



THE SPRINGFIELDER

September 1971
Volume 35, Number 2

positions," apparently almost as though Künne's antitheses did not really appear in American Lutheranism to any degree. I wish I could be even remotely so sanguine!

19. I wish to emphasize that these descriptions are by no means theoretical, not even within American Lutheranism, and with respect to both colleges and seminaries. The sentiment is also widespread that the "wave of the future" is the ultimate disappearance of denominational seminaries, leaving at most a chair or two at university divinity schools to deal with individual heritages and politics. The LCMS probably was impoverished somewhat in earlier years by the unwritten law that future teachers should scarcely even expose themselves to the theology or ideology of other institutions of higher learning, but the solution is not to drop all scrutiny and leave each new Ph.D. "free" to echo uncritically all the great ideas of his mentor.
20. An excellent admission (and somewhat agonizing reappraisal) that the "objectivity" of many college religion departments is really a counter-faith appeared recently in: R. N. Bellah, "Confessions of a Former Establishment Fundamentalist," *Bulletin of the Council on the Study of Religion*, 1/3 (Dec., 1970) pp. 3-6. Just one choice quote: "The establishment view of religion in American universities today is what I have called 'enlightenment fundamentalism.' This is the view that science and historical scholarship have effectively disposed of fallacious beliefs. If the study of religion has any place in the university at all, which is doubtful to enlightenment fundamentalists, it is to disclose the true reasons why religious believers have been so misguided." Of course, the context of the article is that part of recent student disturbances which have been directed against the university itself, especially its failure to inculcate even humanistic—let alone metaphysical—values. Comparable to Bellah's language, some have spoken of an "inverse fundamentalism" which seems to assume that, given enough time and money, all scholars will eventually agree!

Theological Refractions

DO WE NEED BISHOPS NOW?

For some reason or other, the thoughts of having bishops quickens the pulse of many Lutherans. *The Lutheran World*, the officially endorsed theological periodical of the Lutheran World Federation, devoted an entire series of issues to this question in connection with negotiations with the Anglican Church. *Episcopacy in the Lutheran Church* (Fortress Press, 1970) goes over much of the same ground without turning up anything essentially new. There are the arguments from the history of the church and from certain Lutheran State churches where the church is still supervised by bishops. Then there is a general type of discussion on what a bishop should do. (This might be a simple question, but it is hardly clear since bishops in different churches have different tasks.)

But has anybody really answered the question of whether anyone really wants bishops today? The opinion of the clergy is somewhat unimportant since numerically the pastors account for only .0001 of the membership. (This figure is open to mathematical correction.) Unless someone is greatly deceiving us, the great thrust today is against the establishment. And the ecclesiastical establishment is taking it on the chin along with the political establishment. Wouldn't the current prob-

lem be worsened by giving district and synodical leaders permanent tenure with an official ecclesiastical blessing? Put the question this way: What would the average Missouri Synod pastor say to making the current presidents of synod and districts archbishop and bishops respectively? Supposedly the bishop is the symbol of unity, but in the Missouri Synod under today's circumstances, he could quickly become the symbol of disunity.

Of the major Lutheran synods in America, the Missouri Synod both historically and doctrinally has had a greater degree of congregational autonomy and polity. At least superficially, this has been so. Actually the Missouri Synod has combined a monarchial episcopate with congregational autonomy. Leaving the Church of Rome out of the discussion, the president of the Missouri Synod has had more control over the church than his counterparts in other denominational organizations. District presidents are not like other Protestant bishops. In the Missouri Synod, district presidents are chosen by the clergy and congregations in their jurisdictions, but they are responsible to the synodical president. They are his representatives. This is not even in the case in the Anglican Communion or those Lutheran Churches which have bishops. In the Protestant Episcopal Church there is a presiding bishop but with no authority to exercise authority or discipline in the local dioceses, except through personal persuasion. The Archbishop of Canterbury holds a primacy of honor but not of authority. In Denmark, the bishop of Copenhagen consecrates other bishops to their offices, but has no authority over their sees. Not so in the Missouri Synod! The president of the Missouri Synod could remove a district president. The reasons for such possible action is not part of this discussion. But it could be done and has been done in at least one case.

The move towards bishops, at least in the Missouri Synod, could be a reaction against this strong concentration of power in the Missouri Synod. The move to the episcopacy, contrary to the opinion of both those who support and oppose it, is a move toward the decentralization of church power. Whether anyone is willing to acknowledge this motive is another question. Bishops in the Lutheran tradition have been autonomous. The same could possibly be said for Anglican and Orthodox traditions.

Several years ago there was a strong move in the Missouri Synod to centralize all authority for the sake of what was called efficiency. The synod was to be divided into just a few areas, each supervised by a synodical official in St. Louis. District presidents would have become his functionaries more or less. Nothing happened with this suggestion and it seems safely buried. As a reaction, a strong movement at decentralization has set in. The Council of District Presidents has grown in stature, even though its constitutional mandates are limited and somewhat undefined. Still their voices rival and sometimes surpass those of the synodical president, the praesidium and board of directors. If the Council of District Presidents have expressed themselves, it is very difficult to countermand their decisions. On the district level, the influence of the individual presidents is growing. Congregations are more apt now to call as pastors men specifically recommended by the office of the district president. They formally control the flow of pastors in and out of their

districts, even though real authority to do this in every case might be difficult to prove constitutionally.

The very title of 'bishop' suggests a superimposed authority. In the Missouri Synod, we have superimposed authority but without the paraphernalia. The mood of times is running against such authority. This is not a question of cracks in denominational structure, this is a question of how wide the cracks are going to be. Instituting the office of the bishop at this time seems to be a superficial remedy for a more profound disease. In some cases, it could be that final straw on the ecclesiastical back. If the Church of Rome has members suggesting that its bishops come up for periodic review by the diocese, we should not be surprised if some of our congregations would like to do the same with its pastors.

Ultimately the basic question is what the real benefit of having bishops will be. Is the task of the church going to be any different on the day after we have bishops than on the day before? The Gospel will still be preached. The sick and dying visited. The faithful communed. This has happened and will happen with or without the bishop. If the preaching and sacramental tasks of the church will be the same with or without the bishop, the only real question is the practical one. Do churches with bishops have more inner harmony and greater impact than those who don't? Statistically, the Anglican and Methodist Churches have not been powerhouses of mission activity. Theologically, they have had a history of sterility. We can promise that the whole issue will burn up a lot of theological activity that could be put to better use in other places.

The churches in Great Britain and their descendants have spent a lot of good time arguing the merits of episcopal, presbyterian and congregational forms of government. Unfortunately, this bad habit has caught on in America with present plans of Protestant Church Union.

Lutherans have existed under virtually all forms of church government and they have not argued among themselves who has a more valid ministry. It has not been an obstacle to church unity. We have not fallen into the temptation of canonizing church history or tradition, because from this we would prove most anything. It would be a shame if that at this juncture, we would let out theological discussions with each other degenerate into this unfruitful topic. From this point of view, this entire paper might be out of order. Maybe the words of St. Paul that he has no command from the Lord might be a very appropriate ending to a very inappropriate topic.

aps

WHAT DOES IT MEAN TO BE JEWISH?

A question which is frequently battered around, but rarely adequately answered is: "What does it mean to be Jewish?" You do not have to be branded as "anti-Semitic" to raise the question as the question is probably more frequently asked by the Jew than the non-Jews. In most any religious dialogue with Jews the question is almost bound to come up. Ernest van den Haag, a non-Jew, makes a probing excursion into the question in his recently published book, *The Jewish Mystic* (Stein and Day, 1969; Dell Publishing Company, 1971). The mystique of Jewishness can hardly be avoided by the Christian church since the Jews, at least according to the

New Testament, are singled out by God as prime recipients of His revelation and as a means of salvation to the non-Jewish population of the world. Paul's thought "to the Jew first and then to the Greek" is not new or original with him, but can be traced back to the promise made to Abraham (Genesis 12) and is a theme that keeps popping up in the Psalms and Prophets. The Christian theologian can safely forget the history of any people and still be a theologian, but he must take into account the Jews. Jesus was one. Ernest van den Haag's study is sociological in nature, but this hardly makes it any less rewarding for the Christian who still wants to tackle the problem of Jewishness. Some results of his study are so astounding that some with dogmatically liberal persuasion have categorically denied the possibility of what they call "racial differences" and dismissed these findings out of hand.

First of all, Jewish people are smarter! Jewish children generally do better than other groups on I.Q. tests, especially in the area of verbal and reasoning abilities. (By the way some Jewish groups are smarter than others.) For those who do not find the I.Q. to be the last word, there are other statistics which are hard to get around. 27% of all Americans to receive the Nobel Peace Prize for science are Jewish even though they account for only 3% of the total population. That is 900% greater than what could statistically be expected. 75% of Jewish high school students plan to go to college in comparison with 30% of the national average. They are overrepresented in college by about 260%, in elite institutions by 365%, in medicine by 231%, in medical specialties by 308%, in psychiatry by 478%, in dentistry by 299%, and on and on and on. (They are not overrepresented in the ministerium of the Missouri Synod.) There are many reasons for this, one of which is that many Jews are descended from Rabbis. The rabbi functioned not only as the religious leader but as the civil head of the Jewish ghetto in the Middle Ages. He was generally one of the brightest, if not the brightest, young man in the community. Married to a daughter of one of the wealthiest families, he married young and was encouraged to have as many children as possible. What were the best Christian minds of non-noble birth doing? Entering church work. Celibacy was siphoning off some of the best minds.

Dr. van den Haag does offer a definition of what it means to be Jewish. This he offers tentatively. Three characteristics are found more frequently in the Jewish than in the non-Jewish population: messianism, intellectualism, and ritualistic legalism. Not all Jews believe in God and even Jewish theists frequently do not have a completely formed concept of God, but they cannot shake the idea that they are on earth for a purpose. Van den Haag goes to all kinds of corners in the Jewish life: a desire to help the underdog; sex life; their attitude to the Negro, who is in the same place in many ways that Jew was about half a century ago; what they think of Palestine. Van den Haag buys Freud's concept that Judaism is the religion of the 'Father' and Christianity the religion of the 'Son.'

The Jews have hardly received a fair shake from the Gentile world. Genocide is connected with being Jewish. Hitler! All Christians have to feel some guilt in reading history. If the church still has a ministry to these people, learning something about them might be a little helpful.

Besides, it's fascinating reading. Unless you have already made your mind up and come to the conclusion that there are no typical Jewish characteristics, you can greatly profit from this study.

dps

AFTER EVIAN

(EDITOR'S NOTE: Several persons who attended the Fifth Assembly of the Lutheran World Federation at Evian, France in July 1970 have been asked to write for THE SPRINGFIELDER. Dr. Jobst Schæne of Germany provided us with our first evaluation. Our second contribution is by a former vice-president and Executive Committee member, Bishop Bo Giertz of Sweden. This report was put into English by Professor Otto Stahlke.)

The Evian Assembly of the LWF has hardly enjoyed uncritical praise. Many have been disappointed because they expected more than what a general convention of this type could ever produce. The press, the public and many delegates participated in the Evian Assembly somewhat in the style of Vatican II. They acted as if they were plenipotentiaries for the future of Lutheranism. They spoke and acted as though they all had full authority to speak and consult with each other.

But this was hardly the case at all. The delegates had no authority except to decide matters involving the LWF itself. The LWF is not a "superchurch": it has no powers to pass resolutions governing the affairs of the member churches.

But it was just this type of impression that the Assembly made. In the various open hearing rooms, special interest groups waited in hope of being given a hearing. All age groups, from the youth to the aged, had come to express themselves on a host of issues, which splintered in every direction. The broad spectrum included ecclesiastical, social and political issues. They all clamored to be heard. The biggest problem was that there had been no preparation for such a multitude of opinions and presentations. The result was a picture of various vague and compromising testimonies. The representatives from the 200 churches listened respectfully to what these various interest groups had to say; but, of course, the representatives did not have the authority to commit their churches on these issues. The delegates could only express their own opinions.

The LWF has an Executive Committee just for the purpose of giving leadership to the member churches. Its service organizations are the ones to give aid to the member churches with projects they want to carry out. Andre Appel, the General Secretary of the LWF, courageously took on the many problems presented by the Assembly, but at times he vacillated in his opinions.

If the Evian Assembly is to be productive in the future life of the church, then the members of the LWF churches will need to consider the problems raised there. The warning of Evian is that the questions posed by the Assembly are serious.

Bo Giertz

"GOD IS NOT FEELING VERY WELL" (ON CAMPUS)

Under this title, a national magazine presented the results of a poll taken at a dozen universities and colleges. Included in the schools were institutions of diverse attitudes and philosophies of life: Sarah Lawrence,

Williams, Yale, Marquette, Boston University, Indiana, South Carolina, Howard, Reed, Davidson, Brandeis, and Stanford. The students were questioned on their secondary education; political ideas; the origin of their political ideas; what they thought about the country and Communism; student power; and religion. The diagnosis for the religious survey is that "God is not feeling very well." In the eight years that have lapsed since the previous poll religious non-affiliation has risen from 25% to 34%. "Three-quarters said there had been a period in their lives when they 'reacted either partially or wholly against' the religious tradition in which they were raised." Surprisingly enough in nearly 75% of those who reacted against their own religion, this reaction took place before they went to college. About half of all who had antireligious feelings experienced a revival of religion later. "Asked their conception of the Deity only 17% of our students took the position that God is omniscient, omnipotent, three-personned and maintains 'an active concern for human affairs.'" "25% expressed belief in a God 'about whom nothing definite can be affirmed.'" Another 25% were either agnostic or atheist.

Half of those who identified themselves as either Jewish or Christian would call Jesus a great teacher. Of the Christians 20% believed in the "literal truth of the Apostles Creed." 28% accepted Jesus' resurrection and 38% held to some type of belief in incarnation. At one prominent Catholic university 94% eight years ago affirmed the deity of Christ compared with 65% in the more recent survey. Of all students only about 2 or 3% doubted that Christ ever lived. (Ed.: What a comfort! Orthodoxy is not dead!)

The religious situation in our country has been so complex that a few censuring sentences describing the causes would be glib. One could possibly hazard the opinion that the church's children have heard the church's preachers of the last decade proclaim that religion was outmoded and that 'God is dead! . . .' and they believed! Certainly all those pastors who work with high school and college students will have to give a few moments of serious thought to these statistics. In the name of compatibility, much of supernatural Christianity has been jettisoned to save the ship of the church. The ship's deck is pretty bare and a ship without a cargo really has no purpose. The problem of growing irreligion on the campuses is not an isolated problem. "Today's college religion dropouts are tomorrow's empty pews." (Not to mention empty offering envelopes.)

Book Reviews

I. BIBLICAL STUDIES

NEW PERSPECTIVE ON THE OLD TESTAMENT. By J. Barton Payne, editor. Word Books, Publisher, Waco, Texas, 1970. 305 pages. Cloth. \$6.95.

If Pilate was in search of a simple answer to his metaphysical inquiry regarding truth, he turned to an appropriate source for a reply. If a student of the Old Testament were to ask the same question of the "Fathers" of Old Testament scholarship today, they would have to care-