

Concordia Theological Monthly

Continuing

LEHRE UND WEHRE

MAGAZIN FUER EV.-LUTH. HOMILETIK

THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY-THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY

Vol. XVI

February, 1945

No. 2

CONTENTS

	Page
The Marburg Colloquy of 1529: A Textual Study.	
George John Beto	73
Syntactical Peculiarities in Revelation. Paul M. Bretscher	95
Outlines on Gospels Adopted by Synodical Conference	106
Miscellanea	113
Theological Observer	129
Book Review	139

Ein Prediger muss nicht allein *weiden*, also dass er die Schafe unterweise, wie sie rechte Christen sollen sein, sondern auch daneben den *Wölfen wehren*, dass sie die Schafe nicht angreifen und mit falscher Lehre verfuehren und Irrtum einfuehren.

Luther

Es ist kein Ding, das die Leute mehr bei der Kirche behaelt denn die gute Predigt. — *Apologie*, Art. 24

If the trumpet give an uncertain sound, who shall prepare himself to the battle? — 1 Cor. 14:8

Published for the

Ev. Luth. Synod of Missouri, Ohio, and Other States

CONCORDIA PUBLISHING HOUSE, St. Louis 18, Mo.

PRINTED IN U. S. A.



ARCHIVES

Theological Observer

A Book Review and Its Effects.—In the October *Lutheran Outlook* a review of *Toward Lutheran Union*, by Graebner-Kretzmann, appeared over the signature of Emmer Engberg, from which we quote the following:

"In the first place, we find on page 2 this statement: 'According to Scripture this unity presupposes one thing, a feature which is *absolutely essential* to the establishment and maintenance of a God-pleasing oneness of spirit, and that is the *full agreement* (italics mine) as to the inspiration, the infallibility, and the inviolability of the Holy Scriptures. As we shall see, we are compelled by Holy Writ itself to make this a *conditio sine qua non* in all negotiations tending toward church fellowship of every kind and degree.'

"To some this insistence may seem harmless. Indeed it may appear legitimate. But the authors surely know that 'full agreement' by human beings, especially in the realms which they have indicated, one of which by their own admission involves a mysterious process (page 11), is impossible. . . .

"But this insistence takes on terrifying proportions when the writers insist on not only 'full agreement' on the inspiration, infallibility, and inviolability of Scriptures but 'full agreement' on a particular theory of inspiration, viz., verbal inspiration. One would think that such an extreme view, such an extraconfessional demand, would be open for debate; but no, it is a closed question. It is set before the Church as a demand, fully prefabricated. It has the finality of a doctor's prescription. All the 'patient' has to do is to 'take it.'

"But we must not brush aside Missouri's 'insistence on an agreement on the basis of Scripture . . . with a haughty "You can't make me sign on the dotted line!"' To so act would not only go contrary to the author's hope (page 239), it would be in bad taste. On the other hand, we must, some of us at least, reply to this insistence with a plain, firm 'We cannot sign!' And we cannot sign simply because we cannot honestly make the *theory* of verbal inspiration a *dogma*, as they do. And it follows that we cannot, as they can (page 10), make an acceptance of a different theory, no matter how much we may disagree with it, by 'leading theologians in certain sections of the Lutheran Church in America,' tantamount to an attack on the fact of inspiration itself. . . .

"The simple fact seems to be that 'Union Now' with Missouri is utterly out of the question. We are foundationally 'miles apart.' Missouri believes in the dogma of verbal inspiration. We do not! And until we can have 'agreement' on this question, any further talk of union is both unnecessary and nonsense."

This review called forth sharp protests not only from one of the authors of the book, Dr. P. E. Kretzmann, but we are happy to see, from a number of members of the American Lutheran Conference, whose letters were published in the November issue of the *Lutheran Outlook*.

Pastor E. Denef, Theresa, Wis., writes: "I am very sorry that this

denial of verbal inspiration comes from a pastor of our church body. Did he not know that the American Lutheran Church confesses verbal inspiration of the Scriptures?"

From the far West, P.F.H. Theuer, Salem, Oreg., voices his dissatisfaction with the position taken by the reviewer:

"I find it necessary to voice my thorough dissent and protest to the implications contained in the review of the book *Toward Lutheran Union*, by Emmer Engberg in the October issue of the *Outlook*. Especially so when he seems to imply that all other Lutherans outside of Missouri stand with him in his vehement opposition to the Biblical doctrine of verbal inspiration of the Scriptures. He apparently is totally ignorant of the fact that at least one other large Lutheran synod, and that a member of the American Lutheran Conference, is in complete agreement with Missouri on this *Lutheran* doctrine, viz., the American Lutheran Church. . . . When, therefore, Pastor Engberg says in conclusion to his review: 'Missouri believes in the dogma of verbal inspiration. We do not!' then there are those of us, myself definitely included, who must protest against this all-inclusive 'we,' for we do believe it as a fundamental doctrine of God's Holy Word and therefore basic to all other Scriptural teachings, and we shall stand by this Biblical doctrine with all our heart's faith and strength. And then it is a sad fact that 'we are foundationally "miles apart"' even within the American Lutheran Conference."

Dr. P. Buehring of the Ev. Lutheran Theological Seminary expresses himself in this manner:

"Since the *Lutheran Outlook*, according to its masthead, is the 'Official Organ of the American Lutheran Conference,' I as a member of that Conference must register my dissent from the views expressed by Emmer Engberg in his review of the book *Toward Lutheran Union* in the October issue of the *Outlook*, more particularly the categorical statement in his last paragraph, 'Missouri believes in the dogma of verbal inspiration. *We do not!*' (Italics mine.) . . . If the reviewer thinks he is speaking for 'most of non-Missouri Lutheranism' in America when he says so categorically, 'We do not!' he is badly mistaken. On the contrary, the doctrine (not 'theory') of verbal inspiration is today the official dogma of the vast majority of Lutherans in America. The American Lutheran Church confesses it in its constitution, as well as in its *Declaration* of 1938 and in the Pittsburgh Agreement, which it ratified in 1940. The United Lutheran Church in America ratified this Agreement in the same year, hence it is only fair to assume that this doctrine is officially held by that church body. When the American Lutheran Conference was organized in 1930, there was full agreement among the representatives of the five participating church bodies on this important question; certainly the commissioners of the American Lutheran Church heard of no disagreement, or they would never have voted in favor of the organization. . . . Clearly, then, the burden of proof rests upon those who at this time want us to depart from the well-established historic position of American Lutheranism. If the reviewer of *Toward Lutheran Union* is one of these, let him present his arguments; but let him not assume that he is speaking for any appreciable

number of Lutherans in America when he declares so emphatically, 'We do not!' And let not the readers of the *Lutheran Outlook* mistake the opinion of one man for the official position of the American Lutheran Conference."

Another voice from the West, P. Mikkel Lono, Parkland, Wash.:

"I was startled by this statement: 'Missouri believes in the dogma of verbal inspiration. We do not!' . . . The undersigned holds no brief for Missouri. He finds it difficult for several reasons to feel at one with them, and especially does he find it difficult to consider of small importance their heresy concerning prayer fellowship. But he agrees with Missouri that there can be no Lutheran unity except on the basis of the doctrine of verbal inspiration. . . . If we should be compelled to conclude from the review in question that any group within the Lutheran Church believes that God the Holy Spirit has not inspired the words of our Bible, and that therefore they are not God's words we read there, then it is not only a question of unity with Missouri. There would then be no unity within the rest of Lutheranism in America, and the sooner we quit pretending the better. God grant that this is not so." T. L.

The Lutheran Hour a Mighty Missionary Force. — It is an amazing story of growth and progress which "Bringing Christ to the Nations" (a bulletin whose secondary title is "The Lutheran Hour News") tells its readers. One is impressed especially with the reports pertaining to South America and Central America. The Lutheran Hour, as letters evidence, has been listened to in Chile, Argentina, Uruguay, Paraguay, Peru, Colombia, Brazil, Venezuela, Ecuador, British and Dutch Guiana, and in Nicaragua, Honduras, El Salvador, and Guatemala. Among the West Indies, Cuba, Puerto Rico, and the Dominican Republic are represented in this bulletin. Correspondence from Mexico shows that that country has been penetrated, although no station in its borders is permitted to broadcast the Lutheran Hour. The work in the countries south of us is done in Spanish, Portuguese, and English. The progress of the Lutheran Hour is all the more remarkable when one considers that in our country the time for broadcasting has been restricted and only half an hour is granted on the Mutual network and, at that, not at a very favorable time, 11:30 A. M. Sunday mornings (CST). When in addition to this we consider that no appeal for funds is any longer permissible, the forward march of the station is something which one may well describe as extraordinary. May God continue to bless this grand effort for the spreading of the Gospel both in our land and abroad. A.

Lutheran Statistics. — The *National Lutheran Council News Bulletin* submits a compilation of figures in which the statistics of 1942 pertaining to all Lutheran general bodies in the United States and Canada are compared with those of 1943. We reprint here some of the main items.

The number of confirmed members increased from 3,635,588 to 3,713,102 (2.13%); the number of baptized members increased from 5,116,807 to 5,277,128 (3.13%); the number of ministers increased from 13,332 to 13,593 (1.95%); the number of congregations increased from 16,955 to 17,139 (1.07%). The size of "average" congregation increased from 302 to 308 (2%). The number of schools (Sunday schools, parochial

schools, vacation and weekday Bible schools) decreased from 25,473 to 23,035 (9.5%). The number of pupils under instruction increased from 1,856,315 to 1,871,804 (.8%). Regretting that the number of schools experienced such a sharp decrease, we are happy to see, on the other hand, that the number of pupils under instruction showed an increase, even though only a slight one. A.

"Conservative and Confessional, but Not in the Ultra Sense of the Synodical Conference."—This is the description which a reporter uses with respect to the American Lutheran Conference. His article treats of the biennial convention of the American Lutheran Conference which was held in Milwaukee, Wis., Nov. 15—17, 1944, and was published in the *Lutheran Standard* for Dec. 16. Whether the words quoted are of his own coinage or whether they are taken from a paper presented by Dr. L. M. Stavig, secretary of the Conference, is not evident—the report is characterized more by enthusiasm than by clarity—but the words in question have the reporter's approval without a doubt.

Concerning the United Lutheran Church we find that it is criticized somewhat in a statement which speaks of the American Lutheran Conference as "maintaining a virile freedom, but avoiding the extremes of the United Lutheran Church in America." A Synodical Conference member would like to know what is included in the phrase "the ultra sense of the Synodical Conference." What are the reporter and his brethren objecting to? Is it this, that the Synodical Conference insists on purity of doctrine and always maintains that you cannot be for and against a certain principle at the same time? Is it the Synodical Conference's teaching that the Bible is inerrant and its refusal to establish church fellowship with those who will not grant such perfection to our sacred volume? Is it the Synodical Conference's insistence that everything that the Bible teaches is divine and must be binding for us? If this is what the reporter has in mind when he speaks of the "ultra sense of the Synodical Conference," we admit that we stand for the things mentioned. But is this something to be ashamed of? Is not this the position of Luther and the Lutheran confessions? If fellowship can be established only through the shattering of the foundations mentioned, then we shall rather forego the pleasures and advantages which fellowship would offer and continue to travel our way alone.

Since we are here speaking of the American Lutheran Conference, we wish to add that the officers elected for the next biennium are Dr. H. L. Yochum of Detroit, Mich., president, and three vice-presidents: the Rev. Carl J. Wilhelmsen of Racine, Wis., the Rev. John A. Houkom of Ashland, Wis., and Dr. Oscar A. Benson of Chicago, Ill.; Dr. L. M. Stavig of Sioux Falls, S. Dak., secretary; and Mr. Otto Leonardson of Minneapolis, treasurer. Its work for the Lutheran students at the various universities was turned over to the National Lutheran Council.

A resolution was adopted which recommends "that its executive committee together with its Commission on Christian Higher Education explore all the possibilities for the establishment of a Lutheran university in America, including a postgraduate school of theology."

The Overture for Lutheran Unity which was published by a committee of the Conference in the *Lutheran Outlook* about a year ago, and which we at the time declared inadequate, was adopted. A.

How Chaplains View the Work That Should be Done by the Church at Home.—“A group of Presbyterian chaplains serving with the New Zealand forces in Italy recently held a conference in Rome and discussed the problem of rehabilitation as it affects the churches. They forwarded a list of suggestions to the Church at home which include recommendations that there be more simple, practical, and positive teaching of the fundamentals of our Christian faith; active support of the ecumenical movement in a practical way; cultivation of a deeper fellowship, in individual churches, and to this end the formation of men's fellowships or clubs; care of wives and sweethearts now; more frequent observation of Holy Communion, since many men on active service have come to value weekly Communion services; training for Christian citizenship in the forefront of youth work; establishment of churches in new housing areas where many of the returned men will settle; and a form of reception into communicant membership of the church such that men will feel they are joining a church which demands the highest and best of them.” Apart from the indifference with respect to doctrine, which to some extent is reflected here, this paragraph printed in the *Christian Century* of Dec. 13, should be heeded. A.

The Biennial Session of the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America was held from Nov. 28 to 30, 1944, in the William Penn Hotel, Pittsburgh, Pa. On behalf of the *Christian Beacon* the Rev. Carl McIntire attended the meetings, and it is from his report in this paper that we take the following items. In place of Bishop Henry St. George Tucker the Federal Council elected as president Bishop G. Bromley Oxnam of the M. E. Church (Boston Area), who, by the way, is a 32d degree Mason and, as Rev. C. McIntire declares, “an outstanding Modernist and a well-known pacifist.” The new vice-president is Dr. Benjamin E. Mays, president of Morehouse College, Atlanta, Ga., the first Negro ever to be chosen for an office in the Federal Council. The Federal Council is the official spokesman for 25 Protestant denominations and claims to speak for 25,000,000 Protestants. The organization and operation of the Council was handled most smoothly by Dr. Samuel McCrea Cavert, general secretary. The Federal Council, as usually, concerned itself with many questions not directly concerning it as a church federation. But one business pertaining to its very existence was given considerable attention, namely, the applications for membership in the Council by the following five church bodies: the Russian Orthodox Church of North America, the Universalist Church of America, the General Convention of the New Jerusalem (Swedenborgians), the Church of the East and of the Assyrians, and the Czech-Moravian Brethren. The three last were rather quickly disposed of; for since they are relatively small groups, they were referred to the executive committee to consider what should be done with smaller groups, the executive committee having power to act. The application of the Universalist Church of America gave the Federal Council no little trouble.

Dr. Cavert said that there has been considerable uncertainty in the minds of the members of the executive committee as to the position of the Universalist Church today and that it was the unanimous conviction of the executive committee that the Federal Council should maintain an evangelical position in keeping with the preamble of the constitution, which speaks of Jesus Christ as "divine Lord and Savior." He also declared that the application of the Church appeared to be evangelical, but that the doctrinal information concerning it in the federal census looked "in a somewhat different direction." Many representatives spoke in favor of receiving the Universalists, but many also were negative. Finally it was resolved that the vote to be taken should be one of expediency and not one of principle. Three reasons were given for the expediency vote to keep out the Universalists: first, the threat of certain groups to leave the Federal Council; second, the rising influence and organization of the Fundamentalists; third, the unsettled conditions in the world and the need of the Federal Council to "keep its own boat from rocking." The Russian Orthodox Church was finally received as a body which is evangelical, though its anti-Protestant tenets were well-known to the Federal Council (the Mass, transubstantiation, Mariolatry, intercession of saints, prayers for the dead, etc.). Only the United Presbyterian Church voted unanimously against receiving the Russian Orthodox Church, though the Church is a sister to the Eastern Orthodox Churches which are already in the Federal Council. An editorial in the *Christian Beacon* (Dec. 7, 1944, p. 4) says: "The Federal Council cannot possibly call itself a Protestant organization any more. It cannot possibly claim to be evangelical." Another editorial, entitled "Tragedy of Federal Council," appears on the same page. The editorial says (quoted in part): "There were certain things that were emphasized and stood out in the three-day meeting of the Federal Council in Pittsburgh. First, a recognition and a realization of the awful condition that exists in the world and the Church. This fact was impressed repeatedly upon all present in many different ways. Second, an open confession of the tremendous drive being made by the Roman Catholic Church, the effectiveness of its program, the power that it is having upon Government. Speaker after speaker referred to this. Third, a tremendous emphasis upon the taking of the story and the issues of the Federal Council down to the people. The ecumenical movement, it was repeatedly said, does not exist until it exists at the crossroads and in middle-town. The great tragedy comes in its remedy. The remedy, according to the Federal Council, is the ecumenical movement, unity. But what is this unity? It is a unity that in one voice says, 'We must maintain the evangelical position,' and in another voice, 'We must take in the Russian Orthodox Church,' which teaches that salvation is by faith plus works. It is a unity which declares, 'We will not receive the Universalist Church, but many of us are universalists in our beliefs.' It is a unity which must base its actions upon a least common denominator of all blends of views. This is the tragedy. . . . The remedy for the perilous conditions in which we are finding ourselves is not the ecumenical movement. It is the blessing and favor of God upon the simple message of individual, personal regeneration by faith in the

shed blood of Jesus Christ. Much talk about 'the Christian faith,' much talk about serving Jesus Christ, was heard; but it means little in the presence of such gross denials of the truth of God's infallible Word."

J. T. M.

Progressive Education at Columbia University. — *The Calvin Forum* (August–September, 1944) comments very earnestly on the remarks of Columnist Paul Mallon, whose articles appear in papers and magazines with a certified circulation of at least 12,000,000, on the "progressive education theories" of the National Progressive Education Association at the Teachers College, Columbia University, New York. Mr. Mallon, among other things, said: "There was spawned and propagated the theory that a child should be given full, uninhibited expression of his impulses, and there the whole story of education was geared to this free expression."

The Calvin Forum, in describing this theory, writes: "Practically this system of education calls for the removal of all restraints. Don't insist on hard work. Don't be stern in discipline. Better yet, have no discipline at all. Don't guide and direct the child's educational tendencies. Discover them and make it easy for him to grow without any hindrances. Let there be freedom. Trust nature to take the child upward and onward toward the state of 'culturedness.' To flunk him means to give him an inferiority complex. To make him work is to stunt his growth. To discipline him is to make him shy or, what is worse, rebellious. How strikingly in contrast all this is with the educational injunctions which sparkle like so many gems throughout the Scriptures!" In conclusion the *Forum* writes: "What have been the obvious fruits of such a program of education? Juvenile difficulties have increased at an alarming rate. The deficiency in scholarship, as revealed by the Army and Navy tests, is shocking. That should have a sobering effect upon the progressive-education enthusiasts. Adult delinquency is, perhaps, a fruit of this kind of education that is too easily overlooked. The disintegrating forces can be seen in the field of business, where men are not too much concerned about 'black markets' and other illegal transfers of commodities; in the realm of politics, where we condone without protest the reprehensible conduct of our representatives and take the breaking of their promises as a matter of course; and in the kingdom of social living, where there is no righteous indignation against cheapness, sloth, dishonesty, and immorality. That is the temper of our age, and this temper is the product of the educational forces that have been molding this generation."

No wonder that just now conservative forces in Calvinistic circles are planning a Christian university at Philadelphia, where the fundamentals of Christianity are to be applied to every sphere of education. *The Lutheran Companion* (Nov. 8, 1944), in an excellent editorial, has taken notice of the progressive-education movement and reports that Dr. Butler, in an address at the opening of Columbia's 191st academic year, has so inveighed against the Progressive Education Association that, embarrassed by a storm of criticism coming from all parts of the country, it felt constrained to change its name to the American Education Fellow-

ship, without, however, giving up its theory; for in a proclamation it branded as "enemies of good education" all those who are "crying mightily for discipline, facts, and skills, the three R's, emphasis on the learning of the past." The *Companion* expresses the hope that "the Fellowship will undoubtedly find Dr. Butler an antagonist who must be reckoned with."

J. T. M.

Reorganization of "German Evangelical" Church Considered.—The *Religious News Service* informs its patrons that German Evangelical Church leaders "have drafted far-reaching plans for active co-operation with religious bodies in other countries for participation of churches in the re-education of the German people." There is something mysterious about this information. How German leaders could meet and draw up plans whose execution presupposes the overthrow of the Nazis, it is hard to explain. According to the information given, the leaders think of creating the office of archbishop for the whole Protestant Church in Germany. Under him there will be six bureaus, one of which will handle foreign affairs. One objective of the whole undertaking will be to make the German people more church-minded and to regain the youth for the work of the Church. Our readers are warned not to put too much credence in reports of this nature.

A.

The Power of the Roman Press Examined.—Whoever is unwilling to believe that the Roman Catholic hierarchy wields strong influence in our country and asserts itself in the political and other nonreligious fields had better read the article by Harold E. Fey, field editor of the *Christian Century*, which, under the heading "Catholicism and the Press," appeared in the Dec. 13 issue of that journal. These are the opening paragraphs of the article:

"Most newspapers maintain a strict silence on questions which might adversely affect their relations with the Roman Catholic Church. This is so common an occurrence that when a newspaper breaks the unwritten rule, *Time* considers it news. Such an incident was reported in its issue of October 23, 1944. A few weeks previously the *San Francisco News* printed a news item saying that a Roman Catholic priest with a woman companion had pleaded guilty in a Madera, Calif., court to drunken driving. In spite of two attempts by the office of Archbishop John J. Mitty to get the *News* to kill the story, it appeared, as did a later report that the priest had paid a fine of \$250. The result was an organized boycott by the Roman Catholic Church against the paper which had dared to print the item. Archbishop Mitty took the lead in this attempt to discipline what he called a 'bigoted' and 'antagonistic' paper.

"This incident is typical. It reveals clearly that the Catholic Church values a subservient press far more than it prizes the freedom of the fourth estate. Archbishop Mitty stands at the very center of Catholic life in America. He is a member of the board of ten archbishops and bishops who administer the affairs of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, the national organization through which the American hierarchy works to win this nation to the Roman Catholic faith. In acting as he did to punish the San Francisco newspaper, Archbishop

Mitty served notice, if notice were needed, that journalistic freedom will go the way it has gone in all Catholic nations if the hierarchy wins dominance in America.

"Only a few newspaper editors have the courage of the editor of the *San Francisco News*. The majority mistakenly believe that if they handle the Roman Catholic Church with gloves they can win its favor. They seem totally oblivious of the fact that the hierarchy is steadily undermining their position in American life by the development of its own press. Catholics are persistently taught that only in the Catholic press can they read the truth. Yet most newspapers do what all the papers of San Francisco but one did in the case reported by *Time*. Thus they leave to Protestant papers a whole sector in the defense of freedom of the press even though their own future is also involved."

In the body of his article Mr. Fey submits much pertinent information. "The 1942 edition of the *Catholic Press Directory* lists 332 church publications with a total circulation of 8,925,665." "The backbone of the Catholic press is the diocesan weekly. Many of these weeklies are standard eight-column newspapers in size. They are usually edited by competent journalists and accurately reflect the attitude of the bishop of the diocese." "Several devices are used by the hierarchy to develop and extend its national press. . . . By all standards the most effective agency has been the press department of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, which has now been in existence for more than two decades. . . . From the beginning it has been staffed by the most competent available Catholic journalists, men and women, many of whom have had experience on some of the greatest newspapers in the country. . . . By radio, telegraph, long-distance telephone, and air mail it collects news from all parts of the planet. In its spacious offices in Washington this news is translated, evaluated, and put into good newspaper form as efficiently and intelligently as it would be in the office of any of the major news-gathering agencies. There is only one difference, but that is too important to be overlooked. Every event and idea is treated from the angle which best serves the interest of the Roman Catholic Church." "There is nothing surprising in the fact that this workmanlike approach to building a Catholic press is increasingly successful. The Catholic press is being fed, and it is growing. The hierarchy has provided this nurture through the National Catholic Welfare Conference. This press office also serves Catholicism abroad. . . . When one reads in a paper from south of the border an article demanding the recall of Protestant missionaries, it is wise to inquire whether the article was written in Washington." "Another device through which the American hierarchy is attempting to strengthen the Catholic press is the Catholic Press Association. This conference body annually brings hundreds of editors and publishers together. They combine to obtain general advertising for their papers, to reduce costs of publication through co-operative ventures, and to encourage Catholic writers. More than a hundred publication houses are linked in this organization."

Mr. Fey lists several Roman Catholic papers which are not under the direct control of the hierarchy: *America* (Jesuit weekly), *Commonweal* (a weekly published by a group of laymen), *Catholic World*

(a Paulist publication), *Interracial Review* (a monthly in the field of race relations). To show what the Catholic press can do, the article points to the campaign against immoral motion pictures, which, at least for a time, was quite successful. Here, of course, there was an issue in which Protestant religious papers made common cause with the Roman Catholic press.

We submit the above material to bring proof that whatever the position of Roman Catholicism may be in Europe, in the United States its power is very formidable. A.

Brief Items. — A Protestant Episcopal synodical convention in British Columbia passed this resolution: "Be it resolved that this provincial synod urges that positive action be taken through the proper authorities to insure that, should a permanent chaplaincy be maintained after the war, it can be arranged in the three departments, Anglican, Roman Catholic, and Protestant; or that in some other way the rights of all Anglican members of the forces to receive the ministrations of their own Church, at the hands of the Anglican chaplains, be carefully safeguarded." A strong anti-unionistic blast.

Pearl Buck in Chicago said on the Chinese: "The Chinese are not primarily a religious people, just as we are not. The great opportunity for Christian missions, therefore, is to send missionaries who can co-operate with Chinese leaders. This means the sending of a new type of missionary. A Christian strategy based on dogmatic divisions will not do. The Western practicality which has spent itself so largely in reducing Eastern mysticism to hard mechanical dogmas might equally well be directed to co-operative socio-religious endeavor. Then it would meet the Chinese mind on common ground." In other words, preach the Gospel without the doctrine of Christ at the center.

A United Association of Evangelical Christians and Baptists has been formed in the U.S.S.R., according to the information bulletin of the Soviet embassy in Washington. The action was taken at a recent conference attended by delegates from Moscow, Leningrad, the Caucasus, Siberia, the Ukraine, Byelorussia, the Volga Valley, the Crimea, and Kazakhstan. — *Christian Century*.

Great Britain again has an archbishop of Canterbury: Dr. Geoffrey Francis Fisher, Lord Bishop of London, has been appointed to succeed the late Dr. Temple as incumbent of the highest office in the Anglican Church. The new archbishop is 57 years old and, what is surprising, held an ecclesiastical position not earlier than 1932, when he was made bishop of Chester. Prior to that he served in the educational field; he was headmaster of Repton School from 1914 to 1932. His appointment to the see of London took place in 1939. The public press states that, as far as the ecumenical movement is concerned, he agrees with the views of his predecessor.

The Church of Scotland has lost a scholarly missionary in the death of James Hair Maclean, who had studied at Glasgow, Oxford, and Jena, and for almost fifty years served as missionary in South India (Bangalore). A.