

1-1-1946

## Theological Observer. – Kirchlich Zeitgeschichtliches

John Theodore 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, John Theodore (1946) "Theological Observer. – Kirchlich Zeitgeschichtliches," *Concordia Theological Monthly*. Vol. 17 , Article 6.

Available at: <https://scholar.csl.edu/ctm/vol17/iss1/6>

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

---

**Suffering Connected with Population Transfers.**—In the *Christian Century* Dr. Otto A. Piper of Princeton, writing under the heading "Behind the Population Transfers," submits facts which cry to the high heavens. A few of his paragraphs are here reprinted.

"The worst scenes of terror of the Nazi regime are now repeated on a grand scale. Germans have been killed in wholesale massacres. In one such slaughter, which took place in Aussig near the Saxon border, 4,000 perished on August 2—men, women and children indiscriminately. Those who survive are driven empty-handed from their homes—they are not even allowed to take their personal belongings with them, though the law gives them title to these—and are concentrated in 'camps,' i. e., empty factory buildings and barns, with no sanitation and a food ration far below even that in occupied Germany. They are exposed to brutal treatment and torture, from which many have died, and they are denied all legal protection. (All these charges can be substantiated by reliable eyewitness reports.) Behind barbed wire they wait in despair until they die of epidemics or starvation—as almost all their babies have already done—or until the Big Three gives the Prague government the green light to dump them penniless upon German territory.

"Conditions in the Polish occupied zone vary from place to place. While in not a few places wholesale expulsions have taken place, the chunk of Germany that the Poles have swallowed is just too big for ready digestion. With a pre-war population of 33 million, of whom at least six million perished during the war or were ceded to Russia, the present Poland simply lacks enough manpower and experience to take over at once all the property of the 12 million Germans in the new provinces. Accordingly, many of the Germans still remain in their towns. But they are expropriated and have to work as slave laborers for Polish masters or the Polish administration, and they, too, will be expelled as soon as the Big Three's permission is given.

"Those who have already been compelled to leave Poland—and to date their number runs into millions—dragged themselves wearily along the roads to central Germany. No transportation was provided, no food, no shelter. The farmers by the roadsides and the people in the cities through which they passed were unable to assist them effectively. We know of one caravan of 2,400 who were ejected from Troppau in Silesia, of whom more than a thousand had perished by the time the group reached the vicinity of Berlin. And that was only the beginning of their trek."

A.

**Dr. Koeberle on the Social Teaching of the Augsburg Confession.**—The intention of these remarks is to acquaint our readers with a valuable essay by the well-known Lutheran author Pro-

[63]

fessor A. Koeberle of Tuebingen, which he read at a conference held in Augsburg in 1930. The occasion was the celebration of the four hundredth anniversary of the Augsburg Confession. The essay was published in a booklet entitled "Luthertum und soziale Frage" (Leipzig: Doerffling und Franke, 1931). It was done into English by the Rev. John W. Doberstein, chaplain at Muehlenberg College, for the July, 1945, issue of the *Lutheran Church Quarterly*. We profoundly wish that all of our readers might have the opportunity of reading this essay, whose English title is "The Social Problem in the Light of the Augsburg Confession." On account of the efforts now devoted to a study of the many social problems confronting the world, the essay is particularly timely.

The author first points to two difficulties which we have to face in the discussion of this subject. On the one hand, the Augsburg Confession was written more than four hundred years ago and in conditions altogether different from those in which we live; on the other, the document "quite consciously and definitely does not look upon the end and purpose of the Gospel as that of erecting and introducing a new social order and programs of social reform. On the contrary, it makes a clear and definite distinction between the internal and the external (*in corde and foris*), between the 'righteousness of the heart' and the external world of politics and economics." In view of this distinction, Lutheranism, as the author says, today "is accused of an utterly impossible, old-fashioned conservatism." Lutheranism is represented as demanding that we patiently submit to existing conditions instead of "allowing Christ also to penetrate economic and social ordinances with His vital, renewing power, deliver them from their curse-burdened misery, and basically transform them."

Facing this criticism, Professor Koeberle undertakes to show "positively and with necessary brevity what contribution the fundamental loci of the Augsburg Confession can make to the solution of the social problem."

Article I of the Confession, taking its position on Biblical realism, avows belief in the Triune God as "the Creator and Preserver of all things, visible and invisible." In opposition to Gnostic aberrations, whoever fully accepts this article "will treat with utmost seriousness and regard all things which have the earthy odor of creation." "We pray and give thanks for and are concerned about these earthly incidents no less than for the intellectual and spiritual events of life." Another consequence of socio-ethical significance which is inherent in this First Article is that since God is the Creator of all things, He is also "the sole Lord over this whole created world," and concerning all the silver and gold that man makes himself the possessor of, he must remember that he merely holds them in trust. "It is from this truth that the Church must draw the courage to pronounce a severe, earnest judgment upon many shocking capitalistic abuses in our time, where Mammon has taken the place of God and set aside the First

Commandment because money is loved and sought above all things for itself alone." "Thus the very opening of the Confession, if we only understand it rightly, leads us into the midst of the earth-bound events of life upon which, after all, the whole social problem depends, and teaches us to accept these things, to take them into account, and to take them seriously. On the other hand, it should save us from the sinful, devilish peril of making an absolute of the creatural, of confounding the gift with the Giver, and it should give us freedom to make devout use even of the perilous gold in the fear of God."

The Second Article reminds us "of the misery of man in his present state." Total depravity is confessed, taught us "by the word of judgment from Sinai and the Cross," and the deep sorrow and horror that result as we consider the condition of mankind are given expression. In the spirit of repentance we stand before God and with deep sympathy we regard our fellow men, who are "lying in the same hospital of sickness unto death." What are the implications of this? A negative implication is our rejection of Marxism which will have nothing to do with the doctrine of original sin, but espouses the "naturalistic biology of Darwinism," making environment and heredity responsible for unfavorable economic conditions. In a positive way the article confirms what the Christian already "knows from the Word of God—that the wrath of God has been laid upon disobedient mankind and that the inn in which we are sojourning is a bad one." The purpose of the article is "to humble us as a Church, to make us realize the evening character of this world, and thereby make us free to see our oneness with all those who have lost the truth of God in their misery or under the lash of Marxist party-doctrinairism."

Concerning the Fourth Article of Justification, Koeberle says, "Herein lies the social significance of the doctrine of justification that we may learn to look upon one another as brothers and sisters for whom Christ died." "The message of the free, boundless, unconditional grace of God reminds us, after all, of how Jesus sought out and loved the sinners and publicans, the unpleasant, the disagreeable, the despised, the outcasts of the children of men. We dare not extol the article of justification without at the same time permitting it to work itself out as a vital force in our social thinking. We cannot ourselves rest in the blessed state of forgiveness and at the same time cherish in our hearts an irreconcilable hatred toward others."

From this there proceeds "an ethic of action." According to the Third Article of the Confession, "Jesus Christ redeemed the world not only from the guilt of sin, but also from the power of sin, from the power of the devil." "What is the practical, concrete significance of the Confession's message concerning the 'new obedience' for the social question?" "Our answer is: in healing the wounded, in action to protect those who are still sound, in brotherly bearing of inescapable burdens." Certain theological

circles attack the work of inner missions, holding that the Church thereby does become secularized. "In reality the rescue work of our deacon and deaconess houses, carried on by means of services of worship, education, spiritual care and protective labor on behalf of the needy and downcast, is one of the few forms of preaching the boundless grace of God which the Church still has today with which to confront socialism and which it can use to fruitful effect." [This is undoubtedly written from the point of view of the Christian worker in Germany in 1930. Conditions here in America are not quite so distressing and negative, thank God. — A.]

The Church, says Koeberle, must not only salvage, it must fight and protest "against intolerable living conditions, conditions which must with an almost certain, fatal necessity lead and drive everyone who lives in them into sin and despair of God." Voicing such protests does not involve an ignoring of the dualism between the Kingdom of God and the world. The Church does not inculcate blind obedience to the State. There is a higher law: We must obey God rather than men. Certain callings today are of such a nature that one cannot follow them and at the same time be loyal to our great God. The civil government cannot be relied on. When it, for instance, does not protect women employees, the Church must raise its voice against the iniquitous bondage put upon these unfortunates. "The tremendously altered state of the world today forces the Church to assume tasks which are really not her tasks." [The writer evidently holds that the Church, if conditions were normal, should simply preach the Gospel and let the civil government and the family take care of the social affairs. — A.] Let the Church, in order not to become secularized, keep a firm grip on the Word, as it speaks of the needs of the poverty-stricken and the downtrodden. "Luther once called upon the Christian nobility of the German nation for help against usury, immorality, and beggary among the people, and they did help him. Today we lack God-fearing men among the leaders of worldly concerns, and this makes the help of the Church absolutely necessary. "It is true that this activity must be regarded as only "interimistic help," to endure till the government again is conducted by devout and faithful men.

The "romantic enthusiasts" who think the Church can really reconstruct the civil, economic, and industrial life are of course mere visionaries. How can the Church, for instance, protect the proletariat against the always threatening danger of losing their jobs?! Other evils, like the monotony connected with factory work, are likewise beyond the control of the Church. But it can furnish protection against the "smart of ostracism and the meaninglessness of life." It can work for brotherly understanding between the classes and cultivate common prayer and intercession of one for the other. It does this by proclaiming that God has formed one many-membered body under the one head, Christ.

There is, so Dr. Koeberle points out, no hope for an absolute

improvement except in the coming of Christ on the Day of Judgment. For the present "there is only the promise of persecution, martyrdom, and the rising power of Antichrist." [If this is to mean the Antichrist has not yet come, we demur.—A.] "That we should not forget this, that we should not fall into a secularized chiliasm in the form of a naive faith in progress by way of evolution or revolution—this is the warning of the Sixteenth Article of the Augsburg Confession. Here a definite safeguard is erected against all fanatical dreams of paradise on earth." "That we should not weaken and despair . . . is the purpose of the Seventeenth Article with its witness to the second coming of Christ, which awakens the sense of responsibility and joy." To the average workingman, it is true, this may sound like being promised deliverance in "some far off cloudland." He must be shown that while he is opposed to "all abstract dissipations of religion into a pure, pale inwardness, a false, spiritualized innerworldliness or otherworldliness," "the Christian hope for the future is even more opposed to this spiritualization of religion. For it 'the consummation is not opposed to creation, but rather it is the consummation of this very creation which is opposed to the world of sin.'"

Is not all this abstract theology? Koeberle replies, By no means. Think of the great realities that have been touched on: "creation, the fall, reconciliation, redemption, and world-transformation." What we need is fundamental reflections "based upon the Word of God and upon faith."

To our mind, the essay of Dr. Koeberle well illustrates how Law and Gospel should be preached in our day and age. A.

*The Lutheran Scholar.*—The *Lutheran Scholar* is the official journal of the Lutheran Academy for Scholarship, of which Rev. W. F. Beck, 3558 S. Jefferson Ave., St. Louis 18, Mo., is secretary. The managing editor of the *Lutheran Scholar* is L. F. Blankenbuehler (same address). The subscription price is \$2.00 a year. The purpose of the Academy is to give those in our midst who are of scholarly trend encouragement for research and an opportunity to publish the results of their investigations in a periodical published by and for fellow scholars. The October (1945) issue, representing Volume II, Number 4, has the following contents: "The Two Foci of a Pastor's Research" (bringing God's truth to man) by Rev. W. F. Beck, "A Note on Luther's Catechism" by Chaplain Martin H. Scharlemann, Ph.D., "Reading the Interrogative Sentence in the Bible" (the rising and the falling inflection in various questions found in Scripture) by E. F. Scaer, "Notes," "Articles and Releases," "Vitae." The issue contains fifteen pages of well-written and well-edited material. In bringing this number of the *Lutheran Scholar* to the notice of our readers, we wish to direct their attention to the article by Dr. Martin H. Scharlemann, "A Note on Luther's Catechism," which no doubt is of interest to all Lutherans who, either professionally or non-professionally, deal with Luther's Small Catechism. It concerns itself with a statement made

by C. P. Krauth: "In the explanations which follow his questions, What does this mean? How does this take place? he [Luther] has retained, almost word for word, language found in Kero (the Monk of St. Gall, A. D. 750), in his exposition of the Lord's Prayer, in fact, found yet earlier in the Sacramentary of Gelasius (Pope 492—496)." It goes without saying that Dr. Krauth is not the only one finding resemblances between Luther's Catechism and the catechisms published before Luther's time. Now, Cyprian's explanation, as the writer shows, indeed did wield a tremendous influence on the Western Church; but, as the writer shows, too, Cyprian's explanation of the Lord's Prayer "does not have the emphasis Luther later put on *God's Word*" (italics our own). This fact the writer demonstrates by comparing Luther's explanation of the First Petition with that of Cyprian, who indeed stresses the fact that God is the Sanctifier, but does not mention the means (the Gospel) by which God sanctifies. But neither did Luther get his cue from the Gelasian Sacramentary, as the writer further points out. In order to study the Gelasian Sacramentary, Dr. Scharlemann, while serving in Italy as chaplain, was granted permission to undertake special studies in the Vatican Library. The Gelasian Sacramentary shows the following explanation of the First Petition (Dr. Scharlemann, of course, quotes the explanation of the entire Lord's Prayer): "This does not mean that God, who is always holy, be sanctified by our prayers, but rather that we who are sanctified by His baptism may persevere in that which we have begun to be." Dr. Scharlemann writes, in summing up his findings: "It is clear from this translation that the explanation of the Gelasian Sacramentary is strongly under the influence of Cyprian. In other words, it lacks the clear-cut distinction between Law and Gospel, between sanctification and justification, which is characteristic of everything Luther put his hand to, including the Catechism. It will be noted that there is no reference at all to God's Word as the means of grace, whereby His will is made known and His kingdom is established. As a consequence, we must disagree with Krauth's statement above with reference to the influence of the Gelasian Sacramentary on Martin Luther's exposition of the Lord's Prayer. Whether the Sacramentary of St. Gall had any greater influence is the subject of another essay."

Such articles are a real contribution to Lutheran learning, especially at this time when we contemplate a special memorial of Luther in view of his death on February 18, 1546. The investigation and findings of Dr. Scharlemann go a long way to confirm what conservative scholars have pointed out long ago, namely, that Luther as an indefatigable student was well acquainted with practically the entire theological literature of mediæval and ancient times. But while Luther used whatever truth, academical or practical, he found, he never copied, but always remolded by his recreating genius in an original manner in the light of the newly discovered Gospel and its fundamental distinction from the Law. An analytic article on "Luther and Augustine," with special refer-

ence to the doctrine of sin and grace, will clearly show this re-creating genius of Luther — re-creating, of course, because he used human intermediaries only as helps and went back to Holy Scripture as the sole source and standard of his theology. J. T. M.

**Permanent Organization of the World Council of Churches Considered.**—In February there will convene a meeting of the provisional committee of the World Council of Churches. The meeting is planned to be held in Europe. One question that will have to be discussed, according to information spread in the press, is whether the World Council "should constitute itself a permanent organization on the basis of its present membership or whether it should continue its provisional existence until it can broaden its base." The *Christian Century* favors the latter course and then submits some general comments. "Eighty-nine churches have signified their intention to become members of the Council. They have done this by ratifying the constitution which was unanimously adopted by the conference held in Utrecht, Holland, in 1938. The membership of the Council does not yet include as many churches as participated in the Oxford Conference (120 churches) or in the Edinburgh gathering (123 churches). Until the recent Treysa Conference, at which the re-constituted Evangelical Church of Germany voted to join, it did not include the churches of Germany. The main Orthodox churches of Eastern Europe and a number of the younger churches of Asia, Africa, and Latin America remain outside its membership. So also do the Southern Baptist Convention and the Roman Catholic Church."

Why do we (the "we" now designating conservative Lutherans, generally speaking) remain aloof? Are we not for peace, and especially for peace among people who call themselves Christians? We certainly are for peace. But just as in the civic sphere we are not for peace on any and all terms, but only for one that is honorable and proper, so in the ecclesiastical domain. Fellowship is a grand thing if it is of the right kind, if it is based on a common faith and mutual trust and in every other respect conforms to God's will. The World Council of Churches is not interested in bringing about a common faith which includes all the teachings of the Scriptures. Its aim is to bring together in one vast fellowship all that bear the Christian name and then to say to the world, See what a powerful host we are! Yes, a powerful host from the point of view of numbers, but a disunited one, some of the members trampling under foot what others hold sacred! If the Prophet Elijah appeared on earth again and were made acquainted with this motley army, he would exclaim, as he did of old when he addressed Israel on Mount Carmel, "How long halt ye between two opinions? If the Lord be God, follow Him, but if Baal, then follow him" (1 Kings 18:21). Modernists and Fundamentalists are here marching arm in arm. In view of the unconcealed, outspoken rejection of fundamental doctrines of the Christian faith by many of the leaders of the World Council of Churches, we are convinced that the words of Elijah just quoted and 2 Cor. 6:14-18 apply here. A.



**The Lutheran on the Lutheran.** — The *Lutheran* (U. L. C. A.) experiences at present a change of editor: Dr. Nathan R. Melhorn retires and Dr. G. Elson Ruff takes his place. An article in the number of November 7 entitled "There Were Editors in the Old Days" submits a survey of the work done by Lutheran church papers and editors in the past. Several paragraphs refer to Dr. Walther and the *Lutheraner*, which we quote.

"If Kurtz was the 'modernist' among Lutheran editors in the nineteenth century, C. F. W. Walther was the 'fundamentalist.' Walther was the chief genius in building the Missouri Synod from a few shiploads of bewildered immigrants in 1839 to one of the strongest of American denominations. And the chief means Walther had was his paper, *Der Lutheraner*.

"It was in the autumn of 1844, in the thriving village of St. Louis that this periodical appeared. The effect of the paper may be gauged by what it did to Frederick Wyneken, a home missionary pastor of the Ministerium of Pennsylvania who was serving a parish in Indiana. When Wyneken saw the first issue of the *Lutheraner* he exclaimed, 'Thank God! There are still real Lutherans in America.' And Wyneken soon packed up and joined Walther; in fact, became the second president of the Missouri Synod.

"In the same manner scores of conservative Lutherans came over to Walther as a result of the *Lutheraner*. The paper was dedicated to 'exposing false doctrines, particularly among false Lutherans.' Its motto was:

"God's Word and Luther's doctrine pure  
Shall to eternity endure.

"For Walther there were no uncertainties in matters of faith. The truth has been revealed and men ought to make it their business to understand it thoroughly. This perfect understanding of truth is set forth in the Confessions of the Lutheran Church. By them all problems of belief can be solved.

"If we permit in the midst of the Lutheran Church the departure from any one point of the Confessions, we tear down the Lutheran Church itself and show ourselves as traitors,' wrote Walther in the *Lutheraner* in 1855.

"Men who make no allowance for possible error in their understanding of truth always get into trouble with other men who are equally sure of themselves. Walther was drawn into battle with other orthodoxist Lutherans of the Middle West—first with those of Buffalo, then Iowa, and then Ohio. The battles were as violent as those fought by Kurtz and others in the East. Through his papers, the *Lutheraner* and the monthly magazine *Lehre und Wehre*, which he founded in 1855, Walther carried his quarrels into many homes.

"A fish peddler in Detroit came to his pastor and asked whether the words of John 10:27, 28, 'My sheep hear my voice . . . neither shall any man pluck them out of my hand,' referred to

the elect or to temporary believers. "To temporary believers," replied the pastor. "So!" exclaimed the peddler, "Now I have enough! I must follow Dr. Walther and not you." Thus Walther made theological argument a popular indoor sport among Lutherans of his day."

The writer of the article probably did not wish to be polemical, but merely facetious. But certainly we cannot approve of the somewhat flippant way in which he says, "Thus Walther made theological argument a popular indoor sport among Lutherans of his day." What made Walther such a great force in American Lutheranism was not only his learning, but his insistence on acceptance of the truth. He believed that the truth of holy Scripture was set forth in the Confessions of the Lutheran Church, and there he took his stand. That our age, given to laxity and indifference in doctrine, does not take kindly to such a position, one can understand, but a Lutheran editor should at least uphold those men that take a firm stand for acceptance of the Lutheran Confessions.

A.

**The Editor of *Folkebladet* on the Proper Attitude Toward the Scriptures.**—It will be well for our readers to become acquainted with the attitude which the editor of *Folkebladet*, published in the interest of the Lutheran Free Church, takes toward the Scriptures. In the issue of Oct. 3, 1945, writing on this year's Lutheran Editors' meeting, he voices these sentiments (according to the translation of the Rev. Norman A. Madson):

"The difference between Missouri and other Lutherans is, nevertheless, when all is said and done, a basically different attitude toward Scripture. No matter how much you may agree on the selection of words for the definition of that which has been called 'inspiration' (an expression which, by the way, is not found in the Bible), the difference will nevertheless be there. It is vain to formulate definitions and to construct theses when you nevertheless go out from opposite premises. It seems impossible to reconcile that attitude which looks upon Scripture as an independent revelation and that other attitude which looks upon Scripture as a report of or, if you will, a document concerning God's acts in history.

"If we look upon Scripture as a document of revelation—an attitude which Prof. Georg Sverdrup firmly maintained—you will not be troubled by fine-spun definitions of inspiration nor with questions concerning Scripture's infallibility. On the contrary, there may well be errors in certain portions of Scripture, where purely unessential things are concerned, without having your faith in the revelation weakened thereby; it will then become a matter of historical research to clear up such problems.

"But it becomes quite another matter, on the other hand, when it is held that historical research has no justification.

"Now, we do not want it understood as our opinion that the Missourians deny justification of *any* (all) historical research;

but this is our understanding of the Missourian position that in so far as justification (of research) is admitted, it is only from this premise that the research shall never be able to show the least error or error in the most unessential things in the presentation, but only strengthens our faith in 'the inerrancy of Scripture.'

"This was at least not Luther's conception. It is sufficient to remind you of his striking illustration concerning the Child Jesus in the manger and the manger itself with hay and straw and swaddlings. Even as the Christ Child is here the essential thing, thus, says Luther, is that word in Scripture which 'drives us to Christ' the essential word. 'The hay and the straw' may have their meaning and be necessary, but it is not so important to know what kind of straw He lay on or who it was that brought it or if the manger had properly been nailed together, whether or no the straw was clean or that there might have been something unclean from the stable on it. Behold, all such things are of little meaning, and we ought not by elaborate and spiritless exegesis be brought to overlook the most essential by looking at the less essential.

"The well-known Norwegian positive theologian, Dr. Chr. Ihlen, goes so far as to say:

"There is nothing in the declarations of Jesus which would serve as a basis for the thought that you would have to have an infallible doctrine concerning Him in order to come into communion with Him.' (*The Position of the Protestant Principles in Modern Spiritual Life*, p. 146.)

"Judging by Luther's position and the attitude of other reformers, we may draw the conclusion that there is nothing in Scripture itself which would serve as a basis for this thought that we would have to believe that the report of revelation or its documentation, written by men, might not also contain 'hay and straw' in those things which are unessential and which do not concern our salvation or our moral life.

"Without the historical attitude toward Scripture — which Luther himself without a doubt maintained — that accusation, which is so often hurled against Lutheranism in this country, becomes true, namely, that we have set up a 'paper pope' instead of the Roman Vatican Pope.

"Spiritual authority must be found, must be strengthened and clarified in other ways.

"The way will and must be found by going back to the Reformation's Scripture principle."

That the editor is wrong in his evaluation of Luther's position, Dr. Reu has shown convincingly in his last work, *Luther and the Scriptures*. The other errors of the editorial have been refuted so often that it is not necessary to enter upon them now. A.

**Catholics and Religious Liberty.**—In the death of John A. Ryan, September 16, 1945, the Roman Catholic Church lost one of its most able interpreters and vigorous advocates of the Pope's social philosophy. As one of the founders and leaders of the National Catholic Welfare Conference and as professor of political

science in the Catholic University at Washington, Ryan exerted a significant influence in shaping the social thinking of American Catholics. America believes that Monsignor Ryan will rank with Leo XIII and Pius XI as the architect who proposed a new social and economic order. That something akin to a revolution has taken place in Roman Catholic thinking on social, politic, and economic problems, is quite evident from the recent papal encyclicals which deal with such social questions as labor and capital, the family, the modern state, Church and State, international politics, education.\* But we dare not lose sight of the fact that while Rome takes cognizance of, and makes adjustments to, the changes in the social order, it will never yield an inch in its basic principles. The late John Ryan is a good example, for he defended the principles on which the papal supremacy is built as vigorously as he fought for the adoption of a platform of social action along the most advanced lines. He was ready to put into practice the principles of our democracy in the field of social relations, but where the interests of the Roman Catholic Church were concerned, he could conveniently forget the American ideal of the separation of Church and State. This is evident from his *Catholic Principles of Politics*, published in 1940, and used widely as a college textbook. We quote a few significant statements to show the Roman Catholic attitude toward religious liberty:

"Pope Leo . . . declares that the State must not only 'have care for religion,' but recognize the *true* religion. This means the form of religion professed by the Catholic Church. It is a thoroughly logical position. If the State is under moral compulsion to profess and promote religion, it is obviously obliged to profess and promote only the religion that is true; for no individual, no group of individuals, no society, no State is justified in supporting error or in according to error the same recognition as to truth. (Cf. Cardinal Billot, *De Ecclesia Christi*, qu. xix, which is a recent and comprehensive presentation of the whole subject.) (P. 313.) . . . In his encyclical on 'Catholicity in the United States,' the same Pope gave generous praise to the attitude of our government and laws toward religion, but immediately added: 'Yet, though all this is true, it would be very erroneous to draw the conclusion that in America is to be sought the type of the most desirable status of the Church, or that it would be universally lawful or expedient for State and Church, to be, as in America, dissevered and divorced. The fact that Catholicity with you is in good condition, nay, is even enjoying a prosperous growth, is by all means to be attributed to the fecundity with which God has endowed His Church, in virtue of which, unless men or circumstances interfere, she spontaneously expands and propagates herself; but she would bring forth more abundant

---

\* Philip Hughes' *The Popes' New Order* contains an analysis of all the important social encyclicals issued by the Vatican since 1878. This study offers a precise and clear-cut pattern of the Pope's social thinking. Archbishop Spellmann's *imprimatur* makes the book official.

fruits if, in addition to liberty, she enjoyed the favor of the laws and the patronage of public authority' (p. 315). . . . All that is essentially comprised in the union of Church and State can be thus formulated: The state should officially recognize the Catholic religion as the religion of the commonwealth; accordingly it should invite the blessing and the ceremonial participation of the Church for certain important public functions, as the opening of legislative sessions, the erection of public buildings, etc., and delegate its officials to attend certain of the more important festival celebrations of the Church; it should recognize and sanction the laws of the Church; and it should protect the rights of the Church, and the religious as well as the other rights of the Church's members. . . . Neither unbaptized persons nor those born into a non-Catholic sect should ever be coerced into the Catholic Church (p. 316). . . . Should such persons be permitted to practice their own form of worship? If these are carried on within the family, or in such an inconspicuous manner as to be an occasion neither of scandal nor of perversion to the faithful, they may properly be tolerated by the State. At least, this is the approved Catholic doctrine concerning the religious rites of the non-baptized. Only those religious practises of unbelievers which are contrary to the natural law, such as idolatry, human sacrifice, and debauchery, should be repressed. (Cf. Suarez, *De Fide*, disp. xviii, sec. 4, No. 9, 10.) (P. 317.) . . . F. E. M.

#### Roman Catholic Reaction to Bishop Oxnam's Address.—

In St. Louis a Protestant mass meeting was held October 28, which was attended by about 19,000 people, there being in addition about 5,000 that had to be turned away because the auditorium and the opera house, which were both used on this occasion, were filled to overflowing. The *Christian Century* correspondent calls it "the greatest demonstration of Protestant unity ever seen in this city." On account of the unscriptural stand of the Federal Council which arranged the meeting Missouri Synod Lutherans did not participate. The purpose of the meeting was to protest against Roman Catholic propaganda which manifested itself especially in paid advertisements of the Knights of Columbus in the leading St. Louis Sunday papers. With interest one reads of the Roman Catholic reaction to this meeting. *America* of November 10 (Jesuit weekly) writes:

"On October 28, the Protestant 'Reformation Sunday,' Bishop Oxnam, a Methodist, President of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ, addressed a mass meeting in St. Louis, chiefly on the subject of 'Roman Catholic-Protestant Differences.' Bishop Oxnam sees 'serious tension developing between Catholics and Protestants,' and deplors the fact as 'sinful.' How far is it a fact? We think that the tension is chiefly felt, not in Catholic circles, nor among the Protestant laity, but among the organized leaders of Protestantism. At all events, if there is such tension, sufficient to hinder the harmonious co-operation of Catholics and Protestants toward the common good of our country and the world, there is sin in it—a sin against charity, which makes such co-operation

obligatory. The cause of the tension on the Protestant side is thus stated by Bishop Oxnam: 'Protestants are gravely concerned over what they believe to be an attempt on the part of the Roman Catholic Church to exercise political domination here, similar to the control exercised in many nations.' The Catholic ideal, says Bishop Oxnam, is 'a subservient state dominated by an absolute church'; to this our theories of Church and State 'lead logically.'

"On hearing again this familiar Protestant line, let us not waste time, much less lose our tempers in defensive argument. We have to realize that institutional Protestantism today has a mounting fear of Catholic 'power,' based on a fairly complete misunderstanding of it. Our problem, then, is to let it be seen that all our power derives simply from the truth of our faith in Christ and from the vitality of our social program, and that it is directed, not at domination but at service—the service of the common good of all mankind. Secondly, we must let it be known that we are ready to join our power with that of all men of good will in all that concerns the common good. Thirdly, we have to insist, in a friendly way, that we are Catholics, not Protestants. We should be permitted to do so without being charged with 'intolerance.'"

The reader will note how carefully the editorial in *America* avoids the real issue, viz., whether Rome actually denies religious liberty to Protestants where it is in control. A.

**Harvard's Change of Views Concerning Education.** — Using the heading "Harvard's Retraction," *America* (Roman Catholic weekly) submits an interesting editorial showing that the system of higher education which began in Harvard under the presidency of Charles W. Eliot is now being put on the shelf. This development should be a warning to all of us not to be unduly impressed with novel ideas in the field of education or elsewhere. The editorial is, of course, written from the Roman Catholic point of view. We print it without omissions.

"It was at Harvard that the elective system of education was born, and it is now a Harvard report which may give the elective system its deathblow. The report of 267 pages — *General Education in a Free Society* — written by a faculty committee of twelve, has been in preparation since 1943. It is Harvard's final retraction of electivism which Harvard's President Charles Eliot made the pivot of his educational reforms some sixty years ago. This educational fetish, which whose did not reverence was deserving of anathema, spread like a blight over American education, secondary as well as collegiate. It glorified what has been well called the cafeteria-type of education, destroying educational unity and making it possible for a student to graduate from high school and college after four years of nothing more than freshman courses. Though wiser educators viewed with alarm the sad results of the elective principle, as a minority they were powerless to do much about it. Competition was so strong that they were eventually forced to accept in practice, up to a point at least, what they thoroughly

reprobated in principle. Catholic schools were especially perplexed by the problem. Founded on a sound philosophy of education, they knew instinctively that electivism would prove to be a principle of disintegration. Their position was presented in a famous article by Father Timothy Brosnahan, S. J., 'President Eliot and Jesuit Colleges,' which went beyond its title to speak for the entire Catholic educational system. The Harvard report of 1945 is a vindication of that position. The leadership of Harvard in undoing the mischief it set afoot may be a big factor in restoring freedom to educational bodies to apply sound pedagogical principles toward a regeneration of American education." A.

**Brief Items.**— On October 9, 1845, John Henry Newman declared that he accepted the faith of the Roman Catholic Church and was received into that Church. The Romanists of our day are laying much emphasis on what they call the conversion of Cardinal Newman and point to it as an evidence that Roman Catholic teachings must be right, because in Newman's case an eminent Anglican divine saw that Protestantism was wrong and accepted the teachings of the Pope at Rome. Nobody need be surprised at the defection of John Henry Newman from the Protestant faith. Whoever with open eyes reads his famous *Apologia Pro Vita Sua* will soon see that Newman in spite of all his reading and searching remained profoundly ignorant of the true meaning of the central doctrine of the Christian religion: justification by grace through faith.

According to the press of our country the total of casualties in the World War just ended is 1,070,524, of which number 261,608 were killed. It sounds unbelievable that during the period from Pearl Harbor to August, 1945, there were 36,355,000 accidents in our country, of which 355,000 terminated fatally and 1,250,000 resulted in this, that the injured were permanently disabled.

Sir James Young Simpson, the discoverer of chloroform, was asked, "What do you consider the greatest discovery you ever made?" His immediate answer was, "The discovery that I have a Savior." — *The Presbyterian*.

When an enthusiast exclaimed, "I have spent the last five years upon the mountaintop," Moody asked him, "How many souls have you led to Christ in those five years?" When the answer was that none could be recalled, Moody said, "Well, we do not want that kind of mountaintop experience." — *The Presbyterian*.

