

The Northwestern Lutheran

The Lord our God be with us, as He was with our fathers; let Him not leave us, nor forsake us. 1 Kings 8: 57.

Vol. 4.

Milwaukee, Wis., April 21, 1917.

No. 8.

VICTORY

The Lord has been my help; the praise
To Him alone belongs;
He is my Savior and my strength,
He only claims my songs.

Joy fills the dwellings of the just,
Whom God has saved from harm;
For wondrous things are brought to pass
By His almighty arm.

He, by His own resistless power,
Has endless honor won;
The saving strength of His right hand
Amazing works has done.

God will not suffer me to fall,
But still prolongs my days;
That by declaring all His works,
I may advance His praise.

Then open wide the temple gates
To which the just repair,
That I may enter in, and praise
My great Deliverer there.

That which the builders once refused
Is now the Corner-stone;
This is the wondrous Work of God,
The work of God alone.

Thou art my Lord, O God, and still
I'll praise Thy holy Name;
Because Thou only art my God,
I'll celebrate Thy fame.

O then with me give thanks to God,
Who still does gracious prove;
And let the tribute of our praise
Be endless as His love.

COMMENTS

Our Country in War

To the student of history of future generations our time will present an interesting problem. How is it possible that a country can so entirely reverse itself in less than two years? The policy of our government may, upon examination, be seen to have developed steadily toward the declaration of war; but the American people in this instance must be a study apart from their official representatives. Upon the outbreak of hostilities in Europe our nation was convulsed with the horror of it all. Not only the pacifist by principle but the great majority of Americans in general revolted against an order which tried to adjust international difficulties by war. Something like righteous indigna-

tion was expressed by our leaders of public thought in pulpit and in press. War was declared to be the unpardonable sin, the sin of sins. The European war was declared to be the witness of the failure of Christianity. Not a few voiced the opinion that nations which persisted in the barbarity of war deserved no better fate than that they exterminate each other. Still others exhausted their ingenuity in demonstrating that the one or the other side in the war was responsible for all the bloodshed and that it had thereby forfeited the right to be measured by the standard that applied to the rest of humanity.—And these opinions were nowhere more in evidence than in the pulpits of our American churches. The impartial observer would have felt certain that this nation, which was so outspoken in condemnation of war and which consistently refused to prepare itself for war in the midst of the general conflagration, would never think of entering this very war upon strictly formal grounds—as has happened. But time brought a change. About a year ago, the pacifists, as the opponents of war are loosely termed, were losing in numbers daily, preparedness was urged increasingly and public opinion forced millions to go on record in its favor, many of them doing so with but a hazy notion that preparedness meant war, in principle if not fact. The preparedness campaign was also an opportunity for many of those early peace enthusiasts to revise their views of war. Peace sermons became rarer; preparedness sermons took their place. A last flickering of the peace spirit was noticeable in the presidential campaign. "He kept us out of war" re-elected President Wilson, say many.—Now we have war. Clergymen seem to be the most bloodthirsty of all our fellow-citizens. Machine guns have been invoked by such to make their bloody work effective. Dr. Newell Dwight Hillis of New York prayed that the Christian "law" of forgiveness be revoked so that it need not apply to the Germans. He was only ready to forgive the Germans—when they were all dead. Churches have rushed to the front as recruiting centers. Military drills and exercises were added to the curriculum of the Sunday schools. It almost seems as though our country could do no better than turn the whole war business over to these fire-eating churches. After discounting a godly amount of all this enthusiasm by the desire for cheap notoriety which this mock-patriotism provides, there is yet a fundamental trait observable in this unprecedented turning about from pacifism to militancy:

Rev. C. Bueger,
63 N. Ridge,
Jan 18

the conscious or unconscious insincerity of making the Christian faith serve the ends of expediency.

The NORTHWESTERN LUTHERAN has not in the past been preaching pacifism, it will not now preach bloodshed and hatred and extermination of our national foes. Now as before it conceives its duty to its readers to be in guiding them in those affairs that are not decided by machine guns or submarines but by the everlasting Gospel of the salvation of man by Jesus Christ. The nation at war needs its churches more than ever — and its church papers — not for the purpose of battering down enemy trenches but for the purpose of saving souls of men whose end is not determined by the shot and shell that lays them low in death upon the bloody battlefield. Lutheran Christians know better than any others what their duty toward their country is — and they will do their duty in war as they have done it in peace. The attitude of the Lutheran church toward war can be judged to some extent by its history in the trying days of the rebellion. Every other of the large churches was rent into a southern and a northern branch by the political schism — the Lutheran church remained united. It did its duty, wherever it was. More than any others, the Lutherans of Missouri saved that state for the Union; they were men of action when the necessity arose. But in their churches nothing but the Gospel was preached, there they were not concerned with politics or policies. We dare say, in the interest of good citizenship as well as in the interest of Christianity, that the churches of America can do no better than to model their conduct after that of the Lutheran church in this war.

H. K. M.

* * * * *

A Portrait of Christ Some time ago the American Journal of Archaeology brought a note which must be of surpassing interest to Christians.

It describes a silver chalice found in Antioch. In this ancient Christian city it was formerly a part of the treasure of the Constantinian cathedral. The chalice is mounted on a stand which forms part of it; there is an inner bowl and upon the outside of this bowl there are numerous ornaments chased in silver and then soldered to the body. Archaeologists are quite sure that it dates back to the first century of the Christian era. The figures in the ornamentation depict Christ and the Apostles. The work is said to be very fine and of great artistic merit. If the chalice is really as old as its sponsors hold, we have here the very earliest authentic attempt to portray Jesus. Even then it may not be a likeness; descriptions of Christ's appearance, by his most loyal followers, would in later years inevitably lose authoritativeness. As we ourselves change, our impressions of early life unconsciously change with us. Older people frequently are quite unable to identify portraits of the friends of their youth. We know from the Acts that Antioch was one of the

very earliest and one of the most active Christian centers; there is nothing improbable in finding evidence of early Christian veneration in this place.

H. K. M.

* * * * *

A Charitable Soul It is related that one of the Roman emperors became so murderous in the exercise of his tyrannies that he exclaimed: "Would that Rome had but one head that I might exterminate it in one stroke"! We long believed that this was one of the exaggerations of history. In the light of recent events it must be conceded that it is extremely probable, whatever may have been thought before. A New York news dispatch informs the public that it boasts of a presbyterian clergyman who is worthy to be placed in the niche of fame so long reserved exclusively for Emperor Caligula. In a violent outburst of patriotic zeal this minister of the Gospel advocated that all Luther celebrations be forbidden on the grounds that Luther was a German! Professional haters should be more economical with their stock of hate. If it is expended before hostilities are begun they'll have little left with which to fight the enemy.

H. K. M.

* * * * *

"What Constitutes a Man a Catholic?" What constitutes a man a Catholic? We find an interesting letter on this subject in a recent issue of the Living Church. This letter shows very clearly the views held by the Episcopal church. Read it and then read again the treatise on Article VIII of the Augsburg Confession. You will find it in our issue of April 7th.

"To the Editor of the Living Church:

Certain passages in your interesting and able editorial this week (February 24th) move me to ask what constitutes a man a Catholic. The answer seems to me very plain. The Prayer Book pledges us to believe "One Catholic and Apostolic Church," that is, to believe the Catholic Church to be our divinely appointed teacher, all of whose teachings upon matters of faith and morals we must accept. Or, in other words, the above article of the Creed constitutes the Catholic Church in her days of Oneness our supreme rule of faith. Only he who accepts that is truly a Catholic.

Believing rightly about the Incarnation, the Ministry, and the Sacraments does not make a man a Catholic. He must believe those doctrines simply upon the authoritative teaching of the Catholic Church in her days of unity, and not merely because his private judgment has drawn them from the Scriptures. The Church when at unity is infallible—a man's private judgment is fallible; a poor basis for faith to rest upon. So the true Catholic is only he who accepts the one Catholic Church as his rule of faith.

There are various subordinate rules of faith. The Bible is a rule of faith, the Creeds are rules of faith,

the Prayer Book is a rule of faith; but all these get their authority as rules only from the supreme rule of faith, the One Catholic Church, who collated the Books of the Bible, taught us to accept them as inspired, and who set forth the Creeds, and organized this American Church, and authorized it to set forth the Prayer Book.

Therefore to be truly a Catholic a man must accept the Catholic Church in her days of oneness as his supreme rule of faith. Revere and study the Scriptures indeed; but only as a subordinate rule of faith, needing interpretation by our supreme rule of faith, the Catholic Church, in her ancient days of oneness and perhaps in days of oneness yet to come.

CUSTIS P. JONES.

Baltimore, February 23, 1917.

J. B.

* * * * *

An Indirect Tribute

"New Americans must read the Bible before they enter the United States, according to the decision of the Department of Labor. Passages will be selected from more than one hundred languages and dialects, says a Washington dispatch to the New York Sun. The department thus explains its choice for the literacy test:

"This is not because the Bible is considered a sacred book by many people, but because it is now the only book in virtually every tongue. Translations of the Bible were made by eminent scholars, and, what is more to the point, the translating was done by men whose purpose it was to put the Bible in such simple and idiomatic expressions in the various foreign languages as would make it possible for the common people of foreign countries to grasp the meaning readily and thoroughly."—The Literary Digest.

This order of the Department of Labor is an indirect tribute to the Bible. The Bible "is now the only book in virtually every tongue." The reason is evident, it must meet the spiritual needs of men of every age and clime. It is truly catholic.

Eminent scholars have not considered it a waste of time and talent to undertake the task of translating the Bible into foreign tongues. As no great monetary reward awaited them, these men, whose learning cannot be questioned, must have been personally attracted by this Book and have found in it for themselves what they now earnestly desire to bring to others also. What a rebuke for the many who, having spent a few years at some college or university, feel that they must reject the Bible as it conflicts with the scientific views with which they have become imbued!

And finally, it is not owing to these good translations only that the common people of foreign countries are able to grasp the meaning of the Bible readily and thoroughly; this is due chiefly to the message itself and the teacher who brings it to the human heart, the Holy Ghost. Jesus said: "I thank thee, O Father,

Lord of heaven and earth, because thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent, and hast revealed them unto babes. Even so, Father; for so it seemed good in thy sight."

J. B.

* * * * *

Getting Ready

The various boards of the Wisconsin, the Minnesota, the Michigan, and the Nebraska synods are getting ready for the consolidation of these bodies in August. Representatives of these boards met in Milwaukee, April 11th. The subject discussed was the transfer to the general body of all the property in the possession of the individual synods. There are apparently no legal obstacles. A committee of five was appointed, which is to work out certain details that require special attention. Another meeting will be held early in June, in order that the recommendations that will be made will reach the separate synods before their annual conference. J. B.

"THE LAST WEAPON"

On the eve of our country's declaration that a state of war exists with Germany, advocates of peace exerted their influence in a last effort to halt the threatening rupture. As part of their propaganda a book, a novel in form, was sent out broadcast. The novel, written by Miss Theodora Wilson, bears the title "The Last Weapon." It is a wonderfully gripping and compelling argument against war.

Partly allegorical, it opens with a scene in Heaven. The Son of God is revealed upon His throne. A perplexed child, perhaps the human soul, seeks the solution of all the horror now raging on earth from Him. He tells the child of that "Last Weapon," which can alone overcome hate and violence and death.—The scene changes to other halls of power, the kingdom of darkness and evil. A Satan like the Prince of Darkness in Milton's Paradise Lost is surrounded by his minions. They gloat over their success on earth. God's Truth is vanquished, so they exult, because the powers of evil have succeeded in making man disregard the Last Weapon of God and turn to the Weapons of destruction.

As the child goes forth with his secret to whisper it into the ears of stricken mankind so they might come out of their frenzy of slaughter, the Evil One sends forth his spirits to offset the counsels of God with counsels that lead to everincreasing ruthlessness. The Last Weapon, of course, is Love; but though it is brought into this world by Christ Himself two thousand years ago, man has not the courage to use it. Going about on earth unseen by mortal eyes, the child tries in vain to make men see that in the courage of Love lies the victory over the powers of destruction. The Evil One, on the other hand, always succeeds in goading men on to greater outrages. Cruelty is his most faithful ally. If he succeeds in inducing one set of belliger-

ents to commit some exceptionally horrible act, it results in equally horrible acts by their enemies done in retaliation. So the slaughter goes on, feeding and increasing on its own blood.

The story deals with a number of characters, shown in action in brief striking scenes and carries us away with its fearless love of truth in describing the horrors of war. It closes when the vengeful hate of one set of belligerents, having gained possession of "the last weapon" of destruction which would kill a whole nation, men, women, and children in a few minutes, is halted in carrying out this unspeakable crime by the paralyzing news that their opponents hold the same "last weapon" of frightfulness. Having reached the absolute end in the possibilities of destructiveness, the nations that are drunk with the lust of blood must confess the futility of their course. — We are led to infer that now at last they are in a mood to hearken unto the voice of the child with its message of Divine Love.

The story is free from national bias. The scene is laid in England, apparently, but it might as well be any other country. There are pages in this book of most striking beauty. There are many ideas that are purely Christian. If a nation as a whole were truly Christian, there can be no doubt that "the Last Weapon" would not be war and death but Love — and there would be no doubt that it would be successful for the individual soul and for the prosperity of the nation. But as it is, the book is laid aside with reluctance; one feels that its appeal to such that are not of the Christian faith would be merely emotional — and that would rob it of its value. The book stands a noble document of the anguish of a human soul over the devastation of war. Even a warrior might read it and profit. It takes more courage to voice sentiments like this in a war ridden country than to shoulder a musket and face the charge of the enemy. If England has many men and women in its borders that think of war as this book does, it goes a long way in establishing that nation's somewhat shaken credit for sincerity.

If our country shares the experiences of the other nations at war, we shall live to see terrible days. To our other problems will surely come the problem of the "conscientious objector"; in England they dealt with these enemies of war in their own fashion. Before we are able to deal with them we should understand their position, and that may be learnt from this book, *The Last Weapon*. We feel sure that a pastor can better deal with them than a government official. It will be one of the most serious problems the Christian congregation will have to work out, to separate sound from unsound reasoning in this vital matter. H. K. M.

—"A man who would really live to God, must truly die to sin. We cannot at the same time take part with the crucified Savior and His crucifiers, too."—Sel.

THE AUGSBURG CONFESSION

Article IX—Baptism

"Of Baptism they teach, that it is necessary to salvation, and that through Baptism is offered the grace of God; and that children are to be baptized, who, being offered to God through Baptism, are received into His grace.

"They condemn the Anabaptists, who allow not the baptism of children, and say that children are saved without baptism."

Baptism is necessary to salvation, this article teaches. It is necessary because God Himself has commanded it. We have his express command to baptize when the Savior says to His disciples: "Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you." Matt. 28: 19, 20. It is regarding this command that Dr. Luther says (*Large Catech. IV, 6*): "In these words we must notice, in the first place, that here stands God's commandment and institution that we shall not doubt that baptism is divine, and not devised and invented by men. For as truly as I can say no man has spun the Ten Commandments, the Creed, and the Lord's Prayer out of his head, but that they are revealed and given by God Himself, so also I can boast that baptism is no human trifle, but that it is instituted by God Himself, and that it is most solemnly and rigidly commanded that we must be baptized, or we cannot be saved." All men who wish to gain salvation must obey this command; but, of course, God has not bound His own hands or limited His power to save, by this injunction. God can save when and how He pleases: but there is no salvation possible to the man who knowingly and deliberately ignores and rejects the saving grace which God offers him in baptism. "But the Pharisees and lawyers rejected the counsel of God against themselves, being not baptized." Luke 7: 30.

Through Baptism is offered the grace of God.

Acts 2: 38: "Men and brethren, what shall we do? Then Peter said unto them, Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost."

Gal. 3: 26: "For ye are all sons of God, through faith in Christ Jesus. For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ."

Titus 3: 5-7: "Not by the works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us, by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost; which he shed on us abundantly through Jesus Christ our Savior; that being justified by his grace, we should be made heirs according to the hope of eternal life."

Mark 16: 16: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved."

Regarding the benefits which Baptism bestows Dr. Luther says (Large Catech. IV, 23): "Since we know now what baptism is, and how it is to be administered, we must, in the second place, also learn why and for what purpose it is instituted; that is what it avails, gives, and produces. And this also we cannot discern better than from the words of Christ above quoted: 'He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved.' Therefore we state it most simply thus, that the power, work, profit, fruit, and end of baptism is this, viz. to save. For no one is baptized in order that he may become a prince, but as the words declare, that he be saved. But to be saved, we know, is nothing else than to be delivered from sin, death and the devil, and to enter into the kingdom of Christ, and to live with him forever."

Children are to be baptized, the article further declares. The Scriptures do not command infant baptism in so many words, nor do they, on the other hand, exclude infants from receiving baptism: this very lack is conclusive proof that they are meant to be included among those to whom the church is to minister the sacrament of baptism. The Savior's command was: "Go ye therefore, and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them;" the term "all nations" certainly includes children of the most tender age.

Nor has The Savior suffered us to remain in darkness as to His position toward our little children. In Mark 10 we are told, "they brought young children to him, that he should touch them: and his disciples rebuked those that brought them. But when Jesus saw it, he was much displeased, and said unto them, Suffer the little children to come unto me, and forbid them not for **of such** is the kingdom of God." Any question as to the age of these "little children" is brought to naught by Luke 18: 15, where the original text styles them "the newly-born." Thus it is the Lord's gracious will that the children in all nations from earliest infancy have part in the kingdom of God.

The children of men are, however, by nature sinful and corrupt; they are distant from God and His kingdom: "That which is born of the flesh is flesh." John 3: 6. They must be brought to Him, accepted into His kingdom. This is done in baptism; they are born again, they enter His kingdom. "Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." John 3: 5. Not to bring our little children to Him in baptism is, therefore, to restrain them from becoming Christ's.

The Bible truths regarding Baptism, as set forth in the above ninth article of our confession, are denied by many denominations of the present day; and prominent among them are those named above — the Anabaptists. They hold that this sacrament is not a means

of grace which works faith and bestows blessings, but merely a ceremony or sign, by which man signifies that he is of the faith and signalizes his entry into the Christian communion. With them, children are not baptized on the grounds that they cannot believe. Candidates for admission to their communion coming from denominations where infant baptism is practised, are baptized again when age and understanding seem to entitle them to it. The Scripture texts by which we have shown our position above fully answer all their arguments. Childlike trust, humility, and obedience are necessary to all who would stand firmly on the ground of faith. "Verily I say unto you, Whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a child, he shall not enter therein." Mark 10: 15. G.

PROHIBITION AND THE SALOON

Part I.—Prohibition

Prohibition is a much discussed problem. Some people consider it a question of morality, others an economic issue. The "Northwestern Lutheran" as a religious paper wishes to discuss the moral side of the liquor question only, and will leave the economic problems connected therewith for the government to solve to the best interests of the people.

Our first contention is: Prohibition, i. e. the suppression of the manufacture, sale and use of intoxicating liquor, is not a moral duty, because it is not demanded in the Scriptures.

In the Lutheran church the Holy Scriptures are the exclusive rule, which govern our faith and life, and are therefore the sole judge in theological controversies. We recognize no other authority — no tradition, no decrees of councils, not even "the light of the 20th century." The Scriptures alone are our counsellors, Ps. 119, 24, which we consult in all doctrinal and moral questions. They contain all the information we need. The Gospel tells us what God hath done for our salvation, and how we are saved by faith in Jesus Christ. John 3, 16. The Law tells us what is right and wrong, and what we shall do and what we must avoid. Micah 6, 8. Rom. 3, 20. Whatever is good is demanded in the Law, and whatever is evil is forbidden. And what is neither demanded nor forbidden is morally indifferent. Nobody is permitted to add to the word of God or diminish from it. Deut. 12, 32. Accordingly, all questions arising under this head must be decided by this rule.

The advocates of prohibition, as we find them mainly in the Puritanic church bodies, try to make prohibition a moral duty, which the word of God imposes, and quote many passages in support thereof. But, if we examine them closely, we find, they are torn out of their context mutilated and do not prove, what they are quoted for. Let us take up a few of the most important quotations and see. One of the most commonly quoted Bible passages against the use of alcoholic

beverages is Prov. 23, 29-34: "Who hath woe? Who hath sorrow? Who hath contentions? Who hath babblings? Who hath wounds without cause? Who hath redness of eyes? They that tarry long at the wine; they that go to seek mixed wine. Look thou not upon the wine, when it is red, when it giveth his colour in the cup, when it moveth itself aright. At the last it biteth like a serpent and stingeth like an adder. Thine eyes shall behold strange women, and thine heart shall utter perverse things. Yea, thou shalt be as he that lieth down in the midst of the sea, or as he that lieth upon the top of a mast." One glance is sufficient to see that these words do not forbid the use of wine entirely, but **drunkenness**. He, who **tarrys long at the wine** and seeks mixed drinks, shall have all the evil things enumerated. And as wine is tempting on account of its color and taste, utmost moderation in the use thereof is necessary.

Another falsely quoted passage is Prov. 31, 4, 5: "It is not for kings, O Lemuel, it is not for kings to drink wine; nor for princes strong drink: Lest they drink and forget the law, and pervert the judgment of any of the afflicted." These words say nothing about the use of wine as a moral wrong, but admonish those in dignified and responsible positions to the utmost caution that drunkenness may not cause them to forget and neglect their duties to the detriment of those, who are under their jurisdiction. If it were a moral wrong in itself for kings and princes to drink wine, the next verses 6 and 7 could not recommend it: "Give strong drink unto him that is ready to perish, and wine unto those that be of heavy hearts. Let him drink and forget his poverty, and remember his misery no more." If it is wrong in itself, it can not be forbidden in one case and recommended in another. Dan. 1, 8 is a source of joy for the advocates of total abstinence as a moral demand: "But Daniel purposed in his heart that he would not defile himself with the portion of the king's meat, nor with the wine which he drank: therefore he requested of the prince of the eunuchs that he might not defile himself." To fanatical prohibitionists drinking wine and moral pollution are identical, and with the mien of having dealt a crushing blow they point to the example of the godly Daniel. But how absurd to deduct from the example of Daniel a moral rule, which shall be binding on the conscience of all! Daniel, an orthodox Jew, was brought to the palace of Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon, to learn the wisdom and the language of the Chaldeans, as the king had commanded. The mode of living among the Babylonians was entirely different from that of the Jews. The Babylonians ate many things, which the ceremonial law forbade unto the Jews. Daniel wished to remain true to the precepts of his religion, even in a strange land, and therefore refused to defile himself with the unclean food, which the Babylonians ate, and with the wines, which the king used at the festivities of the idols.

Daniel as an orthodox Jew was obliged to observe the ceremonial law (that is the law of his church), and his conduct in refusing certain things was absolutely correct. But how absurd it is to make the deduction, that the use of wine, which was wrong for Daniel under these conditions according to the **ceremonial law**, shall also be wrong for us according to the **moral law**. If such logic of the prohibitionist were correct, eating of food would also be a moral pollution according to the moral law. For what holds good in one case must also apply in the other.

Many a person has been flustered by prohibitionists quoting Hab. 2, 15 in support of their contention: "Woe unto him that giveth his neighbor drink, that putteth thy bottle to him." Such Scripture-quoting is absolutely fraudulent and dishonest. Listen to the closing words of this verse, which are usually omitted: "And make him drunk also, that thou mayest look on their nakedness." The prophet testifies against drunkenness and nothing else. From the new testament we will consider only two passages, which are frequently quoted for prohibition as a **moral demand**. Strange it is indeed, if reference is made to Col. 2, 21, which a prohibition-paper selected as its motto: "Touch not; taste not; handle not." If we look at the context, we will learn that these words prove the very opposite, and that Paul **condemns** such teachings as **commandments and doctrines of men**. Dissensions had arisen among the Collosians in regard to meat, drink and holidays. Some of the Christians thought they were still bound by the ceremonial law of the Jewish church, while others claimed it no longer applied to them. Paul therefore instructs them in regard to these things in the following manner: "Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of an holiday, or of the new moon, or of the sabbath days: Which are a shadow of things to come; but the body is of Christ. Let no man beguile you of your reward in a voluntary humility and worshipping of angels, intruding into those things, which he hath not seen, vainly puffed up by his fleshly mind, and not holding the head, from which all the body by joints and bands having nourishment ministered, and knit together, increaseth with the increase of God. Wherefore if ye be dead with Christ from the rudiments of the world, why, as though living in the world, are ye subject to **ordinances, touch not; taste not; handle not**; which are all to perish with the using; after **the commandments and doctrines of men**? Which things have indeed a show of wisdom in will, worship and humility, and neglecting of body; not in any honor to the satisfying of the flesh." Col. 2, 16-23.

Finally, Romans 14, 21 is supposed to forbid the use of alcoholic beverages: "It is good neither to eat flesh, nor to drink wine, nor anything, whereby thy brother stumbleth, or is offended, or is made weak." This passage does not treat of the **prohibition** of certain articles

of food or drink, but of a **voluntary restriction of Christian liberty** in order not to offend a weak brother, as a close analysis of the entire chapter will show. In the congregation of Rome there were Christians of Jewish and of Gentile extraction. Those who had been brought up in the traditions of the Jewish church could not divert themselves at once of all their former ideas, after they had embraced the Christian religion. Dissensions arose among the Christians of the Jewish and the Gentile nations in regard to meat and drink (V 2) and in regard to the various holidays (V. 5). Those that had been Jews believed they were still bound by the ceremonial appointments, while those of the Gentiles considered themselves free. These therefore despised the former and the Christians of Jewish descent took offense at the doings of the Christians from the Gentile nations (V. 3. 4). Paul therefore instructs both factions in regard to the proper conduct, which they should observe toward each other. He tells the weak Christians that there is nothing unclean of itself (V. 14.), and that they should not judge the others on account of their eating (V. 3.) But the strong in faith he tells that they shall not put a stumbling block or an occasion to fall in their brother's way (V. 13.), and that they should sooner waive their Christian liberty, eat no meat and drink no wine, than offend a weak brother (V. 21), that the work of God may not be destroyed (V. 20.). This charity toward their brethren demands (V. 15.). Paul makes a similar argument in 1 Cor. 8, where he refers to meat, which had been used at the sacrifices to the idols.

From these passages we see that the claim of the prohibitionist is not founded on the Bible. Prohibition is not a moral demand.

On the contrary, the Bible plainly **permits** the temperate and moderate use of wine. Solomon says Eccl. 9, 7: "Go thy way, eat thy bread with joy, and drink thy wine with a merry heart; for God now accepteth thy works." In Psalm 104 wine is classed among the good gifts of God "that maketh glad the heart of man" (V. 15.). Paul advises his pupil Timothy: "Drink no longer water, but use a little wine for thy stomach's sake and thine often infirmities." I Tim. 5, 23. And this does not mean grape-juice, as prohibitionists would have us believe, but fermented wine, the finished product. In the passages from the old testament we find the word yahyin and in the passages from the new testament the word oinos; and both designate fermented wine, while a different word is used for grape-juice. By his own example Christ has also shown us that the use of wine is neither immoral nor indecent. He drank wine with his disciples and was severely censured on that account by His enemies, as He Himself tells us Matt. 11, 18. 19: "For John came neither eating nor drinking, and they say, he hath a devil. The Son of man came eating and drinking, and they say, behold a man gluttonous, and a wine-bibber, a friend of pub-

licans and sinners. But wisdom is justified of her children." Yes, Christ even furnished wine for the guests at the wedding-feast in Cana, when the supply on hand was exhausted. John 2.

Christ left us an example, that we may safely follow. 1 Pet. 2, 21. Was this act of His reprehensible? Some of the fanatical prohibitionists think it was and thereby blaspheme the Lord. An Ex-Methodist minister told the writer, when he held up the example of Christ in a discussion of the prohibition movement: "He set a mighty poor example." And another preacher made the statement in a temperance lecture: "If the bible commends wine-drinking and thus intemperance, the Lord Jesus Christ cannot be my example." Thus we see of what perversion a man is capable, if he prefers to follow his own ideas in religious matters in preference to the written word of God.

Wine has always held an honored position in the religious rites of the old and the new testaments. Wine was used in the daily offerings in the tabernacle. Exodus 29, 38-42. And Christ sanctions its use in the passover, for He used some of the remaining wine for the institution of the Holy Supper. Matt. 26, 27-29. And this highly honored gift of God, through which Christ gives us His true blood in the sacrament of the altar and confers upon us His greatest blessings, is reviled by fanatical prohibitionists as the devil's drink, which should be shunned to the point of total abstinence!

We find no fault with the man, who abstains voluntarily from alcoholic beverages, providing he connects no false ideas of morality therewith. But let him remember, that he is not better nor more virtuous in the eyes of God than he, who makes use of wine in moderation and with thanksgiving. Here also the words of Paul apply: "But meat commendeth us not to God: for neither, if we eat, are we the better; neither, if we eat not, are we the worse. But take heed lest by any means this liberty of your's becomes a stumblingblock to them that are weak." 1 Cor. 8, 8. 9. Let every user of intoxicating beverages take this admonition to heart, that he may not be intemperate, offend his brother and bring damnation upon himself. Christian liberty in this respect is not a franchise for drunkenness. Eating and drinking is not forbidden, but drunkenness and revellings, which are manifest works of the flesh and exclude from the kingdom of God. Gal. 5, 19-21.

Drunkenness is a contemptible vice, against which Christ earnestly warns all children of man, when He says: "Take heed to yourselves, lest at any time your hearts be overcharged with surfeiting and drunkenness and cares of this life, and so that day come upon you unawares." Luke 21, 34. But whosoever cannot be temperate in the use of intoxicating beverages has only one alternative, namely that of total abstinence. He owes it to his God, himself and his neighbor.

(Continued.)

ENGLISH SCIENTISTS AND THE BIBLE

If the Bible is the word of God, we have no choice in the matter but to believe that what it says is true, for we are assured in Num. 1: 24 that "God is not a man, that he should lie," and Paul had the same faith when he wrote to Titus: "God, that cannot lie." To challenge the truth of the Bible is a very serious business, for thereby "we make him a liar." And yet there is nothing so popular today as the doing of this very thing. It takes on the most varied of forms. It ranges from the most polite and even humble attitude of saying that God didn't mean exactly what he said in this or that case—that's called "higher criticism"—to the perfectly honest position of saying that there isn't a smitch of truth in the whole Bible—that's atheism.

There is a more or less firmly fixed conviction in the minds of folks that scientists are the arch enemies of religion and the Bible. There is about as much justice in accusing science of having produced this opposition, however, as to blame the apple tree for the rotten apples found in the barrel.

To show that scientists—that is, real scientists—of some years ago used to align themselves on the side of the Bible, we quote below a statement, which was submitted to the members of the British Association for the Advancement of Science, during the period when the storm aroused by Darwinism raged fiercely, and which secured the signatures of 617 members. The list included the name of nearly every authority on science in Great Britain of that day. It was deposited in one of the libraries of Oxford University. The declaration is as follows:

"We, the undersigned students of the Natural Sciences, desire to express our sincere regret that researches into scientific truth are perverted by some in our own times into occasions for casting doubt upon the truth and authenticity of the Holy Scriptures.

"We conceive that it is impossible for the word of God as written in the book of Nature, and God's word written in Holy Scripture, to contradict one another, however much they may appear to differ.

"We are not forgetful that physical science is not complete, but is only in a condition of progress, and that at present our finite reason enables us only to see as through a glass darkly, and we confidently believe that a time will come when the two records will be seen to agree in every particular.

"We cannot but deplore that Natural Science should be looked upon with suspicion by many who do not make a study of it, but merely on account of the unadvised manner in which some are placing it in opposition to Holy Writ.

"We believe that it is the duty of every scientific student to investigate Nature simply for the purpose of elucidating truth, and that if he finds that some of his

results appear to be in contradiction to the written Word, or rather to his own interpretation of it, which may be erroneous, he should not presumptuously affirm that his own conclusions must be right, and the statements of Scripture wrong. Rather leave the two side by side till it shall please God to allow us to see the manner in which they may be reconciled; and instead of insisting upon the seeming differences between Science and the Scriptures, it would be as well to rest in faith upon the points in which they agree."

That generation of scientists, which must be said to have been among those who laid foundations for the advancement in science—and history records with laud and honor how well their work was done—were noted for two things: their great earnestness in their search for scientific truth, and their fidelity to Bible truth.

Lord Kelvin was of that generation. He was unquestionably the profoundest student of physics, and especially electricity, of his time, and perhaps for a long time to come, still throughout it all he never wavered in his Christian faith. He declared that he was still in utter ignorance of the ultimate nature of electricity after fifty years of study, but that he could see the designing hand of God everywhere in creation. When he died, a few years ago, he was buried in Westminster with the highest honors that could be bestowed on a man for whom England had the profoundest respect.

But, someone will say, how about this generation? There probably are denominations in this country today in which it would be difficult to find 617 clergymen who would sign the above statement without revision. Such has been the change of the times, and scientists are but human, but right down deep in the hearts of a large number of lay and learned lies a deeply rooted feeling of the truthfulness of God's Word.

There is one thing we must not forget, and that is that the enemies of the Bible make much more noise and keep in the limelight both in the press, on the lecture platform, and in the pulpit, much more than its friends. Let us be as zealous for the truth as they are for falsehood, and by God's help "truth crushed to earth shall rise again."—P. M. G., in United Lutheran.

THE NORTHWESTERN LUTHERAN

Edited by a committee under authority of the Ev. Luth. Joint Synod of Wisconsin, Minnesota, Michigan, and other States, and published biweekly by Northwestern Publishing House, Milwaukee, Wis.

Address all communications concerning the editorial department to Rev. John Jenny, 637 Mitchell St., Milwaukee, Wis.

Address all news items to Rev. F. Graeber, 3709 Sycamore St., Milwaukee, Wis.

Send all business correspondence, remittances, etc., to Northwestern Publishing House, 263 Fourth St., Milwaukee, Wis. Subscription Price: \$1.00 per year in advance.