

J 39927

CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY

"In the Likeness of Sinful Flesh"

MARTIN H. SCHARLEMANN

The Geneva Bible

CARL S. MEYER

Casework Therapy and the Clergy

ROBERT DE VRIES

Brief Studies

Homiletics

Theological Observer

Book Review

VOL. XXXII

March 1961



No. 3

ARCHIVES

THE ROYAL BANNERS FORWARD GO

I

Matt. 21:28-32

"The royal banners forward go; the Cross shines forth in mystic glow." The meek King goes to the cross. His banners summon His people to repentance, and they call on us. How do we salute those banners? How do we acclaim that Victor-Servant? How do we serve that King? These are good questions in the week before Good Friday. The words which Jesus spoke to His people in the week before Good Friday can serve us and help us to find an answer to our question. They can help us, that is, if we remember that all those terrible things that happened in the week before Good Friday recur—in respectable, Christianized form, of course—in the years after Good Friday. Let us not spend a comfortable week denouncing Jesus' contemporaries. That would not be keeping a true Lent; that would not be a fast, for people to whom we feel superior make mighty good eating. That would be

to quit the dish
of flesh and still
to fill
the platter high with fish.

Let us consider *Jesus' word to the dodgers, the evaders*, and see how they apply to us. The word which the Father speaks in the parable reminds Israel once more of all God's ancient mercy to His people. They are a summary of the whole Old Testament:

"Son, Go Work Today in My Vineyard"

"Son"—the whole grace of God's covenant love for His people is in that word. "When Israel was young, then did I love him, and out of Egypt did I call My son" (Hosea 11:1). "Go work today"—the LORD'S claim upon His people, the fact that He de-

sired the whole man wholly for Himself, appears in those words—"Thou shalt love the LORD, thy God, with all thy heart." And the inescapable urgency of God's claim is spoken once more in "today." "In My vineyard"—the whole scene of man's work and man's history is the LORD's, under His governance. The Creator God, the sovereign Lord of all history, appears in this word. All the grace and power of God that made Israel the Sabbath among the nations appears once more in the words which bid the son give God a son's devotion and render Him a son's service.

We all know what the men of Jesus' generation answered. The young man said, "I go, sir," and went not. Let us not paint this young man too black. He represents the best in Israel. He did not become a hellion. He did not disgrace his parents and squander his patrimony. He did not look on the wine when it was red or consort with loose women. No (and this is what makes this such an embarrassing text to apply to us), our young man pursued wisdom. He became a churchman and a theologian. He probably attended *leb ebad* (that's a very rough rendering of "Concordia") Seminary.

Our young man cultivated the liturgical life. He fasted; he tithed; he prayed; and he washed. Jesus' contemporaries were probably the "fastingest," the "tithingest," the "prayingest," the "ablutingest" generation of men under the sun. Moreover, our young man developed an intense missionary activity; he compassed sea and land to make one proselyte. He became a theologian and discussed a whole mess of problems. We are not the first generation of theologians to discuss a wide variety of "The Church and" themes. Our young man had them and discussed them too. He had his *The Church and Society*, his theological-sociological problems.

He was interested in almsgiving, in the right reasons for a valid divorce, and he was interested in the supreme question, too, the question, *Who is my neighbor?* He had his *The Church and Government* problem, too, his theological-political problem, and he asked, *Is it lawful to pay tax to Caesar?* *The Church and the Bible* was in his life too; he had his theological-exegetical problem, and he asked, *Which is the greatest commandment?* He was seeking an integrating principle for a truly Biblical theology.

What was it that made our demure young theologian-churchman an abomination? What made his converts sons of Gehenna? Why did the publicans and harlots go into the Kingdom before him? Where did he fail? *He went not.* He remained rooted in himself, cabined, cribbed, confined, bound in by his own religiosity, by his liturgy, his theology. He discussed and groped and fiddled with his problems; he evaded. For our young man knew in his heart of hearts (what we know too) that once we understand and admit that we understand, then we must obey. Then there is only one problem, one that we can't walk around any more, one that we can't discuss any more. This one problem always confronts us head on. Once we know that there is really no problem like "Who is my neighbor?" and know that finding him is not only easy but inevitable; once we face up to the fact that we must take steps if we want to avoid our neighbor, that our neighbor is always lying across our path—then there is only one problem left; then we must love our neighbor as ourselves.

John the Baptist made plain to his contemporaries that there is only one problem, because there is only One God, and that One God is drawing near in the person of His Son and Servant, the Mightier One. There is only one road to go, that is the road of repentance. The unproblematical publicans and the nonliturgical harlots be-

lieved John the Baptist. But what of our evading theologian? "Ye repented not afterward, that ye might believe him."

Theologians find it hard to repent; they do not often repent. They improve their theology; they rethink their position. They modify their views in the light of new discoveries; they peer into hot caves and find new materials for cool disputings. They take into account, of course, the epoch-making work of the great Dr. Gedankenspritzer. For whatever you may think of the great Dr. Gedankenspritzer, you cannot simply ignore him. (It is academic heresy to say so, but the heretical thought *will* rise, *Why not*, for a change, ignore the current Dr. Gedankenspritzer? It might be a good thing, even for Dr. Gedankenspritzer.)

Jesus loved even the churchmen and the theologians, even the disobedient sons. For us theological sons and for our salvation He was made man. The one obedient Son, the Son who had only one problem, to do the will of the Father who sent Him, He *lived* by the Word that proceeded from the mouth of God and went in free obedience the way which that Word marked for Him, the way to the cross. He redeemed the ruin of our broken "I go, sir" lives by His blood outpoured. He has broken open a path to the vineyard of God for us, a path that we can walk because He has walked it before us and for us. Our liturgy, our activity, our theology need no longer be gifts of God that we use against God, to evade Him. Let us face it: that can happen here and now; that has happened here and now. But it need not happen. Our liturgy, our activity, our theology, yea, even the work of the great Dr. Gedankenspritzer, can be a part of our work today in the vineyard of our Father. For the Cross, the royal banner of our King, blazons forth both: "Son, thy sins be forgiven thee," and

"Son, go work today in My vineyard."

II

Matt. 21:33-43

The royal banners forward go; they summon God's sons, and the sons evade the summons. They call on God's workmen, His tenant farmers, to give God the fruits of His vineyard, and God's workmen rebel.

*Jesus' Word to the Rebels:
"Give God What Is God's!"*

That is an old cry, a cry that spans 28 centuries. Isaiah raised that cry; Jesus raised it; and in our 20th century it must be raised again. Isaiah pictured to his generation the free and fostering love of God that chose out Israel to be His pleasant plant. God planted His vineyard in the best soil, on the best site (on a hill where grapes may drink the sun), and gave it the best cultivation. He looked therefore to find noble grapes — and found wild grapes. He looked to Israel to find there a rule of right — and found in this people the misrule of might. (Is. 5)

"What could have been done *more* to My vineyard . . .?" Israel's history is the record of that miracle of miracles, the "more" of God, that inexplicable onward march of the Lord's love for His people, that impetus of God which finally made His royal banner the cross. That "more" is documented in the servants of the Lord, those waves on waves of prophets who proffered Israel God's grace and bade Israel give God what is God's. That "more" reaches its climax in the sending of the Son. "They will reverence My Son." There is the apex of that love of God, love with defenses down, love that risks betrayal, lost love to the loveless shown.

This is the ultimate grace, the culminating revelation. And it provokes the ultimate rebellion: "This is the Heir; let us kill Him, and let us seize on His inheritance." These keepers of the vineyard saw clearly, up to a point. They saw with the stupid clarity of demonic vision. If we get rid of the Son, we'll be in charge: We'll have it made. The

prophets are dead; we can always reinterpret them to suit our ends, and thus stone them anew. But the Son lives and confronts us. His greatness makes us bow. His obedience indicts us in our rebelliousness. He summons us, inexorably, to give God what is God's.

They got rid of the Son. They caught Him, cast Him out of the vineyard, and slew Him. They got rid of the Son, but they could not seize on His inheritance. They lost the vineyard, and the Stone which they rejected became a rock that ground them to powder. — But there was another chapter of God's love written before that chapter of doom. The Son loved these rebels. Christ interceded for them and died for them. When He arose, He sent His messengers first to them. He let His servants Stephen, James the son of Zebedee, and James the Just die in their witness to them.

Such is our Christ, a Christ who died for rebels. Do we qualify as rebels, now, in the year of our Lord 1961? Can it happen here? Can it be that we drag the Heir out of the vineyard and seek to take over? Our Lord foresaw that it could happen. Salt that does not salt, light that does not shine, workmen who will not give the Lord of the vineyard His fruit — these are three of a kind, all highly "unnatural," all rebellion against the God who creates salt, gives light, and makes men His workmen.

It can happen here; it has happened. The heresies of which we read in the apostolic writings are, all of them, attempts to get the Heir out of the vineyard, attempts to remove the Son and to leave the workmen in charge. The men who strove to make a fair show in the flesh in Galatia; the men in Colossae who restored to honor the principalities and powers which the Christ had spoiled; Cerinthus with his Christ who came by water but not by blood, essentially an uncrucified Christ; the Christ party at Corinth (how neatly the rebellion can disguise itself!) who rose to heights of religious self-fulfillment

and left behind and below them the apostle who knew only the Crucified One—they all “revised” the Christ whom God had given. And every “revised” Christ is a Christ dragged out of the vineyard and slain. For this revised Christ is no longer the Son whose obedience indicts us; He is no longer the Christ whose ransoming cross spells out our bankruptcy.

The Christ, the obedient Son, the Crucified One, comes to us still. He comes to us in the word of His apostles. His presence is a real presence—in a book, a presence as offensive as His presence in the flesh, as offensive as His presence in the bread and wine. When we play off the Christ against the Book, His Book; when we leave the Book and wander out behind the beyond, seeking His presence behind and beyond the Book, we are nudging the real Christ out of the vineyard. We destroy the Heir by excision and revision.

We can destroy the Heir also by substitution. When we play off His Word against His Sacrament or His Sacrament against His Word, let's not delude ourselves about what is going on. It is the same ugly business as that recorded in Matt. 21:33-43. And it is the same ugly business when we set an autonomous *Wissenschaft* over His Word, or a philosophy, or a system; when we substitute a set of principles for the living Lord; when we make of His Sacrament our sacrifice, etc., etc., etc.

We cannot destroy the Heir. But we can destroy ourselves. But we need not destroy ourselves. What can happen after Good Friday, what has happened with an ugly repetitiousness since Good Friday, that need not happen here. The Son and Heir has made us God's pleasant plant; He has made us branches of that one Vine whose fruit was all for God. When He comes to us in the Word of His apostles, we can hear Him speaking to us still and can submit to Him in the obedience of faith. When He comes

to us in the bread and wine and the cry goes up, “Lift up your hearts,” we can, in the powers of our communion with Him, reply: “We lift them up unto the Lord.”

III

Matt. 22:1-14

The royal banners forward go. They summon God's sons, and the sons evade. They summon God's workmen, and the workmen rebel. They bid God's guests come to the wedding feast, and the guests despise that bidding.

Jesus' Word to the Contemptuous Guests

The royal banners forward go. And the device upon those banners is grace. It is royal grace, grace bestowed in sovereign freedom, a grace which one cannot induce, cannot claim, cannot compel. One can only receive it. You *get* invited to the king's wedding supper.

It is festal grace, splendid, lavish, extravagant, prodigal. Everybody spends too much on weddings, and so it is just wedding festivity that furnishes the figure for the grace of God. “*All things are ready; come unto the marriage!*”

It is calling, inviting grace, with a repeated urgent, seeking, and unwearied call. This King will have His chambers filled with guests, no matter what.

It is absolute grace, pure grace, and therefore it is universal grace. This grace invites “both bad and good”; that pretty well covers mankind. No one is excepted; no one is excluded. Only those who refuse this grace prove “unworthy” of it.

And it is personal grace. “The King came in to see the guests”—that is the climax and the meaning of the feast, personal communion, face to face. To him who has abused this grace, the king says, “*Friend, how camest thou hither?*”

Dies Evangelium ist nicht schwer, Luther says. The royal banners forward go, and any

fool can read what is emblazoned on them. *Und ist ein schrecklich Evangelium*, he goes on. What makes this Gospel *schrecklich*? Why does the lighted banquet hall have as its foil the outer darkness where there is weeping and gnashing of teeth? Why do our Lord's progressing banners leave behind them the bodies of men lying on the streets of their burnt and ruined city?

Nothing is so sure, so wholly sure, so surely sure as God in the giving of His grace. Nothing is so unsure, so fearfully precarious, as our hold upon that grace. Therefore the whole New Testament is filled with faith and fear, with jubilation and trembling, because of this dark mystery of our manhood, the mystery whereof the prophet spoke: "Wherefore do ye spend money for that which is not bread?" We all know, theoretically, that "there is none good but one, that is God." And yet we decide, practically, that some pelting farm or some mincing merchandise is better than that good, that is, right now at least, *pro tem*. And so we "make light" of the inviting God, despise His invitation, and do away with His messengers. That despised and desecrated grace becomes a treasury of wrath against the day of wrath and the righteous judgment of God.

Our Lord speaks also of another, subtler form of making light of God's inviting grace when He speaks of the man who came to the wedding but came without the wedding garment. We all know, theoretically and in general, that God's grace is not a something, is not a bucket of paint in a corner that we can use from time to time to make our black fences white. We know that the king's grace is a personal grace, one that has both enriched us *and* claimed us. We know that the high majesty of God is in that grace, in fact, *is* that grace. And we know that we not only have that grace: We live by it, must live by it if we are to live at all. But for practical purposes and for the time being we live as

if (that diabolical "as if"), as if that grace were separable from God, as if we could hear the Word that proceedeth from the mouth of God and not live by it, as if we could pray half of the Fifth Petition. And so we take our chances on appearing at God's banquet in a robe of our own wearing, in a tissue of lies. We take our chances on hearing that terrible word, "*Friend*, how camest thou hither?"

The royal banners forward go. This is not a parade that we may watch. The banners summon us, God's sons, God's workmen, God's guests. We have the fearful freedom, the freedom to evade, to rebel, to despise. But no; we do not really have it. The Son has set us free from that fatal freedom; He has set us free for God.

MARTIN H. FRANZMANN

POPULATION PROBLEMS

Why all this furor about expanding populations? Why the sudden concern for what has been called the prevalence of people? Have not populations been growing throughout recorded history?

The last statement is true, of course. At the beginning of the Christian era, it is estimated, the world had a population of between 200 and 300 million. By 1650 this number had increased to 500 million. In 1950 the world's population was estimated to be about two and one-half billion. Today it is estimated that the total world population has increased to about two and three-quarters billion.

There are two things which give concern to demographers. The first of these is the increase in absolute numbers. The second is the increase in the rate of population growth.

That there has been an increase in absolute numbers is apparent from the figures cited above. Studies indicate that there has also been an increase in the rate of population growth. Over the past three centuries the rate of population growth averaged about

0.5 per cent a year. During the first 100 years of this period the annual rate was about 0.3 per cent. Between 1900 and 1950 the percentage growth was about 0.9 per cent. Since World War II the rate of population increase has risen to about 1.7 per cent a year. At the rate of world population increase for the period from 1800 to 1850 the present population would double in about 135 years. At the 1900 to 1950 rate it would double in 67 years. But at the present post-war rate it will double in only 42 years.

But there are still other considerations which give concern. The United Nations estimates that between 1950 and 1975 the average annual percentage of increase may, on the basis of a "medium" increase, be 2.1 per cent and between 1975 and the year 2000 almost 2.6 per cent. Such rates of increase will double the population in 33 and 27 years, respectively. On this basis the world's population is expected to be about 3.8 billion by 1975 and 6.3 billion by the year 2000.

Between 1950 and 1975 the United Nations estimates that the population of North America will grow yearly by about 1.7 per cent and that of Europe by about 1.2 per cent. During the same period the population of Asia is expected to grow at an average annual rate of 2.4 per cent; that of Africa by about 2.1 per cent and that of Latin America by about 3.4 per cent. Between 1975 and the year 2000 the rate of increase for North America is expected to decrease to about 1.2 per cent a year and that for Europe to about 1.0 per cent a year. But the annual rate for Asia is expected to increase to about 3.0 per cent, that of Africa to about 2.8 per cent, and that for Latin America to about 3.8 per cent.

Projection of the post-World War II rate of increase gives a population of one person per square foot of land surface of the earth in less than 800 years. It gives a popula-

tion of 50 billions (the highest estimate of the population-carrying capacity of the globe ever calculated by responsible scholars) in less than 200 years. This estimate is based on the assumption that developments in the utilization of solar and nuclear energy will produce energy at a cost so low that it will be feasible to obtain everything that we need from raw sea and air and that men will be satisfied to subsist largely on products from algae farms and yeast factories.

Over the short run, the remaining years of the 20th century, world populations will no doubt be confined to manageable numbers. There is no problem of exhausting the space on the globe, nor is there reason to fear serious decreases in world per capita food supply. This latter is evidenced by projections of the Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations. However, there is good reason to be pessimistic about the possibility of greatly increasing the world's standard of living during this period. In 1950 world per capita income was estimated at \$223. In North America per capita income was \$1,100. To bring the world per capita income by 1975 to the level enjoyed in North America in 1950 would require about a 7.5-fold increase of the 1950 level in 25 years. To do the same by 2000 would require a 12-fold increase in the 1950 world income within 50 years. Such considerations show the weakness of the argument that a solution to the population problem is to be found in a more equitable distribution of the world's food supply or of goods and services in general. The miserably low level of living of most of the world's population is attributable not so much to maldistribution as to low aggregate product, the result of low productivity of most of the world's peoples.

North America in 1950, with about 16 per cent of the earth's land surface, contained less than 9 per cent of the world's population but had about 43 per cent of the world's income. Asia, by way of contrast, with 18

per cent of the world's land surface had 55 per cent of the world's population but only 12 per cent of the world's income. Per capita income in Asia was at a level of about \$50 a year. The major factor underlying this difference is indicated by the contrast in the difference in nonhuman energy consumed in North America and in Asia respectively. In North America over 10,000 kilowatt hours per capita in a year is consumed, while Asia consumes only 300 kilowatt hours per capita in a year. The availability of nonhuman energy for the production of goods and services is probably the best single measure available of differences in capital investment, know-how, and technology. These account for the great differences in productivity and consequently in the size of the aggregate product available for distribution. Much of the progress of Western civilization has been progress in harnessing these various nonhuman energy sources. Beginning with the Industrial Revolution, the power of coal, natural gas, and petroleum has been harnessed. At the present time much research is going into the harnessing of nuclear and solar energy.

The differences in the levels of living are in general inversely related to present and prospective rates of population increase. As we have indicated above, populations of the relatively underdeveloped continents of the world are increasing at a more rapid rate than those of the economically advanced countries. This rapid increase in world population imposes a severe burden on efforts to raise standards of living. Asia, merely to maintain her present low level of living, must increase her aggregate product by 60 per cent between 1960 and 1975, and by an additional 75 per cent between 1975 and 2000. To raise her per capita income to the European level for 1950 while continuing to experience a rapid population growth, Asia would have to increase her 1950 aggregate income 12-fold by 1975 and 21-fold by

2000. To do the same, Africa must increase her aggregate income 8-fold by 1975 and 13-fold by 2000. Latin America will have to increase her aggregate income 4-fold by 1975 and 8-fold by 2000. To achieve a per capita income equal to that of North America in 1950 while experiencing the projected population growth, Asia would have to increase her aggregate income 35-fold by 1975 and 62-fold by 2000. Africa to achieve the same goal would require a 22-fold and 38-fold increase, and Latin America a 12-fold and 23-fold increase.*

Still another problem is the increasing concentration of populations in underdeveloped areas in urban places. In more advanced countries urbanization during the first half of this century was due chiefly to technological advance and to a high standard of living. It was a symbol of man's mastery over nature. In the underdeveloped nations, however, urbanization represents a transfer of rural poverty from an overpopulated countryside to a mass urban setting. In the economically underdeveloped areas of the world urbanization is outpacing economic development and the city is more a symbol of mass misery and political instability than of man's conquest of nature. While the nations of Asia are attempting to improve their miserable urban living conditions, their urban population will continue to increase explosively. Perhaps it will triple within a period of less than one generation.

What has brought about this tremendous increase in world populations? Why is it that the rate of population increase continues to accelerate? The reason is to be seen in the substantial decrease in the death rate. It does not appear that the birth rate itself is increasing substantially. It is remaining about the same as it was at the time when the average life expectancy was only 25 or

* For additional statistics and a more exhaustive treatment of the subject see *Science* 131:1641—7.

30 years. Rather it is the increase in life expectancy that has brought about the tremendous increase in populations. This increase has occurred even in those countries which do not achieve the 68.5 years of average life expectancy we know in the United States. Even a relatively small increase in life expectancy in underdeveloped countries increases the population substantially. There are only three ways to decrease populations: (1) by increasing the death rate, (2) by decreasing the birth rate, and (3) by some combination of the two.

These facts regarding increasing populations pose a great many problems for those of us who must live out our lives during the remaining years of the century. There is no question but that they play a part in the present ideological struggle between East and West. The underdeveloped countries are essentially "have not" countries. Inevitably they are jealous of the "have" nations. These latter not only have the greatest resources at present but are likely to continue to have greater resources than the underdeveloped countries. The tremendous population increases in the underdeveloped nations of the world lead to a great deal of pessimism as to their possibility of raising their standard of living substantially. Certainly, efforts of these underdeveloped countries to bring population into balance with available resources

ought to be encouraged. God commanded the father of us all to rule over the earth and subdue it. Those who are poorly fed, ill housed, and inadequately clothed are in no position to exercise this rule.

Moreover, we ought to do all that we can to assist these people in solving their problems. We must be careful not to do this by insisting that the American way is always the best way. It is a fact that China is able to support its population on much less land than we need for a mere subsistence level. The Chinese could not afford to adopt our American agricultural methods, good as they are. To do so would result in mass starvation.

There is also a tremendous mission challenge in these expanding populations. To these people the Gospel of Christ must be brought. We need to redouble our mission efforts, for we are living in the time when Christianity is becoming more and more a minority religion.

The best minds of our society will have to wrestle with this problem of expanding population. We do not have a population problem in the United States at the present time. But it is possible that one day we shall have one. We need to do all that we can to increase our productivity, and we need to share this productivity and the know-how which produces it with underdeveloped nations of the world.

JOHN W. KLOTZ

LUTHERAN AND PROTESTANT ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

North America, 1960—1961

<i>Lutheran Synods</i>	Year	Schools	Teachers	Enrollment
The Lutheran Church — Missouri Synod	1960	1,293	5,319	149,201
Wisconsin Evangelical Lutheran Synod	1960	218	795	24,082
Synod of Evangelical Lutheran Churches (Slovak)	1958	2	5	155
Evangelical Lutheran Synod (Norwegian)	1959	14	18	420
Total, Synodical Conference		1,527	6,137	174,858
The American Lutheran Church	1960	48	233	5,104
Augustana Lutheran Church	1960	2	15	290
National Evangelical Lutheran Church	1960	1	2	50
United Lutheran Church in America	1960	9	69	1,157
Non-Synodical Conference Lutherans		60	319	6,601
Total, All Lutheran Bodies		1,587	6,456	181,459

Protestant Denominations

National Union of Christian Schools	1960	206	1,400	39,554
National Association of Christian Schools	1960	146	856	14,845
Seventh-day Adventists	1960	1,046	2,347	43,715
Mennonite Christian Day Schools	1959	153	—	7,568
Los Angeles Baptist City Mission Society	1960	22	140	3,248
Southern Baptist Convention	1959	56	165	3,485
Protestant Episcopal Church	1960	384	—	—
Religious Society of Friends	1959	38	—	5,436
Presbyterian Church, U. S.	Small number of schools			
Total, Protestant Denominations		2,051		117,851
Total, Lutheran and Protestant Schools		3,638		299,310*

* Plus enrollment in 384 Protestant Episcopal schools and a small number of Presbyterian schools for which statistics were not available.

LUTHERAN AND PROTESTANT HIGH SCHOOLS

<i>High Schools, Lutheran Synods</i>	Year	Schools	Teachers	Enrollment
The Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod	1960	19*	425	8,972
Wisconsin Evangelical Lutheran Synod	1960	8*	97	1,866
Total		26*	522	10,838

* One school is maintained jointly by the Missouri and Wisconsin Synods for a net total of 26 schools. The school is credited to each group except in the net total of 26 schools. Each group is credited with its share of the enrollment.

High Schools, Protestant Denominations

National Union of Christian Schools	1960	27	351	17,756
Seventh-day Adventists	1960	250	786	6,539
National Association of Christian Schools	1960	34	219	3,562
Religious Society of Friends	1959	24	—	5,567
Mennonite	1959	7	—	1,325
Total		342		34,749

*Boarding High Schools Connected with Colleges
for Ministerial and Teacher Training*

The Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod	1960	10	—	1,393
Wisconsin Evangelical Lutheran Synod	1960	4	79	915
Total		14		2,308

Boarding Academies for General Education

Seventh-day Adventists	1960	50	584	10,048
National Association of Christian Schools	1960	21	193	1,830
Protestant Episcopal Church	1960	93	—	—
		164		11,878*
Total, all Lutheran and Protestant High Schools		546	—	59,773

* Plus the enrollment in 93 Protestant Episcopal schools.

WM. A. KRAMER, *Secretary of Schools*

1960 ELEMENTARY SCHOOL STATISTICS

The Lutheran Church — Missouri Synod

<i>North America Only</i>	1959	1960	Net Gain	Net Loss
Number of Schools	1,284	1,293	9	
Enrollment	144,240	149,201	4,961	
Men Teachers:				
Graduates, Teachers Colleges or Colloquized Students, Mo. Synod Teachers Colleges	1,909	1,973	64	
Students and Graduates, Other Luth. Colleges	105	85	—	20
Other Men Teachers	60	51	—	9
Pastors Teaching	64	76	12	
	14	16	2	
Total — Men Teachers	2,152	2,201	49	
Women Teachers:				
Graduates, Synodical Conf. Teachers Colleges	489	568	79	
Students, Mo. Synod Teachers Colleges	368	352	—	16
Students and Graduates, Other Luth. Colleges	580	601	21	
Other Women Teachers	1,342	1,504	162	
Emergency Teachers	110	92	—	18
Total — Women Teachers	2,889	3,117	228	
Total Men and Women Teachers	5,041	5,318	277	

<i>South America Only</i>	1959	1960	Loss *
Number of Schools	151	120	31
Enrollment	7,860	7,043	817
Number of Teachers	225	222	3

<i>Total Statistics for the Synod</i>	North America	South America	Total	Net Gain	Net Loss
Number of Schools	1,293	120	1,413		22 *
Enrollment	149,201	7,043	156,244	4,144	
Men Teachers	2,201	137	2,338	35	
Women Teachers	3,117	85	3,202	239	
Total Teachers	5,318	222	5,540	274	

* Previous Brazil figures included some part-time agencies which were not really parochial schools. Their elimination from the statistics resulted in the seeming losses. The "losses" therefore merely represent more accurate statistics.

NOTE: The statistics are 100% complete.

WM. A. KRAMER, *Secretary of Schools*

1960 ELEMENTARY SCHOOL STATISTICS BY DISTRICTS

North America Only

Teachers

Districts	Schools		Enrollment		Teachers					
	Schools	G/L	Enrollment	G/L	Men	G/L	Women	G/L	Total	G/L
Alta.-British Col.	6	—	239	+ 21	2	— 1	7	—	9	— 1
Atlantic	43	+ 3	6,206	+ 605	88	+ 13	152	+ 14	240	+ 27
Calif.-Nev.	39	—	3,723	+ 14	49	— 2	93	+ 15	142	+ 13
Central	107	—1	14,767	+ 175	256	+ 5	255	+ 15	511	+ 20
Central Illinois	34	—	4,028	+ 169	53	— 1	87	+ 6	140	+ 5
Colorado	25	—1	2,837	— 89	37	— 2	68	+ 4	105	+ 2
Eastern	28	+ 1	2,234	+ 215	37	— 1	50	+ 7	87	+ 6
English	33	—1	4,140	+ 272	56	— 2	102	+ 20	158	+ 18
Florida-Georgia	26	+ 2	2,525	+ 293	15	— 1	89	+ 13	104	+ 12
Iowa East	21	—	1,552	+ 46	21	— 3	37	+ 5	58	+ 2
Iowa West	23	+ 1	1,653	— 5	25	+ 3	42	—	67	+ 3
Kansas	30	—5	2,710	— 9	50	— 4	56	+ 3	106	— 1
Manitoba-Sask.	2	+ 1	45	+ 24	—	—	2	+ 1	2	+ 1
Michigan	113	+ 1	16,951	+ 474	278	+ 8	266	+ 14	544	+ 22
Minnesota	79	—	7,049	+ 81	90	+ 2	166	+ 10	256	+ 12
Montana	4	—	371	+ 19	4	—	11	+ 3	15	+ 3
North Dakota	6	—1	453	+ 16	6	— 1	12	+ 1	18	—
North Wisconsin	29	+ 1	3,822	+ 119	48	+ 10	79	+ 2	127	+ 12
Northern Illinois	109	—6	17,323	+ 245	278	+ 5	318	+ 20	596	+ 25
Northern Nebraska	31	—1	2,434	+ 98	35	— 3	53	+ 5	88	+ 2
Northwest	23	+ 1	2,000	+ 148	29	+ 3	47	+ 6	76	+ 9
Oklahoma	10	+ 1	802	+ 120	9	+ 2	18	— 1	27	+ 1
Ontario	1	—	66	— 6	2	—	1	—	3	—
South Dakota	6	—	304	— 9	5	—	10	+ 1	15	+ 1
South Wisconsin	64	+ 1	10,850	+ 387	152	+ 5	198	+ 7	350	+ 12
Southeastern	52	+ 3	4,348	+ 235	39	— 1	121	+ 13	160	+ 12
Southern	18	+ 3	1,922	+ 326	16	—	53	+ 6	69	+ 6
Southern Calif.	60	+ 8	7,253	+ 515	101	+ 3	160	+ 23	261	+ 26
Southern Ill.	30	—1	3,052	+ 56	45	+ 2	58	+ 2	103	+ 4
Southern Nebraska	47	—	2,821	+ 135	54	+ 4	57	— 1	111	+ 3
Texas	85	—	7,849	+ 111	129	+ 3	181	+ 7	310	+ 10
Western	109	—1	12,872	+ 160	192	+ 3	268	+ 7	460	+ 10
Totals	1,293	+ 9	149,201	+ 4,961	2,201	+ 49	3,117	+ 228	5,318	+ 277

CECIL E. PIKE, *Bureau of Statistics*