

THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY.

VOL. XXIII.

JULY, 1919.

No. 3.

PERVERTED DEMOCRACY AND RELIGIOUS EDUCATION.

What are the God-given functions of civil government? We answer: Civil government, whether monarchical or democratic, is instituted by God not only for the material, but also for the moral welfare of its citizens. "Righteousness"—civic righteousness—"exalteth a nation, but sin is a reproach to any people." Prov. 14, 34. Hence in the *locus classicus* on civil government, Rom. 13, 1—7, civil authorities are called God's ministers for them that do good, but revengers to execute wrath on them that do evil. When civil powers therefore issue and enforce laws that suppress all manner of lawlessness and vice, they are discharging a divine function and protecting that civic righteousness—the *justitia civilis*—that alone exalteth a nation. Where government suffers vice and immorality to go unpunished, even connives at public turpitude, there the State as well as the Church cannot thrive, but will finally perish. Hence Christians are enjoined 1 Tim. 2, 1—3 earnestly to pray for all them that have authority in civil matters over them, that they may lead a quiet and peaceable life in all godliness, and honesty. Says Luther (St. Louis Ed., IX, 922): "In the first place, pray for the civil magistrates. For the world needs nothing so much as a strict civil government. The world cannot be governed with the Gospel, for the Word is insufficient and too limited, it apprehends but a few; scarcely one among a thousand accepts it. Therefore you cannot establish secular government through it. . . . Where civil government does not strictly enforce its office, there every one will grab

OUR HIGHER EDUCATION.

COMMENT ON THE PRECEDING ARTICLE.

“Every man,” says Coleridge, “is born either an Aristotelian or a Platonist.” We need both in the Church. Rev. Schoenfeld is, intellectually, a Platonist. The Aristotelian reasons from data, and on the basis of them seeks to arrive at judgments. The Platonist is controlled by ideals, and would refashion his environment to conform to these. Both are needed in the Church, the man who acts under the mandate of strong ideals, and the man who investigates data, and on the strength of his findings formulates judgments. And there is a place for men who hold medium ground between the two tendencies; for, though a man be born either a representative of one or the other method of reasoning, yet one may strive to acquire a habit of thought which, while it gives due cognizance to facts as they are, does not deny the fructifying influence of abstract thought. We shall never attain to perfect balance of these forces within us, and in this sense Coleridge’s dictum remains true. Hence, though endeavoring to take a position of mediation, the writer of this comment remains conscious of a certain bias in favor of things as they are. Rev. Schoenfeld’s paper was written to bring out discussion, and is published in *THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY* for the same reason. Naturally, discussion will bring out differences, and in deciding for one position or the other, the fundamental attitude of those who set forth divergent views, their fundamental difference of mental habit, will be considered by the reader when he pronounces his verdict. Moreover, the writer does not believe that there will be unanimity in the Missouri Synod regarding most of the issues raised by our Educational Reconstruction program, but that in the end a majority, and not a very large one, will decide.

Rev. Schoenfeld’s paper pleads for a greater influence of our Church upon civic and cultural life, and for greater efficiency of our teachers and pastors in their special callings. The realization of these objects is made to hinge on two conditions: 1) Special preparation of the clergy to combat the errors and

evils of the day, first, by a study of science (apologetics), and secondly, by a close acquaintance with economics. 2) The training of our youth for higher spheres of activity. Let us examine these propositions in the order stated.

First, however, the object. Rev. Schoenfeld rightly condemns the prevalent error that the Church is to realize the so-called "social" conception of the Kingdom of God. This, of course (aside from the confessional principle), precludes the cooperation of our Church in the work of the Reformed denominations, which are all under the influence of the Ritschl-Rauschenbusch-Gladden idea of the social message of the Gospel. We should have to do our work alone. But the question which immediately arises is this: Has the Church any such commission as the author sets forth as a field hitherto unworked? He sums the matter up with the term "civic and social betterment." We hold that this is not the province of the Church. Undoubtedly, the Church is the greatest cultural agency in the world. Undoubtedly, it is the only agency which can achieve lasting results in this direction. But, undoubtedly, the Church has only one means of achieving this end: the preaching of the Gospel, and its necessary result, the "exemplary Christian life," as Rev. Schoenfeld expresses it, of its adherents. Social betterment is a by-product of the Gospel. It was so in ancient Galilee, when bloody Herod did "many things" under the influence of the Baptist's teachings, though he remained a reprobate. When Paul left Malta, there was a great improvement in the physical well-being of the dwellers on that island. All that makes our civilization so different from the status of Persia and China is a by-product of the Gospel. On Java, the Christianized portions of the island have good roads — the heathen sections are a jungle with narrow footpaths. How, then, — shall road-making be termed a "purpose" of missionary endeavor? We might fill many pages with parallels. Granted that our Lutheran faith, being simply the ancient apostolic faith, would work tremendous changes for the better in civic life if its influence were predominating, yet such influence upon

the life of our fellow-citizens cannot be urged as a *purpose* which the Church must set for herself in determining her educational program. The educational program of our Church is only a sector cut out of the sphere which her Lord and Master has established for her—to preach repentance and faith. We cannot serve any cultural and civic purpose better, nor more directly, than by centering the entire activity of our Church upon her divinely determined program. In my Chicago parish, numbering 1,400 souls, there was not one case of divorce in five years. According to American averages there should have been a score or more. How was this cultural effect obtained? By educating the intelligent membership to public activity in support of the movement against easy divorce? No, by educating them in the verities of the Christian religion. This is one case out of a thousand,—let us say, out of ten thousand. Preach repentance and faith, and even wicked Herod will become less unmitigated a tyrant, and the health department on Malta will report a decrease in the death-rate. “Cleanliness is next to godliness,” most literally; infectious diseases are rare in America while they slay millions annually in India. Preach the Gospel! Preach godliness! The *by-products* of such preaching make life worth living in America.

Apologetics.—Apologetics is the scientific defense of Christianity. Apologetics says to the skeptic: Let us put aside, for the sake of argument, theology and the Bible; upon your own premises you are wrong,—and proceeds to prove it. Does it convince? We do not know of a single case of conversion to Christian faith through the dissertations of the Apologists. That young Christians, affected by the anti-Christian world-view of their teachers in high school and college, may be strengthened by their talk with a pastor who is able to point out, *e. g.*, the fallacies of the Evolutionary theory, cannot be doubted.* As for working tangible results in the direction of stemming the tide of naturalistic thought in American life by instructing our

* “University pastors,” men who have special training enabling them to exert a stabilizing influence, would certainly be a desideratum in cities where our young people take their courses.

pastors in Apologetic method, — as well attempt to stop an avalanche with the palm of your hand. The difficulty is not at all intellectual; carnal man wants to get rid of the notion of a Creator and of an absolute standard of ethics; he will heed reasonable argument as little as the voluptuary heeds the cautions of his physician.

Our pastors, we should say, are not uninstructed along these lines. In their Seminary course of Dogmatics, in Psychology, in Pedagogy, the *unreasonableness* of unbelief is pointed out with much detail. But as for requiring them to obtain a “thorough knowledge of *all science* and of *every method* employed in scientific research,” that is impossible, since not even the professional scientists are able to cultivate more than a limited field of study; and also unnecessary, since the sciences, in so far as they deal with the data of observation, are not anti-Biblical, and since the anti-Biblical *theories* which men superimpose upon these data are the same in all departments of science, and are practically covered by the argument against Evolution.

The writer agrees with Rev. Schoenfeld inasmuch as he, too, believes it to be highly desirable that we train some of our men for special knowledge in the latest research of science. We ought to have, at all times, specialists who can speak with authority derived from expert training. Such men should be ready to discuss the claims of infidel science not only in our own periodicals and in special works, but also in the secular press, and to advise brethren who have a “hard case” on hand. Even so we ought to have men who cultivate, as a specialty, the field of Higher Criticism. But to have all our men prepared to prove from Assyrian and Egyptian records the errors of modern criticism, — that can never be. The Presbyterians have only one man, Prof. Robert Dick Wilson, of Princeton, who is able to meet the Pan-Babylonians and other critics of the Old Testament on their own ground. And that one man is an army. Let us, too, have specialists, but let us not attempt the impossible, endeavoring to make of every pastor an expert reader of Sumerian tablets.

Economics. — I cannot conceive of one man embodying in himself the abilities of an expert shepherd of souls — and we can only use *experts* in this work — and of an authority on economics. And why should we assume that our people are restless under the attitude of our Church with reference to the Labor problem, sanitary housing, etc.? Our parishes are made up to the extent of 95 per cent. of laboring people. We do not pander to the wealthy, like some Reformed congregations in the cities. Why call up a problem which is a *non ens*? If sporadic expressions are heard which are an echo of Socialist rantings against “the Church,” the pastor will know what to preach on the relations of Capital and Labor. As for bringing our influence to bear upon the solution of economic problems by civic agencies, that, again, is outside the sphere of the Church. None of the New Testament writings contain directions for social activity on the part of Christian clergy and people, except inasmuch as the followers of Christ are commanded to obey the law of love, and each, in his own calling, make this law the principle of action. This, indeed, we must preach unceasingly. But there our commission, and hence our authority, ends. Economics is a tremendous subject. No one man is able, in a lifetime, to span more than a small sector of it. And if he were able to gain expert knowledge of the subject, (and only expert knowledge will serve for leadership,) he would transcend his commission as a preacher of the Gospel if he were to become active in the civic implications (legislation, for instance) which come under the purvey of applied economics. Again, we say, by bringing people to Christ we are doing more for the solution of economic problems than we should be able to do by methods that attack the fruit, and not the root, of social wrongs.

The Training of Our Youth for Higher Callings. — No one will presume to deny that the training of a large percentage of our youth for higher callings by a system of Christian colleges were a consummation devoutly to be wished. However, we must be on our guard in stating the functions of the Church in this respect, and also in our choice of means and measures for the performance of that which may be done for higher education

within our Church. Has the Church the purpose to prepare its people for "an active and prominent part in political and social life"? When Rev. Schoenfeld says that it is "a legitimate and laudable *ambition* to make possible for our youth an education which will fit them for influential careers," we find ourselves in hearty agreement with him. But who is to do this work? The Church as such? Surely, the Church will be found ready to grant her approval to the efforts of those who associate themselves together for the purpose of establishing colleges and academies which our youth can attend with a minimum of peril to their faith and morals. But it cannot be successfully maintained that the Church as a *coetus* of believers is under obligation to create agencies which would serve the purpose of "fitting her youth for high and influential careers." It is a splendid thing to be a skilled architect, a capable physician, a learned jurist, an efficient chemist, an authority on plant life, an expert on soils, an adept at civil engineering, an efficient journalist, a trained accountant, — but shall the Church conceive it her object to train men and women for such callings *in order that* "our people may take an active and prominent part in political and social life"? Has she, at all, the duty to provide for a small number of her membership the special advantage of such training for temporal success? It would be difficult to put the matter thus concretely to our congregations, and then to plead for donations toward such a purpose "for the sake of Jesus Christ." And we have no right, as a church-body, to ask for money on any other plea from our general membership.

This does not mean that the establishment of colleges and academies should not be part of our educational program. Let us grant, by synodical resolution, permission to societies which, having shown evidence of the proper spirit, would associate for such purposes those in our midst who possess a live perception of the advantages which our youth would derive from a Christian college-training. The want of such institutions in our Synod has, as Rev. Schoenfeld says, been acutely felt. But the present writer cannot admit the propriety of placing upon a church-body the obligation to train men and women for the

purpose of "making our influence felt in public life," nor, indeed, of establishing schools from which, for economic reasons, 99 per cent. of our youth would be excluded. The parochial school is not at all a parallel. Every child has a right to a common school education. And the essential purpose of such an education is to train character. American educators are agreed that religion should permeate the entire school-life of the child, in order that a good citizenry may be reared. Our parochial schools are the best means of implanting the religious principle in the mind during its most plastic years. And this the Church ought to do in her own interest. The duty is unescapable. We even believe, with Rev. Schoenfeld, that a large fund ought to be created which would aid poor congregations in maintaining an efficient parish school. The obligation of training her children is one which the Church has by an inherent necessity. On the other hand, no one may say: "The Church has failed of her duty towards me; I might have become a great jurist and, as such, a power in the community, had the Church only provided the means of education." Why, if such reasoning were correct, would it not be the duty of the Church to establish schools for scientific farming, or Institutes of Art, or Musical Conservatories? All such agencies train men and women for social and political prominence. On the other hand, we ought to sympathize with every effort which is made by *free associations* of our laity and clergy for the establishment of schools of higher learning and special vocations, even as we encourage the building of hospitals by (and for) our people.

The suggestion so frequently discussed in our Synod of late that our synodical colleges be so altered in their courses of study that they would serve the purpose of general Christian colleges instead of being (solely) preparatory schools for St. Louis, should be viewed under the same aspect. If a man decides: "My boy shall be a civil engineer," by what line of reasoning can he demand of the Church that she provide special safeguards for the spiritual welfare of *his* son, while the Church makes no such special provisions for the poor man's son who

works in a factory? And why should the institutions which the Church has built up for the sole purpose of preparing men for the ministry be altered to suit the desires of a special class? If that could be done without diminishing the number of graduates for St. Louis, the case might be viewed with indifference. However, the experience of General Synod and Norwegian Synod institutions, to mention only these two bodies, conclusively proves that the number of boys who will eventually choose the ministry is greatly diminished by thus widening the scope of the Church's own institutions. That the courses which now constitute the curriculum of our colleges are in need of revision, no one, I hope, will deny. But the character of the institutions should remain what it is, lest the experience of other synods be repeated among us. By all means, let us do what Rev. Schoenfeld suggests — *found* the largest possible number of Lutheran colleges needed to give our youth an opportunity to secure a higher education in Christian environment. But let this be done through the efforts of those who can be sufficiently interested to associate themselves with others in societies having this special object. Two million dollars, the sum mentioned in Rev. Schoenfeld's paper, would be sufficient to build and equip two first-rate colleges. And the enthusiasm of those who foster the movement would provide the salaries and other funds needed for their upkeep.

Lutheran University.—This suggestion would appear practicable if it were not for several very material difficulties which would almost certainly arise if its realization were attempted.

1) A university, *one* university, would be available only for a part of our Lutheran youth since our Synod is spread over the entire country, and distance alone would be a powerful deterrent to many.

2) A university would be of practical benefit only if Lutheran students could be prevailed upon to attend Lutheran colleges first. *The main damage to faith and morals is done in the secondary schools.* This hiatus must be bridged.

3) A modern university plant could not be erected for less than \$5,000,000 and an endowment of another \$5,000,000 is

absolutely necessary for its running expenses. If free tuition is contemplated, this sum would have to be vastly increased.

4) A university without what is called "academic freedom" is unthinkable. The implications of this statement will become clear upon a little consideration.

5) In building up a faculty, the task of finding a hundred university-bred men who would conform to our Lutheran standards in their religious convictions might be attended with some difficulty.

6) The number of students from our circles attending might prove a very great disappointment. Loyalty to their Church would not prevent young men and women from attending some other institution which has acquired a reputation in the department in which they desire to specialize. The experience of some of our academies (living and dead) speaks eloquently.

7) Since the graduates of our Lutheran university would naturally have some learned profession in view, it would be necessary to make sure that its degrees and diplomas are accepted in other institutions and by State boards. Since university teaching elsewhere conforms to generally recognized norms, and since our doctrinal position is at variance with these norms in many respects (biology, psychology, pedagogy, geology, to mention only these), there would be a choice of conforming to these norms or of granting degrees which would be of limited value only. There is in the United States at the present time not one church-founded (Protestant) university which conforms to the doctrinal standards of the body that gave it birth.

The writer has had opportunity to give Rev. Schoenfeld's paper only somewhat hurried perusal when it was in proof-sheets. However, he finds himself in hearty accord with the author in the following points (possibly in others):—

By all means let us obtain for our missionary and charity work a supply of deaconesses, women missionaries, and parish visitors. Here is a great field which we have permitted to lie fallow.

Lutheran girl schools are a crying necessity. Societies formed for their establishment should receive liberal support.

The Romanists have 850 of them in this country alone. (Some of our Missouri Synod girls attend them.)

The accreditation of our normal schools is a measure on which, to no small extent, the very existence of our parochial schools may soon depend.

Concordia Seminary in St. Louis has vastly outgrown its facilities in more than one respect.

The author's clear conception of the necessity of parish schools has been a joy to the reviewer. With all his enthusiasm for higher education (which, of course, we fully share), Rev. Schoenfeld does not make the mistake of depreciating the parish school as a fundamental necessity. Such it truly is, no matter how our secondary system may be constituted in the future.

TH. GRAEBNER.
