



“Meditate
upon these things;
give thyself
wholly to them;
that thy profiting
may appear unto all”

I Timothy 4:15

Journal
of
Theology

Church of the Lutheran Confession

VOLUME 12

MARCH 1972

NUMBER 1

EDITOR'S NOTE

With this volume of the Journal a long felt need is being filled, namely the need of an index. As a special supplement, a comprehensive index of all previous volumes is being sent to all subscribers. This supplement provides not only an alphabetical listing of subjects and names but also an enumeration of Scripture texts treated. Easy reference can be made to all content material since the subject index goes beyond a simple listing of the titles of articles and essays. The usefulness of it can, of course, be tested only by the one who is searching. But we are confident that a total of many man-hours, specifically study-hours, will be saved through the use of the index herewith being submitted to our readers. The compiler of this index is Pastor Clarence Hansen of Millston, Wisconsin. Our thanks to him for this painstaking work.

The attention of our readers is called to a change in the number of issues to be published each year. Instead of the five issues published per year as heretofore, the number will be reduced to four, thus making of the Journal, in effect, a Quarterly. The masthead will give all the necessary information. Chief reason for the change was the anticipated rise in postal rates which will be accelerated on a graduated scale to such a point that already some magazines have either suspended publication or restricted circulation. Rather than to ask for an increase in subscription rate the editorial staff, in consultation with the CLC administration, decided to reduce the number of issues per year. To compensate we hope to expand each issue.

RELIGION IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

When the news media on November 8 announced that the so-called prayer amendment to the U.S. Constitution had been defeated in the House of Representatives, some may have thought that the issue of prayer in the public schools would finally be dead and forgotten. This, however, is not the case. Representative Chalmers P. Wylie, who had led the fight for passage of the amendment, predicted that public demand would revive it and that the result would be different next time. It is surely significant that the vote in the House was 240 to 162, or 60%, in favor of the bill -- a mere 28 votes short of the required two-thirds majority. And while the amendment was opposed by many religious and legal groups, polls have shown that most people, by about 3 to 1, want government-run schools to include religious exercises in their daily program. Moreover, we are told that the prayer bill is still alive in the Senate. Senator Howard Baker has promised a parliamentary maneuver to assure that the amendment reaches the Senate floor later in this session. And "experts" on Capital Hill predict it may well pass.

The aim of the prayer amendment is, of course, to undo the effect of two Supreme Court rulings made in 1962 and 1963. In the case of *Engel v. Vitale*, the Court ruled that the New York Regents' prayer was unconstitutional, inasmuch as it was in effect a governmental establishment of religion. The same reasoning led the Court one year later, in two cases coming from Maryland and Pennsylvania, to declare the use of Bible reading and the Lord's Prayer to be unconstitutional. While these rulings may have reduced the involvement of public schools in certain religious practices, they did not result in a complete abandonment of the exercise of religion in these schools. The large majority of public elementary and secondary schools in our country have continued in at least the practice and performance of religious music, especially during such seasons as Christ-

mas. While the paragraphs which follow are directed specifically to this situation, the Scriptural truths which they contain would apply obviously to any public exercise of religion in government-run schools.

The principles of Holy Scripture which, we believe, are involved are three in number: the principle of religious fellowship, the principle of not taking God's name in vain, and the principle of not giving offense.

The Principle of Religious Fellowship

By "religious fellowship," we understand all manifestations of spiritual koinonia, whereby people recognize and treat each other as fellow Christians. Such fellowship would include, therefore, any form of worshipping with others or of doing church work with them. By this definition, which we believe to be Scriptural, such activities as joining in the singing of hymns or participating in common prayer would clearly involve religious fellowship.

There are two ways in which religious fellowship can come about between people who happen not to be agreed in the teachings of the Bible. Either they can agree to overlook their differences for the sake of an outward union, or they can first find unity in the teachings of the Bible and then express that unity by worshipping together. Briefly stated, the first method is union without unity, and the second is unity before union.

We realize that most people in America have adopted the first of these methods. They get together for worship without arriving at a united confession in the truths of Holy Scripture. As someone has well put it, "they agree to disagree agreeably." Thereby the teachings of the Bible are put into second place, and generally little or no attempt is made to arrive at true unity of confession.

This method, we believe, is contrary to the will of God. For in Scripture He repeatedly directs us to find unity in His Word above all else. Once that inner unity has been created, He then permits us to express it through outward religious fellowship. Scripture teaches this

principle of religious fellowship in both a positive and a negative way.

Positive:

In Acts 2:42, we are told concerning the first Christian congregation in Jerusalem: "And they continued stedfastly in the apostles' doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread, and in prayers." Continued adherence to the teachings of the apostles, which teachings we now have in the New Testament, was the basis of all their fellowship activity.

In 1 Corinthians 1:10, the Apostle Paul states emphatically that God desires perfect agreement in confession and faith among those who worship together. "Now I beseech you, brethren, by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye all speak the same thing, and that there be no divisions among you; but that ye be perfectly joined together in the same mind and in the same judgment."

So we see that the Lord wants complete unity in confession and faith among those who carry on religious fellowship. We recognize, of course, that such unity is not broken by the presence of weak brethren, who lack full understanding of the truth, but who do not publicly uphold error and are willing to be instructed from the Word of God. (Cf. Romans 14:1, 15:1f.; Galatians 6:1f.; 1 Thessalonians 5:14; and 2 Timothy 4:2.)

Negative:

In Romans 16:17, the apostle asks us not to have religious fellowship with any who teach contrary to the doctrine of Holy Scripture. "Now I beseech you, brethren, mark them which cause divisions and offences contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned; and avoid them."

1 Timothy 6:3-5 requires the same thing: "If any man teach otherwise, and consent not to wholesome words, even the words of our Lord Jesus Christ, and to the doctrine which is according to godliness . . . from such withdraw thyself."

2 Corinthians 6:14-18 bids us to come out and be

separate from any who are openly unbelieving with respect to doctrines of the Bible. "Be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers: for what fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness? and what communion hath light with darkness? ... Wherefore come out from among them, and be ye separate, saith the Lord ..."

In 2 John 9-11, we are told not to extend the greeting of Christian fellowship to any who do not abide in the teachings of Christ. "Whosoever transgresseth, and abideth not in the doctrine of Christ, hath not God. ... If there come any unto you, and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your house, neither bid him God speed: For he that biddeth him God speed is partaker of his evil deeds."

Thus the Lord asks us not to have religious fellowship with those who teach or publicly uphold error -- and this would include, not only teachers in erring church bodies, but also the laymen who by their membership in those bodies adhere to and support that error. From the strong words the Lord uses ("Avoid ... Withdraw thyself ... Come out ... Be separate ... Do not bid him God speed ..."), we know that the Lord forbids all forms of religious worship and church work where error is permitted to stand alongside the truth.

We may wonder why God insists upon unity before union. In the Bible He gives us the reason -- His holy Word, the Bible, is to be given first place in any religious worship. Where His Word is in any way denied, He Himself is thereby dishonored. Before His ascension into heaven, Christ gave His followers this mandate: "Go ye therefore, and make disciples of all nations ... Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you." Matthew 28:19f. Christ's will here is brushed aside whenever people overlook or tolerate religious error for the sake of an outward union. Again Christ says: "If ye continue in my word, then are ye my disciples indeed; And ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free." John 8:31f. Those are truly Christ's disciples who adhere faithfully to His Word! In Isaiah 66:2, the Lord God

declares: To this man will I look, even to him that is poor and of a contrite spirit, and trembleth at my word." In this day of religious indifference, how rare this kind of trembling at God's Word indeed is!

Thus unity in the confession of God's Word is a requirement for God-pleasing religious fellowship. Obviously such unity is lacking in a public school situation. The differences in faith are actually huge. Some students, for example, regard Baptism as merely a name-giving ceremony or a type of initiation into the church. Others believe that Baptism carries with it the forgiveness of sins, and is able to bring about the new birth unto eternal life. Some students suppose that only bread and wine are received by communicants in the Lord's Supper. Others trust in the words of Christ that His true body and blood are actually received in the eating and drinking. Some students regard parts of the Bible as being merely the word of man, and therefore subject to error. Others have come to the conviction that all of the Bible is God's Word, and therefore totally without error. The differences in belief among the students involve even the most important question of all -- How is a person saved? Some suppose that if a person tries to lead a good life, or if he obeys the laws of the church, then God will surely accept him. Others believe that even a man's best efforts fall short of God's just demands, and that a person can be saved only by clinging in faith to the forgiveness of sins which Christ has won for all mankind.

Because of this lack of unity in confession, we cannot in good conscience participate in any type of religious exercise in the public schools. It is not that we are against religious fellowship in itself. But we wish to have it on the one basis that the Lord desires -- unity in the teachings of the Bible! We are eager to help establish this kind of God-pleasing fellowship, and to that end we are always ready to discuss the doctrines of Holy Scripture with others.

The Principle of Not Taking God's Name in Vain

Many people will, however, assert that the singing of religious songs in the public school is not intended as religious fellowship or worship. Some may say that these songs are being used merely as entertainment or for the purpose of developing general singing ability. Others will no doubt defend the use of such songs for cultural reasons, namely, as an illustration of an important part of our religious heritage as Americans. (This latter view has, in fact, received official sanction in the State of Minnesota. On November 20, 1970, the deputy commissioner of education issued a set of "Guidelines for Christmas Observance in the Public Schools." In these guidelines it is stated: "Songs may be sung in school about Christmas, not as worship, but because they are part of the Christian heritage.")

Before considering such arguments in favor of using Christian hymns and songs in the public school, we need to understand how God would have us use His name. The Bible shows us that the term, "name of God," includes, not only such names as "God," "Lord," "Jesus Christ," or "Holy Ghost," but also every statement in Scripture in which God reveals Himself to us. (Cf. such passages as Exodus 34:5-7; John 1:18, 17:6.) In this larger sense, the name of God includes His entire revelation, the Bible itself!

We have, now, come to regard God's name as a precious treasure, which is to be used only for the highest purposes of worship. From the Bible we have learned to know God the Father as the almighty Creator and Preserver of our bodies and souls, our possessions, and all things. We have learned to know God the Son, Jesus Christ, as our Savior, who by His innocent suffering and death has paid that penalty for sin which we would otherwise have had to suffer throughout all eternity in hell, and who by His holy life has won for us a righteousness in which we even now can stand before God as His dear children. And we have learned to know God the Holy Spirit as the One who alone

can bring us to saving faith in Christ Jesus, and keep us in that faith unto eternal life in heaven.

God Himself tells us how we are to use His name. The study of passages like Psalm 50:15, Matthew 7:7, Psalm 103:1, and Psalm 118:1, shows us that we use God's name aright when we call upon it in every trouble, pray, praise, and give thanks.

The use of the name of God for such purposes as the development of singing ability or entertainment would surely go contrary to the 2nd Commandment: "Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord, thy God, in vain." And we remember the strict judgment of Scripture: "The Lord will not hold him guiltless that taketh His name in vain." Exodus 20:7.

But in spite of the above considerations, some there are who defend the use of Christian hymns and songs in the public school as a legitimate part of the study of our religious culture. The singing of "Silent Night" or "Jesu, Joy of Man's Desiring" in the schools is, they assert, no different in nature from the recitation of the religious poetry of the Greek lyricist, Pindar, or the study of the literary qualities of Milton's Paradise Lost. But can this argument be accepted as valid? When the elementary school teacher gathers her little ones about the piano to join in singing "Away in a Manger," are these students going to regard it as a mere exploration of our religious heritage, or are they going to think of it as singing to Jesus? When the high school chorus presents a concert of Christmas music, will they and their audience regard it as a wholly non-religious activity, or will they view it as part of the community's spiritual celebration of the holiday?

We must remember, also, that the content of Christian hymns and songs far surpasses all other knowledge and learning. For the Gospel is God's own saving revelation to a world of sinners, a revelation of which Paul says: "But we speak the wisdom of God in a mystery, even the hidden wisdom, which God ordained before the world unto our glory: Which none of the princes of this world knew: for had they known it, they would not have crucified

the Lord of glory. But as it is written, Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man, the things which God hath prepared for them that love him. But God hath revealed them unto us by his Spirit: for the Spirit searcheth all things, yea, the deep things of God." 1 Corinthians 2:7-10. So precious is this Word of God that the Psalmist was led to confess: "The law of thy mouth is better unto me than thousands of gold and silver." Psalm 119:72. To treat the Christian message, now, in the same fashion as secular aspects of our cultural heritage would seem to demean this message in a most horrible way. We are compelled, therefore, to affirm that the truths of Christianity are so divine, so singular, and so precious, that to use them in a non-religious fashion would involve a taking of them in vain!

A consideration of the above Scriptural principles has led us to the following conclusions. If the singing of religious songs in the public school is worship, it is forbidden by the Scriptural principle of church fellowship. If it is not worship, then it is forbidden by the principle of not taking God's name in vain.

The Principle of Not Giving Offense

One of the great problems confronting truly confessional Christian congregations is the influence of the ecumenical movement upon its members. Some of them so easily forget that the Lord desires unity in faith and confession as the only proper basis for religious fellowship. And therefore when they leave town and settle in some other community they sometimes involve themselves in the worship of false-teaching churches. This is indeed a serious thing. Not only do they thereby disobey the will of the Lord, but they also expose themselves to the dangerous leaven of religious error.

Surely one of our chief tasks, therefore, is to help our children become more sensitive to the fact that the Lord does not want them to join in the worship of a religiously mixed group. Is there not a grave danger that when

they sing religious songs in a public-school classroom this sensitivity to the Lord's will can be broken down? For here they are singing the praise of God with people of widely different religious beliefs.

Is it not possible, then, that we can give offense to our children by permitting them to sing spiritual songs in a religiously mixed group; namely, by breaking down their sensitivity for the Scriptural principle of "unity before union"? If they become accustomed to singing praise to God with people of other faiths in the public school, won't they be inclined to do the same elsewhere? Let us remember Christ's warning about giving offense to children: "Whoso shall offend one of these little ones which believe in me, it were better for him that a millstone were hanged about his neck, and that he were drowned in the depth of the sea." Matthew 18:6.

What will be the effect if, on the other hand, we ask the school to excuse our children from any type of religious observance? We will then have a wonderful opportunity to help establish them in the Lord's will that we are to have our worship only with those with whom we are agreed in confession and faith. How valuable this lesson will surely be when they leave our homes and go out into the world. For it could then warn them away from a false fellowship which could endanger their soul's salvation!

But a second kind of offense could be given by any participation in religious activity where there is not agreement in doctrine. It is very probable that many in the community who see the public school children sing Christmas songs together will regard it as a wonderful display of Christian "brotherhood." Would we want to further such a false impression by letting our own families join in the practice? It is when we take exception to the practice that we especially have an opportunity to testify to the seriousness of all religious error and the importance of true unity in Scripture as the only God-pleasing basis for religious fellowship!

There are many public school children in congregations of our church body who have found it necessary as a

matter of conscience to absent themselves from the classrooms or assemblies because religious songs are being practiced or performed. While it is true that they could thereby incur the ridicule of classmates, yet they are learning the vital lesson that a Christian will often have to be different from the world if he follows his Savior's Word faithfully and consistently. After all, the Bible says: "All that will live godly in Christ Jesus shall suffer persecution." 2 Timothy 3:12.

"Oh, that the Lord would guide my ways
To keep His statutes still!
Oh, that my God would grant me grace
To know and do His will!

"Make me to walk in Thy commands --
'Tis a delightful road --
Nor let my head or heart or hands
Offend against my God."

C. Kuehne

The JOURNAL OF THEOLOGY is published at Eau Claire, Wisconsin, by authorization of the Church of the Lutheran Confession. Subscriptions: \$3.00 per year, \$5.50 for 2 years, payable in advance. The month of subscription expiration is indicated on the address label. Issues are dated: March, June, September, December.

Editor-in-chief: Prof. C.M. Gullerud, Immanuel Lutheran College, Eau Claire, Wisconsin 54701

Managing Editor: Prof. John Lau, 507 W. Grover Rd. Eau Claire, Wisconsin 54701

Contributing Editors: A. Schulz, C. Kuehne. All correspondence regarding subscriptions, renewals, and changes of address, should be directed to the Managing Editor. Correspondence regarding material printed in the Journal should be addressed to the Editor-in-Chief.

GLOBAL MISSIONS*

The undersigned has had the pleasure of reading a very informative book, published in 1971 by Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, Michigan. Title: A Global View of Christian Missions from Pentecost to the Present. Author: Dr. J. Herbert Kane, associate professor in the School of World Mission, Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, Deerfield, Illinois. 590 pages, including a lengthy Bibliography and Index. Price: \$8.95.

The reader can readily ascertain from the title itself that the author has undertaken a most ambitious project. He acknowledges in the Preface that "it is impossible to do justice to all the hundreds of mission boards which work in the various parts of the world. Of necessity the author must be selective." We were therefore not surprised to find that our C.L.C. mission in Japan was not mentioned by name. In view of the wide scope of this book, it is hoped that the reader will indulge this reviewer if he goes into more than the usual detail, hoping that his observations (both bouquets and brickbats) will be of interest to our clergy and laymen alike. -- We noticed only 3 minor typographical errors in the entire book, on pages IX, 193, and 388.

The book consists in two main parts. Part I includes chapters on: Christianity in the Roman Empire (30-500 A.D.); Christianization of Europe (500-1200 A.D.); Encounter with Islam (600-1200 A.D.); Roman Catholic Missions (1300-1700 A.D.); Origin of Protestant Missions in Europe (1600-1800 A.D.); Origin of Protestant Missions in England and USA (1750-1850 A.D.); and Protestant Missions in North America (1620-1800 A.D.). Fine maps of the Roman Empire and Medieval Europe are included.

* Pastor Schulz's review of a book on Missions is presented here as an essay rather than as a regular-type book review, since the work presents many observations that bear on the subject of missions in general. Editor.

Part II includes sections on every country, large or small, in: South Asia, Southeast Asia, Far East, Middle East, Africa, South America, Central America, Oceania and, last but not least, Europe. Helpful maps of each of these areas are included.

I.

We address ourselves first to Part I. This reviewer feels that the author incorrectly describes the relationship between the early Christian Church and Judaism. He refers to it as a "Jewish sect," and says that "there was no clean break with Judaism" (p. 7). It is true that the Apostles were sent first to the Jews (Acts 1:8), but they did make a clean break with the doctrines of men held by the Jews. The author continues: "Christianity remained an integral part of Judaism. It took many years to develop its own theology, chart its own course, and project its own image" (p. 8). At the risk of being branded "restitution theologians," we must object to any thought of theological or doctrinal development. Such thinking is basic to "modern" theology. The Christian doctrine given to the Church by the Apostles was a finished product, complete and perfect, fixed for all times. Christ's mandate in Matt. 28:18-20 extends over the entire New Testament era to the Judgment. Those interested in pursuing this point further will find a chapter devoted to it in F. Pieper's Dogmatics, I, p. 129-134. Pieper remarks correctly: "We will engage in the business of developing the doctrine only so long and in so far as we do not yet know the Christian doctrine." Surely we would not wish to include the Apostles in that category!

We were reminded of the insistence of one of our esteemed Seminary professors when we saw the spelling used to describe the gate in Matt. 7:13-14. That gate was not "straight," as the author says (p. 15), but "strait," referring to a narrow passageway, as opposed to a wide gate.

The author says: "Strangely enough, the Jews proved to be most impervious to the Christian message"

(our emphasis). Is this really so strange, in view of Matt. 27:25? The Christian message is basically this, that Jesus of Nazareth was the long-awaited Messiah promised throughout the Old Testament. The Jews rejected that Christ when He appeared in their midst. They are only being consistent when they continue to reject the Christian message.

We cannot accept the judgment of Adolph Harnack quite as easily as the author seems to do. Harnack was a Unitarian and a teacher of Karl Barth. Attempting to explain why Christianity never took root in Jewish soil, he quotes from Harnack's Mission and Expansion of Christianity thus: "Such an injustice as that done by the Gentile church to Judaism is almost unprecedented in the annals of history... The daughter first robbed her mother, and then repudiated her." Harnack's rejection of the doctrines of Christianity obviously colored his thinking while interpreting the history of Christianity.

In discussing the character of the early Church, the author says: "In the early part of Acts we find the disciples practising a form of Christian communism..." (p. 24). We have never been able to understand why these voluntary and spontaneous expressions of Christian love in Acts 2:44 and 4:32 should in any way be compared, in the same breath, with that ungodly philosophy known in our day as communism. The early Christians did not practise communism, since in no way did they abrogate the right of private property.

The author does, however, correctly assess one characteristic of the early church, and indeed of the so-called visible church of all times, when he says: "Decline set in about the beginning of the third century and greatly accelerated during the forty years of peace from 260-300. Peace brought prosperity and prosperity proved more harmful than persecution" (p. 29).

Discussing the conversion of Constantine, the author says: "For reasons known only to himself, however, he postponed baptism until he was on his deathbed" (p. 35). One possible explanation for this may be a commonly known misconception concerning Baptism. It may

well have been his understanding that Baptism offers forgiveness only for sins committed up to the time of Baptism. He might therefore have postponed Baptism until shortly before death in order to receive forgiveness for all of his sins. This mistaken notion of Baptism is in reality the official teaching of the Roman Catholic Church. Cp. Council of Trent, Session 7, Canon 10, where the Antichrist curses the doctrine of Scripture, that through Baptism sins are forgiven for life.

We must also disagree with the author's judgment when he says: "Islam remains to this day Christianity's most dangerous rival" (p. 49). Islam is of course outside the pale of Christianity. A foe outside the wall is not nearly so dangerous as a foe within the wall. Christianity's most dangerous rival is therefore pictured in Scripture as being within the visible fold. In 2 Thess. 2 Paul describes the great Antichrist, not as being on the outside, but who "as God sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God." This chapter describes nothing other than the Papacy in Rome. This enemy within the borders of external Christendom must therefore be considered the most dangerous rival of true Christianity, for it teaches salvation by works.

In reading the discussion of early China, we found it most interesting to discover that even before the year 1700 there was a Term Controversy concerning the name to be used for "God" in Chinese. The author informs us (p. 60f.) that "later missionaries, Franciscans and Dominicans, quarreled with the Jesuits, accusing them of compromising with heathen practices in concessions they made to Confucianism. Particularly vexatious was the controversy regarding the term for God." Some 230 years later, a similar controversy took place within the Synodical Conference. The 1929 Missouri Synod Proceedings (p. 101) tells us that this "term question" had a part in causing several missionaries to retire from service. The 1932 convention referred the matter to a committee to study. This committee report is printed in the 1935 Proceedings, p. 168-176. We mention this especially for the benefit of our younger readers who

may not have been aware of this particular controversy.

The question of conversion comes into the picture in the author's discussion of Africa. In the Congo "the king, his wife, and one son all embraced Christianity and were baptized. The king's conversion proved to be superficial, however, for later on, under pressure, he returned to his former vices" (p. 69). The fact that a person returns to his former vices does not prove that his conversion was superficial. After all, the devil works hardest on those who have the true faith, 1 Pet. 5:8-9. The unbelieving world by which we are surrounded has caused many a true believer to lose his faith. Cp. Col. 4:14 and 2 Tim. 4:10. The plants which grew in the stony ground and among the thorns were not artificial, but were genuine plants, Luke 8:5-15. We remind our confirmands: "Be thou faithful unto death, and I will give thee a crown of life," Rev. 2:10.

Referring to Europe, the author states that "the Roman Catholic Church between 1500 and 1700 won more converts in the pagan world than it lost to Protestantism in Europe." In presenting reasons for this, he says: "The first, and perhaps the most potent, factor was the theology of the reformers. They taught that the Great Commission pertained only to the original apostles...." (p. 73). At this point we wondered if the author could possibly be including Luther in this blanket statement. No doubt was left in our mind as we turned the page and read: "That this negative view of world missions became orthodox Lutheranism is evident from the official document of the theological faculty of Wittenberg published in 1651 when it was asked by Count Truchsess for an interpretation of the Great Commission." (p. 74). The undersigned is not acquainted with this faculty opinion, nor does he have a copy of it on hand. But we are unwilling to allow any such faculty opinion determine for us what the orthodox Lutheran position is on mission work. And surely this is an unfair reflection on Luther's theology. Luther naturally had to establish the Gospel in its purity at home and have a ministry trained before it could spread the good news abroad. We are familiar with Luther's hymn-prayer for mission success (Hymnal No. 500). Luther him-

self wrote: "We live on earth for no other purpose than to be helpful to others.... God lets us live here in order that we may lead other people to believe, doing for them what He has done for us." (St. L. IX: 968).

It is the author's opinion that the "internecine war carried on between the Lutheran and Reformed churches" had a further enervating influence on world evangelization. The solution he offers is this: "If they had joined forces to present a united front to the common enemy, they might have done a better job with evangelism at home and missions overseas" (p. 74). We have long since lost count of the number of times we have heard that argument. But the answer in 1 Cor. 1:10 always remains the same. How can people present a "united front" if they are not united in what they teach and confess? Luther recognized a "different spirit" among the Reformed. To present a "united front" under the circumstances was impossible. -- The author has no sympathy whatsoever for those whom he refers to as "the exclusive Lutherans" (p. 74), and quotes with evident approval the words of one James H. Nichols who says of the churches of the Augsburg Confession: "Controversy over 'pure doctrine' played a larger role here perhaps than in any other period of church history, and the stage was filled with a fanatical race of scribes and pharisees abusing each other over mint, anise, and cummin." Such statements can be made only by those who regard pure doctrine to be of only minor importance. In spite of all such verbal abuse from those who do not understand, we cannot do otherwise than heed the divinely inspired words of the apostle in 1 Tim. 6: 3-5; Rom. 16:17f., and elsewhere.

The author makes reference (p. 81) to John Wesley's conversion in 1738 while attending an informal prayer meeting. We were struck by a glaring omission in connection with that meeting. No mention is made of the fact that Luther's Preface to Romans was read at that meeting. It was the Gospel as set forth in that Preface that so warmed Wesley's heart. To our way of thinking, Luther was thereby doing mission work through his writings. It is impossible to determine how many souls have been brought to the

saving faith by the Holy Spirit upon reading or hearing the Gospel as set forth in Luther's writings or hymns.

Let us make but one more comment on Part I of this book. In the early 1800's, the Congregational church in Massachusetts determined to start a mission in India. One of the original missionaries was Adoniram Judson. During the 4 month trip from Salem, Mass., to Calcutta, India, Judson changed his views on baptism and upon arrival in India was immersed by a Baptist minister. We are then told of Judson: "With characteristic honesty, Judson resigned from the Congregational Board and offered his services to the Baptists in America" (p. 88). Although we cannot agree with the views of the Baptists concerning baptism, we nevertheless recognize honesty in Judson's act of resignation. Would that today's unionists, both liberal and conservative, would at least be as honest as Judson!

II.

Part II presents up-to-date information from countries around the world. An interesting bit of information is provided concerning the Christian and Missionary Alliance, which has one missionary overseas for every 75 church members at home. This group is non-creedal, but emphasizes sanctification and divine healing. Should not we who have so much more to offer be encouraged by their example to do more for mission work? We cannot resist making a numerical comparison. If we would be supporting overseas missionaries at the same ratio as the CMA, then we of the C.L.C. would now be supporting 126 overseas missionaries.

This book brings us up-to-date on the Missouri Synod mission fields. The Church of South India is a merger of Congregational, Anglican, Methodist and Reformed bodies. Invitations have been extended to others, including the India Ev. Lutheran Church (Mo. Synod) to join the union. The author says that the Mo. Synod group "has shown an interest in the negotiations but remains hesitant to take definite

action" (p. 123). -- In connection with the Philippines, we learn: "Though the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod is not a member of the National Council of Churches here in the United States, the daughter church in the Philippines is a member of the NCC" (p. 203). -- We wonder at seemingly contradictory statements made in connection with the work in Taiwan. The author first says: "The Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod operates independently of the other seven Lutheran groups" (p. 234). But then we are told (p. 236): "In 1966 the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod in cooperation with the Taiwan Lutheran Church launched a weekly TV program called Sunday Theater...." The Taiwan Lutheran Church is a member of the Lutheran World Federation. -- The Missouri Synod began work in Mexico in 1940. According to the author, only 2 missionaries from the Missouri Synod are presently serving in Mexico. In 1968 its 9 congregations formed the "Lutheran Synod of Mexico." The author informs us: "In order to allow close relations with other Lutheran congregations in Mexico the new synod eliminated from its constitution an article on doctrinal standards" (p. 485). How sad! -- Also in New Guinea we are told that the Missouri Synod missionaries "have worked in close cooperation with other Lutherans" (p. 532). Such religious unionism can only weaken and diminish the light of the Gospel in mission fields.

The author obviously has a low regard for the International Council of Christian Churches (ICCC), a fundamentalist group. In every country he informs us of the progress of the so-called Ecumenical Movement, and deals disdainfully with those who do not join in this movement. Commenting on the internal strife within the Church of South India, he states that this was "aided and abetted" by the ICCC (p. 123). However, we are not told what principles were involved in this controversy. -- Similarly we read that the churches of Korea have been plagued by divisions, of which he says: "In one or two instances the ICCC was responsible" (p. 271). How they were responsible we are not told. -- Similar blame is placed on the ICCC in Cameroon, Central Africa (p. 350), and in Chile, So. America (p. 445).

The leader of a religious movement in Nepal, South Asia, is one Prem Pradhan, of Plymouth Brethren convictions. This former army officer is quoted by the author as having "the rather novel idea that religious freedom would be a bad thing for the infant church. The gospel spreads farther and the church grows faster, according to him, when Christians are a persecuted minority" (p. 139). This latter thought would seem to reveal a basic understanding of Christ's words to His disciples in Matthew 10.

An interesting use of radio is brought out in connection with Southeast Asia. Missionaries were evacuated from China in 1949, and in 1966 Bibles existing throughout China were destroyed by the Red Guards. Since that time a radio station in the Philippines has been broadcasting the Bible in Chinese at dictation speed, giving the people in China the opportunity to make their own Bibles (p. 203).

While discussing China, the author makes quite a revealing statement about mission fields in general: "Denominational differences which have kept the Western churches apart for centuries mean little or nothing on the mission field. Church union is, therefore, a much simpler problem there than here" (p. 219). How thankful we must be that the Japanese Christians in our fellowship do not consider denominational differences to be meaningless, but wish to put into practice our Savior's words in Matt. 28:20.

We read with particular interest the section on Japan (p. 238-261). The fastest growing cult in the country is Soka Gakkai, which is openly critical of Christianity and offers salvation here and now from sorrow, suffering, etc. A 4-day fund-raising campaign in 1965 to build a new Hall of Worship on the slopes of Mt. Fuji netted about \$100 million! -- The author is troubled at the proliferation of denominations in Japan since World War II, saying: "No Christian in his right mind can condone the scandal of such proliferation" (p. 256). Such proliferation is brought about by departure from the teachings of God's Word. We cannot condone the scandalous false teachings which bring about such proliferation. -- At the present time there are 2620 foreign missionaries of all denominations in Japan.

It came as something of a surprise to read that "the churches in Korea have been among the most conservative in the world. Certainly they have been more conservative in their theology than their mother churches in the United States" (p. 272). But then the author seems to breathe a sigh of relief as he adds: "Nevertheless the winds of change are blowing in Korea and ecumenism is on the way."

We read about Egypt with great interest. We were not surprised to hear that "for many years Islam has been taught in all public schools." But we were chagrined to read that "since 1953 the government, at its own expense, has made provision for the teaching of Christianity to Christian students" (p. 280). One can only wonder what kind of "Christianity" that might be. -- The author reminds us of a fact of history: "Before the onslaught of Islam in the seventh century most of Egypt was at least nominally Christian" (p. 283). Here was another place where the Gospel had spread its refreshing showers for a while, but when it was no longer treasured by the people, the Lord took it elsewhere.

Speaking of Israel, the author again acknowledges that "the Jews have stubbornly resisted the gospel" (p. 304). However, he says that the reason for this is not theological, but historical. "Some of the darkest pages in church history are those which record the persecution of the Jewish people. Certainly Jews have no reason to love Christians." Behind it all stands the curse which the Jews called down upon themselves, referred to earlier in this article. -- The author mentions that "in Israel today there are indications that the Jews are beginning to show an interest in Jesus." An article published 3 years ago in a Hebrew language magazine (World Vision Magazine) carried the caption: "Jesus Yes, Christianity No." We recognize, of course, that much of what goes on under the name of "Christianity" is nothing of the sort. But to separate Jesus from true Christianity would present some real problems!

In Libya, where Christianity was once very strong, we read that Christian missionaries are not permitted, so there is nothing to report. Algeria too has proved to be

stony ground, like the rest of the Muslim world.

A brief summary of the Synodical Conference work in Nigeria, West Africa, is given. Work began in 1936. The latest report indicates that there are now some 38,000 baptized members in 220 churches. This work was transferred to the Missouri Synod in 1964 following the breakup of the Synodical Conference.

The student of history would again have much to say in commenting on the author's observations concerning Cameroon, Central Africa. He says: "The Roman Catholic Church is now encouraging the reading of the Bible. In some areas the Catholics are taking the lead in distribution" (p. 352). Why are they doing this? We believe that the reason is stated on the dust jacket of a Douay Bible which the undersigned purchased 20 years ago: "The Church has granted a Special Indulgence for reading the Bible. Our Late Holy Father, Leo XIII, on the 13th day of December, 1898, granted to all the faithful who will read the Holy Gospels for a quarter of an hour each day, an Indulgence of three hundred days; and to those who follow this practice for a month, a Plenary Indulgence on any day within the month on which they approach the Sacraments and pray for the intention of His Holiness. These indulgences are applicable to the holy souls in Purgatory." It would thus appear that even while encouraging people to read the Bible, they do so for the wrong reason. Such reading becomes only another "good work" which man does to gain some favor from God.

Reviewing briefly recent political history of the Congo, the author approves of the U.N. intervention with troops. -- He is outspoken in his opposition to the present regime in Rhodesia, saying: "The Christian church in Rhodesia is on the horns of a dilemma. It finds itself at odds with a so-called Christian government that denies the Africans the right of self-determination.... To remain silent in the face of gross social injustice in order to curry favor with the government is to sell one's Christian birth-right for a mess of pottage" (p. 401f.). We would not be able to bestow such warm praise as does the author when he continues: "Be it said to the credit of the church, it is

the only organized group that has taken a strong stand against the repressive measures adopted by the government." We suggest that it would be far more appropriate for church groups to use their time and energy quietly bringing the teachings of God's Word to human hearts, thereby changing also their lives. Open opposition to the government is not Paul's directive to the Roman Christians, Rom. 13.

Since 1964 Northern Rhodesia has been known as Zambia. Zambia is referred to as "the most Christian country in Africa" (p. 403), but soon thereafter this same statement is made concerning South Africa (p. 409). This would include a large number of Roman Catholics. -- Also in South Africa the author finds himself in opposition to the government, particularly because of what he calls "racism." He laments the fact that "it is the leaders and not the members of the resistant churches who are doing battle with the government" (p. 410). How very sad to hear this statement made: "So it is left pretty much to the church leaders and ecumenical councils to oppose the government." They have no Call to do any such thing! Enumerating the ecumenical groups that have been most outspoken in their opposition to the government, he lists: the British Council of Churches, the National Council of Churches in the USA, and the World Council of Churches.

We appreciate the author's statement in regard to developments in Madagascar a century ago. "Supported by royal patronage, Christianity became the religion of the realm and people flocked in droves to the Christian banner. The church was then in greater danger from its friends than it had been from its foes" (p. 421).

In South America, Brazil is about 90% Roman Catholic. Pentecostal groups have been very active and are growing rapidly. They are presently constructing a mammoth church building in Sao Paulo which will accommodate 25,000 persons. When completed it will be the largest church building in the world. The best-known Pentecostal leader in Brazil is Manoel de Melo, who attended the Uppsala Assembly of the World Council of Churches in 1968 and said that he "felt like Ezekiel in the

valley of dry bones" (p. 432). However, in 1969 he announced his intention to apply for membership in the WCC, saying that his group needed the "social orientation" of the WCC, and the WCC needed the "evangelical emphasis" of his group. The author wonders what sort of marriage that will be, but we can predict that any Gospel still remaining will be lost in the compromise.

Of Uruguay we are told that it is the least Catholic of all the South American countries. It is, in fact, virtually a secular state, since the people are largely unchurched and without any religious convictions. -- The Roman Church claims 99% of the people of Peru. Since 1929 Roman Catholicism has been the only religion allowed to be taught in any school, public or private. The author tells us (p. 455) that Protestant parades have been permitted in the interior since 1967, but we are unfamiliar with this as a means to draw people to the Savior.

In Haiti the state religion is Roman Catholicism, the priests being supported by public funds. Here the Catholic Church has incorporated into its worship certain features of the indigenous pagan religion, known as voodooism. The author says that in Haiti "there is little to choose between voodooism and Roman Catholicism" (p. 508).

Interesting is also the section on Oceania, some 1500 islands in the southwest Pacific. Animism and ancestor worship were formerly dominant. The author says that "today some of these islands are more Christian than the so-called Christian countries of the West" (p. 520). All things considered, such a goal may not be too hard to achieve. -- In New Guinea the Methodists confess that they need more of an educated ministry, since "about 90 percent of the men employed in the circuits as pastors and evangelists are illiterate" (p. 531).

Finally, the chapter on Europe provides much food for thought. According to the author "Europe is fast becoming de-Christianized. It can no longer be regarded as a Christian continent" (p. 535). Secularism, humanism, rationalism, higher criticism, and the new morality are

named as being responsible for the downfall. Buddhists, Hindus, and Muslims are making great gains. France is described as "the most pagan country in Europe" (p. 536). "Only 5 percent of the German Lutherans and 3 percent of the Swedish Lutherans attend church on a regular basis." We are not surprised to hear the author state that in Europe "there is a growing spirit of cooperation between the Roman Catholic Church and the World Council of Churches" (p. 543).

The section on Communist Europe is enlightening as to the procedure of communism. The author says: "Sooner or later every organization and institution is required to toe the party line" (p. 548). This would include the churches. He emphasizes one fact: the communists have not changed their view of religion. "The church will be permitted to exist but not grow. It can worship but not witness. Religious services must be confined to church buildings. To hold a meeting in a private home is to invite trouble. Open-air meetings are out of the question. However, there will be no persecution. The state will not make martyrs. If certain influential leaders must be removed, it will be on trumped-up charges with a moral or political complexion. Under these conditions, so they think, the church will gradually wither and die.... The communists insist on having the children and young people under their care. Students in the schools are subjected to a relentless barrage of communist propaganda; but Christian children under 18 years of age are not permitted to receive religious instruction either in the churches or in their own homes. In the place of baptism and confirmation, Christian youth are expected to take the communist oath." That is how it has gone in the eight communist countries in Eastern Europe, besides the USSR. We can anticipate that the same general procedure would be followed in any other country taken over by communism.

In 1961 the leaders of the Russian Orthodox Church were permitted to join the World Council of Churches. Since that time, the author tells us: "its leaders have been active in the ecumenical movement. These leaders,

of course, have never been known to disagree with government policy" (p. 550). The obvious reason for this would seem to be that the religious leaders in these communist countries are themselves communists in philosophy rather than Christian. However, the author attempts to explain or excuse their lack of disagreement with the Communist government by saying: "When the issues are political and not religious, Christian leaders take the path of least resistance and support the party line" (p. 550). Yet the author favors the very opposite course in Rhodesia and South Africa, as noted earlier.

Much more could be said about this book on Global Missions. But we do not wish to weary the reader by prolonging this Review. While reading this book we were impressed by the fact that since our Savior's opening words in Matt. 24:14 have been fulfilled: "This gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world for a witness unto all nations," therefore we can also look for His closing words to be fulfilled: "and then shall the end come." When one makes a country-by-country study of the course of the Gospel on this earth, we find that no part of the earth has remained untouched at one time or another. The earth stands today only because our Lord wishes us to continue bringing the saving Gospel to others, Luke 13:8-9. In the midst of all the false ecumenism being palmed off as Christianity in countries around the world, lost sinners need what we have to offer. Let us encourage one another to ever greater zeal in doing this work which lies before us.

A. Schulz



CHAPEL ADDRESS
MICAH 1:1-8

"The word of the Lord that came to Micah ... Hear, all ye people; hearken, O earth ... and let the Lord God be witness against you ... For, behold, the Lord cometh forth out of his place, and will come down, and tread upon the high places of the earth. And the mountains shall be molten under him, and the valleys shall be cleft, as wax before the fire, and as the waters that are poured down a steep place." (Micah 1:1-4) There is a story here -- not as obvious or on the surface as Jonah's story -- of Judgment, judgment due to Israel's idolatry. Perhaps this sounds archaic to the modern reader -- so "Old-Testament," and of outdated quality. What could the modern Christian learn from God's doings with Israel back in 700 B. C. ?

The Israelites had connived with Egypt to gain a military advantage against the Assyrian push from the North. Mind you, the people of God played power politics!! The chosen heirs of Abraham forsook Jehovah's rule and kowtowed to the arrogant Egyptian so they could have some line of "defense" for their homeland. I suppose it worked. They got their help from man, having chosen whom they would have rule over them. And what did they get in return? They got an infection; a festering disease; the idolatry rampant in the heathen bloodstream of Egypt.

No wonder God aimed at the root of their problem: "For the transgression of Jacob is all this, and for the sins of the house of Israel. What is the transgression of Jacob? is it not Samaria? and what are the high places of Judah? are they not Jerusalem? Therefore I will make Samaria as an heap of the field, and as plantings of a vineyard; and I will pour down the stones thereof into the valley, and I will discover the foundations thereof. And all the graven images thereof shall be beaten to pieces, and all the hires thereof shall be burned with the fire, and all the idols thereof will

I lay desolate: for she gathered it of the hire of an harlot, and they shall return to the hire of an harlot For her wound is incurable."

Now what God had to say through Micah is as pointed as a knife. Some must have felt it pierce even to the dividing asunder of joints and marrow, and lay open the thoughts and intents of their hearts. God called it the sin of idolatry, for idolatry is forsaking Him.

But what is the point for us? There is no theocracy in Wisconsin, nor in Florida. The good old U.S. of A. is a democratic republic, a quite wonderful nation in many ways -- but it is not a theocracy. What portion of God's word to Israel speaks to us in our non-theocratic world? We find that we as a nation are pledged to economic gods quite as much as were the Israelites; we want earthly safety and national security just as fervently; we hate getting involved in wars; we cherish our natural resources and love our gross national product. We are not above cultivating international alliances and playing power politics; our world is overloaded with golden calves. So here we are, the self-made nation, the rebel colonies that made it good; and where are we as a nation before God? What has happened to genuine reverence for the true God and His Word? Men have gone to their spiritual prostitutes of Self, of Mammon, of whatever \$tuff is attractive to the flesh. Our churches multiply and become big businesses; our clergy become civil rights leaders and let the sheep starve for sustenance from the Word of Life. Is our day any exception to the pattern set by the Israelites of Micah's day? -- or of Christ's day? -- or of the time which He prophetically presented, when "because iniquity shall abound, the love of many shall wax cold"?

We don't have Micah sent by God to our generation, to tell us about our idolatry learned from Egypt, and the hand of the Assyrian about to strike us down as a nation; but then, we don't need it. We don't need to know how long God will let the current madness go on in our civilized world which heaps up to itself its pleasures; we do not need to know which nation may become the glove inside

which God's hand will punish with warfare. Will China and Russia clash? Will the U.S. and Russia be forced by power politics to smash one another? The details will differ from Micah's day; but we know all about the pattern: wars shall increase till the close of history. What is past is prologue to the main event. Coming up next is Judgment for idolatry; Judgment on the grandest scale, and punishment for moral prostitution that is becoming an unbearable stench to God. Judgment for this entire globe is next. The glove will be laid aside. No earthly power will be selected to chastise God's people, but an uncovered hand of direct divine destruction. That day is to be the world's day of reckoning, and our day of release; and amid the sorrow and chaos we shall hear the clear voice of our Shepherd-King: "Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the Kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world."

Dear Lord God, whose coming we await with longing, we thank You for having salvaged us from the idolatry of our Egypt; we praise You for Your goodness in redeeming us from the evil in us and around us. Give us a more active faith in Your promise to claim us as Your own in Christ on the Day of this world's judgment. Even so, come quickly, Lord Jesus. Amen.

Paul Koch



===== PANORAMA =====**FAL --
A NEW CHURCH BODY**

In our day and age it has become customary, for convenience's sake, to refer to civic and ecclesiastical organizations by alphabetizing their official names. Helpful as this may be, the proliferation of alphabet designations may become confusing to the uninitiated and to those who are not acquainted with the full name of the organization that is being identified. Be that as it may, this is not the time to enter upon a discussion of the merits and demerits of our widespread habit of alphabetization. What we set out to say was that a new church body has been born which is now known as FAL -- The Federation For Authentic Lutheranism. In a day when the trend among churches has been in the direction of mergers and the "submerging" of individual church bodies into larger ecclesiastical organizations, it is indeed news when a new church body is constituted as a result of separation from a larger synod. (For information we have drawn on the periodical Sola Scriptura* designated as "An International Voice of Authentic Lutheranism" and is the official organ of the Federation.) Under a general heading "Proclamation" Sola Scriptura reports in its Nov.-Dec. 1971 issue: "On All Saints Day, November 1, 1971, a group of congregations who, after having taken the last step of admonition by declaring themselves to be in a state of confessional protest for a longer or shorter period, and having witnessed publicly and conscientiously to the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod against its deviating course, organized themselves as an authentically Lutheran church

*Sola Scriptura, Box 168, New Haven, Mo. 63068. Subscription rate \$3.00. Published bi-monthly by Lutheran News, Inc. To keep the record straight the masthead says, "Editors and contributors are not responsible for Christian News."

body under the name of The Federation For Authentic Lutheranism at a constituting convention held in St. John's Lutheran Church, Libertyville, Illinois." Seven congregations (two in Illinois, two in Wisconsin, three in California) are listed as charter members. Since the constituting convention in November, two more congregations in California have joined. Since the organization of the FAL we have noticed that Missouri Synod members who are carrying on their protests within their church body are seeking more and more to demonstrate the rightness of their continuing protesting membership. Scripture certainly gives no support to such a situation where there can be no question that the issue centers not on dealing with weak brethren but with false teachers and those who support false teachers. In this instance Scripture clearly calls for separation. No reference to church fathers or church leaders can change that. This has been the position of the CLC all along ever since its inception and a consistent adherence to this distinction between weak brethren and false teachers has been a characteristic feature of its position on Church Fellowship.

Members of the constituting Convention of the FAL heard addresses by President O. J. Naumann of the Wisconsin Evangelical Lutheran Synod and by President G. Orvick of the Evangelical Lutheran Synod. In the course of his address President Naumann stated: "We have had meetings with you who have terminated your fellowship in your former church body and we thank God for the oneness of mind and heart that He permitted us to find." President Orvick told the convention: "On September 27 of this year, our doctrinal committee met with the doctrinal committee of the Board of Colloquy of the FAL and we found there a real spiritual unity. We found there a real doctrinal harmony, as it has always existed in the past between 'old Missouri' and the ELS and Wisconsin on the basis of the 'Brief Statement.' Therefore we are very pleased to declare today that there does exist this doctrinal unity between our two bodies, that we of the ELS are ready to practice that fellowship in every way that is possible; and

that our committee will recommend to the next convention of our Evangelical Lutheran Synod that the Synod itself adopt this and declare it for all the world to know." Sola Scriptura reports the hearing of the following resolution of the WELS Doctrinal Commission: "Moved that the Commission finds itself in unity of doctrine and practice with FAL as represented by its officials on the basis of FAL's confessional statements and its discussions of October 22, 1971, with FAL representatives, and that the Commission finds nothing to hinder the practice of church fellowship between WELS and the members of FAL, and that the Commission recommend to the Synod the formal declaration of such confessional agreement."

Reactions from the Lutheran Churches of the Reformation and the Concordia Lutheran Conference were not slow in coming. Their chief objection is to the position that has been taken by FAL on the doctrine of Church and Ministry. They believe that the new church body has departed from what they call the old Missouri position on Church and Ministry. This matter of Church and Ministry as it was previously discussed between the Wisconsin Synod and the Missouri Synod in the Synodical Conference has a long history. Our own CLC position has been set down in the pamphlet "Concerning Church and Ministry" which deserves to be studied by all who wish to know our stand on this question. From a cursory reading of FAL's Declaration of Faith on the doctrine of Church and Ministry we would be ready to say that basically it is saying the same thing as is set forth in our CLC pamphlet. The Declaration deserves, of course, a more careful study than we have been able to give it up to this time. There are a number of points that would need further discussion and clarification before one would be ready to accept it as a confession of faith. Just to mention one point. We quote from Sola Scriptura: "Whoever, then, faithfully applies the Word, in accordance with a freely agreed upon organizational structure conforming to the Word, and in a context of the regular use of the means of Grace, has the power of the Keys, cp. Matth. 18:19; I Cor. 14:40." Vol. II, No. 3. p.

26. We wonder if the authors of this statement would want to circumscribe the possession of the power of the keys in just this way. It is much simpler to say that every believer possesses the power of the keys and to go on from there. We know, of course, that the power resides in the Word.

Certainly the action which FAL has taken in separating from a heterodox church body is an action which God's Word directs and approves. And our prayer will be that the Lord will lead them into all truth and keep them steadfast. In the area of Church Fellowship there are a few questions that call for an answer. In the issue of Sola Scriptura quoted above we read on page 7: "At present, FAL has taken upon itself the responsibility for part of the work being carried on by Independent Lutheran Missions." Our question would be: "How does this fit into the FAL's position on Church Fellowship?" The same question could be asked about its view on the fellowship that is involved in connection with Bethesda Lutheran Home. The last issue of Sola Scriptura carries a plea for helpers under the leading sentence: "Bethesda Lutheran Home is presently seeking several employees to help carry out its ministry of love and mercy." Vol. II, No. 4, p. 19. We recall when we stood shoulder to shoulder with the Wisconsin Synod leaders in the forties and fifties calling Missouri's attention to its unionistic activities in connection with charitable endeavors carried on in conjunction with churches outside the fellowship. Over and over again it was pointed out that this also constitutes church work. Also some questions have come up regarding the policy of contributors and editors for the official FAL organ. Will the FAL include in its editorial staff such men as are still within the fellowship of a church body not affiliated with it? Perhaps these things are being adjusted and taken care of in a proper manner, but as we read the signs now these are areas which are suggesting a problem to be solved. May God's Word in every instance give the guidance, and the power and strength to follow.

C. M. G.

A
RESPONSE

These pages have not previously commented upon the pamphlet by Pastor Paul F. Nolting, entitled "'Mark ...

Avoid' -- Origin of the CLC." It seemed unnecessary to remark upon a well-written and clear presentation of the background of the doctrinal issues which have been and are the basis of the separation that exists between the Church of the Lutheran Confession (CLC), on the one hand, and the Wisconsin Evangelical Lutheran Synod (WELS) and the Evangelical Lutheran Synod (ELS), on the other. The Coordinating Council of the CLC asked Pastor Nolting to prepare the pamphlet, and its contents were later reviewed for historical and doctrinal accuracy by the Praesidium and Board of Doctrine of the CLC, and were approved. The style and rhetoric of the author are his own, of course, which means that freedom was granted to him regarding points of emphasis, arrangement of material, etc. The pamphlet was not, after all, a committee project. Within this framework Pastor Nolting's work has stood on its own merits.

What has occasioned the present reference to this pamphlet is the desire to respond to a critique of it written by Professor Glenn E. Reichwald of Bethany Lutheran College, Mankato, Minnesota (ELS), published in the Lutheran Synod Quarterly, Volume XI, Number 2. The Lutheran Synod Quarterly is the theological journal of the Evangelical Lutheran Synod and is edited by the Theological Faculty of Bethany Lutheran Seminary. In the absence of evidence to the contrary, we have assumed that this periodical speaks for the ELS and fairly represents its doctrinal stance. However, the final paragraph of Prof. Reichwald's review declares: "These comments reflect the personal thoughts of the reviewer. Others will have to read the pamphlet for themselves to see whether or not the review is an overstatement of the case." This disclaimer leaves the reader in doubt as to whether Reichwald's principles as he presents them in his review are his own, or whether he is speaking for his church body.

For it is, after all, the principles that are important. Much of Reichwald's criticism, unfortunately, has to do with the negative tone, spirit, or attitude with which he charges Nolting in his pamphlet. And it must be said that Reichwald responds with charges of his own which are rather harshly stated. For example, he calls the pamphlet "a subjective and argumentative by deductive justification for the continued existence of the CLC," and makes the judgment: "By its very inflexibility it makes the healing of past wounds most difficult. It is a justification which ignores personalities, events, time, much history, and the need for Christian charity." While objecting most strenuously to a use of rhetorical questions in the pamphlet which Reichwald finds "most annoying," he himself phrases a criticism thus: "One cannot help wondering whether or not the three hundred and fifty year old English of the King James Version has influenced Nolting's exegesis more than it should have." If Reichwald's intent was to clarify a situation in which he feels that Nolting's pamphlet "will only serve, at best, to confuse the issues and, at worst, to harden the lines of division," then he would have done well, it seems to me, to have used more moderate language. As a gentle admonition, before getting on to a discussion of the principles, let me say one thing more. Reichwald severely criticizes Nolting's presentation: "There is a certain coldness in the pamphlet, for the Gospel is really mentioned only in the very last paragraph of the tract, a strange inversion of values." I wonder if Prof. Reichwald noticed that in his discussion, which is about half as long as the pamphlet itself, he has no Gospel at all. This is not to say that we are presently faulting Prof. Reichwald for his omission of the Gospel. There are times when one is attempting to correct another that the Gospel need not be applied for the specific purpose. I believe that Reichwald could have granted the same in regard to Nolting's pamphlet.

It is difficult to understand the point that Reichwald wants to make when he criticizes Nolting's interpretation of Romans 16:17. He appears (on page 38) to be opposed to

Nolting's belief that "when one judges a person to be an errorist, the errorist must be avoided immediately."* Yet, I fail to see the point of difference he is striving for, when on the following page he (Reichwald) interprets St. Paul's words: "Since Paul obviously had no specific errorists in mind here, he was simply calling upon the Roman Christians to be in a continuous state of watchfulness against errorists. When they were recognized as such, they were to be avoided." Here Reichwald has been accusing Nolting of using "mark" in a juridical sense, as a judicial term, so that one "judges" a person to be an errorist. But it is Reichwald who has inserted the word "judge"; and it was the WELS which, perhaps, first of all, had given SKOPEIN that meaning, when in 1956 it resolved "to hold the judgment of our Saginaw resolutions in abeyance." A little more careful reading of Nolting's pamphlet reveals his statement that in the matter of identifying those who are causing divisions and offenses "doctrine is involved, not just human judgment." (Pamphlet, p. 12). Nolting speaks of an "official" marking when the observation has been made by a church body, such as occurred in 1955, for example, when the WELS publicly declared that "A church body which creates divisions and offenses by its official resolutions, policies, and practices not in accord with Scripture also becomes subject to the indictment of Romans 16:17-18. The Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod has by its official resolutions, policies, and practices created divisions and offenses both in her own body and in the entire Synodical Conference. Such divisions and offenses are of long standing." It appears to this present writer that if Reichwald wishes to find fault with the "judicial" concept, he would find far more evidence of it in official declarations of the WELS than in the pamphlet under discussion. Note, for example, the term "indictment" in the foregoing quotation. We would also call his attention to "A Report to the Protest

*This quotation is from Reichwald's article, not from Nolting's pamphlet.

Committee," by Prof. Lawrenz, c. 1957. A little more homework would have clearly revealed that this document is the source of the judicial approach, with its references throughout to judgment and even "conclusively put under judgment."

Reichwald makes so much of his explanation of SKOPEIN that one almost passes by one of the most significant things he writes. It is in regard to this very matter, in fact, that we began by questioning whether the principles Reichwald espouses here are his own or those of his church body. We are referring to his quite evident inability to understand the necessity of distinguishing between false teachers (errorists) and weak brethren. Nolting's pamphlet quite correctly points out the urgency of making such a distinction. After all, we frail humans have no way of knowing how God wants us to act in the face of an error that is expressed, unless we identify who is speaking. And so, the pamphlet speaks of patiently admonishing, instructing, the Christian who may utter an error in ignorance or confusion, a "weak brother" who is not teaching or leading others astray but is willing to be corrected by the Word of God. The situation is not the same when through discussion, perhaps through admonition, one discovers that the individual who has spoken error actually means what he has said and is at the same time attempting to gain adherents to his views and teachings. This is what is meant when Nolting writes, "In actual situations that arise admonition ordinarily precedes the 'marking,' but may be involved in the 'marking' to the extent that it is necessary to ascertain whether one is, in fact, dealing with persons who are 'causing divisions and offenses' in the church or with such as have inadvertently fallen into error."

Now, when Reichwald responds to this clear presentation by stating, "Nolting weakens his entire presentation here by allowing for admonition before a final break and also by distinguishing in the 'quality' of errorists," he is revealing either an inability or unwillingness to grasp a point which we believe to be absolutely essential in this matter. As an illustration, Reichwald states somewhat

farther along: "By distinguishing among errorists, he himself is making a value judgment as to who can be admonished and who cannot. How can he then fault others when they do the same -- so long as they ultimately break with errorists when the situation demands it." What Reichwald fails to grasp is that what is involved is the criterion used for making the "value judgment." He goes on at some length with an extremely subjective line of argumentation in which he seems to debate the alternative actions of (1) following the very first person who decides that it is time to break with an errorist, or (2) making the decision as a personal and individual matter, or (3) acting in concert with a larger group, a synod. We assume that Reichwald favors the last choice as being safer, for although synods may err, "when they are moving in a proper direction of action, it does help one to keep a proper balance." This, of course, places a smoke screen around the real issue, namely that of determining on what basis the "value judgment" (Reichwald's term) is to be made. We have stated plainly in "Concerning Church Fellowship" that it is important that "the Christian exercise great care before charging a person or groups with heresy, first determining charitably whether it was done unwittingly and inadvertently, or whether the speaker sticks to his error, which is persistence." (Par. 71). That is plain language, and we do not know why Reichwald will not accept the distinction without beclouding the issue.

Further comments could, and perhaps should, be made concerning Reichwald's criticism of Nolting's failure to use Titus 3:10-11 in illustrating the Scriptural principle in connection with the cessation of fellowship relations; as well as concerning the critique's disapproval of Nolting's "use of history." We shall, however, not enter upon such a discussion at present. This present writer was saddened by reading Prof. Reichwald's criticism of the Nolting pamphlet. It seemed to demonstrate that Reichwald, at least, after reading the publication in question, failed to grasp its most essential points.

John Lau

BOOK "Historical Backgrounds of Bible
REVIEWS History," by Jack P. Lewis; Baker
Book House (copyright, 1971, by
Baker Book House Company); 199
pages; paperback \$3.95, cloth \$5.95.

A question that has interested many through the course of years is whether the men and events spoken of in Holy Scriptures can be known from other sources besides those of the inspired writers. Are there voices coming from the past, perhaps through the work of the archaeologists and their associates, that testify to the existence of the men that move through the pages of Scripture?

Jack P. Lewis' book "Historical Backgrounds of Bible History" answers that question "for the non-specialist rather than for the technical scholar." Using a wide range of sources, he proceeds methodically to present the findings of early and current researchers in this field. In the seven chapters of his book, Mr. Lewis carries his readers from the men and rulers of ancient Egypt through those of Assyria, Palestine, Babylon, Israel and Judah, and Persia to the figures of the New Testament era.

The book is well organized and the material is presented in a clear and forthright manner. The summary at the close of each chapter is a handy feature. For the student who wishes to dig deeper, ample references to source material are provided.

For pastors and teachers a book of this nature is well worth having, not because we need non-biblical proof for the existence of Biblical figures, but because such proof at times provides further information on men and events we already know from God's Word. It is also a joy to note again and again that where man in the past has denied the existence of various individuals presented in Scripture, the very stones have cried out in opposition. Mr. Lewis is presenting to us the voices of such stones.

The book may well be used for a quick initial reading and then serve as a handy reference when one is working in the era of a Necho, a Sennacherib, an Omri,

a Darius the Mede, a Pontius Pilate, or one of the many other figures from the Old and New Testament world.

Roland A. Gurgel

Christian Faith and Modern Theology

Edited by Carl F.H. Henry. Grand

Rapids, Michigan: Baker, 1971.

426 pages. Paper, \$3.95.

This volume is the fourth in a series subtitled "Contemporary Evangelical Thought," and was originally published in 1963 by Channel Press, New York. Contents of the essays included and their authors are: 1. European Theology in the Twentieth Century, Hermann Sasse; 2. British Theology in the Twentieth Century, James I. Packer; 3. American Theology in the Twentieth Century, M. Eugene Osterhaven; 4. The Nature of God, Carl F.H. Henry; 5. The Nature of Revelation, John H. Gerstner; 6. The Nature of the Bible, Robert D. Preus; 7. The Nature of the Physical Universe, Gordon H. Clark; 8. The Nature of Man, Fred H. Klooster; 9. The Nature of Sin, J. Oliver Buswell, Jr.; 10. The Nature of Redemption, Roger Nicole; 11. The Nature of History, C. Gregg Singer; 12. Jesus of Nazareth, Bastiaan Van Elderen, Jr.; 13. The Resurrection of Christ, George E. Ladd; 14. The Holy Spirit, Robert Paul Roth; 15. The Nature of Regeneration, Robert D. Knudsen; 16. The Nature of Faith, Vernon C. Grounds; 17. The Nature of Justification, Lorman Petersen; 18. The Nature of Sanctification, Warren C. Young; 19. The Nature of the Church, William Childs Robinson; and 20. The Nature of Last Things, Harold B. Kuhn. In addition, the volume contains a select bibliography of some 102 entries, listed by reference to the above-mentioned articles.

As Carl F.H. Henry points out in the introduction, many of the contributors attended and took part in a seminar

held in the summer of 1961 by a group of "evangelical" (conservative?) scholars for the purpose of discussing the teachings and influence of Rudolf Bultmann. "It was felt that an exposition of evangelical perspectives over against one or another of the modern alternatives would fill a definite need, even if such an exposition were but a partial doctrinal overview and concerned itself with the schematic investigation of but one or another contemporary nonevangelical scholar at special points of interest."

Without entering upon an exhaustive treatment of each essay, one can nevertheless express his feelings of gratitude that conservative theology can still in our day find such able defenders. In essay after essay, one finds valuable statements supporting the historic, Christian faith in regard to the various aspects of theology treated. This reviewer found Singer's "The Nature of History" and Preus' "The Nature of the Bible" particularly masterful in their treatment of Scripture as the basis of all theology. A brief quotation from Singer: "A meaningful view of history, therefore, depends completely on the assurance that the Scriptures are God's trustworthy revelation to man. If he cannot know God with certainty, then man can never really penetrate the mystery of his own existence here on earth; life must, and will remain for him an unfathomable enigma, forever beyond his apprehension. The true meaning both of individual events and of the composite stream of human history is found only in God's interpretation thereof; clues to this meaning are found primarily in the Scriptures."

One would be hard put, it seems to me, to find a book more valuable for the individual searching for cap-sulated discussions of current theological views together with the conservative theologians' responses to them. In reprinting this work in an inexpensive paperback edition, Baker Book House has performed a valuable service.

John Lau

A Symposium on Creation - III
Edited by Donald W. Patton.
Baker Book House, paperback, \$2.95.

This is the third in a series of publications on the general theme of catastrophist-creationist view as opposed to evolution and written by individuals whose professions and interests are quite varied.

The essays included in this printing are: Theories about Life and Its Origin; Stratigraphic Evidence of the Flood; The Alleged Evolution of the Horse; The Alleged Evolution of Birds; The Scopes Trial; Fossil Man; and The Cell.

The article by Stuart Nevins, a geologist, on Stratigraphic Evidence of the Flood is particularly good in showing the untenable position of the evolutionist as opposed to the simple, completely tenable Biblical Flood explanation.

It is interesting to note that the first and last essays, dealing with areas quite removed from one another, contain opposing views on the question of whether or not the cell ought to be considered the building block of living matter. One might well expect some such difficulty since there is a lack of complete understanding of the intricacies of the cell and virus. Had these comments been omitted, little would have been affected by it.

As one reads these essays, one finds at times a confession of faith bursting forth, glorifying God for the magnificent handywork of His creation; yet, at other times this is completely lacking and one is left with an empty feeling. Be that as it may, for those desiring background on themes which are so flagrantly distorted in a Godless world, much of value can be found on these pages.

J. Pelzl



QUOTES

That the church cannot be advanced nor heresy extinguished by force was most clearly set forth by Dr. Martin Luther as may be seen from the following citations:

We should so preach Christ as one who will reject nobody, however weak he may be, but will gladly receive and comfort and strengthen everybody; that we may always picture him to ourselves as a good shepherd. Then hearts will turn to him of their own accord, and need not be forced and driven. The Gospel graciously invites and makes men willing, so that they desire to go, and do go, to him with all confidence. And it begets a love for Christ in their hearts, so that they willingly do what they should, whereas formerly they had to be driven and forced. When we are driven, we do a thing with displeasure and against our will. That is not what God desires; therefore it is done in vain. But when I see that God deals with me graciously, he wins my heart, so that I am constrained to fly to him; consequently, my heart is filled with happiness and joy.

-- Gospel Sermon, Second Sunday After Easter (Lenker Edition, Vol. XII, #20).

Heresy can never be prevented by force. That must be taken hold of in a different way, and must be opposed and dealt with otherwise than with the sword. Here God's Word must strive; if that does not accomplish the end it will remain unaccomplished through secular power, though it fill the world with blood. Heresy is a spiritual matter, which no iron can strike, no fire burn, no water drown. God's Word alone avails here, as Paul says, II Corinthians X, "(For the weapons of our warfare are not carnal, but mighty through God to the pulling down of strong holds;) Casting down imaginations, and every high thing that exalteth itself against the knowledge of God, and bringing into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ."

-- Secular Authority: To What Extent It Should Be Obeyed, Works of Martin Luther, Vol. III, p. 259.

NOTICES

Our supplies of some of the earlier issues of the JOURNAL OF THEOLOGY have become completely exhausted. Since we still get occasional requests for some of these issues, we are requesting that, if any of our readers have one or more of the following numbers, they contact our Managing Editor if they are willing to return their copies to our files.

Volume I, Number 1; Volume II, #4 and #5; Volume III, #2 and #3; Volume V, #5.

We are missing from our Seminary Library the following issues of QUARTALSCHRIFT: All issues for the years 1914, 1915, 1916. Also missing are the following issues of Wisconsin Lutheran Quarterly: Nos. 1, 2, & 3 of 1964; Nos. 2, 3, & 4 of 1966; all numbers of 1967. Anyone who is able to supply these copies please write to: Immanuel Lutheran Seminary Library
West Grover Road
Eau Claire, Wisconsin 54701.

C O N T E N T S

VOLUME 12

MARCH 1972

NUMBER 1

EDITOR'S NOTE	1
RELIGION IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS	2
C. Kuehne	
GLOBAL MISSIONS	12
A. Schulz	
CHAPEL ADDRESS -- Micah 1:1-8	27
Paul Koch	

PANORAMA

F A L -- A NEW CHURCH BODY	30
C. M. Gullerud	
A RESPONSE	34
John Lau	

BOOK REVIEWS:

1. "Historical Backgrounds of Bible History" .. 39
Roland Gurgel
2. "Christian Faith and Modern Theology" 40
John Lau
3. "A Symposium on Creation - III" 42
J. Pelzl

QUOTES	43
NOTICES	44
