

# THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY.

VOL. VIII.

MARCH, 1928.

No. 3.

## The Blessing of the Work of Christ.

(Translated from Dr. Ed. Preuss's *Die Lehre von der Rechtfertigung*, Part I, chap. 2.)

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

When the Scriptures say that Christ redeemed us, it means the freeing from sin and all its consequences, but chiefly the freeing from *guilt*. Heb. 9, 14; Eph. 1, 7; Col. 1, 14; Rom. 3, 24. This redemption is described as a *purchase*. Rev. 5, 9 the four and twenty elders sing: "Thou hast redeemed us to God by Thy blood out of every kindred and tongue and people and nation." The purchase-money is "not corruptible silver or gold, but the precious blood of Christ, as of a Lamb without blemish and without spot," 1 Pet. 1, 18, 19; in fact, His entire obedience, 1 Tim. 2, 6. This ransom was paid to God, not to the devil. Eph. 5, 2; Heb. 9, 14.

At the same time Christ appeased the wrath of God. St. Paul says that God set Him forth to be a propitiation in His blood. Rom. 3, 25. "He is the propitiation for our sins; and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world." 1 John 2, 2. The Greek verb which is the root of "propitiation" and "reconciliation" means "to appease wrath," "to dispose to grace or favor." The heathen used it of their gods; the Seventy [Septuagint], of God. Ps. 78, 38. It is peculiar that the Holy Scriptures in this connection do not make God the object of the verb (*ἱλάσσομαι*), but rather sin, respecting which the wrath of God is appeased. Thus it is said of Christ, Heb. 2, 17, that He became a faithful High Priest before God "to make reconciliation for the sins of the people"; according to the original Greek, "to propitiate" (*i. e.*, to expiate) "the sins of the people." Col. 1, 20 says the same, although in other words: "He made peace through the blood of His cross, by Himself." In the first place, He made peace on the one hand, by making satisfaction to the wrath of the Father. In this manner the love of the Son had to force its way by means of His blood through the anger of the divine majesty. But we are saved from wrath. Rom. 5, 8, 9.

## THE THEOLOGICAL OBSERVER.

---

Retirement of Dr. Sandt. — The *Lutheran* lost an able editor in the person of Dr. George W. Sandt, who after thirty-one years of service, on December 31, 1927, relinquished his position at the head of the *Lutheran*. Dr. Sandt will continue to be in charge of the department of "Daily Devotions." The other editorial work hitherto done by him will fall on the shoulders of the man who of late was associated with him in the editorship of the *Lutheran*, Dr. N. R. Mehlhorn. Now and then we could not sanction Dr. Sandt's views, but we gladly admit that, generally speaking, he was a champion of conservative Lutheranism and that his eloquent editorials breathed a truly evangelical spirit. Dr. Sandt was born in 1854. He was graduated from the Philadelphia Theological Seminary in 1883. From 1884 to 1889 he was an instructor at Augustana College. From 1889 to 1896 he served as pastor. In the last-named year his connection with the *Lutheran* began, and it continued uninterruptedly to the present time.

"The Divine Call. — The pastors of the Mankato Circuit, assembled in conference at St. James, Minn., November 21—22, 1927, having 'The Divine Call' under consideration, deplore the lax practices altogether too common in our Church, both on the part of pastors and congregations as regards the call. We believe that it is not God's will that a pastor should *seek* a call or *offer* himself for such a call, but he should wait until the Master calls him. We believe that this matter of call needs to be considered carefully and *prayerfully* by both pastors and congregations and that nothing should be done by either pastors or congregations that may tend to lower the estimate of the call in the sight of the Christian people. Unanimously

adopted by the Conference. (Signed.) S. O. Simundson, president. C. K. Malmin, secretary." — We clip this from the *Lutheran Church Herald* of December 6, 1927, organ of the Norwegian Lutheran Church, and pass it on to all whom it may concern. E.

**"How Lutheranism Lapsed from Liberalism."** — That is the heading of an article in the *Religious Press Digest*, December, 1927, which article summarizes an article in the *Christian Century* by Miles H. Krumbine, the Lutheran minister of the U. L. C. who permitted Fosdick to occupy his pulpit some time ago. The friend of Fosdick says: "The one question that I am asked more frequently than any other by my non-Lutheran friends goes something like this: 'How, in the light of Luther's great freedom of spirit, can you explain the ultraconservatism of the American Lutheran Church of to-day?' " If Fosdick should propound this vexing question at his next visit with Dr. Krumbine, he would get some information. "Frankly, until I read Dr. Vergilius Ferm's *The Crisis in American Lutheran Theology*, I could not explain it. The mental daring, the catholicity of spirit, the marked spontaneity and frank avowal of personal conviction of Luther — especially the Luther of those great days before 1525 — always seemed utterly unlike anything I ever knew or experienced in the Lutheran Church of my time. This book makes it plain enough. It is really a sad story." The article then goes on to retell the story of the "Definite Synodical Platform" — how the work of S. S. Schmucker, "the greatest figure since Muhlenberg," came to naught; how "his own son, his brother-in-law, and Dr. C. P. Krauth, one of his students and an intimate friend, became protagonists of the confessional point of view." And Fosdick will say: "It is really a sad story." The article adds: "The old General Synod continued on its way, nourishing a liberal spirit, at least among a minority of its leaders. In 1918 these three bodies joined in what is now the United Lutheran Church of America." And we say: It is really a sad story. The article, as condensed, concludes thus: "It is not unfair to say that in that union there is left little, if any, trace of American Lutheranism as it was, for the trend in the United Lutheran Church is certainly toward an increasing confessionalism." And Fosdick will tell Dr. Krumbine: That is really a sad state of affairs, while we tell him: It is a heartening report. — We do not know whether the original article carried the heading: How Lutheranism Lapsed from Liberalism. But if it has been fairly condensed by the *Digest*, the heading is most appropriate; for it expresses Dr. Krumbine's sentiments exactly. E.

**The "Sunday-School Times" Opposes Unionism.** — Under the caption "Fellowship in a Ministerial Association" the *Sunday-school Times* of December 24, 1927, writes as follows: —

"Friendliness and genuine Christian love toward an individual, whether he is sound or unsound in the faith or a Buddhist or a confessed atheist, is the privilege and duty of all true Christians. But membership or fellowship in a professedly Christian group that includes professing Christians who deny the claims of Christ and the

authority of the Scriptures is forbidden to God's people by his Word. The beloved apostle, who wrote by inspiration on the duty and privilege of Christian love in a way that lays upon every believer such requirements of love as only God can enable us to meet (1 John 4), wrote also this plain and uncompromising command from the Holy Spirit: 'Whosoever transgresseth and abideth not in the doctrine of Christ hath not God. He that abideth in the doctrine of Christ, he hath both the Father and the Son. If there come any unto you and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your house, neither bid him Godspeed; for he that biddeth him Godspeed is partaker of his evil deeds.' 2 John 9—11.

"To join a ministerial association that includes in its membership Unitarians, who deny the unique and eternal deity of Christ, is to ignore and disobey this injunction of the Scriptures. To have organized or official fellowship in any group or in a formal reception of professing Christians, whether ministers or laymen, who deny 'the doctrine of Christ' with all that this includes, is to bid such persons Godspeed, which God's Word forbids us to do. There can be no gain, but only loss, in showing a 'friendliness' toward men which means disloyalty to our Lord. Our truest friendliness toward those who have turned aside from truth and blessing is to show forth real love for them and seek to bring them into the truth, in ways that shall not condone their error or weaken our witness to our Lord."

This is sound Scripture doctrine. But now let us say to the editor of the *Sunday-school Times* and his associates: *Fiat applicatio!* According to their own declaration they have to cease belonging to lodges, since the lodge religion denies Christ. They have to cease fraternizing with people who in one or more doctrines prove disloyal to the Word of God. May God give them strength and willingness to follow the principles so clearly enunciated in the above!

**Good Apologetic Material.** — The *Princeton Theological Review* for October, 1927, contains two apologetic articles of more than passing interest. One is an exhaustive discussion of the narrative of the annunciation of the birth of Christ given by St. Luke. The writer, Dr. Machen, contends for the integrity of this narrative, showing that the theory of interpolation according to which the reference to the supernatural birth of Jesus did not originally belong to the story is from every point of view untenable. The writer proves his thesis in masterly fashion. The other article has the caption, "The Sign of the Prophet Jonah and Its Modern Confirmations." The writer rebukes the unbelieving critics who ridicule the story of "Jonah and the Whale," and shows that there are several cases on record where men were swallowed by a whale and were ejected alive. A point which one will do well to remember is that according to the writer (A. J. Wilson of Oxford) the sperm whale, or cachalot, "subsists for the most part on the octopus, bodies of which, far larger than the body of a man, have been found whole in its stomach." It seems, then, that the critics, when they discredit the story of Jonah, are building their arguments on assumptions which are unwarranted by the facts.

**The Bible Itself Is the Real Issue.** — Under the caption “Is the Bible Trustworthy?” the *Watchman-Examiner* (Baptist) of November 24, 1927, has the following editorial, which we are reprinting in full:—

“In our office we had a conversation with an eminent Baptist minister about the Bible. He said frankly: ‘Of course, the Bible teaches the virgin birth of Christ, the bodily resurrection of Christ, the vicarious sacrifice of Christ, and the visible bodily return of Christ, but in all honesty I must say that I do not believe in any of these things.’

“Those who reject the teachings mentioned in the foregoing paragraph fall into two general classes. The first class acclaims its belief in the trustworthiness of the Bible and then by every art known to man seeks to prove that the Bible, rightly interpreted, does not teach such doctrines. The second class frankly admits that the Bible does teach such doctrines, but just as frankly it declares that for good and sufficient reasons it cannot accept these doctrines. We have more respect for the man who says that Christ and the apostles were mistaken than for the man who, because he is too timid to take that position, juggles with the Bible and tries to make it teach what the wayfaring man, though a fool, knows that it does not teach. There are vast differences among us as to the trustworthiness of the Bible and the authority of the teachings of Christ and the apostles. We can make no progress toward the solution of our theological problems until we are candid enough to state these problems.

“For instance, is there any known method of interpretation that can create the slightest doubt as to what the Bible teaches as to the Virgin Birth, the resurrection of Christ, the vicarious atonement, and the second coming of our Lord? We are trying to emphasize the fact that these doctrines are too plainly taught to be argued away by any honest method of interpretation. Not to accept them is to question either the trustworthiness of the Bible record or the authority of the teachings of Christ and His apostles.

“It is intellectually dishonest to juggle with the unmistakable teachings of the Bible. The great doctrines of Christianity come not from Calvin or Augustine, but from the Holy Bible. It is not the theology of the Middle Ages over which the battle rages, it is the theology of the New Testament. Only two questions are involved, ‘Were Christ and His apostles authoritative teachers?’ and ‘Is the New Testament the record of those teachings?’”

The editorial remarks of the *Watchman-Examiner* point out the real issue in doctrinal controversies. Whether or not a man accepts and confesses the truth will depend upon his attitude towards the Bible: Does he believe that the Bible is the verbally inspired Word of God, or does he not believe it?—It is noteworthy in this connection to read (see first paragraph of editorial) that “an eminent Baptist minister” can frankly deny the fundamental truths of the Christian religion and still be counted a Baptist minister. It is one of the sad signs of the times in which we are living. FRIZZ.

**Strange Ideas of the Kingdom of God Persisting.** — We were in hopes that the strange notions advocated by the late Prof. Walter Rauschenbusch, of Rochester Seminary, would soon die a natural death, since they were so utterly out of harmony with clear Scriptural teaching. But it seems that the spirit of Schleiermacher and Ritschl is strong enough to stand up under a good deal of common-sense criticism, being supported also by recent books, such as *The Economics of the Kingdom of God*, by Paul B. Bull, *The Return of Christendom*, by a group of churchmen, *Ownership*, by Clementina Butler, *Christ and Money*, by Hugh A. Martin, and others. One of the latest articles along this line appeared in the *Living Church*, of Milwaukee, a few months ago. To the author of this article the definition by Father Bull is altogether acceptable when he says that "the kingdom of God may be defined as the organization of human society in obedience to the will of God and for the fulfilment of His purpose." And again: "The kingdom of God, a collection of representative Christian utterances on what its realization would mean, and a selection of attempts which are being made or suggested to move toward its realization and practise." With this ideal in mind, the author deplores the Church's strange persistence in working for the salvation and spiritual cultivation of the individual, whereas, so the author states, her duty is alike to the individual and to society. — It would pay all these people who are dabbling in Christian Sociology to make a thorough study of the ideals of Christ and, above all, of His purpose, when He states that He came into the world to seek and to save that which was lost and to that end to lay down His life for many.

K.

**Growth in Doctrine Is Not Change of Doctrine — a Confounding of Terms.** — What the Rev. Mr. Jones, pastor of Richmond Hill Congregational Church, Bournemouth, England, in an article entitled "The Perils of Routine," printed in the *Northwestern Christian Advocate* of December 22, 1927, advocates does not surprise us; for what he says is quite in line with the policy of his own church-body, the Congregational Church. Nor are we in these days much surprised that a Methodist church-paper reprints approvingly the remarks of Mr. Jones. We quote as follows [*italics our own*]: —

"I believe in the Holy Ghost.' We can all heartily say that, but we do not all accept what that faith involves. For to believe in the Holy Ghost is to believe in growth in our perception of Christian truth; for the Spirit is constantly taking of the things of Christ and revealing them to men. That this is so is abundantly clear to any one who studies the history of the Christian Church. Men have grown in their understanding of Christ's mind. *And the growing understanding of Christ's mind has necessitated changes in the statement of Christian truth.* That such changes have taken place in the course of the Christian centuries is undeniable. Doctrines have again and again had to change their form because of the advances of knowledge. *The heterodoxies of one day have become the orthodoxies of the next. . . .* Once again the Church finds itself in a time of vast and far-reaching change. New discoveries have necessitated new

statements of our faith. *Our views of the Bible, our ideas as to God's relationship to the world have got to be reconstructed.* There are some who make the old protest of custom and tradition. 'Not so . . . for we have never.' I wish to say that if the Church as a whole adopts that attitude, she will inevitably lose all command of the rising generation. May God preserve us from narrowness and obscurantism of that kind! The Church that will not get out of its groove will find its grave. The Church's business in this world is to proclaim a Gospel—the great and wonderful Gospel of the grace of God in the redemption of mankind through the sacrifice of Christ. *It is not here to insist upon a certain cosmogony or a certain theory of inspiration.* It is here to proclaim the Gospel. And what I want to see, what I pray the Church may always be, is a Church that shall be ever loyal to that central Gospel, but which, because it believes in the Holy Ghost, will always be frank and open-eyed and hospitable to *new truth*. Such a Church, at once fervently evangelical and yet progressive and free, will, I believe, capture and hold the world."

Surely we should grow in doctrine. The Bible itself bids us do so. But this means that we should, by prayerful and careful study, better learn to know the revealed and written doctrines of the Bible. Growth in doctrine does not mean, or call for, a change of doctrine. This the Bible itself emphatically forbids. Gal. 1, 6—12; Rom. 16, 17, 18, *et al.* The Bible is the revealed Word of God, and God, being unchangeable, cannot change His Word, denying now what He at one time asserted. Truth never changes; it is its very nature that it cannot; otherwise it would not be truth.

J. H. C. F.

**Reasons for Unitarian Decreases.**—Commenting on the losses which the Unitarians have sustained during the last decade, the *Presbyterian* writes editorially: "In 1916 there were in this country 416 Unitarian churches, while in the ten years following the number of these churches dropped from 416 to 344, a loss of nearly 75 individual congregations, at an hour when the loud call is being made inside Orthodoxy to copy our teaching from the books of liberal Christians. It is always a mystery why men make so earnest an argument for a creedless Church, when the picture of a fading Unitarianism is seen so clearly upon the screen. These 72 Unitarian churches must have causes for their extinction, and we stop to inquire what these causes are.

"First, we may be free to say that it is not because liberal Christianity is unpopular or impoverished. From those early days in New England the most cultured and intellectual and wealthy families were ranged on the side of this indefinite creed. The Unitarian position has made so little demand upon the credulous in men; indeed, they have always boasted of being the real Rationalists of America, kinsmen to those German Liberals who either denied or evaded the region of the supernatural. The decline of a sect like the Shakers is due to their unpopular repudiation of marriage and their communism, which severely limited their disciples. Unitarianism has had nothing like this to impede its progress. All that abounds in the most lavish environment is at the command of our leading liberal churches. We

must look elsewhere for our reasons to interpret this decline between 1916 and 1926.

"Is it not all explained in one simple phrase—the absence of authority? . . . If, indeed, there is no authority except those mercurial emotions of one's inner being, then, indeed, a Church is a questionable investment, financially as well as religiously, and it is hardly logical to labor for a cause that is uncertain, if not unreal. Is it not this absence of certainty and authority that has closed these churches? Humanity craves what the evangelical churches offer in Jesus Christ—a voice that stands from age to age, certain in the midst of uncertainty and infallible amidst the fallible."

Since the conservatives in the Presbyterian Church understand the essence and deadliness of Liberalism so well, we wonder why they refuse to do the only logical and Christian thing, namely, testify against Unitarianism in their midst by the most telling protest of separation.

MUELLER.

**Rome's Triumph in Bavaria.**—Dr. H. Koch, of Berlin, has published an important essay in the *Evangelisch-Lutherische Freikirche*, in which he points out the dangers accruing to the state from the establishment of a concordat with Rome, and especially the almost abject submission of Bavaria to the wishes of the Pope in the concordat of 1924. The article is timely, since Rome is now seeking to arrange a concordat with Prussia and the rest of Germany. Bavaria has agreed not to appoint theological or philosophical professors against whom the Roman bishop raises an objection. Dr. Koch points out that while three-fifths of the population of Bavaria are Roman Catholics and two-fifths Protestants, the state assists the Catholic Church with sums of money three times as high as those given the Protestant Church. The state provides 82 Roman dignitaries with dwellings; but no Protestant dignitary is thus provided for from the public exchequer. In Bavaria, then, the baneful union of Church and State still continues, and Rome is decidedly the beneficiary.

**Education in the Roman Catholic Church of the United States during the Past Year.**—Reviewing education in his Church during the past year, Paul L. Blakely, S. J., writes, among other things, in *America* of December 31, 1927:—

"During the year, sixty-four new parish schools were opened. Adding the thirty-seven reported in the closing months of 1926, the total is 101 for the ninety-five dioceses in the United States, in a period of approximately fourteen months. Fourteen new high schools and one college, Regis College, at Newton, Mass., directed by the Sisters of St. Joseph, were founded.

"A glance at the estimates for 1927 will show that there are 2,488,461 young people in all our institutions, an increase over the 2,428,019 of 1926. In the elementary schools the increase is from 2,111,560 in 1926, to 2,187,576; in the secondary schools, from 204,815 to 215,000; in the colleges and universities, from 74,949 to 85,830. On the whole, a satisfactory growth is indicated. Much remains to be done, however, since approximately half of our young people are either not in any school or in non-Catholic schools.



"For 1926 more complete financial data are at hand, and I quote the items which probably remained unchanged in 1927. Reports from 113 colleges and universities estimated the total value of grounds, buildings, and equipment at \$174,507,928. Thirty-nine of these institutions have a combined endowment of \$17,402,217. Seventy-four either have no endowment or report none. The Catholic University has the largest endowment, \$2,903,642. Creighton University, Omaha, follows with \$2,317,488; Marquette University, Milwaukee, with \$1,871,819; St. Louis University, St. Louis, with \$1,500,000; and Notre Dame and Columbia College, Dubuque, with \$1,000,000.

"As to the parish school, I speak with deference to those who hold a contrary opinion, but I am convinced that its status will never be assured until it is replaced by the diocesan school. I formed that opinion nearly ten years ago, and time has only strengthened it. The Third Plenary Council of Baltimore decreed the founding of a school in every parish, and wisely, since forty years ago that was the best way of securing educational facilities for our people. Conditions to-day are not what they were in 1884. We have parishes amply able to maintain schools and others that cannot possibly have a school; and the rest exist simply because priests and Sisters are willing to win a martyr's crown. We need equalization, and that we cannot have as long as the parishes are mutually independent. We can secure it only by a diocesan control with teeth in it—a central power with authority over the training, placing, transfer, and removal of teachers; a power that can set standards and demand results or the reasons why not; and, finally, which can levy a tax to be expended not in this or that parish, but in this or that neighborhood, where a school is most needed. Parish lines are not intimately connected with the Deposit of the Faith. They are divisions sanctioned by the Church to get the work done better. They can be lifted (not, of course, abolished) by the ordinary when they keep the work from being done at all."

What is said in this last paragraph with reference to parish schools will interest also our readers; for our parish schools have a similar problem to face.

J. H. C. F.

**Degrees and Teaching Ability.** — *America* of December 31, 1927, says editorially:—

"One of the higher degrees from a good university means much, no doubt. But are we not making too much of the doctor's degree for teachers and too little of the doctor's ability to teach? *Doctor* originally meant one who knew his subject and was able to teach it to others. To-day, however, many a college fights for the services of a *savant* with both the higher degrees, only to discover that as a teacher he is a total loss. He may *know*, but he cannot *do*.

"Teaching is both an art and a science. Technical courses may provide the aspirant with the necessary science, but no course yet devised equips him with the art. A B. A. who can stimulate and inspire is a far more valuable asset to a university than the dry-as-dust pedant with an armful of sheepskins."

J. H. C. F.

**The Pope's Temporal Power.** — The Pope must demand territorial possessions. That is the claim made by *America* in an editorial, in which it discusses the "ever-recurring Roman question," reaching the following conclusions: "This, then, is the heart of the question. The Holy See must be acknowledged by all the world to be an independent, though spiritual, Power. This, as things go in this world, it will never be as long as it is not at the same time acknowledged to possess true juridical sovereignty. The only means yet found in the present state of the world by which this sovereignty, admitted as such by all the world, may be kept inviolate is by the possession of a free and independent territory. These four principles are the heart of the Holy See's position: spiritual sovereignty, independence from any state, civil sovereignty of some sort as the outward form of this independence, and possession of territory, however small, as the means of maintaining this outward form."

We profess that we cannot follow this line of argumentation; it is a masterpiece of trickery and juggling of terms. If the Holy See is a "spiritual power," it certainly does not require "civil sovereignty of some sort as the outward form of this independence." Such a deduction is ridiculous — the height of absurdity. MUELLER.

**The Movies and Religion.** — The *Northwestern Christian Advocate* writes editorially: "The movies are making much of the protest entered by the American Association for the Advancement of Atheism against such pictures as 'King of Kings,' 'The Ten Commandments,' and a picture called 'The Atheist,' reported to be in preparation. Mr. Will Hays, writing to the president of the association, says: 'To ask us to eliminate God from motion pictures is equivalent to asking that sunshine be barred from the playgrounds where emaciated, ill-kept children of the tenements find a moment's respite of happiness. It is equivalent to asking us to blot the stars from the heavens because men may look at them and dare ask themselves, as Napoleon did, "But who, gentlemen, made all those?"' Nevertheless, if we were interested in advancing atheism, we should not protest against 'King of Kings.' That picture may not make atheists, but it does not go far toward making believers, either."

We have not seen the film which is now making the rounds through the various cities under the name "King of Kings"; yet we are ready to believe the *Advocate* when it says that it will not make *believers*. The Church would not suffer loss if such films were eliminated; not the movies, but the churches of Christ are commissioned to preach the Gospel of the King of kings. MUELLER.

**The Russian Church Recognizes the Soviet Government.** — Under the heading "Recent Events" the *Catholic World* reports the following with respect to the relation of the Russian Church to the Soviet Government: "The heroic Archbishop Tikhon is believed to have issued a manifesto during his tragic imprisonment recognizing the legitimacy of the *de facto* government in Russia. It had no effect, however, in allaying the persecution. The present Metropolitan, Serge of Nizhni Novgorod, who was also imprisoned for a time, is now trying to legalize the status of the Orthodox Church. In a pas-

toral letter issued last summer, but only recently made known outside Russia, the archbishop unequivocally recognizes the legitimacy of the Soviet *régime* and announces the complete separation of the Orthodox Church of Tikhon within Russia from that of the *émigrés* outside Russia. It may be expected that many will give up their adherence to the Orthodox Church rather than recognize the Soviet Government, but the pastoral letter must inevitably strengthen that government."

Other reports from Russia clearly prove that this recognition of the Soviet Government is based upon far-reaching concessions made by the Soviets to the Church.

MUELLER.

#### What Does the Layman Know Concerning Evolution?—

According to the *American Review of Reviews* the layman is supposed, not to know, but to believe, that man descended from the anthropoids. In his inaugural presidential address before the British Association for the Advancement of Science, August 31, 1927, Sir Arthur Keith had declared that Darwin was right, and he unfolded the thesis: "The evidence of man's evolution from an apelike being is definite and irrefutable." The article in the *Review's* October number, commenting on this address, has the heading: "Science Confirms the Darwinian Theory" and concludes with the statement: "One thing that Sir Arthur makes clear is that Darwin's work is still unfinished. There remains many a gap, or at least clouded point, in the story of evolution. But if the layman of 1927 wants to know if it is true that man, under the action of biological forces which can be observed and measured, has been raised from a place amongst anthropoid apes to that which he now occupies; whether, in short, the vast achievements of science in the last half century still justify rejection of the dogma that man appeared on earth by a sudden creation, the answer rests in a single word: yes." So the "science" of evolution has its adepts and its laymen, those who know of these things and those who have to take the word of the adepts for it. Now, while we cheerfully admit that we and the writer of the *Review* article are, in a manner, laymen in the matter of the scientific research carried on in this field, we, for our part, refuse to accept a single statement of science unless it can be demonstrated to our layman mind. Furthermore, the *Review* is trying to befuddle the mind of the layman. It declares that science confirms the Darwinian theory. What the facts entitle it to say is that another noted scientist affirms the Darwinian theory. It aims at creating the impression that scientists are pretty well agreed on this point. It must know (unless the writer of the *Review* article is at the very bottom of the layman class) that a host of scientists reads the results of all this scientific research differently. The layman of 1927 ought to be told what, to mention only one instance, Dr. Robert A. Millikan, of Chicago, an internationally famous physicist, knows of these things. He went on record in an address before the American Chemical Society at Los Angeles, in 1925, as *knowing* nothing. He declared: "The pathetic thing is that we have scientists who are trying to prove evolution, which no scientists can ever prove." "We must not take

a few facts and then draw conclusions." What has happened since 1925 to bring in "evidence of man's evolution which is definite and irrefutable"? By the way, the *Review* writer cannot deny his status as a veritable layman in science. He speaks of the Darwinian *theory* and winds up with the assertion that the question concerning evolution must be answered with an emphatic yes. The abc class in science knows that a theory refuses to be called a fact. A bad *lapsus* happened to the adept himself. Sir Arthur (and the *Review* layman, of course, as well) is confusing Darwinism, a specific theory of evolution, with evolution. Darwinism has long been dead.—But to get back to our original question, What does the layman know concerning evolution? There are quite a number of laymen who, while incapable of pursuing scientific research, *know* that evolution will never be proved. And they would reject it even if every single scientist of great or little note believed in it,—even if Dr. Millikan and all the rest changed their minds. Luther was one of these laymen. And he said: "You must be so certain of God's Word that even though all men should speak differently, yea, all angels should say *no*, you still could stand upon it and say: 'And yet I know that this Word of God is right.'" (8, 1003.)—By way of postscript: The American Association for the Advancement of Atheism cabled Sir Arthur this greeting: "We hail with joy your uncompromising championship of the ape ancestry of man. Your boldness and plain speaking will encourage atheists the world over." That, of course, was not the purpose of his address. E.

#### Glimpses from the Editor's Window.

It is reported that Prof. Carl Stange, D. D., of the University of Goettingen, has been called to succeed Prof. Reinhold Seeberg, D. D., in the theological faculty of the University of Berlin. (N. L. C. B.)

It is announced that the Second Lutheran World Convention will meet in Copenhagen, Denmark, beginning June 21, 1929, and continuing eight or ten days. One session will be held in the old cathedral of Lund, Sweden. Among the things on the program are the quadricentennial of Luther's Catechisms and the anniversary of the Augsburg Confession in 1930.

According to latest census returns from Washington, the Buffalo Synod numbers 41 churches, with a total of 9,267 members. The Finnish Evangelical Lutheran Church of America, or Suomi Synod, totals 185 churches, with a membership of 32,071. The United Danish Evangelical Lutheran Church in America has 190 churches and 29,198 members.

On New Guinea gold has been found, which means that there is a rush of adventurers to that famous island. The Iowa Synod is carrying on mission-work there, and the missionaries find their efforts greatly hampered by the unscrupulous whites, who care more for money than for morals.

Luther's teaching on the condition of the soul between death and the resurrection of the body is seized upon by unbelievers (for instance, by the *Foolkiller*) to prove that the great Reformer denied the immortality of the soul. What Luther did say repeatedly is that in his opinion the soul is in a state of blissful sleep during the interval between the moment of death and the moment when the archangel's trumpet will sound. To construe this to mean that Luther denied the immortality of the soul is either due to hopeless stupidity or to a malicious intention of deceiving the uninitiated. *Tertium non datur.*

"Pentecostal Assemblies of the World" is the name adopted by an association of Pentecostal churches with headquarters at Indianapolis. A folder setting forth their teachings shows that they believe in immersion, divine healing, Communion as a commemoration of Christ's "broken body and spilled blood," foot-washing, and the Millennium. They oppose going to theaters, moving picture shows, fairs, and picnics. They condemn the use of tobacco and the bearing of arms. Divorce is permitted only in case of adultery. Evidently they have zeal, but it is not altogether according to knowledge.

The almost unbelievable has come to pass — the *American Review of Reviews* admits that Germany was not solely responsible for the war. Says the editor in the issue of January, 1928: "For a while we were in the habit of fixing all the blame upon Germany; but now it is fully realized that there was discredit enough to distribute all over Europe, with plenty to spare."

The exchanges report that the aborigines of New Zealand, the Maoris, are founding a Church which is composed exclusively of people of their own race. This Church, then, will be established along racial lines. The leader, a man by the name of Ratana, is said to place himself on the Scriptures, although what is said about his emphasis on faith-healing and his founding of a city which bears his name does not sound very reassuring.

Mr. Selden was appointed by the editor of the *Ladies' Home Journal* to investigate Christian missions. After spending seven months on that errand, he wrote a book entitled *Are Missions a Failure?* The book was published by Fleming H. Revell Co. When Mr. Selden started out, he took with him, as he says, "a complete outfit of the modern Western man's preconceived notions, prejudices, and skepticisms concerning missions." And he openly confesses that he thought that the missionary enterprise was futile. After his searching investigation, this is what he has to say: "The missionaries are the one group of Western people living in the East who are a credit to the West."

Dr. Cadman, President of the Federal Council of Churches, would like to see all theological controversy outlawed for fifty years, declaring that there is too much theological speculation, and that Modernists have contended for their cause strongly enough and Fundamentalists have written far too much. Dr. Goodchild rejoins very properly: "Instead of a truce I propose a revival of honesty for the next fifty years." Well put! Let Modernists quit using the money of Bible-loving Christians and preaching in the pulpits dedicated to the message of the divine Jesus. How refreshing it would be if strict honesty were practised in this sphere!