

4-1-1945

## Theological Observer. - Kirchlich-Zeitgeschichtliches

J. T. Mueller

*Concordia Seminary, St. Louis*

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



Part of the [Practical Theology Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Mueller, J. T. (1945) "Theological Observer. - Kirchlich-Zeitgeschichtliches," *Concordia Theological Monthly*. Vol. 16 , Article 26.

Available at: <https://scholar.csl.edu/ctm/vol16/iss1/26>

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

---



---

## Theological Observer

---

**Summer School for Pastors at Seward, Nebr.** — In addition to advanced courses for teachers now serving congregations (three terms of three weeks each) and a special course for "so-called emergency teachers," our normal school at Seward is making plans for a pastors' summer school, which will be conducted for three weeks, from June 25 to July 13. "The plans include a special seminar on 'The Present Status of Union Endeavors,' conducted with the collaboration of Synod's Committee on Doctrinal Unity, as well as other courses of interest to the clergy." Besides, a three-day "institute for members of local boards for parish education will be conducted from July 24 to July 26 under the auspices of the Board of Education of the Southern Nebraska District." This institute will be open to pastors, teachers, and laymen. For further information, catalogs, rates, etc., address Prof. A. O. Fuerbringer, President, Concordia Teachers College, Seward, Nebr. A.

**A Most Urgent Request Pertaining to Work Among War Prisoners.** As the number of German war prisoners taken by our forces increases by the hundreds of thousands, so the task of the Lutheran Church of America in this war-made mission field is growing from day to day.

Lutheran civilian pastors, chaplains, and imprisoned *Pfarrer* are ministering to war prisoners in many camps in our country, but not nearly all have been covered. The Roman Catholic Church is following its Catholic prisoners behind the stockade but is also finding difficulty in keeping up with the growing and multiplying POW camps, since some of our men write that this Church is not represented in their camps and that some Catholic prisoners attend Lutheran services.

What is the attitude of the prisoners toward our work? This is a question often asked. The answer is: It varies. Generally speaking, we might say that the more recent arrivals are more favorable toward the advances of the Church than those who were taken longer ago, e. g., in the campaign in Africa; that older men are more inclined to attend Lutheran services than the younger; that the proportion attending is higher in the small side or work camps than in the large base camps. But all this is only generally true. A report for January from one of our pastors crosses our desk as we write this, stating that the attitude of the men attending is excellent, and we know that most of these are younger men. An average of 36 out of about 45 Lutherans at this side camp attend services and partake of Communion, and the pastor writes that they were overjoyed when he suggested that henceforth he would have a Catechism hour with them after each service.

On the other hand, we might take two larger camps not far from each other in neighboring States. In the one the atmosphere is one of courtesy and friendliness toward the chaplain and pastor but of indifference toward the services. From among hundreds of prisoners only a half dozen faithful ones attend divine services, but these come



regularly. In the other camp there prevails a friendly attitude toward pastor and services, and the attendance averages from 100 to 200.

But we endeavor not only to preach the Gospel to the German war prisoners as much and as often as possible, but also to provide them with Christian and general reading matter. Our German devotional booklets, Schwan's Catechism, *Kleines Gesang- und Gebetbuch*, and Christian tracts have entered the prison camps by the hundreds of thousands with the approval of the Censor's and the Provost Marshal General's offices. The *Lutheraner* is a special favorite. Hundreds of copies of Pieper's *Christliche Dogmatik*, Fuerbringer's *Evangelische Perikopen und Einleitung zum Alten und Neuen Testament*, Stoekhardt's *Roemerbrief*, Nestle's Greek Testament, and many other theological books have been sent to the pastors and theological students in prison. Some of these are taking courses in the correspondence school of our St. Louis Seminary.

Many expressions of appreciation have been received from the pastors and other prisoners. Here is a recent letter:

"Sehr geehrte Herren,—Als Fuehrer der — Kompanie unsers Lagers teile ich Ihnen auf Bitten des der — Kompanie angehoerigen evangelischen Lagergeistlichen Gefr. E— D— mit, dass ihm in letzter Zeit mehrfach Buecher theologischen und altsprachlichen Inhalts uebergeben worden sind, die von Ihnen zur Veruegung gestellt wurden. Er dankt Ihnen fuer die geistliche und geistige Fuersorge, die Sie unserer evangelischen Gemeinde schon des oeffteren haben zuteil werden lassen. Besonders wertvoll war fuer ihn die Uebersendung von Piepers Christlicher Dogmatik. Ihre Zeitschrift 'Der Lutheraner' geht uns in 20 Exemplaren zu und wird gern gelesen."

Besides doing work in many prison camps in our country, your Commission is in touch with chaplains who are ministering to German war prisoners in Europe. There, too, the prison camps are increasing in number and growing in size week after week.

A chaplain in Headquarters, European Theater of Operations, writes on January 12: "This letter acknowledges with sincere appreciation both the receipt of your letter of November 13, 1944, and the shipment of the supplies referred to therein. A portion of this shipment is now in our supply rooms and is being checked. The other parcels in this shipment are arriving daily. It will be hard for you to imagine the urgent need which exists here for this kind of printed matter for use with the thousands of Prisoners of War under the jurisdiction of this HQ. These items are very essential if we are to discharge fully our obligations to this ever increasing group of persons. Not knowing what you will be able to furnish in the future, we would like to make a 'blanket' request for all the religious printed matter which may become available to you for overseas shipment." He states that he is making use of German Lutheran pastors who are prisoners, and asks whether we could send for them Communion sets "up to one hundred and fifty."

Another chaplain writes from Europe: "Dear Brethren: To date I have received what I have previously ordered from your department. But the need is staggering here for more material. . . . I have several good Lutheran pastors, Germans, aiding me in my work, also a few theological students who need instruction and help. Now I would like



to have books so that these men may continue with their private study. . . . Send a 1,000 selection of hymns.—Our services are attended beyond all expectations. During December we had more than 17,000 in attendance. They are awakening to the fact that something has been lacking in their entire life. Officers request Bibles, Catechisms, prayer books, private discussions on religion. So, men, send the above request at once."

All is being done and every available source tapped to supply these urgent needs. But the supplies of any German books in our country are fast giving out. However there may be in the parsonages of our pastors and in the homes of our people German books which they would be willing to give up. Therefore, please send us German books in good condition and suitable for prisoners of war: small Bibles, New Testaments, devotional and prayer books, books on various topics, fiction, music, especially for four-part male voices, and, above all, also theological books for the prisoner *Pfarrer* and students. Do not send school-books nor old devotional booklets nor church periodicals, since current numbers are being provided. Send books only to:

#### LUTHERAN COMMISSION FOR PRISONERS OF WAR

c/o War Prisoners Aid of the Y. M. C. A.

33 East 47th St., New York 17, N. Y.

Additional information will be gladly given by our New York office at 231 Madison Ave. or by the undersigned field secretary of our St. Louis Office at 3558 S. Jefferson Ave. CARL A. GIESELER

**Lutheran Unity and Diverse Cultures.**—*The Lutheran Church Quarterly* (January, 1945) approaches the problem of church unity from the viewpoint of the diverse cultures of the various Lutheran groups in our country, emphasizing the distinct contributions to be made to a truly united Lutheran Church by the different bodies professing Luther's name. He speaks of the German tradition, as seen in the Missouri Synod, which is characterized by Confessionalism and Aristotelian dialectics (*sic!*). This extremely conservative Lutheran group, he says, may be commended for its loyalty to conviction and its refusal to yield against conscience. It can contribute the value of positiveness and the courage of standing by unpopular principles. Missouri's firmness for doctrinal position is reflected in its parochial school system and its "closed" communion [rather "close communion"]. Far different from this tradition is the "Swedish culture" that is "characterized by a warm, evangelical type of Christianity which lays emphasis on the personal life of the believers." A representative of Swedish culture is Dr. Bergendoff, who is quoted as saying: "We are suspicious of a unity founded on theses. We believe that the love of Christ is a better bond of union, and that love is expressed in brotherly affection as well as in intellectual agreement. We yield to none in faith in the Word of God, and seek to regulate our life and work according to that Word, but we are willing to allow others as well as ourselves to define that Word. All our faith is in Christ, but we are not inclined to believe that all of Christ is given only to us. . . . Our vision of a united Lutheran Church is characterized by our



hope that the manifold gifts of God shall come to fuller expression in the larger opportunities afforded by a wider fellowship." This may serve as a commentary on Dr. Ryden's words cited just before: "Although the Augustana Synod does not defend unionism, it does believe that we must learn to co-operate with other Christian groups." Furthermore, there is the "Norwegian culture," whose "tradition emphasizes especially personal piety. There is among them a warmth of religion and a subjective expression of Christianity not found elsewhere." The writer quotes the Norwegian churchman Dr. T. F. Gullixson as saying: "Unity for the Lutheran church will center for the future as through the past in a common body of Christian teaching and in the spirit thereby engendered. No other common center is available and no other focus has the power to overcome those centrifugal, occupational, geographical, social, and nationalistic forces which are constantly at work." For the "Danish contribution" the writer quotes Rev. A. V. Neve, who describes Danish theology as "clear, distinguishing between essentials and non-essentials," as "progressive," and as having "the right balance between the Word and the Sacraments." The United Lutheran Church, the writer says, represents "American culture." "Usually called the liberal or progressive branch of the church, it is in a position to bring counterpoise to the extreme conservatism and nationalistic character of some of the other Lutheran groups. In a concluding paragraph the writer says: "It may be observed that the diversity of cultures, which in the past has been a retarding factor in Lutheran unity, can be the ground for the building of a church more truly American than any other Protestant body. An earnest hope is cherished by an increasing number of Lutherans that cultural lines may now converge and the contribution of each group enrich more fully than ever before the united fellowship." Is this "earnest hope" well founded? "Cultural lines" certainly must not be overlooked in the attempt at unifying the various Lutheran groups into one church body, for only then will the various Lutheran denominations understand and appreciate one another when they keep in mind the various historical backgrounds; indeed, only then will they exercise the patience, kindness, and readiness to assist each other in the process of adjustment. After all, however, the problem of church unity does not find its solution in the appreciation of the various denominational "cultures." Such cultures do not unify, but separate. As the writer shows, Missouri is "extremely conservative." Augustana "is suspicious of a unity founded on theses; it believes that the love of Christ is a better bond of union." In the Norwegian group there is "Pietism," a "warmth of religion," and a "subjective expression of Christianity." The Danish group desires a "progressive theology," while other groups may have still other emphases and demands. How, then, can these diverse cultural tendencies lead to true unity? As a matter of fact there is but one spiritually unifying principle, and that is the divine Word as set forth in our Lutheran Confessions on the basis of Scripture. The more earnestly and sincerely the various Lutheran bodies will concentrate on the study of the divine Word, seeking to be "perfectly joined together in the same mind and in the same judgment" (1 Cor. 1:10) and "bringing into cap-



tivity every thought to the obedience of Christ" (2 Cor. 10:5), the sooner true church unity will be granted to Lutheranism in our country by the grace of God. Indeed, only then! There certainly is much truth in the words of Dr. Gullixson: "Unity for the Lutheran church will center . . . in a common body of Christian teaching and in the spirit thereby engendered. No other common center is available and no other focus has the power to overcome those centrifugal, occupational, geographical, social, and nationalistic forces which are constantly at work. *Loyalty to a common body of Christian teaching has held us together and will continue to do so.*" (Italics ours.) J. T. M.

**The Present Situation in the Lutheran Church of America.**—When the American Lutheran Conference held its biennial convention last November, a notable address was delivered by the secretary of the Conference, Dr. L. M. Stavig, which has been printed in the January, 1945, issue of the *Lutheran Outlook*. One of its paragraphs reports on resolutions passed by various Lutheran bodies in 1944, and for its historical value, if for no other reason, it should be inserted here.

"Last January the Executive Committee of the American Lutheran Conference gave expression to this new emphasis and adopted a statement which was presented to each Lutheran body in America. This statement carried the following paragraph: 'We believe that the Minneapolis Theses, the Brief Statement and Declaration, and the Pittsburgh Agreement, all of which we believe to be in accord with one another, have treated sufficiently all essential points; we believe that no additional theses, statements, or agreements are at this time necessary for the establishment of pulpit and altar fellowship among Lutherans.' The Augustana Synod, the American Lutheran Church, and the United Danish Church have officially adopted this statement and made it their own. The Norwegian Lutheran Church in June unanimously adopted a resolution declaring: 'Because of the confidence born of association, conference and co-operation through many years, we extend our hand of fellowship to all American Lutherans who adhere to the historic standards and confessions of the Lutheran Church. We find their doctrinal declarations to be in essential accord with our own. We believe no additional theses, statements, or agreements are necessary for fellowship among American Lutherans. Wherever our congregations and pastors find those ties that bind Lutheran Christians, and that teaching and practice conform to official declarations, they may in good conscience practice selective fellowship both in worship and work.'

"The United Lutheran Church at its convention in Minneapolis last month declared with reference to this statement of the Norwegian Lutheran Church that they 'counted it of such character as to warrant the conclusion that we are now in fellowship with the Norwegian Lutheran Church, even as with the Lutheran Free Church and the Augustana Synod.' It must continue to be our devout purpose to secure recognition by all Lutherans of one another and to make possible free movement between pastors and congregations of all Lutheran groups. This is the most important task which just now confronts American Lutheranism and should be consummated at the earliest possible moment. The



developments within recent months give promise of the attainment of this goal within a reasonable time as between the American Lutheran Conference and the U. L. C. A. Let us work and pray that there may soon be equally definite progress as over against our brethren of the Missouri Synod."

A few comments should be appended. With respect to selective fellowship we have voiced our warning and misgivings before. Matters are chaotic enough without the addition of another dizzying factor. The so-called Overture for Lutheran Unity we have criticized, and we think, properly, for taking the position that adoption of a single one of the documents mentioned (Minneapolis Theses, Brief Statement and Declaration, and the Pittsburgh Agreement) should be a sufficient basis for fellowship of that body with any other Lutheran body. It would have been different if the Overture had stated that adoption by a Lutheran church body of all these documents would be a sufficient basis for fellowship with other Lutheran Synods. A statement of that kind would have created great rejoicing in Missouri Synod circles and, we are sure, in many other quarters where conservative Lutheranism is loved and cultivated. How greatly discussion and clarification with respect to doctrinal questions before fellowship is declared are needed has become evident the last months through the clashes in the American Lutheran Conference on the inerrancy of the Scriptures. Here a definite issue, not a new one, to be sure, but one of peculiar importance, has become prominent, and what folly would it not be if union were consummated before this point of controversy has been settled! That there are other matters on which there is a lack of mutual understanding and agreement became evident several years ago through attacks made in the organ of the Norwegian Free Church on the doctrinal stand of the Missouri Synod. A large united Lutheran front is a desideratum; we pray for it. But what is needed still more is undiminishing loyal witness-bearing to the grand truths which, taken from the Scriptures, are embodied in the Lutheran Confessions, having at their center Christ and the doctrine of justification by grace through faith. A.

"Theology Today." — With the issue of January, 1945, *Theology Today* ends the first year of its existence. Its editor is John A. Mackay of Princeton; its associate editor, H. T. Kerr, of the same seminary. It is published four times a year, namely, on January 1, April 1, July 1, and October 1. Its business manager is L. J. Trinterud, P. O. 515, Philadelphia 5, Pa. Price, \$2. Of all theological publications in our country, outside perhaps of Lutheran periodicals, *Theology Today* at present will no doubt interest Lutheran students of scholarly tendency most. It evidently is a fruit of Brunner's work at Princeton Theological Seminary and represents the Barthian theological trend as this has been modified by Brunner and other men, some definitely conservative, others with a penchant for Liberalism. The periodical is neither Fundamentalist nor Modernist, but seeks to combine the traditional values of Reformed theology with the type that Karl Barth set in motion about a quarter of a century ago. The editorial council consists mostly of Princeton men and Presbyterian divines favoring present-day Princetonian the-



ology, but it includes also such outsiders as H. Richard Niebuhr, Yale Divinity School, Nels F. S. Ferré, Andover-Newton, and J. M. Richards, Columbia Theological Seminary. Among the contributors to the issue of January, 1945, we notice, among others, Prof. E. Lewis, Drew Theological Seminary; T. S. Eliot, an Anglo-Catholic; H. A. Johnson, an Episcopal clergyman. The editorials, with which each number begins, are written by Dr. Mackay. They helpfully characterize the special scope of each issue and fittingly introduce the articles and their authors. The fourth number, for instance, is dedicated to "God and Religion," in repudiation of man-exalting humanism, and endeavors to show that the Church of Christ, to play a worthy role today, must "abandon all by-paths from its duty and believe adventurously in God." Incidentally the editor remarks editorially that the response to the new publication has far exceeded all expectations. The articles are for the most part scholarly, timely, and stimulating. The review of current events, under the heading *The Church in the World*, is carefully edited, and the book reviews, which cover the most important recent theological publications, are well written. We recommend this publication to all students of modern theological trends, especially to those interested in the course which Barthianism is now taking in our country. But the periodical requires judicious reading, for it does not represent Christian orthodoxy, nor can conservative Lutheranism agree to its principles in general and its specific teachings in particular. The doctrinal content, wherever it shows positive confession, is basically Calvinistic; at the same time it cannot be identified with Reformed Fundamentalism. On page 493, for example, we read: "The Bible is not an oracle of divine principles to be applied to every age and condition. Rather, we must understand the methods whereby Biblical people found religious values. Much in the Bible is no longer applicable to our day." This characterizes, as the writer goes to show, the liberal type of Christianity, in contradistinction to the Roman Catholic and the "evangelical" type. But while the writer himself repudiates this "type of Christianity," as he also does the two other types, his own view of the Bible is not essentially different, for all he says of the Bible is: "The Bible is . . . a personal book which possesses the power to confront men with the living God. . . . The Bible is to be understood and taught genetically, historically, and experimentally, always remembering that the Holy Spirit alone can make the Bible the Word of God for the obedient" (p. 500 f.). This is the Barthian doctrine of Scripture, which is but a short step removed from Liberalism. The writer, of course, hastens to add: "While we teachers believe it to be the very Word of God, we must remember that this is the end-product of the Church's mature faith; it is the faith to which we have come after years of experience with the Word's power." In other words, the writer has no *a priori* belief in the Bible as the Word of God, but only a *posteriori* faith, which, as Dr. F. Pieper shows in his *Christliche Dogmatic*, is an essential departure from the traditional doctrine of the Church on the Bible as God's Word. Under the heading "Theological Humor" the editor of the department "The Church in the World" quotes from *The Presbyterian*, "a journal of 'Confessional and Catholic Church-



manship,'” the following bit of theological verse, which was published “as a corrective against jargon, against oversolemnity in theology, and because we would be suspicious of any theology which was not strong enough to laugh at itself or to stand a bit of misrepresentation.” There is, however, much truth in this subtle characterization of Barthianism:

#### How to be Saved

##### Or Barthianism Simply Explained for the Bourgeois

The deceitful human heart  
Has been analyzed by Barth  
With the help of neo-Pauline terminology.  
His aim is to restore  
The crisis Either/Or  
As the fundamental concept of theology.

You will hear with apprehension  
That the dialectic tension  
Is the core of the Immediate Situation;  
And will understand the gravity  
Of Absolute Depravity  
Through an existential *ich-du* confrontation.

To understand the verse, the reader, of course, must know the fundamentals of Barthianism. J. T. M.

**Criticism of Higher Critics.**—*The Living Church* (Episcopalian) recently published a series of four articles on *The Faith and Modern Criticism* (November, 1944), in which considerable concessions were made to the higher critics to the detriment (in particular) of the doctrine of Christ's person and work. To these articles Rev. A. C. Knowles, in the issue of January 14, 1945, replies in a manner that is worth considering in wider Christian circles. The writer, it is true, denies Verbal Inspiration, but his “criticism of the higher critics,” upon the whole, is so good that we offer it to our readers for study. Apologist Knowles writes: “It is only fair to your readers and to churchmen generally to have them know that the Church has never accepted the conclusions of the higher critics and that the vast majority of its members still believe in the traditional faith in the Scriptures as the inspired and infallible Word of God. The Church is not ‘fundamentalist,’ is not bound to verbal inspiration, but definitely accepts the content of the Bible as God's revelation, to be received with faith, love, humility, and reverence, and, in the hard places, remembers that ‘with God all things are possible.’ The attacks of the critics are plain assumptions, which obviously could not be proved, such as that the Scriptural stories are myths and fables, that Moses did not write the Pentateuch, that there were several Isaiahs, and it is bordering on heresy that they suggest limitations of our Lord's knowledge. It is far easier to believe in the Bible than in the critics. I am not going to argue these and other attacks. I would only refer to the following as difficult hurdles for even agile critics: (1) that the Church, guided by the Holy Ghost, accepted the Scriptures as we have them and stamped her *imprimatur* upon them [if this refers to the historic witness of the Church in its fixing of the canon, it is correct]; (2) that for many centuries no doubt was cast upon the text or content; (3) that the Fathers and Theologians throughout the Christian era have accepted and quoted them; (4) that archaeological discoveries in Biblical lands have sustained the Scriptural accounts and proved the critics



wrong; (5) that the advance in scientific knowledge in no way affects the Bible, for God who created all things and ordained the laws of nature can change or suspend them at will; (6) that in the story of Adam and Eve (singled out for attack) the promise 'the seed of the woman shall bruise the serpent's head' implies the Incarnation and Redemption (Our Lord being the Seed, the Blessed Virgin the woman) and that the 'Fall' is inherent [definitely confessed] in the Baptismal Office and the Burial Service; (7) that the critics do not agree and are often biased, since they attack that which sets forth doctrines they wish to deny; (8) that the Scriptures themselves carry conviction of their truth and have brought joy, comfort, and courage to multitudes; (9) that the critics would have no standing in a Law Court where we fancy the judge would say: 'Case dismissed; evidence conflicting and inefficient, petitioner biased.' As to our Lord's knowledge, the Church has always held that He had 'beatific knowledge' as God, 'acquired knowledge' as man, and in addition 'infused knowledge.' Whether He ever spoke with 'reserve' or 'accommodation' is not for man to inquire. No one, without danger of heresy, can question the completeness and fullness of our Lord's knowledge. He is God and Man, one Person, the Only-Begotten of the Father."—We wonder why Mr. Knowles, with the definite, conservative stand which he takes, presumes to deny Verbal Inspiration. Does he perhaps mistake verbal for "mechanical" inspiration? If the Scriptures are accepted as "the inspired and infallible Word of God," it is difficult to understand how Christian believers can ignore the Bible's own witness to Verbal Inspiration, as set forth in such Catechism passages as 2 Pet. 1:21; 2 Tim. 3:15-17; 1 Cor. 2:13; etc. When speaking of "our Lord's knowledge," the writer evidently shows the doctrinal confusion resulting from the blending of Reformed and Romanist teachings on this point. Our Lutheran theologians, following Scripture, ascribe a "beatific knowledge" only to angels, not to the incarnate Christ. For the expression "acquired knowledge" they would substitute "communicated knowledge," meaning by this term the knowledge which was imparted to the human nature of Christ by virtue of the *genus maiestaticum*. What the writer means by "infused knowledge" is not clear; but he is right in suggesting that Christ must not be accused of having spoken with "reserve" or "accommodation" in the sense that "as a child of His time" He taught erroneous views; for He Himself insisted that what He spoke is the truth (cf. John 8:32, 45; 14:6; 18:37; etc.). The apologist's last sentence is a vital confession and proves, as we believe, that there still are such in Episcopalian circles as hold to positive Christian truth.

J. T. M.

**Protestantism's Long Ride on a One-Way Street Leading to Religious Indifferentism.**—Very regretfully *The Christian Century* (February 14, 1945) complains that "Protestantism in the United States has been taken for a long ride on a one-way street leading to religious indifferentism." It writes: "It [Protestantism] has been made the object of a systematic propaganda of good will toward other faiths, in particular, toward Catholics and Jews. It has accepted this propaganda on terms which have weakened its self-respect and inhibited its forthright wit-



ness to its own convictions." The article is directed against the recent Protestant-Romanist-Jewish co-operative endeavors in religion. "Intolerance," the article admits, "is bad ethics and bad strategy. But in the actual situation in which this organized movement to promote tolerance among these groups is carried on, the major responsibility for the exercise of that virtue falls upon Protestantism. This is due to the relative status of the three groups in American life. Protestantism has from the beginning been the preponderant religious factor in this country. Catholics and Jews have been minority groups." So "the major responsibility for the practice of religious tolerance in the United States rests upon Protestantism." But this has been bad for Protestantism. "It has been bad, not because it has caused Protestants to go too far in expressing the spirit of tolerance—there is no danger of that—but because it has evoked a false tolerance which has caused Protestantism, in deference to this supposed enlarging pool of good will, to depreciate and repress its own positive witness. That Protestants should have fallen victim to this false tolerance and that their churches should have welcomed its dissemination so widely, is a pathetic commentary on the vacuity of the Protestant mind with respect to both Christian truth and the Protestant heritage. It cuts the nerve of Protestant conviction. Any theory of a democratic society must take into account this fact ["Christianity is missionary from its roots up. It is operating under the conviction of a mandate to make disciples of all nations"], and with it, the cultural conflict arising inevitably from the profound differences between Christian Catholicism and Christian Protestantism. On neither side can the inalienable missionary purpose be suppressed by a hush-hush exhortation to good will—though, alas, Protestantism has been almost overborne by the sweet strains of this propaganda. But Protestantism must not allow its sense of responsibility for religious freedom for all others to betray its freedom to bear witness to its own faith. It must face the alternatives of the future. American culture is destined to become either Catholic, Protestant, or secular. Unless Protestantism is ready to surrender its priceless heritage, or to be robbed of it by its own default, it will overcome its false inhibitions and speak out on its own behalf. It will also begin with vigor to pull itself together into a unity of consciousness and of organization, without which its historical situation in American culture must be admitted to be precarious." Christian readers with positive convictions, sick and tired of the syncretistic Catholic-Protestant-Jewish religious love feasts, which have been carried on these past years, will no doubt be glad to read this stirring appeal to Protestantism to bethink itself of its priceless heritage and to assert itself over against Romanism. But what "priceless heritage" has this liberal writer in mind? And why should Protestantism, if really it has a "priceless heritage," not bear witness to it also over against the Jews? When the writer asks Protestantism to "pull itself together into a unity of consciousness and of organization," he does not point out to it its true weapon of defense and offense. Unless Protestantism in America is willing to return to the Word of God and to profess it without fear to all men, it is bound to go down before both secularism and Romanism. The very syncretism of



liberal Protestantism is its main weakness; yet, despite this fact, the writer closes his "call to arms" with the weakening concession: "When it [Protestantism] has thus set its own house in order, it will be able with renewed self-respect to invite Catholicism to join with it in making common cause against secularism in American society." Liberal Protestantism itself is destructively secularistic and therefore cannot rightly speak of fighting against "secularism in American society." As long as liberal theologians are not willing to accept the Gospel of Christ as the Lord gave it to us, all their religious talk about "priceless heritage," and the like, is but vain jangling.

J. T. M.

**Catholic Schools and Government Aid.**—*America* (February 17, 1945) very frankly pleads for government aid for its schools, in order to make it economically possible for Catholic parents to send their children to Catholic schools. The article closes with the words: "Our aim should be public recognition and public support of thoroughly Catholic schools. Unless we achieve this aim we have little hope of ever realizing our ideal, 'Every Catholic child in a Catholic school.'" Its argument for receiving government aid is strong and appealing, as a few paragraphs will show. Here is one: "The logic and justice of requesting a just share of tax-appropriated school moneys seems apparent to one willing to face the facts honestly. The Government compels Catholic children to attend school, but fails to provide a type of education which they in conscience can accept. Last year Catholics were taxed over \$416,000,000 for the support of public education, an average of \$89 per Catholic family. They were offered nothing in return but a form of education which violated their religious convictions; consequently many of them, rather than sacrifice their religious freedom, dug into their pockets a second time that they might provide a form of education which would satisfy their conscience, and thus saved the public over \$284,661,000 for current expense, interest, and capital outlay, in addition to a building program that would cost the public nearly a billion dollars had their children attended public schools." Again: "As tax-supported schools expand their programs more and more into the field of social service, Catholic children attending Catholic schools will be still further penalized. We do not have sufficient means to support all the educational needs of our children; hence the increased necessity of Government recognition and support of our schools. If guidance, placement, and occupational adjustment become part of the program offered at public expense, the young man or young woman in the Catholic secondary school is put at a disadvantage when it comes to finding employment. Every child is entitled to equal educational opportunity, but this right is denied to many a Catholic child under the present policy, in which the Catholic parent has to stand the entire cost of educating his own children in addition to contributing to the cost of education for his neighbor's children." The article of course presents the Roman Catholic side of the story. No one will deny that Catholics insisting on parochial schools are asked to make greater sacrifices than are religionists who are satisfied with the secular education offered in our state schools. But Lutherans, Reformed groups, and Seventh-Day Adventists are doing the same, and if they all de-



manded state support for their schools, there would be problems without end. In addition, Catholicism in our country is almost disgustingly aggressive. Its schools, colleges, universities, and other educational agencies are used in the interest of Romanist propaganda. Romanism thus represents a powerful minority insisting upon privileges which it will utilize to its own aggrandizement and—what is more—ultimately, in opposition to our very democracy and its prerogatives for our free citizens. It is just for this reason that non-Catholics are so very averse to considering Rome's plea for government support for its schools. Rome is not quite the martyr which it pretends to be, and there are just too many who know this.

J. T. M.

**Separation of Church and State Versus Rome's Attempts to Be a Political Factor.**—A correspondent of the *Christian Century* (Feb. 28, 1945) submits this interesting report: "A statement was last week addressed to President Roosevelt, Prime Minister Churchill, and Premier Stalin by 1,600 church and religious leaders throughout the nation, which stated, 'Establishments of religion, however widely representative, however exalted, have no place at the council tables of the state.' Striking directly at the Roman Catholic temporal power, the signers declare: 'It is tragically significant that when, in 1929, the papacy re-entered the political field, it did so in alliance with enemies of those very cultures in which its church had thrived. As a political power it gained its first fatal successes in treaties of friendship with fascist powers. Supporting Mussolini in Italy, Dolfuss and Schuschnigg in Austria, Hitler in Germany, Franco in Spain, and Petain in France, the papacy has thrown its weight into the scales of the present human struggle on the side of the enemies of democracy.' The statement goes on to uphold the fundamental separation of government and church. Among the signers are John A. Mackay, Henry N. Wieman, Francis J. McConnell, Mark A. Dawber, Edwin McNeill Poteat, Pierre van Paassen, Raymond Robins, and Alva W. Taylor. A few days after the above statement was issued Archbishop Spellman of the Roman Catholic diocese of New York took the occasion of a welcome to 4,000 Boy Scouts at the cathedral to answer the Protestant clergymen. Declaring the statement to be a 'violation of the Golden Rule,' the archbishop urged the boys 'always to respect others and never lower yourselves to attack the beliefs of others.' Referring to the signers he said: 'It is difficult to believe that there are 1,600 ordained ministers and religious leaders in our country who would put their names to a document offering insult to 25,000,000 fellow Americans who are at least doing their share to win the war and serve their country and whose religion teaches them to love their neighbor.' The same week leaders of the National Conference of Christians and Jews declared they were 'gravely concerned' about the rising tensions between religious groups in the nation, as illustrated by the series of articles 'Can Catholicism Win America?' in the *Christian Century*, by the statement of the Roman Catholic hierarchy advocating that Protestants withdraw their missionaries from South America, and by widespread anti-Semitic feelings. The declaration continued: 'We recognize fully the deep and basic differences that exist. Americans dare not minimize these differences, nor gloss them over in the name of good will.' The confer-



ence proposes the following courses of action: (1) That Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish leaders meet nationally and locally to seek understanding and to arrive at methods for the alleviation of the tensions. (2) That Protestants, Catholics, and Jews work within their respective constituencies to re-examine their responsibilities for the causes of these tensions. (3) That religious leaders take the initiative in extending education in intergroup relations throughout the churches, schools, and civic agencies of the nation. (4) That for the good of our country and the world, Catholics, Jews and Protestants, while maintaining their right to differ, work together to solve the pressing economic, political, and social problems in which we all have a common stake."

We agree, of course, that we must live at peace with our neighbors. But this attitude must not become a steppingstone toward religious indifference. A.

**Brief Items.** — Call for the Bible! Still the call comes from all over Europe for the Bible. For two years no Bible has been printed in Germany; but mimeographed pages of the Scripture are being circulated there. France's Bible Society calls for five thousand Bibles at once; Spain wants the Word; the people of Italy are asking our chaplains for it; and the Russian Government now permits the printing of the New Testament, within paper rationing limits. The American Bible Society is now having thousands of copies printed in Switzerland, and with the British Society it is printing more in Sweden. Which reminds me that the Presbyterian who visits New York and wants to see the sights will find one of the most interesting in Bible House, Fifty-seventh Street and Park Avenue. — *The Presbyterian*.

In New Zealand a book for use in the public schools having the title *Man and His World* is much discussed. A *Christian Century* correspondent writes, Dec. 13, 1944: "The education department has so far lain low and said nothing, and it seems likely that the storm will blow over without having affected the position of the book. It is undeniably written from a Humanistic viewpoint, but what else can one expect to find in a textbook used in an avowedly secular educational system?" The lesson is obvious.

"I have recently had the privilege of visiting the Holy Father and have found him aged, thin, and saddened since I have last seen him. Fifteen months of anxiety and pain have taken a heavy toll. No robust physical stature nor strong broad shoulders has the Pope to bear the sorrows of the world, but the Christlike figure, Christlike shoulders, and, above all, a Christlike sanctity and spirit seem to characterize him. It is impossible for me to see him without identifying, or rather paralleling, his life with the life of Christ and the cross of Christ, and today he reminds me of the wounded Christ." These outrageous words of Archbishop Spellman were brought to our attention by the Rev. John Sullivan.

As a gift to Dr. Albert Schweitzer on his 70th birthday, January 14, the Unitarian Service Committee has dispatched \$500 to him at his medical mission in East Africa.



According to the religious press, President John A. Mackay of Princeton Seminary has been chosen as president of the Board of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America (Northern Presbyterians) to succeed Dr. Paul C. Johnston. Dr. Mackay has served as missionary in South America.

Dr. Rees Edgar Tulloss, president of Wittenberg College, Springfield, O., has been elected President of the National Lutheran Council, Dr. William G. Sodt, administrator of the Milwaukee Hospital, was elected Vice-president, Dr. Martin Anderson of the Norwegian Lutheran Church, Chicago, was elected Secretary, and Mr. S. Frederick Telleen was re-elected Treasurer.

The *Christian Century* correspondent in England reminds us that "It is one hundred years since John Henry Newman left the Church of England and Ernest Renan the Church of Rome."

"Our Latin-American neighbors fear us. . . . They see that at the termination of this war not one Catholic power will be left. There will be two great non-Christian powers, and two powers that have grown out of Protestant traditions. There is great fear for the future."—From an article entitled "U.S. Catholics Study Latin-America" in *America* (R. C.).

*The Living Church* (Feb. 25, 1945, p. 10) reports the death of a prominent theologian of the Lundensian school. "Dr. Hjalmar Holmquist, Professor of Theology at the University of Lund, and one of Sweden's best-known religious leaders, died at the age of 72. Dr. Holmquist took an active part in church work and conducted several preaching and lecturing tours in Denmark, Norway, and Finland. One of his most successful books, *Martin Luther*, was translated into several languages."

We have given many hours and held any number of conferences on Evangelism. We have discussed and re-discussed methods and flooded ourselves with literature. Meanwhile, we have forgotten that the answer can only be in our hearts. Method and machinery without individual fervor are like formality in worship when devotion has languished. Methods are like the letter that kills. It is the Spirit that maketh alive. It is only the constraining love of Christ that can give vitality to our message and drive to our method.—E. C. Herrick, president of the Andover-Newton Theological School at Newton Center, Mass., in the *Watchman-Examiner* of Jan. 11, 1945.

"We have no conception of the difficulties concerning some of these parish priests. It is known that one priest has 75,000 people under his jurisdiction. There are others with 45,000 and 25,000. In Peru, for example, a priest has to be versatile to handle the many problems. In the cities of Peru, he must understand people of the twentieth century, but in the Peruvian hinterland he deals with sixteenth century situations."—From an article entitled "U.S. Catholics Study Latin-America" in *America* (Rom. Cath.) for Jan. 6, 1945.

The Blue Network has given to the American Council of Christian Churches another series of broadcasts covering the months of March, April, and May, every Friday from 8:15 to 8:30 A.M. Eastern War Time.—*Christian Beacon* (Bible Presbyterian). A.