

# THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY.

---

VOL. XVI.

APRIL, 1912.

No. 2.

---

## WALTHER THE LUTHERAN.

(Continued.)

When Walther wrote the Preface to the third volume of *Der Lutheraner*, which we reproduced in our last article, events had occurred which can safely be set down as practical results of his testimony in behalf of genuine Lutheranism, and which foreshadowed Walther's activity as an organizer of the scattered forces of confessional Lutheranism in America.

And first, the immediate effect of Walther's outspoken defense of the original position of the Lutheran Church in doctrine and polity proved to be separating, disintegrating, disorganizing. Echoes of his testimony began to be heard in the councils of the Lutheran bodies operating at the time in the United States. There were mutterings of discontent on the part of men whose conscience had been touched by what they had read or heard of Walther's work. The confessional writings of the Church were being studied, present conditions and practices were being measured and tested by the standards of the Lutheran Church, and protests for conscience' sake were being raised against deviations from the Lutheran norm. Some of these documents deserve to be handed down to posterity, in order that our children who are growing away from the use of the language of their fathers may be enabled to recall at a later time what were the distressing conditions out of which the Missouri Synod ultimately arose, and what were the elements that contributed toward its growth and gave it the distinguishing marks that still characterize this Synod.

## CURRENT EVENTS.

*THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY* (vol. 42, p. 138) says of the series of articles on the "Proof Texts of the Catechism" which we have been publishing for some time: "As a practical exposition this commentary is hard to excel. We hope it will appear in book form." The same reviewer is also favorably impressed with the articles on "Romanism a Plagiarism on Paganism."

---

*A ST. LOUIS DAILY* quotes from a published statement of Lutheran ministers regarding the Men and Religion Forward Movement as follows:—

"We cannot understand why any thinking man cannot realize the seriousness of conditions. The case is plain and simple enough if duly considered. If, for instance, the doctrine of the apostolic succession of the Episcopal Church is Scriptural, then we preachers who have not been ordained by an Episcopalian bishop have no right whatever to be and remain incumbents of the holy office of the ministry. If the doctrine of immersion, so tenaciously held by the Baptist Church, is Scriptural, then all we who have not been immersed are not baptized. If the doctrine of an election to eternal damnation, taught by the Calvinists, is Scriptural, then we are deceiving the people by preaching that Jesus died for all sinners, and that God will have all men to be saved."

The paper goes on to say: "The Lutheran belief in the verbal inspiration of the Scriptures and in the doctrine that the body and blood of Christ are present and orally partaken of in the Sacrament by all communicants is emphasized."

The document of the Lutheran ministers is quoted once more, to this effect: "That these and many similar differences should not be worthy of recognition and of the most prayerful and careful consideration on the part of all Christians and lovers of the truth and their Lord, and sufficient ground to preclude cooperation of these among whom these differences exist, and until they no longer exist, is difficult to be understood by all such as have learned the Word of Truth and have learned to stand for a definite theology on the basis of such Word of Truth, it being the unerring inspired Word of God."

The Lutheran document was prepared by our brethren of the Long Island Pastoral Conference and was addressed to the Committee of One Hundred representing the Men and Religion Forward Movement, and has made a favorable impression, because, "while clearly showing doctrinal differences between Lutherans and those denominations promoting this movement, it is courteously worded," and asks to be considered "in the same Christian and charitable spirit in which it is written."

---

*REV. O. WISMAR*, of New Orleans, and *Rev. A. Kaub*, of Dallas, have been compelled to meet the false claims of Romanists in the daily press of their respective cities. The character of the strife was as usual: Truth and plain facts on our side, equivocation and distortion of facts on the other side. Rome is plainly bent on rewriting the history of the world and the Church in its own interest. It is "making history" in our country in more than one sense.

---

REV. RUHLAND, of Ottawa, Can., sends us press reports regarding the *Ne Temere* decree, as follows:—

“Quebec, January 23. — The marriage question appeared again in the Provincial Legislature at yesterday afternoon’s sitting, when Hon. Jeremie Decarie, Provincial Secretary, replied to several questions that had been put by Mr. Godfrey Langlois.

“Hon. Mr. Decarie said that the decree of the Council of Trent respecting marriage had been promulgated in this province in 1700 by Mgr. St. Valier, and that the Government had not considered the desirability of legislation legalizing marriages contracted by two Catholics before a Protestant minister.

“Mr. Langlois’ query read: ‘Is it the Government’s intention to amend the civil code so as henceforth to render valid any marriage between two contracting parties belonging to different religious creeds or to the same creed when celebrated before any officer duly qualified to celebrate marriage?’

“The reply of the Government was that the matter had not been considered.”

Still the Roman Church has lost one case in court which affects the *Ne Temere* decree. The famous Hebert marriage had been annulled by Justice Larendeau, after Archbishop Bruchesi of Montreal had published the pope’s decree. Later, Justice Charbonneau declared the “marriage valid in the eyes of the civil law.” The decision of the justice plainly deprecates interference on the part of Rome with the civil rights of persons. This drew a reply from the Archbishop of Montreal, on February 26, who said, in part:—

“The agitation carried on from one end of our country to the other, the more or less violent articles appearing in several Protestant newspapers against the wise and beneficent, yet evidently ill-understood, legislation of the Catholic Church, and the deductions gathered from a recent judgment of the civil courts, impose upon me the duty to raise my voice, not for the purpose of trying to interpret the text of human laws, but in order to solemnly affirm the ever immutable principles of our faith touching the august sacrament of marriage as well as the sacred legislation of the Church which neither jurists’ thesis nor the findings of civil tribunals can ever abrogate or modify. . . .

“Marriage, like all other sacraments, belongs to the Church, and consequently it belongs to the Church to direct everything that concerns the validity of marriage. Such was the doctrine of the Catholic Church before the Protestant Reformation, and such will it be in all time. If, however, our separate brethren have rejected it, if they have made marriage a simple contract submitted, like all others, to

the civil powers, which may dissolve or govern at its will, let them at least allow us to remain faithful to our secular traditions, and in the name of that liberty which they claim for themselves let them permit us to act according to the convictions of our faith.

“Whatever happens, the holy laws of the Church on the marriage question will always continue to bind the conscience of its children, *and these alone*, in the eyes of the Church, *will be worthy of the title of husband and wife who will have contracted a marriage according to her forms and rulings.*”

On the same day, Bishop Fallon of St. Thomas was foolish enough to utter the following:—

“What have we done to deserve these attacks? Why are we pilloried in the press? Are we not of the same flesh and blood as non-Catholics? What have we done? *Only what Christ had done when they cried, ‘Crucify Him!’ and what the first Christians had done when they said: ‘The Christians to the lions!’* Catholics are used to these attacks, but I am getting sick and tired, and I want to take this opportunity of protesting.

“The *Ne Temere* decree is an arrangement *purely* for the Catholic people, affecting their conscience, and *having no more to do with the civil law than the man in the moon.*”

We might call this a “retreat with flying colors,” but it is a retreat—until a more convenient season for an advance shall have arrived.

Just as this issue is going to press, the announcement is being made that the pope is preparing a letter repealing the *Ne Temere* decree.

---

*AUGUSTANA* editorially attacks the claim that a pastor must be guided by popular opinion. It says: “Folkets röst är Guds röst (*i. e., vox populi, vox Dei*), this saying is one of the tallest lies which ‘the father of lies’ has uttered in this world.” The article goes on to show what this saying, taken seriously, meant in the days of the French Revolution. It points out the unpopular position occupied by Noah in his age, by Moses in Egypt and in the desert, by Elijah over and against the Baal-worshippers, by the ancient prophets who invariably represented the minority in their day, by John Baptist, by the Lord, whom a popular decision rejected for Barabbas, etc. Yes, the voice of the people is not the voice of God, *except when God’s people repeat what God has spoken.* The pastor surely misses his calling who sets out to be popular, except with the children of God. According to Matt. 5, 12, it is a blessed thing when a pastor is reviled and evil spoken of *for Christ’s sake.*—On the other hand, 1 Tim. 3, 2 requires of the pastor that he be *ῥόμιος*,

which Wilke renders "*bene compositus, decorus, modestus.*" *Κόσμιος* does not mean "worldly," and, in that sense, popular. Bishop Herrey paraphrased it: "with a due proportion in his life, modest in deportment, courteous to all, of a calm temper and grave demeanor." A circumspect walk, a good report among them that are without,—these are the Scriptural limits to pastoral aspirations for popularity. These can be gained, by the grace of the Lord, by the humblest pastor, and they necessitate no sacrifice of principle or consistency. But any popularity purchased at a moral sacrifice is a burden to the conscience, and, in addition, a poor bargain, even from a worldly point of view; for popular favor is an ephemeral thing, a breath, a vapor. Even Cicero and Virgil understood the worthlessness of the "*aurae populares.*"

---

*THE PRESBYTERIANS OF ATLANTA, GA.*, are making an effort to secure for their city the simultaneous meeting of the four Assemblies of the Presbyterian Church in 1913. *The Presbyterian* scouts the idea "that the movers in the matter had designs toward organic union," but has no objection if a union can be effected. "The evil to be avoided is trickery and any manner of force. If everything is ripe for it, let there be a union; if not, let there be none." All of which suggests the lines of the German poet: "Ich ging im Walde so für mich hin, und nichts zu suchen, das war mein Sinn," etc. Accidents will happen. It is just possible that these four Presbyterian bodies, *happening* to meet in the same place, without any design, may *happen* to unite. And that will be the "trickery" of it. Aye, aye, there is much "trickery," little religiousness, in modern union movements.

---

*PROF. MILTON S. TERRY*, in his "Biblical Dogmatics" (p. 8), scorns Quenstedt's and Carpzov's presentation of the divine impulse by which the Scriptures came to be written. He says: "Along with the old rabbinic and allegorical exegesis, there was also begotten a theory of Biblical inspiration which in course of time has taken to itself such qualifying terms as *verbal, inerrant, and infallible*. It has affirmed that the sacred writers were impassive instruments in the hands of God, and that every word and letter of the Bible were supernaturally dictated by the omniscient Spirit. Thus Quenstedt, in 1685, declared that 'all things which were to be written were suggested by the Holy Spirit to the sacred writers in the very act of writing, and were dictated to their intellect as if unto a pen (*quasi in calamum*), so that they could be written in no other circumstances, in this and no other mode or order' (*Theologia Didact.*, IV, 2). Carpzov, in 1728, declared that the divine Power

'impelled the will' of the Biblical writers, and 'directed their hands that they might write infallibly' (*Critica Sacra Vet. Test.*, p. 43)."

This is a fair specimen of the superficial work of modern scientific theology. Note the nonchalant way of giving references: "Theologia Didact." is amusing; "IV, 2" is hilarious. The words to which Prof. Terry refers are in Part I, cap. IV, Sect. II, quaest. 3 in the thesis, page 68 of the Wittenberg edition of 1685. Note also the scholarly rendering of the common Latin phrase "*in calamum dictitare*." Remember, lastly, that Quenstedt's treatise, *De Scriptura Sacra*, runs through nearly 200 pages folio closely printed (pp. 53—240), and that it is one of the most searching studies extant on what the Bible says in plain words, or reveals by unavoidable inference, regarding its origin,—and you have an idea of the "scientific" outrage perpetrated by the above quotation. And now, try to fathom the possible connection between Quenstedt's presentation of the theopneusty and "the old rabbinical and allegorical exegesis."—Possibly, Prof. Terry's citation was obtained at second hand. We do not suspect him of having read Quenstedt or Carpzov.

---

PROF. NICHOLAUS M. STEFFENS in *The Christian Intelligencer* discusses the question, "Is Christianity a Syncretistic Religion?" and refers to the interesting derivation of the term "syncretism," whether it is to be traced to a verb *συνκηρίζειν*, "to do as the Cretans do," or to *συνκεράννυμι*, "to commingle." He says:

"What was the original meaning of syncretism? Plutarch tells us that syncretisize means to act under certain circumstances as the Cretans did. When Cretans quarreled among themselves, which frequently was the case, and a third party tried to interfere, they united and fought against the intruder.

"In the history of the Church we find that the term was applied to union movements, which were a result of the threatening disintegration of the Church and the resulting loss of its visible unity.

"In the formative period of the Reformation of the sixteenth century, when many earnest men deplored the breaking up of the visible unity of the Church of Christ, syncretistic movements were the order of the day. Some optimistic lovers of Church unity, *e. g.*, the theologian Calixtus and the philosopher Leibnitz, did not despair of a reunion of Roman Catholics and Protestants. Melanchthon, perhaps, is the model of this kind of syncretism, for he was even willing to submit to the pope and his hierarchy if Protestants were permitted to preach the doctrine of justification by faith only.

"Later, however, during the time of the fierce dogmatic controversies between Lutheran and Reformed theologians, syncretism

was not in favor. The great champions of Neo-Scholasticism denounced all attempts to unite the two branches of the Protestant Church. According to their idea of syncretism a union between the Reformed and the Lutheran Churches would necessarily result in a mixture of heterogeneous elements. They even went so far as to derive the term syncretism from a Greek verb which means to mix. The Evangelical unionists of our day, however, cling to the original meaning of the term, a little modified perhaps, desirous as they are to enlist all the Christian forces against the common enemy.

"It does not enter their minds to look upon Christianity as a syncretistic religion. Is it not strange that the orthodox teachers of the Neo-Scholastic period and the radical propagandists of the so-called new theology of our own time should hold the same view of syncretism? Truly, extremes meet. But the old teachers would never have consented that Christianity pure and simple has to be looked upon as a syncretistic religion. They objected to a mixture of different tendencies of Christianity because they believed that they had found in their system the correct conception of Christianity; hence they feared an adulteration of the genuine article by an admixture of less valuable materials. The new theologians, however, have no scruples of this kind."

The history of the term, with the documentary evidence, is given in the Henke-Wagemann articles of *Protestantische Real-Encyklopaedie*. Regardless of the derivation, the preponderance of modern usage has assigned to syncretism a meaning synonymous with unionism, indifferentism, agree-to-disagree policy. This, of course, favors the derivation from *συγκράννυμι*, and it is a question whether those who accept this derivation ought not to write *syncratism* instead of *syncretism*. The *Standard Dictionary* still derives the term from *συγκρητίζω*.

Prof Steffens, in the article aforementioned, has some pertinent remarks and criticisms on the syncretistic tendency of the new theology.

"They maintain that Christianity is not a pure and simple religion as we have thought, but a mixture of many religious elements taken from all the religions of the world, and they are of the opinion that even in our day Christian theologians ought to be willing to learn and to assimilate much from other religions or systems of philosophy, especially from the great religions of the world. I quote from a Manual of Theology, which is one of the best of its kind, the following: 'From all religions, Christian theology can learn something, and from the great religions much, even though it can teach them more.' A speculative theologian who ignores the Scriptural



principle may, perhaps, in building up his philosophico-theological system, learn something from Buddhism, Hinduism, Confucianism, and other human systems of religion, but a theologian who finds the fountain of truth in the revelation of God in His Word has only one Master, and is willing to sit at His feet, who is the Way, the Truth, and the Life. A theologian whose aim it is to present the Christian religion, pure and undefiled, will probably concede that formally and historically theologians derive something from non-Christian sources, and none will deny that in the formative period of the old Catholic Church the Greek church-fathers have not in vain studied the works of Plato, Aristotle, and even Pontinus, and have thereby been enabled to handle the problems that came up in their days in a scholarly manner; but materially, ethnical religions do not contribute anything to Christianity. In the works of the church-fathers may be found here and there traces of the influence of their contemporaneous philosophers, as Kant and Hegel have exerted an influence in their times; but it is not Christianity as a religion which has been developed into a more comprehensive religion than it was before. There is development of our knowledge of God's truth, but there is no evolution of new truths brought about by the studies of the theologians of the religio-historical school. It is the philosophical theology of modern theologians which is syncretistic, but by no means the Christian religion. The more conservative among modern theologians allow that Christianity is an original religion, which in the course of time has absorbed all the better elements of other religions; but the more radical among them assert that Christianity is nothing but an aggregate of all kinds of doctrines and maxims. What do you say about the following definition of a syncretistic religion? 'A syncretistic religion is a religion which consists of a combination of elements taken over substantially unchanged from earlier faiths, and without any distinctive character or new contribution of its own.' Is Christianity such a crazy-quilt of many and manifold bits of religious odds and ends? The above-quoted definition certainly cannot be applied to Christianity. Such a mechanical aggregate of parts which have no organic connection would resemble a mosaic rather than a living religion. I wonder whether anywhere such a religion is found. And yet the theologian from whose manual I have quoted finds it at least *plausible* to look upon Christianity as a syncretistic religion.

"The great mistake the new theologians make consists in emphasizing natural religion and the development of all existing religions, Christianity included, in harmony with the theory of evolution. It is revived Deism and Rationalism. Natural religion

is the religion of the natural man, who is in rebellion against God. It is on this account that all ethical religions have many things in common. They all are perversions of the truth. Left to our natural religious instincts, we never find God; for only he who beholds the Son beholds the Father. No man cometh to the Father but by our blessed Savior, the only-begotten Son of God. Christianity is God's gift to lost man. Christianity only is the remedial scheme whereby man is restored to primitive simplicity and future glory. It is the only true religion, which will be hailed by such who as sinners look for a way to God, and as saints desire to walk in this way the Father has disclosed to them in His infinite mercy. To call Christianity a syncretistic religion is a libel of the grossest kind and an act of the basest ingratitude to God for His unspeakable gift. Has theology to build up our Christian religion, developing it up to date with the help of the vagaries of the perverted mind and imagination of fallen man? The Lord forbid! Our great task is to find out more and more the simplicity and sublimity of the only true religion, revealed to us in Christ."

---

*PRECISION AND DECISION* have always been regarded as indispensable requisites for effectual teaching. A discussion between two prominent scholars in London partly turns on this matter, and leads the *Presbyterian* to say editorially:—

"There has been considerable complaint on the part of students, especially in our theological seminaries, because of certain indefiniteness in the instruction. The teachers cite a variety of opinion on certain points, and then leave the students uninformed as to which is true, or as to whether the positions cited are true.

"This is unfair to the student, and untrue to the teachers' responsibility. Men are put into teachers' chairs, not simply to cite opinions, but to teach truths and give the reasons therefor. In fact, when a teacher cites an opinion without disapproval, it means approval, or else it has no significance, and is a foolish action.

"But it is to be feared that this practice is due to cowardice upon the part of the teacher. Believing, for himself, certain things which are contrary to the purpose of the chair he occupies, the teacher cites those things, and thus, having left them in the mind of the student to do their baneful work, he lacks courage to carry them out to full argument.

"The teacher who is employed to teach any subject should be informed upon that subject. He should be able to set forth truth and errors pertaining to it, and to defend the one and disprove the other.

"There are points in all subjects which remain uncertain and

undecided. Then the teacher should be honest, and acknowledge the limitations. Nothing is more mischievous toward a student, mentally and morally, than to cultivate indefiniteness and uncertainty. Harold M. Weiner, a well-known critic of London, in a reply to Dr. Driver, has this to say, which is both sane and helpful:—

“What would any junior student understand by this? One view is mentioned, only to be rejected; certain views are cited without any suggestion that there is any objection to them, or any warning as to adopting them; and other interpretations are not even mentioned. A commentator who puts forward certain views without objective question, warning, expression of doubt, or alternative, must be held to recommend those views. Surely, he cannot be supposed to put them forward because he does not adopt them. Surely, too, no schoolboy would suspect that the commentator regards them as incorrect. If the commentator does not believe the interpretations he himself adduces without doubt or question, what on earth does he believe or mean his readers to believe?”

“We are persuaded that Weiner is right, and that he hits a practice that is as mischievous as it is common in both oral and written instruction.”

Definiteness in teaching is the fruit of definite beliefs. A theology of doubt, skepticism, and denial must of necessity lead to indefiniteness in teaching. A theologian speaks with authority and finality when he speaks after Him of whom it is written: “He taught them as one having authority, and not as the scribes.”

---

*IN THESE DAYS OF FERMENT AND AGITATION* in the churches it is well to be reminded of a saying of Peloubet, the well-known author of religious literature for the young:—

“There is a continual temptation to-day for Christian workers to give up their time and strength to discussing the many theories and unsettled questions which are continually confronting them. All sorts of men say all sorts of things, till it seems as if these clouds were obscuring the whole continent of truth. This is true of many other things besides religion. Now, the way to escape from these snares is to attend to our duties; to go to work for the cause of Christ with all our hearts; to give ourselves to helping save our fellow-men, both body and soul. For then we will use the essential things by which our work is accomplished. We thus test the working theories by using them. Those principles that bring results are the ones we want. We find out what they are worth through testing them by what they will do. Working for Christ and for His children is our safeguard.”

WINSTON CHURCHILL, author of some stirring historical novels that have delighted Americans ("Richard Carvel," "The Crisis," "The Crossing," "Coniston"), is reported to be advocating "Christian Anarchism." Says *The Presbyterian*:—

"But Mr. Churchill magnifies the individual over society, and states that the essence of Christianity is the placing of authority in the individual soul. He attempts this definition: 'The Christian ideal is the least possible government, a government wherein neither you nor I, nor any other man or woman, will labor and obey because we have to, but because we have learned the lesson which Christ taught, that happiness lies alone in service, in giving to the world that which God gave us.'

"Mr. Churchill says many things that are true. But he is dreaming of a time when the Kingdom of Glory shall be fulfilled, when there shall be a new earth, 'wherein dwelleth righteousness,' when the Sermon on the Mount has been realized, when men will have become perfect, even as their Father in heaven is perfect. He skips over the period through which we are now passing, when evil is still battling with good, darkness with light, and sin with righteousness. It would be well to remember what our Lord said: 'Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and unto God the things that are God's;' and the words of the Apostle, when he said: 'The powers that be are ordained of God. Whosoever resisteth the power resisteth the ordinance of God;' and again: 'The Law is not made for a righteous man, but for the lawless and disobedient.' When all men are righteous, Mr. Churchill's dream or ideal will be realized. The great work now is to have men become righteous. And this is the present work of Christianity and the Church. 'Seek ye first the kingdom of God and His righteousness, and all these things will be added unto you.'

Even after "the new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness," *i. e.*, the life everlasting, after the consummation of this present world, will have come, there will be neither "anarchism" nor "Christian anarchism." The Lord God omnipotent will reign even then, over His saints in glory, over His enemies in justice.

---

OUR PRESENT PRESIDENT PLAINLY A TOOL OF ROME.—The following official documents are making history in our Republic at the present time. To the well-informed and observing they merely confirm past impressions, *viz.*, that Rome held both, the past and the present, incumbents of the presidential office in her leading strings. The documents read:—

“DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, OFFICE COMMISSIONER OF  
INDIAN AFFAIRS.

“Circular No. 601.

Washington, January 27, 1912.

“Religious Insignia.

“*To Superintendents in charge of Indian Schools:—*

“In accordance with that essential principle in our national life, the separation of Church and State, as applied by me to the Indian Service, which as to ceremonies and exercises is now being enforced under the existing religious regulations, I find it necessary to issue this order supplementary to those regulations, to cover the use at those exercises, and at other times, of insignia and garb as used by various denominations. At exercises of any particular denomination there is, of course, no regulation in this respect, but at the general assembly exercises and in the public school-rooms, or on the grounds when on duty, insignia or garb has no justification.

“In government schools all insignia of any denomination must be removed from all public rooms, and members of any denomination wearing distinctive garb should leave such garb off while engaged at lay duties as government employees. If any case exists where such an employee cannot conscientiously do this, he will be given a reasonable time, not to extend, however, beyond the opening of the school-year after the date of this order, to make arrangements for employment elsewhere than in Federal Indian schools.

“*Respectfully,*

“ROBERT G. VALENTINE.”

This just order, which was in absolute harmony with the spirit and letter of our basic law, and in keeping with our past history, President Taft has, after a visit from a certain Rev. Ketcham at the White House, rescinded by the following letter to the Secretary of the Interior:—

“*My Dear Mr. Secretary:—*

“It has been brought to my attention that an order has been issued by the Commission of Indian Schools. This order relates to the general matter which you and I have had under consideration and concerning which, at your request, the commissioner was collecting detailed information for our advice. The commissioner’s order has been made without consultation either with you or with me. It not only prohibits the use of distinctive religious insignia at school exercises, but also the wearing of distinctive religious garb by school employees, and provides that if any school employee cannot conscientiously comply with the order, such employee will be given a reasonable time, not to extend, however, beyond the opening of the next school-year, to make arrangements for employment elsewhere

than in Federal Indian schools. I fully believe in the principle of the separation of Church and State on which our Government is based, but the questions presented by this order are of great importance and delicacy. They arise out of the fact that the Government has for a considerable period taken for the use of the Indian certain schools theretofore belonging to, and conducted by, distinctive religious societies or churches. As a part of the arrangements then made the school employees, who were in certain cases members of religious orders, wearing the distinctive garb of these orders, were continued as teachers by the Government, and by ruling of the Civil Service Commission or by executive action they have been included in the classified service under the protection of the Civil Service law. The commissioner's order almost necessarily amounts to a discharge from the Federal service of those who have entered it. This should not be done without a careful consideration of all phases of the matter, nor without giving the persons directly affected an opportunity to be heard. As the order would not in any event take effect until the beginning of the next school-year, I direct that it be revoked, and that action by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs in respect thereto be suspended until such time as will permit a full hearing to be given to all parties in interest, and a conclusion to be reached in respect to the matter after full deliberation.

*"Sincerely yours,*

*"(Signed) WILLIAM H. TAFT."*

Before the foregoing order of the President was issued, Chas. L. Thompson, President of the Home Mission Council of National Protestant Mission Boards and Societies, had addressed the following telegram to the President:—

"The White House, Washington, D. C.

*"The President:—*

"The action of the Honorable Commissioner of Indian Affairs issued January twenty-seventh relative to sectarian insignia and garb in Federal Indian schools, is to our minds so manifestly American in spirit, judicial and righteous, that we heartily approve and commend it. We did not know that such an order was in preparation. But we now express our commendation and ask that nothing be permitted to weaken its force. We desire our representatives to have a conference with you if you find opportunity and occasion for this."

This request for a conference was not granted.

*THE LITERARY DIGEST*, with its customary partiality to the Catholics, claims that no Protestant journal has disapproved of President Taft's act in suspending Commissioner Valentine's order

to enforce a common rule of our country so far as it applied to his office. *The Literary Digest* in this case has not waited to hear and digest Protestant opinion. Here is one from *The Presbyterian* of February 28:—

“Some of our government officials have been guilty of partiality and inconsistency. President Taft made a great mistake when he recently reversed the order of the Commissioner of Indian Education. Commissioner Valentine simply gave the general order that, while teachers were doing lay work in the service of the nation, they must not display church insignia. This order was not in the interest of any party or sect, but common to all. But President Taft reversed it, giving as his reason that the parties should be heard before the order was given. We see no reason for this as it is only the statement of an American principle long since established—the separation of Church and State. Neither Mr. Taft nor any other man could pass upon this principle or the expression of it. The commissioner was simply doing his duty.”

*THE TRUTH SEEKER*, of New York, is quite correct when it values President Taft's claim that in spite of his suspension of Commissioner Valentine's order he believes in the separation of Church and State, at the following heavy discount: “As a government employee, the teacher represents the state. In wearing the religious garb, the employee represents the Church. Church and State are united in that employee, and anybody, whether President or priest, who would permit such a union *is not honest* when affirming his belief in separation.” We cast our humble vote the same way. We think the President's assurance is not worth the paper it was written on. *Facta loquuntur*.

*HERE IS A WHITE RAVEN*. In discussing the dangerous pressure and arrogant demands of Romanism in our country, an anonymous writer in *The Presbyterian* says:—

“If we—Protestants of every name—are to hold our heritage, is not the great struggle of the Reformation to be fought over again? It is clear to every one who has watched the drift of religious thought for the last quarter of a century that the doctrine of salvation by works in some form is rapidly taking the place of the Scriptural teaching of salvation by grace. Within the more pronounced Protestant churches there has been a growing rejection of the atoning sacrifice of Christ, with the substitution of salvation by personal character; or, as one preacher has announced it, ‘every man his own savior.’

“With Rome and the Romanizing bodies, Christ and His atone-

ment are not so much denied as they are buried under the wood, hay, and stubble of sacerdotal rites. These are the facts confronting evangelical Christendom to-day. They are not trifles. How are they to be met? Is the Gospel of Christ to be crucified between the two malefactors, infidelity and superstition? Luther was right when he said that Justification by Faith was the article of a standing or a falling Church. All our activities cannot save us if we abandon the foundation of human hope."

Rome *does* deny dogmatically the atonement of Christ for actual sins, besides burying it in the manner stated above. It is only when this fact is understood that Rome's true character is seen. Rome is "the mystery of iniquity," "the man of sin," "the son of perdition," and Antichrist, because it nullifies the entire work of Christ. Rome destroys the authority of the civil powers, but this is as nothing to the destruction which it has wrought in the Church of God. For this reason Luther prayed: "*Deus vos impleat odio papae!*" That prayer was not inspired by vengefulness or malice, but by a clear insight into the real inwardness of the papacy. One might wish that such knowledge of Romanism as is exhibited in the above quotation might spread among all the Christian churches of our country. It is very, very rare.

AT THE OFFICE OF THE AMERICAN CITIZEN, 120 Tremont St., Boston, Mass., a letter is exhibited to any one who will call to inspect it. The letter was sent to a Protestant who had been mistaken for a Romanist. The letter requires no comment. We offer it as collateral evidence to the truth of things that have been published in the QUARTERLY for the last three years. This is the letter:—

DIRECTORS OF THE CATHOLIC MISSIONARY UNION.

MOST REV. J. M. FARLEY, D. D.,  
Archbishop of New York, Pres.

MOST REV. JOHN IRELAND, D. D.,  
Archbishop of St. Paul.

RT. REV. MATHEW HARKINS,  
Bishop of Providence, R. I.

VERY REV. E. R. DYER, S. S.,  
Pres. St. Mary's Seminary, Baltimore.

REV. MATTHEW A. TAYLOR.

VERY REV. A. P. DOYLE,  
Secretary-Treasurer.

REV. WALTER ELLIOT,  
of the Paulist Fathers.

Represented by  
THE MISSIONARY.

**The Catholic Missionary Union.**

Under its Auspices  
The Apostolic Mission House.

Washington, Brookland Station, D. C., February 6, 1912.

*My Dear Friend:—*

How near at hand do you think is the time when America will be dominantly Catholic? Things move on with rapid strides these days, and the recent creating of three American cardinals has brought the Church once more to the forefront. The dominant note in the



address of the Holy Father as well as in the replies of the cardinals is the hope of wonderful progress among English-speaking peoples. They have all spoken of "the era of convert-making." All this indicates a marvelous advance along the lines whereon the missionaries of the Apostolic Mission House have been working these twenty years.

If all the priests and laity would turn their faces to this one goal, what a tremendous impetus the movement would get! One of our great leaders recently said—and there is a burning truth in it: "We must labor to gain the confidence, love, and respect of the American people. This once gained, the Catholic Church, in her way to claim the American heart, may carry a thousand dogmas on her back."

Last year our missionaries gave hundreds of missions, and the record of convert-making is now away beyond the thirty-five thousand mark each year. Just think what this means! This estimate says nothing of the thousands of fallen-away Catholics that have been brought back to a good life.

Come with us and share the glories of this work!

Sincerely yours in Xto,

*Catholic Missionary Union.*

A. P. DOYLE, *Treasurer.*

---

A GREAT "IF."—Not so long ago prominent men in the Presbyterian Church were pooh-pooing the idea of Roman domination in our country. Charles Francis Greene, in reviewing some anti-Roman literature for the *Princeton Review* two years ago, remarked: "What would happen if the majority of our American citizens were devout Roman Catholics, seems to us somewhat like the question, 'If the skies were to fall, would we all catch larks?'" There seems to have occurred a slight awakening of late; for *The Presbyterian* is beginning to take notice of the growing Roman influence at Washington. But even now this journal, noting the concern of *Zion's Herald*, New England's Methodist paper, about the designs of Romanism on America, says: "We have much sympathy with the concern shown by our contemporary. But the spirit of liberty and tolerance is too strongly entrenched in our American life to allow such a conquest." And then the paper goes on to say, clearly admitting the existence of the danger which it has minimized: "If Protestantism will bestir itself and rise to its true self, it can neither be uprooted nor conquered. . . . If Protestants stand true to their position, any attempt of Catholicism to subdue this land will be met by such reaction as will repeat Catholic experience in other nations." In our opinion these "ifs" deserve to be writ large with a

great question-mark behind them. Protestantism has in many quarters thrown away its only efficient weapon for attacking Rome, the inspired Word of God. In other quarters it has been lulled into the fatal sleep of indifferentism and security. Now that the call is heard throughout the land: Beware of Rome! many Protestants act like drowsy people who are unwilling to be roused, and many pretend to see nothing worth fighting for. Besides, the prospect of history repeating itself in our country, as regards the old war of the nations against Rome's cunning and violence, is not a pleasant one.—The men of the present generation have reason to ask themselves what their children will think of them fifty years hence, if Rome keeps up her present aggressiveness in our country. The greatest danger, however, arising from an ascendancy of Rome in our country, is a spiritual and religious, not a political one, though that is great enough. Modern Protestantism has ceased to regard the papacy as "the mystery of iniquity," the destroyer of God's truth and of the sinner's righteousness by faith in Christ Jesus.