

THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY.

VOL. V.

NOVEMBER, 1925.

No. 11.

Masonry in the Garb of Christianity.

PROF. O. C. A. BOECLER, St. Louis, Mo.

Pastors will often meet with Masons who assert most emphatically that since their initiation they view the Masonic oath-bound fraternity in a different light and consider it a distinctly Christian institution, and that his opposition to their favorite lodge betrays his ignorance, excusable indeed because he has not been "entered, passed, and raised." All material at the service of the pastor proving the distinctly unchristian character of Masonry must in such cases be of special value to him. But Masonry does bedeck itself with the livery of Christianity, both before the eyes of the public and in various of its degrees of the American and Scottish Rites.

From all that has been written and printed about Blue, or Symbolic, Masonry, comprising the first three degrees, Entered Apprentice, Fellow-Craft, and Master Mason, it is evident that in not one of its many lines does it voice any distinctively Christian doctrine or make any reference to the name of our adorable Savior. In Chapter Masonry there are two Scripture-readings from which the name of Christ has been studiously expunged. Mackey admits (*Ritualist*, p. 272) that in the fourth degree of Mark Master, the first degree of the Chapter, "slight, but necessary modifications" have been applied to 1 Pet. 2, 1—5. The Masonic mutilation renders the closing words thus: "to offer up sacrifices acceptable to God," omitting the words "by Jesus Christ." Again, according to Mackey's *Ritualist*, p. 348, when 2 Thess. 3, 6—16 is read during the opening ceremonies of the Royal Arch degree, the fourth of the Chapter, the name of our Savior is omitted from verses 6 and 12. But when some of our anti-Masonic friends maintain that Masonry in no instance adopts a Christian garb or mentions the name of Christ and His suffering and death, they are quite mistaken.

THE THEOLOGICAL OBSERVER.

“A Word for Us as We Open Our Conference. — We are gathered from far and near for the one great purpose of bettering ourselves, of growing in strength and knowledge of God’s Word. We pray therefore that God would fill us with the covetousness of which the apostle speaks when he says, ‘Covet earnestly the best gifts.’ He speaks of the gifts of the Holy Ghost. How much we need these gifts! We need to be better preachers, better theologians, exegetes, better men of prayer. We should long to be able to serve ‘the golden apple of God’s Word on a silver server.’ We should study to deliver

the message of our Savior with the beauty of simplicity, clearness, and exactness. Paul had an eye for all these things. He was not inclined to encourage slovenliness or indifference in things small or great, not even in the search for the greater gifts of the Spirit. But after treating the various gifts of the Spirit in God's kingdom even on earth, he calls attention to the great essential in all our service. He continues: 'And yet show I unto you a more excellent way,' and tells us in our text that, after all, even the longing for greater gifts must be the fruit of love, the desire to be of greater service to the brethren. . . . One possesses a rich treasure of Christian knowledge. Another has the gift of clarity and conciseness; another, the gift of oratory. Another is gifted with untiring energy and enthusiasm, and therefore it may happen that Christian pastors or teachers are tempted to be proud of their attainments and thus destroy the Christian virtue in all their work. Instead of having in mind only the edification of his fellow-Christians and fellow-men, he falls into a self-idolatry and self-emulation that destroy his real worth in the sight of God. Against such temptations we must pray God to keep us alert and make us keep in mind at all times that even with the highest attainments we are, after all, nothing without true faith in our Lord Jesus Christ, which in its living essential is active in love. Those works alone shall be crowned with the reward of grace which are the fruits of God's Spirit in faith and love." These sentiments are culled from Rev. G. A. Gullixson's Opening Meditation on 1 Cor. 13, 1-3 at the General Pastoral Conference of the Norwegian Synod at Lake Pomme de Terre, Minn., August 19, 1925. The entire meditation is published in *Evangelisk Luthersk Tidende* and *Lutheran Sentinel* for September 23. A noble covetousness! Would to God that it would become a veritable passion with every one of us! The Church and the world and, last, not least, we ourselves would soon see a marked difference in all our activities.

DAU.

A Business Man Advises Ministers. — Roger W. Babson, widely known business man and prominent statistician, has something of value to say to ministers: "Let the minister 'stick to his last.' A business man does not go to a lawyer for medical advice, and a real lawyer does not attempt to give lectures on the physical anatomy. The minister who attempts to give advice on all political, labor, and other subjects should get a position as an editorial writer with a newspaper — although, as a rule, people never read these editorials — rather than continue a minister. In other words, these men should remember the real meaning of the word 'minister' and truly minister to the men, women, and children of their parish."

MUELLER.

How a Modernist Came to Unshakable Christianity. — The new biography of Dr. Abraham Kuyper, theologian, journalist, statesman, Prime Minister of the Netherlands, by W. Kolfhaus, gives us the story of a man who, although steeped in Modernist doctrine, pure Fosdickism, as it presented itself a hundred years ago, nevertheless came to embrace the real Christian faith. In the University of Leyden the

simple faith which was his when he entered it beat a shameful retreat and finally fully succumbed under the assaults of the rationalism of the Dutch "Modernist" Scholten. In his country parish of Beesd the young preacher came in contact with Christians who were untainted by the world in doctrine or practise and found that they knew something which he did not know. Their conversation was not limited to the affairs of the village. They had interest in spiritual things. *Above all, they knew something.* "I could not measure my impoverished Bible knowledge, the fruit of university study, with that of these plain people. And not only in Bible knowledge. They had a consistent *Weltanschauung.*" For years the knowledge of the Way could not assert itself in Kuyper because of the lack of earnestness which had become inbred through the university training. But finally, he says, "in the recesses of my being the warmth of the Gospel began to drive out the freezing chill of philosophy. I came to the conviction that the foolishness of the Cross was the highest and best wisdom, and with a heart of thanksgiving I ranged with those who fought under its banner." From this time on he vigorously opposed Unitarianism in the state church. He fought it for fifty years as editor of several papers published in the interest of Evangelical Christianity. After the graduates of Kuyper's Free University had been banned from the pastorate, 160,000 members, under the leadership of Kuyper, formed a protesting body. The parents built Christian schools for their children, at the same time paying taxes for the support of the godless state schools. Kuyper's influence was acknowledged even by his enemies, as one, Franz Netscher, wrote: "Does he not, with his abilities, his convictions, his powers of work, stand heaven-high above the cackling, gesticulating mediocrities, ever talking about 'science,' whom we allow to reign over us? Let us frankly confess that we envy this man of faith and look up to him." Though Kuyper led a life of conflict and had acquired all the learning of his age, he could nevertheless with simple piety maintain the family altar and watch over the religious instruction of his children and household.

MUELLER.

The United States Supreme Court decisions of 1923, in the Nebraska foreign-language case, and of 1925, in the Oregon compulsory schools case, have, in the opinion of Nelson Collins (*The Commonwealth*, September 23), created a "danger of safety" [security?], especially for Lutherans. "The possible danger among the responsible Lutherans at least, is not so much in the assertion of their Germanic prides and inheritances. Rather it is from the fixed article of belief in Lutheran administrative tradition that not only no control, but no affinity, shall exist between the Church and the State. It is a little hard to follow their extreme development of this admirable standpoint. Men are citizens even while they sit in church. Children are candidates committed to citizenship even while they sit in school. The State shall not dominate the schools, we know now, but it shall have its rightful assertiveness there, in all of them. This interplay of the State with the parent, the Church,

the child, and the teacher is a problem that here and there, in reactionary or careless corners, may prove to be a Catholic problem, but from the very nature of Lutheran administrative principles it is much more of a Lutheran problem than it is a Catholic problem." It would be interesting to know where this writer has made his studies of Lutheran administrative principles. No Lutheran believes that American citizenship is temporarily suspended when a person crosses the threshold of a Lutheran church or school. Nor is there any inclination to deny the State "its rightful assertiveness" in, or over, Lutheran schools. This danger, however, does distinctly exist in Catholic circles because of the dogma of papal supremacy even in the temporal and civil affairs of Catholics. But what can be the object of a Catholic paper in issuing the above misdirected warning to Lutherans?

DAU.

Prohibition and College Students.—The Department of Research and Education of the Federal Council of Churches, in reporting on its findings with respect to conditions in our colleges and high schools concerning rowdyism and drinking, states: "There is a marked tendency on the part of young people to depart from conventional rules of behavior. This tendency is in no apparent way related to prohibition save as liquor drinking has become one of the many commonly tabooed performances that are turned to for 'kick' that large numbers of young people are trying to get out of life. If any single material factor is more important than another, it is probably the automobile, certainly not the hip flask. . . . Certainly, the non-observance of the law by parents has a rather tragic effect on boys and girls. . . . In the colleges, undoubtedly, some alarming conditions have developed. . . . The evidence, however, seems to indicate a favorable trend at the present time; at least this is the opinion of nearly all the college deans consulted, and it receives some measure of support from other sources. The most serious aspect of the situation in the colleges is the fact that the students' attitude toward drinking appears to be determined almost wholly without reference to the law. . . . It is a matter of personal preference or perhaps of school discipline—the responsibilities of citizenship play but a little part. . . . But however much we may legitimately discount stories of excessive drinking among young people, *the fact that prohibition has had no more decisive effect in heightening their moral tone gives food for earnest thought.*"

MUELLER.

On "Evolution in the Public Schools" an article was contributed to the *Lutheran Church Herald*, June 2, by J. G. Halland, former State Superintendent of Public Schools in North Dakota. Mr. Halland, I think, is a graduate of Concordia Seminary, St. Louis. He says: "Those who believe they have descended or ascended *à la* Darwin and his followers certainly have their constitutional rights, but so have their fellow-citizens. Let's take a look at the case from a layman's point of view. The Constitution of the United States as well as the constitutions of every State in the Union provide for the separation of Church and State. Every person is guaranteed full freedom to believe or not believe and to worship as he may

see fit; but so is his neighbor, and each must play within his own yard. Neither of them has the right to use public tax money, collected for educational work, to spread and establish his own peculiar religious ideas. The question, then, would seem to be, Is evolution in fact a religion? Does the teaching of evolution to children and young people affect, and interfere with, the religious instruction given them by their parents, priests, or pastors? One of the principal marks of every religion, be it Christian, Hebrew, Mohammedan, or what-not, is that it concerns itself with first causes, *i. e.*, origin and creation of things, and with man's place in the universe. Each group answers the *whence*, the *what*, and the *whither* according to its faith and creed. This is exactly what the evolutionist does. He has a hypothesis, or creed, that explains to his satisfaction the origin and nature of things, of man, and of mind and matter. This is his religion. With him it takes the place of Genesis and all other theories of creation, or cosmogonies. To this religion he is entitled. It is his constitutional privilege. If, however, in the enjoyment of this privilege, he becomes enthusiastic and feels a great urge or desire to spread his religious belief, it is also his privilege to build a lecture-hall or climb a soap-box, where he does not interfere with traffic, and to invite his neighbors to listen to his explanation of his creeds, theories, etc.; but he must not expect the taxpayers of any American community to build schoolrooms, compel the children to attend, and then turn him loose on them to teach his particular brand of religion, even if he attempts to disguise the nature of his efforts by calling it science. The work of the public schools is clearly mapped out for the different States, and while the courses may vary a little for different localities, nowhere does the course of study include the elements or principles of the teacher's personal religion or of any one else's. The regular subjects mapped out for the elementary and high school courses are too well known to need repetition. They are based on our experience in requiring work of young people from six to eighteen years old and as to content have been found satisfactory to practically everybody who has children to send to school. While the children are gathered for the purpose of acquiring this knowledge, parents have the right to feel that the religious training given the children at home or in their own church, whether that be Protestant, Catholic, or some other creed, shall not be undermined, contradicted, ridiculed, or attacked by representatives of creeds differing from their own or by teachers who are atheists, agnostics, so-called freethinkers, Bible enemies, evolutionists, or members of any other 'ism,' 'mism,' or 'fism.' Neither does this demand on the part of parents and guardians exclude the teaching of real biology in any of its phases. The anatomy, physiology, life history, habits, and habitat of all living things, plant or animal, from unicell to man, with every fact relating to the amoeba, mollusks, worms, insects, frogs, cats, dogs, etc., observed by Darwin, Huxley, Fabre, Burroughs, or any other scientist, can be used. Facts are facts. If biology or any other science is required, all its known facts are available for school purposes according to the age and grade of the pupils. Evolution, on the other

hand, is not a science, but a theory, a speculation, a guess, a supposition. It has never been proved, nor, according to its most enthusiastic devotees, can it ever be proved in the same sense that the laws of physiology, physics, or chemistry are demonstrated. Ever since before Plato and Aristotle, philosophers have struggled with the problems of mind and matter, and evolution, at best, is another effort in that mysterious realm of thought. Teachers who have become fascinated with evolution naturally like to preach their faith while doing their regular school-work. So do Catholics, Protestants, Jews, and members of many other creeds, all of them just as honest and serious in their religious beliefs as the evolutionist. The public school, however, is not the place for religious or philosophical propaganda. Turned over to any one sect, cult, or church, the public school will cease to exist. The majority will refuse to pay taxes for such purposes, and rightly so. That the evolutionist should regard himself as a martyr for truth and not as a lawbreaker and violator of the basic principles of American government, is natural. It is difficult to see and place oneself correctly, especially when suffering from a new and strong enthusiasm. The public, however, has been watching and measuring this new cult and is fully aware of its nature, its effects on other forms of faith when adopted by the young, and its general tendency. In order to enable the citizens of the American Republic to get along and to cooperate in public matters, education included, it has been found necessary to separate Church and State, not only in theory or appearance, but in fact and in reality. Nor has the adoption of this principle checked or interfered with religious work in the home, in the press, in the pulpit, or on the street. Each one of us is free to pay and pray as he pleases. If the followers of this new faith feel that what it is and what it leads to is worth their time and money, there is nothing to hinder them from spending both in its support and doing as other societies and churches have done. In a rather careless way the public has permitted them for some time past to stab other creeds in the back by trying to steal the hearts of the children entrusted to their care for instruction in secular branches. This, of course, must cease. And this is not unreasonable, as no right-minded person should expect to teach in the schools if he cannot do this work without breaking the law and without doing injury to the American plan of public education. Attempting to establish a new cult under the pretense that it is science, is dishonest and unworthy of any honest teacher, no matter what his personal feeling may be regarding its correctness and truth. He owes it to his country not to lessen the public's confidence in our public school system by smuggling in his personal views, suspicions, and convictions in matters properly belonging under the head of philosophy or religion."

DAU.

Clarence Darrow, the lawyer of Loeb and Leopold fame and a rabid opponent of Bryan in the recent Scopes trial, received the following stinging rebuke from Chief Justice Carrington T. Marshall of the Ohio Supreme Court in an address at Cleveland: "The law in that case was plain and simple. Neither the indictment nor the

statute under which the indictment was framed, contained any mention of evolution. . . . That the forbidden doctrines were taught was freely admitted by the defendant. No defense was therefore open except that of the constitutional validity of the law itself. And yet Darrow sought to browbeat and to bluff the judge into admitting expert evidence upon the soundness of the theory of evolution. And upon refusal he became abusive, highly disrespectful, and contemptuous in his conduct toward the court. He had no purpose or motive except publicity and notoriety. After he had been cited for contempt and when faced with the probability of paying a fine, he made the most humble and abject apology. The character of Darrow is again shown by a recent public statement made by him that 'courts are cockpits in which lawyers may fight.'"—In connection with this may be cited the expression of Dr. Millikan, of Chicago, Nobel Prize winner and world-famed physicist, before the meeting of the American Chemical Society at Los Angeles recently: "The pathetic thing is that we have scientists who are trying to prove evolution, which no scientist can ever prove. . . . We must learn to get away from overassertiveness and dogmatism, whether scientific or theological. I see overassertiveness from scientists in connection with such things as the late evolution trial, and I see on the other side assertiveness on subjects about which I know nobody knows anything."

MUELLER.

The International Catholic Confederation.—The *Catholic World* of October, 1925, reports on the work of the new International Catholic Confederation. This body is a development of the Catholic Council for International Relations, which was begun in Reading, England, through the efforts of Cardinal Bourne, organized "to put before Catholics of all parties and classes the teachings of the Church concerning the mutual rights and duties of nations as members of the great human family, the place of the Holy Father in world affairs, and the obligation of Catholics to use their influence to the end that in all international relations justice shall prevail; and further, to provide a channel of communication between the various branches of Catholic action in Great Britain and those in other lands." The new Catholic Confederation was, in addition, supported by the International Office of Catholic Organizations (Rome), the International Catholic League (Zug), and the Catholic Union of International Studies (Fribourg); Dr. Monti, of Rome, was selected secretary. The objects of the new confederation, according to its constitution, are: "To labor to preserve, and to render more effective, the unity of Catholic action throughout the world. To promote international peace, based upon justice and Christian charity, according to the desire and directions of the Holy See, by forming in every country a Catholic conscience, well instructed in the Church's teaching concerning the moral principles of international conduct; by creating the good will necessary for the application of such principles; by united study of all questions immediately concerning Catholic interests in the international sphere; and by establishing closer contact and collaboration, where desirable,

in all branches of Catholic effort (moral, social, educational, etc.), between the Catholics of different nations; by prayer for the Holy Father's intentions."

MUELLER.

Radio Station WLWL. — Under this title the *Catholic World* for October, 1925, presents the following: "On Thursday evening, September 24, the new five-thousand-watt radio station of the Paulist League made its formal bow to the radio audience. 'Come, Holy Ghost' and 'The Star-spangled Banner,' sung by the Paulist Choristers, were the opening numbers of the station and followed the brief announcement that the motto of WLWL was, 'For God and Country.' His Eminence Cardinal Hayes gave a brief address, urging broadcasters to recognize their great responsibility in the power they had to influence the lives of so many people and emphasized the cultural, intellectual, and moral possibilities of a powerful radio station. Musical numbers, vocal and instrumental, of a high class continued the program until late in the evening. WLWL had probably over one million listeners on the opening night. It broadcasts on a wave length of 283.3 meters and is now on the air every Sunday, Tuesday, and Friday evening."

MUELLER.

The organization of a secret society composed of former soldiers and sailors was described in a dispatch from Toronto, Ont., to the *Sunday News-Leader*, March 15, as follows: "The first meeting of the chivalric order of the Crusaders, the soldiers' secret society, which has mystified Great Britain with its spectacular march to Westminster Abbey to pay homage to its first knight, the unknown soldier, has been held in Toronto. Application has been made for an Ontario charter. It will be affiliated with the parent body in England, which numbers the Duke of York amongst its officers. Lieutenant-Colonel John Allister Currie, member of the Legislature, is Knight Commander of the order just launched in Canada. The greatest secrecy cloaks the origin and news of the new order. It cannot be determined yet whether Colonel Currie or the general now in England interviewing the British order is the originator of the Canadian association. Several officers who attended the first meeting have not divulged their personalities. Besides Colonel Currie, Major W. F. Orr, Captain W. A. Orr, R. R. Brancier, J. Calder, D. C. M. and T. Eversfield have been clothed with authority. T. Eversfield is Grand Scribe, or secretary. 'As the Grand Consistory of the Crusaders of Canada is a secret organization of soldiers and sailors who served in the late war, I am not at liberty to discuss it or to divulge the names of those behind the order. The order is open to all soldiers and sailors of the late war who are of good character. Its membership will be recruited with great care,' declared the secretary. The initial fee into the secret soldiers' society is \$20. The Canadian Crusaders will have the motto: 'Patriotism, equality, fraternity, and justice.' Many of the most distinguished soldiers in the army will become members, it is stated. The Canadian Crusaders will wear a cloak of khaki, on which will be worn the symbol of a sword, in the shape of a cross, on either side, blood-red in color. Instead of the plumed hat of the English order, the Canadian will

wear a steel trench helmet. Spurs will be worn and a girdle. And a broadsword of the Crusader type will be carried. It is said that by July the membership will in Toronto consist of several thousand members, of at least a dozen assemblies. But the membership will not be rapidly increased, as every applicant must be *bona fide* and undergo investigation. By the time Armistice Day comes, a full parade, consisting of several battalions, will be ready to march to the cenotaph in front of Toronto's City Hall. The first knight will be that unknown soldier who lies in Westminster Abbey. In England the Crusaders wear a cloak, or habit, that covers the soldier from head to foot, concealing the social position or standing of the individual."

Paralleling the recent Stockholm World Conference with the Ecumenical Council at Nicea is a precarious effort. The Stockholm Conference was not ecumenical, and if the Nicene Creed were used as a measuring-rod, or test, of the Christianity of its membership, it was not Christian; for the doctrines accepted at Nicea are not the doctrines held by all those who met at Stockholm. The men who met at Nicea set up a Christian creed of very respectable quality; the men who gathered at Stockholm would rather induce men to forget creeds, as some of them have done. The Council of Nicea met A. D. 325, that of Stockholm exactly 1,600 years later, and that is where the parallel ends. Placing the two events together in any serious meaning is nothing but a fine piece of prestidigitation and theatrical scene-shifting worthy of an expert. One cannot but smile at the reveries of reminiscence that seem to have seized some who have written about the Stockholm Conference and have remembered Nicea. Those who did this for the press were evidently bidden to do so and ignorantly performed their stupid newspaper scribes' task. Others who should have known better permitted themselves to be duped. But who was the artful trickster that worked the deception?

DAU.

One of the issues debated at the Stockholm Conference was "the Church and International Relations." A committee had submitted a report which "emphatically recommended the League of Nations to the benevolent consideration of Christians," pleaded for the protection of national and religious minorities, and proposed the establishment of a permanent international court to which all controversies that might lead to war are to be submitted. During the discussion of the report Dr. Kapler, in the name of the German delegates, declared that they could not arrive at the conviction that the measures proposed would achieve the desired end. The General Superintendent of the Rhine Province, Klingermann, stated: "What we are concerned about is the kingdom of God; but we find it impossible to identify the kingdom of God with a state of prosperity this side of heaven. The great issues of war and peace will develop in accordance with their own earthly laws, which are unalterable. My countrymen in the Rhine country would fail to understand why at this place our yearning after liberation from grievous mental and physical oppression was not given utterance. They will never

tire of emphasizing the fact that our nation has equal rights with the other nations. Try to realize what it means that Germany is a disarmed nation. In vain are we looking for universal disarmament. I am far from underestimating the value of a league of nations, but I am unable to see in the present form of the League of Nations any religious achievement, any connection with the kingdom of God. In our view the League of Nations is a judge that undertakes to guarantee a state of affairs that is intolerable to us. Regarding the issue of the protection of minorities, we have to raise the charge that the League of Nations has denied protection to German minorities." The English Bishop Brent replied to the speaker, strongly opposing him and asserting that the League of Nations is not a dubious formation, but the fulfilment of the will of God. He expressed the belief that war will be abolished within the next century. He was followed by Lady Parmoor, who spoke in the same strain.—This incident characterizes the Stockholm Conference: it was a social-political gathering set in a quasi-religious frame. The kingdom of God which the leading advocates visioned is the old chiliastic figment of temporal happiness. The only new feature is that this mundane realm of happiness is to be set up under a British protectorate. Whoever fights British imperialism fights against God—that is a cardinal tenet of present-day British politicians, who are in league with politicians in other countries. As regards the principle of the protection of minorities, there is lurking behind this plea a disquieting fear that harasses the pleaders. They know that the coterie of tyrants who have imposed their will on the people are a minority, and that their scheme has been discovered. Hence the desire and the cry for protection. DAU.

Dr. Ihmels had submitted to the Stockholm Conference the following theses on "The Kingdom of God and the Natural Conditions of Life," from which the following is quoted: "1. The sole mission of the Church is to proclaim the message of the kingdom of God and, by doing this, to serve as the instrument in the hand of God for enforcing this kingdom throughout the world. 2. By the kingdom of God is understood the royal rule of God, under which men who by faith in Jesus Christ have without reservation submitted to God hold communion with God in their faith and are joined to one another by the love of God, which necessarily becomes mutual love. 3. The kingdom of God is something absolutely transmundane. Having been introduced into this world wholly by God through the living, suffering, dying, and rising again of Jesus Christ and being continually worked into the world by the Spirit of God, it is something entirely new in this world. It is neither evolved from out of the world, nor does it enter into an alliance with the world. 4. For this very reason the kingdom of God does not start with a discussion of the natural conditions of life which are found in the world as expressions of the divine will of the Creator. It rather acknowledges in principle that these conditions are amenable to laws of their own and directs Christians for their life in communion with God to enter into the created order. 5. From this very fact it follows

indeed that community life within the created order must ultimately be permeated with the thoughts of the kingdom of God. According to the sayings of Jesus the kingdom of God is to be like unto a leaven that leavens everything. 6. As a matter of fact, however, the world of God has become at the same time the world of sin, and the aforementioned natural order of God has become entwined in sinful connections to such an extent that the individual, even if he is personally a Christian, is unable simply to extricate himself from this connection in its practical operations. But the only truth to be deduced from this state of affairs is that the permeation of community life within the aforementioned order can be accomplished only by conflicts, which make the necessity of the permeation only the more urgent. 7. The laws of economic life, viewed purely by themselves, seem to be in opposition to the thoughts of the kingdom of God; but, being community life, economic life cannot possibly be withdrawn from the operation of those thoughts; rather must this form of community life be permeated with the thought of love, which is the dominating thought in all Christian ethics; and that in such a manner that this love operates to the achievement of its end in this domain as the principle of both service and righteousness. 8. Economic life, by its production of merchandise, enters consciously into connection with the entire community life of mankind and thereby renders a service that cannot be dispensed with. Nor is this relation in any way altered by the fact that economic life is necessarily directed to gain, or profit, although this latter, too, is in definite need of being ethically regulated. Accordingly, the perverse question whether economics should be built up on an egotistic or on an altruistic basis must be set aside by the knowledge that economic life will serve the community so much more surely if it resolutely follows its own immanent tendencies, but has these tendencies, themselves regulated from the start by its consciously avowed purpose of serving. 9. In the relation between employer and employee the fundamental requirement of love will have to assert itself as righteousness in this sense, that the employee renders to the employer with complete devotion every service that he owes him, while the employer holds himself ready in principle to satisfy without reservation the just demands of the laboring profession in fixing its wages and working hours, in any possible amelioration of their dwellings, and, above all, in recognizing the personal equality of the laborers,—all this within the limits set up for him by the combinations that may appear in the markets of the world, and, in general, by the impossibility of laying down rules that are to be universally applicable. 10. In all claims set up by social ethics the real difficulty lies in the question to what extent the fundamental requirements of Christianity may claim and demand recognition beyond the circle of persons who are consciously Christians. At this point we must hold, especially with reference to political life, that it would be just as wrong to force upon people any ordinances that conflict with their conscience as to give up the attempt to permeate, as far as this is feasible, the political life with

Christian thoughts. 11. Under all conditions we must strictly maintain this position, that every permeation of the natural order of life with the spirit of the Gospel will have to remain imperfect as surely as sin will not cease while this world exists. Even the most advanced Christian is able to live only by faith in Him who died for us and rose again, and hence it is nothing but fanaticism (*Schwaermerei*) to dream of a perfect realization of the kingdom of God within the present world-eon. And it would even be utterly antichristian to maintain that the final consummation of the kingdom of God must grow out of present conditions by an immanent process of evolution. As at its entrance into the world and in its operations in the world, so, too, at its final consummation the kingdom of God is strictly supernatural. 12. Rather than growing gradually towards its consummation the growth of the kingdom of God is accompanied by an incessant growth of the mystery of iniquity. Accordingly, not until the appearing of the Lord the final catastrophe will come, which will signify to the kingdom of God a complete new creation. Although every conflict of our times which aims at putting the kingdom of God into reality is in accordance with God's will and supported by the promise of God, nevertheless we shall never be able to figure out in what sense the coming of the kingdom of God is conditioned by our present-day labor. However, all our working and praying is privileged to hasten on the day when the consummate royal rule of God will be made manifest from above." Barring the intricate style of the author, what he says is good. Only at the last words in his ninth thesis we would place a question-mark. For a gathering of *Schwaermer* like those in Stockholm these thoughts of Ihmels were the proper medicine; they might have sobered the minds intoxicated with millenarian dreams of a kingdom of God this side of the pearly gates. As a matter of fact, none of the leaders at Stockholm has paid, or will in future pay, the least attention to these thoughts.

DAU.

The papal bull of Leo X relative to the renowned indulgence (cf. Luther's Works, St. Louis ed., XV, 232) which roused Luther from his lair refers to "the alum from our Tolfa" (col. 235). Similar references are found cols. 227, 278, and 282. The reader is left in a quandary when he meets this phrase, but so much is clear, that His Papal Highness makes mention of the alum of Tolfa in connection with sins for which no indulgence could be granted, such as conspiracy against the Pope, murder of bishops and other prelates, forging of papal bulls and letters, and smuggling of weapons to the infidels, in this case the Turks, although heinous sins and black crimes could be forgiven in limitless number. C. Ullmann (*Reformatoren vor der Reformation*, II, 443) found a reference to this same alum in the writings of John Wessel († 1489), who disputed the claims of Pius II regarding it, and in a footnote Ullmann admits that this passage had been obscure to him until he found a short treatise by Professor Kist (*Kirchenhist. Archiv*, part 6, p. 171): "Sluikhandel eene Doodzonde, ter Verklaring der: Alumina Tulfa." The following historical data offered explain the whole matter: In

the middle of the fifteenth century John de Castro discovered within the papal state rich deposits of alum at Tolfa, near Civita Vecchia. The Pope derived very acceptable dividends from this source, amounting to an annual income of 50,000 *Taler*. Heretofore alum had been imported from Eastern countries, and to create a monopoly of this commodity, the wide-awake business man at Rome forbade the importation of Oriental alum, turned to his roster of unpardonable sins, and in holy zeal deftly listed the smuggling of alum to their number. And in Luther's days the Christian world was still caused to tremble in fear lest they commit this unpardonable crime of papal invention. — Footnote 3, p. 227, Vol. XV of the St. Louis edition must be corrected in accordance with the facts given above.

O. C. A. B.

Glimpses from the Observer's Window. — At the recent Stockholm Conference the eulogies of the American delegates on Prohibition were "listened to with respect," but left the assembly icy cold, whereas a talk on birth control was received with uproarious applause.

"Is Radio Going to the Devil?" queries the *American-Christian-Humanitarian* for April and says: "Any close observer of radio press programs will discern a decided tendency in radio broadcasting toward low standards. . . . If this God-given discovery gets into the clutches of people and interests that will turn it into a common sewer, — as the motion-picture discovery has been diverted and corrupted, — it is time that human society looked to its moorings. . . . The home is already invaded by degrading ether waves." All the more reason why Christians should make the most extensive use of the radio. Rev. H. Hohenstein has now taken charge of Station KPFO at Concordia Seminary. Godspeed to his efforts!

The *Commonweal* (September 23) claims, on the authority of Friedrich Ritter von Lama's books about the late war, that the reason why Germany did not obtain peace before the armistice in 1918 was because Chancellor Michaelis ignored the Pope's peace overtures.

"A better time for fewer people" is suggested as a slogan for advocates of birth control.

Bishop Barnes, of Birmingham, England, recently preached a sermon at Westminster Abbey in which he traced the Roman Mass to the Mithraic ceremonies, calling it a parody of the latter. Lord Shaftesbury, a leader of the Anglo-Catholic wing of the Establishment, in the name of the committee on the English Church Union, has denounced the occurrence to the Archbishop of Canterbury as a "most distressing and scandalous event."

Boy Scouts "from every corner of America, from Arabia, from all the fringes of Europe," had come to Rome because of the Holy Year, and as they marched into St. Peter's for Mass and benediction, it gave the Pope especial delight to bless them — "the world's hope and responsibility for the future" — with his lifted hand.

Forty French judges have interpreted the "Loi de la Presse" and decided that when an author's production has been reviewed adversely by critics, the author may exact space for a rejoinder from the periodical that published the review.

For our scrap-book on evolution the following sentiments are valuable: "Professor Millikan, of Chicago, a very distinguished physicist and the recipient of a Nobel prize, says: 'The pathetic thing is that we have scientists who are trying to prove evolution, which no scientist can prove.' Loeb holds that, until some scientific man has developed a new species from an old one, evolution must remain an unproved theory." (See article "Shaky Ladders" in the *Commonweal* for September 30.)

At the senatorial election in Wisconsin, Catholicism and Klannism stood openly arrayed against each other. Mr. Wilcox, who received the regular Republican nomination in the primaries and was repudiated by Senator Lenroot and Chairman Butler, is a Catholic. Mr. Dithmar, whom Senator Lenroot espoused, is a Klansman. And now the *Commonweal* is praying for the election of Mr. La Follette and hopes that at another election, soon to follow, Senator Lenroot will be provided "with a non-stop ticket to the political limbo he is so thoroughly qualified to inhabit."

DAU.
