

THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY.

VOL. XV.

JULY, 1911.

No. 3.

MISCELLANY.

The Spirit of the State Universities is the subject of an "Address delivered at the Charter Day Exercises, University of California, by Dr. Henry S. Pritchett," who is President of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Knowledge. This board controls the proceeds of \$15,000,000 donated as a capital by Mr. Carnegie, which proceeds are to be applied to the pensions of teachers at such universities as are complying with the conditions imposed by the Committee. A prime condition is, that the university applying is not to be affiliated in any sense with a religious denomination, in other words, that religion of a positive nature is not to prevail or be recognized in said institution. An education that does not recognize religion, it is charged, cannot develop the whole man, and Mr. Pritchett felt the charge. In the address before us he endeavors to answer it, by asserting that the education he represents, which also he considers ideal for the universities, and which, apparently, he sees them adopt, indeed has a "faith," a religion. Of what nature is this? We cannot claim space for copious extracts from the address; besides, a few sentences will suffice. "If by faith," Mr. Pritchett says (pp. 18. 19), "the men of old subdued kingdoms, quenched the violence of fire, turned to flight the armies of the aliens, by faith no less Charles Darwin and Louis Pasteur wrought righteousness, stopped the mouths of lions, and from their work women re-

ceived their dead raised to life again. To-day, as always, faith leads man on, and the university which is without such a living faith is dead. I believe the American university to be the home of a living, triumphant faith, a faith which, in the largest and truest sense, is also a Christian faith." Again, on p. 23: . . . "a faith broad enough and deep enough to welcome alike Jew and Gentile, Catholic and Protestant, bond and free, wherever the light of truth shines into the hearts of men. The American university is to-day the home of that faith. . . . It is the faith of humanity. . . . And the American university, which embodies the intellectual aspirations of a free people, is becoming day by day also the representative of their spiritual aspirations as well."—Let us note that Mr. Pritchett, who is the man most representative of the American universities to-day, holds that the universities *do and should teach a religion*. In the second place, the faith, or religion, he advocates is in *clear contradiction of the Bible*, entirely setting aside Christ as our Savior. Universities teaching no religion whatever and confining themselves strictly and absolutely to the teaching of branches and subjects assigned them, are at least within their natural province. Our public schools should teach no religion, nor should our public universities, being but advanced public schools, inasmuch as all are supported by public money.—We have seen what kind of "faith," or religion, the universities teach, or are to teach, according to Mr. Pritchett, and if so, they are extremely dangerous, religiously, to all young people, Lutherans included. The seminaries and colleges *Alma Mater* represents are the very opposite in spirit; their motto is, "The fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom." What a positive, clearly-defined religion means in the development of character is experienced the more the longer one lives. Students of our colleges do not and cannot, because of their comparative youth, appreciate the full bearing of this. But it certainly is a fact that in the development of a strong Christian character *positive* religious truth,

preached, taught and lived, must be the stay of man in his dealings with fellow-men, and is his only hope in death. When a teacher deals with a student on the question of right and wrong, he cannot hope to achieve any lasting good, unless there be positive religious truths, as a recognized standard, at the base.

A. W. M.

Rev. Geo. H. Ratchford writes in the *Christian Observer* on lack of church discipline as a cause why churches become depleted. Laxity is usually considered a mark of the popular minister, and connivance at the wrongdoings of Christians is thought to attract people to the church. Accordingly, the statements which we approve are surprising and refreshing; however, surprising only in so far as another has come to see an old truth.

There is in our Church a large and growing list of vacant churches, and in the recent Assembly at Lewisburg it was brought to the attention of the commissioners, and published in the report of the Committee on Narrative, that there are now 900 of our churches which are marked "vacant." It has been a matter of surprise to many of our people that this should be the case, and it does seem not a little strange, in view of the fact that there are so many ministers in the Church who are willing and anxious to work, and to serve the Church in the capacity of pastors, and who are able to do the work, and yet are without charges. It has occasioned a good deal of questioning on the part of the Church, and numerous inquiries have been made as to what can be the cause of such a languishing in the life of the Church.

Some of the answers which have been given have partially touched the matter; others have gone wide of the mark. None, or almost none, have made the point that there is a vital relation existing between the ancient and Scriptural custom of discipline in the Church, and the material and spiritual growth and prosperity of the Church. The writer has worked in different Presbyterian churches in the States of Texas, Arkansas, Tennessee, South Carolina, and Oklahoma, and in all these the same condition of things has been found to exist to a greater or less degree.

Discipline has become a forgotten thing. This is hurtful to the Church. In all the foreign lands where our Church has a work among the heathen, discipline is rigorously practiced, and the Church

is growing by leaps and bounds. In the days when discipline was practiced in the home churches, there was no such condition of things as at present. There was then no such scarcity of ministers as at present. There were then no such cases as we have now, where a minister, able, educated, thoroughly orthodox, willing, and anxious to work, recognized as fully equipped for the work, and commended by the Presbytery which had examined him, and approved by the highest authorities in the whole Church, was unable to secure a hearing from a church that was without a pastor and was dying by reason of long vacancy in the pastorate.

The writer knows of individual cases in which there have been vacant churches (some of them vacant for years), which have been in a dying condition for the lack of a man in the pulpit, and which have repeatedly refused to allow men of the highest credentials, approved piety, and full equipment to preach in them, or to take the position of pastor for even a temporary period.

There are other churches in the Assembly which have been vacant for a long period, which have never been able to secure a pastor, though they have repeatedly called men to the position. There are some churches in the Assembly in which the officers have been chosen without regard to their qualifications for the places, and whose conduct and reputation in the community are notorious for evil, and yet nothing is done about it, and these men continue to retain their official positions and church standing, and have even been elected as representatives to the higher courts of the Church.

When such conditions exist within our churches, and are allowed to go on unnoticed; when different officers within the same session are not on speaking terms, when one member of the session refuses to attend church because another one is there; when the private members of the church spend more time and money in the saloons than they do in the church, and when all this is allowed to continue unrebuked for years, and when it is almost as much as a minister's life is worth to mention these facts, is it any wonder that there should be so many vacant churches on our roll? Is it wonderful that such churches should not have pastors?

These things show that there is a vital need of the revival of the exercise of the discipline of the Church, not simply for punishment of the offenders, but more for the purpose of reclaiming them, if possible to show them the enormity of their offenses, to show to others the need of carefulness in the Christian life, and to preserve the life of the Church.

Des Moines, N. Mex..

The following was printed in the *St. Louis Globe-Democrat* of March 20:—

Archbishop John J. Glennon made a public pronouncement in behalf of Catholic education before a large congregation which witnessed the reception of postulants and profession of novices at St. Joseph's Convent, in Carondelet, yesterday morning.

"The world to-day is practically divided into two camps," the archbishop said. "On one side is the Catholic Church, standing for the religious training of little children; on the other, the rest of the world, practically united in opposition to the Catholic Church, and consequently in opposition to all religious instruction, and consequently against religion itself."

The deliverance came in sequence of the recent "first communion" letter which the archbishop sent out to pastors of the archdiocese, strongly protesting against other than Catholic education for the children, and urging that children be sent either to the Catholic parish schools or to academies, colleges, or other institutions conducted by religious orders of the Catholic Church.

"It is the kingdom of Satan," he continued, yesterday, "against the kingdom of Christ." The archbishop preceded these remarks with a description of prevailing differences of opinion as to the education of children along religious lines.

"If there was ever a time," he said, "in the world's history when St. Joseph needed helpers to guard the children, it is to-day. The battle-ground of the present day is upon the question of the education of children. It is the point toward which the attention of the thinking world is turned, and which decides the future of our civilization itself. The enemies of St. Joseph and of the Christian family and of the Christ, knowing well that the child is father to the man, and that as the child is trained to-day, so shall be its future, are endeavoring to rob the child of what is his inherent right—namely, that he know his Father, who is in heaven. They want to make the education of the future without religion. They want to divorce religion from education, and thereby control not alone the body, but the soul of the little child."

Nuns militant were commended as a force against this tendency, and the archbishop spoke strongly in favor of the teaching orders. While saying he did not wish to minimize the contemplative orders for which he had only words of commendation, he declared he saw a great work for the religious orders which teach the children. He said different ages of the world bring forth different forms of religious activity. When the world, touched by pagan Rome and pagan

Greece, was very wicked, the tendency of members of religious orders was to leave the world entirely, "to save their own souls, even if in doing so they failed to help others," he said. But the archbishop declared, "The teaching order is the order best suited to the church's need in these later days."

Inquiry at the publisher's office, whether there was not some error in the reporter's account of what Archbishop Glennon had said, brought the assurance that he had been reported correctly. — At the time of the election of President Cleveland there were attacks made upon parochial schools, especially in Illinois and Wisconsin. These attacks brought out the fact that Lutherans, *e. g.*, believed in the religious training of their children, and would suffer fines and imprisonment rather than surrender what they consider a divine and a constitutional right. All America learned these facts at the time, and we have personal knowledge of the joy which this position of the Lutherans caused in Catholic circles; for it made Lutherans — strange to relate! — for once practical allies of the Catholics. There is not the least doubt in our mind that the Archbishop of St. Louis knows all this. Moreover, the Archbishop lives in a city where church-schools other than Roman Catholic are not entirely conspicuous by their absence. Some of them, *e. g.*, one on Twentieth and Benton Sts., another on Ohio Ave., near Winnebago St., another on Eighth St., near Lafayette Ave., are so large that they could hardly be overlooked. And we do not believe for a moment that a gentleman who is so well informed about the city in which he lives as the Roman Archbishop of St. Louis does not know these facts. We would like to charge him with blank ignorance because of his remarks on religious training of children being an exclusive custom of the Roman Catholic Church. But we are persuaded that his information was better than his utterance. What, then, is a proper explanation of his action? Bigotry, sheer bigotry. The Reverend Romanist wishes to be understood as saying: There is no religion outside of the Romanist religion. If you teach your child, let us say, Luther's Small Catechism, you are

strengthening the kingdom of Satan.—We have heard these views expressed before. We recognize in this Romanist's expressions "his master's voice."

About a year ago the following account was cabled to the *Chicago Daily Tribune* from London:—

George Bernard Shaw, addressing the Eugenic Education Society, to-night advocated the abolition of property and marriage, and authorization by the state to kill undesirables.

"It is most obvious to everybody," he said, "that before we can begin to breed the human race with a view to its improvement, we must go further in the direction of political revolution than the most extreme Socialist now ventures to suggest publicly. It is evident that we need the entire abolition of property and marriage, as now understood, as a preliminary step. I do not see any way out of that.

"I have found when addressing audiences on political questions that they immediately get extraordinarily interested whenever I touch upon the subject of marriage in the improvement of the human race. They already feel that if it is demonstrable that property is incompatible with achieving a high level of humanity, property must go, and it is evident that if they could be made to conceive that marriage also is incompatible with reaching that level, they would be prepared to consider whether marriage should not go."

Briefly attributing the existence of poverty, ignorance, and idleness to property, Shaw did not elaborate on this point, merely adding:

"Let us only get rid of property, and we shall get rid of all that."

He then concentrated his remarks on the marriage question.

"It is the experience of almost everybody regarding marriage," he said, "that instead of people finding themselves in a great community of marriageable persons of their own age, there are only about three persons within their reach, and they do not like any of them. Nevertheless, they have to make the best they can of these three. They are driven into a marriage which consequently hardly ever represents their natural impulse, yet the natural impulse seems to be the only thing which can be trusted for the improvement of the race."

Shaw contended that in order to give the natural impulse a chance to operate satisfactorily, there ought to be a serious effort to make the whole community intermarriageable, and to widen the sphere of sexual selection. Eugenic politics should be directed to those ends. Mating now was mainly a matter of income. A man might see an attractive scrubwoman, but he could not very well marry

her. Then he might see a duchess who would not want to marry him. In order to improve things the state would have to provide incomes for everybody and see that each person earned his income.

"Eugenic politics," continued Shaw, "would land us in the extensive use of the lethal chamber. It would be necessary to revise our views of the sacredness of human life. We should find ourselves committed to the killing of a great many people. Some would have to be removed simply because it wastes other people's time to look after them.

"On the other hand, we should leave living many people we now kill. We should have to get rid of all ideas of capital punishment. It is right to kill a man who cannot be trusted to go about in society without injuring others, but a man may commit murder, and yet be a perfectly safe and desirable citizen afterwards. Indeed, it might have been a desirable thing to have removed the murdered man. A man ought to be allowed to commit a certain number of crimes just as he is allowed to have a certain number of sicknesses."

Recurring to marriage, Shaw put a hypothetical case.

"Suppose property had been abolished," he said, "a whole community made intermarriageable, and a department of eugenics established. This department, in making experiments, might introduce a man to a woman and tell him he is to marry her.

"The man might object that she had a bad temper, and he therefore did not wish to live with her. The department would reply that her temper was the reason it wished him to marry her. 'We think,' would be its argument, 'that crossing her temper with your temperament would produce a highly desirable temperament.'

"It seems to me that to meet cases of that kind we shall have to make some provision by which women can become mothers without having to live domestically with the fathers of their children."

This drew applause from the audience, whereupon Shaw said:

"I notice that immediately I begin to talk immorality I get a response. I am so gratified with that success that I will not try to improve on it, but will sit down."

The speaker is a member of the Fabian Society of socialists. He became known to the world of fame first as a brilliant musical critic and journalist and as a writer of fiction and drama. Into all his literary productions "he works in most various ways his brilliant presentations of the ideas of Fabian socialism." The above account surely suffices to make him known forever in the world of infamy.

On the question of what it costs to create a Romish saint, the *Independent* lately obtained "inside information," which it published as follows:—

The leading Catholic organ in Germany, the *Germania*, of Berlin, which sometimes ventures to criticise pretty freely things that happen within the pale of the Mother Church, recently published with critical purposes an account of the costs of a beatification, declaring that its information is from official sources.

It distinguishes between a public proclamation of a "blessed" person (beatification) and of one declared a saint (canonization). The costs for the former are: Introduction of the proposal, 10,000 francs; the process "non cultu," 2000 francs; the process "de fama sanetitatis," 2000 francs; the process "de validitate," 2000 francs; the investigation concerning the "virtues" of the candidate, 12,000; the decree on this matter, 1000; approval of the examination concerning the miracles performed by the candidate, 2000; the investigation itself, 12,000; the "second decree," 1000; the congregation and decree "de tuto," 3000; the costs of the ceremony, 50,000 francs.

The expenses attending a canonization are these: Preparing the case, 2000; approval of the miracles, 2000; examination concerning these miracles, 12,000; the decree, 1000; the congregation and the decree "de tuto," 3000; cost of the ceremony proper, 100,000; other expenses, 50,000 francs. The total expenses of either of these ceremonies is, accordingly, from 260,000 to 270,000 francs.

Nowadays there are always two of such beatifications taken together in order to lessen the costs; but the *Germania* adds that this decrease is very small. It adds that, in connection with such a ceremony, the decorations in St. Peter's cost more than 150,000 francs, the papal concessions, by actual count, cost about 2000 francs for candles alone; the preparation of the papal throne at the recent ceremonies involved an expenditure of 12,276 francs; the candles on the altar at the High Mass cost 1287 francs; the presents given by the postulants on this occasion to the Pope amounted to 1438 francs; the new coverings needed for the altars on such occasions cost 13,000 francs; the rent paid to the Chapter of St. Peter for the utensils, etc., used is 18,000 francs, while at the last ceremony the presents and tips given to the officials and servants of the Vatican amounted to exactly 16,396 francs. The architect of the ceremony of beatification received for his work 7000 francs and for his preliminary sketches an additional 1200. The *Germania* closes its instructive list of expense items with a significant "and so forth"!

But who paid the money for the late canonization of Joan of Arc? Doubtless her French devotees.

June 6, 1911, will be remembered as the date of a tragedy without a parallel in the annals of our country. On that day the heads of our government had gone to Baltimore to pay homage to the Church of Rome. The occasion was the celebration of the fiftieth anniversary of Cardinal Gibbons' initiation into the priesthood of his church. Events of this character have occurred ere this in the churches of our country, and there is no reason why the people of any one church should not honor the men who have served them in positions of trust. Such celebrations are church affairs, — nothing else. If government officials have taken any notice of them, it was as private citizens. An attempt was made to divest the presence of President Taft, Vice-President Sherman, Speaker Cannon, Senator Root, Governor Crothers, Mayor Pressley, Ambassador Bryce, and Ex-President Roosevelt at the Cardinal's jubilee of all official meaning. But if these gentlemen think that they have convinced the intelligent citizens of the North American Republic that politics had nothing to do with their participation in the honors conferred on a Roman priest, they give their fellow-citizens credit for very little critical judgment and independence of thought. Cardinal Gibbons may have exhibited in his long life virtues which deserve praise. There are thousands of good citizens and good Christians in all walks of life in the United States who have served their country and their church just as sincerely and efficiently as he has, if not better. Or do we wish to insinuate that it is an extraordinary event when a person in high station in the Roman Church proves a good citizen, and therefore deserves to be exceptionally honored? The honors heaped upon the American Cardinal were honors shown not to the man Gibbons, or citizen Gibbons, but to "the prince" of the Church of Rome. Rome has scored a distinct triumph when it brought "the wheels of government pretty nearly to a stop" on June 6. Well might the Cardinal smile at the unusual spectacle which the heads of the nation had prepared for him, and the eulogies which they pronounced upon him and his church. In his reply to the speeches that had

been made in his honor, the Cardinal, with studied exactness, dwelt on the *official* character of the speakers. He should probably have cared very little about what private citizen Taft, or private citizen Roosevelt, or private citizen Cannon, etc., had to say about him, but he cared very much about what the heads of our national government had to say. Hence the smile and the undisguised pleasure.—We reiterate what has been stated in these pages before, *viz.*, that the Church of Rome has officially denounced our form of government, and that Cardinal Gibbons, as a loyal son of the Pope, has officially endorsed the utterances of his Italian master. We would here enter our solemn protest against the prostitution of the dignity and authority of our government on the occasion at Baltimore. We consider the action of our government officials a disgrace to the nation. Incidentally we may record the fact that on this very occasion Ex-President Roosevelt has replied to the Lutheran letter of protest of November 10, 1909, thus: "We will see presidents who are Catholics, as well as presidents who are Protestants." This shows that it is useless to argue with Mr. Roosevelt. But we trust that the nation will not soon forget what happened at the Fifth Regiment Armory at Baltimore on June 6, 1911.

Attempts have been made time and again to illustrate the basic idea in the doctrine of the Trinity. All illustrations, however, break down when measured against the coeternity, consubstantiality, and coequality of the Three Persons in One Essence. The following from the *Chicago Evening American* of May 22 fails likewise to *explain* what will ever be and remain a mystery.

"There are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost; and these three are one," 1 John 5, 7.—This quotation is sent to us by a reader who apparently has lost his faith in religious teachings, and expresses the belief that any teaching as to a religious Trinity is an impossibility, an absurdity which should not be imposed upon the human mind. It is well occasionally to remind human beings that things which to them *seem* impossible are not impossible, and that statements which we believe to be the crea-

tions of imagination and scheming are often expressions of profound truth. As an example and proof of the fact that a Trinity may be *real*, and that three separate things *may* find expression through three voices, and that all three of them may be one, we ask our friend to imagine the following conditions: You are sitting in a room with the door closed. In the adjoining room there is a sound, the playing of a Beethoven sonata. You hear the music. If you had never seen a piano, and knew nothing of music, you would not believe that in that room there were three separate and distinct forces, giving expression simultaneously to one thought, one sound. You would not believe if it were said to you, "In that room there are three that bear record of the greatness of musical genius, the piano, the artist, and the dead composer; and these three are one."

This incident proves no more than this, *viz.*, that one person may appropriate and apply the labor of two others who have preceded him.
