

11-1-1943

The Reunion of Christendom

Th. Engelder

Concordia Seminary, St. Louis

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



Part of the [Practical Theology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Engelder, Th. (1943) "The Reunion of Christendom," *Concordia Theological Monthly*. Vol. 14 , Article 64.
Available at: <https://scholar.csl.edu/ctm/vol14/iss1/64>

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.

Concordia

Theological Monthly

Vol. XIV

NOVEMBER, 1943

No. 11

The Reunion of Christendom

(Continued)

"Interim hat den Schalk hinter ihm!" When the attempt was made to reconcile Lutheranism and Catholicism by means of the Augsburg Interim, the Lutheran laymen rose in their might and declared: **"Selig ist der Mann, Der Gott vertrauen kann Und wiligt nicht ins Interim, Denn es hat den Schalk hinter ihm!"** **"Of the Interim beware, For a knave is hiding there."** (Hurst, *History of the Christian Church*, II, p. 217.) When Melancthon and others offered the Church a modified form of this union document in the Leipzig Interim, 1548, the Lutherans at once detected the same knave hiding there. And whenever and wherever unionism works on the Church, in whatever form or shape, there is knavery at work. — No discussion of unionism would be complete without a chapter on the dishonesty of it.

Unionism likes to work (1) with ambiguous formulas. One party will draw up a doctrinal statement which plainly expresses its teaching but is so skillfully worded that the other party finds its own, the contrary teaching, therein expressed and fondly believes that agreement in doctrine has been effected. Or — and that is usually the case — both partners are practicing the fraud. Their formula of concord expresses the doctrine in controversy in such general, such vague, such equivocal terms that each side can easily find its own particular teaching there expressed and confessed. Thus the conscience of all is salved; nothing has been denied. That is the first fraud. The second one is that they pretend that the common acceptance of such an equivocal formula, a formula which permits each side to retain its own particular teaching, constitutes a real reunion. They are deceiving themselves and want to deceive Christendom. A reunion of Christendom effected by such dishonest methods is not worth having. The Formula of Concord refuses to work along such lines: **"We wished to make a**

pure, clear, distinct declaration concerning all the disputed articles . . . in order that every one may see that we do not wish in a cunning way to dissemble or cover up all this or to come to an agreement only in appearance." (*Triglotta*, p. 1097.) The use of ambiguous formulas is so transparently dishonest that certain groups of unionists absolutely refuse to have any share in it; they prefer a form of union which frankly and honestly avows the doctrinal disagreement. But as a rule the unionists want to create a show of unity, and the use of ambiguous formulas well serves this purpose.

The Augsburg Interim was a rather crude affair. "In regard to the doctrine of justification, although this was conceded to take place through the merit of Christ, nevertheless the Roman Catholic doctrine asserted itself." (*Lutheran Cyclopedia*, by H. E. Jacobs and J. Haas.) The camouflage "through the merit of Christ" could deceive only those who wanted to be deceived. Melancthon's Leipzig Interim went about it more craftily. It plainly asserts justification by faith and explicitly denies justification by works; but not only does it omit the "sola" of the *sola fide*, which "sola" is, in any discussion between Lutherans and Catholics, absolutely necessary, but it presents the whole matter in such an equivocal way that the Romanists could accept it with some little manipulation. *The Lutheran Cyclopedia* states: "No evangelical doctrine was directly abandoned; yet the chief doctrine, that of justification, was expressed in an indefinite formula." The knave was there! H. E. Jacobs states in *The Book of Concord*, II, p. 53 f.: "It clothes the articles of faith on which there was difference in language so ambiguous that those who did not hold the evangelical faith, while putting upon it their own interpretation, could be induced to subscribe them." "It was," says F. Bente, in the Historical Introduction, *Triglotta*, p. 99, "a unionistic document sacrificing Lutheranism doctrinally as well as practically. Throughout the controverted doctrines were treated in ambiguous or false formulas." (The full text of the Leipzig Interim is given in Jacobs, *op.cit.*, p. 260 ff.; excerpts in Bente, *op. cit.*, p 107.)

An ambiguous formula of the first water is the notorious formula of distribution in use in the Prussian Union. "Our Lord Jesus Christ says: Take and eat, this is My body." The Lutherans believe that they receive the true, the real body of the Lord in Holy Communion; the Reformed believe that the real body is not present. So, if a union between the Lutheran and the Reformed Churches was to be effected, this difference must be hushed up. And the unionists agreed to hush it up by agreeing to use a formula which evaded the issue. It seems incredible that for the sake of an external union men would be willing to introduce evasive, lying propositions into the holy of holies.

They have been about that these many years. Is there anything wrong with the statement "De coena Domini docent, quod cum pane et vino vere exhibeantur corpus et sanguis Christi vescentibus in Coena Domini"? That is the absolute truth. But when you compare Article X of the Augsburg Confession with the form of it in Melanchthon's *Variata*, you will see that it is a dishonest proposition. It omits the words "are truly present," "they reject those that teach otherwise" and substitutes for "distributed" the vague term "exhibited." It hides the difference and permits both the Lutherans and the Reformed to find their doctrine expressed in it.⁵⁵ Melanchthon, the father of unionism in the Lutheran Church, was willing to have his re-united Church play a farce at the altar of the Lord: playing at being united and despising one another for their hypocrisy.

Melanchthon need not have bothered to delete the "truly present." The unionists are ready to accept even that term as a compromise formula. Zwingli was ready to do so at Marburg. He was perfectly willing to teach that the body and blood are "truly" present, i. e., spiritually present, and to let the Lutherans teach that they are "truly" present, i. e., bodily present. Luther: "Sie versprochen aber mit vielen Worten, sie wollten mit uns so weit einerlei Rede fuehren: Christi Leib sei wahrhaftig im Abendmahl gegenwaertig (aber in geistlicher Weise), nur damit wir uns herbeilassen moechten, sie Brueder zu nennen und so eine Eintracht zu erheucheln." (XVI:2305.— See also Walther, *Law and Gospel*, p. 165.) CONC. THEOL. MTHLY., 1930, p. 421, has this to say on the matter: "Der Zweck der von den Schweizern vorgeschlage-

55) In an essay on Melanchthon in *Tercentenary Monument in Commemoration of the Three Hundredth Anniversary of the Heidelberg Catechism*, J. H. A. Ebrard (Reformed, unionist) writes: "The sole intention of the modification of the tenth article was that it might, according to the sense of the Wittenberg Concord, be made possible for the Tetrapolis to subscribe the Confession, and thus, with the other Protestant powers, as an organization having one faith, press forward with their cause in opposition to both Emperor and Pope. For this reason the doctrine of the Lord's Supper was expressed in a form which in no wise conflicted with the genuine Lutheran theory, nor yet with Bucer, Calvin, and Melanchthon, without, however, bringing out either to a full expression." Ebrard was an admirer of Melanchthon. His essay begins with the statement: "Melanchthon . . . is rightly claimed by the Reformed Church, beside Zwingli and Calvin, as the third of her Reformers." (Pp. 89, 106.) Joseph Stump: "Although Melanchthon claimed that the alterations affected only the words and not the substance of the confession, this was not strictly true. No doubt the changes made did not conflict with Melanchthon's interpretation of the original reading. But at the same time the wording of the tenth article was so altered that the Reformed as well as the Lutherans could read their doctrine of the Lord's Supper into it. He desired to make it easy for the Reformed to unite with the Lutherans." (*Life of Ph. Melanchthon*, p. 175.) See CONC. THEOL. MTHLY., 1931, p. 594 ff. on Melanchthon's treatment of Article X.

nen Unionsformel war, die Welt und die Kirche zu betrogen. Die innere Uneinigkeit der beiden Kirchen sollte durch ein Heuchel- und Luegenwort verdeckt werden. Die Schweizer nahmen es nicht genau mit der Wahrheit. Und mit dieser Luege wollte man vor dem Angesicht Gottes erscheinen, bei der Feier des heiligen Abendmahls bei Gottes Namen luegen und truegen." And they are doing exactly the same today. The Report of the *Edinburgh World Conference* declared: "We all believe that Christ is truly present in the Eucharist, though as to how that presence is manifested and realized we may differ. Every precise definition of the presence is bound to be a limiting thing, and the attempt to formulate such definitions and to impose them on the Church has itself been the cause of disunity in the past. The important thing is that we should celebrate the Eucharist with the unfailing use of bread and wine and of prayer and with agreement as to its essential and spiritual meaning." (See *Christendom*, 1937, Autumn, p. 670.)

Stating that the Lutheran and Episcopalian members of the World Conference differ indeed from the Presbyterians and Baptists as to the nature of the Presence, but that in spite of that "we all believe that Christ is truly present" is following the tactics of Zwingli. The purpose is to simulate an agreement where there is fundamental disagreement. We do not attack the honesty of those Presbyterians who insist that their Church teaches a "real presence" and explain at once that they mean a "real spiritual presence" of the body and blood, or, preferably, a real "presence of Christ." But we denounce the dishonesty of the unionists who want the phrase "real presence" used for the purpose of hiding the difference and deceive the world and the Church with a show of unity. The cause of the Church is not served by glorying in a counterfeit union.⁵⁶⁾

The unionists apply their tactics of equivocality to any doctrine on which "agreement" is sought, not only to non-fundamentals, but also to fundamentals, and not only to the important doctrine of the Lord's Supper, but also to the all-important doctrines of the deity of Christ and saving grace. Will the unionists really operate with ambiguous formulas in the all-important matter of the deity of the Savior? Yes, if that is necessary to bring about their form of the reunion of Christendom. Recall W. A. Brown's statement: "Such a federal unity is the proposal for a World Council of Churches. This is a fellowship open to all churches which accept Jesus Christ as God and Savior, each church being the judge of

56) Rudelbach: "The more careless we are in stating the differences and the more anxious to hide the sores, the farther removed we are from the unity of the Spirit, which is the innermost essence of all true union." (*Reformation, Luthertum und Union*. See *Concordia Cyclopaedia*, p. 775.)

the meaning it puts into these words." (*A Creed for Free Men*, p. 250.) "Jesus is God" is a good, honest confession, but since any body joining the World Council is permitted to put any kind of meaning into it, it has become an ambiguous formula. And it is accepted by the World Council as a sufficient statement. If any member-church would call for a more explicit declaration, the World Council would tell it: "Don't quibble about the godhead of the Savior." From the very beginning the unionists have been engaged in this dishonest business. At Nicea they offered the Arians, who would not accept the "of one substance with the Father," the compromise formula: "God of God." Anything wrong with that? Only this, that the Arians were willing to accept it because they could hide their heresy behind it. Others proposed to settle the controversy by saying nothing about *ουσία* at all. (Council of Sirmium, 357.) Do not quibble about *ὁμοούσιος* and *ὁμοούσιος*! And the times have not changed. The Unitarian groups have been using ambiguous formulas in order to keep peace in their church family. The Universalists, for instance, accepted the "Winchester Profession of Belief" (1803), and "it was so framed as to be acceptable both to those of unitarian and to those of trinitarian leanings." (*The Christian Century*, Jan. 37, 1943.) It confesses: "We believe that there is one God, whose nature is love, revealed in one Lord Jesus Christ, by one Holy Spirit of Grace, who will finally restore the whole family of mankind to holiness and happiness." And there are Trinitarian groups who, in order to remain on good terms with Unitarians, couch their confession of the Deity of their Lord and Savior in ambiguous terms. The Federal Council refused to confess belief in "Jesus Christ, the Son of God, our Lord and Savior," but accepted the formula: "Jesus Christ, the divine Lord and Savior" — Unitarians could subscribe to that.⁵⁷ The Preamble reads: "Whereas, in the providence of God, the time has come when it seems fitting more fully to manifest the essential oneness of the Christian Churches of America in Jesus Christ as their Divine Lord and Savior, and to promote the spirit of fellow-

57) Sasse: "In the original draft of the constitution of the Federal Council, the preamble referred to churches which confess belief in 'Jesus Christ, the Son of God, our Lord and Savior.' The words aroused very hostile criticism, as involving adherence to a trinitarian conception of God and to the Christology of the ancient Creeds. Therefore, in order to facilitate the inclusion of unitarian minds, the formula was changed, so as to speak of 'Jesus Christ, the divine Lord and Savior.' That change won over those who sympathized with the Unitarians, but alienated the Anglicans and Lutherans, who naturally enough were quite unwilling to join a union movement of such a character." (*Some Prolegomena to the 1937 World Conference on Faith and Order*, p. 10.) It did not alienate all Episcopalians. At the present writing a leading Episcopalian heads the Federal Council — H. St. George Tucker, presiding bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church.

ship, service, and co-operation among them. . . ." This preamble, says Macfarland, "was a masterpiece of artlessness. Simplicity is often the mark of spiritual guidance." (*Christian Unity in Practice and Prophecy*, p. 56.) Artlessness? A knave is hiding there! The knavish formula permits men who openly deny the deity of Jesus to have fellowship with Lutherans and Presbyterians. Bishop Francis J. McConnell declares: "Is not the tendency to deify Jesus more heathen than Christian? Are we not more truly Christian when we cut loose from a heathen propensity and take Jesus simply for the character he was and for the ideal that he is?" (*The Christlike God*, p. 15.) And Dr. McConnell was a president of the Federal Council. Dr. H. E. Fosdick preached a sermon on "The Peril of Worshipping Jesus," and he stands high in the councils of the Federal Council. McConnell and Fosdick might hesitate to call Jesus "the Son of God," but they will call Him "their Divine Lord." Dr. E. E. Reinartz writes in *The Luth. Ch. Quarterly*, 1942, p. 220 f.: "Unitarians, denying as they do the deity of Jesus Christ, can so interpret the words 'divine Lord and Savior' as to accept them and join the Federal Council without any change in the Preamble. If they were required to dot the i and cross the t, they would not do it. . . . The Executive Board [of the U. L. C. A.] believes that for the United Lutheran Church to subscribe to such a statement as that contained in the Preamble referred to would be to show itself *willing to speak in terms which are equivocal.*" (Underscored by author.)⁵⁸⁾

The Federal Council might just as well have put into the Preamble: "Jesus Christ, Son of God." The Antitrinitarians and Arians are willing to call Jesus "Son of God." It has become an ambiguous formula. The Lausanne World Conference's "common Confession of Faith" declares: "We members of the Conference on Faith and Order, coming from all parts of the world in the interest of Christian unity, have with deep gratitude to God found ourselves united in common prayer, in God, our heavenly Father, and His Son Jesus Christ, our Savior, in the fellowship of the Holy Spirit." "His Son Jesus Christ"—could anything be more explicit? Well, *Le Chrétien Evangelique*, as quoted by *The Presbyterian*, reported: "The Message to the World" [statement of Lausanne Conference] carries in it the affirmation of some of the fundamental verities of authentic Christianity: the divinity of

58) Bishop McConnell has toned down the formula on which he entered the Federal Council still more. See page 333 above. He and his church ask those who would become members of the Methodist Church: "Do you consider Jesus Christ as your Savior and Lord?" Not a word here about the deity or divinity of Jesus. If the candidate for membership believes in the eternal godhead of Jesus, well and good; if he believes that Jesus is a mere man, he can come in under the same formula: "Savior and Lord."

Christ, His pre-existence, the expiatory sufficiency of His death, His glorious resurrection, all the orthodoxy of the Apostles' and the Nicene Creed. How such and such theologians, well known for their horror of dogmatism and for their rationalistic *personnel*, came to subscribe to any such formula or at least recommend it to the attention and study of contemporary Christians, their brethren, these dogmas which they regard as defunct and contrary to simple good sense — this is quite beyond comprehension. . . . The members of the conference, at least many of them, do not believe that Christ is God, the Son of God, the Word made flesh; they do not believe that He has come 'to give His life as a ransom for many'; they do not believe that the Bible is written uniquely, distinct from all other books, clothed with a special, inspired authority; they do not believe all this. Every time they express their own views freely, they deny these verities; and in this they do well, for they do not believe them." And *The Watchman-Examiner* reports: "Dr. W. E. Barton, who was very sympathetic with the Lausanne Conference, gives in *The Congregationalist* his view of what was accomplished there. He says: 'I do not think the churches will pay much attention to our findings. I cannot imagine our National Council wasting much time parsing and analyzing our timid and compromise declarations. . . . If we had agreed to recite the multiplication table together as an act of agreement, that would have meant something; and what was said was perhaps not very much more!'" (See *THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY*, 1928, p. 2, 112.) "Jesus, Son of God" has become a compromise formula. The Federal Council, again, might just as well have put the stronger term "Jesus is God" into the Preamble. Any Church joining the World Council is at liberty, W. A. Brown told us, to give these words a new meaning.⁵⁹⁾

For the Reunion of Christendom agreement on the *articulus fundamentalissimus*, salvation by grace, justification through the merit of Christ, by faith, is of first importance. And here, too, the unionists achieve "agreement" by the use of ambiguous

59) One more remark on the inadequacy of the doctrinal statement of the Federal Council as a basis of church fellowship. It is inadequate because of the ambiguous formula concerning the deity of Christ. But when one compares it with the Preamble, say, of the American Council of Christian Churches, a second significant deficiency is seen. The American Council has this in its Preamble: ". . . the full truthfulness, inerrancy, and authority of the Bible, which is the Word of God . . . the true deity and sinless humanity of our Lord Jesus Christ, His virgin birth, His atoning death, 'the just for the unjust,' His bodily resurrection . . . salvation by grace through faith alone. . . ." Why does the Federal Council and the proposed North American Council evade these points? Would their inclusion keep too many out of the brotherhood? There is a knave hidden in what this union-document says and in what it does not say.

formulas. The Methodist Church and the Federal Council (see above) and also the World Council of Churches are satisfied if men accept "Jesus Christ as Savior." "The Lutherans and the Reformed can subscribe to that. So can the Catholics. The Ritschlians and Unitarians, too, and the followers of McConnell and Fosdick can and do use that phrase. What about the formula "The sinner is justified through faith, through the merit of Christ?" The Catholics accept it. The Regensburg (Ratisbon) Book (1541), which some list as the first of the three knavish Interims, had it. "Even on the article of justification a formula was constructed which Eck and Melanchthon signed. Luther called it 'eine weitläufige Notel, darin sie recht und auch wir recht haben.'" (*Proc. Syn. Conf.*, 1938, p. 11.) The Augsburg Interim conceded that justification takes place *through the merit of Christ*. Protestants and Catholics are perfectly agreed on that.—What about the formula that justification is "by grace"? People ought not to quibble about that term! If a church only uses the term "by grace," all is well. The Lausanne Interim was satisfied with it. See footnote 10. It is true says Macfarland, *op. cit.*, p. 164, that the Lausanne committee which drew up "The Doctrine of Grace" found "that the very word 'grace' is used in three main senses, but they reached, by both elimination and synthesis, one very simple meaning." Give God all or some of the credit—it amounts to the same thing.⁶⁰ The Edinburgh Interim, too, wants no quibbling in this matter. Its Report says: "In regard to the relation of God's grace and man's freedom, we all agree simply upon the basis of Holy Scripture and Christian experience that the sovereignty of God is supreme. By the sovereignty of God we mean this all-controlling, all-embracing will and purpose revealed in Jesus Christ for each man and for all mankind. Thus we men

60) Read also in this connection the declaration of the Lausanne Interim on "the Gospel." (See *Theological Monthly*, 1927, p. 355, for the full text.) It contains some fine statements, but the *vicarious* satisfaction and justification *by faith* are not as much as mentioned. The representatives of the Orthodox Church (Rome was not represented) did not hesitate to subscribe to these eight articles on the Gospel. Dr. P. Ainslie reported: "The Eastern Orthodox delegation asked to be excused from voting on the other reports; but they heartily supported this one." They found nothing in it to conflict with their doctrine of justification by works. Any Ritschlian will heartily subscribe to Article Four: "Through His life and teaching, His call to repentance, His proclamation of the coming of the kingdom of God and of Judgment, His suffering and death, His resurrection and exaltation to the right hand of the Father, and by the mission of the Holy Spirit, He has brought to us forgiveness of sin and has revealed the fullness of the living God and His boundless love toward us. By the appeal of that love, shown in its completeness on the cross, He summons us to the new life of faith, self-sacrifice, and devotion to His service and the service of men."

owe our whole salvation to His gracious will. But, on the other hand, it is the will of God that His grace should be actively appropriated by man's own will and that for such decision man should remain responsible. . . . We are glad to report that in this difficult matter we have been able to speak with a united voice, so that here there ought to be no ground for maintaining any division between churches. Some churches set great value on the expression *sola gratia*, while others avoid it. The phrase has been the subject of much controversy, but we can all join in the following statement: Our salvation is the gift of God and the fruit of His grace. It is not based on the merit of man, but has its roots and foundation in the forgiveness which God in His grace grants to the sinner whom He receives to sanctify him. We do not, however, hold that the action of divine grace overrides human freedom and responsibility." (*Christendom*, 1937, Autumn, p. 662.) We are not going to stress now that this statement was written in the Arminian interest. What we want to point out is that the Edinburgh Interim is glad to know that "we have been able to speak with a united voice" in saying: "Our salvation is the gift of God." Surely it is. But when the old Pelagians said that, and the Catholics say it, and our Modernists say it, and the Lutherans and Calvinists say it, they do not mean the same thing.

The Lutheran R. Jelke believes that if the Lutherans, Reformed, and Catholics in Germany would agree to define saving grace as "*goettliche Gnadendarbietung*," they could unite and form the United Protestant-Catholic Church of Germany. (See above, p. 608.) He will not be disappointed in the Catholics. They can easily hide their teaching in it. Dr. Reu comments: "Hat Jelke mittlerweile wirklich gelernt, dass 'die Offenbarung Gottes in Christo als goettliche Gnadendarbietung' das Herz des Evangeliums voellig wiedergibt; weiss er nichts mehr davon, dass *das Rom annehmen und dabei doch Rom bleiben kann?* . . . Jelke kennt offenbar weder Rom noch den gegenwaertigen Stand seines eigenen Volks." (*Kirchliche Zeitschrift*, 1942, p. 190 f.) Does he not know that the liberals in Germany and in America are able to use the phrase "God's grace towards men" and still deny saving grace, the forgiveness of sin by grace?

Dr. Pieper presents the matter before us thus: "It is sinful unionism and a farcical playing with holy things when ambiguous phrases, phrases which can bear both the true and a false sense, are employed for the purpose of bringing about a church union. The papists, for instance, are willing to say that a man is justified and saved 'by grace,' but they take grace to mean what they call 'infused grace,' that is, sanctification and good works. The Christians, on the other hand, when they speak of salvation and justifica-

tion by grace, define 'grace' as God's gracious disposition, His mercy, which moves Him to forgive sins because of Christ's merit, which is proclaimed in the Gospel and which is appropriated by faith. . . . That is one example out of many which shows that the same words can be used to express different, contradictory doctrines. And if we, for the purpose of establishing Christian union, would use ambiguous words—intentionally or because of ignorance—we would only deceive ourselves and the others. We would not be establishing a Christian Reunion, but an ungodly union of truth and error." (*Proc. Oregon and Washington District, 1924*, p. 37. See *Christliche Dogmatik*, III, p. 491.)

When the negotiations for the formation of the United Christian-Jewish Church get under way, the negotiators will be looking for suitable compromise formulas. Here they are: "Comprehensive Concordat. To the Editor: The Commission on Reunion with the Jewish Church has now completed its work, and it is with great pleasure that I submit its findings for the instruction and edification of your readers. In the course of our discussions an astonishing measure of agreement has been reached in all important questions of faith and order. (1) Both Churches—Jewish and Christian—believe in the Christ, that is to say, the Messiah. The only real difference lies in the question whether He has already come or is yet to come. A merely abstract, theological problem of that nature should certainly not be regarded as an impediment to that larger unity after which we are both striving. (2) As regards the Trinity, we both believe in one Messiah, one God, and one Spirit of the Lord. All these phrases are used in both the Old and the New Testament. It is clear that there is no essential barrier here." (3, 4, and 5 treat of other points of agreement.) "It is anticipated that there may be a number of narrow-minded, uncharitable, medievalist, obscurantist bigots in both bodies who will object to this eminently lucid and comprehensive concordat. However, we feel sure that such a narrow, schismatic, sectarian spirit will be disavowed by the Churches concerned and that the big, broad, flexible outlook and a few more ambiguous formulae will dispose of all difficulties and divergences, past, present, and future.—(Rev.) William H. Dunphy, Secretary of the Commission on Reunion with Everything and Everybody." (*The Living Church*, Nov. 1, 1939.) This is a satire on the devious methods and sinister manipulations employed by some of those who are working for the union of Episcopalians and Presbyterians. However, something like it is actually occurring. There is the manifesto quoted page 607 above, issued by "Catholics, Jews, and Protestants," which *The Living Church* calls a "Declaration of Common Religious Beliefs." "We believe in one God, Creator

and Sustainer of the Universe, etc." And recall what the old rationalist Teller thought of this matter: "Because of their faith in God, virtue, and immortality the Jews ought to be regarded as genuine Christians." (See page 608 above.) There is nothing ambiguous about the formula itself. "One God, Creator and Sustainer of the Universe" is a good Christian phrase. But aside from the fact that the deniers of the Godhead and Saviorship of Jesus cannot use this phrase in the Christian sense, it is dishonest to speak of religious affinity on the basis of agreement in one or two truths. The fact that the Jews believe in "God, virtue, and immortality" does not make them Christian or near-Christian. The fact that the Mohammedans believe in "one God" does not make them near-Christian. It is not honest to speak of any sort of kinship between bodies which happen to agree on one point and differ on other, on fundamental points. It is the same dishonesty as that practiced by the Federal Council in its Preamble, as discussed in footnote 59.

Just now the Church is watching with great interest the movement for an Anglican-Presbyterian Reunion, and the indignation voiced by the confessional groups in both churches against the surreptitious methods employed by the managers of the union movement is of special interest to us. The "Concordat," the "Basic Principles," and other proposals dealing with "Joint Ordination" and related matters, "agreements which are to be regarded as interim steps toward organic unity between the two churches" (quoted from the report of the joint commission), makes copious use of evasions and ambiguities. There is, for instance, the statement that both churches "believe in Episcopal ordination." In a solemn protest (published in *The Living Church*, Oct. 4, 1939, and *The Presbyterian*, Oct. 12, 1939) Bishop W. T. Manning says: "But the Presbyterian Church honestly and conscientiously rejects this belief in the office of the priesthood and in the necessity of episcopal ordination for that office. The Episcopal Church declares solemnly and officially that 'no man shall be accounted to be a lawful Bishop, Priest, or Deacon in this Church . . . except he hath had Episcopal Consecration, or Ordination.' The Presbyterian Church says in an official statement published in 1934 that 'It is difficult to see how the Presbyterian Church can enter into union with churches which regard as essential the acceptance of the episcopacy as . . . a *sine qua non* of the Church of Jesus Christ or is even necessary for its *bene esse*.' In the light of this clear, definite, and official statement the statement in the proposed concordat that both churches 'believe in episcopal ordination' is a strange one. It is evident that the two churches use these words in entirely different senses and with quite different meanings. . . .

The proposed concordat is one of those well-meant but mistaken efforts to promote unity by the use of ambiguous phrases which cover up fundamental differences. The plan proposed for the commissioning or 'authorizing' of ministers is an impossible one and carries ambiguity to its furthest limits." When in "Joint Ordination" the Episcopalian official and the Presbyterian official join in "ordaining" a "priest," "presbyter," "minister," the Episcopalian ordainer has in mind different rights and duties to be conferred than the Presbyterian ordainer has in mind, and the ordinand can take what he chooses.⁶¹ Dr. L. C. Walter writes in *The Presbyterian*, Nov. 19, 1942: "Either joint or supplementary ordination is only a surreptitious scheme of securing Presbyterian recognition of the fiction of the 'historic episcopate.' My conviction is that not only is there today no such thing as apostolic succession, but that there never was any valid basis for such assumption." *The Living Church*, Nov. 9, 1938, "One of the Presbyterians at the conference rightly objected to what he termed 'surreptitious ordination.' . . . If we are simply receiving a Presbyterian minister without reordination, the whole structure of our catholic order is in jeopardy; if on the other hand we are reordaining him, our intention to do so should be clear to him, to the officials of the Presbyterian Church, and so to the entire Christian world. Otherwise the act is so ambiguous as to be definitely misleading and certainly lays us open to the charge of 'surreptitious reordination.'" Bishop Conklin of Chicago condemned the proposals that "would set apart elders in a sort of quasi-ordination by presbyters, and would administer confirmation by presbyters acting as if they were bishops. If our basic principles are capable of such elastic adjustments, I see no reason for our existence in the past, much less for our continuance. . . . I cannot walk the way our commission on approaches to unity would propose, nor shall I." (See *The Christian Century*, Feb. 24, 1943.)

It seems that in these negotiations the limit of equivocation and dishonesty has been reached. The Proposed Statement on Reunion states in paragraph 5: "The conferring churches are agreed that the ministry is the gift of the Lord Jesus Christ to the Church." Any Presbyterian subscribing to that, knowing that the Episcopalian puts "apostolic succession" into that phrase, sub-

61) Bishop Manning concludes his protest with these words: "At such a time as this especially when we are in the midst of the tragedy of world war the consequences of which no one can foretell, so impossible a measure as the proposed concordat, a measure which will not promote unity, but will create dissension and division in our own Church and household should without delay be withdrawn." Compare this with the idea discussed in the preceding article, that in times of war the best interests of the Church are served by the practice of unionism.

scribes with an evil conscience. And vice versa. Dr. J. H. Cotton (President of the Presbyterian Theological Seminary at Chicago) said at an Episcopalian-Presbyterian union conference at St. Louis: "The Presbyterians believe in the doctrine of apostolic succession, not outwardly as an unbroken conferring of orders, but as a succession of great doctrines and Christian life." What quibbling! What an insult to the intelligence and honesty of the Episcopalians and Presbyterians! A South India Union Committee: "Whatever differences there are, however, all the uniting churches are agreed that as episcopacy has been accepted in the church from early times, it may in this sense fitly be called historic and that it is a form of church government which at the present time is expedient for the Church in South India." (See CONC. THEOL. MONTHLY, 1939, p. 69. 1940, p. 468.) Of the Interim beware, for a knave is hiding there — a doltish one at that.

Bishop Manning would say, A plague upon your lying words. He said in *The Reunion of Christendom*: "We shall make progress not by refusing to see the difficulties, nor by concealing them under ambiguous phrases, but by facing and considering them in frank and brotherly conference." (P. 226.) Rev. W. O. Cross: "Nor should we encourage well-meaning efforts toward unity that are dishonest. There ought to be no sly conveying of Episcopal order. Church unity is not a lawyer's game of finding loopholes in polity. . . . We cannot betray the truth for a superficial and shallow unity." (*The Living Church*, April 3, 1940.) Dr. W. H. Dunphy: "Our objection to the concordat is that it seems to let us down. It covers up with words differences in faith and order that are fundamental. It would admit to the function of the priesthood those who are not priests. Vital differences of faith divide us. . . . The faith as to the authority of Holy Scripture is different in the two Churches. . . . The concordat is an instrument not of peace but of disunity." (*The Living Church*, April 17, 1940.)

"Vital differences of faith divide us" — but the knavish Interim hides them under ambiguities. There is the difference on the Lord's Supper. A writer in *The Living Church*, July 4, 1943, asks: "Do they (the Presbyterians) fully believe in the Real Objective Presence of Christ in the Blessed Sacrament?" Another writer (Jan. 15, 1941): "There is a subject that has been strangely kept out of sight in all these negotiations; I do not ever remember seeing it referred to; it has been carefully and closely kept in the closet. I refer to Calvinism. . . . The confessors of the seventeenth century resisted even unto blood that this teaching might not be foisted on the Anglican communion; and now our leaders and rulers apparently intend to swallow it wholesale; at least I have never heard a voice raised against it. It seems to me that the

Presbyterians should definitely throw Calvinism overboard before we should ever consider entering into any union with them." On the other hand, the presbytery of Rushville, Ill., protests against the vague phrase used in the "Basic Principle" plan that "the Bible is the Rule of Faith and Life." It wants a declaration to the effect that because of inspiration the Bible is the supreme, the sole foundation of faith. It fears that the teaching current in Episcopalian circles that the authority of the Church transcends that of the Bible might find a hiding place in the vague phrase. And the Rev. F. L. Ciriat, who himself does not share the position that "we believe all the Articles *because, and only because, 'the Bible tells us so'*" but rejects "this position as *demonstrably false, basically and essentially,*" gives this presbytery credit for honesty. "It is perfectly right in doubting that the Episcopal Church would mean the same thing by those words which they have traditionally meant among sectarian Protestants. Nor could we adopt them, in the sense given them by our Presbyterian friends, without abandoning our Catholic position and flying in the face of reason and history. If they are to be adopted in a *different sense*, that fact ought to be made perfectly clear to all concerned so as to guard against imputations of bad faith in a matter so crucial and fundamental." (From an article in *The Living Church*, May 30, 1942.) We do not share the position of this writer, but we give him credit for honesty. He wants no ambiguous formulas in doctrinal declarations.⁶²⁾

62) In this connection it is interesting to note how Dr. A. R. Wentz, of the Gettysburg Seminary, classifies the *Pittsburgh Agreement*. Referring to the statement of the *Lutheran Witness*: "Note well that this agreement means that there will be no denial of the inerrancy of Holy Scripture and that there will be a definite change of front regarding unionism and secret societies," he quotes the minutes of the Omaha Convention (1940): "The U. L. C. does not regard these Articles of Agreement as changing in any respect the doctrinal basis of the U. L. C." and says: "I can assure you that without this assurance on the part of the Commission the Articles would not have been adopted by the convention. . . . You will observe that three of the members of our Commission on Lutheran Unity presented a statement of dissent from the Articles on the ground that 'neither truth nor the cause of unity can be served by the ambiguity of the report in question, particularly as regards the third Article of the Agreement,' and that a large number of delegates presented their names for record explicitly voicing their protest." (See *Lutheran Witness*, 1943, p. 29.) — Let us pause here for a moment to point out that the use of unionistic ambiguous formulas, besides being dishonest, never achieves its purpose. It only creates confusion. And usually the conciliatory ambiguous formula satisfies neither party. That was Melancthon's sad experience. Ebrard: "As *Præceptor Germaniæ*, it was incumbent upon Melancthon vigorously to controvert the consubstantiation theory" [the Lutheran doctrine] with Biblical arguments. But instead of this he satisfied himself by undertaking to smother the fire of the conflict where it had burst into flames by the recommendation of unionistic doctrinal formularies.

Another class of dishonest formulas is exemplified by the Methodist test question: "Do you receive and profess the Christian faith as contained in the New Testament of our Lord Jesus Christ?" (See page 333 above.) Bishop McConnell has told us that the Methodist Church considers this a sufficient basis for fellowship with other denominations — "it would not ask more than this." The Christian Church (of the Congregational and Christian Churches) also declares: "No test of faith shall be established other than the acceptance of Jesus Christ as Savior and the Word of God as a standard for the conduct of life and the guide of the Church." (See *Popular Symbolics*, p. 297 f.) And the Disciples, another professedly unionistic body, also insist that the inspired New Testament, instead of human creeds, should be made the rule of doctrine and life. (*Ibid.*) "Do you believe what the Bible teaches?" There is nothing ambiguous about the words used in this test question. Every Christian can sincerely answer yes. But it cannot serve as a test question. It evades the issue through its vague generality. The Lutheran will not ask the Methodist: "Do you believe what the Bible teaches," but will ask him: "Do you believe in the Real Presence, as the Bible teaches it?" Bishop McConnell and the other antitrinitarians have no difficulty in declaring their belief in the Bible. The Methodist test question cannot unmask any errorist and is not intended to do so. A knave is hiding behind the formula under discussion.

What do you think of the *Symbolum Biblicum*? K. J. Nitzsch composed it for the General Synod of the Prussian Union (1846) as a basis for union. It contained nothing but Bible passages! A fine Symbolum, of course, but utterly worthless and altogether knavish. (People did not think much of this "Nicum." They called it the "Nitzschenum.") Ian Maclaren formulated a creed on which he would have all unite. The first two paragraphs are: "I believe in the Fatherhood of God. I believe in the words of Jesus." A church paper quoted by *The Lutheran Witness*, 1897, p.127, asked: "How many people will that unite?" We would say: All those who have a liking for meaningless phrases, all unionists who want to hide their disunity behind deceiving generalities.

Cf. the *Formula Consensus*, by which, at the Colloquium of Worms (1557), he wished with unjustifiable concessions to conciliate the Flacians and only provoked those who were opposed to this party." (*Op. cit.*, p. 110.) Nor could he pride himself on his Interim. He expected great things of it, but later was ashamed of it. J. Stump: "He permitted himself to be induced to take part, greatly to his subsequent regret, in the compromise known as the Leipzig Interim. . . . That he yielded in the Leipzig Interim he himself confessed was an error. . . . He wrote in a letter to Flacius: 'I acknowledge that I erred in this matter and pray God to forgive me for not fleeing far from such treacherous deliberations. But those things of which you and Gallus falsely accuse me I shall refute.'" (*Op. cit.*, pp. 208, 239, 267.)

The politicians who want to become proficient in the use of *double-entendre* and weasel-words, half truths and untruthful generalities, and other kinds of diplomatic legerdemain, should go to school to the church politicians and study their Interim documents.

It is a sorry business. Dr. Walther said: "To be sure, the *Variata* and even the Leipzig Interim could be understood correctly. But Guericke was right in what he said concerning the latter: 'A great number, yes, the majority of the Protestants in Saxony, saw at once that this compromise formula, too, was a clear betrayal of the pure doctrine, and they found it worse than the Augsburg Interim.' The true Church has never, never been disposed to use 'milder' expressions in order to conciliate the enemy; on the contrary, whenever it was seen that the enemy could possibly hide the error behind certain terms, the true Church has always used the clearest, most definite, and unequivocal terms. It is a principle of true ethics that only he is truthful in his speech who uses language that not merely permits him to find his own meaning in it, but does not allow the other party to find any other meaning in it. Nowhere are equivocations more sinful than where the confession of the truth is called for." (*Lehre und Wehre*, 1872, p. 54. 1925, p. 289.) Christian honesty requires that God's truth be confessed and not evaded, that the differences be defined and not disguised. The Catholic J. A. Moehler agrees with Walther. "I have made it my duty to define, with the utmost possible precision, the points of religious difference, and nowhere, at no time, to cloak and disguise them." (*Symbolism, or Doctrinal Differences*, p. XVI.)

It is a sorry, disgraceful business. The honest worldling will not stoop to the use of ambiguous language. Luther: "Fabius says: 'An ambiguous word should be avoided as a reef.' Where it happens now and then inadvertently, it may be pardoned; but where it is sought for designedly and purposely, it deserves no pardon whatever, but justly merits the abhorrence of everyone. For to what does this hateful double-tongued way of speaking tend? It only furnishes an opportunity of disseminating and fostering in safety the seeds of every heresy, under the cover of words and letters that have a show of Christian faith. Even the public laws of the Roman Empire condemned this manner of speaking and punished it thus: they commanded 'that the words of him who should speak obscurely, when he could speak more plainly, should be interpreted against himself.' For if in religion, in laws, and in all weighty matters, we should be allowed to express ourselves ambiguously and deceitfully, what else could follow but the utter confusion of Babel?" (XVIII:1996 f.)

Unionists have committed (2) a lot of other dishonesties.

Let us examine ten examples. (a) Men are permitted to subscribe to the historic creeds with a Jesuitical *reservatio mentalis*. It is a notorious fact that the Modernists who deny the deity of Christ, the resurrection of the body, etc., still recite the Apostles' Creed and, for that matter, the Nicene Creed. There is nothing ambiguous about these old creeds. The words can have only one meaning. But the Modernists choose to put a different meaning into them—and the Federal Council treats them as members in good standing. It sanctions this dishonest practice with the plea that one must "distinguish between the intellectual formula and the Christian substance of the Creed." (Macfarland, *Christian Unity*, p. 161.) These unionists defend the monstrous thesis that the creeds are subject to the individual's interpretation. Macfarland: We may "permit all Christians in our union to use as much of all of them (the creeds and confessions of Christendom) as they find to their edification. Indeed, almost any creed is subject to general acceptance when the individual is permitted to interpret it." *Op. cit.*, p. 157.) Bishop F. T. Woods: "We could, as a matter of fact, find a basis of unity in the Nicene Creed, though we might not all attach the same importance to a specific form of words and might not all give the same interpretation to every phrase." (*The Reunion of Christendom*, p. 118.) The South India Scheme of Union has this paragraph: "The uniting churches accept the fundamental truths embodied in the historic creeds as providing a sufficient basis of union but do not intend thereby to demand the assent of individuals to every word or phrase in them." (*Christendom*, 1942, Winter, p. 155.) The acceptance of the creed in a sense differing from that expressed in the words is considered legitimate practice in some unionistic circles.

It is an old story. The Swiss theologians could not accept the fifteenth point presented by Luther at Marburg, but they did accept the first fourteen articles. But, as it turned out, they accepted them not in the sense which Luther's simple words conveyed but according—to their own interpretation. The Reformed writer J. Mackinnon says: "To these articles Zwingli and his associates as well as Luther and his adherents subscribed, although in the matter of original sin and some other points they did not exactly express the conviction of the Swiss theologians. They were willing to compromise to this extent *for the sake of union*." (*Luther and the Reformation*, III, p. 318 f.) Luther: "Also schieden wir von Marburg mit solcher Hoffnung. . . . Weil nun durchs Teufels Geschaeft solches gefehlt und ich wohl betrogen, wie ich aus dem Buechlein, nach des Zwingels Tode ausgegangen, muss merken, dass er nach dem *colloquio* aerger worden ist denn zuvor und gewisslich zu Marburg hat faelschlich mit mir gehandelt." (XX: 1776. — See CONC. THEOL. MONTHLY, I, p. 424.)

(b) A union established by permitting different interpretations of the accepted confessions is a fraud. We are not now speaking of the fraud practiced by accepting creeds with a *reservatio mentalis* but of the dishonesty of accepting a common creed with the understanding that there is no common acceptance of it. The "American Church Union" published this statement in *The Living Church* of June 4, 1941: "For example, the Methodist, the Presbyterian, the Lutheran, and the Episcopal Churches all accept the Apostles' Creed as their statement of faith; but to take one instance only, the matter of the article on the Church, their interpretations of its meaning are so diverse as to constitute fundamentally variant ideas of what the Church is. It is hardly necessary to point out the impossibility of accepting as a basis of unity a form of words which all are willing to repeat while giving totally differing meanings to the words. *The mere unity of language counts for nothing. Unity of interpretation is essential.*" All honest men will subscribe to the lines we have underscored. The Constitution of the Evangelical and Reformed churches does not come up to this standard: "Doctrinal standards: Heidelberg Catechism, Luther's Catechism, and the Augsburg Confession. . . . Wherever these doctrinal standards differ, ministers, members and congregations, in accordance with the liberty of conscience inherent in the Gospel, are allowed to adhere to the interpretation of one of these confessions. However, in each case the final norm is the Word of God." The creed concerning the Lord's Supper on which these congregations have united would be: "This is My body." But each congregation has the right to interpret their common creed differently. Is this Church the united body it claims to be?

Some say that Luther's Small Catechism is a sufficient basis for the reunion of the Lutherans. Now some interpret the words of the Third Article: "I believe that I cannot, etc.," synergistically. The others take these words in the monergistic sense inherent in them. Would a Lutheran union on the basis of the Small Catechism be honest? "The mere unity of language counts for nothing. Unity of interpretation" (if you want to use that word) "is essential."

(c) "The principle of fellowship without surrender of conviction," applying which men say: "One can join the errorists outwardly without consenting to their teaching," does not comport with spiritual integrity and common honesty. An editorial in *The Baptist* states: "To some degree, though slowly, the world is discarding that idea (namely that those who differ in their religious ideas can hold no fellowship with one another, still less co-operate) and is substituting for it the principle of fellowship without surrender of conviction." (See *CONC. THEOL. MONTHLY*, 1932, p. 545.)

Dr. Pieper discusses this matter thus: "People are saying: 'One can join the errorists outwardly without consenting to their false teaching; you need accept only so much of their teaching as is based on the truth.' And so, if there is no orthodox church in their vicinity, they join a sectarian church. But what about Rom. 16:17? This divine command does not merely say that the Christians must not agree in their hearts with the false teachers, but requires, in addition, that the Christians have no fellowship, no outward communion with them." (*Proc. Syn. Conf.*, 1908, p. 30.) Common honesty, too, requires that. If you have retained your Lutheran convictions, you cannot join in worship, in honest worship, with the Calvinistic or Pelagian errorist.

Again, common honesty should not permit a man to remain a member of a church with which he is not in doctrinal agreement. Unionism permits just that. But the Lutheran who no longer has any Lutheran convictions does not pursue an honorable course if he remains in the Lutheran society; he should unite with his spiritual brethren. And how can the liberal preacher conscientiously retain membership in a conservative church whose creed he cannot conscientiously accept?⁶³⁾

(d) Can a theologian seriously believe that Catholics and Protestants are alike in that both groups have seven sacraments? Can he honestly make himself believe that? We read in *CONC. THEOL. MONTHLY*, 1938, p. 53 f.: "Unionistic Make-Belief. — *The Chris-*

63) J. G. Machen: "Whatever may be thought of Christian doctrine, it can hardly be denied that honesty is one of the 'weightier matters of the law.' Yet honesty is being relinquished in wholesale fashion by the liberal party in many ecclesiastical bodies today. . . . Whether we like it or not, these churches are founded upon a creed; they are organized for the propagation of a message. If a man desires to combat that message instead of propagating it, he has no right, no matter how false the message may be, to gain a vantage ground for combating it by making a declaration of his faith which — be it plainly spoken — is not true. Finding the existing 'evangelical' churches to be bound up in a creed which he does not accept, he may either unite himself with some other existing body or else found a new body to suit himself. . . . The Unitarian Church is frankly and honestly just the kind of Church that the liberal preacher desires — namely, a Church without an authoritative Bible, without doctrinal requirements, and without a creed. . . . The fact that the Church is more than a political club does not mean that in ecclesiastical affairs there is an abrogation of the homely principle of honesty. The Church may possibly be more honest, but certainly it ought not to be less honest, than a political club." (*Christianity and Liberalism*, p. 162 ff., 169.) — C. F. v. Ammon, a rationalist and an honest man: "Jede Kirche, die nicht mit dem Heiligen spielt, betrachtet die Einheit des Glaubens als ein wesentliches Merkmal ihres inneren Seins und Lebens; wer unter dem Vorwande, es moege jeder fuer sich denken, was er wolle, Rationalisten, Schwenkfeldianer, Unitarier und Griechen vor einem Altar vereinigen will, der kann zwar eine Gesellschaft von Gottesverehrern periodisch versammeln, aber zuverlaessig wird sie sich nie zu einer wahren christlichen Kirche verbruedern." (Quoted in *Rudelbach*, op. cit., p. 264).

tian Century of Sept. 22, 1937 states: "This realism (at Edinburgh) led to the discovery of unsuspected margins of agreement. The discussion of the number of sacraments is a good illustration. . . . It emerged in the discussion that we all have the equivalent of seven sacraments and perhaps more! Certainly the Orthodox and Roman Churches are not peculiar in holding marriage to be a "divine ordinance." Also, every clergyman of the now liturgical churches performs some act of grace for the dying, which is the equivalent of "extreme unction." Moreover, all churches "ordain" their ministers. There is also in the discipline of all churches at least a suggestion of "penance." Confirmation is a universal practice in churches which practice infant baptism. And as for those churches which practice only adult baptism, a new "sacrament" is coming into wide use, namely, the dedication of infants and their recognition as members of the Christian community for whose care the Church has peculiar responsibility." That is a form of mystification.⁶⁴⁾

(e) A favorite maneuver of the unionizers is to keep the people in ignorance of the matter in controversy. The churches will the more readily unite if the people can be made to believe that the churches are really one in doctrine; the less said about the actual disagreement, the better for the cause of the reunion of Christendom. This "diplomatic conspiracy of silence" (p. 330 above) is dishonest. Luther points out the honest way in his "Instruction fuer Gregor Casel, was er den Strassburgern mitteilen solle." "Jener Rat hat keinen Bestand: dass man die Glaebigen von der Frage nach der Gegenwaertigkeit des Leibes und Blutes ablenken solle und sie allein im Wort und Glauben ueben. . . . Daher hat hier kein Rat oder Mittel Statt, jeder Teil muss bekennen, was er glaubt. Und hier bitten wir, weil sie so gewiss sind, sie moegen bei dem Volke nicht verheimlichen, dass sie mit uns uneins sind. Dies ist die vierte Warnung des Geistes, welcher nicht so heuchelt. . . ." (XVII:1535 f.)

(f) It is dishonest when a church union is planned and effected for reasons of state, for the sake of political advantages. It is shameful hypocrisy when men pretend to be working in the interest of the Church and spiritual welfare while they are actuated merely by carnal interests. The history of the rise and

64) The official Report of Edinburgh World Conference presents the matter thus: "The number of the sacraments depends upon the definition of the term 'sacraments' as given by the various churches." (P.10.) True enough. However, the Report goes on to say: "In most of the Protestant churches there are such solemn religious acts as correspond more or less closely with some or all of the five other sacraments which are taught by the Catholic churches." The "unity" of doctrine established by such findings is fictitious.

reign of unionism has a long chapter of these shameful dealings. Macfarland says: "Among the motives for the attempts at Protestant union was . . . the desire for unity and uniformity in the interest of political peace." (*Op. cit.*, p. 25.) Zwingli's plan of a great political alliance from Venice to the Baltic against the menace of the united Pope and Kaiser was to be furthered through the Marburg Colloquy. The Prussian Union came into being because the Prussian dynasty believed that a strong state presupposes unity of religion. "German Protestantism was to be used for political effect." (*Proc. Syn. Conf.*, 1938, p. 27 f.) And R. Jelke as we have seen, is working for a united Lutheran-Reformed-Catholic Church in the interest of the unity and strength of the German State.⁶⁵⁾

Schleiermacher worked for the Prussian Union because he hoped that it would strengthen not only the state, but also Calvinism. He declared in a theological opinion: "Durch die Trennung wuerden die Staatskraefte nur zersplittert und die Reformierten koennten so nicht frei genug wirken." (Rudelbach, *op. cit.*, p. 617.) And W. Elert points out that the Calvinistic unionizers had in view not so much the "unity of Protestantism" but the spread of Calvinism. "Das spaetere Draengen auf Union von Seiten des Calvinismus tritt dadurch in die richtige Beleuchtung, dass der Calvinismus ueberall da, wo er dem Luthertum die 'Einheit des Protestantismus' einzuhaemmern versuchte, in urspruenglich lutherische Kirchengebiete eingedrungen war. Dass seine 'Irenik' eine versteckte Form der Agitation fuer sich selbst war, kann man be-

65) Hagenbach (Reformed) says in his *Church History*, III, p. 455: "Der Landgraf, Zwingli und Jakob Sturm waren die Traeger dieser Idee (ein allgemeines Schutz- und Trutzbuendnis aller protestantischen Obrigkeiten und Staedte, ein 'christliches Buergerrecht' [Civitas christiana] im ausgedehntesten Sinne zustande zu bringen), deren Verwirklichung leider ein Hindernis im Wege stand: der theologische Zwiespalt in der Abendmahlslehre." Prof. W. Bauer (Eden Seminary): "Wenn es wahr ist, dass Zwingli in Marburg geweint hat, dann muessen das Traenen des Zorns und der Enttaeusung gewesen sein; denn ihm lag, wie wir wissen, aus politischen Gruenden gar viel am Zusammengehen mit den Wittenbergern." (*Ev. Kalender*, 1930.) Playing politics with the reunion of Christendom!—Political considerations had something to do with Melancthon's *Variata*. See footnote 55.—C. F. v. Ammon on the Prussian Union: "So wenig die Gerechtigkeit jemals militaerischen Einfluss vertraegt, so wenig laesst die Religion das Uebergewicht politischer Momente zu. Alle Interim begannen mit Gewalt und endigten in grosser Schwachheit." (Rudelbach, *op. cit.*, p. 624.)—Attention has been called in our circles to "the general trend of some Government official to use the present emergency as an opportunity to foster a 'unity of the churches.'" And a Methodist minister is demanding that the Government compel all Protestant denominations to unite in one big Church. "This man expressed openly what many have felt privately. The idea is gaining momentum." (*Northwestern Lutheran*, Feb. 23, 1941. *Witness*, 1941, p. 132. *CONC. THEOL. MTHLY.*, 1941, p. 307.)

sonders lehrreich an dem polnischen Agitator Johann a Lasco studieren, der als 'armer Emigrant' mit einem Anhang von zwei anderen Predigern und 170 Seelen die lutherischen Laender von Daenemark bis Wittenberg durchzog. Er bestand stets darauf, mit den lutherischen Geistlichen zu disputieren. Wenn er aber daraufhin nicht als der Ihrige angesehen und behandelt wurde, erfuellte er die Welt mit seinen Klagen ueber die lutherische Intoleranz." (*Morphologie des Luthertums*, I, p. 246.)

(g) In this connection Elert makes the statement: "Diese Stellung Luthers und der Kirche Augsburgischer Konfession war allen ein Dorn im Auge, die Kircheneinheit durch Kirchenpolitik statt durch Einheit der Lehre herstellen wollten." This chapter in the history of the rise and reign of unionism — the machinations of the church politicians — presents a sorry picture. These church-politicians have learned all the tricks of the ward politician. They beguile the people with fine-sounding phrases, cry down the opposition, stir up mass hysteria, operate with numerical majorities, and employ all kinds of other unsavory methods. How was the Methodist merger of 1939 effected? The Modernists were back of it; it would help the dissemination of their heresies. And a Laymen's Organization raised "the charge that the plan was railroaded over, they went about it as secretly as possible and suppressed all public discussion; it was done against the will of the churches; the church leaders employed the political game." (See *Der Lutheraner*, 1939, p. 362.) How did the United Church of Canada come into being? *The Presbyterian Record*: "A hurricane of spiritual tyranny has swept over our Church. It left in its path ruin, wounded hearts, broken friendships, separated families, split organizations. . . . Our Church has been ruined through political methods. It is the greatest wrong committed in the entire Canadian history." (See *CONC. THEOL. MTHLY.*, 1930, p. 420.)

(h) Here is a partial list of the terms used by some unionists in denouncing those who will not go with them: Subtile Differenzen, mikrologische Haarspalterei. Silly differences. Hairsplitting philosophies of doctrinal theology. Idiotic divisions. War of words. Needless bickering. Doctrinal bullfights. Quibbling about non-essentials. Quibbling about Verbal Inspiration. Quibbling about the Lord's Supper. Hagglng about the literal body of Christ in the Lord's Supper. Etc. Etc.

Other bad language: The sin of separation. The cause of division too unimportant to justify separation. Separation the greatest heresy. The scandal of Christianity. Ugly bickering and unchristian quarreling. Unchristian counsel (to separate from the errorists). Unchristian aloofness; the sinful isolationism of the Southern Baptists and some Lutherans. The spook from Marburg.

Some more smearing: *Gewissensknechtschaft* und *paepstliche Anmassung*; *Anmassung paepstlicher Unfehlbarkeit*, *unausstehliche Rechthaberei* und *Meinungsstolz*. *Streitsucht*. Disturbers of the peace. Pack of canines. *Rabies theologica*. Intolerant dogmatism. Obscurantists. Mediaevalists. Bigots. Shackles of an old-fashioned confessionalism. Narrow type of Christianity (represented by "the Southern Baptists and the Lutherans of the Missouri Synod." P. 321 above). Luther's stubbornness and sectarianism. Denominational self-satisfaction. Self-seeking. Inherent prejudices. Smug complacency. Personal pride. Swelled head. Holier-than-thouers. Lack of Christian charity. Lack of the evangelical spirit.⁶⁶) Unwillingness to go through intellectual struggles. Lack of the will to unity. These terms do not describe the situation correctly. Those employing them are engaged in a dishonest campaign.

Just analyze some of these slanderous terms. "Self-seeking"? *The Christian Century* says of the motives of the organizers of the National Association of Evangelicals: "What the organizers of this new movement seek is therefore not representation within a united Protestantism, but control of one segment of a divided Protestantism. They have seized upon this moment when the co-operative agencies are in process of a larger integration to make a bid for power under the aegis of a revised sectarianism." *CONC. THEOL. MTHLY.*, 1943, p. 505, comments: "*This is not fair*. The Protestants who have formed the new organization simply refuse to be represented by men who trample under foot the truths which they themselves hold sacred. They furthermore wish to have an opportunity of testifying as widely as humanly possible to the truths which they love. Such an opportunity would not be given them if they were members of the Federal Council."—"Lack of the will to unity?" *The Christian Century*, Oct. 15, 1941, states: "It may now be the gravest of sins to refuse to strive for visible church union." The insinuation is that the confessional churches have no great interest in this matter. *That is not fair!* We refuse to work for a fictitious, wicked union, but it is *not fair*—not to use a stronger term—when two writers in *The Lutheran* jibe: "Where do you suppose the priest and the Levite were going when they passed the broken and robbed man on the road to Jericho?" "Perhaps they were headed for a theological conference to draw up some 'article of agreement.'" (See page 398 above.) But it is an old story. *Is it fair* when the errorist disrupts the Church and

66) "J. A. Tittmann zuechtigte derb die Anmassung, damit namentlich Schleiermacher allen denjenigen den 'evangelischen Sinn' absprach, welche nicht mitgehen wollten," nicht fuer die Union zu haben waren. (Rudelbach, *op. cit.*, p. 625.)

then puts the blame for "the scandal of Christianity" on those who will not condone the heresy? "Also meine Schwaermer auch, die haben das Feuer angezündet, wie sie selbst gar herrlich rühmen, als eine Wohltat, und wollen nun die Schuld der Uneinigkeit von sich schieben auf uns. Wer hiess Dr. Carlstadt anfahren? Wer hiess Zwingli und Oekolampad schreiben? Haben sie es nicht von ihnen selbst getan? Wir haetten gerne Frieden gehabt und noch; sie wolltens aber nicht zugeben; nun ist die Schuld unser; das ist recht." (Luther, XX:772.)

(i) It is a misrepresentation when the unionizers present the laity as favoring the reunion of Christendom and the clergy as opposing it. E. S. Jones: "The laymen will rise up!" *The Lutheran Companion*: "How long will the laymen of the Church put up goodnatureedly with this kind of a procedure at a time when the Church needs to unite and marshal all her forces?" (See p. 322 and 604 above.) And *The Lutheran Standard*, April 12, 1941: "The laity of the several Lutheran bodies involved in these controversies would welcome the day when the hatchet would be buried for the good of all concerned." If this means that the theologians as a group delight in disunion and useless controversy and need to be called to order by the laymen, the clergy is being vilely slandered. The Christian theologians desire peace and union as ardently as the Christian laymen.

The laymen, too, are being slandered when men declare that the laity as a group favors a union by compromise. In his address "The Laymen's Point of View," Judge R. Marsh declared: "The laymen want action. The only feasible action is compromise, each church conceding something to the other for the sake of coming together." It is not true that the laity as a group stands for unionism. The Christian layman abhors a dishonest union as much as the Christian theologians. When the attempt was made to reconcile Lutheranism and Catholicism by means of the Interim, the Lutheran laymen rose in their might and declared: "Of the Interim beware, for a knave is hiding there." The theologians who refuse to work for any other union but a union in the truth are not in opposition to the laymen as a group. Many laymen stand behind them. It is true that there are many laymen who want a unionistic peace—just as there are many theologians who are unionists. And in view of that *The Lutheran Companion* should have said: How long will our unionistic laymen follow the leadership of the confessional theologians?⁶⁷⁾

67) "Judge R. Marsh is not speaking for the laymen in general. He is speaking only for his group. But that is a part of the unionistic strategy to make it appear that the laymen as a body are backing the union movement. That is pure propaganda. There is nothing in the

And in this connection we shall again point out that the laymen are being deceived when their theological leaders tell them: "Our differences are so little." The *Augustana Quarterly* utters the solemn warning: "The broad insinuations of 'hairsplitting' against the theologians of the Church must stop. A union in which the laity has been taught to despise or minimize the fundamental necessity of theology or its teachers will have a weak foundation to stand upon." (See p. 618 above.) The laity must not be taught that the differences are due to misunderstanding or different "interpretations" and touch only insignificant non-essentials and have been brought about by God Himself, etc., etc.

(j) One of the most flagrant forms of dishonesty is that practiced in intercommunion. We have already adverted to this abomination in the section treating of ambiguous, dishonest formulas. Let us now examine it more in detail. Intercommunion is rank hypocrisy. Here are men who confessedly do not share a common faith and yet engage in a rite which is meant to express, in the most solemn way, spiritual communion. They pretend a unity which does not exist—and practice this deception in the innermost sanctuary of the Christian Church. And the wickedness of this deception increases a hundredfold when those who believe in the Real Presence and those who abominate it commune together. Each party—if it is honest in its belief—abhors the faith of the other. How can they meet as brethren in the faith? They can do it only if they are not honest in their belief. Furthermore, intercommunion involves a denial of the truth, of the true doctrine of the Lord's Supper and of the true doctrine in general. When you commune together with the adherents of false doctrine, you make the truth a matter of slight importance; you hold the truth cheap; you condone the false teaching. And by doing that you fail in your duty towards the erring Christian. You are strengthening him in his error. Faithless towards men—and faithless towards God. God wants His truth confessed, but intercommunion is a virtual denial of the truth. Surely the conscience of the honest Christian warns him against entering into this most intimate fellowship with false teachers; if he does it, he does not keep faith with himself.

H. P. Scratchley writes in *The Living Church*, Oct. 5, 1929: "The thing that puzzles me about these interdenominational 'com-

make-up of the Christian layman's mind that would make him more susceptible than the clergy to the unionistic disease. . . . There are, proportionately, as many unionists among the theologians as among the laymen. Professor W. A. Brown starts it: 'Our differences are so little, and the unionists among the laity are glad to hear it and repeat it. The stampedes organized at times by groups of laymen are, in some cases, directed from headquarters.' (CONC. THEOL. MONTHLY, 1940, p. 467.)

munion services' is, what do they mean to the Protestant ministers? Has the Presbyterian or the Congregationalist *lost his spiritual integrity*, so that he kneels to receive that which is declared to be the body and the blood of Christ when the entire history of his religion declares that he does not believe this to be true? . . . Is it not time that we Christians do away with rank sentimentalism and be spiritually straightforward in thought, word, and deed?" Luther, too, cannot understand how Christians can practice the dishonesty of intercommunion. "It shocks me to hear that in one and the same church, at one and the same altar, the two parties [Lutheran and Reformed] should take and receive one and the same Sacrament, with one party believing that it receives nothing but bread and wine and the other believing that it receives the true body and blood of Christ. And I often ask myself whether it is possible that a preacher and pastor could be so callous and wicked as to tolerate such a thing, to let each party conceive of the Sacrament in its own way and let both parties think that they are receiving the same Sacrament. But if there should be such a pastor, he must have a heart harder than stone, steel, and adamant; he certainly is an apostle of wrath." (XVII:2016.) Quoting this, the *Proceedings of the Synodical Conference, 1875*, p. 17, say: "Wenn nun jemand das heilige Abendmahl bei uns genießt und durch die tatsächliche Bekenntnisgemeinschaft ein Glied unserer Gemeinde wird, aber im Mund und Herzen in Wahrheit nicht das gleiche Bekenntnis hat, da heucheln Prediger und Gemeindeglied gemeinschaftlich und treiben am Altar schrecklichen Spott mit dem Heiligen." Whether the false teaching be the Reformed denial of the Real Presence or the denial of any other Scripture doctrine, Open Communion defiles the holy of holies with lying hypocrisy.⁶⁸⁾

68) Additional testimonies. Protesting against *The Lutheran's* justification of Open Communion, Dr. J. C. Mattes (now professor at Wartburg Seminary) declared: "A Lutheran who communes with those who deny the Real Presence is denying his own faith before men. The one who is permitted to commune at a Lutheran altar while actually denying the Real Presence as far as his own convictions go, is put into a dishonest and false position before men." (See *The Lutheran*, Feb. 26, 1931.) Prof. J. P. Milton (Norwegian Lutheran Church): "If we commune at other than Lutheran altars, we thereby say that there is no essential difference, and we tear down the teaching of our own Church and build up that of others. . . . If we believe these things (Real Presence, promise of the remission of sins) to be true, it behooves us to guard our faith by a clear confession of it not only in creedal statements, but in the conduct of our worship as well. . . ." (*People Are Asking*, p. 13 f.) C. P. Krauth: "To go to the same table with those whom we know to be in error in regard to *any truth* which Christ has revealed, is not only to hold the truth of Scripture cheap, but to make such persons all the more settled in their error or indifferent to the importance of truth." (See *The Lutheran Witness*, 1938, p. 53.) Dr. E. Denef: "Es geht Christen gegen das Gewissen, erkannten Irrtum in kirchlicher Gemeinschaft zu dulden. . . . Pastor Petri, weiland in Han-

There is trickery behind the demand for intercommunion. Peter Ainslie's and his Christian Unity League's method to "remove the barriers" is to go ahead and practice intercommunion and hold joint services. (See *The Lutheran*, Feb. 3, 1927.) The honest way is to remove the barriers by coming to a full doctrinal agreement. The extreme unionists prefer to take the short cut. Ainslie: "We can resolve doctrinal differences only by affirming and practicing Christian unity," by practicing pulpit and altar fellowship. Editor C. C. Morrison wrote in *Christendom*, 1936, Autumn, p. 49: "Dr. Ainslie conceived the idea of celebrating the Lord's Supper (at Lausanne) on the coming Sunday morning. This act, he thought, would draw the participants into closer fellowship and signalize the fact that beneath the apparent divisions of the Church there was a unity of all its branches in the one Vine. Whether this suggestion of a conference Communion service arose from Ainslie's naiveté or from that instructive shrewdness which always accompanied his naiveté no one will ever know. My own opinion is that it was made in all good faith." Be that as it may, it is a shrewd maneuver to get men to celebrate joint Communion services by playing upon their emotions, their "sentimentalism" (Scratchley's phrase), and then cutting off all further discussion of the doctrinal differences by stressing the alleged fact that they are already united.—Intercommunion is the goal to which all union movements must be directed; it must not be made a means of promoting Christian unity. The intercommunionists are making a dishonest use of the meaning and purpose of the holy Sacrament.⁶⁹)

Some more knavery. P. Ainslie and his group tried hard to get Episcopalians by hook or crook to practice intercommunion. Bishop Manning called them to order and said: "The members of

nover, schrieb einer fruheren Konfirmandin, der er bezeugte, dass sie mit gutem Gewissen am reformierten Abendmahl nicht teilnehmen duerfte: 'Da wir einmal durch Schuld unserer Suende und Gottes geheimen Rat getrennt sind ueber dem Worte Gottes und nun durcheinander leben—lutherisch, reformiert, katholisch usw.—, so duerfen wir die Aufgabe nicht gering schaeetzen, wie wir in diesen Verhaeltnissen unstraeflich und unanstoessig wandeln muessen, und wie wir die *Treue gegen Gott* und die *Liebe gegen den Naechsten* miteinander ueben.'" (*Kirchenblatt*, Nov. 3, 1937.)

69) Alfred E. Garvie: "Intercelebration of the Eucharist by all the Churches will alone adequately manifest the essential unity of the Church. This cannot be the first step, but must be the last." (See *The Reunion of Christendom*, p.148.) Conrad Bergendoff: "Christians are not divided because they do not celebrate the Sacrament together: they do not celebrate the Sacrament together because they are divided on other issues. Until greater unity is established in these other fields, only another issue is added if we insist on making the Lord's Supper a means to agreement. . . . Open Communion is too easy a remedy for the wounds of the Body of Christ today." (See *Christendom*, 1942, Autumn, p. 536.)

the Christian Unity League will not aid the cause of unity by seeking to force their views on others and certainly not by trying to override and break down the laws of the churches to which they do not belong." *The Living Church*, May 14, 1932: "The Christian Unity League is up to its tricks again. This organization seems to have an inordinate desire to hold celebrations of the Holy Communion in Anglican churches, in direct defiance of the canon law of the Church. . . . But what amazes us and causes us sorrow is that Christian men should be so misguided as to think they can build such a sacred thing as Christian unity upon a foundation of evasion of the law and order of the Church, of trampling upon principles that she holds most dear, and of defiance of her constituted authority. Such steps lead not to unity, but to anarchy." We condemn the tactics of the unionists because of their disregard of the *divine* law, Rom. 16:17. But aside from that the point the *Living Church* makes is well taken. Some unionists will go to any length to achieve their purpose. (See further, CONC. THEOL. ΜΗΤΡΥ., 1930, p. 419; 1932, p. 626 f.)

Finally, the intercommunions betray the cause of the reunion of Christendom. *The Living Church*, Nov. 6, 1937: "When we join with our Protestant brethren in the celebration of what purports to be a united Communion service when actually it means one thing to us, another thing to orthodox Protestants, still another to liberal Protestants and something still different to Unitarians, we are not promoting Christian unity, but simply muddying the waters and confusing the issue." A statement in *Christendom*, 1942, Summer, p. 399: "Intercelebration likewise at once obscures and condones the fact of schism — it hides the symptoms of the disease of disunity while the disease remains unhealed." Bishop Manning endorses the statement of "Dr. Raymond Calkins, one of the most honored and trusted leaders of Congregationalism: 'A common Communion before we have acquired the spiritual perception of the total truth which makes us one can hardly hasten, but must seriously retard our progress.'" (See *The Reunion of Christendom*, p. 226.)

(3) The basic dishonesty of unionism lies in its proposal to unite the churches by way of compromise. Not every unionist will resort to the bald use of ambiguous formulas or practice the dishonesty of intercommunion.⁷⁰⁾ But every unionist is heart and

70) See the pertinent statements of Bishop Manning and others above. — The Presbyterian Church of England calls for "the acknowledgment in unambiguous terms of the differences in doctrine" and the National Synod of the Reformed Evangelical Churches of France, while it "declares itself ready to grant intercommunion to all the churches affiliated with the Lausanne movement," says: "What would be the good of using the same words without agreeing on their meaning?" (See *Convictions*, pp. 91, 104, 106.)

soul for a union by way of compromise. For that is the only way which unionism knows. And that is a dishonest way.

Unionism does not want to remove the doctrinal differences, but asks the Churches to compromise them. "The laymen want action. The only feasible action is compromise, each church conceding something to the other for the sake of coming together." (See above.) Concede, say the unionizing theologians, that the other Church may be just as right as yours. Let all Churches retain their distinctive teachings: all serve a good purpose. Do not be so stubborn and uncompromising, since "our differences are so little." (W. A. Brown.) Compromise on the non-essentials: "There will never be peace in the churches if we cannot bear differences in secondary points" (Zwingli); "united in the fundamentals, but allowing, and gladly allowing, very wide divergencies in secondary matters" (Bishop F. T. Woods); "there must be no compromise on the *fundamental* doctrines of our faith." (See p. 324 f. above.) If the doctrine of your Church, say that of the *sola gratia*, be offensive to the other party, tone it down a little.—Compromise is of the very essence of unionism, and the compromise, briefly, is this: the Lutheran Church grants the other Churches the right to teach what they think is right, and the other Churches are willing to let the Lutherans teach what they think is right, all observing Christian comity and tolerance.

The Christian Century said, April 14, 1943: "The sin of being divided is far more grievous in the sight of Almighty God than any compromise on issues that have heretofore kept us apart." The Lutheran arch-unionist Melancthon was ever ready to conciliate the errorists by yielding some "minor point" and toning down the important points. (Dr. Pieper: "His policy at Augsburg was: 'The dangerous times do not permit the confession of the whole truth. To save the chief points, we must yield to the papists in some points.'" See *Proc. Del. Synod*, 1899, p. 34.) The position of the unionists is certainly not misrepresented when Dr. C. E. Macartney thus defines it: "The movement toward church unity amounts to giving up this or that distinguishing truth and doctrine." *Sunday School Times*: "In uniting they minimize or drop out any doctrine that any of the parties to the union do not believe or stress." (See pp. 615 and 617 above.) *The Old Paths*: "Union can only be brought about by compromise. Compromise means the surrender of dearly bought convictions. The surrender will be in regard to doctrine as well as to church government. In both considerable territory will be yielded before union takes place." (See *Toward Lutheran Union*, p. 156.)

But this business of uniting the churches by way of compromise is dishonest. We have no right to put any doctrine of

Scripture on the free list. For "the doctrine is not ours." When theologians minimize the importance of any Scriptural teaching or yield its exclusive right and grant men the right to reject or doubt it, they are as dishonest as the servant who disposes of his master's goods for his own profit or the clerk who, contrary to instructions, gives a liberal discount to his friends. Putting error on a level with the truth or minimizing its wickedness, or condoning and tolerating it in any way, is high treason. God has entrusted you preachers and laymen with the pure doctrine. He has asked you to "contend earnestly for the faith which was once delivered unto the saints." If you refuse to do so and instead make an appeasement with the false teachers, you betray your trust. You are forsworn traitors.⁷¹⁾

In earthly matters compromising is in place. "All government, indeed every human benefit and enjoyment and every prudent act, is founded on compromise and barter." (Edmund Burke.) God has left certain things to our discretion, the decision to be made on the basis of human reason. Here we cheerfully admit that we may be wrong and the others right. Here it is the part of wisdom to compromise, and an honest compromise is honorable in the sight of God. But matters of doctrine are not left to our free decision and disposal. The Christian doctrine is fixed by Scripture for all time. It is inviolable. It is not subject to barter, trade, compromise. The doctrine is God's. Our sole business is to proclaim it. We are merely God's messengers, and if we took it upon ourselves to change the message according to our wisdom and whim, that would be the betrayal of a sacred trust. The way of unionism is dishonest.

71) A layman, C. F. Liefeld, wrote in *The Lutheran Standard*, June 5, 1943: "With great interest but also with some consternation I have been following the correspondence in *The Lutheran Standard* under the heading 'The Layman's Quill.'—If all Christian churches are to be judged as being alike, and differences in doctrine to be more or less discarded, what justification was there for a Lutheran Reformation in the first place? If church history has not convinced us that the Reformation under Dr. Martin Luther was divinely guided, why remain a Lutheran at all? Truth can never be compromised nor even taken lightly. Two opposite views by different denominations on the same doctrine cannot both be right. . . . A person who is a Lutheran solely because he has been born into the Lutheran Church can hardly be called a convinced Lutheran; but even in his case we have to remember that these circumstances happened under divine guidance, since no hair falls from our head without the will of our Father. Also for these Lutherans the word of St. Paul to Timothy applies, 2 Tim. 3:14 (Luther's translation: 'You, however, remain in the things you have learned, and which have been entrusted to you')."

It is not the Lutheran way. Listen to Luther. "Now our wise men are beginning to take a hand and would patch up the matter. They tell us that the way to end the strife is for each party to yield something and meet the other party halfway. In other matters, in worldly affairs, on questions of government and the like, which are left to our control, mutual concessions are in order; patch up what you can; here I, too, would advise and demand that you come to some agreement. But where faith and Christ's kingdom is concerned, you may not twist and warp His scepter; He will have no patching and botching. . . . It is the kingdom and scepter of the Lord who sits at the right hand of God and rules in the midst of His enemies. Who, then, are we that we should tell Him how to manage His affairs and advise Him to yield something to His enemies, Satan and the world, and conciliate them?" (V:977. On Psalm 110.) "Judas, betrayest thou the Son of man with a kiss?" (Luke 22:48.) "We may well say to these enthusiasts and spirits who offer us such a peace what Christ said to the traitor Judas in the garden: 'O Judas, betrayest thou the Son of man with a kiss?' Yes indeed, it is a Judaic peace and traitorous kiss when they act friendly and ask us to keep silence and calmly view the hurt and ruin, the eternal ruin they bring upon men, and ask us to consider it a small matter that amounts to nothing." (XX:776.)

It is not the way of the Southern Baptists and the other confessional groups. We read in *The Watchman-Examiner*, May 9, 1940: "In all discussions of church union, one other important fact must be clearly kept in mind; namely, there can be no real merger or unity at the expense of truth. Dr. Truett's ringing words on this point are very forceful and timely. 'Any unity, except in the truth, would not only be fatal, it *would be treachery to Christ*. It behooves all Christians to faithfully inquire how they may come closer together. Shall they do so by reducing their beliefs to a minimum? . . . That would indeed be very shallow and unworthy reasoning which advocates union by compromise in the realm of spiritual truth. . . . We are separated ecclesiastically from all other people, and we cannot help it, unless we stultify our consciences or renounce the truth, as we are given to see the truth, a course no Christian would wish us to take.' Our Southern Baptist brethren seem to have sensed the lurking danger in the present movement for mergers and union, for at their convention in 1938 they adopted the following resolutions: 'We would issue a friendly warning to our brethren of every communion of the danger of a man-made union. . . . Since the present divided condition of Christendom is unquestionably the result of

the departure from the simple teaching of the Scriptures, the only possible road to merger and union is back to the Scriptures. . . ."⁷²⁾

"Unless we stultify our consciences or renounce the truth"—a word on that point. You cannot make any kind of compromise with error without violating the spirit of truth. "Truth is constitutionally opposed to error and refuses to tolerate it." (Pieper, *Christliche Dogmatik*, III, p. 491.) Truth and error will not mix and never make an appeasement. And when the truth has entered into the Christian's heart, his Christian conscience fights the error to the death. A man has to violate, kill his conscience before he can consciously grant the error the right of existence. Hear Dr. W. H. Greever: "To concede any part of the revealed truth is to go against conscience and to become disloyal to truth, and to compromise it is to concede it. No part of the revealed truth may be conceded because of the unity of truth as well as because of the essential value of all truth." (See p. 409 above.) And listen to the warning Luther gave Melancthon. "In the second place, it will not serve to make any compromise for the sake of union. A compromise is in itself untruthful, because its purpose is to unite things which are mutually opposed. Moreover, if a compromise is once accepted, consciences become so unsettled that they will finally believe nothing at all." (See *Concordia Cyclopaedia*, p. 775. Luther, XVII:2049 f.) Unionism exacts a high price from its disciples. Dr. A. C. Headlam said: "The evils of disunion are great; but a far greater evil would be compromise with the truth." (See *THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY*, 1921, p. 372.) And one of these great evils is the loss of spiritual integrity which is always involved when error is given a place side by side with truth. "When the price of unity is disobedience to conscience, it is too high a price to pay. This is the point which in one form or another always comes up in unity negotiations." (Quoted from the article "What Price Unity?" in *The Living Church*, Feb. 14, 1943.)⁷³⁾

72) It seems that the reason why certain unionizers like to link "the Missouri Synod and the Southern Baptists" is that these groups are unalterably opposed to a union by compromise. The grouping: "Missouri and the Southern Baptists" is meant as ridicule. We will say that we are proud of being linked together with the Southern Baptists on this point. And no doubt they feel the same way.

73) Union by compromise entails other losses. *The Pastor's Monthly*, 1935, p. 695, calls attention to this loss: "The unions brought about in the nineteenth century signified that it was the opinion that confessional unity was unnecessary; that it was necessary only to act as if they were united. What came out of this is evident. We shall give but one example. At a Rhenish Teachers' Institute the future teachers are instructed in the Lutheran as well as in the Heidelberg Catechism in order that, according to the requirements, they might give instructions either in the Lutheran or in the Reformed religion, and so that in case

Do you see the knave back of the Interim? We Lutherans will not have any dealings with him. When the drive for the Prussian Union was on, Professor J. A. Tittmann spoke up in this way: "The Lutheran Church knows pretty well what these friendly invitations mean; she sees in every interim a knave, in every invitation of that sort a temptation to renounce her confession, in every union movement the self-seeking schemes of syncretism. — But, they tell us, since not everything can be accomplished at once, 'something' is surely better than nothing, and one must have patience, everything will work out well in the course of time. I answer, nothing good can come of it, for the truth is not there; consequently that 'something' is worse than nothing, for it beclouds the truth, benumbs the zeal for the truth, and does not lead to the unity in faith and in the truth, but to the domination of human opinions." (See Rudelbach, *op. cit.*, p. 623.)

(To be concluded)

TH. ENGELDER

Outlines on Old Testament Texts (Synodical Conference)

Twenty-first Sunday after Trinity

Dan. 3:19-30

In war, nations frequently place their trust in weapons, number of soldiers, and brilliant leadership, but in the crisis are confounded. We Christians, too, are at war—against temptation and sin. By placing our confidence in God's mercy our trust will be vindicated, even as the trust of Daniel's friends.

A Flaming Vindication of Ardent Trust

1. *Ardent trust put to a fiery test*
2. *Midst raging flames it finds its vindication*

1

Vv. 19-23. This is not the first test of the three friends. Cf. chap. 1:10 ff. Their trust became more ardent but now faced more

of a change they can go over from one confession to the other without difficulty. The training of future preachers by the majority of German theological faculties has not been much different lately. *Is it surprising that our Church has lost its moral esteem among the people in most of Germany?* The people certainly do not understand much theology; yet they understand something about veracity and have a finer feeling for it than many an educated person. They understand more about theological honesty and veracity than many an educated theologian. The people certainly notice whether the preacher or teacher is profoundly convinced or if he is only presenting a theology of the "as if."