

11-1-1948

## 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. (1948) "Theological Observer. - Kirchlich-Zeitgeschichtliches," *Concordia Theological Monthly*. Vol. 19, Article 72.

Available at: <https://scholar.csl.edu/ctm/vol19/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).

## Theological Observer

---

**KFUO and the Lutheran Hour.**—The march of the Gospel continues. While the imprint of secularism can be seen all about us, there is no generation in which the Good News has been spread so widely and powerfully as in ours. We are happy to announce that KFUO has added substantially to its plant and equipment and that its renovated and enlarged facilities have been dedicated on October 17 to their exalted, holy use. It is a synodical child and receives an appropriation for its work, but what is granted is hardly more than a token. The station has to be supported by the direct gifts of its friends and well-wishers. Many of those who send donations are not members of the Lutheran Church or of any Church.

The Lutheran Hour, embarked now on its sixteenth season, has quite correctly been called one of the grandest evangelization agencies which the world has seen. Dr. Walter A. Maier continues to serve as its regular preacher. It seems incredible, but is borne out by the lists at the Lutheran Hour office, that the message of this herald of the Gospel is now heard over 1,100 stations in nearly all the countries of the world. In humble gratitude we bow our heads and invoke God's blessings on both the ventures mentioned. Like KFUO for the by far greater part of its budget, the Lutheran Hour has to depend mainly on the support of its friends—the people inside and outside our church body who desire to see the good news of pardon through the blood of Christ spread throughout the world. Those who would like to receive full and detailed information on its globe-encircling activities should write the Lutheran Hour Office, 3558 S. Jefferson Ave., St. Louis 18, Mo., for a copy of the October issue of the *Lutheran Hour News*. KFUO regularly issues a bulletin which can be obtained by writing to the station.

A.

**Dr. Hamann's Remarks on the Breslau-Free Church "Theses of Union."**—The "Theses of Union" adopted by the Evangelical Lutheran Free Church (Free Church of Saxony) have rightly aroused interest far beyond the confines of Germany. In far-away Australia, Dr. H. Hamann, principal of Concordia College (Unley, S. A.), has published a translation of the Theses as they were submitted to him in typewritten copy, together with notes and comments which, we believe, will greatly interest our readers. Professor Hamann, for a number of years, has proved himself, in his capacity as editor of the *Australasian Theological Review*, a man of sound judgment, rare insight, and broad vision, whose opinions are worth noting. His fine translation of the Theses and his comments appeared in the December, 1947, issue of the periodical just mentioned. In an "editorial note" Dr. Hamann writes by way of preface: "The doctrinal matters that divided Breslau from our Free Church brethren parallel, to a certain extent, the



divergent doctrinal views and teachings that have hitherto separated the Evangelical Lutheran Church in Australia from the United Evangelical Lutheran Church in Australia. The publication of the *Einigungssatzte*, which we offer to our readers in exact translation, may help to remove whatever doctrinal and practical differences still keep the two branches of the Australian Lutheran Church apart. Such at least is the ardent hope and the earnest desire of the editors."

Summing up his impressions of the "Theses of Union," Dr. Hamann writes in conclusion: "The translator has no fault to find with these theses and the explanatory remarks appended. In his judgment, not a particle of divinely revealed truth has been sacrificed or called into question. He also believes that our Church (the E. L. C. A.) as a whole would not hesitate to accept these *Einigungssatzte* as a basis of fellowship with the U. E. L. C. A.; and that if the latter body were to declare its acceptance of them, the remaining differences and difficulties would be overcome with comparative ease. Every reader who studies these Theses and who has followed the discussions and negotiations on Lutheran unity in the United States of America, cannot fail to observe a certain similarity between them and the 'Declaration' of the American Lutheran Church as regards both the matter treated and the manner of treatment. The *Einigungssatzte* are perhaps a little more carefully and conservatively worded, but the kinship is unmistakable. It is probably due not to accident, nor only to the fact that there were points of contact between Breslau and the former Iowa-Ohio Synods, but to a study of the documents that have so long engaged the attention of the Missouri Synod and the American Lutheran Church. Of the five 'points of doctrine' that were declared to be non-divisive of fellowship in 1938, three are thus designated by the *Einigungssatzte*, viz., the chronology of the Thousand Years, the possibility of the conversion of larger numbers of Jews in the last times, and the possibility that, before the end, the Antichrist may unite with other antichristian forces. In short, it is admitted that the Word does not reveal all that the future may bring. There is no mention of the resurrection of some martyrs before the general resurrection—and a very good thing, too. Besides, Breslau seems to have accepted the only sound definition of the Church and of its *notae*. The concluding remarks on eschatology added to the theses strike us as quite admirable, considered both theologically and practically. At about the same time when the Scriptural truths and principles embodied in the *Einigungssatzte* prepared the way for unity and fellowship in Germany, the Missouri Synod withdrew the Basis of Fellowship of 1938, though this action did not carry with it any repudiation or condemnation of the doctrinal contents of that Basis. Perhaps no other measure was open to the Chicago Centennial Convention if it wished to escape from the *impasse* created by subsequent resolutions in 1941 and 1944 as well as by



conditions within the Synodical Conference. Yet if the cause of Lutheran unity is to be advanced in America and Australia, it will have to be done in somewhat the same manner as that adopted by the *Einigungssatzte*; for church-fellowship presupposes, not absolute unanimity on all matters that may occur to the Christian when contemplating the entire body of Divine Truth, but 'common acceptance and confession of all doctrines revealed in Holy Scripture.'"  
 J. T. M.

**The New Zealand District Convention of 1948.**—The *Australian Lutheran* (June 23, 1948) reports on the annual convention of the Evangelical Lutheran Concordia Conference of New Zealand, held in the capital city of Wellington, from May 15 to 17. The convention was attended by the Rev. F. Hassold of Eudunda, Australia, as the official representative of the General President, and by Mr. Ben Koch of Adelaide, who addressed primarily the laymen of the District. The New Zealand District is perhaps the smallest in any Church affiliated with the Missouri Synod. Its pastoral conference numbers only six persons: Pastors M. Hedrich, G. Fischer, C. Venz, H. Te Punga, C. Koch, and J. Paech. Essays were read on the subject "Pastor and People." While the congregations are few and scattered, President Fischer urged thanksgiving to God for many blessings bestowed by Him upon the Church in New Zealand during the past year, especially the remarkable increase in attendance at the Lord's Table. The brethren were grateful also for the deep interest which the Australian Church took in their welfare and for the many greetings which the convention received. Despite the small numbers and the many difficulties they are facing in their work, our New Zealand brethren are faithfully continuing in the Lord's work, the report showing no discouragement on their part at all. May the ever-supporting presence of our precious Lord be their comfort and strength in their arduous and lonely, but glorious task.  
 J. T. M.

**Barth vs. Brunner on Communism.**—Under this heading the *Christian Century*, August 4, sheds light on the lively question, why Karl Barth has taken no position on the question of Communism, whereas he took such a violent position against Nazism. This topic is discussed widely in German theology today. Our readers will therefore be interested in having a résumé of the entire issue as it was brought to light in the correspondence between Barth and Brunner. We quote from the *Christian Century*. "Since Brunner insists that totalitarianism is the same, whether Nazi or Communist, Barth's present position is unintelligible to him. Must not the church of necessity, with unambiguity and passion, say No to Communist totalitarianism, just as it said No to Hitler? . . . Existing Communism leads logically to totalitarianism. The question for the Christian church, therefore, is not whether it will take a negative stand against ideal communism, but whether it will say No to a total state, which is the only kind consistent with existing Communism. . . . Brunner favors certain



state controls and even state ownership. There is a strong movement toward the correction of these capitalistic abuses. . . . Socialism, he reminds Barth, is not authoritarian, which is one of the reasons why Communism seeks to destroy it. 'Shall we allow socialism to be assassinated by our refusal to say anything as Christians against its murderers?' Must not Christians rather join with Socialists in this battle? To remain silent is to deny a fundamental Christian principle—something Christians must never do. For the totalitarian state does not recognize the natural rights of human personality. It is also atheistic by its very nature. . . . Brunner notes that Hromadka of Prague, formerly of Princeton, takes practically the same position as Barth, in that he interprets the present situation as a historical necessity. . . . As for the argument that by opposing these Communist governments Protestants will be aligning themselves with the Roman Catholic Church, Brunner asks whether, just because the Roman Church takes an anti-Communist stand, Protestants must stand aside. Did not Protestants and Catholics stand side-by-side against Hitler? . . . Barth's reply is characteristic. Christians, he declares, do not act by eternal and guiding principles, but according to the authority of the Word of God in concrete situations. What obtained in 1933 simply does not obtain now. The situation is different. Therefore, the Word of God which must be spoken today must be formulated afresh. The position of the church in political matters, says Barth, is determined at the point where the church faces the necessity of speaking responsibly out of the Word of God. The church has nothing, as church, to do with isms and systems, but only with the Word of God in historical situations. It does not speak according to 'principles.' The church makes her judgment according to the situation. One day she may speak and another day she may be silent. She declines to systematize her actions. She insists upon keeping her freedom to speak when the time comes to speak. The church confronted such a concrete situation in 1933. It was time to speak then. Why? Because Hitler's regime represented a temptation to the church. Many an American, Britisher, and Frenchman admired Hitler. Even Churchill had something good to say for him! The nations allowed themselves to be seduced by nazism, which claimed to be Christian. It was not a question of totalitarianism, nor of nihilism, nor of anti-Semitism. Hitlerism had a charm about it which overwhelmed men's souls and made them believe its lies. It was a matter of life and death for the church, since nazism was a 'masked godlessness.' This, says Barth, is why he would not compromise at that time, nor pardon any who had collaborated. But, asks Barth, are we faced by the same situation today? Can we apply what we said then against nazism to Communism now? He has seen western Germany and the non-Russian sectors of Berlin. He knows the fear, the hate, the repugnance which is felt toward this 'eastern monster.' But among those who have this feeling, there is not one who regards Communism as a temptation which constitutes a danger! None will



go along with Communism, except a few Communists. Is this not also true of those who live in America, England, and France? 'Whoever wants a political negation from me against this system and method can have it immediately.' But it is rather cheap to give, and cheap to have! Barth will not admit that it is a Christian, or a church, responsibility to say about Communism what every citizen can read in his newspaper and what Mr. Truman and the pope are saying so well. Has the 'East,' or whatever one may call it, such a power over us that we must counteract it with an ultimate word? No, says Barth, for when the church confesses its faith, it does so by going against the tide with fear and trembling. Surely the church has no cause to go against the tide today by giving its witness against Communism, because Communism does not merit this, whether on account of its Marxist, its imperialistic or its Asiatic elements. . . . Where is the spiritual danger, or the need, which requires that the church should give a witness to this truth? What is the occasion? Whom would the church instruct, set right, comfort, or call to repentance and new life thereby? Certainly not the nations of the 'Christian' West. Certainly not the Americans! Are they not secure enough against Russia without our Christian assurance? Certainly not the poor Russians and the poor Communists! . . . If a concrete situation should arise as it did in 1933-45, then we shall have to see how to deal with the situation that may have developed. But in any case, says Barth, it will not be according to any of the timeless 'principles' to which Brunner wished to win me. It will begin, rather, with the first sentence of the Barmen Declaration, which was distasteful to Brunner at the time it was adopted." [Ed. NORZ: The first Barmen thesis stated that "Jesus Christ as He is testified to us in Holy Scriptures, is the one Word of God to which we must listen, and which we must obey in life and death. We reject the error as though the church may seek as the source of its proclamation events, persons, powers, and truths aside of the Word of God as God's revelation." According to the principles of dialectics, revelation occurs when the veiled and timeless Word of God becomes a re-vealed message for a specific person or group at a specific time.]

F. E. M.

**Early Lutheran Influence in England.** — Recently a book appeared which contains interesting material for all students who are engaged in research pertaining to the influence which Luther and his co-workers exerted in England when the blessed Reformation of the sixteenth century began. The book has the title *Studies in the Making of the English Protestant Tradition (mainly in the reign of Henry VIII)*. The author is E. G. Rupp. The book is published by Cambridge University Press and can be obtained in New York from the Macmillan Company. The price is \$2.75. Prof. P. V. Norwood of Seabury-Western Theological Seminary reviews the book in the July, 1948, issue of the *Anglican Theological Review*. We quote a few of his sentences: "Much has been



written with regard to the impact of Calvinism and the Reformed type of Protestantism on the English Church and religion; little about the Lutheran influences which preceded. It is now more than a half-century since the publication of the *Lutheran Movement in England* by the competent American Lutheran scholar H. E. Jacobs. In the essays which make up the volume under consideration, Mr. Rupp, an English Wesleyan and 1940 winner of the Cranmer prize, returns to this neglected theme. It is his purpose to trace the avenues of infiltration of continental reformation ideas into England and the germination of Lutheran thought in English minds. Latent Lollardy was quickened by winds from across the North Sea, and our attention is called to a group of 'Christian Brethren,' an association, 'which embraced men of different callings, different interest, and different theological opinion, yet all joined by a common concern for reformation in doctrine and church life, and that linked the workers for that reform in England with their brethren overseas.' Their effective promotion of the study of the Bible and Lutheran books naturally alarmed the ecclesiastical authorities. Men like Tyndale and John Frith seem to have had connections with this group. Through the 'Brethren,' through young Cambridge dons who were adherents of the New Learning and of Erasmian Biblical scholarship, and through English exiles on the continent, Lutheranism won its way—at great personal peril to its exponents. Henry's diplomatic dealings with the Lutheran princes of Germany and their theologians are recounted at length—a matter too little regarded by Anglicans, since it was through the medium of these negotiations that the language of the Lutheran Confession entered the English formularies at certain points. Rupp's eighth chapter, 'Justification by Faith and the English Reformers,' amply demonstrates the appropriation of this cardinal article of Lutheranism by the English evangelicals—a fact unpalatable to certain myopic schools of Anglicanism, who apparently take for native manufacture what is clearly shown (by verbal parallels) to be an importation." We hope that by and by Mr. Rupp's book can be reviewed in this journal.

A.

**Lambeth and Pan-Protestantism.**—*America* (August 28, 1948) presents an excellent summary of the Lambeth Conference in an editorial which reads: "After five weeks of private consultation, the 326 bishops of the Anglican Communion issued on August 18 the resolutions, lengthy committee reports, and a superbly written covering letter summarizing the first Lambeth Conference to meet in eighteen years. Press reports emphasized the condemnation of Marxian, atheistic Communism, its cruelties, injustice, and lying propaganda, as a heresy, deriving from Christianity but its antithesis and contradiction. The resolution, however, concedes that, provided he believes only in Marxist economic interpretation, a Communist can be a practical Christian—a designation applied



by the Archbishop of Canterbury to the whole Russian Orthodox Church. Likewise censured were 'other forms of economic domination which do not in practise exhibit any clearer recognition of moral law.' In phrases reminiscent of last November's Statement of the Bishops of the Administrative Board of NCWC [The National Catholic Welfare Conference], the spread of secularism was deplored. Respects for human rights, irrespective of race or color, was demanded; collective control of atomic power, limitation of national sovereignties and support of UN were recommended. The growing concern of the State for human welfare was welcome, but warning was given of the encroachment of the State, especially in the field of education, which endangers human personality. Remarriage of divorced persons remains forbidden; the Committee of Marriage Discipline, however, approved a private form of prayer and dedication where marriage in the church is forbidden. Central in the Conference agenda was the theme of church unity. Lambeth, 1908, had declared that 'there could be no fulfillment of the divine purpose in any scheme of reunion which did not include the great Latin Church of the West.' Lambeth, 1948, represented the triumph of the Pan-Protestant policy in the Anglican Communion, the Conference expressing the hope of an ultimate comprehensive merger with other Protestant denominations and its present gratification at the common-denominator unity of the Church of South India. Significantly, 1948 is the fourth centenary of Cranmer's proposal to Melanchthon and Calvin that Protestants should agree on a common confession of faith lest their differences make them appear contemptible in the eyes of the Roman Communion, and urging a general assembly of Protestant divines to be held in England as the safest place." The last sentence refers to a bit of history which perhaps is not generally known but shows Cranmer's close contact with both Geneva and Wittenberg. Nor is it generally known that in 1548 Cranmer had the Nuremberg Catechism translated into English, and that scarcely without any change, that he induced Justus Jonas to translate the Nuremberg Catechism Sermons into Latin, that, to win the remaining Catholics in England to Protestantism, he sent itinerant preachers throughout the land, and, finally, that he called into England a number of prominent Reformed theologians. In the following year (1549) he had the Parliament accept and sanction the first draft of the Book of Common Prayer, and when his plan to secure a common Confession of Faith, acceptable to all Protestants, failed, he moved the writing of the Forty-Two Articles of Faith, which were sanctioned in 1552. Nor must it be forgotten that in December, 1548, Melanchthon published the flexible, indulgent Leipzig Interim, so violently opposed by Flacius and other Gnesio-Lutherans. It was largely the confessing spirit of Flacius and his fellow opponents of the Leipzig Interim that put an end to Melanchthon's unionistic meddling with Romanists and Calvinists.

J. T. M.



**International Council of Christian Churches.**—Immediately before the World Council of Churches met in Amsterdam, a meeting was held in that city at which the so-called International Council of Christian Churches was organized. The *Christian Beacon* of August 26 gives this account of the meeting. "52 churches and 31 countries were represented at the first congress of the International Council of Christian Churches in Amsterdam, the Netherlands, which has now closed. And it was declared that real unity in the Spirit and in the things of Christ was enjoyed by the many delegates, observers, and advisers that attended this first congress of fundamental Bible-believing churches of the world. Elected chairman of the sessions and then elected president of the International Council, the Rev. Carl McIntire has been kept busy in directing the work of the sessions. Other officers have been elected and appointed, and the commissions to further the diversified work and ministry of the Council have been established. . . . Taking its stand on the Word of God as the only rule for faith and practice, the Council called upon 'Bible believers and true Protestants throughout the world to separate themselves' from the World Council and invited them to join the testimony of the International Council. . . . The basis of this call was the inclusion within the World Council of 'leaders and spokesmen, past and present, some of the most notorious and near-blasphemous unbelievers of the day.'"

On the World Council of Churches the official pronouncement of the International Council of Christian Churches reads thus: "While undoubtedly there are many church units in the denominations officially claimed by the World Council, as well as many individual members in all the churches belonging to the said denomination who still believe the whole Bible to be the Word of God and are Protestants in the historic sense, the World Council in its official proposals, attitude, and doctrinal expressions and ecclesiastical organizations, is anti-Biblical, anti-evangelical, and un-Protestant, as is also shown by the fact that some of its ecclesiastical units have chosen as leaders and official spokesmen, past and present, some of the most notorious and near-blasphemous unbelievers of the day. An organization which is led by men who call the doctrine of the deity of Christ 'distilled nonsense,' who discredit the Old Testament, and ridicule many of the doctrines of the New Testament, especially the truth of the efficacy of Christ's blood, cannot, in the Biblical and historical sense, truthfully be called Christian."

As to its own character and purposes, the pronouncement says: "On the other hand, the International Council of Christian Churches exists to protect against the tenets of Modernism and to proclaim the doctrines of the faith of the Reformation which it identifies as the 'faith once for all delivered to the saints,' and for which the New Testament admonishes us earnestly to contend." A.



**The Harvard Lectures on Immortality.** — In the *Sunday School Times* (April 3, 1948) Dr. Ernest Gordon, under the given heading, writes on the downward course which the "Harvard lectures on immortality" have taken. About 50 years ago, Miss Caroline Ingersoll of Keene, New Hampshire, dedicated \$5,000 for the establishment of a lectureship on that subject in honor of her father, a loyal alumnus of that university. These lectures were to confirm the hope of life eternal, but, as Dr. Gordon shows, they manifested, for the greater part, downright apostasy from the Christian faith. There were exceptions, of course, but most of the lectures evinced the "creeping paralysis that marks university and theological life in the America of our time." Sir William Osler, for example, the "paragon of Anglo-American medicine of the last generation," presented "an amazing essay, marked by brilliant writing," but one also "without any positive witness to the resurrection or even to immortality as a thing in any way certain." Dr. Osler was a Canadian minister's son who had drifted far from the Christian moorings. His colleague Prof. H. A. Kelly, one of Johns Hopkins' greatest surgeons, who boldly and fearlessly confessed the resurrection of the dead and life eternal through faith in Christ Jesus, was never asked by President Eliot, one of the trustees of the Ingersoll Lectureship, to state the ground of his Christian hope, though the lectureship was established for the very purpose that this Christian hope might be defended. Again, Professor Ostwald, the Leipzig chemist, then teaching at Harvard, was a leader in international free thought. His contribution was as pagan as it possibly could be, for he wrote as "a materialist with whom death ends all." Then there was Prof. Wm. James, who confessed that "his own personal feeling about immortality was never of the keenest order." He wrote: "Our common animal essence of patience under suffering and enduring effort must be what redeems us in the Deity's sight. An immortality from which these inconceivable billions of fellow strivers should be excluded becomes an irrational idea for us." To this Dr. Gordon remarks: "He forgets Romans, as Osler does 1 Cor. 15." Professor Palmer, another of the lecturers, indeed defended the immortality of the soul, but he "turned for the defense of immortality to intimations found in Shakespeare's Sonnets." His colleague Professor Royce "spent most of his time defining individuality, as if that were not a thing we could take for granted. His essay was a Sahara sand-waste, nor was there a trace of a mirage of Scriptural oasis in it." Prof. Kirsopp Lake, who also lectured on the subject, was at the time professor in the Harvard Divinity School. He wrote: "Men regard the permanent survival of their individuality much as they look at schemes for their permanent rejuvenation — a pleasant dream, as Ponce de Leon's fountain of perpetual youth." He proposed as a substitute "for the hope of a better world above for ourselves to enjoy, the pursuit of a better world for another generation to inherit." Dr. H. E. Fosdick likewise was asked to lecture, and he said, among other things, that modern minds are not concerned



with "orthodoxy's theatrical settings of heaven and hell." Shailer Mathews, onetime president of the Federal Council, delivered his lecture under the title of "Immortality and the Cosmic Process." One of his statements, quoted by Dr. Gordon, reads: "We shall never be more truly immortal than we are at the present hour." Another statement of his reads: "By making our social relationships more personal and by controlling our physical urges in the interest of those ends which are superanimal and timeless, we come into harmony with the eternal personality-producing activities of the cosmos and so share in the creative urges." Dr. J. S. Bixler, who at the time he wrote his essay was teacher of the Bible in Smith College, based his hope of immortality on Walt Whitman and Emerson. He said: "We must learn with Whitman to cultivate a mood where knowledge blends with contemplation and in which we can look up with perfect confidence and peace to the stars." Again: "It is upon the human soul with its capacity for aesthetic and mystical detachment . . . that man's theories of life must be built. It is by the light of the soul that man must go forward to wrest a meaning from the ultimate mystery and to solve the final riddle of his origin and fate." Dr. Gordon judges rightly: "Bixler trusts in man for self-redemption," and he concludes his article with the words: "'Hath not God made foolish the wisdom of this world?' asks the Apostle. He surely has. And how? By leaving them to their own imaginations and reasonings and philosophizings. This the Ingersoll Lectures prove to the hilt. They have forsaken the fountains of living waters and hewn themselves out broken cisterns that can hold no water, least of all water of life." Since this type of unbelief is being taught also at other higher schools of learning, it is well for us to remember in our intercessions and otherwise the splendid work which our Student Service Commission performs through the many student pastors who are serving our young people at many colleges and universities. That their work is not in vain is proved again by the April issue of the *Lutheran Student Pastor*, published by the Commission's active secretary, Rev. R. W. Hahn. Here are some reports: "Colorado State College: Two students were confirmed last month by Student Pastor Theo. A. Meyer"; or: "The average church attendance at services conducted by Student Pastor Weber at Purdue University is 199. The average contribution is 44 cents per worshiper. The total number of Synodical Conference students at Purdue is 375"; or: "Student Pastor Heintzen's group of 471 at the University of Illinois includes 89 women, 247 veterans, 91 married students." And these are only a few of the numerous reports of signal success reported by Rev. R. W. Hahn. "My Word shall not return unto Me void" (Is. 55:11).  
J. T. M.

**The End of "Cuius Regio, Eius Religio."**—In the *Theological Quarterly* (*Quartalschrift*) of the Wisconsin Synod (July, 1948) Mr. Eugene Wengert, a prominent Lutheran attorney and leading Lutheran layman, offers an excellent article on the implications



of the well-known formula *cujus regio, eius religio*, adopted as a recognized doctrine of politics in the Religious Treaty of Augsburg, 1555. The doctrine, though practically repudiated at the close of the Thirty Years' War in 1648, was not fully abrogated until the constitutionalism of America brought forth a new political doctrine of religious freedom in the Bill of Rights. We believe our readers will appreciate the following paragraph of Mr. Wengert's article even though they must read it removed from its context: "The century from 1555 to 1648, having adopted as the *raison d'état* *cujus regio, eius religio*, was without doubt the most gruesome and perverted in the annals of Christian thought. In the emphasis on religious warfare it must not be assumed that in practical effect the formula evolved in the Treaty of Augsburg had its repercussions only in Germany and ended with the Thirty Years' War. On the contrary, such a perspective would be altogether too narrow. Its principles embraced every European nation impregnated with the ideas of the Reformation and became the constitutional norm for the ecclesiastical and political policy of the State. It was clearly an attempt to import into the State the ideology of the Israelitic theocracy, where disloyalty to the State was blasphemy against Jehovah. The literature of the time abounds with repetitious references to personages and incidents of the Old Testament in proof that the State is God's direct institution, as was the Church, and therefore it must not only protect religion but also sponsor and advance true doctrine. However, it is not our intention to discuss the physical aspects of the religious wars of this period. These facts can be found in any textbook. Our intention is to trace social and political ideas and their impact upon the Christian Church. Hence, before proceeding farther in our investigations to discover the new ideas, tendencies, and movements in this world, it is quite important for comparative purposes to advert once more to the position of Luther. He had indicated precisely the area of activity for Church and State in matters of heresy. On the question of absolute and passive obedience to secular authority, he had conceded the implicit right to resistance and even deposition of the emperor if he violated his oath of office and refused compliance with the constitutional prescriptions. In other words, he had substituted a regimen of law for ruled and ruler instead of the arbitrary will of the ruler regardless of law. Although Luther's perspicacity into the reality of things was never pursued to its logical end, yet this view established in the progress of political theory two basic principles: First, no emperor, ruler, or king is above the constitutional law of the State and his oath of office, or to use the phrase of the Civilians, he is not any longer to be regarded as *princeps legibus solutus*; secondly, although less precisely, the individual Christian may refuse obedience to secular powers when his religious convictions are the object of the attack. Thus in the orderly process of social and political development the century here under review should have compelled the conclusion in Lutheran thinking that man functions in a dual capacity in the



social and the political order. He is bound by the social institutions of time in his secular existence, but transcends time in his divinely preordained destiny for eternity. In the one area the State and secular institutions function by trial and error and are the result of social experience; in the other the divine institution of the Church functions by revelation. Therefore, in the evolution of the idea of freedom from the state-control of religion and in the development of the new conception of religious liberty and of the separation of religion from institutionalism and animosities, the contribution of theological thinkers was admittedly inconsequential. Progress toward and consummation of an explicit doctrine of separation must be credited to the Civilians, who were not so much interested and motivated in securing peace for the Church as they were in stabilizing the political foundations of the State. But it must not be inferred that the tendency ripened at once into maturity. A new idea is a delicate plant and needs the utmost care and cultivation. Its final fruition came in the constitutionalism of America through the enlightened rationalism of Jefferson despite the opposition from the politically entrenched religion. Hence the theory was juridical and not theological. The dominant concept of the Christian religion is the love of God. The dominant characteristic of society and the social institution of the State is the sanction and coercion of the law. In their antithesis neither the State nor the Church can adopt the function of the other without denying its specific purpose and attributes." — As proof of the perspicacity and fairness of the great Lutheran political leader Gustavus Adolphus, it might be said here that even during the Thirty Years' War he fully recognized and protected the religious and civil rights of Roman Catholic subjects in the areas which he had subdued. Humanly speaking, it is quite believable that had the King of Sweden dictated the Peace of Westphalia, Europe would have been blessed with a Bill of Rights, similar to the one we have in our country today.

J. T. M.

**Religious Freedom and Roman Catholicism.**—Among the matters that are widely discussed these days on account of the Supreme Court decision pertaining to the Champaign case is the attitude of the Roman Catholic Church toward religious liberty. The Roman Catholics themselves have joined in the debate and are furnishing contributions. One of their number, Wilfred Parsons, a Jesuit, has issued a book called *The First Freedom, Considerations on Church and State in the United States*. An important review of this book has appeared in the *Christian Century* of August 25, written by the review editor of the journal, Dr. W. E. Garrison. There are various reasons why this review should be widely read. One of them is that it contains quotations from authoritative Catholic sources showing what the real position of the Roman Catholic Church is toward religious freedom and separation of Church and State. In order that our readers may have this material at their elbow, we shall quote the most important



statements: "Pope Pius IX declared it an error to say 'that in the present day it is no longer expedient that the Catholic religion shall be held as the only religion of the State, to the exclusion of all other modes of worship.'" "Pope Leo XIII deplored the 'unrightful position' unto which the Church is driven or when the Catholic religion is allowed a standing in civil society equal only, or inferior, to societies alien from it.'" "Msgr. John A. Ryan writes: 'Should non-Catholics be permitted to practice their own forms 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 perversion to the faithful, they may be properly tolerated by the State.' To this he adds the familiar words which stand unaltered in the current edition of his book: 'Superficial champions of religious liberty will promptly and indignantly denounce the foregoing propositions as the essence of intolerance. They are intolerant, but not therefore unreasonable. Error has not the same rights as truth. Since the profession and practice are contrary to human welfare, how can error have rights?' Coming right down to 1948, we find the official Jesuit organ in Rome, *Civiltà Cattolica*, in its April issue (see *Christian Century*, June 23), with unaccustomed frankness giving this gem of Catholic wisdom: "The Roman Catholic Church, convinced through its divine prerogative, of being the only true Church, must demand the right to freedom for herself alone, because such a right can only be possessed by truth, never by error. As to other religions, the Church will certainly never draw the sword, but she will require that, by legitimate means, they shall not be allowed to propagate false doctrine. Consequently, in a State where the majority of people are Catholic, the Church will require that legal existence be denied to error, and that if religious minorities actually insist, they shall have only a *de facto* existence without opportunity to spread their beliefs. If, however, actual circumstances, either due to government hostilities or the strength of the dissenting groups, makes the complete application of the principle impossible, then the [Catholic] Church will require for herself all possible concessions, limiting herself to accepting, as a minor evil, the *de jure* toleration of other forms of worship. . . . The Church cannot blush for her own want of tolerance, as she asserts it in principle and applies it in practice."

Commenting on these official utterances Dr. Garrison says: "Here, then, are the official papal and Jesuit pronouncements on 'religious liberty' and on the equality of churches before the law. Father Parsons does not dare to repeat them in this book, but he does not dare to disclaim them. They are not the statements of fringe fanatics, but the considered declarations of the head of his Church and high representatives of his own order. These are the basic presuppositions behind his argument that the Constitution of the United States supports a type of Church-State relationship with equally proportioned aid to all churches — a system in which he cannot believe but which he defends as a step toward a happier arrangement under which 'error' will have no rights."



In spite of the assertions of some Roman Catholics to the contrary, it is very evident that their own authorities do not consider the conditions under which we live, where there is freedom of religion and of religious expression for all, as ideal, but merely as something that has to be tolerated till something better can be achieved. A.

**Atheists and Broadcasting.**—According to a *Religious News Service* dispatch from Washington, radio stations in this country will not be punished for refusing broadcasting time to atheists. This was stated by the Federal Communications Commission. A Protestant churchman, two Roman Catholic priests, a Jewish rabbi, and an atheist had appeared as witnesses before the special House Committee investigating F. C. C.'s stand on religion on the air. Commissioner Hyde said the F. C. C.'s 1946 Scott Decision, which upheld the right of atheists to broadcast their views, had been misinterpreted as meaning that atheists must receive radio time equal to that given religious programs. He told the House group that radio stations need fear no F. C. C. reprisal if they gave atheists less time or no time." The 1946 ruling followed a demand by Robert H. Scott of Palo Alto, Calif., that three California stations have their licenses revoked for refusing to grant him time for atheistic programs. Scott's petition was rejected by the F. C. C., but in its decision the Commission held that atheists had the right to air their viewpoint. Many stations subsequently interpreted this as establishing a policy calling on them to give atheists an equal opportunity to present their views if they gave or sold time for religious broadcasts. Commissioner Hyde in testifying before the Congressional Committee stated "that the Scott case emphasized the fact that in exercising its own judgment a radio station should not deny anyone air time on a controversial issue solely because it does not agree with the opposite viewpoint. He pointed out that an organization or an idea which might otherwise not be entitled to radio time 'may be projected into the realm of controversy by virtue of being attacked.' He gave as his personal point of view that Sunday broadcasts of religious services would not give atheists a right to reply with equal time."—This is reassuring information. A.

**Hromadka Answered by Niebuhr.**—Those of our readers who have perused accounts of the World Council of Churches meeting in Amsterdam will recall that a widely reported speech made by Prof. Joseph Hromadka of Prague, Czechoslovakia, attacked Western civilization and the social system which it sponsors. Dr. Reinhold Niebuhr of Union Seminary in New York answered him. Addressing the World Council of Churches, he admitted many points in Prof. Hromadka's attack on the West, but "asserted that he was wrong in presenting the Soviet system as a possible alternative to the Western way of life." Giving a brief report of Dr. Niebuhr's speech, the *Religious News Service* says that the New York theologian stressed that the real tragedy of our age lies in the



"horrible evils generated by the Communist alternative to our civilization. Hell knows no fury like that of a prophet of a secular religion who has become the priest-king of a Utopian state. The ramparts of our civilization may be tattered, but they contain defenses of freedom which require that we support them against this new fury." A.

**Find Protestantism in Indianapolis Not Attracting Men (R. N. S.).**—Protestantism in Indianapolis lacks attraction for men, is failing to reach low income groups, and is barely keeping pace with the population growth of the city.

These facts were revealed in a report based on a detailed statistical study of Protestant churches here compiled by Dr. Frederick A. Shippey, director of research for the Board of Missions of the Methodist Church.

The survey showed that:

1. Only 29.2 per cent of all Protestant church members are males.
2. Laborers—who comprise over 26 per cent of the employed population—make up only 8.6 per cent of Protestant church membership.
3. Between 1930 and 1945, when Indianapolis grew 15.6 per cent, church membership increased by 16 per cent.
4. In spite of the population growth, Sunday school enrollment between 1930 and 1945 dropped 10.3 per cent.
5. An average of only 31.4 per cent of Indianapolis Protestants attend Sunday morning services and only 6.9 per cent attend evening services.
6. An estimated 50,000 persons of the Protestant faith are unreached by the churches.

Other findings disclosed by the survey were that less than half of the Protestant church membership contributes regularly to the churches; and Protestant preachers are poorly paid.

The survey indicated that 37.1 per cent of the ministers make between \$2,000 and \$3,000; 17.7 per cent earn between \$1,000 and \$2,000; 24.8 per cent get \$3,000 to \$4,000; and only 7.1 per cent receive over \$5,000.

Dr. Shippey said the survey proved that "urban church work is not sufficiently aimed at males" and that "few churches have a vital program for adult males."

He said the survey advanced 11 recommendations to improve the Protestant church situation here. Among these were:

1. Broadening of pastoral counseling to include juvenile delinquency, adult crime, alcoholism, racial problems, and labor-management problems.

2. A house-to-house religious census to locate "the many thousands of unchurched residents."



3. A study of occupational distribution of church membership.

4. Appointment of an interdenominational committee to study the Sunday school situation thoroughly.

5. Investigation of the small percentage of church members who contribute regularly to financial support of the church; and

6. Leadership training schools for Sunday school officers.

The survey here was conducted under the auspices of the comity committee of the Church Federation of Indianapolis.

**Romanism Adds.** — Ernest Gordon, in the *Sunday School Times* (August 14, 1948), calls attention to the fact that while Rome retains essential fundamentals of the Christian faith, it adds to these fundamentals pernicious teachings, by which the Christian doctrine is obscured or even set aside. The papacy, in other words, hedges in true doctrine by means of false, unscriptural doctrines which imperil the salvation of the members of the papal church. He writes: "Pius XII asked visitor J. Frank Norris what Fundamentalists believed. He replied: In a supernaturally born Savior, a supernaturally risen Lord, by whose death we have salvation. The Pope smiled and said that he believed that too." Then Dr. Gordon writes: "But the trouble is that he and his followers believe other things too. In the *Converted Catholic* mention is made of a booklet by the Jesuit Father Delaney, with the endorsement of Cardinal Spellman, on the fifteenth page of which is this sentence, addressed to priests and italicized by the author: 'By offering the Mass you *add* something to Calvary, you *almost improve* on Calvary.' And in another book, officially endorsed by Cardinal Stritch of Chicago, entitled 'Novena in Honor of the Immaculate Heart of Our Lady of Fatima,' one finds, on page 28, the words: 'Thou art the Gate of Heaven, O Mother beloved, no one shall enter save through thee.'" This tragic adding to the Christian doctrine may well be remembered in connection with our coming Reformation Festival, which demands of us, as does our whole Gospel witness, both *Lehre* and *Wehre*, that is, both positive statement of the evangelical truth and refutation, in clear, unmistakable terms, of Rome's soul-destroying errors. No man, not even the Pope at Rome, can *improve* on Calvary; any addition to the saving death of Christ on the Cross only destroys Calvary, so far as the believer is concerned. That becomes clear especially when Mary is made the "Gate of Heaven," without whose merit and intercession no one can enter eternal life. Luther's verdict that "Rome and the entire Papacy have lost the Gospel, because they no longer desired to hear Christ, but themselves began to preach" [what they liked], is fully justified by statements such as those quoted by Dr. Gordon (cf. St. Louis Ed., V. 1029 f.). However, as Dr. Gordon points out, despite its errors Rome continues to make converts and gain friends among Protestants. He writes: "M. Jacques Maritain, a convert from French Protestantism to



Romanism and at present ambassador of the French Republic to the Vatican, has been appointed professor of philosophy in Princeton University. In this connection it may be noted that the son of Mr. John Foster Dulles, who is marked to be the coming Secretary of State (himself a Presbyterian minister's son), is studying for the Roman Catholic priesthood in St. Andrews Jesuit College in Poughkeepsie; and also that Mr. Taylor, the Roosevelt-Truman ambassador to the Vatican, has given his fine establishment in Florence to a Dominican sisterhood." Still there are such in the Roman Church as find their way to Protestantism by the study of Scripture. Just now Antonio Gianvittorio, a former Catholic priest and professor in Italy, is studying theology at Concordia Seminary, and such cases are by no means rare. J. T. M.

**British Methodists Reject the Idea of Ordaining Women as Ministers.**—It had been widely forecast that this year's Methodist Conference in Great Britain would go on record as favoring the ordination of women pastors. While the matter previously had been sanctioned in principle, it was rejected when the issue confronted the Church in a definite proposal. The main reason for this negative attitude does not seem to have been the teaching of St. Paul on this subject, as given in 1 Corinthians 14 and 1 Timothy 2. The considerations which moved the members of the Conference were, at least to a large extent, of a practical nature. Methodist ministers are supposed to change parishes frequently, in order that they may not become worldly-minded and view a certain manse as their paradise. They are, figuratively speaking, to be in the frame of mind and have the equipment of the children of Israel at the Passover meal, with loins girded, shoes on their feet, and their staff in their hand, Ex. 12:11. It would be a hardship for women pastors having families to be constantly on the move. We can understand that the women delegates at the Conference are said not at all to have been enamored of the plan to have members of their sex lead such itinerant lives. A.

**Outward Growth of Christian Churches in the United States.**—If the Kingdom of God depended on the number of the professed adherents of churches or religious organizations, the outlook in our country would be more favorable now than ever before. From New York comes the information that according to the compilations of the *Christian Century* about 58 per cent of our population claims membership in some religious society or denomination. In comparison with last year this means a gain of 3,716,006. The total is the largest number of people claiming some religious affiliation that has ever been reported. Analyzing the figures, one finds that in our country there are 46,149,676 Protestants, 25,286,178 Roman Catholics, and 4,641,000 Jews. Roman Catholics in the aggregate have been more successful in winning followers than Protestants. The percentage gain for the former is 3.5, while that of the Protestants is 2.6. A.



**Brief Items from *Religious News Service***

**Concerning Protestants**

A conference of German Quakers expressed opposition to capital punishment. The conference declared that capital punishment "does not repair a crime, does not return life to the dead, and is ineffective as a deterrent."

The Methodist Church in the United States has thirty-five episcopal areas. Two new ones were added at the last quadrennial General Conference.

Seventh-Day Adventists will open 140 new schools in all parts of the country during the next year. The denomination now operates 290 colleges and high schools and 3,631 elementary schools, in which more than 157,000 pupils are enrolled. This information was given at a Youth's Congress of the Adventists held in Philadelphia. Five hundred young men and women pledged themselves to missionary service.

"Great Scenes from Great Plays," the new radio program sponsored by the Protestant Episcopal Church, is said to have the largest radio hook-up ever used to carry a church message. Every station of the Mutual Broadcasting Company and a number of independent stations will "air" the program. The number of stations used is estimated to be more than five hundred.

Three high lay officials of the Lutheran Church in Hungary have resigned, shortly after the Minister of Information in the Communist-dominated government had demanded a revamping of the Lutheran Synod. It is rumored that the Lutheran Bishop Lajos Ordass will soon announce his abdication, owing to government pressure.

At the fiftieth annual convention of the Brotherhood of St. Andrew, an organization of Episcopal laymen meeting in Oxford, Ohio, the president, Mr. Samuel S. Schmidt of York, Pa., said, "Christianity began with twelve men listening to one Man, and these twelve men spread the principles of His teaching throughout the world." He urged his fellow-members to follow the example of their British brethren (whom he had just visited) to spread "the timeless good news of Christianity."

A resistance movement has been launched at Great Falls, Montana, in an effort to curb the invasion of the Hutterites into Montana. A plan is being drafted for driving these religious bands from the areas in which they have settled during the last few years. Oldest religious communistic society in the world, the Hutterites emigrated to the United States from Canada because of controversy and protest over their way of life. The charge is that Hutterite children are taught to speak German before they learn English, attend only the schools on grounds belonging to the sect,



and are segregated from all other youngsters not of their faith. An attorney representing the Hutterites and two members of the Augusta colony were denied admittance to the meeting. [The Hutterites, generally speaking, belong to the Mennonites.]

#### Concerning Roman Catholics

Joseph Cardinal Mindszenty, the Primate of Hungary, was refused a passport by his Communist-dominated government when he expressed the desire to go to Cologne.

In Cologne the seven-hundredth anniversary of the founding of the famous cathedral was observed. 250,000 persons jammed the surrounding streets, seven cardinals and more than 35 archbishops and bishops participated in the rites. In the procession "the most precious shrine of the three kings," a huge silver and gold casket set with ivory and precious gems was carried on a cart.

Headed by Joseph Cardinal van Roey, Archbishop of Malines, the Belgian Roman Catholic hierarchy has issued a joint pastoral letter warning Catholic parents against sending their children to new schools being established throughout the country under State supervision.

From Montreal comes the news that Mayor Camillien Houde joined Catholic theologians of his city in signing a petition that the Holy See proclaim as dogma the bodily assumption of the Virgin Mary into heaven.

A statement issued by the Catholic hierarchy of Germany, after a meeting of the prelates in Fulda, called on Catholics to work for the elimination of social inequalities in postwar Germany. It cautions them also against adding to "the misery of the poor" by charging high prices for scarce commodities.

There are sixty Benedictine abbeys in the United States. The Abbot Primate of the order, Rev. Bernard Kalein, has come from Rome to visit these institutions.

The Roman Catholic Church has launched its new English translation of the Old Testament, which will replace the Douay Version in the United States. The book of Genesis has now been printed. A group of more than thirty scholars is at work. In 1941 the same group issued a new translation of the New Testament. The translation is under the supervision of the Catholic Biblical Association of America. The printing is done by the St. Anthony Guild in Paterson, N. J. Among features of the new translation are the elimination of "Thou," "Thee," "Thy," and the substitution of "see" for "behold."

---