

THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY.

VOL. VI.

JANUARY, 1926.

No. 1.

Will Christ Come Again?

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

Those "earnest Bible-searchers," the Russellites, had confidently fixed upon the fall of 1925 as the time of the coming of the heavenly kingdom. ("Millions of men now living will never die.") While they are collecting their shattered wits and gathering sufficient audacity for a new prophetic escapade, Christians will all the more earnestly search their Bible for real information regarding the great event to which they are taught to look forward.

The daring predictions of millenarians, when demolished by the course of events, have always hurled many who had accepted them as genuine into rank unbelief. That is happening again since the uneventful close of the fall of 1925. The army of credulous dupes who first "believed" too much now refuse to believe anything. They were eager to accept anything upon the authority of a man's word. Now that they are undeceived, they decline acceptance of the facts about the Lord's return, for which there is ample guaranty in the Word of God. The host of infidel worldlings, moreover, who are habitually heaping scorn upon the idea of the Second Advent of Christ are pointing with unholy glee to the Russellite prophecy for the fall of 1925 and exclaim: "Didn't we tell you you were going to be fooled! Out upon all your Bible trash!" It is too pathetic a spectacle. The Christian pastors whom Mr. Rutherford, prior to the fall of 1925, haughtily lectured on their skepticism should now rivet the responsibility for the increase of infidelity on him. And when Russellites launch their next slogan, it should be met with the counter-slogan: "Thousands of men now living who accept Russellism will turn infidels."

Scripture warns against a twofold error to which men are liable in connection with the Second Coming of the Lord. On the one hand, it declares that the date of Christ's return will never be known in advance, either in the world of created spirits or in the world of men. Matt. 24, 36. Even the Son of Man in His

THE THEOLOGICAL OBSERVER.

Concordia Publishing House, or *The Art of Printing in the Service of the Church*.—The first printing-plant of our Missouri Synod was a small, two-story building of scarcely two thousand square feet of floor space, erected in the 3600 block on the Texas Ave. side of our Seminary property and dedicated in February, 1870. In 1875 a much larger building was erected on the corner of Miami St. and Indiana Ave. In the course of years this building was enlarged, in 1893 an additional building was erected on the corner of Jefferson Ave. and Miami St., and in 1911 another building was joined to this on Jefferson Ave. In 1924 an entirely new manufacturing plant was erected on the two hundred feet adjoining the other buildings on Jefferson Ave. On November 6, 1925, the large new building, in fact, the entire plant, which had been renovated and considerably altered, was dedicated to the service of the Lord.

A dedication service was held in the new auditorium in one of the old buildings, to which, on account of lack of space, only the Board of Directors, the employees, and the editors had been invited. Addresses were made by the Secretary of the Board and by representatives of Synod and of the editorial and executive staffs, as well as by spokesmen for the various Concordia Publishing House boards and the employees. As our first educational institution, the little log cabin in Perry County, Mo., in the course of years branched out into a large number of colleges and seminaries located in various parts of our country, in Canada, in South America, and in Asia, so our originally small Concordia Publishing House in the course of years grew to be a tremendous institution; it is to-day the largest church printing plant of its kind in the country, and, compared with any printing-plant in the country, it is up to date and modern. Although we recognize the labors of those who helped to make Concordia Publishing House what it is, as, for instance, the good work of the Manager, Mr. Edmund Seuel, who has been in charge for a period of twenty years, we give all glory to God for the wonderful growth of our printing-plant and for the blessings which have gone forth from it for the upbuilding of Christ's kingdom in the world. "The art of printing," says Luther, "is the last and most blessed gift of God, by means of which He spreads the Gospel here on earth." We could not imagine that the Church would be what it is to-day if we had had no printed Bibles and catechisms and hymn-books and prayer-books, and the many other good books and church-papers which have been, and are being, published.—While many other churches in the course of years have been using the printing-press to spread false doctrine, and while a large percentage of the printed religious books and other publications in our day is denying the very fundamental truths of the Christian religion, our Concordia Publishing House has from its beginning, in the year 1870, to the present time remained in the service of the pure Gospel. For this grace bestowed upon us we are especially thankful to the Lord. May the Lord continue to grant us His blessings, preserve His Word unto us in its truth and purity, and let our Concordia Publishing House and our entire Church remain faithful to Him and to His Word! May the blessed truth that the sinner is saved by grace, through faith in Jesus Christ, continue to be proclaimed and taught from our pulpits, in our schools, by means of our printed literature, and also by means of the most modern discovery, the radio, until the very end of days, for the salvation of many blood-bought souls and to the glory of our only God and Savior!

J. H. C. F.

On All Saints' Day and All Souls' Day the *Lutheran* (October 29) offered this happy editorial information: "All Saints' Day, which was set for celebration on November 1 by Pope Gregory III about the year 740, was a provision against any errors in honoring the saints. The *Catholic Cyclopedia* says: 'It is instructed to honor all the saints, known and unknown, and, according to Urban IV, to supply any deficiencies in the faithful's celebration of saints' feasts during the year.' Its institution is a model of courtesy. One infers.

that it not only soothed the ruffled feelings of any heroic soul that the Church may have failed to place in the calendar; it also enabled careless worshipers to make amends for their neglect of their particular patron saints by a sort of lump adulation once a year. It may have been the precedent or the reflection of the social custom of giving a big annual reception by which all social debts were paid. [It is possible, too, that some such notion as prompted the Athenians' worship of their unknown god was back of the installation of the rite.—D.] We are told that it was largely attended, and that Luther's theses were sure of the greatest possible attention when they met the eyes of the throngs that came to Mass on All Saints' Day, November 1, 1517.—November 2, unless it falls on Sunday or conflicts with a major 'feast,' is called 'All Souls' Day.' It is a provision, we learn from the *Catholic Cyclopaedia*, whereby the faithful can help all the departed 'who are not perfectly cleansed from venial sins or have not fully atoned for past transgressions.' The priests recite masses for the dead, and the faithful on earth 'can help them by prayers, almsdeeds, and especially by the sacrifice of the Mass.' The last refers to masses 'ordered' by friends and others at the current rate. One is impressed by the perfect ecclesiastical organization that was developed in the course of ten centuries through consistent centralization at Rome. It not only covered the earth, but crossed the line of death and articulated with the spiritual world. We make this final observation advisedly after reading a recent book authorized by the American papal representatives, which compared the claims of Spiritism and Spiritualism with Rome's relationships with the departed." DAU.

Birth control is a ground for divorce in the opinion of an Austrian court of justice. Meyrick Booth relates in the *Hibbert Journal* for October: "A Vienna woman, wife of a civil servant, recently brought an action against her husband on the ground that he wished to make the union sterile by the adoption of 'birth control.' The case went to the highest Court of Appeal, judgment was given in her favor, and she obtained a divorce on that ground alone. The Judge of Appeal laid it down as a principle that maternity was inherent in the marriage rights to which the wife had legal claim. An interference with this right amounted to refusal of consummation." The case may be turned around, of course, and the male party to the marriage contract may obtain a ruling that paternity is inherent in the marriage rights. This raises the question, How is the relation between the sexes under birth control to be viewed and called? That relation has eliminated the *finis matrimonii*.—The article of Booth ("Woman in Rebellion") brings out the fact that one cause of the prevailing unrest and discontent in the world of women is the suppression of "the main underlying motive of the feminine personality—the desire for children of her own." Modern "machine-made civilization" gives to woman "no real say in its life and work (except in so far as they are willing to become mere imitation men)." This view is a revelation. It is usually believed that birth control finds its chief support among women. DAU.

Candidating.—A practise which has prevailed in sectarian churches, but has not, at least not officially, interfered with the administration of pastoral calls in our midst, is that of passing on a pastor's qualification before calling him by means of a sample sermon. The *Watchman-Examiner* of October 22 hails the passing of this system with delight: "A man ought not to be called to a church until he has seen the congregation and the congregation has seen him, but his Sunday's visit ought not to come until the pulpit committee has practically decided on his recommendation to the church. Dr. Charles E. Jefferson has the following wise words on this subject: 'Candidating is a disgrace to the house of God. Who thinks of God when a candidate is preaching? Not the preacher, because he is thinking of the people; not the people, because they are dissecting the preacher. . . . Moreover, it is humiliating to the preacher. To be inspected like a pumpkin at a fair, to be put through the paces like a horse at a race, to be judged by a miscellaneous assembly, many of whom do not know what a good sermon is, is an outrage upon ministers which ought to be abolished forthwith. . . . You must hear a man preach a year before you have a right to judge him. . . . A minister is more than a preacher. He does various kinds of work. Fidelity in these other labors is as important as ability in pulpit ministrations. Manhood [?] is the supreme qualification. You cannot judge of manhood in one sermon.'"

MUELLER.

The National Council of the Congregational Church, in its last meeting at Washington, was addressed by its Honorary Moderator, no less a person than President Coolidge, on "The Interrelation Between Religion and Government." The President pointed out the function of the state in preserving order and justice, and of religion in helping the government to achieve its purposes: "The utmost ingenuity on the part of the police powers will be substantially all wasted in an effort to enforce the law if there does not exist a strong and vigorous determination on the part of the people to observe the law. . . . It is only by a constant renewal and extension of our faith that we can expect to enlarge and improve the moral and spiritual life of the nation. Without that faith all that we have of an enlightened civilization cannot endure." A layman of Appleton, Wis., was elected Moderator, and a Negro, the Rev. W. L. Ashe, of New Orleans, Second Moderator. The total membership of the organization is placed by the Secretary's report at 879,000, with the explanation: "Congregationalists are working for fewer and better churches. . . . The time for rapid organization of new churches is past." Single tax, unemployment and old age insurance, and the right of labor to organize, were movements endorsed by the convention. With the exception of the President's emphasis on Bible-teaching this church convention did not think it necessary to give the Word of God a place among the topics that were up for discussion.

MUELLER.

"Incorporated to Abolish the Belief in God."—A recent application for incorporation in New York reminds one of the Goddess

of Reason and the state acts of Bolshevism. "The particular object for which this corporation is formed is as follows: To abolish the belief in God together with all forms of religion based on that belief. In prosecuting its work, which shall be purely destructive, a radio station shall be erected for the delivery and broadcasting of lectures, debates, and discussions on the subjects of science and religion, and it shall publish and distribute scientific and anti-religious literature and conduct a general propaganda against the Church and the clergy. Specializing in mental reconstruction, the society shall contribute to the building of a better civilization by operating as a wrecking-company, leaving to others the designing and establishing of the new order. Especially shall it endeavor to free American scientists and statesmen from the necessity of patronizing religion." The application was denied by Justice Mitchell of the Supreme Court of New York, who said: "I consider incorporation of a society with such purposes highly improper." This action is defended by Dr. John Roach Straton, Baptist Fundamentalist: "Religion is the foundation of the state and the only bond for decent and orderly society. Anything seeking to overthrow the Church is a scoffing at the foundation of government itself." Against this the Unitarian Dr. A. W. Slaten says: "The American guarantee of religious freedom means the atheists have the same right to organize for promotion of their views that other citizens have," and aligns himself with Norman Thomas, Socialist candidate for Mayor of New York City, who remarks on the decision: "Such a decision certainly is a violation of the right of every American citizen to promulgate religion; for that right certainly includes the right to promulgate atheism. When a group of persons takes up atheism and wishes to convert others to it, then atheism itself becomes a religion, and all the rights concerning religious freedom apply to it."

MUELLER.

The Heresy of Bishop W. M. Brown. — One of the most impressive acts of the recent General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church at New Orleans was the deposition by the outgoing Presiding Bishop Talbot, in the presence of sixteen other bishops, of William Montgomery Brown, on the charge of preaching and publishing heretical doctrine. *Time* (October 26) comments: "Thus passed the first deposition for heresy in the Church's history. Pitiably, childish, old, 'bad Bishop Brown' received the news at his hotel, muttering meaningless optimisms." Significant of the spirit of the times is the general sympathy of the country at large with ex-Bishop Brown as a martyr to conviction and to "liberty of conscience." The *Watchman-Examiner* of October 22 expresses this condition as being "in keeping with the overworked doctrine of soul liberty" and warns against failings in the ranks of the Baptist Church: "Originally this principle guaranteed to men the right to worship God as they pleased. Now it is used in extenuation of perverting the well-known doctrines of a Church. We have many leaders in our own denomination who reject the virgin birth of Christ, His substitutionary atonement for sin, and His actual resur-

rection from the dead. Dr. Slayton was an acknowledged Unitarian, and yet he quietly drew his salary from one of our colleges. Dr. Fosdick rejects immersion as essential to baptism, and he not only remains a Baptist preacher, but he takes a whole church with him in his extraordinary view. The Baptists have always held a clearly defined system of truth. They knew no soul liberty which guaranteed to ministers and members of Baptist churches the right to believe what they pleased." This condemnation of unionism and "broadness" in preaching is doubly emphatic, coming from a denomination that has tried it and found it wanting. MUELLER.

Regarding the speaking of Dr. Fosdick at Wittenberg College, Springfield, O., the National Lutheran Council has issued the following bulletin: Writing on a recent convention at Findlay, O., of the Ohio Synod of the United Lutheran Church, Dr. N. R. Melhorn, in the *Lutheran* of November 5, has a most interesting report to make concerning the widely discussed appearance of Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick, "liberal" churchman, at Springfield, O., some months ago and at Wittenberg College, an institution of that Synod. "Among the recommendations in President Koller's report," says Dr. Melhorn, "was one that was more or less head-lined in the secular press of Ohio. It reads as follows: 'We call upon our pastors and leaders to guard well their pulpits and platforms against those who would call into question our Lutheran faith and disturb by presence or speech the unity in faith and teaching of our Lutheran Zion. And we urge upon all our churches and pastors the importance of keeping in mind their relationship and responsibility to the Church of which they are confessedly a part and to which they have given allegiance. In the reports of several of the synods one notes a formal declaration of loyal adherence to our distinctive confessions of faith and standards of practise. The recommendation of Dr. Koller probably took a somewhat unique form because of a visit of Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick to Springfield, O., some months ago and an address he then gave in Wittenberg College. We listened to the discussion of the report of the trustees of the college, in connection with which President Tulloss spoke in explanation of the circumstances. Dr. Fosdick was invited by the Springfield Y. W. C. A. to lecture in Springfield on a Saturday night. A group of Wittenberg students and some others, to the number of about 125 people, requested permission to hear him at the college during the forenoon. Their petition was looked upon as a desire natural among young collegians who were curious to see and hear a person so much in public notice. That compliance with their request would have the appearance of a recognition of the ambiguous and unsound views of the lecturer was not considered until too late. The occurrence was deeply deplored by the college, and the college authorities by means of a written statement read by President Tulloss declared themselves to be 'most heartily in accord with the spirit of President Koller's recommendation' which we have quoted from his report. The incident was very frankly discussed by members of the synod, and the interpretations given it by those outside the college were referred to. An observer

would not only discern that Dr. Fosdick's liberal doctrinal views had no sympathizers in the Ohio Synod, but that there was sincere regret, when even by misinterpretation and contrary to fact an institution of the United Lutheran Church appeared to have given him an opportunity to spread false teachings. That the occurrence did give rise to unfortunate questionings we ourselves know both from other Lutheran periodicals and from conversations with men of other Lutheran synods. It is perhaps now impossible to correct the impressions thus made last spring. It should, however, be noted by observers of the doctrinal positions of the United Lutheran Church that its synods are not indifferent to the principles of our faith; that synod after synod in recent conventions has given public expression to their conservative fidelity to our Confessions, and that where an institution has given occasion to questioning, it receives attention by the body to which it owes responsibility. And we ourselves are again impressed with Luther's definition of the Eighth Commandment, especially its positive sentences: 'We should so fear and love God as not to belie, betray, or raise injurious reports about our neighbor, but speak well of him, apologize for him, and put the most favorable construction on all his actions.'"
 DAU.

A Scholar on Inspiration. — When asked recently by Mr. Trumbull, the editor of the *Sunday-school Times*, in a conversation on the greatness of the Scriptures, "Isn't it divine inspiration that accounts for this?" Sir William M. Ramsay, one of the most eminent archeologists and New Testament scholars of our time, made this remarkable statement: "Yes, it could not be something wrought out of a man's inner consciousness. There is no other literature in which you can press so hard the meaning of the words. And the more you press it, the more meaning you can get." Incidentally this statement is also generous admonition to all readers of Scripture to "press hard."
 MUELLER.

The United States is in a fair way of being made Catholic by the Board of Temperance, Prohibition, and Morals of the Methodist Episcopal Church, the Anti-Saloon League, the Klan, etc. The connection is this: Smith, the Governor of New York, is being groomed for the Presidency of the United States. He is a Catholic and an antiprohibitionist. He has become popular as an able executive. The Methodist Board has now come out in a warning against "Al" Smith to spoil his prospects for the candidacy. The Catholics are replying to this warning. They say that the Methodists are laying down religious rules for a candidate for public office and are thus injecting their religion into our political campaigns. They ask with what right Protestants after this can raise a cry against Catholic groups, like the Holy Name Society or the Knights of Columbus, if the latter should become politically active. They charge the Methodists and their associates with fanaticism on the Prohibition issue by pointing out that these same people seem to feel no indignation about the restriction of Negro voting in the

South, the practises which the Mann Act seeks to suppress, counterfeiting, and other evils for which our Government in its efforts to stamp them out might need their assistance. Lastly, they open up the whole question of Prohibition, especially the methods by which Volsteadism and the Eighteenth Amendment came to be adopted. Here are a few samples of the withering scorn with which the *Commonweal* treats the doings of the Methodist Board, etc.: "Governor Smith may not run for office, the Methodist Board declares, because he does not support and further a particular statute, the subject and matter of which has now become part and parcel of the creed and dogma of a group of churches. He is un-American, say the spokesmen of this group, because he does not support the Constitution, which means, in plain language, that he may wish to change the Constitution from what it now is to what it once was. When these same reverend board members actually changed the same Constitution from what it once was to what it now is, none would have more heatedly resented the implication that, in seeking that change and pleading for it, they, too, might be considered un-American." "Does any record exist of a corporate appeal by the Methodist or Baptist churches for special legislation to assist States in controlling the present dreadful wave of homicidal mania, of diminishing the enormous and growing volume of thefts and depredations, of lessening and lightening the black scandal and shame of the fetid American divorce courts? It would really seem that all measures do not require the same cooperation, and the suspicion is in order that it is not Prohibition or temperance or morals at all which are the real concern of the board, but rather control over the lives of the community at large by a Church which cries eternally for the right of private judgment and in the same cry denies the right of any opposition to the latest and dearest article of its shifting creed." "Put down those who oppose by force of arms, call out army and navy to carry on our plans," said these representatives of the board of morals and its allies in their Chicago convention, anxious only to see their will imposed on all, their creed crammed down the throats of unwilling, unsympathetic unbelievers. This detestable attempt to commingle Church and State [*sic!*] is aimed directly at the one feature of American life to which we have ever pointed with most pride. Here we have had no national church. Church and State have gone, each its own way, each seeking its own ends undisturbed. Thus it must continue." [*Sic!*] These arguments are going to tell, for there is truth on their side. Does it not make Protestants hang their heads in shame to be thus taken to school by Catholics? The Protestants who have fathered and are fostering Volsteadism are pillorying Protestantism. In the eyes of the common people of America Volsteadism is identified with Protestantism. The Catholics are seeing to it that this fact is not forgotten by the people. "It may be urged," says the *Commonweal*, "that many of the activities to which exception is taken

by liberty-loving Americans are those of the Anti-Saloon League and that this league is a body of lay citizens. As an answer it is quite enough to point to the leaders and supporters of the league and to the identity between the declarations of these leaders when they happen to be laymen and those of the ministers themselves. Not a day passes but the readers of the daily press are told that this or that well-paid agent of the dry forces has addressed a congregational meeting at a regular service in some Methodist church or another. General Andrews himself has announced his intention, as National Director of Prohibition, to work through the 'churches' and through the Young Men's Christian Association, a distinctively evangelical religious group. He, at least, has no doubt where support to the dry forces is massed. If in the pulpits of a particular group the representatives of a particular organization are always to be found, and if the leaders of the organization are the prominent preachers of the group, the names which these activities assume become a matter of very secondary importance. The truth is there for him who runs to read." I have pointed out ere this on a number of occasions that the Protestant churches which specialize in Volsteadism are paving the way for Rome, but I did not think that the development would come so soon and in such a striking way as through the presidential campaign for Governor Smith. The Protestant churches that are guilty of these Catholic charges will find, when the smoke of battle clears away, that their bigotry and fanaticism has dug a grave for Protestantism.

DAU.

Compulsory military training at the colleges and universities of our country is meeting with increasing disfavor because it is "training in killing." At a recent referendum among the 3,200 students of the College of the City of New York 2,092 voted against, 345 for this kind of training. "Students of the University of Wisconsin took the lead in the campaign which forced the State Legislature to abolish the compulsory feature of military training in that great university. Students in Pomona College persuaded the board of trustees to end compulsory military training in that institution. Last spring students in Howard University and the University of Minnesota made notable protests against compulsory military training. An effective agitation is beginning at the Ohio State University, and we know not at how many others. The University of Missouri, like the College of the City of New York, recently arranged for a student referendum under supervision of the Student Council on the question of compulsory military training. But before the vote was taken, the regents unanimously endorsed compulsion, and at the request of the president the vote was called off. Influential groups of students, however, are so determined that they are already talking of following the example of the Wisconsin students and carrying the fight to the State Legislature." (*Nation*, Dec. 2.) Besides the reason given above, the following are advanced: 1. "Military discipline demonstrably has not produced that type of self-discipline on which good citizenship depends." 2. The reserve officers who conduct the training "have nurtured distrust of other

nations" in the students. 3. This training "is in itself a kind of disloyalty to the deeply rooted American aversion to compulsory military training and service." 4. It is an injustice "when a boy anxious for an education can secure it only at the price of at least two years' required work in military courses." DAU.

Glimpses from the Observer's Window. — When General Charteris returned to England, he was called on the carpet by the Minister of War, and he recanted his New York speech. In other words, he reaffirmed the German atrocities which he had said in New York were lies. The New York reporters stick to their account of the speech, and as regards the general's reaffirmation, the *Nation* says: "We do not believe a word of it." Neither do we; but if any one does, he has the choice between calling this fellow Charteris a liar during the war or a liar recently at the banquet in New York.

The remark of the Austrian statesman that the biggest political task of the moment is "to overcome stage-fright in the presence of truth" leads the Catholic *Commonweal* to say: "We all — nations of the New World as well as peoples of older Europe — must face the fact that prejudices and impressions to which we succumbed during long years of constant battle cannot be squared with actuality or political justice. Our representatives should be brought to admit frankly that the society in which they professed to believe we were living during the war was, for the most part, a highly colored product of imagination and passion. The hour has now come when we must realize that improvement depends upon everybody's rubbing his eyes and looking fearlessly." This is a sound view. But the same paper goes on to say: "It will not do to bewail the human vision. It would be foolhardy to say, 'We have been misled; therefore from now on we shall trust nobody.'" This is only half sound. The war has taught men to distrust some people, and that rightfully, for instance, Belgian Catholics, who filled the world with "Belgian atrocities" tales about the Germans. And there are others who deserve no man's trust. It is only some people who can be fooled all the time. To fool the world into the next war, there will be required at least another set of political and ecclesiastical conjurers to do the fooling, and a different menu of deception will have to be served.

The reason why the Italian Debt Funding Commission secured so much better terms at Washington is said to be the profound respect of politicians for the Italian vote backed by the Roman Catholic vote.

Speaking of the recent pilgrims at Rome from the Scandinavian countries, the *Commonweal* (November 18, 1925) said: "With the exception of some remnants of old Lutheran controversies, there is very little rancor left in the Scandinavian heart in the questions of religion. [Thanks to the illuminating work of Archbishop Soederblom!] The people are rather in an uninstructed state and regard with a sort of frightened mystery the continued existence and multiplying powers of Catholicity throughout the world, while they recognize, some of them with deep concern, the decline of the religious spirit, especially in their cities, and the apparent lack of efficiency on the part of the Lutheran clergy to stem the tide of unbelief, misguided radicalism, and even immorality that assails their communities." This information should be studied at Stockholm, Uppsala, Helsingfors, Oslo, and Copenhagen.

IKA stands for International Catholic Association and CSG for Catholic Social Guild. Both societies conducted meetings simultaneously at Oxford.

A Catholic Internationalism is proposed by the Jesuit Martindale to offset two other formidable international movements. "There are," he says, "two great non-Catholic forces in existence, one, labor, and the other, the great anti-Catholic force, by whatever name it calls itself — rationalism, materialism, even undenominationalism. Labor has not got still to become

so: it just is so. And the anti-Catholic peril, from what I call 'Y. M. C. A.-ism' right up, through the rationalist organization formed, or reformed lately at Teplicz in Bohemia, to Bolshevism, is, or at least definitely means to be, international too. The Catholic Church is by its very nature such as to include internationalism within its definition of universal." This means that Rome will either have to fight or to absorb labor and rationalism.

A new church home for evolutionists is opened up by the reviewer in the *Commonweal* of *Evolution in the Light of Modern Knowledge*, by various authors, which was published by Blackie and Company at London. The reviewer says regarding one of the authors: "We are told that he is in the habit of showing his friends the picture of the Creator shaping Adam from clay which appears in that quaint collection of folk-lore, the *Nuremberg Chronicle* and describing it as representing "the orthodoxy of the whole Church" at and after the time of its printing. If he had read his St. Augustine he would know that the idea in question was described by that doctor of the Church as '*nimis puerilis cogitatio*' and that it never was included in the 'orthodoxy' of the Catholic Church. It was the idea of Milton and of the Calvinists and Puritans, doubtless, and very probably of the less learned members of the Church of England. But only Tooley Street would describe these bodies as 'the Church.'" (See review of Dorle-dot's Darwinism and Catholic Thought in THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY, Vol. IV, pp. 93—96.)

In the Bampton Lectures of 1922 Dr. Leighton Pullan tells the following anecdote which he culled from Todd's *Life of Brian Walton*: "It is said that the first person in Oxford in the seventeenth century who publicly denied that the Pope is Antichrist was Dr. Gilbert Sheldon, afterwards Primate of all England, when reading his academical exercise for a degree in divinity, 1628. "The doctor of the chair [Dr. Prideaux], wondering at it, said, *Quid, mi fili, neges Papam esse Antichristum?* Sheldon answered, *Etiam nego.* Dr. Prideaux replied, *Profecto multum tibi debet Pontifex Romanus, et nullus dubito quin pileo cardinalitio te donabit!"*

Another anecdote told in the same series of lectures related to Dr. Samuel Clarke (1675—1729), who was thought to be an Arian. "The nature of his views on the Trinity was adequately tested by a Roman Catholic named Dr. Hawarden, who was invited to meet Clarke by Queen Caroline. Clarke unfolded his theory, endeavoring to defend it as Scriptural and orthodox. Hawarden listened patiently and then said that he had just one question to ask, and would the reply be given in a monosyllable? Clarke agreed; 'Then I ask,' said Hawarden, 'can God the Father annihilate the Son and the Holy Ghost? Answer me "Yes or No." ' Clarke continued for some time in deep thought and then said it was a question which he had never considered. The conference then ended."

"The Bible holds out a hope to man. It holds out something that is beyond this life and gives him hope. Infidelity gives him no hope. It tears down all the hope he has got. He has nothing to build on. If this Book fails, what have we got? I should like to say to the people here to-night, If you step into a church and hear a man talking about Jesus Christ not being divine, — for I am sorry to say some of these infidels have got into the pulpit, — if you take my advice, you will get out of that church as quick as you can get out. But you say, 'My father and mother belong to that church.' Suppose they do. You get out as Lot got out of Sodom. Make haste. You think a man who would sell you poison and kill your children is a horrid man; but I tell you a man who would paint infidelity in the mind of my child is worse than a man who gives it poison" — these words of D. L. Moody deserve to be hung low throughout the land and printed in flaring, big type, with a hearty Lutheran "Amen!" at the end.

Will the Catholic *Commonweal* or some other Catholic paper take notice that the poor Ursuline nuns at Owensboro, Ky., are being persecuted? They were appointed during the past five years to teach the chil-

dren of the district schools in Davis County and have been wearing the garb of their order while instructing the Protestant children of the schools. Now the citizens of Owensboro are out in a protest against this practise. The easiest way for Catholics to quash this protest would be by charging it against the Klan.

Have you noticed how stands for the sale of magazines are multiplying in our large cities, how the cities seem to be systematically divided into districts for the sale of this literature, what varied titles are appearing in the gaudy collection, and who the buyers are? A word from our Juvenile Literature Board about reading magazines would be in season.

During the Sesquicentennial of American Independence next summer the Lutherans of the Merger Synod at Philadelphia are planning street preaching. It is said that, while this kind of preaching is not a common practise, it is not altogether an innovation, and Luke 14, 21, 23 is cited in justification. — All will depend on how it is done and what is being said.

Not until recently tentative statistics (note the implied self-contradiction!) regarding the ravages of the Spanish influenza in 1918—19 have begun to appear. Exact figures will never be available, but conservative estimates place the number of deaths around 20,000,000. The casualties during the war were about 30,000,000. The total number of famine victims is as yet unknown. These three grim reapers, war, famine, and pestilence, have again stalked the earth, but has the world heeded the awful warning? Evidently not; for from all corners of the globe reports are constantly increasing about the growing moral retrogression. And now the physicians are telling the world that there may be a recurrence of the terrible scourge of influenza, and when it comes, they will be just as powerless in fighting it as seven years ago. For spite of the feverish search, in biological laboratories, for the germ of this disease and for an effectual antitoxin, nothing that looks like a sure remedy has been discovered.

At a polyglot service on September 27, 1925, in Rev. Streufert's Peace Evangelical Lutheran Church in Chicago the first Spanish missionary of the Missouri Synod, Jose G. Fernandez, was ordained.

"Sowing pseudoscientific tarradiddles in United States schoolbooks" is what Saintsbury, the octogenarian English critic, charges prohibitionists "in that misguided country," America, with.

Before making up one's mind on the merit of the Locarno Treaty and its possible effects on the disturbed conditions in Europe under which the Protestant churches are suffering, and before passing judgment on what has been going on in the German *Reichstag* prior to the adoption of the Treaty, one should read four articles: 1. "Security, Real and Illusory: A Comment on the Locarno Compact." By George Wharton Pepper, U. S. Senator from Pennsylvania; member of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate. 2. "The Locarno Pacts: Their Meaning to Europe and to America." By Norman H. Davis, Acting Secretary of State of the United States. 3. "The Conference at Locarno." By William Macdonald, Lecturer on American History, Yale University. (All these articles, together with the text of the Security Treaties, in *Current History* for December.) 4. "Giving Europe Another Chance." By J. Ramsay Macdonald, former Prime Minister of Great Britain, in the *Nation*, December 2. The Locarno Treaty may mark a crisis also for Protestant church activities.

On December 4, Clinton N. Howard, chairman of the United Committee for Prohibition Enforcement, addressed a letter to Pope Pius XI, asking him to lend his moral support to the "civil authority" of the United States. This amazing procedure, by which the Pope is asked to step in and do for the United States what the appointed enforcers of our laws cannot do, shows to what extreme the blind fanaticism of our Prohibitionists is ready to go, and is another proof that they are — no longer indirectly, but very directly — paving the way for papal rule in America. The Roman Catholics, in replying to Mr. Howard, charge him with casting opprobrium on the Catholic citizens of the United States by making them appear as law-

breakers, with wanting to ensnare the Pope as the Pharisees wanted to ensnare Christ with their question, and with seeking to embroil the Holy Father in American politics. "Prohibition," says Father Burke of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, "is a political question, was born of politics, and to-day is the most critical question in America." Mr. Howard is the same party who not long ago attacked President Coolidge for "not doing enough to enforce the Volstead act." This last action of his ought to open the eyes of the Protestants on whom the Prohibitionists rely for their main support.

DAU.