

THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY.

VOL. III.

MARCH, 1923.

No. 3.

England's Divine Destiny.¹⁾

Synopsis.

The article begins by describing the conditions in England prior to the reign of Queen Elizabeth. No industry; hardly any fleet; the trade in the hands of foreigners. "A home-staying, agricultural, and pastoral people."

Then the rise of English sea-power after the decline of Spain (1588). The founding of colonies in America. The rivalry with France, which did not end till 1815. Treaty of Utrecht. Subsequent policy of England. Commercial rivalry of Spain and France. The Mediterranean. Treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle. Pitt. American Revolution. Colonization of South Africa, Australia, New Zealand, Canada, Egypt. Policy after 1870 to the present day.

Follows the translation:—

The policy of giving up, preached and practised by the liberal economists, the dissenting conservatives, and the philosophic radicals, has never been accepted by the Tories. The latter wrote in the *Times*, in reply to the articles by Smith: "They wish to state, once for all, that England has no intention whatever of giving up its possessions overseas."

In 1874 the conservative party takes the reins. It is the triumph of the imperialistic policy. It is the awakening of the

1) The subjoined article has been contributed by Rev. H. Ruhland, of Ottawa, Can. It has been taken from an article by Jean Desy, Professor of Higher Commerce, in the *Revue Trimestrielle Canadienne*. The article is inscribed "De L'Ile à L'Empire" (From Island to Empire). Rev. Ruhland gives a synopsis of the article, then translates the most remarkable portion, and, omitting a lengthy dissertation on the strengthening of the ties that bind the British Colonies to the mother country, reproduces in condensed form the Professor's concluding remarks. D.

THE THEOLOGICAL OBSERVER.

Our recent synodical anniversary is noted in terms of admiration by *Deutscher Brief*, a Hamburg semimonthly publication (December 15, 1922). The historical facts relating to the origin of the Missouri Synod are briefly stated, and on the basis of our latest statistics the present size and activities of our Synod are described. "Regarding their doctrine," the writer says, "on which they insist rigorously, we may note only these facts, that they view the universal priesthood of a truly believing congregation as vested with the office [of the ministry], and that they deny every cooperation of man in his conversion (doctrine of election). They adhere firmly to the doctrine of inspiration." Brevity, otherwise the soul of wit, is here seen as the mother of inaccuracies. The Missourians believe that the universal priesthood of believers and the office of the ministry are two distinct matters. The right and duty to prepare, call, maintain, and, if need be, dismiss ministers belongs indeed to the Christian congregation, in which the Lord has vested the power of the keys. (See Walther's *Rechte Gestalt*, etc.) What connection the writer intended by his parenthetical remark about the doctrine of election with the monergism of the Missouri Synod's doctrine of conversion is not plain. The encomium which he bestows on us when he describes us as "*Hueter des Deutschtums*" (protectors of Germanism), we fear, never was applicable to our Synod in the sense in which this phrase is commonly used. It is certainly not applicable to-day, when nearly half the Missouri Synod is English. By the way, the name of our Synod is not "*Missionssynode*," but *Missourisynode*, named after the State of Missouri.

D.

The Supreme Court of Michigan has handed down a decision adverse to the petition for a referendum on the question whether all persons of school age shall be compelled to enter the public schools of the State. This means that the agitation against private schools in Michigan will rest for about two years.

D.

An ominous warning is sounded against the spread of evolutionism within the Church of Christ by J. H. Tornell, in the *Lutheran Companion* (January 20), under the caption: "Where Tolerance Ceases to be a Virtue." He says: "It is not the opposition to evolution, but the evolution theory itself, which would so vitally affect the Church of Christ. Therefore, to adopt a new theory in place of the evolution theory would merely be taking the longest way around, which would only bring us a recurrence of difficulties, with new problems to solve. While there are many of us mortals here below who find it exceedingly difficult to concede Bible-truth, the rest of us find it equally impossible to accept scientific unbelief for anything over and above its face value. Confusion, pretense, and blundering may find its place in politics, but in the Church of Christ there is no room reserved. We regret that mistakes have been made in the name of the Church, yet it may be the only means of rousing a slumbering

Christianity. If the Church is to continue its function as a Christian institution, it must sooner or later suffer the abolishment of disbelief, and when this takes place, we realize as never before what gashes it will cut. It must be borne in mind that not all members of the Church are liberals; there are many who yet hold to the fact that treason is treason, not loyalty, and a traitor to his God is doubly dishonorable. There are many who have not rejected fundamental Christian truth for modern liberalism, where honest criticism is not tolerated and skepticism is held forth as being the cream of Christianity; these also are some of the errors committed in the name of the Church. (See Dr. Fosdick's statement in the December 2 issue.) 'God will not be mocked'; in due season He will surely purge His holy Church of all that is abominable in His sight, and when this process gets under way, it will profit no one in giving aid and comfort to the enemy." D.

Rome in Russia. — *Our Sunday Visitor* (January 21) reports that there are only 6,000,000 Catholics in Russia (population, 130,000,000), who are served by about 2,000 priests, 6 bishops, and 1 archbishop. "Because the people of Russian Poland, who were Catholics, frequently rebelled against Czar rule, the Catholic religion was bitterly persecuted at different times, and in 1864 all religious orders were suppressed. Following an edict of toleration, promulgated in 1905, 500,000 conversions occurred in two years. This success of the Church provoked new opposition and more hostile laws. Emigration from Russia to the United States was very heavy, beginning in 1902 until the World War. New York, with 1,500,000 Russians, has about one half the total number in this country." The writer calls the present Russian government "the merciless Soviet or Socialist (Bolshevik) rule," and, while branding it as antichristian, regards it as "the natural reaction from the slavery under Czardom." Rome hopes for much from present-day Russia. "Never before was the outlook so bright for the union of the Russian with the Catholic Church, and a stable government would promote such union. The Russian peasants, on the whole, are good and peaceable [mostly illiterates and full of superstitions and bigotry], and before the war were devoted alike to State and Church." In the new Baltic Republic, which maintains representatives or special emissaries at the Vatican, Rome is also pushing forward, and hopes to capture some of the old Lutheran churches. D.

Roman Diplomats in Europe. — At President Ebert's New Year's reception of foreign representatives at Berlin the Apostolic Nuncio, Mgr. Pacelli, acted as *doyen* of the diplomatic corps. He expressed "a fervent wish for peace, brotherly love, and justice," and the hope that the new year would advance the great family of men towards the goal for which the hearts of all men of good will are striving, and that with the solution of present tasks it would bring that satisfaction and security which are an earnest of order, industry, thrift, and progress. At a similar reception in Paris Mgr. Ceretti, acting as *doyen* of the diplomats, pointed out that the spirits and the hearts

of men must be demobilized before peace can be restored to the nations. This drew from Millerand a sharp rejoinder to the effect that peace could only be established on the basis of the Treaty of Versailles, otherwise it would be built up on lies and injustice. (*Sic!*) At Cologne Archbishop Dr. Schulte, in a New Year's proclamation, declared the Treaty of Versailles no peace treaty at all because consent to it had been wrested from Germany by force, and he warned the French that the "Rheinland" was German and proposed to remain German. D.

A small voice, but full of sound reasoning, was raised by eighteen women of Morrison, Mo., in a special dispatch to the *St. Louis Globe-Democrat* (January 18), to this effect: "1. We, the women of America, are getting tired of paying the interest on the capital which we have lent to the allied powers. 2. We are getting tired of furnishing milk for those children and sick, which has been taken away from them by the allied powers. 3. We are tired of sending clothes and money to a people who are able to secure these for themselves if the opportunity to do this were not taken away from them by the allied powers. 4. We are tired of seeing that our efforts to aid the German and other nations are in vain because of the robbery carried on by the allied powers. 5. We are tired of seeing the homes of children, the aged, the sick, and the homeless without proper heat while coal is taken out of this country to a country where there is an abundant supply of fuel. We demand therefore that an immediate and sufficient supply of coal be furnished the German homes, and that export of coal to France cease until Germany has been fully supplied. Further, we demand that it may be made possible, through the intervention of our Government, that the opportunity may be given the German people to support themselves. In this connection we ask you to remember that our nation has declared that it fought the German Government, not its people." — In the same issue the editor argues, on legal grounds, that the view is correct that the Treaty of Versailles has been abrogated by the invasion of the Ruhr by France, and says: "Something will have to be done, and sooner or later the United States will have to take the leadership in doing it." Strange coincidence! If truths like these could only have been published four years sooner! They were just as true then. D.

Our "Exact" Science. — For use, eventually, we may file this report in the *Detroit Free Press* (April 24, 1922) of the closing session of the American Philosophical Society at Philadelphia. The question was concerning the age of the world. The *Free Press* said: "The answer of Prof. T. C. Chamberlain, of the University of Chicago, was between 70,000,000 and 150,000,000 years. He arrived at his conclusion, he said, by working with the methods of a geologist and presented readings from formations of the sea by various geologists. The answer of Prof. William Duane, of the Harvard Medical School, was between 8,000,000 and 1,700,000,000 years. His calculations, he said, were based on radioactivity. In estimating the age of the earth Professor Duane explained, as a 'clock,' some process in nature that

'moves in one direction only' should be used. Calculations from geological periods were not reliable, he said, because physical conditions were not the same and the periods of formation of geologic structures may have been rapid in some cases and slow in others. Likewise, he said, estimates based on the temperature of the earth or sun were not reliable because the temperature of a body may rise or fall. Geological calculations, Professor Chamberlain said, were made by finding the present rate at which sediments are formed, comparing this with sea formations supposed to have had their origin at the beginning of the earth. But for radioactivity, Professor Duane made the claim of dependability within reason. Radioactivity, the process by which one element transforms itself into one or more other elements, is not subject to any physical conditions, he declared. No one has been able to change the rate of this transformation, Professor Duane said, although repeated efforts have been made to do so. Speaking for the paleontologists Prof. John M. Clarke, director of the State museum at Albany, N. Y., said that he and his colleagues had always accepted the calculations of other branches of science and admitted that to make calculations from the periods of evolution of animal life was impossible." The difference between these calculations amounts to 1,692,000,000 years. And these scientists want to be taken seriously! Wonder whether they take themselves so, or whether they put on the old haruspex grin when they meet each other to enlighten the public and to feed a pen like that of Arthur Brisbane. D.

The Strange Logic of Dr. Steinmetz. — Commenting editorially on this subject, the *Catholic World* (February, 1923) writes: "The address of Dr. Steinmetz, on 'The Place of Religion in Modern Scientific Civilization' is one more illustration of the fact that a scientist, although supreme in his own element, may flounder hopelessly when he plunges into the deep water of philosophy and theology. The enthusiastic editor of the lecture declares that Dr. Steinmetz is 'probably the most learned figure in the world of electrical engineering.' But he is evidently something more than that. He lays claim to a knowledge of all philosophy; for he says, authoritatively, that 'Immanuel Kant is the greatest and most critical of all philosophers.' Surely, no scientist, trained in the inductive method, would make such a statement without having read and thoroughly studied all the philosophers. And he is also, presumably, a student of all theologies; for he speaks scarcely less authoritatively of Mohammed and Buddha and Moses and the 'founders of other religions,' including, of course, Christ. To lead the world in electrical engineering, while at the same time accumulating a thorough knowledge of all philosophies and all theologies, must require intense and prolonged application even for the most prodigious intellect. Curiously enough, however, the engineer-philosopher-theologian seems rather shaky in his logic. For example, he says: 'There has grown up through the centuries an increasing antagonism between science and religion, making the two *incompatible* with each other.' And: 'The conceptions of physical science are *incompatible* with the metaphysical conceptions of God, immortality,

infinity, etc.' But two pages beyond this latter sentence he says: 'Science and religion are not incompatible.' Incompatible, yet not incompatible. Is this a Kantian antinomy, or just a flat contradiction? Again he says: 'If we are honest, we must confess that in science there exists no God, no immortality, no soul. Scientifically, God and immortality are illogical conceptions. Science inevitably had to become atheistic.' That would seem to be final, at least for the scientist. But no; for he says, further on: 'The negative answer of science on immortality, God, etc., is not conclusive. The question is still open as it ever was.' To us Dr. Steinmetz's amphibologies are as bewildering as the dictum of Hegel: '*Das Sein und das Nichtsein, das ist dasselbe,*' 'To be means not to be.' As a theologian the 'most learned engineer' is even less felicitous than as a philosopher. See how speedily and how conclusively he ushers God out of the universe! 'The terror of the thunderstorm led primitive man to the conception of a Supreme Being, whose attribute was the thunderbolt. But when Franklin brought the lightning from the clouds, and showed it to be a mere electric spark; when we learned to make lightning harmless by the lightning-rod, and when, finally, we harnessed electricity to do our work, naturally our reverence for the power of the thunderbolt decayed. So the gods of experience vanished.' '*So!* Just so. It is all very simple — and very striking. But there are — or there were — other arguments for the existence of God, besides the argument from thunder and lightning. Among these was the 'argument from design,' which (permitting Dr. Steinmetz to define it in his own words), is that 'the wonderful fitness of nature gave argument for the conception of a Supreme Being, who had made everything in nature so perfectly fitting its purpose.' That argument, or that idea, is as old as human thought. But Dr. Steinmetz asserts that it was demolished by Darwin, who, he says, 'gave a ridiculously simple explanation of the fitness of nature by showing that only the fit can survive, and anything unfit is rapidly exterminated. . . . Thus no evidence, or proof, of the existence of God has been found in the phenomena of nature.' Surely that is swift and reckless logic. But getting rid of God is not so 'ridiculously simple.' Dr. James J. Walsh, in the October number of this magazine, quotes the late Professor Cope of the University of Pennsylvania, who used to say: 'What we are interested in is not the *survival* of the fittest, but the *origin* of the fittest. Until you explain origins without God, you have not made God unnecessary.' There is an occasional note of bitterness in the address under discussion, unworthy of a dispassionate scientist. After declaring that Darwin's discoveries destroyed the 'argument from design,' Dr. Steinmetz says: 'Therefore the hatred of all the forces of darkness against the theory of evolution.' The Doctor may think it clever to use the Scriptural phrase 'the forces of darkness' to designate those who believe in God, but when he imputes vicious motives to those who disagree with him, he is unscientific. Is it not conceivable that a man should oppose materialistic evolution out of devotion to what he thinks to be the truth? But whatever be the spirit of science, the Doctor must have

his little sarcastic flings. He speaks of 'semicivilized countries, such as attempt to forbid by legislation the teaching of evolution in State universities.' Perhaps Kentucky is not the apex of wisdom, but when Dr. Steinmetz inferentially refers to that State as 'semicivilized,' he is only calling names; he is doing something eminently unworthy of 'the most learned figure in the world of electrical engineering.' Finally, Dr. Steinmetz commits the 'suicide of reason.' He removes the ground from under his own feet, and he is swallowed up. And with him, if his words be true, all science disappears. He explains that 'science derives its conclusions from the sense perceptions by the laws of logic,' and in the next breath he asks: 'But what proof is there of the correctness of the laws of logic?' If there is no proof of the correctness of the laws of logic, all thinking is nugatory, all argument is futile, and all science is impossible. Science is logic applied to facts. If logic be uncertain, there remain only the facts. And an aggregation of facts can never be a science. We should never have believed that Dr. Steinmetz could do science so ill a turn. Perhaps he had better stick to his dynamos and his artificial lightning and leave Immanuel Kant alone."

MUELLER.

The Cocksure Mr. Scientist. — The cocksure Mr. Scientist is taken to task by the same periodical (*Catholic World*), which declares: "But the typical 'scientific' person is cocksure. His opinions are clear-cut and irreformable. He knows what he knows, and he is impatient of all who disagree with him. He challenges religion to say what it has ever done for mankind, and he knows beforehand that religion has no word to say to justify its existence. His devotion to science seems to demand that he deride religion. To him there is no room for science and religion in this big universe. There is place only for science. 'The fundamental dogma of all materialistic science is that all the phenomena of life, including the poetry of Shakespeare and Wordsworth, the reasonings of Aristotle, a Sir Isaac Newton, and all minor manifestations of life can be explained, and some day will be explained, in terms of chemical equations and physical experiments.' (Windle, *Facts and Theories*, p. 56.) There is an old phrase about measuring all things with a yardstick. It is just as absurd to imagine that all things can be analyzed in a test-tube. 'There are more things in heaven and earth, Horatio, than are dreamt of in your philosophy.' And there are more things in heaven and earth than can be investigated in your laboratories. There are things in human life and in human nature that cannot be ground in a mortar with a pestle or boiled with a Bunsen burner. As the same newspaper writer says, there are 'mysteries of which there is no rule-of-thumb solution.'"

MUELLER.

A national searching of hearts seems to be impending as to our "moral obligation" in, or resulting from, the late war, if reports from Washington and newspaper editorials all over the country are to be credited. This concerns every citizen of our country. Rummaging in old files, we found the following editorial on "Underlying Causes" from the *Detroit News* of July 26, 1917, which may serve as food for

reflection: "Often it is difficult to formulate the purposes of a great movement. The causes first assigned gradually grow dim, and new reasons appear which seem more logical and more worthy. Great Britain entered the war of the nations ostensibly because Belgium was violated and she was a guarantor of Belgium's neutrality. Of course, she had guaranteed Belgium's neutrality because a small nation on the North Sea did not threaten her own trade supremacy, while Germany, as possessor of Antwerp, would. But that was neither here nor there. Britain, because it served her purposes, had guaranteed Belgium; so when the war began, she could afford to stand up for the rights of small nations. Russia entered the war because Austria was pressing humiliating demands on Serbia, a Slavic nation. Russia's ambition to control the destinies of the Slavs in the Balkans could not allow Austria to obtain an advantage there in addition to those which the southward-pushing policy of the dual monarchy had already secured in Bosnia and Herzegovina. France entered the war partly because she was bound to do so as Russia's ally, partly because Germany's refusal to recognize Belgium's neutrality was a threat that could not be ignored. Now these aims have been almost forgotten. The allies in Europe are fighting, not for the restoration of Belgium, but for the crushing of a system which, they feel, is a menace to their safety as long as it exists. Russia has even renounced the predominance in the Balkans which made her take Serbia's part. The war party in the United States first pleaded that our Government take action because Belgium had been violated. When this failed, they sought a reason for entering the war in the sinking of the *Lusitania*. When we finally did recognize a state of war as existing, it was on neither of these grounds, nor for the specific reason that our ships of trade had been sunk illegally. We entered on the broad ground that the world must be safe for democracy, and could not be safe while Germany was controlled by the powers which now rule her. This is a far cry from the motives which were assigned in 1914; but is it not fundamental? Our own Civil War began as a war to preserve the Union, to insist that no State could secede from the nation. Yet by the end of 1862 it had become, as much as anything, a war to abolish slavery. Secession was the proximate cause; but the reason for secession was the existence of slavery. With the underlying cause out of the way and its supporters rendered helpless, the nation could begin rebuilding in the confidence that there could never be another outbreak of the kind. So in this war we have found that all the causes first assigned were inadequate, and that the all-inclusive motive, the motive which is to guide the reconstruction of Europe and of the war-torn world, is the right of a people to live after its own fashion, to govern itself as it pleases, as long as it does not interfere with any other people. But if a nation falls under the control of a small, but powerful class, and prepares an army and navy to secure for herself a place in the sun, and announces plans for the acquisition of world supremacy, she menaces all the rest of the world, and the world must unite to maintain its integrity. The objects of this war will not be

won if no international organization is formed to keep the world in order. Germany is the menace to-day, but who can say that it will not be some other nation fifty years hence?" D.

Ignorance of the Bible in Colleges. — On this issue the *Catholic World* offers the following comment: "Some years ago experiments were made at various universities to discover what the students knew of the Bible. The results were both ludicrous and scandalous. In one of the experiments, conducted at the University of Michigan, the following amazing information was unearthed: 'Jordan was the name of the man who took Moses' place.' 'Sinai was the mount from which Christ spoke.' 'The Temple of Solomon was in Babylon.' 'Levi was a man; Leviathan was a follower of this man.' 'Levi was a Jewish male, Leviathan a woman.' 'Levi was a priest; Leviathan was a law laid down by the priests.' 'Christ was crucified at the age of twenty-one.' 'Christ lived to a good old age.' 'The Gospel were the letters which St. Paul wrote to the churches.' That leaves the epistles to be explained. Perhaps the student thought that the epistles were the wives of apostles. 'In the New Testament every chapter is by a different man,' while in the Old Testament 'all the chapters were written by one man.' 'The language of the New Testament is more modern than that of the Old.' It may have been this scholar who first discovered that the 'Bible was written B. C., parts of it before B. C.'"

MUELLER.

The Eternal Problem of Sermonizing. — Quoting the *Expositor* (Cleveland), the *Biblical Review* (January, 1923) shows an experienced preacher's method of solving the difficult problem of sermonizing. The method of this preacher is as follows: "When I have found my theme, subject, or text, I dedicate myself to uninterrupted, world-forgetting reflection and meditation; then, as said the psalmist, 'while I muse, the fire burns'; and when the fire of my heart, my soul, begins to flame up, I seize my pen and rush into writing; I write and write and write, slamming down (so to speak) thoughts, thoughts, thoughts, as they come to me. And they come to me in troops, rush upon me in mass. I write with speed, not considering either logical order or sermonic form, nor anything else except just to jot down thoughts, put down points, fasten somehow the rushing stream of ideas safely to the page, 'holding wide my skirts while the heavens rain gold,' as says the poet. I write, it may be, an hour, two hours, or only thirty, fifteen, ten minutes, all depending on how long the heavens rain gold. But just as soon as the river of thoughts, of ideas, of visions, runs dry, I fling the pen to one side without reading or even glancing at that which I have written, and rush out of doors. After a time the river of thoughts begins to run flood-tide again, and again I hasten to my desk to write, until at last no more inspiring thoughts come. Then my day's work is ended. I never attempt to pump water out of a dry well instead of dipping it up from a living, flowing spring. The day following I read with great care everything I have written; I arrange and collocate all the thoughts in severest logical order; I write with greatest pains a full outline of my thoughts, illustrations, quotations,

and make a perfect skeleton of all the material of my sermon; and from then on I think and think, I pray and muse, I write and pray, until my whole soul is aflame and impassioned with the divine truth, the message which God has given me for my people. Then I go to my pulpit, without speaking with anybody, avoiding, if I can, all human companions, and doing nothing save think and pray in my heart concerning that message. Those last few moments before preaching are purest gold to me, and must not be tarnished by profane fingers. In the pulpit the whole sermon, not its words, but its entire thought structure and living form, stands in front of my eyes absolutely clear. I hardly try to remember, rather, I cannot forget. I cannot break down, I cannot go wandering from my subject. Then, confiding in God alone, praying ever in my heart of hearts, I preach—I preach with all my force, all my heart, all my soul. And I am a free man in my pulpit. Freed from the chains of a manuscript which I have to read with bending head and fixed eyes; free from the slavery of thousands of words committed to memory and ever trying to escape me; free from the rope-halter of a written outline placed on the pulpit before me, and from which I must not move far, even to find fresh pastures or drink of bright, bubbling waters; yes, I am free to preach as a prophet of God, an ambassador of His eternal truth.”

MUELLER.

British Spleen.—At the celebration of the 78th anniversary of St. George's Society of Ottawa there was much glorification of Englishmen. Telegrams were received from all over the world. At the roll call every member rose and stated the country from which either he or his forebears were descended. Hon. H. H. Stevens, M. P. for Vancouver Center, speaking on "England," declared the charter wrung from King John the basis of all modern government and Lloyd George the hope of humanity. Rev. W. S. Heathcote, a visitor from New Zealand, held that "all other races are nature's failure in the attempt to make an Englishman." (*Ottawa Journal*, April 25.)—A dispatch from Toronto (October 26) reported:—

"King George is as clearly descended from King David as you are from your grandfathers," declared Lieut.-Col. W. G. Mackendrick, D. S. O., in an address to the Empire Club here to-day on 'Allenby's campaign, as laid down in the Bible.' Colonel Mackendrick said the Prince of Wales was Christened 'David' in anticipation of days to come, and he quoted 'My servant David shall rule from Jerusalem' as Biblical substantiation of this. Other Biblical quotations were interpreted by Colonel Mackendrick as relating to Great Britain and the British Empire.

"'Christ came to the world,' Colonel Mackendrick said, 'not to save the world, but to save the lost sheep of Israel. Those lost sheep were our forefathers. The house of David was promised an earthly throne forever. They have it. It is the throne of Great Britain.'

"Colonel Mackendrick said the capture of Jerusalem was effected by prayer. General Allenby and his staff were on their knees praying for guidance, he explained, when the Patriarch of Jerusalem entered their camp with a white flag.

“Wherever you see “Israel” in the Bible, read “the British Empire,”” said Colonel Mackendrick.” D.

The Value of the Religious Paper. — That there ought to be a great crusade in behalf of the religious papers is the contention of the *Biblical Review* (January, 1923), which quotes Dr. Frederick F. Shannon, pastor of Central Church, Chicago, as follows: “Who can measure the power for right and wrong our newspapers wield? There are a few really great independent papers in the world. But in thinking of the average metropolitan daily, I am invariably reminded of a Joseph’s coat of many colors — with no Joseph inside the coat; or, varying the metaphor, I am reminded of the voice of Jacob, the hand of Esau, and the silver of Judas Iscariot. But there is another type of journalism for which too much cannot be said. I mean that large number of denominational and undenominational Christian weeklies. They are the salt of our journalistic earth. Most of them are published at a financial loss; a few with, perhaps, a slender margin of profit. Let this be said to our shame! Without the inspiring tides of idealism constantly poured into the world’s life by our Christian editors, we should suffer untold loss in our politics, schools, homes, and churches. They are solvents of civilization. They clear the atmosphere. They lift discussion out of partisan muck up to the prophetic mountains. I think every man who reads his partisan daily — Republican, Democrat, Socialist — would greatly profit by seriously reading some one of the fine and definitely Christian weeklies. They are an antidote to rabid nationalism; they are an offset to violent partisanship; they foster an atmosphere of brotherhood and world vision.”

MUELLER.

Concerning Eugenics. — What eugenics is the same quarterly shows by quoting the history of the Edwards family, published years ago in the *Ladies’ Home Journal*. We read: “What is eugenics? some ask. It is perhaps best told in the story of one man: He was born in England, in Queen Elizabeth’s time. He was a clergyman, and he lived an upright life. So did his wife. His son came to the United States, to Hartford, Conn., and became an honorable merchant. His son, in turn, also became a merchant, upright and honored. His son, again, became a minister, and so honored was he that Harvard University conferred two degrees on him on the same day — one in the morning and one in the afternoon. This learned man, again, had a son, and he became a minister. Jonathan Edwards was his name. Now, let us see, in 1900, what this one family, started by a man in England who lived an upright life and gave that heritage to his children, produced. 1,394 descendants of this man have been traced and identified; 295 were college graduates; 13 were college presidents; 65 were professors; 60 were physicians; 108 were clergymen; 101 were lawyers; 30 were judges; 1 was Vice-President of the United States; 75 were Army and Navy officers; 60 were prominent authors; 16 were railroad and steamship presidents. And in the entire record not one has ever been convicted of a crime. It seems to pay — this living along upright lines and handing a clean life down to one’s children, doesn’t it?”

MUELLER.