

9-1-1941

## 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. (1941) "Theological Observer. - Kirchlich-Zeitgeschichtliches," *Concordia Theological Monthly*. Vol. 12 , Article 61.

Available at: <https://scholar.csl.edu/ctm/vol12/iss1/61>

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 Church and the Word.**— Under this heading Rev. G. H. Muedeking (ALC, Columbus, O.) offers, in the *Journal of Theology* (May, 1941), a keen analysis of the relation of the divine Word to the Church, and *vice versa*, in order to stress the fundamental differences on this point between Lutheranism, Catholicism (including Greek Catholicism), and Calvinism (including Quakerism). At a time when a world church union is being considered in wide circles, the article is of eminent importance. The author reaches the conclusion that reconciliation between the denominated groups is impossible, unless they are ready to surrender their specific doctrines on the Word and the Church. If there is to be a union between Lutheranism and Calvinism, either Lutheranism must give up its principle that the Spirit is bound to the Word, or Calvinism must give up its principle that the divine election determines completely the destiny of men. Lutheranism cannot give up its doctrine, for then it, too, must give up its fundamental tenet of justification by faith, while Calvinism cannot give up its view, since in that case it must surrender its entire theology built on the majesty of God. Again, Lutheranism cannot unite with Greek Catholicism, since the Greeks insist that the very meaning of Scripture is ascertainable only from the traditions or ecumenical decisions of the Church, while Lutheranism regards Scripture as the *norma normans* interpreting itself. For a similar reason Lutheranism cannot unite with Roman Catholicism, since Romanism contends that "the interpretations of the meaning of Scripture is to be gained only from the historical insights of the historical Church" or from the decisions of the Pope, who, to speak in the phrase of the Smalcald Articles, "has all rights in the shrine of his heart."

As said before, it is necessary that these *differentiae specificaе* be constantly stressed. While in agreement with the article as a whole, the undersigned failed to see the correctness of a number of statements. The writer, for example, says that "for the two Catholic groups the interpretations of the meaning of Scripture is to be gained only from the historical insights of the historic Church" (tradition) and then continues: "Lutheranism does not transcend this position completely, for it, too, understands the Word which is a normative for the believer to be a *viva vox* (Luther: "The gospels are to be a living voice")." Then he says: "But the Scriptures themselves also become the material faith of the believer for Luther when he makes the Holy Spirit to be bound to the Scriptures by God." Evidently the writer has misunderstood Luther, who, when saying that the gospels are to be a living voice, merely wished to insist upon the public proclamation of the Word, and indeed of the same Word which Scripture teaches. To Lutheranism the Bible is in every way the *norma normans*, or to speak in the words of the author, in every way "the material faith of the believer." The statement "But the Scriptures themselves also become the material faith of the believer for Luther" therefore weakens the point which the writer means to stress, namely, that Lutheranism knows of no other norm and of no other interpretation of this norm than Scripture itself.



Not clear is the statement that "Luther insisted that the universal priesthood guaranteed the possibility that the Spirit could speak to the Church directly through the Scriptures. And tradition was not needed." Against the Romanists Luther insisted upon the *perspicuity* of Scripture, it being clearer even than the light of the sun, and this not only to the learned, but also to the simple and unlearned. "On earth no clearer book has been written than Holy Scripture, which in comparison with all other books is like the sun compared with all other lights." (St. L. Ed., V:334.) The universal priesthood of all believers, of course, was emphasized by Luther also in connection with his insistence upon Scripture as the only source and norm of faith. Just because of their high prerogative as spiritual priests, all believers are to read the Bible and judge from it between truth and error, rejecting in particular the new enthusiasm, which fought for recognition after papal enthusiasm had been revealed and overcome by the great Reformer. The reference to the universal priesthood at this point is therefore well in place, though in the argumentation we find an essential omission. J. T. M.

**Free Will and the Grace of God.**—In the May issue of the *Journal of Theology of the American Lutheran Conference* Pastor E. J. Boerger (Fort Wayne, Ind.) of the American Lutheran Church discusses the interrelation between divine grace and human free will in a way that bears witness to the fruitfulness of the careful intersynodical study of these vital subjects. The writer closes his article with the words: "May God in mercy keep us in the channel of grace that we suffer spiritual shipwreck neither from the Scylla of synergism nor from the Charybdis of Calvinism!" Before this he had said of the human free will and divine grace: "The Law, charging natural man, the sinner, with utter corruption, proclaims that 'free will' can do absolutely nothing, and the Gospel publishes the sweet message that grace does everything. The sweet doctrine of salvation by grace alone is the very heart, soul, and center of the Gospel and the Christian religion. A grace that is in any way or part conditioned on human work and merit; a grace which needs even the most infinitesimal way or part of man's endeavors and cooperation to accomplish its purpose, is not real grace; it has forfeited the very essence of grace and is a useless grace, because free will has no spiritual power whatever to accept or appropriate it. If salvation is by grace at all, it must be by grace alone (in no respect of man's work or cooperation), otherwise grace is no more grace. The teaching (synergism) that a man's salvation depends in any way on his self-determination subverts the whole Christian religion, denies Christ as the sole Foundation of our salvation and the only Savior of mankind, repudiates the Gospel, disavows the power of the blood and death of Christ and His redemption, and takes from God the glory that He alone saves us." With equal vigor the writer champions the *gratia universalis*: "The curse of original sin is universal; thank God, the grace of God is universal too and extends over all men. Holy Scripture is most clear and emphatic in its declarations and promises of grace by which mercy, life, peace, and salvation are extended from God to all men, confirmed by the very oath of God Himself." Just so our own Church has always taught the



*sola gratia* and the *gratia universalis* side by side, neither denying the one nor infringing the other.

On the *cruz theologorum* (*Cur alii, alii non?*) Pastor Boerger writes: "We learn from Scripture that the sole cause of a man's salvation is the grace of God; also, that the sole cause of man's perdition is his wickedness. But when we investigate the question why, since the grace of God is universal and equal in all, not all are saved or not all are lost, we find no answer that is fully clear and conclusive or comprehensive and satisfactory. Human reason cannot account for the difference in the outcomes. . . . For a perfect solution we must wait for 'the light of glory.' The mystery, as the writer next says, lies, in a certain sense, in God, namely, "because He has not revealed all mysteries to man." However, as he continues, there are mysteries in this doctrine of election also that are human and psychological, inasmuch as "some are not touched by the Law and reject and despise the offered grace of God, viz., wilful and malicious unbelief, while others, equally wicked by nature and in like condemnation, are nevertheless converted, brought to faith, justified, sanctified, and saved." The paragraph closes with the thought: "This [the mystery just discussed] will ever be for us a mystery and miracle of grace that leaves us humbly indebted to Christ and the Holy Spirit in loving gratitude of service and praise forever." While the writer's *modus loquendi* is not at variance with Scripture, it may perhaps be best, for the avoidance of confusion, to place the mystery neither in God nor in man but simply to say that the *Cur alii prae aliis?* involves a mystery for the simple reason that God has not given us the solution in His Word. Scripture clearly teaches that sinners like Peter are saved by grace alone and that sinners like Judas are lost through their own fault; but it does not explain to us why the one was brought back to faith, while the other ended his life in despair, though both were in *eadam culpa* and both were seriously offered by God the same saving grace. "When studying the cause why men are saved," says the author, "we never get beyond *sola gratia Dei*; when studying the cause why men are lost, we never pass beyond *sola culpa hominum*." The *Journal* is to be commended for offering so clear and Scriptural an article on this Christian fundamental.

J. T. M.

**News from Ichang, China, and Manchuria.**—From our synodical biweeklies the readers of this journal have learned that Ichang, one of the Missouri Synod mission-stations in China, is occupied by Japanese troops. Amid great difficulties our brother Missionary E. H. Thode has been faithfully working there till now. In the *Christian Century* (un-denominational) a correspondent writing from Edinburgh, Scotland, makes mention of Scottish mission-work in Ichang and then appends a little information on the work in Manchuria. To understand the item, one must bear in mind that it is written by a British subject.

"Ichang, the important city on the Yangtze River, which is the center of the Church of Scotland mission in China, has for some time been in Japanese hands. The missionaries there are quite cut off from the outer world, but it is known that they still carry on their work with certain restrictions. Two of the schools, however, had been transferred



before the Japanese occupation to Western China and are carrying on there. From Ichang there is, of course, no opportunity for the missionaries to go on furlough. The position in Manchuria, where the Church has a much larger mission, is uncertain. Unable to accept the Japanese demand that all schoolchildren must worship at a Shinto shrine, the missionaries have closed the educational work. Evangelistic and medical work still goes on, and the Manchurian Church is very much alive, but no one knows what the future holds. Should the Japanese go to war against us, the missionaries would probably be interned. If the Japanese extend the policy they have adopted in their own country,—the elimination of foreigners,—they will probably be sent out of the country.”

A.

**National Days of Humiliation and Prayer.**—The information given in the following paragraphs will be appreciated. It is taken from the *Christian Statesman* as reprinted in the *Presbyterian*.

“Repeatedly the Continental Congress appointed days for national humiliation, fasting, and prayer, adopting resolutions, deeply religious, in connection therewith.

“Within seven years five such days were appointed: July 20, 1775; May 17, 1776; December 11, 1776; May 3, 1780, and April 1, 1782.

“The resolution adopted in the call for May 17, 1776, contained the following: ‘that with united hearts we may confess our manifold sins and by a sincere repentance and amendment of life appease His righteous displeasure and through the merits and mediation of Jesus Christ obtain His forgiveness.’

“President John Adams, on recommendation of Congress, proclaimed two national fast-days: May 9, 1798, and August 2, 1799. In the first proclamation President Adams spoke of ‘the just judgments of God against prevalent iniquity as a loud call to repentance and reformation.’

“President Madison appointed the third Thursday of August, 1812, as a day for national humiliation and prayer; President Tyler, May 14, 1841; President Taylor, the first Friday of August, 1849; President Buchanan, January 4, 1861.

“President Lincoln, on recommendation of the Senate and House of Representatives, twice proclaimed a day of prayer and fasting: the first Thursday of September, 1861, and the 30th of April, 1863. This last proclamation is the most profoundly religious state document of our history. Shortly after the observance of this last fast-day the tide turned, and victory for the Union was assured.

“President Wilson, in the period of the World War, appointed October 28, 1917, as a day for national prayer.”

A.

**Northern Baptist Convention.**—The Northern Baptists this year met in Wichita, Kans. In a resolution pertaining to the present war, totalitarianism was condemned, and sympathy with the democratic peoples now engaged in war was expressed. The President was commended for keeping our nation out of the war and for furnishing aid to the democracies. He was implored to “use every influence at his command to mediate a just and lasting peace among the nations.” One of the chief visiting speakers, to whose influence the above resolutions



are largely attributed, was Missionary E. Stanley Jones of India. According to a report in the *Christian Century* (undenominational) the convention was marked by a conflict between Modernists and Fundamentalists. The leader of the Fundamentalists is the Rev. Earl B. Pierce of Minneapolis. His "role as a traveling evangelist enables him to build organizational fences and keep them in repair." Governor Harold Stassen of Minnesota was elected vice-president, while the president is Dr. W. A. Elliot of Ottawa, Kans. The convention "opposed the appointment of a successor to Mr. Taylor at the Vatican, attacked the growth of gambling and the use of liquor, especially in the Army camps, opposed block-booking of motion-pictures, defended the right of labor to organize, warned against the possible loss of labor's gains in the National Defense effort, urged that governmental relief standards be adequate to maintain families in health and decency, endorsed cooperations, and affirmed belief in 'the equal rights of man regardless of race, creed, or political affiliation.'" It can be seen from this summary that the social gospel was quite much in evidence. A.

**Meeting of Northern Presbyterians.**—At the meeting of the Presbyterian Church of the United States of America (Northern Presbyterians), held in St. Louis in the latter part of May, about 850 commissioners were in attendance. One of the most important events of the convention was the election of Dr. Herbert Booth Smith of Immanuel Presbyterian Church of Los Angeles, Calif., as moderator. His chief opponent in the election was Dr. Henry Sloane Coffin, president of Union Seminary. It is stated that there were two reasons why Dr. Coffin was defeated in spite of his prominence as a Presbyterian leader and author. In the first place, he is connected with Union Seminary, which is a liberal, modernistic school. In the second place, he is known to favor our aiding Great Britain in the present war as an active ally. Among other interesting resolutions was the one that called upon the Government to supply food and clothes for the conscientious objectors in the camps where they are confined. As to participation in the war, the Assembly voted "that much more is to be gained in meeting the needs of the world by America remaining free from participation in the present conflict." A.

**The Convention of the Disciples.**—The first week of May the Disciples of Christ held their annual convention in St. Louis. One of the chief addresses was delivered by E. Stanley Jones, a Methodist. This was in keeping with the tendency represented by the Disciples, who endeavor to destroy denominationalism. Another speaker of prominence was Toyohiko Kagawa of Japan. A million-dollar campaign was undertaken, chiefly in the interest of Christian missions. Perhaps the climax of convention activities is represented by the following resolution, which was passed by a vote of two to one and telegraphed to President Roosevelt: "The International Convention of Disciples of Christ respectfully and earnestly petitions the President of the United States to use the great powers of his office to keep this nation out of the war now raging in Europe, Asia, and Africa. We make bold to present this petition in the view of the President's repeated and solemn pledges assuring



the country that the armed forces of the United States would not become involved in the war. We note with anxious apprehension that the policy of aid to Britain has carried the nation to the brink of belligerent participation and that the country and the President now face a crucial and irrevocable decision, which will profoundly affect the destiny of America. We affirm our conviction that America's responsibility to the civilization of the future requires the maintenance of her own peace and the preservation of the democratic way of life. . . . We implore the President to revive the role of mediator for himself and our nation and to adopt no further policy in aid to Britain which will carry the hazard of involvement in the war. The American people are overwhelmingly opposed to belligerent participation, and we look with great foreboding upon any action by the Government which will plunge a divided nation into war." We hold that a religious convention leaves its proper sphere when it discusses political questions. There is no hint in the resolution that the people adopting it are speaking not as churchmen but as American citizens. A.

**A Guide to be Used after the Rapture.**—The horrible confusion which millennialism is causing in the minds of such as are misled by this fanatical and dangerous delusion appears from an article in the *Sunday-school Times* (non-denominational), recopied from the number of April 1, 1933, at the request of a reader. In part the article reads: "With regard to bearing testimony concerning the rapture of the Church to those who are left behind, the following, prepared by a minister in Saskatchewan, has been adopted and placed in the safety-deposit boxes of a number of business and professional men in Vancouver, B. C., as well as in Los Angeles: *A Guide to Those who are Left after the Rapture of the Saints.*" In this *Guide* the following is impressed upon the Christians who have missed the "rapture": "The great EVENT has now taken place. The Church of the Living God, composed of His blood-bought children, has been taken away from the earth. Both living believers and the dead in Christ (who have been raised from the dead) have been caught up to meet the Lord in the air, in accordance with 1 Thess. 4:15-18. The Church now remaining is not the true Church, but the apostate Church of Laodicea, spued out of the Lord's mouth, Rev. 3:16. This message is directed to all those who are left, and its object is to bear witness that the Scriptures teach that even yet there remains a chance for some to escape the final doom of the Lake of Fire (as grace still continues to operate, Rev. 7:13, 14). In due time, and after an awful period of tribulation has taken place upon the earth, the Lord, together with His saints, will be revealed from heaven, after which the Great White Throne of final judgment will be set up; but between the present hour and the time of His revelation from heaven, the Bible tells us, many will be saved, according to Rev. 7:9-14: 'These are they which came out of [the] great tribulation and have washed their robes and made them white in the blood of the Lamb.' This clearly teaches the way in which YOU can prepare to meet God. Your 'robes' are stained with worldliness, pleasure-seeking, and sin. Now, then, separate yourself to God, absolutely and entirely, and seek cleansing



in the blood of Jesus Christ, which was shed on Calvary for the remission of sin. Accept this by faith on the assurance of Rev.7:14. Study your Bible. You may have refused to believe its prophetic warnings. But sure now, in view of the great events which you have seen, you will accept by faith that which is prophesied to follow. Shortly the Anti-christ Ruler will appear and compel men to bear his mark and to worship him and his image. Refuse the mark and refuse to worship at any cost, even unto death. It is better to suffer now and reign with Christ later than to escape suffering now by yielding to the Beast and then to be lost eternally and suffer forever. Be of good courage! Hold fast to the Word of God. The tribulation time will pass. The prize of being with Christ soon is worth everything. You will do well to show kindness to the Jews. A good book teaching the premillennial coming of the Lord will help you in your study of the Bible. By all means get one. Pass the message on." It has been said that there are as many millennialistic views as there are millennialists, and each adds a little more to the confusion created by the wild, visionary theories expounded and published with a zeal that is amazing. The subject of millennialism and, in particular, of dispensationalism should receive new study in view of the wave of enthusiasm and hysteria caused by the present war. Millennialism is unscriptural in its origin and scope, draws the attention of believers from the necessary fundamentals of sin and grace, changes the heavenly hope into an earthly one, makes of Christ's spiritual kingdom a worldly reign, and by its morbid emphasis on a false prophetism tends to destroy true faith and helps to spread liberalism and unbelief.

J. T. M.

**National Conference of Catholics, Protestants, Jews.**—From the newspapers we all know that conferences between Catholics, Protestants, and Jews are held in various parts of our country. In *America* (Roman Catholic) a writer discusses these conferences, stating that he is in favor of this endeavor. Going into the history of it, he says, "the idea of bringing together face to face leading citizens of the Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish people emerged in the early 1920's, when the Ku Klux Klan was riding high. Catholics should appreciate this fact. The Ku Klux Klan was the last of four serious rioting hysterias against Catholics in one hundred years of American history. The nativist fanatics in the 1830's, the Know-nothings of the 1850's, the American Protective Association of the 1890's, together produced scores of anti-Catholic organizations, whose literature distorted the truth about our Church. Their members were trained to hate our people, and their tactics injured our business, social, and political relations. If the National Conference of Christians and Jews can be made to succeed, our children and our children's children need not suffer from such causes again." That the methods employed by the people representing these movements at times were wrong we have no doubt, but that they were based on only too well-founded suspicions about the dangerous character of the Roman Catholic Church likewise should not be doubted.

The writer in *America* mentions these purposes of the National Conference: 1. To analyze and allay prejudice arising among religious



groups in the United States. 2. To establish a basis of cooperation for common ends, while insuring the right of individuals and groups to differ. 3. To immunize the public mind and emotions against propaganda of misinformation and hatred by developing mutual understanding and appreciation — the only secure foundation for an abiding democracy.

The writer continues: "The conference does not seek uniformity of religious beliefs or any least common multiple of faith. It does not attempt to achieve its goal by weakening the distinctive loyalties and beliefs of its members. It does not hold that 'one religion is as good as another.' It does not aim at any sort of union or merger of religious bodies, nor does it undertake to represent official religious bodies. . . . The Catholics in the conference, then, strive for civic tolerance, not theological tolerance. This is the end for which the National Conference is working." Civic tolerance is, of course, something that the United States stands for. Are Catholics willing to grant it in full measure to dissenters?

A.

**An Appraisal of the Present Sunday-School.**—Writing in the *Watchman-Examiner* (Northern Baptist) under the caption "What Are the Facts?" Daniel Heitmeyer of Colorado submits a frank discussion of Baptist Sunday-schools, which, we suppose, applies to Sunday-schools in many other circles likewise.—

By the stern test of results in a critical time we have to judge that the teaching program in our Baptist churches is tragically inadequate. Any study of the situation is handicapped by the lack of dependable statistics. Such statistics as are available are little better than guesses. Most of them have not been scientifically compiled, and they omit important factors. Nor can all the results of a teaching program be captured in statistics.

All agree, though, that an adequate educational program of a church must have an outreach. That is to say, the church should "go teach." Practically that means "go get boys and girls and bring them into the church-school." But the fact is that on an average Sunday in an average American community out of every 100 children and youths only about 60 will be enrolled in Sunday-school. Out of every 100 who are enrolled, 40 will be absent. Those who are present will spend about 40 minutes each in class. The teacher will probably not have had any special training for the work. He or she will have an average understanding of Christianity and the Bible corresponding to that of a twelve-year-old child's understanding of history and arithmetic. Much school equipment and general methods will be about on a par with the two-room rural or small-town secular school of fifty years ago. Of course, exceptions to these statements may be found in any church or community. It is believed, however, that as averages they are accurate.

The teaching material will probably be excellent. The teacher will probably be devoted and of exemplary character, and these can balance many deficiencies. Something of the inspiring and life-shaping influence of the New Testament will be imbibed by the pupils despite all shortcomings in methods and equipment. Even in the least efficient schools the pupils will be exposed to the influence of the matchless Christ.



But the inadequacy of the educational program of the average church is none the less tragic.

We are told that eighty-five per cent. of the new additions to the churches come from the Sunday-schools. That sounds good, but it means little in itself. The other side of the picture is that a large percentage of pupils drift out of Sunday-school without ever being won to Christ and the Church. If we follow up the eighty-five per cent. after they are baptized and join the church, the figures are not so inspiring. Probably the spiritual history of a third of them can be written in three words: "inactive," "non-resident," "dropped."

But the most tragic feature of the whole situation is that "by and large" our church-educational program is not producing graduates who are adequately indoctrinated, and it is not producing strong Christian character.

The numerous "peculiar" and subversive sects and movements which are causing so much confusion and disruption in many places recruit a large proportion of their following from among the membership of the churches. Members are easily led away after the false prophets because they have not been indoctrinated. They are spiritually illiterate. They do not know the contents of the Bible. They cannot read the Bible with understanding, and they do not know where to find what they need. They come from Sunday-school into the church and even into official positions in the church while still spiritually "babes in Christ." They swallow the false teachings of the misleaders because their minds are not equipped to see the difference between truth and error. Instructive and constructive preaching from the pulpit can do something to make up for this failure in the Sunday-school, but not much.

Much is said about young people from our church homes having their Christian faith wrecked when they go away to college. To what extent this happens no one knows. I assume that it does happen. But is the Christian faith of our Protestant young people so frail a thing? If so, it must be because our homes and Sunday-schools give our boys and girls such a woefully inadequate preparation.

We have a right to expect that the religious training we give our children will fortify them against the testings and perils of life. These children, when they grow up, will live in a society where there are saloons and gambling joints, where cocktail parties are popular, where vice is commercialized, and where facilities for sinning are abundant. If our home and Sunday-school teaching does not prepare them to live as Christians in that sort of environment, it fails.

Much is being said to the effect that we should do something to safeguard the moral and spiritual security of the young men who are being drafted into the Army. Certainly, everything possible should be done. Surely the people have a right to demand that the regions round about the camps should be kept clear of bawdy houses and gambling dens and boozing kennels. But the best safeguards against the perils and pitfalls of Army life are those which have been built into the characters of the draftees by the teaching processes of the home and the Sunday-school.



Baptists are most insistent that there shall be no religious teaching in the public schools. Well, if we say there shall be no religious teaching in public schools, then home and church have to do it. Most homes fail to do it. Therefore the churches have to do it. If we do not do it better than we have been doing, we shall presently discover that the whole matter will be taken out of our hands. In ultimate consequence our nice theory of voluntariness in religion will be discredited.

The solution of the problem will not be found along the cheap and easy way. A denominational commitment to a prolonged and intensified campaign can do something. Continued agitation of the matter can do much. But ultimately the answer will have to be found in an honest facing of realities in the local church. We must do so before it is too late.—

Thus speaks a Baptist pastor in the *Watchman-Examiner*. Are we willing to make the proper application not only with respect to our Sunday-schools but our Christian day-schools as well? A.

**A Two-Edged Sword.**—Passing political resolutions at religious conventions may have in its wake a rude awakening where people are sensitive as to the implications of the principle that Church and State are separate. Baptists traditionally endeavor to observe this principle. When they momentarily depart from this course, there is likely to come a sharp reaction against the lapse. Witness what happened at the convention of the Southern Baptists held in Birmingham, Ala., May 14—18, 1941. The *Watchman-Examiner* (Baptist) describes the episode to which we refer in these words:

"The one exciting episode in the convention occurred Friday afternoon, when Dr. Powhatan James of the First Church, Tuscaloosa, Ala., begging the indulgence of the chair for intruding upon the special order which had been set apart for an address by Dr. Truett on the Baptist World Emergency, began reading a flaming appeal for all-out aid to Britain, stopping short of nothing to make it effective. Expressing full respect for conscientious objectors and condemning war in unqualified terms, he nevertheless proceeded to describe the dire threats to liberty by the totalitarian dictators and to pledge utmost support of the Administration in its policies and to plead for a quickening and enlarging of the measures announced by the Government. There arose from the emotionalized audience a roar of applause. Dr. A. J. Barton, advancing to the front, moved that, instead of passing to the resolutions committee in regular course, the paper should be adopted as the expression of the convention. The chair ruled that the vote indicated the necessary two-thirds majority required to carry. Thus, in a few breath-taking moments, the unexecuted vote was being head-lined in the newspapers and wired to Congressmen.

Reaction to the implications of the James resolution on Saturday morning impelled the resolutions committee to recommend an interpretation which might serve to correct possible misconception. This interpretation construed the resolution passed the afternoon previous to mean an affirmation of loyalty to the United States Government and



to the ideals of the founding fathers rather than a commitment of the convention to militaristic principles or to war as a recognized method of settling international disputes. This was voted almost unanimously. Another resolution asked for effort to keep fellowship unimpaired among Christians differing as to measures and for high endeavor to live above the war."

A.

**The Christ of Modernism.**—It is quite common for Modernists to praise Christ in the most extravagant manner, without, however, according to Him the divine adoration which we owe Him and which also He demands. The *Christian Beacon* (May 15, 1941) points out how recently this has been done again by Dr. E. G. Homrighausen, liberal professor of "Christian Education" in Princeton Theological Seminary, in a book published by him under the title *Let the Church Be the Church*. The *Christian Beacon* writes: "It is evident by what he says in this book concerning the Lord Jesus Christ that he does not hold to the accepted position of the Church in regard to our Lord. In the chapter entitled *Jesus Christ Is Our Religion* Dr. Homrighausen, though saying many splendid things about Christ, declares on page 175: 'According to our best moral judgment, another Jesus has not appeared since or before. We feel that another such Christ would require a unique creation on God's part to produce again. Nobody has approximated the dazzling clarity and originality of his spirit, and those who have followed closest have been most conscious of his distance from them.' There are certain patent things that should be said about this astonishing statement: 1. The Christian Church has never expected, and never will expect, another Christ. 2. Jesus Christ is not a 'unique creation on God's part.' He is the Second Person of the Trinity, the eternal Son of God. There can be only one Christ. He is the only-begotten Son of God. The Bible is very plain in its teaching that there can be only one Christ. It is in full accord with the teaching of the Bible to say that God cannot create another Christ. Christ was never created; and second, there can never be another. All the high praise of the Lord Jesus Christ amounts to only words when we talk about the possibility of another one being produced and of God creating one. He said, 'Before Abraham was, I am,' John 8:58. Men may vow and declare that Dr. Homrighausen is sound in the faith and that Princeton is holding true to the old fort, but such things as this declare clearly and plainly otherwise." When the *Christian Beacon* says that "God cannot create another Christ" this must be understood in the light of the two statements that follow. Taken in that sense, the "cannot" does not limit divine omnipotence but merely stresses the two Christological truths here emphasized. When Dr. Homrighausen declares that "another such Christ would require a unique creation on God's part to produce again," he shows that the Christ whom he praises is a mere man and that his view coincides with that of Kant, who saw in Jesus "the ideal of moral perfection" and no more. Modern Princeton theology repudiates the Apostles' Creed and with that, of course, the central doctrine of Christianity concerning Christ's divine person and work.

J. T. M.