

# THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY.

---

VOL. IV.

JUNE, 1924.

No. 6.

---

## Sincerity in Theologians.

W. H. T. DAU, St. Louis, Mo.

The House of Bishops of the Episcopal Church was in session at Dallas, Tex., last November. A report of a committee came before it which by implication found well-known bishops, hundreds of the clergy, and thousands of the laity guilty of a position regarding the creeds inconsistent with "honesty in the use of language." In other words, many Episcopalians in pulpit and pew, when they recite the ancient creeds, do not mean to say what the creedal statements express. They attach their own meaning to them, and thus their recital of the Creed, as the committee report charged, results in "dishonesty and unreality." As a particular example the interpretation was cited which many Episcopalians give to the words of the Apostles' Creed: "conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary." They decline to accept these words in the literal sense. The bishops adopted the report of the committee and on the basis of it issued a Pastoral Letter, in which they warned the Episcopal clergy that they would be "liable to be presented for trial" if they held or taught any other than the literal interpretation of the words of the Creed regarding the Virgin Birth.

This started the recent inglorious newspaper controversy concerning the Virgin Birth. The controversy is not merely about a particular item in the Creed, but about a general principle of wide application that affects any confessional statement which an Episcopalian may make. The Episcopal attitude is that of Modernists and liberal Protestants generally. Almost immediately after the bishops' meeting Rev. Lec W. Heaton, of the diocese of Dallas, Tex., was presented for trial. The Bishop Coadjutor of Texas, Moore, in receiving the indictment, acknowledged that the presentment was warranted, but declared himself unwilling to con-

## An Interesting Page from the Congressional Record.

INTRODUCTORY NOTE.—In the House of Representatives the First Efficiency Appropriation Bill for the fiscal year 1924 was up for debate on March 13. During the discussion of an item appropriating \$13,850,622 per annum to the Coast Guard to enable it to enforce the Volstead Act, the following intermezzo occurred, which sheds considerable light on the aims and methods of the Federal Council of Churches.—DAU.

The CHAIRMAN (*Mr. Lehlbach*). The gentleman from Massachusetts [*Mr. Tinkham*] is recognized for 45 minutes.

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks

unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Chairman, I desire to read certain correspondence between the Rev. Charles S. McFarland, general secretary of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, and myself and make certain remarks thereon.

On the 10th of February I received the following letter:—

Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America (Inc.).  
Office of the General Secretary.

HON. GEORGE H. TINKHAM,  
Washington, D. C.

New York, February 9, 1924.

MY DEAR MR. TINKHAM: I have the honor to convey for your information the following resolution passed by the administrative committee of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America regarding the pending House immigration bill (H. R. 6540), so far as it proposes to abrogate the treaty with Japan and to annul the "gentlemen's agreement" without conference or consultation with the Government of Japan.

The administrative committee regards the proposed action as a flagrant violation of accepted principles of courteous and friendly international relations and earnestly requests that the bill not be passed.

The resolution reads as follows:—

"Resolved, That the administrative committee of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, in harmony with the principles repeatedly advocated by the Federal Council and its executive committee, deploras the proposal of the immigration bill (H. R. 6540) to deny admission to the United States of 'aliens ineligible for citizenship':—

"First, because it abrogates treaties and annuls international agreements by an act of Congress without consultation or conference with the nations with which the treaties and agreements were made; and

"Second, because it is unnecessarily and inevitably offensive to the nations affected thereby and certain to be resented as an unfriendly act.

"Resolved, That these resolutions be sent to each Member of Congress with a suitable covering letter."

Respectfully yours,

CHARLES S. MACFARLAND,  
General Secretary.

CHARLES S. MACFARLAND,

February 13, 1924.

Secretary, Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America,  
105 E. Twenty-second St., New York, N. Y.

MY DEAR SIR: It is with resentment and indignation that I read your communication of February 9, in which you, representing your organization, presume to advise me in relation to a purely secular matter, namely, the House immigration bill (H. R. 6540).

It is one of the fundamental principles of the American Government, preceding the adoption of the Constitution and embodied in that instrument, that there shall be in the United States complete separation of the Church and the State as religious and political entities, and that there shall be no interference one with the other.

The action of certain churches of certain denominations or, I might more properly say, of certain leaders of certain denominations, in passing resolutions in relation to legislation of a secular character and of raising funds to be used for political elections, as was done in connection with the Anti-Saloon League of America, is indefensible.

It is my settled opinion that some of the great lawlessness and actual crime in this country to-day is directly caused by the loss of respect for

the Church and its teachings on the part of the people because churches, abandoning spiritual affairs and direction, have become quasi-political institutions. As respect for the Church and its teachings declines, so must its authority over the hearts and consciences of men diminish.

I have not a drop of blood in my veins which has not been three hundred years in America, and my ancestors, as Separatists, came to this country upon the *Mayflower*. I inherit their complete resentment of interference by the Church in affairs of the State.

Inclosed is copy of a resolution recently introduced by me in the House of Representatives, which, together with this letter, I should be pleased to have you read to your board of directors. All the allegations contained therein are supported by documentary or sworn evidence.

Very truly yours,

GEORGE HOLDEN TINKHAM.

---

#### HOUSE RESOLUTION 82.

WHEREAS, One of the fundamental principles of the American Government preceding the adoption of the Constitution and embodied in that instrument is that there shall be in the United States of America complete separation of the Church and the State as religious and political entities, and that there shall be no interference one with the other; and

WHEREAS, Certain leaders of sectarian bodies, perverting the great powers of religion during recent years, have actively engaged in partisan elections and in the presentation of legislative programs to the Congress and to other legislative bodies, which are constituted to represent all of the people of the United States in all of their activities; and

WHEREAS, The leaders of such sectarian bodies, in conjunction with large aggregations of business capital and encouraged financially by several men of great individual wealth, have constituted as their political agent an organization known as the Anti-Saloon League of America, with departments or subsidiaries in every State in the Union; and

WHEREAS, The name adopted by this league was and is fraudulent and misleading as to its intentions and purposes, which were to establish complete prohibition and not alone to abolish saloons; and

WHEREAS, For a number of years the Anti-Saloon League of America and its respective State departments and subsidiaries have raised and expended vast sums of money, the amounts, sources, and expenditure of which have no public accounting; and

WHEREAS, Such vast sums of money have been used to influence public opinion in various ways, now entirely unsuspected by the American people, directly to control elections and to pay professional organizers and lobbyists throughout the United States, particularly in Washington, D. C.; and

WHEREAS, For many years the Anti-Saloon League of America, its respective State departments or subsidiaries, have openly and flagrantly violated the national campaign contributions law and the corrupt practises laws of the several and certain of the States; and

WHEREAS, The Anti-Saloon League of America paid campaign expenses of Hon. Andrew J. Volstead while chairman of the Judiciary Committee, having foreknowledge that the representatives of said league would appear before him for legislation, and subsequently did appear before him and obtained the legislation it desired; and

WHEREAS, Through practises hereinbefore set forth said Anti-Saloon League of America has successfully added to the Constitution of the United States the Eighteenth Amendment and has caused to be enacted into law the national prohibition act, otherwise known as the Volstead Law, by the Congress of the United States, and of so-called enforcement acts by the legislatures of several and certain of the States of the Union; has attempted to influence Federal judicial appointments; has denounced judicial officers and decisions; has attempted to influence the President of the United States in his appointments of heads of departments, and actually exercised its insidious influence successfully upon a bureau of an executive depart-

ment (a bureau whose unparalleled corruption and lawlessness is without example) to the extent that even appointments of persons in the service of such bureau are made with the sanction and approval of the Anti-Saloon League of America; therefore

*Resolved*, That a select committee is hereby created, to consist of seven members to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to investigate the activities of the Anti-Saloon League of America and its respective State departments or subsidiaries as hereinbefore alleged in particular and in general; and said committee is authorized to send for persons and papers, to compel the attendance of, and to administer oaths to, witnesses, to conduct such inquiries at such times and places as the committee may deem necessary, and to report its findings and recommendations to the House of Representatives, either separately or together, with such report as said committee may submit in connection with any proposed legislation.

---

The Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America.

Office of the General Secretary.

New York, February 25, 1924.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN TINKHAM: In reply to your letter of February 13, first of all, may I explain that your references to the Anti-Saloon League have no bearing on any issue in which the Federal Council is concerned, as there is no relationship of any kind whatever between the Federal Council and that body. Therefore there is no reason for bringing your resolution before the administrative committee of the Federal Council, except perhaps for information.

Is not the real question as to the content of the term "secular"? The Federal Council does not consider any question involving principles of right and justice as being secular. Such questions are regarded as moral and therefore inherently religious and coming under Christian ethics. The measure in question surely involves questions of right and justice.

The Federal Council was constituted by its denominational bodies with this purpose, as stated in the constitution adopted by all those bodies separately, "to secure a larger combined influence for the Churches of Christ in all matters affecting the moral and social condition of the people, so as to promote the application of the law of Christ in every relation of human life." To claim that a church-body has no right to protest against an injustice just because it is legislative would be to nullify the constitution of the Federal Council. It is the very separation of Church and State that makes it possible to make such protest freely. Suppose that the Federal Council were to perpetrate a public wrong. I should say that Congress would have the right to protest against it, if not to prohibit it. Indeed, you yourself are claiming just that right in the bill you introduced on the Anti-Saloon League.

My own recollections of the history of those who came in the *Mayflower* and those who followed them are that they exercised a great deal of influence on matters of State, while at the same time keeping the Church free from interference by the State. Indeed, their reason for separating the two was that the Church might be free to criticise the actions of the State.

I think the general feeling is that, on the one hand, there should be organic separation between Church and State, neither controlling the other, but that, nevertheless, this does not preclude moral relations between them

If I remember rightly, the State, during the war and at other times, has sought counsel and support from the churches. Various departments of the Government often call on the Federal Council for counsel and help. This is quite a common occurrence at our Washington office.

Is there not a great difference between organic separation and separation in moral sympathy? As a matter of fact the strictest denominations

have always held the right of the Church to petition the State, and that is exactly what is done in this case.

In this case our feeling is that this legislation runs counter to the efforts of the churches to maintain social justice. Do you not think, therefore, that they have not only a right, but a duty to protest and petition? I rather think the administrative committee regarded the immigration proposal "with resentment and indignation," just as you do their action. The committee which took the unanimous action is composed of the official representatives of twenty-nine denominations, and some of them also date their ancestry back to the *Mayflower*, as well as yourself.

We evidently have an honest difference of opinion here between men entitled to each other's respect, and I suspect many of these men are just as positive as yourself. Doubtless both you and they are conscientiously trying to perform duty. In this case they certainly represent a very great body of public opinion, and several Congressmen have written expressing their appreciation of the interest of the churches. Some Congressmen are actually desirous of getting such expressions of public opinion. As I get the trend of public opinion, it means that Christianity is to be applied more and more to these great public moral questions rather than to remain in vague abstractions. Many of the people feel that the weakness of the Church has been because it did not exert its influence more directly in affairs of social brotherhood. What is the use of proclaiming justice unless you can apply it to concrete cases? Personally, I would quit the ministry if confined to mere abstractions and prohibited from applying them to public interests.

The people in the churches are rapidly coming to look at all public affairs as matters of Christian ethics. The present problem of immigration, so far as it affects our attitude toward other peoples, is no exception. The leaders of the Church are tired of preaching justice in theory and closing their eyes to injustice in practise. If an act of Congress violates a treaty, whether in letter or spirit, it is an injustice. If it treats a treaty or any agreement like a "scrap of paper," it follows the bad example of a nation now suffering for doing so. If, then, this was the view of the administrative committee, would you want them to hesitate to say so? Even if you disagree with their interpretation, you surely would want them to express their judgment from the point of view of the Christian principles to which they are committed. Probably they would insist on having as much right as yourself to determine whether or not the question is ethical, and in any event surely Christian ethics are not left entirely to be determined by Congress.

Sincerely yours, . CHARLES S. MACFARLAND.

*P. S.* — I earnestly trust you will not object to my making this correspondence public, including your name, because it is very important that both points of view should be presented. If you prefer not to use your name, I shall probably wish to release it without mentioning your identity.

HON. GEORGE HOLDEN TINKHAM,

C. S. M.

Committee on Appropriations,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

REV. CHARLES S. MACFARLAND,

February 29, 1924.

Secretary, Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America,  
105 E. Twenty-second St., New York, N. Y.

MY DEAR MR. MACFARLAND: Your communication of February 25 in answer to my communication of February 13, which was sent to you in reply to one which you sent me under date of February 9, has been received. I am pleased to be informed that "there is no relationship of any kind whatever between the Federal Council" and the Anti-Saloon League.

If I read aright your letter of the 25th, it is a statement that the churches included in your organization propose to take a formal and active part in American politics.

Let me point out that this is a pretty dangerous program for the

churches. Of course, their ministers and members are, as individual citizens, at liberty and, indeed, ought to be encouraged, to act politically with the utmost vigor; but for churches as organizations to attempt this is a grave departure from American policy and a violation of American traditions.

We exempt the property of churches from taxation because they are regarded as apart from the ordinary public organizations and activities of our people and as entitled to this measure of public support because of the purposes which they aim to serve.

The argument of your letter is expressed at so great length and so vaguely that I may be misinterpreting it, but I think not. In any event, I beg you to consider carefully before committing the organized churches of the country to participating in political activities.

You request me to allow publication of my communication of February 13. I appreciate the courtesy on your part of making the request. You have my permission to publish my communication of February 13, provided there is published at the same time this communication, both with my name. As I know you will have no objection, it is my intention at the first opportunity to insert our correspondence in the *Congressional Record*.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE HOLDEN TINKHAM.

This correspondence was written in ordinary course of office routine and was not originally intended for publication.

Upon reviewing this correspondence, I note that in my communication of February 29 to Rev. Charles S. Macfarland I said:

The argument of your letter is expressed at so great length and so vaguely that I may be misinterpreting it, but I think not.

In this sentence I did not intend to be ungracious or to suggest that the subject was not of such importance as to warrant treating it at great length. I appreciate the sincerity of Mr. Macfarland in the position he takes and from which I dissent.

In addition to what the correspondence contains, I should like to state that I know of no political question or issue which could not be denominated either a moral or ethical question or issue or one involving right or justice if it served the will or purpose of any organization so to term it.

There are no limits to the definition of moral, ethical, right or justice in reference to any political question or issue. The free-silver issue was called a moral question. The tariff has been spoken of as such an issue. The Socialist claims that his principles are moral principles and involve right and justice. Whether one person should possess more property than another might be a moral or political question or an issue of right or justice if one wished to make the claim.

If an organization asserts its intention to interest itself in every legislative and political question which it considers moral or ethical or involves right or justice, there is no limit to its participation in any legislative or political matter in which it desires to exert its influence.

Finally I wish to add that until recent years the traditions and philosophy of the Pilgrims who came to Plymouth upon the *Mayflower* in 1620 have directed American action and have been embodied in American policies.

The Pilgrims were not Puritans. They were separatists, and believed in the complete separation of the Church and the State as religious and political entities, and that there should be no interference one with the other.

The Puritans were non-conformists and dissenters who saw no objection in the state controlling the Church or the Church the state, but desired the purification of the Church, its ritual and practises, and a reform of state authority.

With the advent of Cromwell the Puritans in England controlled the State and consequently the Church. Large numbers settled in New England and were fiercely intolerant, cruelly dogmatic, and devotees of fanatical sumptuary law. At one time their political power was so great that they prescribed that no one should have political franchise unless he was a member of one of certain church denominations. But this intolerance and fanaticism of the Puritans was gradually superseded by the tolerant philosophy of the milder Pilgrims, which tolerant and milder philosophy previous to the adoption of our Constitution and until recent days has dominated this great Republic.

A perilous course is being adopted by this Republic if churches, as organizations, are to enter American political activities and if reliance is to be placed upon sumptuary law instead of upon moral suasion and education. [Applause.]