

5-1-1951

## Theological Observer. - Kirchlich-Zeitgeschichtliches

Paul M. Bretscher

*Concordia Seminary, St. Louis*

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



Part of the [Practical Theology Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Bretscher, Paul M. (1951) "Theological Observer. - Kirchlich-Zeitgeschichtliches," *Concordia Theological Monthly*. Vol. 22, Article 31.

Available at: <https://scholar.csl.edu/ctm/vol22/iss1/31>

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

---

### TRIBUTE TO DR. GRAEBNER

Under date of February 5 Rev. Herbert Goltzen, Oldenburg, Germany, who had participated in the first theological conference held at Bad Boll in the spring of 1948, penned the following warm tribute to the late Dr. Theo. Graebner. In translating Rev. Goltzen's almost intractable German, we were guided by the familiar rule taught us at college: "As literally as possible; as freely as necessary." Rev. Goltzen writes:

"My contact with the honored teacher of the Missouri Synod Dr. Graebner was granted me in Bad Boll in 1948. This contact left a deep impression on me. The scientific thoroughness of his lectures and his telling and potent remarks in the discussions contributed most significantly to this session. Impressive was also his rigid and unflinching loyalty to the truth of Scripture, whose witness in the Lutheran Confessions Dr. Graebner had fully mastered. The closely knit compactness of his confessionally molded theology was linked, however, with a sincere appreciation of the breadth of spiritual life, therefore also of lines of thought and experiences of faith which differed from his own. And so he could enter into a real discussion with others not merely as champion of his own thoughts, but also as a receptive listener who delighted in distilling newly gained impressions. His very obvious readiness to broaden his perspective of given areas of thought, together with his scintillating temperament, made him appear surprisingly young. How effective was also his sparkling humor, his quick and persuasive repartee, his warmhearted and truly human way of meeting one in conversations, which, in spite of one's awe of his superior intellect, immediately dispelled all feelings of fear and inferiority. I shall never forget his delightfully humorous address at the social evening toward the close of the sessions in which he described with much love and a strong dose of genuine German sentimentality his impressions of Germany. He charitably understood our changed world and preserved in his heart, owing to home influence, a picture of Germany which we ourselves, after so many bitter experiences and the destruction of our whole past with its cultural and material blessings, find it difficult to discover. Therefore it profoundly touched one to note in him as in some of his associates traits of character which, like sacred vestiges of our heritage, are now being preserved and cul-



tivated in lands far remote from the mother country and which we have all but lost after a generation of collapse and unrest. That all these rich intellectual gifts and character traits of this distinguished man were rooted in genuine piety, we all felt instinctively. . . . How much the life's work of this eminent teacher of the Church has meant for your Synod I can well imagine. A whole generation of servants of the Church is laid under obligation to him. Yet in the Church of Christ we do not speak of a 'loss' when one of its members is called home, but we rather thank the Lord for the grace which He, through the services of blessed witnesses, granted His Church. . . ."

In passing, it should be said that the Lord blessed Dr. Graebner's testimony in Europe in the hearts of many others who heard him. To Him, the Lord of the Church, be all glory, praise, and thanksgiving!

P. M. B.

#### FREEMASONRY IN ENGLAND UNDER FIRE

Materials recently received from England tell the story of the controversy in the Church of England regarding Freemasonry. The controversy was occasioned by an article titled "Should a Christian Be a Mason?" which appeared in a recent issue of *Theology*, a journal published by the Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge. The author of the article is Mr. William Walton Hannah, a former priest in charge of St. Thomas', Regent Street, London, later Rector of Balcombe, Sussex, but who at present is giving himself to study and writing. The article caused such a flurry that *Reynolds News*, a London paper, opened its columns for an airing of the issues raised by Mr. Hannah. It therefore published an article by Mr. Hannah in which he summarized his chief objections to Masonry, as well as an article by a Freemason who defends Masonry. *Reynolds News* also invited reader comment. Readers were not slow to reply. In the overwhelming number of reactions of individuals from all walks of life, Freemasonry draws the short end. The latest development in the controversy is the report that "a motion calling for an inquiry into the Craft was accepted for discussion at the Convocation of Canterbury in May." The motion to be presented to the Convocation reads as follows:

"In view of the facts that—

"1.—The usages and customs of Freemasonry, its signs and symbols, its rites and ceremonies, are officially declared to 'correspond in a great degree with the mysteries of ancient Egypt';

"2.—The innermost secret of Freemasonry, disclosed in the Royal Arch degree, is concerned with the nature of God;



"3.—The name of Jesus Christ is excluded from all Masonic rituals under the jurisdiction of Grand Lodge;

"4.—The names of certain pagan deities are pronounced with great solemnity in the Royal Arch Ritual;

"5.—According to universal Christian tradition, 'idolatry consists in worshipping God under any other conception of Him than that which is set before us in the Gospels' (Archbishop William Temple);

"6.—Many members of the Church of England enter Freemasonry without realizing its doctrinal implications:

"A Committee of the Lower House be appointed to inquire whether the theological implications of Freemasonry, as distinct from its benevolent activities, are compatible with the Christian faith as held by the Church of England, and to report."

Mr. Hannah attacks Freemasonry on the grounds that it has "a ritual based on various primitive mystery cults." He brands it as "an easy and pleasant substitute for religion." "The well-known presence of bishops and other clergymen at lodge meetings," he continues, "has lulled the apprehensions of the average non-Mason into the widely accepted belief that Freemasonry is no more than a benevolent society, full of sociability and high moral principle" (according to *Reynolds News*, February 4, 1951, No. 5,239, "Dr. Fisher [Archbishop of Canterbury] is a prominent Freemason"). Another quote from Mr. Hannah: "Freemasons may claim that these pre-Christian beliefs have much of moral value. But to revert to these shadowy types and secret mysteries of bygone centuries is to go behind Christ's back and to dishonor the Incarnation. Rome has spoken out loudly and clearly in condemnation of Freemasonry. A Methodist conference in Bradford in 1927 condemned the craft. Is the Church of England too mortally involved with the heresy to speak her mind?"

From the reactions of readers of which *Reynolds News* published almost fifty, we reproduce a few samples. C. E. M. Joad, distinguished British philosopher, tries to get out from under the controversy by observing: "Freemasonry is a harmless device for amusing men who are insufficiently grown up by introducing a little pageantry into their glamour-starved lives, helping them to feel important (for an evening) and enabling them to get away from their wives. I see no harm in it at all, but I cannot believe that it is of the slightest importance." A Scotsman from Glasgow writes: "The bigotry and intolerance of Freemasonry in Scotland has to be experienced to be believed. The country is run by a dictatorship of Freemasonry; few persons can achieve any position in life if they are outside the cult." Dr. H. S.



Box, Rural Dean of Cuckfield and Proctor in Convocation for the Diocese of Chichester, writes: "I am convinced that Christians should have nothing to do with Freemasonry for these reasons: The innermost secret of Freemasonry (Royal Arch) is concerned with the nature of God. The name of Christ is excluded from mention in Masonic lodges. The names of two pagan deities, Baal and On, are solemnly pronounced in the Royal Arch ritual. According to universal Christian tradition, worship of God other than in the name of Christ is pagan."

The principal note struck by readers who defend Masonry is that non-Masons know nothing about Masonry though Mr. Hannah is repeatedly referred to in the materials before me as having spent three years in investigating Masonic literature. One reader writes: "It is obvious to a Mason that Mr. Hannah has never been initiated into Freemasonry. Therefore he has committed a grievous crime by writing on a subject about which he has no genuine knowledge." The same complaint has been frequently directed against Synod's Commission on Fraternal Organizations, sometimes with insulting innuendos. Nevertheless, whenever the Commission, in reply to that complaint, quoted from factual and least doctrinaire interpretations of Masonry by Masons, such as Pike, Mackey, and Gould, our correspondents in no instance challenged our statements. Except for a few whining losers, they even failed to reply.

With respect to the question whether Freemasonry is a religion or not, we take the liberty to quote the opinion expressed by Mr. Hannah (*Reynolds News*, February 11, 1951, p. 3) as well as that expressed by Mr. Ernest Beha, editor of *The Freemason* (*Reynolds News*, February 25, 1951, p. 3). Mr. Hannah writes: "Masonry claims that it is not a religion. But Lodge meetings are opened and closed with prayer and sometimes hymns, and a Royal Arch motto is: 'We have found the worship of God, O citizen of the world,' which sounds very like religion to me. A religion entirely without Christ. They say that you can believe in Christ, too, as long as you never mention His name in the Lodge. But I don't think St. Paul would have approved of that limitation, and the Christian who believes in Christ as God's supreme revelation of truth cannot regard all religions as equal in the way Grand Lodge appears to do." And here is Mr. Beha: "The primary basis of Freemasonry is admittedly religion, but it is not a substitute for any form of religious belief or divine worship, and I would emphasize, contradictorily to any suggestion that this is the case, that no masonic meeting, purely as such, is held on the Sabbath. The plain



fact of the religious aspect is that every Lodge is dedicated to God and His service—and this precept is a bridge that unites all people who believe in God and so presents a common ground for service to humanity, irrespective of class or creed, for Jews, Gentiles, Mohammedans, and Hindus alike." Comments not necessary. P. M. B.

#### THE EVANGELICAL FAITH COMES BACK

Under the heading "The Theological Trend," Prof. J. R. Mantey, head of the department of New Testament at Northern Baptist Theological Seminary (Chicago), in the *Watchman-Examiner* (February 1, 1951), enumerates many indications that "the evangelical faith comes back into its own." He points, for example, to *Look* magazine (January 2, 1951), which, in an article by L. W. Gillenson, "A Religious Revival Stirs America," declares that "more people are attending regular church services and uniting with churches than ever before, and that more people are attending services and being converted in meetings conducted by Billy Graham than in services held under Dwight L. Moody or 'Billy' Sunday."

Among other "indications" that he mentions are the following: "Religious books rank among the best sellers. Favorable response to the preaching of the Gospel to men in our Armed Services is exceptional. The response to religious services in schools is most heartening. Dr. Robert A. Millikan says that, whereas only twelve per cent of older American scientists are church members, forty-four per cent of the younger scientists are church-affiliated."

Dr. Mantey marks also a noticeable "increase in a return to accepting the Bible as God's inspired revelation." In a conference of seminary professors at Green Lake, Wis., some time ago a professor who still championed "a liberal, diluted type of Christianity was found weeping in his room because he was so much alone in advocating a decadent and unsuccessful system of belief. Younger men on the faculties of these various seminaries . . . had returned to the faith of their forefathers, accepting Christ as the only Savior and the Bible as the only revelation from God."

That the return to the evangelical faith is largely sponsored by younger professors is attested by the following: "A professor in a large, well-known, non-Baptist seminary recently stated that the most orthodox members, with one or two exceptions, on the faculty of his school are young men holding Ph. D. degrees from a certain university that is anything but orthodox."

Quoting a number of recent books, in particular, some belonging



into his special field, he expresses the opinion that "the most popular of the recent books in the theological field are definitely and increasingly evangelical in their advocacy." But what is more, also "the Bible is coming back into its own." He writes: "The emphasis these days is no longer on a philosophical approach to man's problems, as it was a few years ago. But rather it is on Biblical theology, on what God has to say about man as a sinner, and on what man needs to do to find and retain God's favor."

Dr. Mantey closes his refreshing article by saying: "In view of this wholesome and prevalent trend toward the evangelical position, we can all thank God and take courage. . . . Also, the recent trend of thinking should tend to make evangelicals more patient and helpful toward those who are less evangelical, for they need our prayers more than our criticism. Since they are moving in our direction, we need all the more to be patient."

They need, however, also our kindly, sympathetic witnessing. Conservative Lutheranism, just because of its peculiar orientation to the principles of Scripture and grace, should recognize in the present theological trend to return to the Christian faith a challenge to assist those who now again seek the divine truth. Let it be our glorious mission not only to enlarge our home and foreign missions, but also to draw into theological discussions and so to the study of the divine Word whomever we may interest, at home and abroad, in the precious heritage of evangelical doctrine which is ours in a special sense by virtue of Luther's Reformation.

J. T. MUELLER

#### NEO-THOMISM ONCE MORE

Neo-Thomism was one of the topics of discussion at the Bad Boll conferences in 1949. Two of the essays devoted to this subject were subsequently published in the *Evangelisch-Lutherische Kirchenzeitung* (October 21 and November 15, 1949). Authors of these essays were Professor Eduard Ellwein of Neuendettelsau and the undersigned (my own essay appeared also, in substance, in our MONTHLY in April, 1950). In a later issue of the *Kirchenzeitung* (July 15, 1950) Pastor Adolf Ortenburger of Germany adds a number of most significant observations to those made in the articles referred to. His article bears the title "Die kulturgeschichtlich-symptomatische Bedeutung des Neo-Thomismus." We believe the contribution by Rev. Ortenburger to be so valuable that we are submitting its most vital paragraphs. Rev. Ortenburger writes:

"The person with an optimistic bent of mind and vulnerable to mass



suggestion, especially to current 'ecumaniac' tendencies, might gain the impression that the Roman Catholic Church and the Lutheran Church, tired of past controversies and misunderstandings, will, within the foreseeable future, resolve the last few remaining differences which result from Rome's attachment to Aristotelian philosophy, and become reconciled. For has it not been said that the Catholic Church has preserved 'apostolic elements' inasmuch as she defends the 'absolute sovereignty of God,' teaches a 'theocentric theology,' stresses Paul's concept of 'the mystical body of Christ,' yes, even extols the 'grace of God'? And are there not at present interchanges of thought between Evangelical and Roman theologians? To all this I must reply that the Roman Church will not tolerate fraternization beyond certain limits and that those of her theologians who dare to cross that limit will meet the fate of Doellinger, Loisy, Murri, and others. Furthermore, a church which prides herself to be the 'alone-saving' and 'infallible' church, cannot grant equal status to other churches. The Roman Church indeed possesses in rare measure the gift of elastically accommodating herself to historical crises, but she never loses sight of her aim since she almost instinctively discerns the difference between essentials and non-essentials. In the last analysis, the Roman Church insists on only *one* essential: submission to the Pope. As the 'religious' Pope, Pius X indeed began his pontificate with the pious declaration 'instaurare omnia in Christo.' But 'to renew all things in Christ' meant for him to make the entire world subject to the Pope. Thus there rests on the 'absolute sovereignty of God' and the 'theocentric theology' promoted by the Roman Church an ominous twilight which disturbs one all the more when one remembers that it was Thomas who said 'quod subesse Romano Pontifici sit de necessitate salutis.' Thomas demands this submission from the states and princes. Being under the sovereignty of the vicar of Christ, they should fulfill their highest calling, that is, be concerned about the preservation of peace. If a prince neglects this supreme duty, the Pope has, according to Thomas, the right to release his subjects from their oath.

"Luther's position regarding popery is well known. Yet we need to remember that Luther formed his opinion of popery not as a result of his contacts with worthy or unworthy successors of St. Peter. He knew well enough that even a pope could not be expected to be perfect. Luther rather saw in popery the embodiment of antichristian forces. For him the antichristian element in popery lies in the fact that 'the Pope has wished to be called the supreme head of the Christian Church by divine right. Accordingly he had to make himself equal



and superior to Christ and had to cause himself to be proclaimed the head and then the lord of the Church, and finally of the whole world, and simply God on earth, until he has dared to issue commands even to the angels in heaven' (*Smalcald Articles*, Part II, Art. IV, 12; see *Triglot*, pp. 474—75). What Luther here says is historically true.

"In his theological system, Thomas also finds a place for the manner in which heretics are to be dealt with. For him heresy is deserving of death. He bases his argument on Tit. 3, 10: 'A man that is an heretic after the first and second admonition reject.' The Roman Church, as is well known, made most effective use of this argument, particularly in Spain and France, where thousands of 'heretics' were burned at the stake. Whoever wishes to study in detail the inhuman brutalities perpetrated by the Roman Church, let him read Ranke's *History of the Popes*, the sections dealing with the Counter Reformation, or the monograph *The Counter Reformation in Silesia* by Heinrich Ziegler. The Rome pictured here is the true Rome.

"Also the concept of 'grace' in Thomistic theology is not synonymous with the Biblical concept of grace and with that current in the churches of the Reformation. In Neo-Thomistic theology, 'grace' is not the pardoning love of God, but a *habitus*, a quality in man. It is regarded as a substance, as the term 'gratia infusa' suggests, a stuff which, operating like medicine, transforms man. Thomas writes: 'Deus infundit aliquas formas seu qualitates supernaturales, secundum quas suaviter et prompte ab ipso moveantur ad bonum aeternum consequendum.' He therefore indeed maintains the necessity of grace but regards it as a 'donum superadditum.'

"This concept of 'grace' as a mysterious physical stuff and force and as a communication of 'real' ('dinglich') rather than 'ideal' gifts is most evident in Thomas à Kempis' *Imitation of Christ*. In this work, the term 'grace' occurs at least hundred times, but always either in the most general sense of God's kind disposition or in the specific Catholic sense of a supernatural gift poured into the soul, as one can gather from the following expressions and judgments: God's grace and comfort, God's grace and friendship, grace and freedom of the children of God, grace and love, goodness and grace, rich in God's grace and virtue, the grace of devotion, infused grace, grace shuns all evil appearance, grace rejoices in labor, grace does not cling to temporal things, grace loves also the enemies, grace is a supernatural light, etc.

"With reference to Thomas' doctrine of the sacrifice in the mass, his classical statement 'hoc sacramentum dicitur sacrificium, inquantum



repraesentat ipsam passionem Christi' flatly contradicts the formulation of the Tridentine Council (Sess. XXII): 'Si quis dixerit in missa non offerri Dei verum et proprium sacrificium—anathema sit.' And, so the declaration of the Council continues, the sacrifice is brought 'non solum pro vivorum fidelium peccatis, poenis, satisfactionibus, sed et pro defunctis in Christo nondum ad plenum purgatis.' The sacrifice in the mass is therefore interpreted to be an expiatory sacrifice in the literal sense of the term. Roman theology thus finds itself in the embarrassing situation of being committed to the Tridentine interpretation of the mass and at the same time paying homage to its greatest teacher, Thomas, who spiritualized the sacrament. On the other hand, Rome may be said to be in the fortunate position of rescuing its dogma of the mass by surrendering it and spiritualizing it in a way which would have satisfied even the Zwickau prophets and Enthusiasts.

"But now let us cast a glance at the cultural and historical features of Thomism. That is, let us place Thomas into that larger context of thought and culture which he, too, represents. In Thomas scholastic thought and theology reached its zenith. This phenomenal development of classic scholasticism had its source, however, outside the Medieval Church and its theology. It was the result of the so-called 'Renaissance,' a movement which introduced completely new areas of knowledge and whose basis was the philosophy of Aristotle known until that time almost exclusively because of his works on logic. Although indeed some radical opponents of ecclesiastical Christianity employed weapons forged by Aristotle in order to crack and undermine the foundations of the faith of the Church, a serious threat to medieval Christianity was hardly thinkable since the hierarchy in the days of Innocent III was not only externally, but also intellectually at the peak of its power. Furthermore, medieval schoolmen soon noted that what the rediscovered Aristotle had offered both formally and in terms of content especially in such neutral areas of thought as natural science, psychology, metaphysics, and ethics, could well be employed for the purpose of confirming and methodically supporting convictions which they shared with him. The result was that Aristotle, this Greek pagan, whom Luther was destined to call the 'most impudent slanderer and most wily deceiver of spirits' was placed alongside John the Baptist, the 'praecursor Christi in gratiis,' as the 'praecursor Christi in naturalibus.'

"This leads to another development in Thomism of which not only church history, but also the history of culture in general must take



note. It is the extravagant, almost idolatrous veneration shown Thomas in the Roman Church. To begin with, let me call attention to some of the sugary epithets heaped on Thomas. He is known as 'doctor angelicus,' 'doctor universalis,' 'doctor ecclesiae,' 'angelus scholae,' 'pater ecclesiae,' 'alter Augustinus,' all epithets which can do no one any good whoever he might be. In the great Paris edition of 1560, one reads the following dedication: 'Aeternae sapientiae voci, splendidissimae trinitatis oraculo, incarnati verbi splendori, angelorum socio,' etc. In the same edition Thomas is called *sol, luna, lumen, decus, gemma, fons, flos, princeps, sanctissimus inter doctissimos, doctissimus inter sanctos* . . . 'in theologia nullus sublimior, in mathematica nullus acutior, in philosophia nullus profundior, in logica nullus subtilior, tacente Thoma mutus Aristoteles. Tolle Thomam, et dissipabo ecclesiam. Thomas est splendidissimus athleta catholicae fidei, clypeus militantis ecclesiae, ensis, quo hydrae amputantur, ignis, quo, ne succenseant, consumuntur. Omnes haereses ante se et post se profligavit, solus sufficit ad tuendum. Tot miracula, quot articulos fecit. Aenigmata dissolvit, nodos rescindit, fallacias eludit, nubes obscuras resolvat.' But worse than that. Thomas is placed on a level with St. Paul. In the wake of his passing, signs and miracles were said to have taken place. The story of the superstitious treatment of his remains and the distribution of various parts of his body is so offensive and in violation of one's sense of propriety that my pen refuses to record it. An interesting painting of the fifteenth century in the Louvre in Paris shows Thomas enthroned between Aristotle and Plato, rays of the sun emanate from his breast, and a legend underneath says: 'Vere, hic est lumen ecclesiae.' We Evangelical Christians know only one who could say: 'I am the Light of the world.' That any one teacher in our Church—and we, too, have had teachers of great stature—should be venerated as Thomas is venerated, is for us a perfectly unthinkable thought.

"Nevertheless, infractions noted above are harmless compared with the endeavor of the Roman Church to bind the consciences of people to the end of time to the philosophic and theological views of a man who lived in the thirteenth century. At this point one may even disregard completely the errors in Thomas which the Roman Church shares with him to this day. The fact is that soon after his death the teachings of Thomas became canonical for the Occidental Church, and again and again Rome declared his teachings to be the norm of knowledge and the salvation of society. Even Leo XIII declared in his encyclical *Aeterni Patris Unigenitus* (August 4, 1879) scholastic



philosophy and especially the teachings of Thomas to be the foundation of all theological studies in schools and seminaries from which no one could be permitted to deviate. Pius X solemnly confirmed the proclamation of Leo XIII. Yet these decrees fly in the face of all cultural development, for, as anyone can know, philosophic systems replace one another with such rapidity that, what is affirmed in one century, is denied in the next. Yes, even at their birth, the twins known as Thomism and Scotism were hostile to each other like Esau and Jacob.

"The question arises: Why does the Catholic Church cling so tenaciously to the teachings of Thomas? This will become clear to us as we endeavor to understand Neo-Thomism from the point of view of its cultural significance. Neo-Thomism may be understood to be either a thorough repristination of Thomism or an adaptation of Thomism to the most characteristic features of a given period. A Neo-Thomistic tempest has repeatedly broken loose on the world. The fifteenth century, for instance, witnessed such a return to Thomism induced by the dissolution of scholasticism resulting from the dangerous advances of humanism and renaissance. We understand humanism to be, in general, a resurgence of interest in Greek and Latin antiquity including its highly developed languages. Humanism is part of the so-called renaissance, that is, of the rebirth of classical antiquity and its influence on the arts and sciences, literature, society, conventions and customs, and an emphasis on the individual's personal freedom. Renaissance and humanism developed differently, however, in Germany than in countries like France and Italy. One need think only—not to mention Erasmus and Reuchlin—of the combination of humanism and the Gospel as represented in Melanchthon, whereas in Italy knowledge of the classical languages was frequently misused for the purpose of assigning mythological names to objects and persons of the Christian faith. In the Italian renaissance and humanism, God is called 'Zeus Kronion' or 'Jupiter optimus maximus.' Christ becomes 'Apollo,' the Holy Spirit 'Zephyr,' and the Virgin Mary 'Pallas,' or 'Niobe,' or 'regina sacra potens Olympi.' And how did Boccaccio describe Easter? It is for him the day 'on which man celebrates the glorious return of the son of Jupiter from the spoiled kingdom of Pluto.' In a tribute to a Christian advanced in years, Boccaccio writes: 'May he, when he leaves this earth, joyfully participate in the banquets of the gods.'

"Yet all this is harmless alongside the violations of moral principles which the spirit of the renaissance tried to justify on the grounds that it was a 'rebirth for freedom.' It was not the new man



who was born. It was not a regeneration through divine grace. It was not the 'freedom of the Christian man' extolled by Luther. On the contrary, this 'rebirth' was no more than the uninhibited exhibition of man's natural and sinful impulses. Man was encouraged to live out his life without giving undue attention to moral checks and balances. Even Jakob Burckhardt, who certainly was sympathetic to the whole renaissance movement, admitted that in the Italian renaissance marriage was violated more frequently and more deliberately than elsewhere. What concerns us, however, chiefly is the fact that the renaissance man also attacked the irrational and offensive developments in the Roman Church. Together with its superstitions, he also threw overboard faith and endeavored, in opposition to the artificial limitations placed on life and the false renunciation of life advocated by the Church, an unqualified and therefore equally objectionable affirmation of life.

"The reply of the Roman Church to the attacks made by the renaissance was Neo-Thomism. In fact, Neo-Thomism has invariably been the reply when the Roman Church believed itself threatened in its innermost existence. Let us concentrate on the modern period. The syllabus of Pope Pius IX of 1864 and the encyclical *Quanta cura* dated December 8, 1864, represent a general condemnation of modern culture and the modern state. Both appeared at a time when modern science was proudly raising its head. It was the time when science believed it could, with the help of Darwinism, solve all riddles of the universe without God and the Church. But it was in particular the syllabus of Pius X *Lamentabili* dated July 3, 1907, and the encyclical *Pascendi dominici gregis* dated September 8, 1907, which were a trumpet blast against 'modernism' and which urged the study of Thomas as the antidote against the destructive errors of the day. The Protestant reader might almost gain the impression that the Pope had directed himself against German theology as such. Yet the syllabus addressed itself to 'inter catholicos non ita paucos scriptores, qui praetergressi fines a Patribus ac ab ipsa Sancta Ecclesia statutos altioris intelligentiae specie et historicae considerationis nomine eum dogmatum progressum quaerunt, qui reipsa eorum corruptela est.' And the encyclical declares that it is addressing itself to enemies within the family, to a large number of Catholic priests and laymen who, though protesting their love for the Church, lack a solid philosophical and theological training and are presuming to introduce reforms into the Church. Therefore 'Hannibal ante portas!' had already



in the guise of 'reformed' Catholicism penetrated into the very sacred precincts of the Catholic Church.

"But what is the real point at issue against which modern Neo-Thomism is reacting? It is Rome's fear of the researches of modern science and of the historical method. . . . In opposing this modern movement, the Roman Church has, in addition to Thomas, nothing to offer except coercive measures, police regulations, vigilance committees, the Index, strict censorship, 'non-imprimatur,' etc. No one, of course, resorts to final measures unless he is persuaded that it is a case of 'to be or not to be.' The encyclical issued by Pius X and referred to above, however, openly and repeatedly declares: The opponents are determined to destroy the power of the Church and thus the kingdom of Christ; therefore 'procul, procul esto a sacro ordine novitatum amor!' Whether Rome will be able, by resorting to coercive measures, to hold its fort, only the future can tell. But her threats prove the spiritual bankruptcy of the Roman system. They also mean that the Pope no longer has faith in the power of Catholic Christianity to overcome scientific 'modernism' through scientific theological research. Therefore he seeks refuge behind, and support from, Thomas. However, if the colossus stands on feet of clay, then the Church indeed has reason to fear every stone which might touch its feet. Therefore every appearance of Thomism in history is a call to arms, a symptom that the Roman Church feels itself threatened in its nerve center, and, to say it concretely, a declaration of war against the freedom of scientific, especially of historical, research.

"One word in passing. In the background of Neo-Thomism lies the question of faith and knowledge. This question is not solved by Thomas, who sets up the axiom that there is no disagreement between the natural and supernatural knowledge of God, because for him the axioms of thought and the mysteries of faith stem from the same God. Yet the Scriptures clearly state: 'Natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God; for they are foolishness unto him; neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.' Nevertheless, the difficult problem of a 'Christian philosophy' may be deserving of a special investigation."

PAUL M. BRETSCHER

#### AN INSPIRING MISSION TALE

Ernest Gordon, in the *Sunday School Times* (February 3, 1951), narrates the following gripping mission story:

M. [Monsieur] Charles Cook died last September from a wound in the head received three years before when he was chaplain in



the French army, for he was French although bearing an English name.

His mission field was at Aures in the Saharan Atlas Mountains. His mission folk were the Chaouias, 80,000 of them, living in extreme poverty, such poverty indeed that they were despised by all other North Africans. Their language had no relation to Arabic and contained few Berber words. It is perhaps a corruption of the Punic of Hannibal's day, never reduced to writing, or possibly some old dialect coming from Palestine or Persia. No one knows.

A most unattractive field, yet M. Cook chose it for his life testimony. As he and his wife could not live in the mountains, they settled for eight years in the little garrison town of Baina, some twenty kilometers from the field proper. Thence M. Cook made solitary expeditions, pack on back, preaching the Gospel everywhere to any who would listen. Few these were at first. "God? There is none; we believe nothing; we do not care to listen." In time he spoke the Chaouia dialect so well that he was even suspected of being a renegade from the Chaouia people.

In winter he traveled on skis, which seems strange for North Africa, but the snows are deep in the Atlas Mountains. Finally, by a providential turn, the only stone house in Menaa, the capital of Aures with its 3,500 inhabitants, came into his hands, and he was able to move there. In winter it was often hard to get supplies through, because of snow blockades. Because of his relief work, the people became more receptive. Their confidence was won. He was their poor man's advocate. They consulted him on all sorts of matters and often followed his advice.

Things were brightening, and the days of harvest seemed in sight. Then came the war. M. Cook was mobilized. The wound he received brought on multiple fainting spells, to which he finally succumbed. His hope of an abundant ingathering was not realized. He was at any rate another faithful witness, welcomed into the joy of the Lord. The ingathering will yet come, someday.

It is well for us to note such heroic, self-sacrificing mission efforts when the little daily worries of our own sheltered life sometimes appear to us as overwhelmingly great. And what a tale to tell to the young men who go out into foreign service to minister to the Lord's elect under difficult circumstances!

In the same "survey" Dr. Gordon, by the way, reports the founding of the first university in Uganda by the government. One of its instructors will be Carey Francis, a direct descendant of the pioneer missionary to India, William Carey. There is an initial student body of two hundred, largely drawn from mission schools. J. T. MUELLER



## THE MCCOLLUM DECISION: THREE YEARS AFTER

*America* (February 24, 1951) affords its readers an overview of what happened to the McCollum decision since it was made three years ago. It says (quoted in part):

"The most significant news to report on the third anniversary of the McCollum decision, outlawing 'released time' religious instruction on public school premises, is this: In no 'court of record,' i.e., in no court above the municipal and county level, has that decision been applied as the controlling precedent."

The nearest approach to such an application, it next states, occurred in California on April 29, 1950, when the Court of Appeals of the Ninth Circuit disallowed the claim of some Jehovah's Witnesses. They contended that a California property tax (California being the only State which taxes church property) violated their religious liberty. The court rejected this claim on the ground that California could levy a tax on religious goods and religious literature because the State provided police and fire protection for such religious commodities. At the end of their opinion the judges noted that if the State were to provide this protection gratis, without levying taxes in payment therefor, it would be using public funds to "support" religion, in violation of the McCollum decision.

Even in dissenting opinions, the report proceeds, no Federal and only three State judges have invoked the McCollum doctrine. Justice Wolfe of Utah's State Supreme Court invoked it on July 24, 1948, in a decision involving a large grant of State money to Mormons (*Am. 7/2/49*, pp. 398—99). Justices Adel and Wenzel likewise invoked the McCollum doctrine in a "dismissed time" religious instruction case which was decided against them in the Appellate Division, Second Department of the New York State Supreme Court, on January 5, 1951.

The McCollum decision, according to the report, has been considered as a *possible* precedent in only three other cases. New York Supreme Court Justice Di Giovanna, in a decision rendered June 19, 1950, pointed out eight features of New York's system of "dismissed time" (commonly known, however, as "released time") religious instruction which distinguished it from the Champaign, Ill., system outlawed in the McCollum decision. The Supreme Court of the State of New Jersey on October 17, 1950, unanimously upheld the State law requiring "that a portion of the Holy Bible known as the Old Testament shall be read, or caused to be read, without comment, in each public school classroom. . . ." The law also permits the "repeating of the Lord's Prayer."



Even in Illinois, according to *America*, the decision was invalidated, for there the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois early in 1950 invalidated an Illinois statute granting great discretion to judges in divorce, annulment, and separate-maintenance proceedings. Among many reasons given for this decision one was that permitting judges to call in religious counselors ran afoul of the McCollum decision. The McCollum decision was applied, but not as the "controlling precedent" for the decision as a whole.

As time goes by, the article says, misgivings over the McCollum decision multiply. In a recent issue of the *Illinois Law Journal*, for example, Robert Fairchild Cushman, professor of political science at Ohio State University, stated that more confusion than clarity was added to our constitutional law by the Everson (1947) and McCollum (1948) decisions. He declared: "Religion does and should, as a part of the public, share in the benefits extended to the public in general," and "to hold otherwise is to adopt a position which would permit the State to make religion an outlaw having no rights which the State is bound to protect." In view of the confusion created by the decision, law students urge clarification. Still the future is uncertain. The article closes with the following words: "Late in February the parties of the New Jersey case involving the reading of the Bible and the recitations of the Lord's Prayer will file their briefs asking for Supreme Court review. If the high court accepts jurisdiction, it will have to pass on the constitutional validity of the long-standing American tradition of allowing passages from the Bible to be read, without comment, in the public school classrooms. The McCollum thesis will be directly at issue. The Court will have either to admit its previous error or defy the verdict of most legal experts that the McCollum decision went too far."

J. T. MUELLER

#### ROME AND THE HOLY YEAR

*America* (February 10, 1951) reports on the benefits which the "twenty-fifth and greatest jubilee," coming to an end by the closing of the "holy door" on Christmas Eve, 1950, brought to the Church and the world. It admits that no man can say whether the Holy Year was in fact the "occasion for the great infusion of grace in men's souls," for "that must be left to God's providence," but to some extent men can evaluate at least the "external manifestations of grace."

Which were they? To Rome, a "huge, sprawling city," "spreading rapidly out into the Campagna," there came an estimated number of "more than two million pilgrims." It is definitely known that 736,626



"foreigners in general" spent 3,099,233 days in Rome. There were definitely 137,734 Americans in Rome who spent 506,433 days in the Holy City. What "stood out," as one viewed these pilgrims, was "the very evident faith and hope of the pilgrims, rich and poor alike."

The 137,734 Americans, spending 506,433 days in Rome, spent a minimum of \$10 a day, which means that they left at least \$5,000,000 in the Holy City. Other foreigners may not have spent quite as much as did the Americans, but also their financial contributions were no doubt considerable.

Most of the money, as the article says, was received by the hotel owners and the merchants, especially the religious goods stores. We may add that the contributions at the various churches and charities seemed to be large, and it is certain that the numerous beggars in Rome received a gratifying share of the contributions.

The papal audiences were of course the chief center of attraction, as the writer rightly remarks. Twice a week for most of the year the Pope received 30,000 to 40,000 people in the Basilica, in addition to morning schedules of private and semiprivate audiences. During the summer months at his residence at Castel Gandolfo, he received thousands of pilgrims every day. Sometimes the courtyard was filled twice a night, and it holds 5,000. St. Peter's Square was filled on Easter Sunday; on the feast of Corpus Christi, for the canonization of St. Maria Goretti; and for the definition of the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin on All Saints' Day. The Square and the adjoining Via della Conciliazione hold about 135,000 people. Numerous other appearances of the Holy Father took place at various times and at various places, and all were attended by large numbers of people.

During the Holy Year, Rome was host to a number of conventions, of philosophers, doctors of medicine, doctors of theology, and so forth. In September alone there were ten international congresses, the attendances at which were large.

Speaking of the many pilgrims and their evident piety, the writer says: "It just does not seem consonant with our idea of God's love for us that He could forbear to pour great graces into the hearts of the many people who have shown this year their real efforts, despite all their difficulties, to love Him more."

As one who spent some time in Rome during the last summer the undersigned would remark that he finds the general tone and tenor of the report very sober. Rome was attended by many pilgrims even in the oppressive heat of the summer, and for the greater part they seemed serious, especially those that came from Germany and Austria. But



we might add to the article a number of other things that seem important.

On the whole, the Italian — or, let us say, Roman — populace did not take the Holy Year very seriously. While in general they received the visitors in a friendly way, there was noticeable everywhere the spirit of mundane gaiety, money making, and, wherever there was an expression of piety, of formalism. The Pope very wisely warned the pilgrims not to be offended at what they saw or heard at Rome, a warning which seemed quite necessary at times.

But there was more. Rome is a city of contrasts also in religion. While there was bigoted piety, there was also evident rebellion against the Church, and Communism in places and at times did not conceal its abhorrence of the superstition manifested in so many ways.

For the Lutherans and other Protestants the Holy Year was one of deep study of the fundamental difference between Rome and Wittenberg. Numerous articles in English, German, Austrian, and other European periodicals appeared in which the greater cleavage between Romanism and Protestantism, produced especially by the definition of the Assumption of Mary, was almost vehemently stressed. Thus Rome's glory became her shame, for evangelical Christianity was made to realize that the "holy year," with the offensive dogma in which it culminated, was a new disavowal of Christendom's fundamentals: the *sola Scriptura* and the *sola gratia*, and so a new and definite repudiation of the Reformation.

J. T. MUELLER

#### REPEAL AFTER TWENTY YEARS

The *Christian Century* (February 14, 1951) contains an article under the given heading which draws a terrifying picture of the tragic effects of the abuse of alcoholic beverages upon thousands in our country. One instinctively feels that here all Christian citizens should work together for law and order against the criminal elements that ply the lawless liquor trade to the physical and spiritual ruin of countless numbers of young and old people in our land. A few sentences quoted at random will suffice to depict the horror of the situation. We read:

"When the Prohibition Amendment was repealed in 1932, the Administration and the liquor trade agreed with the prevailing sentiment of the time that under repeal there would be much less drinking and crime due to drinking. After almost twenty years' experience, let us impartially and factually review the evidence. The record is to be found in the courts, hospitals, homes, and industries of the nation."

The following paragraph is a good summary of the harm that has



been done, and is still being done, by the wholesale abuse of alcoholic beverages:

"There are now 482,000 legal retail liquor outlets in the country. The best estimates indicate that there are 50 million people above voting age who drink and that of this number 10 million are heavy drinkers. These figures are the highest in our history. According to the Department of Commerce, Americans are spending about \$9 billion a year for alcoholic beverages. This compares with \$2 billion spent in 1932. In 1933 the per-capita consumption of alcoholic beverages was 1.69 gallons. In 1947 it was 27.25 gallons. FBI figures show that during these twenty years of repeal, arrests for drunkenness increased 197 per cent. Arrests for driving while intoxicated increased 122 per cent. Arrests of women for drunkenness increased fivefold. In one city, Los Angeles, arrests for drunkenness in proportion to population increased 14 fold during this period."

Equally horrifying is the picture which the writer paints of the rule of gangsters in connection with the destructive liquor trade. He says:

"Prohibition was roundly condemned because it fostered gangsters and racketeers like Al Capone. Twenty years after, we have syndicates of goons and lobbyists in operation that make the old Capone mob look like amateurs, and the new Capone mob has added some tricks to its bag. These extensive criminal operations are supported by legal and illegal liquor. Their lawless threat is so great that a number of newspapers recently began to report the situation, and the United States Senate has set up a crime commission to investigate it. This body has cited, with documentation, the case of Charles Binaggio of Kansas City (lately murdered), a racketeer politician who was 'second only to Governor Smith in Missouri political circles. . . .'

"California's Governor Warren has said that in that State a man by the name of Arthur H. Samish has more power than the Governor on matters that affect his clients. Samish himself boasts that he is the governor of the Legislature. Who is this secret boss of one of our greatest States? He is the legislative lobbyist of the California State Brewers' Institute. . . .

"Then there is Frank Costello. Mayor Morrison of New Orleans, president of the American Municipal Association, representing the governments of 9,500 cities and towns, declares that the nation-wide crime syndicate headed by Costello is so powerful that it threatens to take over the government of several of the nation's key cities. . . .

"Bootlegging was supposed to pass out of the picture with legalized drink. However, the Florida crime commission records show that there



was never a year under prohibition when as many bootleggers were arrested as have been arrested each and every year since. And the Chicago Juvenile Protective Association reported that 66 per cent of all complaints it received concerned illegal conditions in places selling liquor.

"On the other hand, it is the legal sale of alcoholic beverages that causes most trouble for the law-enforcement people. The final report of the Los Angeles grand jury for 1948 stated: 'Our jails and prisons are crowded; our courts and police organizations are burdened; our law-enforcement and social-welfare problems are seriously aggravated because of the licensed liquor traffic. . . .'

"Similar reports come from every section of the country. The last State to analyze the cost of alcohol was Massachusetts. . . . It [the report] showed that 50 per cent of the felonies and 85 per cent of the misdemeanors are due to alcohol. Insanity caused by alcohol cost the State \$4 million a year; crime caused by alcohol cost \$6 million a year. The cost of financial dependence on charity caused by alcohol was \$51 million a year. The care of chronic alcoholics alone cost the State \$61 million a year, or 4.5 times the State revenue from liquor taxes.

"Mayor Martin Kennelly of Chicago says that 80 per cent of all cases sent to the Chicago lockups involve alcohol. City Judge George J. Grellner of St. Louis reports: 'Excessive drinking is responsible for most of the crime, broken homes, business failures, and juvenile delinquency in St. Louis. . . .' Judge John J. King of Columbus, Ohio, stated that 80 per cent of the crimes there were committed under the influence of drink. In Washington, D.C., 14,000 out of the 19,000 arrests made in 1949 were for drunkenness."

And so the story goes on. The question is: What can we who are Christian citizens do to assist our lawful Government to fight this wave of perdition which comes from the frightful abuse of liquor in our country? Congregations and pastoral conferences might do well to give this matter due attention in connection with their duty to "seek the peace of the city" (Jer. 29:7).

J. T. MUELLER

#### HOW THEY GET THAT WAY

Roman Catholics tell us that they agree with many of our teachings and regard some practices in the Catholic Church to be superstitious hocus-pocus, but that they are bound in their consciences to continue their affiliation with the Church in which they were born and reared. Though we cannot agree with them, we can at least understand their position. For we must remember that it is dinned into the minds and



hearts of Catholics from childhood days forward that the Catholic Church is the "only-saving" Church, that it was instituted by Christ, that it originated on Pentecost Day, and that Peter was its first Pope. What else can the Catholic layman brought up in this climate of thought conclude except that all other Christian churches are heretical bodies which ought to return to the mother Church. The argument advanced in Catholic thought runs about like this: "The Christians of the first century were all Catholics; Peter, Paul, the Christians in Jerusalem, etc., lived in the first century; therefore Peter, Paul, the Christians in Jerusalem, etc., were Catholics." And so one appreciates the dilemma in which the good Catholic neighbor finds himself who, though not blinded by the external glamor of his Church and occasionally displaying a genuine interest in Protestant teachings, nevertheless decides to stay with his Church on the grounds that, after all, it is the oldest Church, that it has the longest tradition, and that, therefore, the chances that it is Christ's true Church are at least ten to one.

Of course, the Catholic Church has propagated this egregious distortion of historical truth since the early Middle Ages. But only in modern times has it used all available means to propagandize this error. There is a reason for this propaganda. This teaching is basic in her whole system. Deny that the Catholic Church was instituted by Christ, that the Catholic Church as we know it originated in the first century, that Peter was the first Pope, and the foundations of the Catholic system begin to crumble. But does the Roman Church really teach all this in our day? Well, here are two little booklets, published for the Paulist Press by Gerald C. Treacy, S. J., which supply the evidence. The booklets carry the title "Bible Stories for Children" and in very simple language trace the content of the Book of Acts. Here are a few choice gems from these booklets. "St Peter, who was head of the Apostles and the first Pope, heard the whisper" (Acts 2). . . . "The people said to St. Peter, 'Give us baptism, we believe in the Catholic Church founded by Christ.'" . . . "The people who were baptized on Pentecost were the first Catholics. And they were good Catholics, too, learning the catechism from the Apostles and saying their prayers and going to Holy Mass and Holy Communion every day. These first Catholics lived like one big family" (Acts 2). . . . "Five thousand became Catholics after St. Peter had finished speaking" (Acts 4). . . . "When the Apostles at Jerusalem heard that so many people of Samaria had been baptized, they decided to send St. Peter and St. John to that city to give the people Confirmation. When



St. Peter and St. John got to Samaria, they called all the Catholics together. . . . This is how the first Catholics of Samaria were given the Sacrament of Confirmation" (Acts 8). Referring to the death of Herod (Acts 12), the author writes: "As he fell, a great number of worms came up out of the ground, climbed all over his outstretched body, and began to eat it. 'This is how he died because he did not honor God,' are St. Luke's words as he finished the first part of the Story of the First Catholics. It is a book called the Acts of the Apostles. It is the record of the Catholic Church in its first years."

A few more samples from the manner in which the life of Paul is presented. "Sergius Paulus was the first Proconsul of the Roman Empire to become a Catholic" (Acts 13). . . . "So the delegates went down to Antioch and calling all the Catholics to a meeting, delivered the letter to them. On reading the letter, the Antioch Catholics were delighted and encouraged" (Acts 15). . . . "When they reached Derbe and Lystra they met a man named Timothy whose mother was a Jewish Catholic. Timothy went along and did great things for the Church as a priest and a bishop" (Acts 16). . . . "Wherever they went on their travels they told the people the story of the Council of Jerusalem and what had been decided upon in regard to the Gentiles. The Council was the first ever held in the Church. The last Council was held in Rome in 1870 and is called the Vatican Council" (Acts 15). . . . "Lydia said to Paul, 'Now that you know that we are all Catholics, come into my house and stay here'" (Acts 16). . . . "When Paul and Silas left Philippi, they had a nice reunion with all the Catholics" (Acts 16). . . . "While at Troas one Sunday, Paul decided to give a very long sermon after he had offered Mass for the people. . . . At Troas, all the Catholics were gathered together in an upper room on the third story of a house where they always met for Holy Mass" (Acts 20).

Say it often enough, say it loudly enough, and people will believe you. Hitler knew the secret, Stalin knows the secret, modern advertisers over radio and television know it. But no one has mastered the trick of having people believe what you want them to believe so successfully as the powers that be in the Catholic Church. The antidote? Support of our pastors, development of our system of higher and parish education, more Christian literature, a more genuine interest in Lutheran theology, more fervent prayer, and, above all, more preaching of Christ and His Word as we know it from the Holy Scriptures.

P. M. B.



**BRIEF ITEMS FROM "RELIGIOUS NEWS SERVICE"**

Yale Divinity School has adopted a new "tailor-made" curriculum designed to fit students to individualized ministries. The new study program is an attempt to break away from the trend toward seminary "core" curricula or general education. Yale is introducing its new curriculum in order to put emphasis on various forms of specialized services, including the rural ministry, the ministry to industrial workers or to college students, and religious journalism. In order to achieve this fundamental reorganization, the entire three-year Bachelor of Divinity course of study has been divided into four major areas in which students can choose from a total of more than 150 courses. The first major area of study aims at giving the student a good knowledge of the Bible; the second provides a study of the history and teachings of the Christian Church; the third is devoted to an investigation of the character, culture, and social institutions of the people to whom the students will minister; the fourth comprises special group study to give students skill as competent workmen in a particular church vocation. First-year students work in the four major areas of the curriculum for a general grounding in theology and toward the end of the year will be required to take a course in "Varieties of the Christian Ministry," the last half of which will be devoted to vocational counseling. Only students who demonstrated adequate promise will be admitted to the second-year class and will be expected to elect a major in one of six prescribed vocational groups and present a written proposal of their program for the second and third years. The six vocational groups are: (1) The Preaching Ministry and Pastoral Service; (2) Foreign Missionary Service; (3) Religious Education in Church and School; (4) Christian Service in the Community; (5) Religious Leadership in Colleges; and (6) Teaching and Research in Religion.

Senator Ralph Flanders (R., Vt.) has introduced an amendment to the Constitution in the Senate which would declare that the United States "recognizes the authority and law of Jesus Christ." The text of the proposed amendment is as follows: "Section 1. This nation devoutly recognizes the authority and law of Jesus Christ, Savior and Ruler of nations, through whom are bestowed the blessings of Almighty God. Section 2. This amendment shall not be interpreted so as to result in the establishment of any particular ecclesiastical organization, or in the abridgment of the rights of religious freedom or freedom of speech and press or of peaceful assemblage. Section 3. Congress shall have power in such cases as it may deem proper to



provide a suitable oath or affirmation for citizens whose religious scruples prevent them from giving unqualified allegiance to the Constitution as herein amended."

The new version of the Old Testament authorized by the International Council of Religious Education is nearing completion. The first five books of the Old Testament are going to press now. By the end of summer the entire Old Testament will be in the hands of the printers. The distribution of the new version will begin September 30, 1952.

The Louis M. Rabinowitz Institute for research in rabbinics is getting ready to publish accurate texts of ancient rabbinic works. Dr. Louis Finkelstein says that project will take ten years and will cost \$250,000 to \$300,000. According to present plans nine books, including the Mishnah and its related texts, will be published. To make scientific editions possible, photographs of original manuscripts were made in the libraries of the British Museum, English universities, the Vatican, and the state libraries of Berlin and Vienna. Included in the investigation will be manuscripts in Geniza, a room in an ancient synagog in Cairo where lost Hebrew documents were stored for centuries until discovered by Dr. Solomon Schechter, a noted Jewish scholar.

The McCollum Decision of the United States Supreme Court dealt weekday religious education a serious blow two years ago. However, Dr. Erwin L. Shaver of Chicago said in his annual report to the Division of Christian Education of the National Council of Churches that weekday religious education has returned strongly in forty States. More than 2,250,000 children are sharing in the benefits of weekday religious programs. In his estimation the comeback is definite, especially in a half dozen States where the relinquishing of programs had been heaviest. (See p. 366.)

Dr. Truman B. Douglass of New York made a strong plea for Christian education in an address before the first meeting of the Division of Christian Education of the National Council of Churches. He based his plea on the fact that public education toward religion has shifted to a neutrality very close to indifference and so amounts to practical atheism.

Chinese Communists are opposing the missionary movement in China on the ground that it is guilty of "cultural aggression." Writing from Hong Kong, Dr. Baker James Cauthen, secretary of the Southern



Baptist Foreign Mission Board, said the Communists see missionary work as a bond of good will between America and the people of China and therefore they are trying to break down this bond by accusing the missionaries of "cultural aggression."

The Sudan legislature has passed a law giving Moslem missionaries permission to work in the South Sudan under the same conditions applying to Christian missionaries. In addition to this law, the legislature passed an additional law which puts a heavy burden on Christian mission schools by making Arabic the official language of the whole of tribal Sudan. Missionaries report that it is extremely difficult to find Arabic-speaking Christians who can undertake this extra language work.

The Iowa Senate Schools Committee is considering a bill which would broaden religious teaching in Iowa public schools. Under the terms of the bill, teachers in all schools would be permitted to "teach the philosophy of Christianity," say the Lord's Prayer, read and discuss the Bible as it is recorded in the Old and New Testaments. The bill also gives children in public schools the privilege of reading and discussing Holy Scripture, and permitting schools to discuss and explain the Ten Commandments.

Two South Korean churchmen, Dr. Hyunki J. Lew, Methodist, and the Rev. Kyung-Chik Han, Presbyterian, have brought some bloody reports to the United States about Communist activity against church people in their homeland. According to their report the United Nations forces found about 75% of all clergymen killed or taken captive when they crossed the 38th parallel last September. They also discovered that in Sunchun more than forty church elders and deacons had been rounded up in a valley and shot down by the Communists. They also said that in Shinchun, Communist troops had stormed into a Presbyterian church during services and shot and killed in cold blood many of the worshipers and the church pastor with machine guns.

The evangelical community of Katerini, the largest Protestant constituency in Greece, was busy building the first Protestant school in Greece. When the school was almost finished, the Greek Ministry of Education and Religion informed Dr. G. A. Hadjianтониου, moderator of the Greek Evangelical Church, that "a permit for the operation of an evangelical school cannot be granted, as no law provides for the separate operation of schools by each of the existing religious minorities in Greece."