

7-1-1938

Theological Observer. - Kirchlich-Zeitgeschichtliches

J. T. Muller

Concordia Seminary, St. Louis

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



Part of the [Practical Theology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Muller, J. T. (1938) "Theological Observer. - Kirchlich-Zeitgeschichtliches," *Concordia Theological Monthly*. Vol. 9 , Article 50.

Available at: <https://scholar.csl.edu/ctm/vol9/iss1/50>

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.

Theological Observer — Kirchlich-Zeitgeschichtliches

I. Amerika

Is the Bible the Word of God? — A manifesto issued by the Catholic Advisory Council (an Anglo-Catholic federation) against the *Report of the Commission on Christian Doctrine* (appointed by the archbishops of Canterbury and York) states in paragraph 2: "The Church of England has ever professed a profound reverence for the Bible as the written Word of God, divinely inspired and authoritatively recognized as such by the Church. The current easy rejection by some accredited teachers of plain testimonies of Holy Scripture — e. g., to the occurrence of miracles, the existence of an order of spiritual beings, both good and evil, and the eternal punishment of the finally impenitent — is clearly inconsistent with that Scriptural and historic Christianity to which the Church of England is irrevocably committed." Paragraph 3 points out that the Church of England "requires all priests at their ordination to promise that they will be 'ready with all faithful diligence to banish and drive away all erroneous and strange doctrines contrary to God's Word' and requires all bishops to renew this vow at their consecration." (Book of Common Prayer, on the Ordering of Priests: "Are you persuaded that the *Holy Scriptures* contain all doctrine required as necessary for eternal salvation through faith in Jesus Christ?" "Will you be ready, with all faithful diligence, to banish and drive away from the Church all erroneous and strange doctrines contrary to *God's Word*?" Articles of Religion, Art. VI: "*Holy Scripture* containeth all things necessary to salvation." Art. XXXIV: "Traditions and ceremonies may be changed . . . , so that nothing be ordained against *God's Word*.") The editor of the *Living Church* (May 4, 1938) states: "It is only fair to say, however, that there are undoubtedly many Anglo-Catholics both in England and in this country who would not fully endorse every statement made in the Anglo-Catholic manifesto. For our own part we find ourselves perhaps 95 per cent. in agreement with the manifesto, which we gladly hail as a timely and important document." He mentions and discusses several paragraphs with which he is in agreement. But he does not list paragraphs 2 and 3 among them. In fact, he refers to the six articles published in the February and March issues, covering the *Report of the Commission*, the concluding article of which series states: "The significance of this section of the *Report* lies chiefly in its bearing upon homiletics. As 'the method of direct appeal to isolated texts' is so evidently liable to error, it is to be expected that preaching from isolated texts will gradually give place to genuine expository preaching in which the Word of God contained" (italics in original) "in the Scripture will be sought, studied in all the light that modern scholarship affords, and then applied to problems of the modern world. . . . In forceful terms the Commission states its conviction that 'the authority of the Bible must not be interpreted as prejudging conclusions of historical, critical, and scientific investigation in any field.'" Paragraph 2 is one of the parts of the manifesto with which the *Living Church* does not agree.

The historical and scientific mistakes of the Bible do not permit the identification of Scripture with the Word of God. The best one can do is to say that the Scriptures contain the Word of God. We, on our part, are glad to note that the manifesto, wrong in many instances, upholds the old Christian teaching that "the Bible is the written Word of God, divinely inspired."

A similar pronouncement is made by the *Allg. E.-L. Kz.* (March 11, 1938), and we are glad to take note of it. "Die lutherischen Bekenntnisschriften sind sich uebereinstimmend darueber klar, dass letzte Quelle und Autoritaet alles Wissens um Gott das Wort Gottes ist. Unter ausdruecklicher Berufung auf Luther stellt daher die F. C. in der Solida Declaratio von dem summarischen Begriff fest, 'dass alleine Gottes Wort die einzige Richtschnur und Regel aller Lehre sein und bleiben solle.' Dieses Wort Gottes ist fuer das lutherische Bekenntnis in der Heiligen Schrift, oder wie es an andern Stellen heisst, in den prophetischen und apostolischen Schriften Alten und Neuen Testaments, 'dem reinen und lauterer Brunnen Israels' enthalten." And the writer does not mean that the Word of God is contained in the Scriptures. For later on he uses the phrase: "Das in die Bibel gefasste Wort Gottes." And again: "Aus den Worten der Bibel stroemt uns der Heilige Geist entgegen."

It is well to take note of such testimonies as these. The conditions which evoked the protest of the Catholic Advisory Council confront us, too; we, too, need to protest against the voices heard within the Lutheran Church of America, discrediting the Bible as the very Word of God, divinely inspired. We dare not keep silence when accredited teachers of the Church write a New Testament commentary incorporating the liberal view of the miracles. We protest against the un-Lutheran, unscriptural thesis proposed and defended at the Washington Debate by a spokesman for the United Lutheran Church: "As one writer on this question says: 'It [the Bible] has carried with it the husk as well as the kernel,' and in illustration of his meaning he quotes some stories of vengeance, cruelty, *lex talionis*, polygamy, adultery, which he relates." (See *CONC. THEOL. MTHLY.*, p. 359. — Dr. Snyder is quoting Dr. Alleman. See *Luth. Church Quart.*, July, 1936, p. 240.) Dr. Alleman tells us: "The Bible contains the Word of God. It is the rule of our faith because it enshrines the Word." (*Luth. Church Quart.*, l. c.) Our Confessions declare: The Bible is the Word of God. They identify Scripture and God's Word: "Die Schrift und Gottes Wort." "To teach men Scripture and that those admonished by the Word" (Apology, Art. 24, § 3). Men do not speak the Lutheran language who cannot state definitely, The Bible is the Word of God, but when they try to say it, stammer all sorts of restrictions and reservations: "The Bible, then, is the Word of God not because of any theoretical explanation of the method of divine inspiration, but because as one connected, harmonious, authentic, recorded whole, from beginning to end, the Sacred Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments are 'they which testify of Christ.'" (Dr. G. Drach, in *Luth. Church Quart.*, July, 1936, p. 246.) Dr. Alleman and Dr. Drach and the others say, "The Bible contains the Word of God." The Catalog of Testimonies says in the Conclusion: "God's Word is comprised in the Scriptures of the holy prophets and apostles" (*Trigl.*,

p. 1149). But there is a vast difference between the two statements, the difference between saying that parts of the Bible are not God's Word and that all of the Bible is God's Word. No, these men cannot speak Lutheran on this point. The best they can do is to say: "The Bible is the Word of God because it contains the Word of God." (J. A. W. Haas, in *What Is Lutheranism*, p. 176.) And we protest against such a statement as being an attempt to speak the language of the Confessions without uttering the full sense of the Confessions as to the full reliability of every part of Scripture. The present time demands a firm reaffirmation of the truth confessed in the Old Protestant standards, in the Episcopal Book of Common Prayer and in the Lutheran Book of Concord, as quoted above. E.

A Voice from the Augustana Synod.— In the *Lutheran Companion* of April 28, 1938, we find an article by George Stephenson, of the Department of History, University of Minnesota, having the title "Whither Augustana?" He lists the forces that bind the synod together and enumerates them as follows: 1. the lingering and still potent spirit of nationality; 2. the point of view and influence of the older leaders in the Augustana Synod, to whom Swedish is the language of childhood; 3. vested interests—schools, hospitals, orphan homes, even the synod and conferences themselves; 4. the liturgy of the Augustana Synod, which is different from that of other Lutheran bodies; 5. the natural inertia in the great body of the synod's membership.

Next he lists forces that work for Lutheran unity. 1. The virtual cessation of immigration from Sweden. As a result the Augustana Synod has become an English Lutheran body. 2. "With the exception of a single large and powerful body there are no formidable doctrinal walls that divide the Augustana Synod from sister synods." 3. Intra- and extramural proselyting in the Lutheran Church has almost entirely disappeared. 4. Controversies that formerly raged over certain questions—secret societies, amusements, the puritanical Sabbath, and the like—have largely vanished. 5. "Institutionalism is in the ascendancy in American Lutheranism, and in the Augustana Synod High Church tendencies are unmistakable. Vestments, gowns, and choir robes are among the adiaphora." 6. "The activity and influence of laymen in the Augustana Synod is a twentieth-century phenomenon, and it will increase. Many surprises would be in store for pastors in the Augustana Synod if they made a systematic effort to plumb the doctrinal depth of their parishioners. 7. There is not much interest among pastors and laymen in the history of the Augustana Synod. 8. Through the depression and the resulting financial difficulties of the synod and its conferences the desire has been strengthened to avoid duplication in education, in Home and Foreign Missions, etc. 9. "Events at home and abroad are moving with cataclysmic swiftness; the spirit of change is in the air. A feeling of instability permeates every branch of human activity. Can the Augustana Synod by erecting and maintaining walls shut out this nation-wide spirit?"

The last paragraph is arresting: "The Church needs Conservatives as well as Liberals. It is in even greater need of animated Conservatives and Liberals who have the courage and the intelligence to differ

from their fathers as well as to withstand what may appear to be an overwhelming majority of their contemporaries. Of such persons it may be said that they are the salt of the earth." The author should have pointed out that in matters of doctrine we have to insist on loyalty to the truth. In adiaphora it is well enough to have Conservatives and Liberals.

A.

Dr. Leander Keyser's Defense of Biblical Inspiration.—In 1935 the late Dr. Leander Keyser of the Hamma Divinity School (U. L. C.) published in *Christian Faith and Life* a sharp criticism of the Presbyterian Auburn Affirmation, under the title "That Famous Auburn Affirmation." The article is now being spread in pamphlet form by Fundamentalistic Presbyterians, since it briefly but strikingly proves the Unitarian character of the Auburn Affirmation. Among other things Dr. Keyser takes issue with the modernistic authors and signers of the Auburn Affirmation on account of their repudiation of Biblical inspiration. Dr. Keyser writes: "Let us note what they say on the question of the inerrancy of the Holy Scriptures. The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church made this clear pronouncement in 1923: 'It is an essential doctrine of the Word of God and our standards that the Holy Spirit did so inspire, guide, and move the writers of Holy Scripture as to keep them from error.' Against this statement the Affirmationists protest. They do not believe in an inerrant Bible. Note what they say: 'There is no assertion in the Scriptures that their writers were kept from error. The Confession of Faith does not make this assertion, and it is significant that this assertion is not found in the Apostles' Creed or the Nicene Creed or in any of the great Reformation Confessions. The doctrine of inerrancy, intended to enhance the authority of the Scriptures, in fact impairs their supreme authority for faith and life and weakens the testimony of the Church to the power of God unto salvation through Jesus Christ. We hold that the General Assembly of 1923, in asserting that "the Holy Spirit did so inspire, guide, and move the writers of Holy Scripture as to keep them from error," spoke without warrant of the Scriptures, or of the Confession of Faith. We hold rather to the words of the Confession of Faith that the Scriptures "are given by inspiration of God to be the rule of faith and life" (Conf. I:2). Let us analyze this manifesto to see whether it rings true. They declare that the Scriptures make no claim that their writers were kept from error. Well, Paul's First Epistle to Timothy is a part of the Holy Scriptures, is it not? Paul, in speaking of the Old Testament, said: 'All Scripture is given by inspiration of God,' 2 Tim. 3:16. That is, it is God-breathed. Would God inspire men to write error? What kind of divine inspiration would that be? And remember Paul said: 'all Scripture.' Peter's Second Epistle is also a part of Holy Scripture. Let us quote him again: 'For the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man, but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost,' 2 Pet. 1:21. If the Holy Spirit moved those prophets, is it not clearly understood that He would have kept them from error? Why would their utterances be attributed to the Holy Spirit if they contained human errors? But the Auburn Affirmers contradict themselves in the paragraph quoted above. They hold that the General Assembly

was wrong in saying that the Biblical writers were so inspired as to be kept from error; yet, in concluding their paragraph, they hold that the Scriptures are given by inspiration of God to be the rule of faith and life. What kind of logic and theology is that? If Holy Scripture is given by inspiration of God, must it not be inerrant? Would God inspire men to write error? And here is a most serious consideration. If the Bible contains both error and truth, who is so wise as to tell us what is true and what is not true? In that case we would have to fall back on fallible human reason, and that would be the old rationalism of fifty to a hundred years ago, which has proved itself to be such a dismal failure. Moreover, this view is Modernism out and out. It is not evangelical and historical Christianity. An errant Bible leaves the human family in the mists of uncertainty. If the Bible is to be the rule of faith and life, it must speak in no precarious tones."

What Dr. Keyser argues so convincingly in this article is certainly correct. It is a strange thing, however, that, were Dr. Keyser alive today, he would have to argue this truth not merely against the Auburn Affirmationists in the modernistic Presbyterian Church, but also against prominent theologians in the United Lutheran Church, of which he himself was a member. As has been shown in these columns repeatedly, these liberal Lutheran theologians have adopted the modernistic views of the Presbyterian Affirmationists, denying the inerrancy of Holy Scripture. For this reason also what they teach on this point is not evangelical and historic Christianity but "Modernism out and out." J. T. M.

Lutheranism or Revivalism?—From an article by Pastor John Milton which appeared under this heading in the *Lutheran Companion* (Augustana Synod) of April 21, we quote the following: "Recently the following question was received by the Question Box department: 'Is not revivalism beginning more and more to be looked upon as a means of grace in our Synod? Or how do you explain the fact that Holy Baptism is so seldom referred to?' Answer: 'From the viewpoint of a sound Scriptural exegesis I do not see how Baptism as a means of regeneration can be set aside without doing violence to the whole plan and purpose of God with regard to the making of disciples. The choice of language in Matt. 28:19, 20 is decisive. It is one command with two parts to it: to make disciples by baptizing and by teaching to observe the commandments of Christ. . . . There has been a tendency, and we see it still, to consider a man a Christian just because he has been baptized, regardless of whether he today with his lips and life confesses Christ as his Savior. It almost seems that some Lutherans hold to the slogan that 'once saved, always saved,' if applied to the experience in baptism. . . . It is inevitable that such an extreme should invite a swing to the other extreme, to an emphasis on present life and experience which comes dangerously close to denying all spiritual experience to baptism. There is such a tendency today within Lutheran circles. To a very considerable extent it clothes itself in the forms and methods of Reformed revivalism. It so quickly assumes that a man is not a Christian unless he can point to some definite moment of 'conversion.' At the very least, it assumes that a baptized person is more likely to have fallen from the baptismal covenant than not. . . . Worst of all, in my judgment, is the amazing

self-confidence with which some within this group presume to tell at a glance whether a man is saved or unsaved. . . . Let us remember that final judgment as to any man's relationship to Christ belongs to Christ alone. He is the Judge, not we. Some glib lip confessions of Christ may mean less than those which are more hesitant, just because they are more sincere. I confess that I don't care much for that brand of piety which can pray and testify of a definite conversion but which cannot forgive a sin or show ordinary charity or courtesy towards those who have come to a conscious faith in Christ by a quieter process than that of the sudden or violent conversion. . . . Christians need to be quickened and awakened; yes, they need even to be converted in the sense of the daily conversion, which consists in a daily renewed repentance and faith. Let us learn not to speak as if all men must pass through a violent spiritual crisis before they can be called Christian. . . . We need to be revived, all of us, continually, some more, some less; but may God help us to see the difference between such a 'reviving' and the artificial technique of a 'revivalism' which counts souls as if they were passing through a human turnstile into the kingdom of God."

In the May issue of the *Journal of the American Lutheran Conference* Dr. K. Ermisch states: "It seems to me that the great issue in our American Lutheran Conference is just the question of piety vs. pietism." (P. 22.) In the article "Additional Thoughts on Piety and Pietism" (p. 24 ff.) Editor Dell discusses revivalism, the editor of the *Lutheran Messenger*, of the Augsburg Seminary faculty, having found fault with his views on revivalism. We quote a few paragraphs. "I want you all to know exactly why I am not keen on revivalism in the Lutheran Church, and I want you all to believe that I am nevertheless a Christian. Note that it is revivalism I oppose and not revival. Revival is 'bringing back to life,' and it is the work of the Holy Spirit. Revivalism is a human technique, a system of methods by which men think to make the success of the Holy Spirit more probable. That original editorial of mine said: 'Any revivalistic (not revival) tendency in the Lutheran Church gets short shrift from me.' . . . There are other things I dislike even more [than "the revival type of hymn"]. For example, its unrestrained emotionalism. Please do not think of me now as a 'stolid German' who is incapable of emotion. And do not conclude that I am a cold intellectual who thinks of religion only as a set of propositions to be intellectually apprehended. I teach my classes in religious education that intellect, emotion, and will are inseparable in the soul. . . . What is it, then, that is objectionable in the use of the emotional technique in the Bible camps? For one thing, it takes no account of the fact that these are *young* people we are dealing with. And young people, though they feel deeply, do not wish to make public display of their feelings. It is unnatural for them to do so, and to force them to do it against their will only awakens resentment in them. The very ones whom religion has touched deeply are the ones who will not bring out those deep inner responses of their souls for you to finger and handle in public. Those feelings are too sacred, and the souls are too shy. . . . For another thing, this emotional technique at the Bible camps takes no account of the fact that these are fine *Lutheran* young people we are

dealing with. One of the questions asked me above was: 'Do you not believe it possible for a person baptized as an infant to fall away from Christ and become as a lost sheep which must be brought back?' I answered, Yes. But the point is that sometimes it seems to be taken for granted that *all* of our Lutheran young people who were baptized as infants have fallen away from Christ and need to be converted. . . . The normal Lutheran way for baptized children to develop into Christian maturity is for them to *grow up* in the Christian life as uneventfully as a bud expanding into a flower. Testimony is not wanting that this is a better way than the way of storm and stress. . . . These four non-Lutherans describe the normal experience of a Lutheran child baptized in infancy. Ours has been the technique of religious education, not that of revivalism. Now, when non-Lutherans are recognizing the superiority of our methods, should we Lutherans abandon our methods and reach out after those which they are discarding? In our view those children have been God's children since God received them in Holy Baptism in infancy. We believe in baptismal regeneration; sects that developed the revivalistic technique did not. Here is a difference that runs clear down to basic doctrines. . . . Again I ask, How shall we attain the desired end of more sanctification of life? By demanding of our young people that they testify? By working on their emotions with revival hymns? By calling on them for public prayer? That would be demanding the harvest before having sown the seed, would it not? That is not a way of bringing people into contact with the grace of the Spirit; that is a *fruit* of the Spirit. The *means* by which the Spirit works is the Word. Neglect of the means of grace is bound to result in a lessening of the influence of the Spirit in our lives. A part of Jesus' prayer for His Church is: 'Sanctify them through Thy truth; Thy Word is truth.'

E.

The Wesley Bicentennial.—On May 24 two hundred years had elapsed since Wesley had his remarkable experience in a meeting in Aldersgate Street, London. It is proper that we should record here how he himself in his *Journal* wrote about this experience.

"I think it was about five this morning that I opened my Testament on those words: 'There are given unto us exceeding great and precious promises, even that ye shall be partakers of the divine nature.' Just as I went out, I opened it again on those words: 'Thou art not far from the kingdom of God.'

"In the afternoon I was asked to go to St. Paul's. The anthem was: 'Out of the deep have I called unto Thee, O Lord; Lord, hear my voice. O let Thine ears consider well the voice of my complaint. If Thou, Lord, wilt be extreme to mark what is done amiss, O Lord, who may abide it? But there is mercy with Thee; therefore Thou shalt be feared. O Israel, trust in the Lord; for with the Lord there is mercy, and with Him is plenteous redemption. And He shall redeem Israel from all his sins.'

"In the evening I went very unwillingly to a society in Aldersgate Street, where one was reading Luther's preface to the Epistle to the Romans. About a quarter before nine, while he was describing the change which God works in the heart through faith in Christ, I felt my

heart strangely warmed. I felt I did trust in Christ, Christ alone, for salvation; and an assurance was given me that He had taken away my sins, even mine, and saved me from the law of sin and death."

Strange to say, a little more than half a year later (January 4) Wesley made this entry in his *Journal*: "Though I have given, and do give, all my goods to feed the poor, I am not a Christian. Though I have endured hardship, though I have in all things denied myself and taken up my cross, I am not a Christian. My works are nothing; my sufferings are nothing; I have not the fruits of the Spirit of Christ. Though I have constantly used all the means of grace for twenty years, I am not a Christian." An editorial in the *Christian Century* points out that after this lamentation, written in January, 1739, the *Journal* of Wesley contains no similar note any more. In answering the question, how it happened that Wesley now ceased that morbid self-examination to which he had been given, the editorial replies: "The answer seems to be simply that Wesley suddenly lost himself in service for others, in his mission, and he never had time to fall back into his former introversion. For in that early spring of 1739 George Whitefield, having raised congregations of thousands of brutalized miners on the hillsides near Bristol, sent for Wesley to come down from London to help him. Leaving London took John Wesley out of the hothouse atmosphere of the Fetter Lane society into the open air. It proved the beginning of the marvelous ministry which was to carry him more than two hundred and fifty thousand miles over the roads—or what then passed for roads—of England, preaching on the average three times a day and bearing administrative burdens beyond reckoning. No wonder that William T. Stead wrote of this once tubercular little man as one who gave the impression of having a 'marvelous body, with muscles of whipcord and bones of steel, with lungs of leather and the heart of a lion.'"

A few more of the points which the editorial raises must be mentioned. We are told that for a number of years Wesley and his brother Charles, "remembering their own experience and seeing the evidences of sudden conversion among the sodden or brutalized masses to whom they were preaching, insisted that all their converts could enter the Methodist ranks only after passing through the same sort of sudden, dramatic crisis. In the case of many of the desperate men and women with whom the Wesleys had to deal, there was sound psychological reason to expect an experience of that cataclysmic nature. But as he grew older, Wesley's appreciation of the varieties of religious experience grew broader; he confided to one of his ministers his wonder that he and his brother had not been stoned for their stiff insistence on one mode of conversion in their younger days."

The editorial further remarks: "As Wesley's sympathies for other varieties of religious experience broadened, his reticence toward his own deepened. In later life he could rarely be induced to say anything about it. While his Methodists were not slow to claim all manner of spiritual achievements, ranging up to 'entire sanctification,' Wesley never made any such claims for himself. Once, when his intimate, Samuel Bradburn, pressed him for a testimony as to his spiritual experience, Wesley shyly answered that it was most nearly suggested by the lines

of one of his brother's hymns: 'O Thou, who camest from above.' Beyond that, he would not commit himself. Many entries in his *Journal*, together with the minutes of his conferences, show with what reserve—and indeed skepticism—he regarded the extravagant spiritual claims of many of his followers."

In thinking of Wesley's work, facts such as those mentioned above should not be overlooked, in order that our judgment of his activities do not become one-sided. A.

The Meeting at Utrecht.—From May 9 to 13 the eyes of the religious world were focused on Utrecht, where eighty men representing a large number of denominations were gathered "to confer upon a plan for a world council, to be submitted to the churches, and to determine upon an interim organization wherewith to carry on the work of the Commission on Faith and Order and that of the Commission on Life and Work." As these words indicate, the meeting was intended to continue the work of the two large interdenominational conferences held last summer, the one at Oxford, the other at Edinburgh. Besides Protestant bodies the Old Catholics and the Greek Orthodox churches were represented. From the United States there had come a delegation representing Episcopalians, Baptists, Congregationalists, Disciples, Lutherans, Methodists, Presbyterians, Friends (Quakers), the Polish National Catholics, and Negro churches. The large "alliances" had sent delegates—the Baptist World Alliance, the Lutheran World Convention, the Protestant World Alliance, the World Student Christian Federation, the Y. M. C. A., the Y. W. C. A., the World Sunday-school Association, the Ecumenical Youth Commission, and the European Central Bureau for Church Aid. What an imposing list of organizations! It seems that three languages were used, English, German, and French. Speeches, after a subject had been introduced, were limited to five minutes. The Archbishop of York, Dr. Temple, presided. "There was by resolution no balloting, no counting of support and opposition, no lobbying, no attempt to coerce or control—only free discussion, which led finally to practical unanimity." The request of Unitarians and of the World Alliance that the meeting should not declare belief in "our Lord Jesus Christ as God and Savior" was rejected, we are glad to say. This statement points to what is called "the one great and primary and central and most significant decision" inasmuch as it represents the adoption of a doctrinal base for the plan for a world council to be submitted to the churches. This doctrinal base is included in the brief statement that what is contemplated is "a fellowship of churches which accept our Lord Jesus Christ as God and Savior." The writer whom we are quoting, the Protestant Episcopal Bishop of Chicago, Dr. Stewart, says: "We know that only upon a solid foundation of a common faith can we realize unity. There is not a Church on the continent that is one bit interested in a federation of churches for social service. They all agree that such a plan is superficial. There must be rooted faith in God Incarnate." One wonders whether the bishop's favorable judgment on the attitude of the Continental churches is not an exaggeration.

The planned world assembly is not to have any authority over the various constituent churches. Besides, provision has been made for

letting at least one fourth of the assembly members be laymen (or lay women). The work of the World Conference on Life and Work and of that on Faith and Order is to be continued. A fairly large committee will be established for this purpose. We are told that the question of intercommunion was not discussed. However, joint services were held, in which the spokesmen were taken from the various denominations. It is clear that we are here dealing with a grossly unionistic venture. How the American Lutherans that participated can continue being connected with it, unless they have protested and continue to protest against the many features of doctrinal indifference which characterize it, we simply cannot understand.

A.

Union of Methodists Assured.—When the Southern Methodists in May met in Birmingham, Ala., the decisive vote on the union of the three Methodist bodies that have been negotiating with each other to amalgamate was taken. It was overwhelmingly in favor of the plan of union, 434 of the delegates voting affirmatively and only 26 negatively. The three bodies in question are the Methodist Episcopal Church (Northern Methodists), the Methodist Protestant Church, and the Methodist Episcopal Church South. The first two of these bodies had previously voted in favor of the plan of union. Among the arguments that were offered against union the race question was given a prominent place. One is surprised to see that in the reports on the debate, which lasted a whole day, the ultramodernistic character of much of the teaching in vogue among Northern Methodists was not stressed. The South is known to be conservative, and we suppose that Southern Methodists share in this conservatism; but if they used this laudable tendency to remain true to the old message as a weapon against the advocacy of union with Northern Methodists, the reports we have seen fail to make mention of it. The new church-body formed by this merger will number almost eight million members living here in America. If size is to be aimed at in church-work, then we are here viewing a commendable achievement. But we may well say that just as little as the kingdom of God is meat and drink, Rom. 14: 17, so little is it dependent on the outward size of church-bodies and their secular wealth and influence.

A.

What is Meant by "the Son of God"?—The *Sunday-school Times* (March 26, 1938) under this heading quotes for the orthodox interpretation of this expression against that of Unitarian Liberalism, the unbiased testimony of the late Don Marquis. In introducing this clever and often profound writer, it declares: "Toward the end of December [1937], three days before the new year began, a brilliant journalist, poet, and playwright, Don Marquis, died. Though not apparently a professing Christian, he published a statement some years ago that is a remarkably significant answer to the question that heads this editorial. It is the answer of an open-minded literary man of the world. It was part of an author's note at the end of a play Don Marquis had written, *The Dark Hours*, which is a dramatic setting forth of the last twenty-four hours in the earthly life of Christ, culminating in His death on the cross. The extended newspaper accounts of the death of Don Marquis mention his famous newspaper columns in the *New York Sun*

and the *New York Herald Tribune*, his poems and another book, but made no mention of the *The Dark Hours*, which a literary critic has called 'one of the few great dramas ever written in the United States.' Another critic said: 'He has published a drama of poignant beauty and memorable reality on the betrayal, trial, and crucifixion of Jesus. Whether any other poet in America could have approached his achievement on this theme I do not know. No one has.'

What Don Marquis discovered when he read through the four gospels, and this contrary to his expectations (as he expressly tells us), he strikingly summed up in the following antimodernistic witness concerning the "Son of God" of the four gospels: "I believe there is a contemporary school of thought which holds that, when Jesus spoke of His Father, He meant that God is the Father of all of us—the Father of Jesus and of you and of me and of everybody else in much the same way. And I rather inclined myself to the opinion that such was the meaning of Jesus. But the careful and repeated examination of the Bible necessary for this play has convinced me that it was not His meaning. I cannot escape the conviction that He intended to convey that He was the Son of God in a sense special and unique, that He differed from other men who might call God their Father not merely in the degree of His spirituality but also in the character of His relationship to His Father. You may or may not believe this; I may or may not believe it—but I cannot evade the belief that Jesus Himself believed it. He seems to me to have been as explicit as possible in this claim. Either the four gospels have not reported Him correctly, or He meant just that. At least I can make nothing else out of it, and I began an examination of the Bible with a contrary view. It was for this assertion, that He was the Son of God, that the Sanhedrin condemned Him, for the Sanhedrin considered it blasphemy. If He had meant anything else or anything less, He would have answered otherwise when the question was discharged at Him pointblank by Caiaphas and His life or death hung upon the answer. He died for that belief because it *was* His belief. To think of Him as dying for some belief that He did not really hold, seems to me to be merely idiocy. You or I may hold what opinion we will, but I do not see how, if we accept His reported utterances as evidence, we can have any doubt as to the opinion of Jesus Himself. My intention is nothing exegetical, but only to present my view. And I make this note merely because I think His claim to be the Son of God in a special sense is the central knot of the drama of His closing hours on earth. When Caiaphas, the high priest, heard this claim from Jesus' own lips, he rose and rent his garments, crying, 'Blasphemy!' and the Sanhedrin condemned Jesus to death."

This certainly is a most weighty witness to the fact that the Christ of the Bible is the divine Christ, God's Son in a unique sense, as the Christian Church has ever confessed Him. J. T. M.

Conditions at American Theological Seminaries. — The following letter appearing in the *Presbyterian* of April 14 should be pondered:

"In your issue of February 14 I was interested in the article 'Do We Need Trained Ministers?' by the Rev. Dr. H. S. Brown of Princeton. In this article he calls attention to the falling off in recent years in gifts

to our theological seminaries. These gifts being so small in comparison with those to other educational enterprises, the question naturally arises, What are the reasons? Why are the givers in our churches so reluctant to support so worthy a cause? It is an open secret that many who would be disposed to remember these schools of the prophets are held back in doing so because of the perversion of trust funds committed to their keeping by our fathers in years of the past. I do not have in mind any of the seminaries mentioned by Dr. Brown in his article but many such schools in our and other denominations. I have just read again the chapter on the 'Looting of Andover,' by Ernest Gordon in his *Leaven of the Sadducees*. That once great citadel of orthodoxy, founded and endowed at a great sacrifice to offset Unitarianism and Universalism and to promote evangelical Christianity and which safeguarded its creed by every possible device to hold its teachers to their covenant vows, — nevertheless we find its directors, who were the custodians of her trust funds as also the guardian of the doctrines taught by her professors, shamefully violating their solemn oaths and handing over her endowments and property to the keeping care of Unitarian Harvard. Read also the chapter in this book of Gordon's on 'The Apostate Seminaries.' What a blight it reveals on American Christianity! Professors holding down chairs endowed at a great sacrifice by godly people in past years to teach evangelical doctrines, but teaching that which would be acceptable in any Unitarian school in the land. These revelations are certainly an eye-opener. Look at Union Theological Seminary, once so famous in the days of Shedd, Schaff, Robinson, Smith, and Adams but now sending forth young men who are acceptable in any heterodox church in the land.

"The writer is a graduate of what was once one of the soundest Calvinistic seminaries of the Congregational body — a school as true to evangelical doctrine as Princeton ever was, a school founded and endowed to teach the tenets of the Christian faith; but if it keeps on degenerating in the next ten years as it has in the past twenty-five, an agnostic wanting a position on its faculty to teach agnosticism could have it. These remarks are not aimed at the seminaries listed by Dr. Brown, for, as far as I know, they are teaching what our General Assembly would have them teach and, so far as I know, are worthy of the confidence and support of our churches. Yet, nevertheless, the great body of intelligent givers are well aware of the unsavory history of the dishonest use of funds entrusted to the care of those who have the management of the funds given to perpetuate the faith of the Church. Such a history is unfortunate for the seminaries that are worthy of support; nevertheless givers are slow to open their pocketbooks because of the suspicion that history may repeat itself. I put this forth as one of the reasons. My years in the ministry in dealing with people confirm it."

A.

The Same Old Intolerance. — According to the *Christian Century* Cardinal Villeneuve of Montreal delivered a speech in which he laid down the following points:

1. The granting of freedom to various religions and even to areligious

sects is perverse Liberalism, the effort of eighteenth-century rationalism. States should not be neutral in regard to God.

2. True freedom is freedom to believe and practise the truth. The Roman Catholic Church has the truth.

3. All other churches are false and their teachings are false, except in so far as they coincide with Roman Catholic teaching. They are to be tolerated only in so far as they are willing to cooperate for the common good in conformity with natural morality and Christian revelation.

4. It is a false conception of liberty and of the role of the State to put the divine Law and the authority of the Church on a common footing with all other systems of doctrine and all other religious denominations. "As if society could in principle and of deliberate purpose consent to allow some to serve the Lord and others to deny Him their service, or at least to serve Him badly."

5. Human rights are not absolute. "It is never permitted to argue, to defend, to grant, freedom of thought, writing, or teaching and the indifferenced freedom of religions as so many rights which nature has given to man." These liberties may be tolerated only if "a chaste temperament prevents them from degenerating into license and disorder."

6. Democracy, considered as the rule of the majority in a State, is necessarily rejected in favor of rule by those who have "the truth." "I do not want any kind of democracy; I want an aristocratic democracy." "The most libertarian democracies, arrived more or less at the term of their dissolution, can be saved only if the most penetrating authority . . . recovers possession of them and preserves them. It is thus they have risen in Italy and elsewhere."

Rome cannot see that opposition to error must not include an attempt to employ the powers of the government in such opposition. Its conception is that the kingdom of Christ is of this world. The above summary shows that Cardinal Villeneuve stands on the platform of Pius IX and Leo XIII.

A.

The Confession of a Higher Critic. — Dr. H. L. Willett (professor emeritus, University of Chicago) is a thoroughgoing higher critic. He is recognized as a leader in the realm of higher criticism. The *Christian Century*, Jan. 26, 1938, states that "Lyman Abbott once declared that no man in America has done so much as Professor Willett to open the new Bible of the historical criticism to the popular understanding." Well, the Question Box of the *Christian Century* of March 2, 1938, contained this question: "What is the 'Q' or Matthean 'Q' on which the gospels are said to be founded?" and this answer by Dr. Willett: "In the textual criticism of the gospels one of the documents which scholars have assumed as a source used by the first and the third gospel along with the gospel of Mark was a writing, perhaps in Aramaic, dealing with the teaching of Jesus, and possibly from the hand of Matthew himself. It has been given various names by different authorities, such as the 'Logia' or 'sayings,' or the 'Quelle,' or 'source,' often referred to as 'Q.'" Please underscore the words "have assumed," "perhaps," and "possibly" and read Professor Willett's statement once more. Question: Did Matthew

write "Q"? Answer by the higher critic: We do not know. Question: Did he write it in Aramaic? Answer: We do not know. Question: Was this "Q" one of the sources of the first and third gospels? Answer: We do not know. Question: Did this mythical writing affect the writings of the evangelists? Answer: It certainly did; that is one of the assured results of higher criticism.

The higher critics certainly know on what flimsy foundations their theories rest. If they do not know it, their leader is here telling them. And still they keep on declaiming on the "established results of higher criticism" and protesting that they cannot conscientiously accept the doctrine of verbal inspiration. The *Report of the Commission on Christian Doctrine* (Church of England) asks us to accept the findings of higher criticism with a firm faith, and on the basis of this *Report* a writer in the *Living Church* proclaims that the days "when higher criticism was undreamed of" are happily past and "scholars engaged in scientific Bible research read in its [the *Report's*] recognition of the legitimacy of their work and its insistence that the freedom for carrying out their work be not denied to them the Magna Carta of their liberties" (see *CONC. THEOL. MONTHLY*, May, 1938, p. 384). Dr. E. H. Delk, a leader of the liberal wing of the U. L. C., tells us that he can no longer believe in the verbal inspiration of the Bible because of the assured results of higher criticism and is glad that "higher criticism has set theology free from that tyrannous literalism and false idea of inspiration which," etc. (*Lutheran Quarterly*, Oct., 1912, p. 568. *Lehre u. Wehre*, 1913, p. 154.) Dr. Willett himself states: "If it has been proved in the process of critical inquiry that . . . Moses is only a common denominator for the legislation of Israel rather than the lawgiver which later Hebrew tradition made him to be . . .; that the four gospels are anonymous . . .; that the relation of the Apostle Paul to the Pastoral Epistles is improbable . . .; if, let it be repeated, it has become evident that these are among the conclusions to which painstaking and accurate scholarship has been led, the result is not the discrediting of these portions of the Bible but rather a closer approach to their true origin and purpose." (*The Bible through the Centuries*, p. 260 f.) — *The New Testament Commentary*, Alleman, uses similar language.

We are wondering how much of this "accurate" scholarship is made up of *assumed*s and *perhaps*s and *possiblys*. As for us, we are not going to exchange our verbally inspired Bible for the "new Bible" advertised by Willett and Delk and Alleman and the *Report of the Doctrinal Commission*. We do not want a Bible built upon *assumed* and *perhaps* and *possibly*.
E.

Modernism with a Vengeance. — Speaking of church services during Holy Week, the London correspondent of the *Living Church*, after describing some of the services using the old liturgy, says: "Contrasted with these ancient and beautiful rites is the conduct of services in the Birmingham parish of Harborne, in which the Modernist Bishop Barnes resides. The modernist vicar Canon Richardson has rewritten the Gloria, has invented two creeds more to his satisfaction than the Nicene and the Apostles', and has made a variety of interpolations in, and abstractions from, the Communion service. His Communion service was cele-

brated in his church on Maundy Thursday evening, the chalice being administered by a Methodist minister and the sermon preached by a Salvation Army lass—a member of a body which condemns Holy Communion and all other sacraments. The *Church Times* insists that this is a flagrant act of fantastic lawlessness, which calls for interference on the part of the archbishop of the province." Yes, indeed. The bishop of the province, Dr. Barnes, will, of course, not interfere, because he is an arch-Modernist himself. A.

A Beautiful Tribute to Missionaries in China.—George E. Sokolsky, the celebrated author and newspaper man, in an article published recently in the *New York Herald Tribune*, paid splendid tribute to the missionaries in China who are continuing sturdily to do their work in spite of all difficulties and danger. He writes:

"The most significant job done by Americans in China is neither the buying nor the selling of goods. It is so great a work that it is altogether misunderstood by small minds and even smaller hearts. That is the tremendously important and valuable services of the American missionary.

"These men and women have gone to town and village, bringing with them not only the many varieties of Christianity but a new cultural pattern—in my opinion, a nobler cultural pattern than the Chinese retained amid the disintegration of China's indigenous social and intellectual establishments during the last century. . . .

"These missionaries brought medicine and hospital and nursing and child welfare to China. They brought a new conception of social relationships,—not man for his family but man for society,—a broadening of viewpoint.

"They planted the seeds of a social revolution which, if it did not quickly make China strong, at any rate produced in China a forward-looking, progressive, non-opium-smoking, monogamous leadership. . . .

"It is impossible to overemphasize the great value to China of the American missionary, of the American school and hospital situated in that country. And it is something to note in these days of collectivist materialism that there has been no return to the United States for this service. It has cost us more, over a century, than we ever earned out of our trade with China. It was the contribution of a well-off people to those who needed our help and assistance.

"And it is to be noted here that in a measure we did as well by Japan. It is true that the Japanese, sooner than the Chinese, were ready to take over many schools and hospitals which American good will had established in their country. But for years our missionaries labored there as in China—not forcing anything down unwilling throats but offering help and service to those who were willing and eager to receive.

"I have known the American missionary in China well. He has been my friend. I have lived at his house. He has dined at my table. I know of no human beings who are more self-sacrificing, more loyal to the people among whom they live, more generous, and less materially rewarded for an arduous life than most American missionaries. No matter what happens to China, most of them will remain at their posts, valiantly laboring for the simple people who love them."—*N. L. C. Bulletin*

A Surprise. — We have all become accustomed to seeing Modernists endeavoring to bury all polemics in the work of the Church and urging that there should be no more doctrinal controversies. Imagine, then, the surprise we experienced when a recent article of the *Christian Century*, written by its editor, Dr. Charles Clayton Morrison, in New York, not only bore the caption "The Return of Controversy" but stated very definitely that doctrinal controversy is unavoidable. He says there are three strong convictions which are held widely by the leaders of the Church: that Christianity is true; "that its responsibility for civilization is more clear and vastly greater than the churches ever before realized"; and that "the inherent nature of the Church as the body of Christ, together with the faithful exercise of its function in the world, requires that its sectarian divisions give place to a new organic expression of the Christian community in which the spiritual treasures and powers of each part shall become the treasure and powers of the whole body." Explaining his position, Dr. Morrison continues: "It is because these three affirmative convictions are taking form in the mind of the Church that the old-fashioned subjects of Christian controversy are coming to life again. These subjects constitute the obstacles which must be removed if these convictions are to be translated into action and living organization. Questions of Baptism, the Eucharist, ordination of ministers, liturgy, polity, as well as questions of creed, these are all bound to emerge when the churches begin to talk to one another in terms of their common faith. Such subjects are the *given* elements of the problem of a united Christianity. One may take a top-lofty attitude toward them. One may be highly impatient with any discussion of them — but they are there! They cannot be solved by ignoring them."

That certainly is refreshing. We do not agree with Dr. Morrison when he, continuing, says that these matters are not of vital importance and that, if the Church were united, it would be unjustified to start divisions on account of a difference of opinion on the points enumerated. But one must give him credit for recognizing that the widely advocated policy of forgetting the doctrinal differences now dividing the churches will not solve the difficulties Christianity is facing. It is true that Dr. Morrison insists controversy must take on a different character from that which it had years ago. We quote: "The old controversies differed from the new in that they proceeded from a fundamentally different motive. All our old-fashioned controversies over polity, Baptism, the Lord's Supper, ordination, and doctrine were motivated by the need of providing an apologetic for the existence of this denomination or that. This is the case no longer. No one cares now about the apologetic which any denomination can give for its separate existence. Its Christian right to a separate sectarian existence is under challenge, and that not alone by its neighbors but by itself! A wholly new kind of interest in these denominational differences has emerged. We are interested in them because they stand in the way of the Church's unity and catholicity. The new controversy arises in this perspective. The aim of the old controversy was apologetic; the aim of the new is irenic. In the old controversy the right of schism was taken for granted; in the new the fact of schism is deplored in humility and penitence. The old contro-

versy was an attempt to justify differences and divisions; the new is an attempt to heal and transcend them. To this fundamental distinction between the old and the new controversy we must add another. The subjects are indeed the same, but new criteria have emerged, by which conclusions are to be judged. Our thinkers and leaders return to these old-fashioned differences emancipated from the legalism and literalism which characterized the old-time type. . . . No issue between the churches can now be settled by the quotation of a Biblical text, as our fathers used to assume. No issue will be settled by reference to an authoritarian standard, whether doctrinal or ecclesiastical," etc.

We shall not take the time to differentiate between what is true and false in this passage. It must suffice that we say that in our opinion Dr. Morrison does our ancestors a cruel wrong when he thinks that in their controversies they were actuated exclusively by the motives which he assigns to them and that they did not have the desire to bring about peace and harmony in all Christendom, and that his position as to the authority of one Bible-text certainly is not in keeping with the recognition of the Bible as our supreme authority in matters of faith and life. But we are happy to see that there is at least one Modernist who is wise enough to perceive that a united Church cannot be built on a foundation of disunited creeds. A.

Brief Items. — A writer in Vienna declares that Roman Catholicism in Austria capitulated to Hitler. Speaking about the audience which Cardinal Innitzer sought with the *Fuehrer*, he writes this striking sentence, "A cardinal had gone to Canossa." Developments will have to show to what extent this view is justified.

It seems that in Georgia a new sect calling itself the "Kingdom of Jehovah" has made its appearance. It was given publicity when in Griffin, Ga., one of its members was arrested for distributing tracts and a magazine issued by the sect. The Supreme Court of Georgia, after the Court of Appeals had upheld the Griffin authorities in their action, reversed this decision, declaring that in the interest of religious freedom the city ordinance of Griffin, Ga., which was responsible for the arrest mentioned, would have to be held invalid. One wonders whether this is the same sect as "Jehovah's Witnesses" (Russellites)?

From 1920 to 1930 120,000 suicides were reported in the United States. It has been correctly stated that here we are facing one of our country's most alarming problems. Indications are that the number of suicides from 1930—1940 will be vastly larger than that of the preceding decade.

The Episcopalians here and abroad are having their troubles, and deservedly, because the denomination does not resist the inroads of Modernism as it should. In England the so-called Catholic Advisory Council, which is backed by two thousand Anglo-Catholic ministers and fifty thousand Anglo-Catholic laymen, makes an attack on the *Statement of Doctrine*, which was issued by a special committee of the Church of England some time ago. What is criticized is the doctrinal laxity of the report of the commission. Besides, there are other things in the teaching and practise of the Church of England to which exception is taken, for instance, the communing of people who are not members of

the Church of England, the recognition of the office of the ministry in Protestant denominations other than the Episcopalian (an error on the part of the critics), the remarriage of divorced persons, the assistance given by bishops to movements for union in India and elsewhere. In our own country 1,406 clergymen of the Protestant Episcopal Church have signed a statement which is directed especially against the practise of letting people commune who are not members of the Protestant Episcopal Church. These people very correctly state that the tendency they criticize will not accelerate union but rather hinder it.

Recently Karl Barth visited in London. Naturally, he was asked about the situation in Germany. When the inquiry was placed before him whether the Gospel can be preached in that country without interference, he is said to have replied: "Yes, if the message consists of 'innocuous sentiments.'" He is quoted as saying that a "spiritual Gospel" is not opposed, but it must not affect the lives of people here on earth. To what extent he is reporting actual facts will have to be determined by those who have first-hand knowledge of the situation. Very alarming is a certain tendency of the German government, if he is quoted correctly and states facts. According to his view, the German Government has the intention of cutting the youth off from the Church, so that the latter will become an association of old men and old women. It will mean that the Church will be immeasurably weakened. Barth charges that men are made professors of theology who are without experience and other necessary qualifications and whose lectures as a result are poorly attended.

How conditions affecting the churches may change is illustrated by what recently happened to a Presbyterian church in Manhattan and another one in the Bronx, New York. The influx of Negroes and Puerto Ricans into their territory was so strong that they closed their establishments and their members joined white congregations in a different neighborhood. One of the two churches which are now empty may become a Negro church.

We often forget that people are influenced far more by considerations of the heart than of the head. The *Christian Advocate* (South) makes a statement which deserves being pondered. It reads: "The stately and elaborate arguments of Butler's *Analogy* made no impress on the masses. The convincing answer to unbelief and wickedness of the day was made by the revival under Wesley and Whitefield, when the lives of men and women were transformed by the Holy Spirit, when a new hope and strength came to despairing lives and blasphemers became saints and drunkards became heralds of the saving power of Christ. The Church of today cannot but meet the cynics and scoffers by the same irrefutable logic of lives transformed by the power of the Gospel, the logic of unearthly living amid the sense-bound materialism of a self-indulgent generation." While not Christian lives, but the power of the Gospel melts sinful hearts, the importance of the testimony rendered by a Christ-centered life needs continual emphasis.

About the first of the year Bishop Arthur J. Moore of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, cabled that the disaster to Chinese churches

could not be overestimated. Nevertheless, missionaries are showing magnificent faith, courage, and persistence. The *Christian Advocate* (Nashville) quotes the following from a letter written in Shanghai by Dr. J. C. Thoroughman, superintendent of the Soochow Hospital: "We on the field think there is only one course to pursue. That is, to get back and rebuild and to face the future in a spirit of Christian service that will attempt to meet the need of the people of China in this darkest hour of their modern history. We believe this will be the wish of the Church in America when it learns the full extent of the catastrophe that has overtaken us." — *The Presbyterian*.

Four synods of the U. L. C. belonging to the six U. L. C. synods in the State of Pennsylvania have made preparations to merge. They are the following: The West Pennsylvania, the Susquehanna, the East Pennsylvania, and the Allegheny synods. The name proposed is: The Central Pennsylvania Synod. Committee reports are ready which, if adopted, will bring about this union.

A minister living in Czechoslovakia states, as the *Allg. E.-L. Kz.* reports, that his congregation is woefully in need of Bibles, that in every group of ten families, on an average, merely one owns the Holy Scriptures. The reason, he says, is that many of his people have become Lutherans through conversion from Roman Catholicism; that while they were Roman Catholics, they did not own a Bible; and that now, financial difficulties being universal, there is very little money for the purchase of Bibles.

One of our exchanges reports that Dr. Purd E. Dietz of Yale University will be inaugurated as professor of pastoral theology at Eden Theological Seminary.

The editor of the *Living Church* complains: "Another church-school, St. Albans, Sycamore, Ill., has gone under. The reason is the usual one — lack of support by church people. The neglect of church-schools and colleges is one of the most amazing phenomena of the Episcopal Church." Unfortunately, Episcopalians are not the only ones that have reason to voice such a lament.

Crime among America's youth and adolescents continues to grow. While the attempts to reform the movies were not entirely in vain and standards have been raised, the radio is becoming a very serious menace. The *Lutheran Companion* writes: "In the opinion of many, the radio has taken up the business of educating children in crime where the cinema left off. Thrilling detective stories, reeking with every human instinct of cruelty and cunning, have captivated the imaginations of millions of children and hold them spell-bound from day to day. Sex problems, love triangles, domestic unfaithfulness — these and many other sordid themes are being presented to the youthful mind, and in many instances this type of program is arousing increasing interest among the children, since it appeals to their natural curiosity."

A layman in the Church of England is sensible enough to see that, before the Anglican Church endeavors to unite with the Non-conformist churches in England, it ought to achieve a higher degree of unity within its own ranks. The layman is Lord Hugh Cecil. He believes that there

is a growing sympathy and understanding between Evangelicals and Anglo-Catholics, that is, the Low Church party and the High Church party. As to the Broad Church party, the Modernists, he seems to think that it will be impossible to achieve an understanding with them. More power to men of this type, we say.

In France Reformed groups have united. These bodies are the Evangelical Reformed Church, numbering about 400 congregations; the Reformed Church (a liberal body), with about 160 congregations; the Free Evangelical Church, with a few more than 50 congregations; and the Methodists, with 26 churches. These four bodies now form the Protestant Church of France. Baptists and Lutherans are not included in this union.

In an article in the *Christian Century*, headed "Japan Invades China with Drugs," the writer has this disquieting paragraph: "When the new Peace Preservation Council was set up in the largest Japanese-occupied territory last August, it was announced that the Nanking Law no longer applied. The drug habit reassumed its tyranny. Antinarcotic hospital work was stopped. In the old Japanese concession is a street in which about fifty per cent. of the houses are drug joints. They are not allowed to sell to the Japanese; but foreigners and Chinese, men and women, are offered the stuff openly as they walk through the streets." In justice one ought to add the following sentences of the writer: "No trade was apparent, however, when I visited the street (February 3); the shops had been temporarily closed the previous day. It was reported that coolies employed by the Japanese were paid part of their wages in drugs; but I was not in a position to get evidence of this."

To do their work more effectively, the press committees of eighteen Catholic societies have formed "a united Catholic front in the press and magazine field." The leaders in this movement are Jesuits voicing their views in their well-known journal *America*. If this new agency should succeed in influencing, for instance, every one, or at least the great majority, of the 1,733,954 Roman Catholics who are said to live in New York City, what power it could wield and what a menace it might become to free speech in opposing all papers and journals which fearlessly criticize Roman Catholicism and its pretensions! A.

II. Ausland

"Eccentric Services in the Church of England."—Using this caption, the *Manchester Guardian* of Jan. 28, 1938, has some illuminating remarks on conditions in the Anglican Church. The writer says: "A belief that the present disorders in the Church of England were exaggerated was expressed by the Bishop of Winchester, Dr. Cyril Garbett, last week, when the Upper House of Convocation of Canterbury resumed discussion of the Joint Committee's Report on Relations between Church and State. He said that there were variations in the services in different parishes, but they were quite minor and there was nothing like general disorder. 'There are services which are eccentric and even fantastic in different churches,' Dr. Garbett went on. It ought to be made perfectly plain that the bishop is the authority, and the proposed declaration will, I think, make it plain that, when the bishop gives directions, he is

speaking in the name of the Church and that he has authority over additional services as well as over the liturgical services. I think the way we could strengthen order in our Church is from within. We shall not get it from legislation or coercive action in the courts.

"The Bishop of Coventry, Dr. Haigh, supporting the proposed synodical declaration, said: Any regulation designed to reduce disorder in the sphere of public worship would command very great respect from many priests who at present either believed that the Church of England had no mind in regard to the questions at issue or thought they knew much better than the Church itself.

"The Bishop of Birmingham, Dr. Barnes, said he did not approve of the report. 'I speak with reluctance,' he added, 'but I am weary of the endless sacramental controversies, of which the present proposals are but another stage. I am resolved to administer the law as I can see Parliament would desire it. So I have during these last years refused institution to any man who was not willing both to have no reservation and also to obey the law when I directed it. I think I can say the result is that Birmingham, which, when I went to it, was the most disorderly diocese in England bar one, is now quite orderly save for a few surviving rebels.'

"The Archbishop of Canterbury said there was now less bitterness and party spirit in the Church of England than he had ever known. The time had come when, in the interests of rightful worship, the Prayer-book should be restored to its central position in the Church and any alterations which might be permitted should be made by the authority and command of the conscience of the Church. It was impossible to say that it should be left to Parliament to order proper public worship in the Church. Further discussion of the report and an amendment by the Bishop of Norwich were adjourned until the next meeting of Convocation."

That the institution of the episcopacy is not a panacea for all the ills which afflict the Church is quite evident from this report. A.

Die Weltkirchen auf dem Weg nach Rom. Äußerst wichtig ist, was P. O. Gerß in seinem Gemeindeblatt „Nur selig!“ in bezug auf die letzte Weltkirchenkonferenz in Oxford schreibt: „Der Erzbischof von Canterbury von der englischen Kirche hat sein Bedauern ausgesprochen, daß der römische Papst an der Weltkirchenkonferenz in Oxford nicht teilgenommen hat. Zugleich hat er aber mit Befriedigung hervorgehoben, daß römisch-katholische Theologen zu den wichtigsten Mitarbeitern an den Arbeiten und Beschlüssen der Weltkirchenkonferenz gehört haben und daß die ‚wundervollen‘ Enzykliken (Kundgebungen) der Päpste Leo XIII. und Pius XI für die auf der Konferenz in Oxford gefaßten Beschlüsse über die Lehre vom staatlichen und sozialen Leben sehr wertvoll gewesen sind. Dann schreibt das Blatt des römischen Papstes, der *Osservatore Romano* in Rom, daß die katholische Kirche nicht bloß Mitarbeiterin an den Kundgebungen und Beschlüssen der Oxforder Konferenz gewesen ist, sondern ihr eigentlicher Urheber [?]. Und diese von römischem Geist durchtränkten Beschlüsse von Oxford werden nun den Christen in Deutschland dargeboten als große und herrliche Kundgebungen der allgemeinen ‚ökumenischen‘ Kirche Christi, die angeblickt der Welt das Heil bringen soll. Das Blatt des Papstes sagt ganz mit Recht: Die eban-

geliſchen Weltkirchen, die ſich beim Papſt ihre Weiſheit borgen müſſen, ſollten doch lieber gleich römisch-katholiſch werden und ſich offen dazu bekennen. Übrigens haben von den ca. 25,000 Geiſtlichen der evangeliſchen Kirche, die in Oxford die unbeftrittene Führung hatte, in den letzten acht Jahren ganze 1,016 die Lehrbeſchlüſſe des maßgebenden römischen Bekenntniſſes, des Tridentinums (in dem die Lehre Luthers bekanntlich nicht bloß verworfen, ſondern ſogar verflucht wird), unterſchrieben und ſich verpflichtet, ihre Gemeinden in dieſem römisch-katholiſchen Geiſt zu erziehen. Und ca. 2,000 andere Geiſtliche der engliſchen Kirche ſtimmen innerlich damit überein und beten regelmäßig mit ihren Gemeinden für die Vereinigung mit dem römischen Papſtum. (Dies iſt eine Feſtſtellung von Walter Adams in einem Antrag auf der engliſchen Kirchenverſammlung vom 7. Februar 1938.) Mit dieſer engliſchen Kirche aber iſt die ganze Bekennende Kirche in Deutschland, von den ‚Lutheriſchen‘ um Prof. Saffe und Biſchof Mahkarens an, über die Brüderräte bis zu den ausgeſprochen Liberalen aufs engſte verbunden und will durchaus mit ihr kirchlich verbunden bleiben! So werden die Chriſten in Deutschland durch dieſes Kirchenweſen der Bekennenden Kirche allmählich auch für den römischen Papſt erzogen, ohne daß ſie es merken. So wird aber auch Luther und ſein Werk in Deutschland durch die Bekennende Kirche verleugnet und zunichte gemacht.“

Es iſt nötig, daß dieſe Schwäche der Bekennenden Kirche aufgedeckt wird, beſonders hierzulande, wo man im allgemeinen die Bekennende Kirche zu gänzlich einſchätzt. Solange ſich die „Bekennner“ innerhalb der Volkskirche Deutschlands befinden und ſich von dem Staat beſolden laſſen müſſen, bleibt ihr Bekenntniſſe immer ſchwach. So ſehr es einen wundernehmen mag, daß der Papſt in der Oxforder Kirchenkonferenz mitgewirkt, ja den Ton angegeben hat (?), ſo dürfen wir doch nicht vergeſſen, daß mit dem gänzlichen Unglauben der letzten Zeit (Luk. 18, 8) ſich auch das Antichriſtentum, wie es im Papſtum vertreten iſt, befeſtigen wird, ſo daß der Endchriſt erſt dem wiederkehrenden göttlichen Richter unterliegen wird, 2 Theſſ. 2, 8. Damit wollen wir durchaus nicht ſagen, daß wir die Bekenntniſſeausſprachen ſolcher Männer wie Saffe nicht recht einſchätzen. Sie ſind in der Tat wertvoll und werden Frucht ſchaffen. Aber weit mehr würden ſie fruchten, wenn hinter dem Wortbekenntniſſe auch das Tatbekenntniſſe des Kirchenauſtritts ſtände. Unſere lutheriſche Kirche muß wieder kräftig daran erinnert werden, was die Apologie einbleut: „Wiewohl nun der Antichriſt mit ſeinem falſchen Gottesdienſt zum Teil bleiben wird, bis daß Chriſtus, der Herr, öffentlich kommen und richten wird, ſo ſollen doch alle Chriſten verwahrt ſein, ſich zu hüten vor ſolcher Abgötterei, und ſollten lernen, wie man Gott recht dienen und Vergebung der Sünden durch den Glauben an Chriſtum erlangen ſoll, daß ſie Gott recht ehren und beſtändigen Troſt wider die Sünde haben können. Denn darum hat Gott gnädiglich ſein Evangelium ſcheinen laſſen, daß wir verwahrt und ſelig würden.“ (Triglotta, S. 418, Art. XXIV [XII], 98.)

J. T. M.

Über die Lage in Rußland. Die neue antireligiöſe Welle, die in den letzten Wochen eingefeßt hat, hat ihren Höhepunkt in der ruffiſchen Oſterwoche erreicht. Die Sowjetpreſſe ſpricht von Verhören, Liquidationen, Unterſuchungen und Arreſten in Moſkau, Petersburg, dem Wolgabeden, der Ukraine, dem Kaukaſus, in Turkmeniſtan, Sibirien und Weißrußland und

nennt Orthodoxe, Protestanten, Katholiken, Baptisten, Evangeliumschriften, Adventisten und Mohammedaner. Die Berichte sind aber oft unklar, da öfters an Stelle der Namen nur die Anfangsbuchstaben der Metropoliten, Erzbischöfe und Bischöfe angegeben werden. Ihnen wird vorgeworfen „Bucharinismus“, „Trozkismus“, die Organisierung nächtlicher Einbrüche, von Meuchelmord, Eisenbahnunglücken, Anschlägen gegen die Ernte, von Spionage für Deutschland, Polen und Japan, die Propaganda für Monarchismus und Faschismus und alle möglichen andern Verbrechen. — Die Kirchen waren an den Ostertagen überfüllt, zum Teil stärker noch als in den Vorjahren, trotz des antireligiösen Feldzugs und trotz der Ankündigung, daß Tschow, das Haupt der GPU, persönlich die Leitung der Operationen gegen die konterrevolutionären Kirchenmänner übernehmen werde.

(Allg. Ev.-Luth. Kirchengtg.)

Eine halbe Million neuer „Gottloser“. Der Sekretär des Zentralkomitees der kommunistischen Partei der Sowjetunion, Andrejef, stellt fest, daß die Mehrheit der Mitglieder der kommunistischen Partei nicht den Gottlosenverbänden angehört. Sie müssen binnen drei Monaten dies nachholen. Die zuständigen Stellen sollen feststellen, welche kommunistischen Parteimitglieder diesen Befehl nicht ausgeführt haben. Sie sollen aus der kommunistischen Partei ausgeschlossen werden. Nach Mitteilung der sowjetrussischen Gottlosenverbände werden die bolschewistischen Gottlosen dadurch einen Zugzug von fast einer halben Million Mitglieder erhalten.

(Allg. Ev.-Luth. Kirchengtg.)

„War Christus Jude?“ Ein mehrere Spalten füllender Leitartikel im „Stürmer“ (1938, 15) beschäftigt sich erneut mit der viel erörterten Frage „War Christus Jude?“ Der Schriftleiter des Blattes, Karl Holz, folgert in seinen Ausführungen über die Werte christlicher Kultur: „Eine Lehre, die nicht aus nordischem Blute kommt und nicht nordischen Geist in sich trägt, kann sich nicht unter nordischen Völkern verbreiten. Die christliche Lehre hat sich aber nicht nur unter allen nordischen Völkern verbreitet, sie hat sich auch zweitausend Jahre in diesen Völkern gehalten. Und nicht nur das: sie hat auch eine zweitausendjährige christliche Kultur geschaffen. Es entstanden die Dome und Kirchen und Münster. Es entstanden die grandiosen Kunstwerke eines Michelangelo, eines Rubens, eines Albrecht Dürer, eines Veit Stof, eines Riemenschneider usw. Es entstanden gewaltige musikalische Werke. Es regte sich die Kunst auf allen Gebieten. Sinnlos aber wäre es, zu bestreiten, daß dies alles nicht von der christlichen Lehre und vom Christentum gewedt und ausgelöst worden wäre. Nein, wer die Wahrheit sagen will, der muß frei erklären, daß die christliche Idee zu den größten Kulturschöpferinnen der menschlichen Geschichte gehört“ (im Original gesperrt. — D. Schriftl.). „Ebenso groß aber als diese Idee und ihre Auswirkungen ist auch ihr Verkünder. Christus war eine der größten und genialsten Persönlichkeiten, die je die Erde hervorgebracht hat“ (Sperrung im Original). Die Zugehörigkeit zur jüdischen Rasse wird verneint.

(Allg. Ev.-Luth. Kirchengtg.)