation of the whole Bible into the Massachusetts dialect of the Algonquins. When King Philip's War came, Eliot's 'praying Indians' dwindled away. But his great influence over the savage undoubtedly saved many a Puritan life. John Eliot died full of years and good works at 86, outliving his wife, all but one of his six children. Said his admiring friend Cotton Mather: 'We had a tradition among us that the country could never perish so long as Eliot was alive.'

*Time's* somewhat cynical but nevertheless appreciative comments suggest several weighty lessons. In the first place, in no popular secular United States History that we have studied is the difference between New England Separatism, Puritanism, and Congregationalism correctly stated. The Pilgrim Fathers were Separatists in the strictest sense of the term. Separatistic Puritanism was less extreme, and gradually the differences between the two disappeared and both separatistic trends were united into Congregationalism. The *Concordia Cyclopaedia* presents the subject correctly and should be consulted by those who in our schools teach United States History. Eliot, properly speaking, was not a Puritan but a Congregationalist, and so organized his Indian parishes "after the manner of the Congregational Church" (McClintock & Strong). Secondly, Eliot's amazing success among the Indians (for such it actually was) reminds us of our own manifold opportunities for doing mission-work in our neighborhood.

Let us keep our eyes open and honestly face the mission needs in

our communities. (Eliot, by the way, was also a pioneer mission-worker among the Negroes of Massachusetts!) To his contemporaries Eliot's study of the difficult Algonquin and his determination to win these Indians for Christ must have seemed fantastic; but when afterwards he stood on "pulpit rock" (not far away from our own Martin Luther Orphanage in West Roxbury), surrounded by his Indian fellow-ministers and heard by hundreds of believing Indians, his precious work was vindicated against those who regarded the Indians merely as so many Canaanites, unfit to live and therefore to be missionized by the musket and halberd.

Lastly, as *Time* rightly remarks, First Church in Roxbury is today Unitarian, and that First Unitarian Church of Roxbury should celebrate the 250th anniversary of Eliot's death and the 300th anniversary of *Bay Psalm Book* (which, by the way, was a creditable achievement for that time) is indeed more than self-contradictory. Unitarianism largely displaced Congregationalism in Massachusetts about 1800, almost two hundred years after Eliot's birth. Today as the tourist in Massachusetts studies the bulletin-boards of the ancient, graceful, churches that dot the country from Stockbridge to Boston, he is saddened by such notices as these: Founded \_\_\_\_\_; Congregational till 1800; Unitarian since 1800. There is a warning in this general apostasy for us today. The *New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia* says: "The chief origin of American Unitarianism was in the Congregational parishes of Eastern Massachusetts, where Arminian tendencies began before the middle of the eighteenth century. *Aversion to creedal control and to strict adherence to Biblical teaching differentiated these churches from those responsive to the new Calvinism of the school of Jonathan Edwards.*" (Italics our own.) Modern Liberalism also finds its stronghold in "aversion to creedal control and to strict adherence to Biblical teaching," and unless we conscientiously continue in Christ's Word (John 8:31, 32) and do what Matt. 10:31, 32 demands of us, we shall find it hard to avoid the tragic fate which befell the Christian churches in Massachusetts about two hundred years ago. Our course lies between fanatic narrowness, of which Separatism was guilty, and liberalistic Arminianism, in the wake of which came Unitarianism in New England. J. T. M.

**Emergency Committee in Behalf of Religious Liberty Meets.**—For June 11 a meeting of this committee was scheduled to be held in Washington, D.C. The "Statement of the Principles of Religious Liberty" on which the conference is standing reads:

"We believe that religious liberty is a God-given, ineradicable right, to be recognized and conserved by all human agencies that exercise authority.

"We believe that religious liberty is the enjoyment by the individual of the inalienable right to choose his religious affiliations, without coercion from any source whatever.

"We believe that religious liberty is the ultimate ground of democratic institutions and that, whenever this liberty is questioned, restricted, or denied by any group, political, religious, or philosophical, the friends of religious liberty should become greatly concerned.

"We believe in the complete separation of Church and State as set forth in the First Amendment of the Federal Constitution: 'Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.'

"We believe that the recognition and the preservation of religious liberty by civil governments involve the acknowledgment through their constitution, written or unwritten, that religion, or the duty which every man owes to his Creator, does not come within the cognizance of the government.

"We believe that the time has come for all friends of religious liberty to consider that within the past twenty-five years one fourth of the population of the whole world has come under the sway of dictators who either delimit or completely destroy the religious liberties of the people over whom they rule, and considering this alarming fact, the friends of religious liberty should unite in its defense.

"We believe that every friend of religious liberty should exercise himself to the utmost in the maintenance of absolute religious liberty for his Jewish neighbor, his Roman Catholic neighbor, his Protestant neighbor, and for every one else. Profoundly convinced that any deprivation of this right is a wrong to be challenged, we condemn every form of compulsion in religion, whether it be exercised by a religious body or a civil state.

"We believe that the basic distinction between religious liberty and religious toleration must be clearly recognized, that the moral right to the full enjoyment of religious freedom can be consistently claimed only by those who repudiate religious coercion, and that the cultivation of a sentimental religious tolerance toward groups who within their own domain of authority deny to the individual his religious liberties should be condemned, because this tends toward the betrayal of a basic human right.

"We believe that subtle and powerful forces are now at work within our own country threatening our democratic institutions, that the surest and most effective method for maintaining security is to strengthen the hands of the people of America in the God who has granted to every man the right to religious liberty, and therefore we call upon all who serve God, all who appreciate democratic institutions, and all who desire to restrain authoritarian and totalitarian aggression wherever found to join in the defense of religious liberty."

Full information concerning the conference can be obtained from the offices of the sponsoring committee, 715 Eighth St., N. W., Washington, D. C.

Let us hope that the aim of the committee is not to cast our country into war to bring the blessings of religious liberty to other nations.

A.

**Brenz und die Reformation in Württemberg.** Aus dem „Kirchl. Anz. für Württemberg“, Nr. 2, druckt die „A. G. L. N.“ verschiedene Ausfagen ab, die nach ihrem Dafürhalten „einer Nachprüfung dringend bedürftig sind, soweit sie die geschichtliche Seite anlangen“. Wir stimmen dem zu, daß diese Sätze einer Nachprüfung dringend bedürftig sind, geben sie daher hiermit (wegen Raummangels leider nur im Auszug) weiter. Sie lauten: „1. Bei der Reformation des Herzogtums haben ein Lutheraner und ein Refor-

mierter mehr oder weniger friedlich zusammengearbeitet. Das ist ein Unikum in aller Reformationsgeschichte. Wie es dazu kam, ist nur zu vermuten. Aber die Tatsache besteht: am Anfang der württembergischen Kirche steht eine Union. . . . 3. Nimmt ein solcher [ein Lutheraner] zur Prüfung der Lehre den württembergischen Katechismus in die Hand, a) so wird er mit Befremden die ihm ungewohnte Anordnung der Lehrstücke bemerken. Daß der Dekalog dem Glauben nicht vorans, sondern nachgestellt ist, ist in der Tat nicht lutherisch, sondern reformiert und betrifft nicht etwa bloß eine Nebensache, sondern geht auf verschiedene Auffassung der Bedeutung des Gesetzes zurück. b) Die Brenzische Erklärung der Taufe wird ihn mißtrauisch machen. . . . Für uns ist keine Frage, daß Brenz mit seiner Erklärung nicht bloß glücklicher ist im Formulieren, sondern auch evangelischer. c) In der Erklärung des Abendmahls wird ihn beruhigen, daß die wirkliche Gegenwart von Leib und Blut Christi gelehrt wird; aber es klingt doch anders, wenn Luther sagt: „Es ist der wahre Leib und Blut unsers HERN JESU CHRISTI“ usw. Und wenn für Luther in den nachfolgenden Erklärungen das eigentliche Heilsgut nicht Leib und Blut, sondern die Vergebung der Sünden ist, so ist es Brenz gelungen, beides in seiner Erklärung zu vereinigen und in Beziehung zueinander zu setzen. 4. In unsern Tagen hat auf dem Tübinger Lehrstuhl ein Menschenalter lang ein Mann gewirkt, der in der Abendmahlsfrage nicht bloß seine Studenten, sondern auch seine Gemeinde unlutherisch unterrichtete, und der das Herzstück lutherischer Frömmigkeit, die Rechtfertigungslehre, so unbefangen und so kritisierte, daß man immer wieder erschrocken ist. In seinem Grab hat ihm die württembergische Kirchenleitung für seine Lebensarbeit gedankt und ihn als einen gesegneten Lehrer der Kirche gefeiert. Das entspricht der Tradition der württembergischen Kirche von ihrem Anfang an“ (von uns unterstrichen).

Man wundert sich, wie man es wagen darf, dem theologischen Leserkreis in so wenigen Sätzen so viele historische Unwahrheiten aufzutischen, da an dem Artikel fast alles verkehrt ist und die Geschichte der Reformation in Württemberg geradezu auf den Kopf gestellt wird. Fürchtet man denn gar keine Kritik mehr? Wir haben hier nicht den Raum, auf die verkehrten Darstellungen einzugehen, möchten uns aber einen gründlichen Artikel von einem Historiker erbitten über Brenz und die lutherische Kirchenreformation in Württemberg, mit besonderem Nachdruck auf die Abweisung calvinischer Irrlehre. Als Fazit könnte gesagt werden: Brenz stand in allen lutherischen Lehren immer mit Luther gegen Römische, Reformierte und irrende, abweichende Lutheraner, besonders auch Melancthon. Meusels Darstellung der Sache in seinem „Handlexikon“ (sub Brenz, S. 551) ist durchaus historisch korrekt: „Aber auch fernerhin trat Brenz, namentlich den bedenklichen Schwankungen seines Freundes Melancthon gegenüber, mannhaft ein für den lauterer und vollen Sakramentsbegriff.“ Und nicht ist zu vergessen, daß Brenz kurz vor seinem Tod alle in Stuttgart antwefenden Kirchendiener zu sich kommen ließ, „damit sie den ersten Teil seines schon vor vier Jahren abgefaßten Testaments vorlesen hörten, in welchem er noch einmal sich mit aller Freudigkeit und Entschiedenheit zu Luthers Lehre bekennt und nicht nur die Greuel des Papsttums, sondern auch alle gegen die Augsburgische Konfession erhobene Irrlehre, insonderheit ‚ausdrücklich und mit Namen die falsche, verdammte Lehre der Zwinglianer‘ [von uns

unterstrichen] vertvirft und davor warnt. Er erklärte, daß er dabei sterben und genesen wolle, empfing zur Bestätigung dessen und zur Stärkung seines Glaubens mit den Anwesenden das heilige Abendmahl und ermahnte seine Amtsbrüder unter Tränen zu rechter Beständigkeit und Einigkeit". Als Theolog reichte Wrenz nicht an Luther heran, was er auch offen zugab; als Organisator war er Luther wohl überlegen. In seiner Person und seinem Wirken zeigte er oft Einzigartigkeiten, die sich nicht leicht erklären lassen. Eins aber steht fest: „Der Tradition der württembergischen Kirche von ihrem Anfang an“ entspricht es nicht, daß Lutheraner und Reformierte „friedlich“ zusammenwirken; im Anfang der lutherischen Kirche wiesen die leitenden Lutheraner einen solchen Unionismus ab. J. T. W.

“School Life,” the official organ of the United States Office of Education, Washington, D. C., reviews in the February and March, 1940, issues the present practice in America regarding the accrediting of professional schools, such as medical, dental, law, engineering, and other schools. With respect to the accreditation of theological schools in the United States and Canada the March issue reports the following:

The American Association of Theological Schools, successor to the Conference of Theological Schools and Colleges in the United States and Canada, was organized out of the older conference in 1936 by the adoption of a new constitution. Article VII of the constitution provides for the setting up of a commission on accrediting and specifies its duties as follows:

“It shall be the duty of the commission on accrediting to institute and maintain a list of accredited theological schools under standards determined by the association.”

Upon appointment the Commission on Accrediting Theological Seminaries and Theological Colleges was given “full and final authority to institute and maintain a list of accredited theological seminaries and theological colleges.”

During the next two years it carried on the work of inspecting such seminaries and colleges as desired to be considered for accrediting, and on June 30, 1938, issued its first report, containing a list of accredited theological schools.

The standards used in accrediting the institutions follow for the most part those of organizations accrediting other types of higher educational institutions. They relate to (1) admission, (2) length of courses and graduation, (3) fields of study and balance of curriculum, (4) faculty, (5) library, (6) equipment, (7) finances, (8) general tone, and (9) inspection.

The report listed 46 accredited theological schools, 3 of which are in Canada. Of this number, 11 (1 in Canada) were found to meet all the standards. The rest fall short of them, some in one particular, others in several. To the names of the latter institutions certain “notations” are appended, according to the number of items in which they were found to be deficient. In explaining its application of the standards to the schools, the report says:

“Because of the unique combination of circumstances governing the development of the theological schools in the United States and Canada



it was natural and perhaps inevitable that there should be the widest differences between these schools in their organization and manner of work. These schools were not cut to a pattern as they grew, and it is the last thought in any mind now to try to make them uniform.

"But the association, by its own act, had adopted a statement of minimum standards and assigned to a commission the duty of administering a policy of accrediting theological schools with these standards as a basis. And it was discovered, as soon as data from individual schools began to be presented in detail to the commission, that very few theological schools meet the standards completely in every particular. The very first problem that confronted the commission was that of dealing both fairly and honestly with these divergencies." A. M. R.

**Strange Soviet Indignation.**—The Soviet's atheistic periodical *Bezbozhnik* is grieving bitterly over the oppression of the Greek and Russian Orthodox churches in Poland by the Roman Catholic hierarchy. The Soviet, in its "righteous and liberating" invasion and division of Poland, in cooperation with Germany, discovered to its great horror and indignation that "forty per cent. of the Orthodox churches in Poland have been destroyed or converted into Roman Catholic churches." Polish legionnaires are charged with carrying off icons and church plates, with preventing the people in Polish territory from "freely fulfilling their religious obligations." In all likelihood the charge is true enough, but to assume that the "Polish legionnaires" did this solely as Catholic crusading devotees is going rather far. However, what has happened to the Orthodox churches in Russia during the last twenty years? What has become of the churches of other religious groups, the Lutheran, for instance? What has been done with their churches? What has become of their pastors? Their disappearance under a welter of calculated communist hate and godlessness has none of the chaos of war to account for it.—*The Lutheran*.

**The Original Home of the Indians.**—Those who fear a Russian invasion of our hemisphere will shiver when they learn that such a calamity has already taken place. But it was long ago; and though the occupation continues, it is nothing to worry about. Dr. Ales Hrdlicka, noted anthropologist of our celebrated Smithsonian Institute, is authority for the information that the Eskimos and Indians are essentially one people, and that they came originally from Siberia. Be relieved to know that Dr. Hrdlicka is dealing with ancient race migrations, not with political possibilities of the present. His examination of numerous deposits of ancient human remains in the Irkutsk region of Siberia has fully convinced him that they are the archeological residue of a Neolithic population which lived there 3,000 years ago, but which later vanished from that whole region. Comparing the bony structure of these remains with those of the Eskimos and Indians, he found them identical in all important characteristics with the early American remains of these people, which characteristics persist in their present-day descendants. Dr. Hrdlicka concludes that "all the native people in America, *without exception*, belong to one and the same basic race," a race that could

only come from Asia and that was "neither physically nor culturally a very ancient race." The Mormons may feel the need of revising Joseph Smith's "revelations" of the Lamanites and Nephites who inhabited this land, the more so, because he claimed they were the descendants of the lost ten tribes of Israel. — *The Lutheran*.

**Brief Items.**—The *Allgemeine Evangelisch-Lutherische Kirchenzeitung* reports the death of Prof. Karl Mueller of Tuebingen at the age of eighty-seven and that of Prof. Eduard Schwartz of Berlin at the age of eighty-two. The former was active as a church historian, the latter continued the work of Mommsen, giving, however, more attention than Mommsen to the study of the early Christian Church. He published a number of ancient Christian writings.

When Walter Lippmann wrote that the delegates to the American Youth Congress showed themselves "shockingly ill-mannered, disrespectful, conceited, ungenerous, and spoiled" and stated furthermore that these young people "are hypnotized by Moscow," he offered a severe indictment. *Videant consules*, etc., we say as we think about the young people in our own camp.

In Quebec a controversy is being waged on the question whether woman suffrage should be introduced in that Canadian province. The measure is opposed by Cardinal Villeneuve, the head of the Catholic Church in Quebec. According to the *Christian Century* Mr. Jean-Charles Harvey, the brilliant editor of *Le Jour* (Montreal), in a leading editorial reminded the cardinal that, while the Church is sovereign in religious matters, the State is sovereign in civil matters. He further pointed out that in 1919 Pope Benedict XV assured one of the leaders in the woman suffrage movement in England that he did not disapprove of the granting of the suffrage to English women, that the bishop of Tasmania recently commented on the fact that woman suffrage had notably improved the condition of women and especially of working women on that island, and that the rector of the Catholic Institute of Paris in 1924 had espoused the cause of woman suffrage in France. It seems the heads of the Roman Catholic hierarchy are in disagreement with one another.

From Buenos Aires comes the information that there seems to be less willingness at present to let the Roman Catholic Church conduct religious instruction in the public schools during class hours. A bill, so it is reported, has been introduced by the minister of public instruction which seeks to change the present laws. What is proposed is a course of study which eliminates the teaching of religion. This would be in keeping with the federal constitution of Argentina, according to which religious instruction can be given only outside of class hours and must be based on requests from parents, and which opposes all discrimination in favor of a certain Church. What a boon if true separation of Church and State would be achieved!

One of our exchanges submits the following distressing item: "Dr. Frederick Bartlett, Episcopal Bishop of Idaho, has sent out a warning that rural America is fast becoming paganized and that, unless the trend is halted, the Christian Church in the United States is doomed.

Father Andrew Kelly of St. Anthony's Roman Catholic Church, Hartford, Conn., calls for a united front of all religious forces against the movement toward paganism in this country. He said, 'It becomes more obvious every day that all religious forces must unite in a common battle on paganism, if for no higher motives than defense of our own possessions, among which is liberty.'

The cigaret has become a large source of Federal revenue. Last year it yielded more than \$500,000,000. The Federal revenue from all tobacco products combined totaled \$580,000,000, or more than twice the amount the Department of Agriculture estimates the tobacco-growers received for their tobacco crop. The total consumption of tobacco has increased approximately 136 per cent. in the last forty years—from 381,000,000 pounds in 1900 to approximately 900,000,000 pounds in 1939. The total population increased during this period about 75 per cent. Government tobacco specialists say that these figures do not necessarily mean that the individual consumes more tobacco now. They believe that most of the increase in consumption is because a much larger proportion of the population now uses tobacco.—*Watchman-Examiner*.

According to the *Living Church* seven Episcopal clergymen of New York, together with thirteen other members of the clergy of that city, signed a statement favoring birth control. It has often been observed that Modernism in theology is accompanied by a lack of sensitiveness as to what God teaches in the field of morals.

It is reported that the bishop of Truro, England, has refused to install a priest in his diocese who insists on the practice of the reservation of the Sacrament. The bishop is Dr. Hunkin. Some of his clergy are said to be up in arms against his decision. A serious situation indeed!

On March 26 there occurred the death of Dr. George W. Wright, who for 35 years had been a Presbyterian minister in the Philippine Islands. Among his activities is mentioned the help which he extended lepers on those islands. The chapel of San Lazaro Hospital at Manila, dedicated to the care of lepers, is called the Wright Chapel for this missionary.

On Long Island 13 members of the cult known as "Jehovah's Witnesses" (Russellites) who had been convicted of disorderly conduct in their distribution of tracts were freed by a judge of a higher court, who held that, while they had evinced "lack of manners and bad taste," they could not be punished for what they had done because of the religious liberty guaranteed by the United States Constitution.

An editorial in the *Watchman-Examiner* laments that the Spanish government bans Freemasonry. If the report is correct that the new legislation "not only bans Freemasonry but applies penalties retroactively, so that even if a man had surrendered his Masonic membership years ago, if it is discovered that he had once been a Mason, he is liable for punishment," then, it seems, some real injustice is involved. But that Freemasonry and free government are contradictory has often been demonstrated.

The falling interest rate has affected Union Seminary in New York. Its public-relations representative publishes information concerning a

drive to secure \$300,000 to "create a stabilization fund for the endowments." Most of this is now in hand. Only \$48,000 remains to be secured before July 1. A special committee of Episcopal clergy is assisting. Union Seminary will probably become in time the spearhead of the movement for union between the Presbyterian and Episcopal churches. Out of reach of all control on the part of our Church, Union Seminary has for years exercised a strong influence upon our denominational affairs. This seminary was "modernist" until that cause failed and is now strongly "liberal," "socialistic," and "union," these being momentarily the "current trends." — *The Presbyterian*.

The Seventh-day Adventists take their missions seriously, even in their Sabbath-schools. Though they are not a wealthy group, they have persistently and intelligently instructed their people, old and young alike, in missions and tithing. Each Sabbath, in every Sabbath-school, a definite missionary message is delivered, and then an offering is made for that particular purpose. Both their churches and their schools are on a tithing basis, and the entire tithe is devoted to their denominational missions, the largest proportion of which is put into foreign work. The Southern Presbyterian organ, the *Christian Observer*, sadly confesses that, though the Adventists number scarcely half the Southern Presbyterian membership, they contribute from four to six times as much to foreign missions. One small college congregation of 150 members is said to have given \$7,000 for missions in one year. Just what would be the ratio of other denominations in such a comparison — say our own, for instance? — *The Lutheran*.

According to the official Catholic Directory there are now 21,403,136 Catholics in the United States. The number of converts during the past year is stated to have been 73,677.

In New York, it seems, the forces of law, order, and morality won out in their attempt to prevent the appointment of Bertrand Russell as teacher in the City College of New York. The budgetary provision for his professorship has been stricken out. The newspapers reported recently that a judge declared Russell, prominent radical, on account of his views on marriage and morality, ineligible for the position of professor in that college.

On April 7 there died, 76 years old, Dr. Cyrus Adler, president of the Jewish Theological Seminary, New York, and of the Dropsie College for Hebrew and Cognate Learning in Philadelphia.

The *Bay Psalm Book*, whose tercentenary is observed this year, was the first book to be printed in what now is the United States. The importance of the work can be gaged somewhat by the fact that 27 editions of it were printed in New England and that in Old England itself the work became quite popular, too. Speaking of its significance, Henry Wilder Foote, writing in the *Christian Century*, says: "It is the earliest literary monument of the English-speaking colonies, and it was an important contribution to the religious life of its time. For more than a century it was the cherished collection of worship songs of our colonial ancestors." A.