

# THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY.

VOL. III.

APRIL, 1923.

No. 4.

## The International Scapegoat.

PROF. W. H. T. DAU, St. Louis, Mo.

A view, rare in our bigotry-ridden and fanatical times, is propounded in the *Kristeligt Dagblad* of Copenhagen (July 27, 1922) regarding the Jews. In an effort to apportion fairly the responsibility for the intolerable state of affairs which is distressing and perplexing the nations of the earth, a writer who signs himself E. C., offers for general consideration the following thoughts:—

Nearly everywhere in the world the bush (Ex. 2, 2) is blazing brightly: the blaze of anti-Semitism, or hatred of the Jews, is spreading and rising in ever higher and wilder flames around the Jewish people. In Germany anti-Semitism is burning everywhere, and the concealed fire blazed forth in the murder of the Jew Rathenau. In Russia the Soviet, spite of its Jewish leaders, has not been able to prevent the medieval pogroms, which during the last year have cost 150,000 Jews their lives, and all Jews and friends of the Jews are trembling with fear at the thought of what is going to happen to the Jewish masses in Russia when finally the Jew Trotzky will be overthrown. For if the slogan in 1905 was: Extinguish the revolution with the blood of the Jews! will the coming slogan not be: Drown Bolshevism in Jewish blood? In free America, where within a generation 2,500,000 Jewish fugitives have been granted asylum, hatred of the Jews is gathering ever-increasing force, just as in all those countries where the Jews are rapidly growing in numbers. It is no better in England. Even here in our home country in the North [Denmark], where Jews are among the most respected citizens, "the mountain-climbers on the Mont Blanc of toleration" are ever becoming fewer. Professor Rozniecki, who died recently, is certainly correct when, in his excellent book *The Jewish Problem*, he writes: "Suppose, now, that Copenhagen were to shelter as many Jews as Warsaw, — that means in proportion to the number of its in-

## THE THEOLOGICAL OBSERVER.

A conference for the purpose of a doctrinal discussion took place at St. James Hotel in Ironwood, Mich., on February 20. The conferees were President K. E. Salonen and Rev. G. A. Aho, representing the Finnish National Church, and President H. Daib, Rev. A. Lucas, Rev. O. Hattstaedt, and Rev. A. G. Sommer, representing the Missouri Synod. The Finnish paper *Auttaja*, published at Ironwood, briefly notes this meeting in its issue for February 22, and records the cordial spirit in which it was conducted. In its issue for March 1 the same paper, under the caption "An Important Conference," says the following: "The last annual meeting at Lehtijaervi authorized the directors of the National Church to deliberate on a union with the Missouri Synod. . . . This deliberation took place February 20. . . . We submit a general account of the results of the conference. As regards doctrine, the position of the Missouri Synod is genuinely Biblical and strictly Lutheran. Accordingly, we found ourselves easily in agreement in this respect. The leading doctrines were discussed in broad outlines, and we discovered that we occupy the same position. The Scriptures and the Lutheran Confessions united us. — We are also fairly agreed in the matter of church-polity (*Praxis*). Our ideals were the same; there were difficulties on either side as regards the realization of the ideals." — These meetings are to be continued for the purpose of finding the most practical way toward bringing about a union of the Finnish National Church with the Missouri Synod. *Auttaja* urges its readers to discuss this issue publicly. D.

American Lutheran theologians to whose lot it falls to render advice in the reconstruction of the former German *Landeskirchen* will certainly be expected not to renounce principles and ideals in Germany which they maintain in America. While a certain latitude must be allowed to the reorganizers of the Church in Germany, which will enable them to take charge of vested rights and appurtenances, of time-honored, perhaps legalized customs; moreover, while admitting that the external form of a church organization is not of the essence of the Church, still any organization which reproduces the intolerable conditions of the former *Landeskirche* should be denounced. The new *Volkskirche* is simply the old *Landeskirche* under another name. In a review of Dr. Schneider's *Kirchliches Jahrbuch* Dr. Reu says in *Kirchliche Zeitschrift* for March: "We occupy an ecclesiastical standpoint different from that of Schneider. For, although he is numbered with the adherents to the old Gospel, he champions nevertheless the idea of the present *Volkskirche*, however, in a sounder manner than is frequently done. As for us, we cherish the conviction that only a *Bekennniskirche* (confessing or confessional Church) — to use, for once, the German terminology — deserves the Biblical name of Church, and for this reason the ecclesiastical development in the old fatherland must energetically forge ahead toward a genuine *Freikirche* (free church) — a *Freikirche* which should indeed never

segregate itself from the "people," but, operating from its clear position and not loaded down with all the millions of dead church-members who are united only by their baptismal certificate and their receipt for church taxes with what is truly the Church, should struggle to win these poor souls for Christ and His kingdom." If the Church in Germany is to be truly a *Bekennniskirche*, a separation is unavoidable, just as in America. This separation in no wise abrogates or limits the mission of the Church. The very separation is one of the most effective and fruitful missionary acts which the Church can perform under the circumstances. The Lord takes care of those who obey His charge: "Be ye separate!" If a Church fails in this duty of separating where separation is a plain duty, all its frenzied mission-endeavors and eager efforts to retain its hold on the "people" (and their pocketbooks?) will lead nowhere. We have learned some things in this respect here in America, of which very many good people in Germany are ignorant. Let us all help them to see things as we have long seen them, and as they should have seen them long ago. D.

**Present-Day Novels and the Orthodox Church.**—On this subject the *Watchman-Examiner*, February 22, 1923, writes: "Even literary men of marked ability have become the traducers of the Church. . . . It is our candid belief that there never has been a Baptist Church or such a Baptist minister as Sinclair Lewis describes in *Main Street*. If there is such a minister, we have never met him, and we perhaps know as many Baptist ministers of all varieties as any one living. Now Mrs. Helen R. Martin takes up the cudgels in her new story, *The Church on the Avenue*, published by Dodd, Mead & Co. Mrs. Martin is a clever writer, and her charming stories of the Pennsylvania Dutch, some of whom appear in this new book, have given her a well-deserved popularity. In this book she joins the ever-growing army of those who are making war on a condition of things in the Church that really does not exist, or that exists so rarely as to prove that it is exotic rather than indigenous to the Christian soil. . . . Robert Watts, the young Presbyterian pastor of 'The Church on the Avenue,' is orthodox to the core, but utterly under the thumb of Jacob Leiter, the rich man of the church and the very incarnation of littleness, meanness, and cruelty. When his rich parishioner says, 'Thumbs up!' up go the thumbs of Pastor Watts, and in excusing and explaining his subserviency and cowardice he makes one despise both his conservatism and orthodoxy. Pastor Watts refuses to lift his voice for any kind of reform and agrees to let the devil hold high carnival in his town because his salary is paid by Jacob Leiter, who is at once the devil's chief lieutenant and the leading man of 'The Church on the Avenue.' Rev. Clément Colloway, the rector of the Episcopal church at Leitersville, makes no claim to extraordinary orthodoxy, and on all social questions he is frankly a radical. He identifies himself with the people; he bears their burdens; he pleads their cause. He despises not only the big Jacob Leiter in the Presbyterian church, but all the little Jacob Leiters in his own church. But while standing for God and humanity and winning the respect

and affection of the whole town, he is bitterly persecuted by 'the money power' and at last loses his church. On the other hand, the cowardly, but orthodox Mr. Watts, while losing his own self-respect, wins a call to a great New York City church. There he will continue to preach on 'orthodoxy,' which will win the applause of the selfish rich, because it has no bearing on the practical affairs of life. Ministers like Robert Watts may exist, because in all callings there are compromisers, time-servers, and cowards. We hold no brief for ministers of that kind. Indeed, we should like to see every one of them drummed out. But the curious thing about this Rev. Robert Watts is that he was sincere and conscientious in his subserviency to the plutocrats and in his non-participation in the practical affairs of the every-day life of the people whose shepherd he was supposed to be. This book, by the clever identification of the cowardly, cloistered, conscientious, orthodox preacher with the doctrinal system that produced him, holds up to ridicule the old-fashioned, conservative theological attitude. By the clever identification of the big-hearted, unselfish, fearless, unorthodox preacher with the liberal ideas that produced him, this book holds up the social conception of Christianity as the only interpretation of Christianity that is worth while. . . . We do desire to express our indignation at the contemptible methods by which modernism, liberalism, rationalism — call it what you please — promotes its cause. In such stories as *The Inside of the Cup*, *Main Street*, and *The Church on the Avenue* conservatism is always identified with ignorance, narrowness, littleness, meanness, cruelty, and devilishness. God knows there is enough of these things among orthodox people, but orthodoxy has no monopoly of them. We know that ridicule is an effective weapon, but it is an ungenerous and unfair weapon. We cannot change things by our protest, but we can warn our people to beware of such specious arguments. Everywhere our holy religion is being attacked. We need to be on our guard. We find these covert attacks in all kinds of papers, magazines, and books. We hear them at public lectures and in halls of amusement. They are the subject of many a jest and the point of many a story. The devil is marshaling all his forces against the supernaturalism of our holy religion. That is the *crux* of the whole matter. Rob Christianity of supernaturalism, and it ceases to be a religion and becomes merely a system of ethics." MUELLER.

**Obscurity and Happiness.** — "The conspicuous personages in any age or society are few in number," writes the *Watchman-Examiner*, March 1, 1923. "The mass of men and women are unheard of beyond the little circle of which they form a part. Obscurity is the general lot. Often we rebel against this and wish that by some noteworthy deed we might be lifted into fame. Is this a condition to be deplored? Is it a grievous thing to be unknown? Ought we to be miserable because we are obscure? Not at all. On the contrary, happy are they whose lives are hidden from the search-light glare and the peculiar temptations and trials of publicity. What Pastor Wagner calls 'the simple life' is best for most of us, the life of humble service

and retired endeavor. And the life thus lived is very far from being a useless one. The greater part of the world's work is done by humble hands. The rough-clad oiler with his can is as necessary to the running of the train as the president in his office — more necessary, indeed, to its safe running. The ministries, the humble gifts, the right living of the obscure majority are more essential to, and more effective in, promoting the good of society than the more showy contributions of the few so-called 'prominent citizens' who are hailed as leaders of the body politic. We have no desire to minimize the value and importance of eminent talents employed for the benefit of society. But, valuable as they are, they do not, after all, constitute the chief element in promoting the progress of the world. The palms that flourish on the coral reef did not make the reef. Society is built up by the combined labor of the little units that toil unseen. The part that each contributes may be small, but it is, in its humble place, essential to the mighty whole. And God loves the humble worker, who in his simple, unpretentious way labors to promote the kingdom of Christ. How highly our Savior thought of him is shown in His surprising exclamation, 'I thank Thee, O Father, that Thou hast hidden these things from the wise and discerning and hast revealed them unto babes.' To be obscure to the world is not to be hidden from God. He who marks the sparrow's fall is not unmindful of the humblest of His sons and daughters. More precious than wisdom or wealth is the mindfulness of God. It is our joy here and our ground of hope for the hereafter. So far, then, from bemoaning the fate that places and keeps us in obscurity, let us rejoice that God permits us, in our lowly estate, to be fellow-laborers with Him and thus efficient contributors to the final consummation of Christ's kingdom. Our gifts may be small, but the hands that multiplied the loaves and fishes can multiply our offerings a thousandfold. Our words may be few and feeble, but, reinforced by the power of the Spirit, they may become words of power. Our immediate influence may not extend very far, but some who are affected by it may become Peters or Pauls in the service of the Master. No humble toiler in the kingdom of Christ should be cast down because his name and work are not more widely known. He is working for eternity, and God values his service and will make it contributory to vast and glorious results." MUELLER.

**Overdoing and Underthinking.** — Commenting on an assertion found in a Methodist journal to the effect that the real difficulty which besets a bishop in these days is "the temptation to overdo and underthink," the *Reformed Church Messenger* says: "It is safe to conclude that every minister is subjected to this temptation and peril. The Church has been demanding of its spiritual leaders a combination of all the gifts and virtues in one man: saintliness, statesmanship, organizing ability, administrative genius, pulpit eloquence, as well as the fine art of a successful shepherd of souls. . . . For the sake of pastor and people more opportunity should be given the minister to think and study. Everywhere that chance seems to be denied by the multiplicity of calls upon his time and strength. The minister must

insist on time to think and study both for his own soul's health and for the welfare of the people committed to his charge, of whom he must one day give account to the Chief Shepherd. Continued over-doing and underthinking is fatal." MUELLER.

**Carlyle's Opinion of Charles Darwin.** — "Thomas Carlyle was a great man," writes the *Lutheran Church Herald*, February 27, 1923. "He was a leading essayist and historian, whose many works are still used and loved by all thinkers. He was born in 1795 and died in 1881. Not long before his death, Carlyle, who knew Darwin well, wrote the following: 'I have known three generations of the Darwins — grandfather, father, and son — atheists all. The brother of the famous naturalist, a quiet man, who lives not far from here, told me that among his grandfather's effects he found a seal engraven with this legend *Omne Ex Conchis* (Everything from a clam-shell). I saw the naturalist not many months ago; told him that I read his *Origin of Species* and other books; that he had by no means satisfied me that we were descended from monkeys, but had gone far to persuade me that he and his so-called scientific brethren had brought the present generation very near to monkeys. A good sort of man is this Darwin and well-meaning, but with a very little intellect. It is a sad and terrible thing to see nigh a whole generation of men and women, professing to be cultivated, looking around in purblind fashion, and finding no God in the universe. I suppose it is a reaction from the reign of cant and hollow pretense, professing to believe what in fact they do not believe. And this is what we got to — all things from frog spawn — the Gospel of Dirt, that is the order of the day. The older I grow, — and now I stand on the brink of eternity, — the more comes back to me the sentence in the Catechism which I learned when a child, and the fuller and the deeper its meaning becomes: "What is the chief end of man? To glorify God and to enjoy Him forever." No Gospel of Dirt, teaching that men have descended from frogs through monkeys, can ever set that aside.' " MUELLER.

**Child-Marriage and Widowhood in India.** — The January number of the *Modern Review*, an Indian monthly periodical sailing under the flag of progress and reform, quotes the following from another Indian periodical called *Stri Dharma*, which name one is tempted to translate "Woman's Sphere": "The recent Madras census shows that in the Andhra District the number of child widows is increasing. Among the Kalingis, for every 1,000 children under ten years of age about 664 are married. There is an increase of 50 per cent. in the number of infant marriages and girl widows. These figures speak volumes for the failure of the work of social reformers in the Andhradesha, a country which is clamoring for political rights in the face of such a scandalous state of things. How can the God of Justice grant Home Rule to those who rule their homes so unjustly as to sentence six out of every ten girls of the tenderest years to the possibility of child-widowhood?"

The region designated by the terms "Andhradesha" and "Kalingam" coincides, roughly speaking, with the Telugu language area,

and includes the Guntur District, which was one of the first districts to attempt the final step in Mr. Gandhi's scheme of progressive non-cooperation, *viz.*, non-payment of taxes. It is to be feared that the Madras census will reveal similar conditions throughout the Madras Presidency, and that, indeed, all reformers and all reform movements in all India have made but little progress in combating this crying social evil. In the number of the *Modern Review* to which reference has been made, the editor notes with regret and despair that Dr. Gour's bill to legalize marriages contracted by persons belonging to different castes, which has been before the Legislative Council of India several times, has made no headway in the face of determined and obstinate opposition, and this in spite of the fact that, as the editor also points out, the bill is purely permissive in character, and leaves every Hindu community free to excommunicate those of its members who may offend against the law of their caste. A knowledge of facts such as these should act as a corrective of exaggerated ideas about progress in India — ideas probably traceable to the sensational manner in which a part of the American press has been "playing up" recent developments in Indian politics. Every attempt to form an estimate of the character and the condition of the average Indian from what one knows about Mr. Gandhi or about any other highly educated Indian will lead to grave errors; but still greater is the error of him who thinks he is beholding the true type of Indian womanhood in the person, say, of that fiery, eloquent poetess-patriot, Mrs. Sarojini Naidu. To this day the condition of Indian womanhood, viewed as a whole, is that which is decreed and pictured in the *Manava Dharma-sastra* (composed not later than the fifth century B. C.); and the increasing number of illustrious exceptions but serves to emphasize the somber colors in which that picture must still be painted.

In the sentences quoted the editor of *Stri Dharma* has, probably without intending to do so, pointed out the one great weakness of the Indian Nationalists' program; he has revealed the spot where this program is most vulnerable to criticism from friend and foe alike. Their program has been charged, perhaps not unjustly, with a lack of constructiveness even in the purely political sphere. But its great weakness lies elsewhere. It is to be found in this, that Indian nationalism just now thinks of all progress and reform in terms of political development. In the minds of many, reform is synonymous with the achievement of *swaraj*, *i. e.*, complete autonomy. That there are other kinds and forms of advancement and progress seems to have been forgotten for the time being. As some one has said, India is "politics-mad." It has been for some years. And many who have genuine sympathy with the national aspirations of India are distressed by the recklessness with which so much energy and enthusiasm is directed into this one channel, to the exclusion or, at least, grave neglect of problems which are far more pressing, and of reforms which are of vastly greater significance to the India of to-day. — The entire platform of Mr. Gandhi and his nationalist followers contains but two "planks" which can be classed under the head of social reform. One

is his war on the liquor traffic. But that is nothing new; both Mohammedanism and orthodox Hinduism teach abstinence from all intoxicants. The other is his pronouncement that "non-touchability must go," *i. e.*, that the teaching that the touch of the out-caste defiles the caste-man must be dropped, and that a place must be found for the out-caste in the fold of Hinduism. This is indeed hopeful. But, granting that Mr. Gandhi has the support of all his followers or of most of his followers in this matter, — after a long residence in India, in close contact with Hindus, one may well feel a little skeptical on this point, — the fact remains that the mere admission of the out-caste to the pale of Hinduism would not essentially change the system of caste, nor remove the disabilities, inequalities, and obstacles to real progress imposed by that system. And Mr. Gandhi has repeatedly confessed himself a believer in, and an upholder of, the institution of caste. As for those who have waited for some clear-cut, authoritative pronouncement from the Nationalists' camp regarding the improvement of the lot of Hindu women, they have waited in vain.

There are no indications that even *swaraj* would bring India escape from the trammels of caste and a bettering of the conditions in which Indian women live. Meanwhile the statement will stand unshaken that the Christian religion, working through Christian missions, has done more toward restoring to Indian womanhood its true dignity and towards improving the lot of the out-caste than any other agency — than all other agencies together, quite apart from the fact that only the message of the Christian Church brings men and women that freedom wherewith Christ has set us free.

(Communicated by REV. H. HAMANN, A. M., missionary at Ambur, North Arcot District, British India; at present on furlough in the United States.)

The Mendelian laws defining the results of cross-breeding in plants and animals are lucidly explained in the *Dearborn Independent* (February 10). These laws blasted the theories of evolutionists like Darwin, Lyell, and Lamarek, but did not offer, as had been hoped, a substitute for those theories, for they revealed even to the eye of the experimenting scientists that nature in its production work is governed by laws of unbending rigidity. This was an involuntary proof for the botanical exactness of Gen. 1, 11. 12. 21. Likewise, the geological strata with their evidences of former plant and animal life, which were presented with such plerophoric certitude to prove the theory of evolution have ceased to function in an argument for evolution; for the sequence or succession of the strata which evolutionists had presented in a rigidly fixed order — who of us does not remember the brilliant graphs in text-books of geology? — has been shown to be a mere assumption of scientists. Not only intelligent men, but the brute creatures rise in indignant protest against the "unscientific pipe-dream," as the writer, Prof. G. McR. Price of Union Pacific College, California, calls evolution.

D.

Religious services controlled and paid for by the non-religious state have always seemed a curious anomaly to those who understand



the full bearing of the Constitution of the United States on the subject of state religion. In an emergency these people may have made use of government chaplaincies, because that was the only way to reach their coreligionists effectively. But government chaplaincies will always be a practical repudiation of the principle to which the citizens of our Republic stand pledged, the separation of Church and State. Besides, how foreign to the spirit of true religion and how irreverent (not to mention the inherent syncretism) have the performances of government chaplains and their treatment by the chaplains' clients occasionally been! An instance to illustrate this point has just been reported from the Legislature of Colorado, for which the chaplain, J. B. Kader, prayed: "O Lord, how long is this condition to endure? Our courts are corrupt. God has been expelled from our churches. Our pulpits are filled with essayists. Our boys and girls are going to the dogs. Laboring men go to work with empty pails, farmers starve, middlemen wax fat, banks are bursting with money." Immediately after the prayer the representatives adopted a resolution of censure, rejecting the prayer. There is reason to doubt whether this American fad of beginning any kind of public function with prayer is really to be looked upon as a religious act, and not rather as a decorous pose of virtuousness and good manners. (Not that these manners are good!) For not infrequently the loudest advocates of prayers at public functions are not at all in anything remotely resembling an odor of sanctity. D.

**Ten Years of Newspaper Lying.** — Under the caption "Untainted Sources of News" the *St. Louis Globe-Democrat* (March 9) says editorially: —

"Before the next war comes, if it comes, governments and nations must be convinced that lying does not pay," reads a part of resolutions adopted at its St. Louis meeting by the Executive Committee of the Press Congress of the World. If the resolutions may seem to some to embody only a platitude, it is one that probably has been more disregarded in the last ten years than in any other similar period in the world's history, and the protest is most seasonable and perhaps the more helpful because of absurd censorship still maintained by a number of European countries. Some reserve is undoubtedly necessary during a state of war, to which state the resolutions seem by their references to be especially directed, but military secrets can generally be better guarded than by drastic censorships, which invariably are stupid. And an idea strongly emphasized is that such things as are communicated for the information of the world shall be the truth, and that the benefits of untruth designed to deceive are evanescent and quickly changed to losses.

"The principle of a free transmission and free publication of news was not arrived at without a full consciousness of the abuses and evils that often attend the principle. But it has become an accepted principle because an appraisal of generations has shown that it can result, in no abuses or evils that can be compared with those resulting from a denial of the principle. This is a time when a uni-

versal resort to propaganda of infinite form causes us to suspect that the purposes back of very many things we read is not to inform the public, but to serve some *ex-parte* end. But the committee would consistently permit the unlimited distribution of propaganda, at least it would place no bureaucratic ban on its distribution that would prevent its being judged on its own merits. It is predicted that the public will learn to discriminate at least between the more plausible and the less plausible. The public has already learned a discrimination much greater than that. To let propaganda meet the fate which its own worth or lack of worth may indicate is the remedy, not official suppression. If it results in no other good, propaganda may incline to the side opposite to the one which it attempts to serve.

“Truly, as is stated, the chief concern over denials of free expression is not with journalists, but with governments, nations, peoples. At no other time have an accurate knowledge of, and an accurate interpretation on, what is afoot in all the world been more important than now.”

What a fine, guarded expression of opinion this is on the part of the dear old *Globe-Democrat*! The resolution of the Executive Committee has sent the editor off in a virtuous quest of the criminal to whom the resolution may apply, and, lo! he has found him: the absurd European censors are the culprits. Remarkable discovery! And how speedily it was made! The editor also is aware of a propaganda that rouses suspicion. This fact must have dawned on the editor with the force of a revelation. — The poor, patient public which is being fed the lies of the press will now wonder what the next menu will be. Most probably more skilful lying. For while lying certainly does not pay, liars just as certainly can be paid. Let us be grateful that this happens only among stupid Europeans. *Propos*, some unsophisticated persons believe that the trouble with our news is not so much at the sources as rather in the channels.

D.