

# Concordia Theological Monthly

---

Volume 17

Article 72

---

12-1-1946

## Miscellanea

W. Arndt

*Concordia Seminary, St. Louis*

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



Part of the [Practical Theology Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Arndt, W. (1946) "Miscellanea," *Concordia Theological Monthly*. Vol. 17 , Article 72.

Available at: <https://scholar.csl.edu/ctm/vol17/iss1/72>

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).

---

## Miscellanea

---

### **An Eloquent Appeal to Representatives of Fundamental Christianity**

Taking as his caption "The Sun Goeth Down," Prof. Carl F. H. Henry of a Baptist seminary in Chicago, Ill., writes a thrilling plea calling on evangelical Christians to assert themselves. The article, written for the *Watchman-Examiner*, deserves careful study and consideration.

"The sun is setting on Western culture, and man has not put things right with God. The drift of the nations is toward political naturalism, not toward Biblical supernaturalism, and it is the same way with most individuals.

"The sun is setting on religious liberalism also; the optimistic pre-war modernism is as dead as a dinosaur. But repentant voices are few. Everywhere, there is a scramble by the liberals to climb aboard a more realistic train; the participants vie to outdo each other in their indictment of the now outmoded 'extreme liberalism.' This diversionary flank movement has two or three aspects, none of which is a return to historic Christianity.

"The first movement, to the dialectical theology of Barth and Brunner, represents the most violent shift. Some Americans who have climbed aboard the neo-supernaturalistic bandwagon admittedly are nearer to the Christian tradition than those spearheading the movement. Most crisis theologians, in their reaction against liberalism, are hardly reacting in the name of fundamentalism; they are eager to escape 'both extremes.' In their views of revelation, of origins, of the fall, of Christology, Barth and Brunner stop short of traditional evangelicalism, and one recent writer bluntly accuses them of dominance by the very Kantian epistemology which underlay modernism.

"The second movement away from 'extreme liberalism' also avoids 'extreme fundamentalism' in the interest of a 'higher view' for which the authority of Jesus is claimed. This is the pattern for an increasing number of recent books. The 'extreme liberalism' renounced is the near-humanism which was uncertain about a personal God, which viewed the universe as a self-contained process automatically evolving upward and conceived man as inherently good. The 'extreme fundamentalism' to be avoided is usually depicted as an obscurantist literalism, a theology that virtually denies the humanity of Jesus, an insistence on doctrine with almost total indifference to changing the social order, an acquiescence in the admitted world evils.

"Against such fundamentalism, of course, any reader is bound to react—even a fundamentalist. But by this presentation of extremes, the 'converted' liberal does not mean to declare flatly for the historic Trinity of one God, the essential deity of Christ, a substitutionary and vicarious atonement, a bodily resurrection,

and a supernatural regeneration. Instead, he usually uses as much of this terminology as possible and, in a great cloud of tension vocabulary, manages to fill it with a nonevangelical meaning. His reaction against 'extreme fundamentalism' boils down to a reaction against apostolic Christianity, and his reaction against 'extreme liberalism' boils down to an avoidance of semi-humanism in the interest of a modified liberalism.

"The third movement is a desertion of liberalism in the very course of liberalism. It was the insistence of Shailer Mathews that doctrines originate and must be continually remade in the image of the changing social patterns. On this approach, the superoptimism of pre-war liberalism had its proper place; the postwar social process, however, demands a theological mood relative to the new hour. Such modernist self-repudiation is too often misread as a movement to conservatism, whereas it merely expresses the modernist conviction that doctrines *must* change and fluctuate. Modernism, on this approach, is not a creed, but a method. The repudiation of optimistic views of man, demanded by the distintegrating modern culture, does not preclude a future reassertion, when the social pattern demands it. Obviously, a change of doctrine within this framework is hardly a change of heart, but is a consistent reapplication of liberal methodology.

"Now, although liberalism is dead, the evangelicals have permitted the corpse to become too unapologetically vocal. The hour is desperate for an evangelical manifesto, but the conservatives have been so long men of a defensive spirit that they simulate an Independence Day firecracker that sparks away while refusing to explode. When liberalism has been dead for four days already, the Christian world ought immediately to detect what is happening; only when a miracle-working Christ enters the scene can life be added to the dead, and such a Christ finds room only with the supernaturalistic Christian tradition.

"There are reasons for the defensive mind of the contemporary evangelical, and not all of them are good. It is not surprising that, with the eloquently mistaken liberals in control of many centers of propaganda, as publishing houses and educational chairs, the spokesmen for the Hebrew-Christian view increasingly accustomed themselves to silence, so much so that with the current collapse of religious optimism they hardly know how to take the offensive. But there are other reasons, more embarrassing. There were — and we need to admit it frankly — 'extreme fundamentalists' who occupied themselves with prophecies about world events which were matched only by the vigor by which global history has proved them wrong. There are 'extreme fundamentalists' who live unto themselves, as if Jesus has no message for the United Nations conference, for labor-management disputes, for atom bomb steering committees. There are 'extreme fundamentalists' who are interested in deliverance from punishment for sin, but not in deliverance from the power of sin.

"But fundamentalists need to tell the world that this is not fundamental Christianity, but rather a perversion of it. These are not external criticisms of Christianity, but internal criticisms such as were leveled by Jesus and Paul. The great hosts of evangelical Christians themselves repudiate such 'extreme fundamentalism'—which is not the proper name for it, though the stigma serves the purposes of liberalism well, of course. It will not harm the fundamentalist cause to become vocal about these dangers; it may even clarify the thinking of those sensitive conservatives who think that, just because liberal elocution succeeds in cloaking fundamentalism in the garb of the obscurantist *ignomus*, they must thereby accept the caricature as an infallible picturization and immediately declare for some undefined 'middle-of-the-road' position.

"The day is ripe for a new reformation, this time within the Protestant Church, with Schleiermacher and the liberals rather than Aquinas and the popes as the infection to be dealt with. The liberals have failed. They confess that they have failed. Why, then, let them outline the pathway to yet more failure?

"The hour is here to proclaim the Word of God as that Word of God which in truth it is. The hour is here for some modern Augustine to give us a new *City of God*, for some modern E. Y. Mullins or A. H. Strong to write a timely systematic theology geared to the Book, for some modern Luther to post conspicuously the great theses, for some modern Wesley to lead evangelicals into revival fires, for some modern Carey to burn home the missionary call until China and Burma and India and Africa ring with the good tidings proclaimed by Baptist evangelicals, for some modern James to give us no rest until our faith issues in works known far and wide.

"The apostolic evangelical was not outdone by his pagan neighbors, neither in his passion nor in his vision of a new social order. He was unsurpassed in his thinking and in his living. Christianity was for him a world and life view, a revelational philosophy and a regenerate ethics. It was the wisdom of God and the power of God. The sun is setting on other messages, as inevitably it does, for they are of temporary origin and duration. The sun will not permanently go down on the redemptive message of Christ. It may go down for a decade, even for a generation. Whether it does, depends, without doubt, on evangelicals themselves. It is for them to become explicit about the power of God and the wisdom of God."

A.

### Unionistic Practice

Under the heading "Selective Fellowship" Dr. S. C. Ylvisaker writes the following little article in the *Lutheran Sentinel* for August 27.

"We quote the following from the *Minneapolis Star-Journal* of July 21, 1946: 'Thousands of worshipers at the Minneapolis

Aquatennial interreligious service Sunday at Powderhorn Park heard the Rev. E. S. Hjortland, pastor of Central Lutheran Church, call for a restoration in this generation of the fear of God, which was ever present with early Americans. Fear of God, he said, is the beginning of wisdom, makes man more temperate and casts out all other fears. "The fear of God," Mr. Hjortland said, "is not to be confused with the fear of man. It involves a deep sense of reverence at God's awe and majesty." Other clergymen who participated in the services were Rabbi Albert L. Gordon of Adath Jeshurun Congregation; Dr. Victor Nelson of Aldrich Avenue Presbyterian Church; the Rev. Arlin H. Halvorson of Hospitality House, and the Rev. John Dunphy of Ascension Catholic Church.

"Earlier during the summer President Aasgard (also of the Norwegian Lutheran Church in America—now the Evangelical Lutheran Church) officiated religiously together with the Catholic Archbishop of St. Paul at the inauguration of President Morrill of the University of Minnesota. Still earlier in the year a prominent pastor of the same church served the Masonic order at a public service in Eau Claire. These are not isolated cases. Others of a similar nature could be listed.

"We naturally ask in all simplicity, but also in Christian earnestness: Is this what we are to understand by the much-discussed term Selective Fellowship? The interpretation offered by the act of Dr. Aasgard, the general president of the whole synod, would rightly be considered authoritative for that Church. By way of contrast, we do not hesitate to say that the cases referred to above are to be designated as nothing else than a plain denial of Christ. About this there can be no argument among those who have accepted the Scriptures as the Word of God. And let him learn who will."

To us it seems that the instances listed are not to be placed into the category of Selective Fellowship, but of Unionism. When the Evangelical Lutheran Church, formerly the Norwegian Lutheran Church in America, pronounced in favor of Selective Fellowship, it evidently did not have acts of the kind here described in mind, but the fellowship of Lutherans belonging to church bodies with which their own organization officially was not in fellowship.

A.

### Lynching Flares Up Again

On this dread subject *America* submits an editorial having the caption "Lynch Law Again." Since the editorial is informative, we reprint the greater part of it.

"Once more the terrible question of the responsibility of the nation as a whole for lynching raises its head. The slaughter of the four Negroes at Monroe, Ga., on July 25, was not only a simple murder, nor is its significance to be estimated only in terms of local conditions in Georgia. What happened at Monroe, Ga., occurred in a very definite social pattern; it occurred be-

cause of a social system which is nation-wide and which is supported by the activity or passivity of Americans everywhere. It is intimately connected with the recent riots in Columbia, Tenn.; with an attempted lynching in New York City on July 28; with the death of Leon McTatie, a Negro who was flogged and drowned in a bayou in Lexington, Miss., about July 22.

"The pattern is that of a vast section of the American people placed outside the protection of the law on racial grounds. A Negro is accused of a crime—accused, mind you, not convicted. A white mob decides it will not wait for due process of law, seizes the accused—often from the very hands of the law itself—and murders him.

"A lynching mob does not assemble for its bloody work unless it knows the civil authorities either cannot or will not mete out punishment. That such security for the mob exists is shown by the long history of lynching in this country. And that security rests solidly on the pattern of segregation and discrimination which, in one form or another, is nation-wide, and therefore lies upon the conscience of the whole American people. . . .

"In the Monroe case, Major William F. Spence, head of the Georgia Bureau of Investigation and of the State police, said that 'we just can't cope' with the situation. Earlier he reported he was getting no co-operation from local authorities.

"Federal legislation has been opposed on the grounds that lynching is dying out. The Monroe murders—and a number of similar outrages—show that to be only wishful thinking. This lynching occurred under the liberal rule of Governor Arnall; it occurred at a time when Georgia is going to revert to Talmadge conditions, and Bilbo has won in Mississippi. It occurred at a time when the Klan and similar organizations are on the march again. It is a throw-back to a pattern of lawlessness and violence which racist elements in many parts of the country are all too ready to imitate. Violence breeds violence; and continued violence, with impunity, against the Negro may breed desperation. The time has come for the Federal Government to act, and to act strongly and quickly."

## A Negative Verdict on the Revised Standard Version of the New Testament

Believing that our readers are eager to obtain as much information as possible on the excellencies and defects of the Revised Standard Version of the New Testament, we here reprint an article by Dr. Samuel M. Zwemer pertaining to this translation. The article appeared in the *Presbyterian* of August 15 and had the caption "The Revised Standard Version Once More."

In the issue of the *Presbyterian* of July 4, a correspondent expresses his belief that I stigmatized the Revised Standard Version as "Liberal" in my review of the volume (March 14 issue). May I point out a few additional reasons why I still hold that opinion

after reading a number of other reviews of this new version and the entire text itself.

On the very day of its publication, P. W. Wilson wrote a six-column review for *The New York Times*, February 9, 1946. He happens to be an earnest evangelical, and although he finds much to commend, as I did, in the translation, he wrote regarding John 3:16 that we find the great Gospel text, John 3:16, on which so many thousands of sermons have been preached, altered thus:

**King James Version:** God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have everlasting life.

**Revised Standard:** God so loved the world that He gave His only Son, that whoever believes in Him, should not perish but have eternal life.

The old view was that Jesus said these words verbatim to Nicodemus. Later scholars hold that the verse was added as a comment on the above conversation and was not actually said by Jesus. By leaving the words out of quotes and putting them into a new paragraph, the revisers appear to lean to the later conclusion. The omission of the word "begotten" opens up a vista of theological history reaching back to the Council of Nicea in A. D. 325 and to the Nicene Creed, recited with its phrase "begotten not made" at holy communion in the Protestant Episcopal Church.

The same critic also pointed out that while the size of this New Testament has increased (from the usual 210 pages of this format to 553 pages) the word content by actual count is less. E. g., Matt. 5 has 1,081 words in the King James Version, here 1,002; John 4 in King James 1,096, here 1,038. A New York lady, writing to *The Times* (February 10, 1946), comments on this newspaper brevity of style: "To me the changes are deplorable. When you take away 'Thee' and 'Thou'; when you substitute for 'Fear not; for behold I bring you good tidings of great joy,' the words 'Be not afraid; for behold I bring you good news,' you lose not only a sense of the past stirred by the older and lovelier words, but 'Tidings of great joy' has spiritual significance. 'Good news' might refer to a battle or the winning of a lottery. Certainly, it has no wonder in it." Of course she is not a liberal in her views of God's Word and of the English language.

In *Theological Studies*, the leading quarterly of the Society of Jesus (June, 1946), there is a lengthy review with high commendation of the work of the scholars who have prepared this translation and its modern form, but we also read that Catholic scholars disapprove strongly of their rendering of Rom. 9:5, Luke 1:34 and especially the relegation to footnotes of John 7:53—8:11; and Mark 16:9-19. My criticism of these omissions, therefore, was not a personal view but stands on an ecumenic basis of "semper ubique et ab omnibus" (e. g., all the Bible Societies and all older versions) until liberal critics began to whittle away the text of the Old and New Testaments. The same Roman Catholic reviewer calls atten-

tion to another important passage: "Catholic scholars will object to the rendering of Matt. 16:26, 'For what will it profit a man, if he gains the whole world and forfeits his life?' The word here translated 'life,' undoubtedly refers not to physical life, but to the life of the soul, and the English expression for the loss of that spiritual life has been from time immemorial 'soul,' which besides is the literal translation of the Greek."

I would also call the attention of your correspondent to a review of the RSV in *The Calvin Forum*, by Professor William C. Robinson of Columbia Theological Seminary, in which he notes several passages where the deity of our Lord is put in question, contrary to the actual Greek text: "This opinion is strengthened by the fact that the 1946 Revision fails to give the title of God to Christ in four passages where Nestle's Text gives it. In addition to 2 Thess. 1:12, these are John 1:18, Acts 20:28, and Romans 9:5, which last Professor Hendriksen mentions. In John 1:18 Nestle has 'God only begotten who is in the bosom of the Father.' The 1946 Version reads, 'the only Son who is in the bosom of the Father.' In Acts 20:28 Nestle reads, 'The Church of God which He purchased with His own blood.' The 1946 Version reads, 'The church of the Lord which he obtained for himself with his own blood.' Then it adds as a footnote, 'Or with the blood of his Own.' John 20:28 is not translated quite so explicitly with reference to Jesus as Nestle's Text, and Hebrews 1:8 has a footnote suggesting that the translation in the text applying the term God to Christ may be otherwise rendered thus: 'Or God is thy throne.'"

He also points out that in 1 Cor. 15 the Greek word "psychical" is regularly translated "physical." "The effect of the mistranslation is to encourage the belief that Paul 'spiritualized' the Resurrection, de-physicized it. The true emphasis of the Apostle is the contrast between Adam and the Fall on the one hand, and Christ and the Resurrection on the other."

A long review in *Our Hope* points out the same and other passages where the translation is offensive to conservative believers. The same is true of the lengthy and appreciative review of the RSV by Professor N. B. Stonehouse of the Westminster Theological Seminary. Although he agrees regarding the so-called "spurious" ending of Mark's Gospel with the critics and says the RSV is "not to be cast aside as a Modernist work from which we can expect no profit," there are "other characteristics which tell against its trustworthiness in a distressing fashion." And he then gives two examples (why only two?) "of what appears to us a definitely Modernist tendency." And he explains these examples by letting the cat out of the bag. Both examples, Rom. 9:5 and Jude 5, challenge, in the first case, the scholarship and, in the second, "the ethics of the revisers"; (*The Presbyterian Guardian*, June 25). The entire article deserves careful reading. Let this paragraph suffice: "There can be no serious doubt that the revisers, in common with the negative critics generally, reject the genuineness of

the Epistles to Timothy and Titus, and assign them to a period long after the death of Paul, perhaps even to the second century. In keeping with their critical judgments, they might quite consistently allow that Jesus came to be referred to as God late in the first century, and yet hold that, when Paul wrote to the Romans about the middle of the first century, there was not such an explicit evaluation of Jesus as God." For, as Dr. Stonehouse says, "All the scholars who determined the final form of the RSV belong to the Modernist camp."

The footnotes of the RSV are sprinkled profusely with "Some versions," "Some ancient authorities insert," and then omit it from the text. Conservative scholars have one standard of judgment and Liberals quite another in many such cases. This is perfectly evident in Dr. Moffatt's translation of Matt. 1:16, where Joseph is called "the father of Jesus"! What a Conservative scholar thinks of Westcott and Hort's text may be seen in *The Primitive Text of the Gospels and Acts*, by Albert C. Clark (Oxford, 1914): "Nowhere is the falsity of the maxim 'brevior lectio potior' more evident than in the New Testament. The process has been one of contraction, not of expansion. The primitive text is the longest, not the shortest. If my analysis is sound, we are brought back to an archetype of the four Gospels in book form, which cannot be later than the middle of the second century. This archetype appears to have contained the passages which have been most seriously suspected by recent critics, e. g., the end of St. Mark and St. John 7:53—8:11."

But Clark's study has been silently ignored, although the *Times Literary Supplement* stated in a two-column review: "No critic henceforth can refuse to take account of this book; and the worship of the 'short text' has had the rudest shock it has met with for years."

For all of the above reasons I still believe that the RSV bears the unmistakable marks of Liberalism.

### A Reply to Dr. Morrison

The *Presbyterian* of June 27 touches on some remarks of Dr. Morrison, editor of the *Christian Century*, which should not remain unchallenged. Since the article of the *Presbyterian* is brief, we quote it in full. —

"In *The Christian Century* for June 5, Dr. Morrison, the editor, makes this astonishing statement: 'In the degree in which attention is focused upon the Bible as the authority, the authority of Christ is bound to be eclipsed. The Protestant mind has not allowed Christ to be the interpreter of the Bible; it has used the Bible as a legalistic and literalistic interpreter of Christ.' Of course, every sane Protestant must admit that narrow and literalistic interpretations of Scripture have been responsible for some of the divisions in the Protestant Church. That distresses many of us as it does Dr. Morrison. But Dr. Morrison's discussion of

that point leads him on to startling lengths. His objection to the orthodox Protestant doctrine of the authority of Scripture is, apparently, that it gives to every man the privilege of private judgment. I had supposed that the liberal mind would glory in that. On the contrary, Dr. Morrison believes that we must lift our eyes to Christ, 'asking him whether this is what he requires or whether it is consonant with his mind.' It is proper for us to ask him how we come to know Christ, or to know anything about Him; how we could ever have heard of Him or known anything about His will for us, if it had not been for the Bible; and especially to put to him the question, What do you mean when you say we must let Christ 'be the interpreter of the Bible?' He criticizes Protestantism for insisting on the right of private interpretation; but in saying that we should let Christ interpret the Book for us, he becomes the victim of a far more subjective method. For Protestantism posits the guidance and restraint of the Holy Spirit in our study of the Word.

"Obviously, Dr. Morrison's position is the logical sequel to his theory of inspiration and revelation. I am amazed to find him saying that 'the Christian Church was in existence and had spread throughout the Roman Empire many years before a single book of the New Testament was written.' The Epistles to the Thessalonians date from A. D. 52, and the Synoptic Gospels from A. D. 60—70. Not so 'many years' had passed; indeed, surprisingly few. But Dr. Morrison goes further: 'No apostle, save Paul, wrote any part of the New Testament, so far as we know.' Such a statement runs contrary to the evidence in the case. No one need doubt for a moment that Matthew and John wrote the books ascribed to them. Nor need any one doubt that the books ascribed to Luke and other non-apostolic writers are authentic. The evidence is abundant enough — even for 2 Peter. It is not so surprising, therefore, that Dr. Morrison, when he arbitrarily disqualifies the New Testament, must find another source of authority. But when he finds that source in Christ, I think we have the right to ask, What Christ?"

### Is the Bible Too Old-Fashioned?

A little article in the *Christian Herald* for July, 1946, having the heading "Parents Beware!" by Helen Pierson Osgood, draws attention to the iniquitous efforts of certain teachers and educators to eliminate the Bible from religious instruction. We reprint her article without alterations.

"Sunday afternoons, they would tap on my front door and ask, 'Please can we come in and look at the book of Bible pictures? And will you tell us the stories about them?' There were many books for children in our library, but Mary and Johnny always asked for *that* one. It was hard, at first, for me to understand that.

"Now our Johnnies and Marys do not seem to be hearing Bible stories in our modern homes. And, to make matters worse, they are not hearing them in church school, either. I wonder if our Protestant parents really know what's going on?"

"My own conclusions about all this were slow in crystallizing. I saw what was coming—saw this trend toward using the Bible as little as possible. I saw it first when I took some special courses in religious education in one of our outstanding divinity schools; I learned here, to my utter amazement, that many of the old Bible stories were definitely 'taboo'—that they were 'unsuited to the child mind.' Against my better judgment, I confess I accepted that, for I remembered the stories of Jonah and Daniel, and I recalled how as a child they had confused rather than informed me. (Of course, the manner in which they were told had something to do with that!) My teachers were ill prepared; they failed to answer my questions about Jonah and Daniel.

"Soon, in my work at the church school, I heard parents criticize the lesson materials we were using, on the ground that they were 'character-centered,' instead of Bible-centered. They complained that the Bible stories that were being told were skipped over quickly, as though the teacher were on a rocking-horse, rocking furiously and getting nowhere. I heard some parents say they just weren't interested in that sort of lesson, at all.

"Then, after I had left the profession of religious education, I heard another criticism that made me wonder again. I called on Mrs. Jones to ask her why her little Mary had been absent from church school. A dozen little girls had graduated from the primary department in July, and all of them had enrolled in my junior department except Mary. Why was that? Mrs. Jones explained that her husband was a Roman Catholic; thanks to the divided church relationship of the home, Mary went to no church at all. She had not attended any church school since last winter. Reluctantly, Mrs. Jones admitted, 'I guess Mary isn't interested in your school. When I asked her about attending, she said, "Oh, Mother, I just don't want to go. They never talk about God, Jesus, or the Bible. They only color pictures!"'

"I begged for another chance at Mary. I promised to see to it, personally, that there would be talk of God, Jesus, and the Bible. I went back to our Director of Religious Education and insisted that we discard the 'new' lessons which emphasized crayons above God. That was hard to do, for the Director told me frankly that she hoped to get God, Jesus, and the Bible out of our school curriculum within three years' time.

"The text assigned to our group was a book of folk tales. The first one dealt with Australia, and with the belief of the ancient Australians concerning the origin of the earth. The second one dealt with Norway. The others with other countries. We

were expected to lead up gently to the Bible account of creation in Genesis, contrasting it always with these other accounts. The children were completely uninterested; they were too young to contrast such accounts, even if they had wanted to.

"In my effort to hold their interest, I tried supplementing Bible material at the close of each lesson. The young man who taught another class of boys, the same age as my girls, was trying to do the same thing; he had his youngsters memorize a Psalm, with a little dramatization of its lines. After two Sundays he asked the children which part of the lesson they liked best, and as one they shouted, "The Bible!"

"My definite conclusions concerning the failures of the non-Biblical materials, however, came when I tried experimenting with these lessons in the first junior grade. I added to this course certain lessons of my own, built on the parables.

"I was amazed at the ability of the children to grasp the meaning of the Bible story. When suddenly I asked them, 'Shall we go on with these Bible lessons, or go back to the folk tales?' their answer was a quick 'We want the Bible.'

"Out of this experience, it seems plainer than plain to me that we need not *less* of the Bible, as some 'religious educational' experts seem to think, but *more* of it. Out of their own mouths the children call for a better choice of teaching materials. And the parents I have talked to agree with that, too!

"What are we Protestants up to, anyway? Are we trying to educate children away from the Church? Isn't it time we woke up? Am I right, or am I just old-fashioned and out of step?"

