

THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY.

VOL. VIII.

OCTOBER, 1928.

No. 10.

Full Forgiveness.

Translated from Dr. E. Preuss's *Die Lehre von der Rechtfertigung*, Part V.

THE REV. JUL. A. FRIEDRICH, Iowa City, Iowa.

(Continued.)

Are we to produce still more testimonies? Are we to show — and this would be an easy task — that our Evangelical Lutheran Church has confessed the doctrine of full forgiveness at all times? Are we to summon Martin Chemnitz to the arena? or Aegidius Hunnius? Hunnius says: There are no degrees in justification. For it is impossible that a man should have partly obtained forgiveness of sins and partly not. It is also impossible for a man to be partly in grace and partly without it, or to be an heir of eternal life and at the same time a child of the devil. But he that is justified *has obtained full forgiveness of all his sins* and is fully in grace and an heir of eternal life. For in justification our greater or lesser worthiness does not come into consideration, consequently our justification cannot be increased or decreased by our worthiness. Not even our faith conditions our justification in so far as it has this or that quality, being strong or weak, but only in so far as it apprehends its object, the merits of Christ. But the merits of Christ are indivisible.¹⁾ John Gerhard says: The Word of God “carefully distinguishes between justification and

1) *Justificatio nec magis recipit nec minus, quandoquidem fieri non potest, ut quis ex parte remissionem suorum peccatorum obtineat, ex parte vero non; nec quisquam partim in gratia est, partim extra gratiam; nec quis potest esse ex parte haeres vitae aeternae, ex parte vero filius gehennae et damnationis. Sed homo justificatus plenariam omnium peccatorum adeptus est veniam, et totus est in gratia Dei atque vitae sempiternae haeres. Neque spectantur in justificatione illae virtutes, quibus auctis vel diminutis ipsa quoque justificatio tale subeat vel incrementum vel decrementum. Quin ne quidem fides ingreditur justificationem, quatenus ex sua conditione aestimata nunc firma, nunc languida est, sed quod subjectum suum aspicit, quod aequabile semper est. Considerat quippe gratiam justificantis Dei, quae infinitate sua omnem inaequalitatem respuit. Considerat meritum Christi, quod, quia infinitum est et in justificationis actu totum apprehenditur, itidem hujusmodi graduum inaequalitatem in justificationis arcano non constituit. (A. Hunnius, *Articulus de Justificatione*, p. 102.)*

THE THEOLOGICAL OBSERVER.

Iowa Synod Reaffirms Position.—Under this heading the *Lutheran Standard* for August 18 reports: "One of the most important matters before the recent general convention of the Iowa Synod at Waverly, Iowa, was the proposed merger of the Iowa, Ohio, and Buffalo synods. According to the *Lutheran Herald* the Iowa Synod again affirmed its stand on the Scriptures as a basis for organic union with the other two synods. The following resolution was unanimously adopted: 'In view of the present situation we deem it necessary that Synod adopt a clear and unequivocal declaration concerning the doctrine of the inspiration and inerrancy of the Scriptures as we now have them and the true sense of its own confessional paragraph. We therefore move the adoption of the following declarations: 1) Synod to-day, as always, confesses the old Lutheran doctrine concerning the inspiration and inerrancy of the Bible as this doctrine again and again has been presented in its publications. 2) As a brief and unequivocal summary of the same we adopt as our own the words of Dr. Sigmund Fritschel: a) The Scriptures are the Word of God as to contents and form in the full and real sense of the word. b) It is

this in all its parts, and it is not permissible to discriminate between divine and human elements, between God's Word and the word of men. c) The fact that the Scriptures are of divine origin and character establishes the fact of its inerrancy. 3) When we confess the inerrancy of the Bible as we now have it, this does not exclude inaccuracies of transcription, different readings, omissions, or minor additions to the original text, or passages which to us seem to be contradictions or discrepancies, but which do not affect the interests of salvation and faith.'

"The *Herald* further reports: 'On the basis of this declaration the Iowa Synod declared it will no longer insist on the form that was given to the confessional paragraph at Dubuque in 1926, although that form is perfectly correct, and that it will be satisfied with any wording of this paragraph which properly expresses the Lutheran doctrine of the Scriptures. The synod again declared its willingness to enter into organic union with Ohio and Buffalo. The changes proposed by the Joint Commission were approved. The synod resolved that all debt must be paid before the merger is effected. The officers were, by resolution, instructed to do "everything necessary to be done" to bring about the merger with the synods of Ohio and Buffalo.' President G. A. Fandrey, of Chicago, was reelected. He was also elected visitor to the Lutheran World Conference at Copenhagen in 1929."

MUELLER.

Concerning Divorce. — As reported by the *Lutheran Standard*, the Canada Synod of the United Lutheran Church in America at its recent meeting, after devoting a "large portion of its time to the consideration of Scriptural teaching" on the subject, unanimously adopted the following propositions relative to divorce: "1) God intended marriage to be indissoluble. 2) Christ recognized adultery as the only ground for divorce. 3) Christ was opposed to the granting of divorce on any other ground. 4) The New Testament Scriptures admit only of separation, not divorce with the right to remarry, as relief from marital infelicity arising out of other grounds than adultery. Even in these cases earnest efforts should be put forth to effect a reconciliation that separation may be avoided."

Point 4 in this set of resolutions covers all cases of marital infelicity among Christians, and it is correct so far as it goes. But it leaves out of consideration all cases of which Paul speaks in 1 Cor. 7, 15: "But if the *unbelieving* depart, let him depart. A brother or a sister is not under bondage in such cases." The meaning of this passage clearly is that in case of malicious desertion on the part of a non-Christian the innocent party may again marry, of course, after the demands of civil law have been complied with. Another sentence should be added to the propositions to include such cases. It is tyranny to impose restrictions upon Christians where the Word of God does not command them. Also such a procedure is Calvinistic rather than Lutheran.

MUELLER.

What Constitutes a Lottery? — This is the question that is asked and answered in a recent issue of the *Lutheran Church Herald*. Since it is rumored that in one or the other of our churches, affairs are

conducted that are as much like lotteries as one egg is like the other, we shall submit some of the statements of our contemporary on this subject. The *Lutheran Church Herald* writes: "There are State and Federal regulations against lotteries, but they are often violated through ignorance of the law. But this is no excuse. Professor Jones, of the University of Washington, gives some good information on this subject in the *Inland Printer* which it might be well for some of our church societies to study. These are the essential features of the lottery: 1) The drawing or award must be by chance and not by merit. 2) The chances or tickets must be purchased or secured upon some consideration by the ticket- or chance-holder. 3) The prize must be awarded. Advertising a lottery is also a punishable offense. The publication of a news account of a lottery drawing is also contrary to law. . . . The prosecuting attorney in your community is the individual who will take action in case he believes a lottery is being held, and it would be an excellent thing to go to him, lay the facts before him, and find out what he holds to be a lottery before going ahead with an idea that is in any way near the line. . . . Church societies, although they may feel quite secure from prosecution, should be careful and not do anything against the law. They are expected to set a good example and avoid even those things which have the appearance of evil."

The "Interdenominational" Church Passes. — "The Community Church movement is undergoing a change," writes the *Lutheran Standard*, "if a statement recently appearing in the *Northwestern Christian Advocate* (Methodist) is to be taken at face value. The Community Church as first established was to be interdenominational and independent, existing for the purpose of bringing together in one fellowship all Christians in any community adjudged to be 'too poor or small to support more than one church.' Ordinarily such a community does not bear alone the responsibilities and obligations of supporting its churches, but depends upon churches in other communities who aid it through mission boards. Now, from the practical standpoint we are told by the Methodist journal: 'The Independent Community Church is found to be a failure. It lasts only about a half dozen years.'

"The *Northwestern Christian Advocate* goes on to say: 'At the recent meeting of the leaders on rural church-life and other related subjects, at Cleveland, O., it was found that the consolidated church, hitherto known as the Community Church, must have behind it some great denomination. Therefore the name now accepted is the "Denominational Community Church."'

"From this change of front the so-called Interdenominational Church seems likely to pass out of existence. Its only appeal has been interdenominationalism in a type of community where all sincere Christians support some existing church, whether their own preferred denomination is represented or not."

It has frequently been said that the Community Church has neither a religion nor a message. As a matter of fact it has both, but they are paganistic. The Community Church fosters the worship

of the "unknown God" through work-righteousness. It is essentially negative and therefore has no positive message of consolation when comfort is really needed. The Community Church therefore defeats itself by the very blankness of its "creed," which can never satisfy the soul. Again, the Community Church is superfluous; for what it purposes to supply is already offered in the scores of lodges which infest even the villages and towns. There churchless persons find what they seek: a few superficial moral precepts, social facilities, and support in case of sickness and death. In addition to this there is the charm of secrecy and exclusiveness. For this reason we may be sure that lodgery, this most prevalent type of "interdenominationalism," will never "pass out of existence." Yet we must oppose it unceasingly and relentlessly as an unchristian and antichristian institution.

MUELLER.

Union without Unity.—After discussing some church unions that proved successful because the respective church-bodies were "one in faith and doctrine," the *Presbyterian* says: "There has fallen upon the Canadian churches in this recent union of Methodist, Presbyterian, and Congregational churches no similar blessing nor indeed any striking evidence of that 'unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace' which is the necessary condition for effective union. We all rejoice in the organic union of groups of small, struggling, evangelical churches, such as existed in many little villages and towns over those great Canadian stretches, but these three churches, as religious bodies, are too diverse in their theological outlook to be comfortable and happy under one roof. The ecclesiastical experiment across the border cannot serve us as an example or incentive to union, but must rather stand before us as a warning, since it has left so able and influential a section on the outside of the union as 'The Continuing Presbyterian Church in Canada.'

"This idealism is a most bewitching theory and sounds the call to the approaching millennium, as the picture is painted by language artists who rightly decry our unfortunate divisions, but who wrongly suggest the remedy for these ills. It is all of the same logic that would scrap our army and navy defenses and remove clubs or pistols from the hands of policemen. That morning has not yet dawned when ideals alone make life's program. Human nature is the most impressive in its approach to the divine known to us in this life and as a study ranks next to our attempts to know the character of God. However, human nature is not to be listed and classified by any artificial methods or by the fiats of coercion."

One consideration is not touched upon in the above, namely, that the Word of God warns against union with errorists, telling us that a little leaven will leaven the whole lump. The question of union between two church-bodies is not merely a matter of expediency, but must be determined on the basis of Holy Scriptures.

American Episcopalians Revising Their Prayer-Book.—On this subject the *Christian Herald* writes: "Like her mother Church in England, the Protestant Episcopal Church of America is revising her Prayer-book. But while the English Church has been denied

the proposed revision by her foster-parent, the State, the daughter Church on this side of the Atlantic is free to bring her book of devotion into harmony with the thought and aspirations of our day. For fifteen years a commission has been working on the revision, and at the General Convention next October the revised book will be presented for adoption. Concerning the new book the Right Rev. Chas. L. Slattery, Bishop of Massachusetts and chairman of the commission, says: 'Baptism is lifted into the expression of God's loving care for His children; the marriage service makes the wife equal with the man in privilege and responsibility; the burial service substitutes New Testament trust for Old Testament fear; aspirations of our time for social justice, good government, and world brotherhood are recognized; services may be made shorter and, with hymns and sermon, may have a new force and a new unity. In a word, without ceasing to be the book of the ages, the Prayer-book becomes also the book of this generation.'” Enough evidence is furnished in the statement of Bishop Slattery to show that the proposed revision is not in the direction of greater fidelity to the Scriptures, but rather away from it.

The Princeton Seminary Situation.— It had been expected that the last General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church would decide the question whether Princeton Seminary is to remain a conservative institution or not. Undoubtedly the meeting felt that since on this question it was like a house divided against itself, it would be better not to render any decision on the questions in controversy. The *Watchman-Examiner* gives this brief summary of the resolutions affecting Princeton Seminary: "The Presbyterian General Assembly put off till next year the final settlement of the Princeton Seminary dilemma. They felt that the acceptance of the majority or the minority report of the special committee of eleven which has been studying the question would leave bitterness in the hearts of many. The Assembly urged those interested in Princeton to try to compose their differences during the coming year. In consequence of this action the Liberals and the Fundamentalists will go on with their discussions. Whatever the decision may be, we hope that Princeton Seminary will ever remain a bulwark of conservatism." Inasmuch as Princeton Seminary still stands for the inspiration of the Bible, the deity of Christ, and the atonement through the blood of Jesus, we endorse the sentiment expressed in the last sentence.

An Inadequate Confession of Faith.— In the *Watchman-Examiner* of April 26 the editor publishes a number of propositions which express his faith. Since he states that this confession of faith was adopted at the preconvention conference on fundamentals at Des Moines in 1921, it possesses more than passing significance. Here are the propositions:—

"1. We believe that the Bible is God's Word, that it was written by men divinely inspired, and that it has supreme authority in all matters of faith and conduct.

"2. We believe in God the Father, perfect in holiness, infinite in

wisdom, measureless in power. We rejoice that He concerns Himself mercifully in the affairs of men, that He hears and answers prayer, and that He saves from sin and death all who come to Him through Jesus Christ.

"3. We believe in Jesus Christ, God's only-begotten Son, miraculous in His birth, sinless in His life, making atonement for the sins of the world by His death. We believe in His bodily resurrection, His ascension into heaven, His perpetual intercession for His people, and His personal visible return to the world, according to His promise.

"4. We believe in the Holy Spirit, who came forth from God to convince the world of sin, of righteousness, and of judgment and to regenerate, sanctify, and comfort those who believe in Jesus Christ.

"5. We believe that all men by nature and by choice are sinners, but that 'God so loved the world that He gave His only-begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have everlasting life'; we believe therefore that those who accept Christ as Savior and Lord will rejoice forever in God's presence, and those who refuse to accept Christ as Savior and Lord will be forever separated from God.

"6. We believe in the Church — a living spiritual body of which Christ is the Head and of which all regenerated people are members. We believe that a visible Church is a company of believers in Jesus Christ, baptized on a credible confession of faith and associated for worship, work, and fellowship. We believe that to these visible churches were committed, for perpetual observance, the ordinances of Baptism and the Lord's Supper, and that God has laid upon these churches the task of persuading a lost world to accept Jesus Christ as Savior and to enthrone Him as Lord and Master. We believe that all human betterment and social improvement are the inevitable by-products of such a Gospel.

"7. We believe that every human being has direct relations with God and is responsible to God alone in all matters of faith; that each church is independent and autonomous and must be free from interferences by any ecclesiastical or political authority; that therefore Church and State must be kept separate as having different functions, each fulfilling its duties free from the dictation or patronage of the other."

The careful reader will notice that certain great doctrines are conspicuously absent in this statement. For instance, the doctrine of the Trinity is not referred to, nor is the deity of Christ mentioned. Altogether the language is too vague to form a satisfactory basis for Christians to unite on.

Dr. Cadman's View of the Bible.—Dr. Cadman, the noted Brooklyn preacher and churchman, is known as a Modernist. Lately he outlined his position on the nature of the Bible as follows: "The literature of the two Testaments is an unfolding and progressive revelation of sacred truths, verified by the personal experience of those who recorded them. It is therefore neither wholly divine nor wholly

human, but a blending of both, and its contents vary according to the capacity of its authors to receive the spiritual realities it sets forth. . . . Do not regard them [the books of the Bible] as infallible in every particular or of equal value in all their parts. The claim that they are a perfect whole has wrought more mental distress and created more skepticism than any other dogma of Christian or Jewish theology known to me." The *Presbyterian* very correctly points out that Dr. Cadman is here placing himself in direct opposition to evangelical Christianity. He sets at naught the clear words of Jesus: "The Scriptures cannot be broken," and the words of St. Peter: "The prophecy came not in old time by the will of man, but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." That a man like Dr. Cadman is at the head of the Federation of Churches forms a serious indictment of the federation.

Evolution as Taught at the University.—*Introductory Geology*, "for use in universities, colleges, schools of science, etc.," in its chapter on evolution says: "*Theory of Organic Evolution*. In more modern times it was Galileo, Newton, and Laplace who gave the thinking world a scientific theory as to the changes in the inorganic world; and Buffon, Lamarck, Darwin, Wallace, and Spencer who foreshadowed the present theory of organic evolution. Charles Darwin is by general consent regarded as the father of the theory, since through his books, chiefly the epoch-making *Origin of Species*, published in 1859, came the conviction that life has been continuous, descending from previous life with change from the most primitive organism to the complex faunas and floras of to-day.

"There is now no question about the truth of the theory of organic evolution as opposed to that of special creation. What is under discussion by the biologists is the detailed method by which Nature has brought about the manifold organic change that we see. Scarcely any worker in the sciences of botany, zoology, or paleontology now rejects the theory; in fact, all work in these studies is based on the concept of life having continuously descended from life since it began on the earth. The evolution theory is without doubt the grandest generalization of the nineteenth century, since it has not only transformed the method of study in biology, geology, and the social sciences, but has given a new point of view to all science, art, and even progressive religions.

"Since, then, we are to accept the orderly development of life throughout the ages as the basis for our study of the organic side of historical geology, we may well sum up briefly the procedure of evolution as it is generally held by scientists to-day. The present theory is built around six basic concepts: —" Is evolution a fact or a theory? The professor will have to point out to his class the contradiction in the statement: "There is now no question about the *truth* of the *theory*." He will also have to point out that his text-book contradicts the plain teaching of the Bible on "special creation." We wonder what reason he will give his curious class for spelling nature with a capital N? What is he going to say about the non-"progressive religions" whose point of view is not set by evolution? Finally he

will have to point out to his class that they must not deride the Christians for their faith in the Bible, since the text-book states that "what is generally held by scientists to-day" "*we are to accept.*"

Further on in the same chapter: "Succession of Life. A great array of ancient forms of life is now known, and their appearance in geologic time has been determined. From this evidence we learn that geology begins in obscurity, with an absence of all life. At the very beginning of the third great era, the Paleozoic, however, there is an abundance of marine forms; but nevertheless for a long time there is no evidence of land plants, and a land flora does not appear until still later times. . . . Finally, the line of mammals leading to man appeared first in the lemurs (monkeylike forms); shortly afterward came the true monkeys, and more recently arose the anthropoid apes and the ape-man." The professor will have to explain to his curious class—and if it is trained in thinking, it is going to be very curious—why the sentence ending with the words: "with an absence of all life" was not separated from the succeeding portion dealing with life on earth with a dash, a long and heavy dash, for the purpose of indicating the wide gap between absence and presence of life. He will have to explain that because the "true" theory of evolution cannot bridge this gap, it prefers not to call the attention of the college student to it. In discussing the last sentence, our unfortunate professor will have to point out that the statement in the first section that "*all work in these studies is based,*" etc., is not consistent with the truth.

E.

Opposition to Evolution Increasing.—The *Australian Lutheran* reprints some valuable remarks by Stuart MacColl, M. D., of Melbourne, on the subject of evolution. We submit a few statements which appear to us most striking. After dwelling on the popularity of the theory of evolution, the writer says: "It [evolution] has gripped the popular imagination; and no wonder, for fully ninety per cent. of the university professors hold and teach the hypothesis. It is only the men of outstanding mental caliber in the schools of learning who have the courage to put a mark of interrogation after this fashionable and all-embracing philosophy. During the past ten years these men of courage are on the increase, and the marks of interrogation are more numerous and formidable to the advocates of this purely speculative hypothesis. It is not a science; here we join issue with the evolutionist. . . . The informed Christian has nothing to fear by the advance of science either in the infinitudes of space or in the ultramicroscopic world of wonder revealed to us in the laboratories of physics, chemistry, and biology. . . . Why do we question evolution? Because it lays the ax at the root of divine revelation unfolded in the Bible. . . . I know there is a school of modernistic theologians who endeavor to harmonize evolution and Revelation; but the task is logically impossible—it is the harmony of the lamb devoured by the tiger. Modern evolution, even in its modified form (and this is far removed from that of Darwin and Huxley), is irreconcilable with the Bible view of God and the universe. . . . Evolution, despite its claims, explains nothing; it knows nothing of the origin of anything. In all

the vast range of paleontology and biology — life as it once was, and life as it now is — it fails to produce even one undoubted evidence of the transmutation of species. Darwin attached great importance to paleontology, or the study of fossils as found in the various strata of the earth's crust. He bewailed there was so little evidence from this source in his day, but confidently expected that further study in this direction would yield overwhelming evidence of the truth of his theory. Nearly seventy years have passed since Darwin published his great book *The Origin of Species*, and extensive work has been done in the realm of geology during that time; but evolution is now as destitute of support from the fossil record as it was in 1859. One of the foremost scientists of to-day (Prof. Trenchard More) says that the importance of geology to the doctrine of evolution is immediate and profound, but that the estimation of time by geological methods 'amounts almost to mere guessing.' At the height of the evolutionary enthusiasm, More says, chronological tables were published which were supposed to give the age of the earth and its epochs, but that the figures were purely fanciful and are now abandoned by conservative geologists. . . . If evolution be true, there is no sin in the Bible sense, and thus our ideas of redemption and atonement are meaningless. Evolution and Revelation are eternally irreconcilable as far as sin is concerned; and if the Church is to rise to her primitive witness and power, she must disinfect her halls from the blighting effects of this 'working of error.'" This is heartening testimony from a man qualified to evaluate the facts which come into question here.

The Bible and Science. — Discussing the question whether the Bible can be called a text-book on science, the *Presbyterian* of July 19 says quite correctly: "During the long centuries of change in scientific outlook and the reversals of philosophic systems there have arisen very serious questions of human knowledge and revolutionary discovery that have alarmed Christians lest the distinct declarations of Scripture on science and history should be refuted. However, it was finally observed that on those phases of fact or theory where the most acute conflict was believed imminent, the Bible itself was silent, or if it spoke at all, it was either in the language of the day and really made no scientific declaration to be either refuted or to be accepted or was in strict agreement with the recent discoveries made by patient research and so confirmed the great assumptions or affirmations of science rather than ranging itself against them. . . . A single illustration which is familiar were the years in which the critics insisted that the Bible writers were utterly astray on the existence and influence of a great race known as the Hittites. Now it is finally known that the Hittites rank in power close to Assyria and Babylonia and Egypt, and thus the discoveries of their vast ruins confirm all that the Bible assumes or declares about this nation north of Palestine." It is next pointed out that the statement heard so often that the Bible is contradicted by science has never been proved. The closing remark is: "Where the Bible speaks upon the great events in the creation and preservation of life, it is always in harmony with facts, and in this sense is a correct text-book on science."

A Missionary Concerning Wrong Tendencies of Protestant Work in China.—Pointing to some errors into which Protestants doing mission-work in China have fallen, Rev. Martin A. Hopkins, of the North China Theological Seminary, located at Tengshien, Shantung, discusses, in first place, the tendency to exalt Chinese civilization unduly and to ignore its defects. Some missionaries, in order to make a good impression on the Chinese and to get a hearing, so he avers, overlook the superstition and misery of those who have no hope and are without God in the world. The Chinese have to be shown that they *need* saving. Next, he deplores the tendency to view Christianity “as only one of a number of rival religions that are to mingle together and pool their best, so that the collection of their best will be the ultimate faith of mankind.” He rightly insists that the Christianity of the New Testament “is an absolute, perfect, and final faith, and as such is indispensable to man’s salvation.” The missionaries who have left this position naturally no longer stress soul-winning, but rather education and social uplift. And finally, says he, “there is the tendency to propagate Modernism in China.” According to Rev. Hopkins, Modernists have entered the mission-field chiefly by means of the educational institutions, many of which they have made strongholds for the spreading of their destructive teaching. “Modernists do not engage in evangelistic work among the masses. They have no Gospel to preach.” What a challenge there is contained in all this for us, who have the Gospel pure and unadulterated, to preach it to the poor benighted heathen.

On the Separation of Church and State.—Discussing this subject, Mr. William D. Upshaw, former member of the United States Congress and a Baptist, recently made some remarks which show how difficult it is for men to follow the Bible in all simplicity. He says: “‘We must avoid all entangling alliances,’ says one school of orthodox leadership, ‘and we must preach the pure Gospel in all its power, and the Christian character thus developed will take care of the State.’ To be sure, this is true, as far as it goes, from a basic spiritual standpoint, but it does not go far enough. We who believe in more militant methods as applied to present-day devilments accept all of this beautiful doctrine—and ‘then some!’” His chief argument he takes from the words of Holy Scripture which say that Christ came to destroy the works of the devil, and on this statement Mr. Upshaw builds his theory that the Church is to join hands with the State in fighting for the success of the prohibition law. This is altogether in keeping with the Reformed tendency to bring about outward reform, whether the inner man has been changed or not. Mr. Upshaw’s selection of a text shows how poor a case Calvinism has when its attitude with respect to political reforms is judged by the Scriptures.

Fifty Thousand Suicides.—Recently the *New York Herald Tribune* stated that according to figures published in *Paris Midi*, 50,000 Europeans killed themselves last year. Hunger, poor living conditions, and love entanglements are given as the chief causes.

Hungary and Czechoslovakia top the list, each with twenty-six to every 100,000. Germany is next with twenty-three; Austria fourth, with twenty; France fifth, with seventeen. In Spain only four of every 100,000 ended their own lives. In our opinion the three causes mentioned by the *Herald Tribune* do not sufficiently explain this dreadful self-butcherery. Would this army of suicides have destroyed their lives had they lived in communion with God through faith in His mighty, comforting, and sustaining Word? Also in the appalling misery of such self-destruction we hear the Macedonian cry: "Come and help us!"

MUELLER.

Freemasons Trying to Unite.—One of our exchanges informs us that the efforts of Freemasons to unite have hitherto failed on account of the refusal of the French Grand Lodge to accede to the wish of English and American Masons, who hold that the Bible ought to be lying on the Masonic altar and that the symbols of the Great Architect of the Universe should be acknowledged. It is hoped, however, that a union can be reached by adoption of the following four propositions: 1) Freemasonry is an intellectual movement, embracing various tendencies, which aims at the moral and material improvement of mankind. 2) Freemasonry advocates no political or social tendency. Lodges may, however, in an unprejudiced way discuss those problems which may lead to the uplifting of mankind in the sense of Freemasonry. 3) Freemasonry acknowledges the existence of a highest and ideal principle, which symbolically is designated as the Great Architect of the Universe. It is neutral over against every religious faith. 4) No Masonic authority has the right to found a new lodge in the territory of another lodge without the consent of the latter. French Freemasonry, it seems, would prefer to be openly atheistic, but the old deistic foundation on which the lodge was established about two hundred years ago will remain. Freemasonry will continue to be the enemy of true Christianity, teaching a false god and a false way of salvation.

Glimpses from the Editor's Window.

In the province of Shantung, China, a famine of indescribable intensity and extent is raging at present. People have to eat the bark of trees, roots, and dry leaves. Innumerable beggars are said to line the streets, clad in rags that are just as filthy as they are scanty. Let us hope that the efforts to bring aid to these people in their indescribable distress will be successful.

In his book *What Remains of the Old Testament?* Dr. Gunkel, of Halle, Germany, proclaims that after criticism has done its work, very little remains. He makes the claim that all workers in the sphere of Old Testament science nowadays place themselves on a negative basis. Dr. D. S. Clark, writing in the *Presbyterian*, says: "Evidently he [Gunkel] has never heard of Prof. R. D. Wilson, Harold Wiener, Dr. Sanda, of Prague, or even of his own countrymen Max Loehr, Edouard Koenig, Wilhelm Moeller, Reich, Dahse, Erdmans, Troelstra, Noldeke, *et al.*"

Answering the question why Protestants are prejudiced against Roman Catholics, Dr. Charles E. Jefferson, of New York, points to the refusal of Rome to recognize other churches, its refusal to participate in religious conferences with Protestants, its refusal to take part in union meetings, its opposition to the public-school system, and its wrong position concerning

the separation of Church and State. What a superficiality and mixture of truth and error! To be antiunionistic is Scriptural. That Rome has robbed the Gospel of its very heart by its doctrine of works Dr. Jefferson either does not know, or he ignores it.

In Australia a man died whose name, years ago, became familiar in our circles through the visit of the sainted Dr. Graebner in New Zealand. We are referring to Rev. F. K. G. Blaess, missionary among the Maoris in New Zealand. That his work was not in vain is testified to by the fact that one of the pupils whom he baptized is now a Christian missionary in New Zealand, namely, Rev. Hamuera Te Punga.

The airplane may serve Christian missions. It is reported that a Presbyterian mission-station in West Persia was thrilled recently when an airplane descended, bringing two American friends to the mission. They came from Tabriz for breakfast, a journey which formerly, when horse and carriage were used, required four or five days.

Dr. John R. Mott, so well known in the sectarian church-life of our country, has resigned as general secretary of the National Council of the Young Men's Christian Association and accepted the position of president of the International Missionary Council. We are told that Dr. Mott will continue his connection with the Y. M. C. A. as president of the World's Alliance of the Young Men's Christian Association.

E. Stanley Jones, author of *The Christ of the Indian Road*, is quoted as saying: "Greece said, Be moderate; know thyself. Rome said, Be strong; order thyself. Confucianism says, Be superior; correct thyself. Buddhism says, Be disillusioned; annihilate thyself. Hinduism says, Be separated; merge thyself. Mohammedanism says, Be submissive; bend thyself. Modern materialism says, Be industrious; enjoy thyself. Modern dilettanteism says, Be broad; cultivate thyself. Christianity says, Be Christlike; give thyself." In order not to be misunderstood, Dr. Jones should have described Christianity as saying, "Receive Christ and then give thyself."

According to the *Watchman-Examiner*, Princeton University has just dedicated a two-million-dollar chapel, which is said to be the largest college chapel in the world, except one at Oxford, England, and Chicago Theological Seminary, a Congregational institution, has dedicated a magnificent one-million-dollar seminary building.

Concerning the reading of books Dr. G. H. Betts, of Northwestern University, sounds a warning. To select the books the general reader needs, he cannot, so says this professor, "go to the reviews in popular journals nor to publishers' statements. The purpose of these is to sell books, not to guide readers. Experienced librarians, professional journals that make book-reviewing a science, specialists in the particular field, are the best guides. In reading, as almost nowhere else, the aphorism holds good that the worst enemy of the best is the good. Many persons waste time reading 'good books.'" The last statement, of course, means that one should not be satisfied with merely good books, but read the best ones only.

Somewhat related to the above is the following utterance by J. Tooker Ford: "Ministers are natural lovers of books. It is a joy to listen to the voices of the good and great of the centuries and of the day; but if their voices drown the 'sound of gentle stillness' that issues from the Book, then everybody is the loser. The great Biblical scholar Bengel thanked God for the loss of his father's library because it removed from him the temptation to read 'too great a variety of books.'"

Gov. Fuller of Massachusetts vetoed a bill passed by the Legislature of his State permitting the sale and delivery of certain articles of food on Sunday. The argument he used in justifying his veto is unassailable: "There never was a time when a day of rest and quiet each week was more needed than it is to-day." It seems that he did not in this matter violate our constitutional principle of separation of Church and State.