

# The Northwestern Lutheran

Jan 18  
Rev C Buenger  
65 N Ridge

The Lord our God be with us, as He was with our fathers; let Him save us, nor forsake us. 1 Kings 8: 57.

Vol. 4

Milwaukee, Wis., July 7,

No. 13.

## THE GRACIOUS ANSWER

The way is dark, my child! but leads to light.  
I would not always have thee walk by sight.  
My dealings now thou canst not understand.  
I meant it so; but I will take thy hand,  
And through the gloom  
Lead safely home  
My child!

The day goes fast, my child! But is the night  
Darker to me than day? In me is light!  
Keep close to me, and every spectral band  
Of fears shall vanish. I will take thy hand,  
And through the night  
Lead up to light  
My child!

The way is long, my child! But it shall be  
Not one step longer than is best for thee;  
And thou shalt know, at last, when thou shalt stand  
Safe at the goal, how I did take thy hand,  
And quick and straight  
Lead to heaven's gate  
My child!

The path is rough, my child! But oh! how sweet  
Will be the rest, for weary pilgrims meet,  
When thou shalt reach the borders of that land  
To which I lead thee, as I take thy hand,  
And safe and blest  
With me shall rest  
My child!

The throng is great, my child! But at thy side  
Thy Father walks; then be not terrified,  
For I am with thee; will thy foes command  
To let thee freely pass; will take thy hand,  
And through the throng  
Lead safe along  
My child!

The cross is heavy, child! Yet there was One  
Who bore a heavier for thee: my Son,  
My Well-beloved. For Him bear thine; and stand  
With Him at last; and from thy Father's hand,  
The cross laid down,  
Receive a crown,  
My child!

—Henry H. Cobb, 1834.

## COMMENTS

**Closed Eye Opens Eyes** A juror in a recent trial closed one eye in an indiscreet manner and thereby opened the eyes of Judge King of Boston to certain influences at work in his court room. The story which the Christian Cynosure reprints from the Boston Journal of April 26, 1917, may serve to open the eyes of others as well:

"An incidental wink by a juror, as he was passing out of the Superior Court yesterday, caused Judge King to take away the \$30,000 suit brought by John McAleer against C. N. Kimball & Co., arising out of injuries received by McAleer in being struck on Charles street by an automobile owned by the defendants.

Incidentally, the insignia of a secret order had something to do with the case, although it was not the proximate cause of a mistrial. One of the jurors and a witness called for the plaintiff wore similar fraternal badges, and an attorney says he saw a wink exchanged between the juror and the witness.

This led Judge King to remark that hereafter all jurors and witnesses should refrain from wearing any insignia of fraternal associations while on duty."

J. B.

\* \* \* \* \*

**Welfare Work of Doubtful Value** Another case of welfare work of doubtful value was brought to the attention of the public by the recent riot in the Joliet penitentiary. Acting Warden A. L. Bowen places the blame for this deplorable occurrence on certain welfare workers. A Milwaukee paper quotes him as follows: "The unpleasant truth of the matter is that the Joliet penitentiary has been overrun with women."—It appears that an organization known as the "Library league" had about two years ago gained the permission to work in the penitentiary. "The principal purpose of the organization was to supply women correspondents for the prisoners. . . . But either through neglect or because the league was powerless to control their work the other kind of women soon took advantage of the opportunity afforded them. Their letters for the most part were of the most suggestive character and the favorite pastime of the men was to gather during the recreation hours and read their letters to each other and speculate on the character and appearance of their correspondents. Such a state of affairs I, of course, could not permit to continue. The men had come to the point where they felt that they were petted idols rather than inmates of a penal institution."

Though the fact that abuses have crept in does not immediately discredit the plan of these women to benefit the prisoners, we cannot but feel that this plan by its very nature almost invites abuse. There are professions for which woman is peculiarly adapted; she will, for instance, never be supplanted by man as a nurse

for the sick. Perhaps a woman can deal better with her fallen sister than a man could. We admit that there have been, and that there are now, women whom the Lord calls from their home into broader fields of labor, women whom He has endowed with special gifts for work among such unfortunates. Such women have done noble work among men also, work for which the world owes them thanks. Instances may be found where a good, old-fashioned home woman has in her home life found the opportunity to exert a beneficent influence on a man not a member of her family. But we do not believe that a woman should of her own choice go out among men and look for such opportunities. She cannot avoid carrying the element of sex into her work, a very dangerous element to toy with. What husband would want his wife to attempt to uplift some male stranger by writing letters to him? There is frequently but a very short step between correspondence and corespondency. Let the average woman exert her influence for good in her home and in the circle in which she moves. That will do much toward keeping men out of the penitentiary. If she feels that she must go beyond the bounds of her home, let her restrict her attention to her erring or poor sister and to the helpless child, leaving the care of the man she does not know to other men. Safety first!

But aside from this—we have here again the mistake of substituting human influence for the only power that can really benefit or, if one would call it so, uplift the prisoner in our penal institutions. The result is that of which Mr. Bowen complains—the offender against the law begins to consider himself a petted idol, which is to his temporal and eternal harm. The work of a Lutheran missionary will not have this effect. He will try to lead the offender to see the error of his way and to humble himself in true contrition before his God. Then the missionary will take him to the cross of the Savior who died for sinners, where alone are found comfort and healing for the bruised conscience. That source of comfort is at the same time the fountain of strength for the battle against the devil, the world, and the flesh. In Christ the penitent sinner will be able to lead a new life, a life in the love and service of God. There is still much room for Lutheran “welfare work” among the thousands of prisoners and other unfortunates inside and outside of our state institutions. J. B.

---

—“A modern writer has designated home as “Heaven’s fallen sister,” and a delightful truth lies shrouded in the title. A **Christian** home should be a heaven begun on earth; the happy abode of warm and loving hearts,—thinking, working, and sorrowing together; all melted down by grace, and uniting together in love.”—Gatherings.

## THE AUGSBURG CONFESSION

### Article XIV—Of Ecclesiastical Order

“Of Ecclesiastical Order, they teach, that no one should publicly teach in the Church or administer the Sacraments, unless he be regularly called.”

Who has the right or authority publicly to teach in the Church and to administer the Sacraments? The answer to this question is set forth in this article.

Primarily and immediately the means of grace, i. e., the Word of God and the Sacraments, are given to the whole Church with the high commission to administer them for the accomplishment of the Lord’s beneficent purpose, the salvation of men’s souls. The saving of souls by the administration of the means of grace, through which alone it can be effected, is the work of the Church, that body of believers of whom it is said: “Ye are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, an holy nation, a peculiar people; that ye should shew forth the praises of him who hath called you out of darkness into his marvellous light.” 1 Pet 2: 9.

It will be observed here that the Christians are a priesthood to whom all instructions for the maintenance and spread of Christianity are given. Even the keys of the kingdom of heaven are committed to them, that their work may be effectual for the accomplishment of the Lord’s gracious purpose. All the rights and duties of the children of God by faith are theirs. For thus the Lord says: “Peace be unto you; as my Father hath sent me, even so send I you. . . . Receive ye the Holy Ghost: whosoever sins ye retain, they are retained.” John 20: 21-23. And St. Paul states: “All things are yours; whether Paul, or Apollos, or Cephas, or the world, or life, or death, or things present, or things to come; all are yours; and ye are Christ’s, and Christ is God’s.” 1 Cor. 3: 21-23.

On the basis of Scripture the Lutheran Church has ever emphasized, that to the believers the means of grace are entrusted. All of them being kings and priests unto God, each one rejoicing in the great salvation which he has received through grace, and each one intent upon glorifying the Savior and confessing Him before all men and using the means given to him to bring others to the faith which imparts peace and eternal life, they are commissioned to administer the Word of God and the Sacraments for their own edification and for the extension of the communion of saints. These their precious gifts must not be disparaged, and their holy rights and privileges must not be disregarded.

But while these people enjoy their holy rights and privileges to administer the means of grace, each and all, it is quite a different matter to make use of their rights and privileges in public when these people unite in a congregation, and their duty to preach the Gospel is to be exercised in public assembly, not all can at the same time exercise their individual rights and du-

ties as believers. The whole congregation cannot as a body preach and administer the Sacraments. Hence, to avoid confusion and strife among the members of such body, and inasmuch as our Lord has provided that everything shall be done decently and in order that the Church may be edified, it is the Lord's appointment that the Church or congregation shall call some properly qualified individual or individuals to act as the representatives of all and to discharge the rights and duties common to them all in their name and in their behalf, and thus establish a public ministry.

The office of the ministry is indeed God's gift and institution. In the same sense that the Church is God's institution or workmanship, so is the ministerial office, but only in this sense; there is no sacramental side to the question. This may be inferred from the following Scripture passages: "Are all apostles? Are all prophets? Are all teachers?" 1 Cor. 12, 29. "How shall they hear without a preacher? And how shall they preach except they be sent?" Rom. 10: 15. "He gave some, apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers; for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ." Eph. 4: 11-12. "Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock, over which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed the church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood." Acts 20: 28. There is then a public office of the ministry which the Lord has instituted for the **public** performance of the privileges and duties of the Church in preaching the Gospel and administering the Sacraments.

But, as Scripture says, Hebr. 5: 4: "no man taketh this honor to himself but he that is called of God, as was Aaron," no one should assume the ministerial office unless he is rightly called. No one has a right, without proper calling, to administer these means of grace publicly in the Church. And this is what the Fathers of the Lutheran Church mean when they state in the XIV. article of the Augsburg Confession, that no one should publicly in the Church teach or administer the Sacraments unless he be regularly called.

The question naturally arises, who has the right to call to the ministry, and when is a pastor rightly called? The Pope claims that all divine authority is vested in him, and that without his approval no one has a right to officiate in the Church. It is a most serious error which not only is illustrative of the hierarchical papal system but which naturally terminated in the obnoxious opinion that, as only such persons have a right to administer the means of grace committed to the Church who have been approved by the Pope, these persons themselves were the exclusive possessors of these means and lords of their administration, so that the forgiveness of sins and eternal life could be given or withheld at their own volition.

Against this grave error the Lutheran Church in her profound reverence for the Word of God in Holy Scripture holds, that God alone has authority to call his ministers. As it is He alone who sends the laborers into His harvest—"pray ye therefore the Lord of the harvest, that he would send forth laborers into his harvest," Matt. 9: 38, even so does He alone call the public ministers of His Church, not, indeed, immediately as the prophets and apostles of old, but mediate through the Church, to which He has committed the means of grace with the commission to administer them in His name. Thus the person called is the minister of the Church and publicly discharges her duty at the same time that he is the minister of the Lord doing His will in the administration of the Word entrusted to His congregation of believers, and it is thus that every rightly called minister of the Church can claim for himself the saying of St. Paul: "Let a man so account of us as of the ministers of Christ and stewards of the mysteries of God." 1 Cor. 4: 1. It follows, then, that he alone is rightly called, whom the congregation calls to exercise in its name the rights and duties entrusted to it in the gifts of the means of grace. Thus only can it be decided who is authorized to minister in the public office of the Church.

In support of this position concerning the ministerial office we would add in conclusion a quotation from the Smalcald Articles which form a part of our Lutheran Confession, and which is designed to vindicate the right of the Church to elect her own ministers. In the appendix of said articles it is declared: "Wherever the Church is, there is the authority (command) to administer the Gospel. Wherefore it is necessary for the Church to retain the authority to call, elect and ordain ministers. And this authority is a gift exclusively given to the Church, which no human power can wrest from the Church, as Paul also testifies to the Ephesians (4: 8) when he says: 'He ascended, he gave gifts to men.' Among these gifts which belong to the Church he enumerates pastors and teachers, and adds that these are given for the edification of the body of Christ. Hence it follows that where there is a true church there must also be the power to elect and ordain ministers; as in case of necessity a mere layman can absolve another and become his minister. So St. Augustine relates the case of two Christians in a ship, one of whom baptized the other and then was absolved by him. Here belong also the words of Christ which testify that the keys are given to the whole Church, not to a few particular persons, as the text says: 'Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them.' Matt. 18, 20."

J. J.

## IS THE POPE INFALLIBLE?

Bishop Strossmayer

(Concluded)

Monsignor Dupanloup, in his celebrated **Observations** on this Council of the Vatican, has said, and with reason, that if we declared Pius IX. infallible, we must necessarily, and from natural logic, be obliged to hold that all his predecessors were also infallible.

Well, then, venerable brethren, here history raises its voice with authority to assure us that some popes have erred. You may protest against it or deny it as you please, but I will prove it! Pope Victor (192) first approved of Montanism, and then condemned it. Gregory I. (785-90) calls any one Antichrist who takes the name of universal bishop, and contrariwise Boniface III. (607-8) made the parricide Emperor Phocas confer that title upon him. Hadrian II. (867-72) declared civil marriages to be valid; Pius VII. (1800-23) condemned them. Sixtus V. (1585-90) published an edition of the Bible, and by a bull recommended it to be read; Pius VII. condemned the reading of it. Clement XIV. (1700-21) abolished the order of the Jesuits, permitted by Paul III., and Pius VII. re-established it.

But why look for such remote proofs? Has not our holy father here present, in his bull which gave the rules for this Council, in the event of his dying while it was sitting, revoked all that in past times may be contrary to it, even when that proceeds, from the decisions of his predecessors? And certainly, if Pius IX. has spoken *ex cathedra*, it is not when, from the depths of his sepulchre, he imposes his will on the sovereigns of the church. I should never finish, my venerable brethren, if I were to put before your eyes the contradictions of the popes in their teaching. If then you proclaim the infallibility of the actual pope, you must either prove, that which is impossible, that the popes never contradicted each other, or else you must declare that the Holy Spirit has revealed to you that the infallibility of the papacy only dates from 1870. Are you bold enough to do this? Perhaps the people may be indifferent, and pass by theological questions which they do not understand, and of which they do not see the importance; but if they are indifferent to principles, they are not so to facts.

The learned Cardinal Baronius, speaking of the papal court, says, "What did the Roman church appear in those days? how infamous. Only all-powerful courtesans governing in Rome! It was they who gave, exchanged, and took bishoprics; and horrible to relate, they got their lovers, the false popes, put on the throne of St. Peter." (Baronius, A. D. 912.) You will answer, these were false popes, not true ones: let it be so; but in that case, if for fifty years the see of Rome was occupied by anti-popes, how will you pick up again the thread of pontifical succession? Has the church been able, at least for a century and a half, to go on without a head? Look now! the greatest num-

ber of these anti-popes appear in a genealogical tree of the papacy; and the absurdity it must have been that Baronius described! because Genebrardo, the great flatterer of the popes, had dared to say in his *Chronicles* (A. D. 901), "This century is unfortunate, as for nearly 150 years the popes have fallen from all the virtues of their predecessors, and have become **apostates** rather than **apostles**." I can understand how the illustrious Baronius must have blushed when he narrated the acts of these Roman bishops.

I do not speak of the schisms which have dishonored the church. In those unfortunate days the see of Rome was occupied by two competitors, and sometimes even by three. Which of these was the true pope?

Resuming once more, again I say, if you decree the infallibility of the present bishop of Rome, you must establish the infallibility of all the preceding ones, without excluding any; but can you do that when history is there establishing with a clearness equal only to that of the sun, that the popes have erred in their teaching? Could you do it and maintain that avaricious, incestuous, murdering, simoniacal popes have been vicars of Jesus Christ? Oh! venerable brethren, to maintain such an enormity would be to betray Christ worse than Judas; it would be to throw dirt in His face. [Cries, "Down from the pulpit quick; shut the mouth of the heretic!"]

My venerable brethren, you cry out; but would it not be more dignified to weigh my reasons and my proofs in the balance of the sanctuary? Believe me, history cannot be made over again; it is there, and will remain to all eternity, to protest energetically against the dogma of papal infallibility. You may proclaim it unanimously; but one vote will be wanting, and that is mine!

## ARE THEY IN PERIL?

Are they in peril—"our Christianity and our much-loved democracy"? They are, though the danger does not come from the source the Western Christian Advocate indicates in an article that appeared in a recent issue. The article, headed "The Man With a Flaming Tongue", reads as follows:

"If ever a commissioner came to this country with a message burning in his soul, Ernest Bysshe, superintendent of the Methodist Episcopal Missions at Grenoble, France, is the man. He has seen things no human being can describe. They rest upon his mind like a burden of crumbling walls and mountainous wreckage; where men cry out with wild despair for the heavens to fall and deliver them from their tormentors. Who can understand his message? It burns like fire, scorching indifference and slackerism burning them to a crisp. He prods and hurts, threatens and shames bruises and slashes in his flaming zeal to

arouse his countrymen here to their responsibility. He claims our Christianity and our much-loved democracy are in peril. The world is looking to us to give the finest demonstration of Christianity the world has ever seen. The only religion worth while now is the one men are willing to die for. And the only government worth while now is the one people are willing to suffer for. Are Americans willing to die for their religion and their political ideals? The United States is being weighed in the balance. The world is the judge. Will we be found wanting? He eloquently declared that 'we've got to convince the world that we mean business and do it in a hurry. We are thirty-three months late in this war. We've been hiding behind the breasts of living men all the time.' Then, with a force capable of one touched with prophetic vision, he throws this question like a long shaft of darkness across our American Christianity: 'Has the Gospel we've been preaching enough vitality to make men of us in the days that try men's souls?'

He comes from the devastated fields of France to speak in behalf of five hundred thousand orphans, and to do what he can to arouse his countrymen to the desperation that demands they move quickly."

It is not difficult for us to understand the mental condition of Mr. Bysshe, for whose feelings are not stirred to their depths by the horrors of the war that is now devastating the world and claiming untold numbers of victims? Mr. Bysshe has seen, and he shudders. We feel with him and for those unfortunates in whose behalf he makes his powerful appeal; yet we cannot but deplore the terrible confusion that reigns in his mind, blurring his eyes that he can no more discern, if he ever was able to do so, the dividing line between Church and State. To him democracy and Christianity are, if not identical, at least interdependent of each other. He tells us our Christianity is endangered—we ask, Whose Christianity? Have we a national Christianity, are the United States a religious unit as well as a political one? Are we waging a religious war? It would appear so, for he says: "The world is looking to us to give the finest demonstration of Christianity the world has ever seen. The only religion worth while now is the one men are willing to die for." A call to arms in the name of Christianity! And Jesus, whom Christianity confesses its Head and Lord, says, John 18: 36: "My kingdom is not of this world: if my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight, and I should not be delivered to the Jews: but now is my kingdom not from hence." In verse 37 He continues: "Thou sayest that I am a king. To this end was I born, and for this cause came I into the world, that I should bear witness unto the truth. Every one that is of the truth heareth my voice." Yes, Christianity is in peril, but the peril comes from within. We are in danger of

losing Christ when we depart from the Word of Christ.

Is our democracy in peril? War now endangers the safety of our country, spies and traitors may be lurking among us; but we fear more than the arms and intrigue of the foe the misdirected zeal of those among us who, like Mr. Bysshe, well-meaning though they may be, attack the first principle of democracy, the separation of Church and State. Democracy begins to totter as soon as the Church attempts to assume the functions of the State, or the State the functions of the Church. God save both Church and State from these perils!

J. B.

In this connection we offer our readers an able article taken from the Lutheran Witness of June 12th, "Press Censorship and Religious Liberty."

#### PRESS CENSORSHIP AND RELIGIOUS LIBERTY

Our Administration has repeatedly urged upon Congress the necessity of legislation which will limit the freedom of the press. It has been asserted that the successful conduct of the war will in a manner depend upon the extent in which these suggestions are embodied in our Federal legislation. The clause in the Espionage Bill which placed the press under a special censorship has been temporarily shelved, but it is expected to reappear.

The Church has a press of her own, and for this reason is interested in the proposed piece of legislation, even as the Church is interested in legislation affecting her schools. The religious press cannot avoid making reference to the war, since the issues of this war to so great a degree lie within the moral domain. Christians look to religion for their guidance whenever moral questions are involved. They would order their conduct according to the infallible Word of God. Nor can the Church remain silent in the presence of wrong-doing. The Church, through its organs, must bear witness against transgressions of the immutable Law of God. And it must draw lessons of warning, admonition, consolation, and instruction especially from this great world-catastrophe, in which also our country and its citizens, also its Christian citizens, are so deeply involved. To be silent regarding the war and its issues, so far as they affect religious thought, is therefore out of question. Hence any movement which would interfere with the free expression of our church-papers in these affairs must be a matter of gravest concern to the Church.

As American citizens we have the right of appeal to the Federal Constitution when the freedom of the press is involved. Without that measure of freedom which our Constitution guarantees to all citizens in its First Amendment, the editors of religious periodicals are as seriously interfered with in the performance of

duty as the editors of secular papers. Under the democratic institutions of our country our Lutheran Church has had free and unhampered development. There can be no violation of American traditions which will not work harm and injustice to the free development of the Church and the free exercise of its rights under the constitutional guarantee of religious liberty. Chief among these rights is the guarantee that it may teach its doctrines according to conviction, taking no regard of the wealth, rank, or station of those whose actions and opinions it must condemn as contrary to the Word of God. Its freedom of testimony to the Truth and witness-bearing against Error must not be interfered with. In the legislation now before Congress there is such latitude of construction given to the executive branch of government that the Church might be subjected to actual persecution because it obeyed the dictates of Christian conscience in testifying to the truth and warning against sin and error.

We have several examples before us which will illustrate what has been said. In a sermon delivered at Dallas, Tex., by a Presbyterian preacher, Rev. John A. Marquis, the doctrine was set forth that the Church has the function to aid the enforcement of law and righteousness. Rev. Marquis said: "It is the business of religion to make the world a dangerous place for evil and evil-doers." "God intends His Church to build a world where no man and no nation can sin with safety." Now, we hold that these statements contain false doctrine, and dangerous false doctrine, at that. These statements convey in undiluted potency the doctrine of Calvin and Zwingli, who made the State a handmaid of the Church, bound by the laws of the Church under obligation to propagate that brand of righteousness which the Church of Calvin professed. By burning Servetus because he denied the doctrine of the Trinity, and by beheading adulterers, Calvin did just what John A. Marquis now proclaims as the duty of the Church: he made the city of Geneva a "dangerous place for evil and evil-doers." Our Lord taught with utmost clearness that His kingdom is not to be extended by means of force. Calvin and Marquis say: **that**, precisely, is the function of the Church. The Presbyterian divine says: "What Christ was His Church must be,—'the greatest fighter the world has ever seen,' and for this reason the Church of America must help crush Germany. The Church is to make her influence felt to the end that the world "may no longer be half autocratic and half democratic"; the "Christian forces of the country will put themselves under discipline, and go and serve where Christ leads them"; "we fight for principle, for humanity, for an ideal which Christ Himself would be willing to die for"; "this war is a struggle for the Christian order of things."

Now, just what will the state of our Lutheran papers be when the censorship bill is passed by Congress? Will it put them in a position which will preclude their testimony against such Calvinistic ranting, because any protest against this and similar wretched perversions of the doctrine of Scripture regarding the Church, her nature, her functions and purpose, may be interpreted as a reflection on the war-aim proclaimed by Mr. Wilson? In Germany there has been just such blasphemous raving as that of the Presbyterian preacher. German editors said of Germany exactly what Marquis says of America: "Our country is a nation that, despite her shortcomings, stands for more of the ideals of Jesus Christ, and deserves more of His Church, than any other nation that ever lifted a flag." What did the Lutheran press of Germany do? It protested against such ridiculous and pharisaical self-exaltation and issued a call to repentance! Will American church-papers have this liberty when the muzzle-bill goes through? Will they still be permitted to condemn that which the Word of God condemns?

Our Government has issued statements which are just as objectionable in their perversion of Biblical truth as the sermon of Rev. Marquis. In a circular issued by the Treasury Department in May, 1917, we read: In the Bible, both Old and New Testament, "the righteousness of a war for human liberty is clearly revealed and well sustained." Have we a right, as Christians, to ask the Director of Publicity, Mr. R. W. Woolley, to state chapter and verse where this is "clearly revealed in the Bible"? May we deny the correctness of his assertion, as a statement of theological truth, without being guilty of *lèse majesté*? The same circular contains these statements: This war of our Nation has "an essentially religious character." "The warfare to which America is called is so missionary that investment in the bonds is a religious act—participation in a crusade against oppression." The Churches are now in a position to "make our land a better 'Republic of God.'" "If America continues the war as she has commenced it, . . . America will be Messianic." William II is called the "King of the Gentiles," with whom Christ, "the Founder of the Kingdom of Love," is placed in contrast. "The issues of this war are, to an unprecedented degree, moral and finally religious, and they call, therefore, pre-eminently, for the rallying of all our spiritual forces from the start."

Now, this is much more than simply the Calvinistic doctrine of a theocratic state, which shall use force to make men good. It is no less than the making of a religious issue of the whole war! On religious grounds, as disciples of Jesus, in a Messianic capacity, the United States has entered the war!!

Who gives Mr. Woolley the right to make these statements. Has Congress made war on these

grounds? Congress made war on the submarine issue. Shall we, then, both as citizens and as Christians, sit supinely while listening to statements which are at the same time political heresy and perversion of religious teaching? Shall we permit religious fanaticism to add a new horror to the world war? Shall we be gagged by Federal censorship, so that no protests against **religious error and false doctrine** may any longer be voiced in our press if an official of our Administration is the offender? We hold that such statements regarding the function of the State, as contained in the bulletin of Mr. Woolley, are very dangerous political heresy because subversive of that separation of Church and State, of religion and politics, which is the foundation of all our other liberties. Shall we not as citizens possess the right of protest? Above all, God has enjoined upon the Church the special duty to protest and testify against all error, whether within or without the Church. Unless the Church has this right of protest unmodified and unhampered, her religious freedom is lost.

Love of country, no less than love of our Church, must prompt us to protest against the special censorship clause. Mr. Arthur Brisbane has forcefully said: "When this war is over, and the peoples at last discover how they have been deceived and deluded and inflamed to furious passion and deadly hatred and awful slaughter by this huge conspiracy of organized lying and concealment of real facts, a roar of universal execration will go up, and men who have given their pens and talents to this sinister work, miscalled patriotic propaganda, will be fortunate if outraged peoples do not hang them as fast as they are caught. We charge the prolongation of this horrible massacre and destruction of Europe directly upon censorship and propaganda, and time will amply prove how true is the indictment. And it is certainly true that if this war had not been prolonged until the fears, passions, and hatreds excited by these devilish instruments of censorship and propaganda had made Germans and every other people in Europe madmen, we would not now be preparing to go to war." We endorse Mr. Brisbane when he says: "There should not be a single policy proposed by the President or by Congress which should not be clearly submitted to the people for free discussion. We want no military despotism set up here while we are professing to go to war to free other peoples from military despotism."

The constitutional grounds for our objection to censorship are well set forth by Mr. George Wickershaw, Attorney-general of the United States in President Taft's cabinet, who said in an interview recently:—

"In making these statements, I desire to make it clear that my criticism is non-political. I am speaking as an American citizen whose profession happens

to be the law, and who consequently is thinking about them along legal lines.

"Assuming that the censorship proposed aims chiefly at suppressing any criticism of the Administration officers, whose chief duty, in fact, whose chief ideals are to be servants of the people, such an aim is the most dangerous political mine which could be laid to explode the structure of constitutional right upon which this United States of America has grown to be the greatest nation in the world.

"The theory of the American Government is that the people are sovereign. The office-holders are the public servants. To attempt to stifle criticism of their servants by the sovereigns is to subvert the whole theory of our Constitution. It is a deliberate violation of one of the most sacred and most fundamental rights.

"Politically, the course which our ship of state has been taking lately is incomprehensible to any man who has given the legal purposes of our Constitution any intelligent thought. It seems that we are asked through our Congress to enact legislation in support of the ideals of democracy that would defeat the essential principles of democracy.

"The First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States adopted in 1789 declared that Congress shall make no law abridging the freedom of speech or of the press. Thus the Constitution of the United States definitely repudiated the European idea of censorship." G.

#### WHITHER ARE WE DRIFTING?

Glaring with a peculiar, ghastly glare were the reports of a fearful crime perpetrated in and near Springfield, Mo. A child of fourteen months, the only child of its parents, was kidnaped from home while father and mother were at a dance. The kidnapers demanded a ransom of six thousand dollars. The father made every effort to ransom his child, but the criminals, alarmed by the popular fury and fearing for their safety, refused to negotiate. At last the child was found dead in an old well on a forsaken homestead. A mob was at once ready to round up suspects to extort confessions and to execute vengeance without due process of law.

In Tennessee a mob has again burned at the stake a negro suspected of crime. Instead of unreservedly condemning all mob violence as anarchy and demanding legal procedure for every citizen, the *Times*, a large and influential daily of St. Louis (June 12, 1917), writes as follows:—

"The ghastly crime which recently was the prelude to the horrifying punishment of a Tennessee negro by a mob, and the infinitely callous murder of a Missouri babe kidnaped for ransom, which was followed by the passionate attempts to extort confession from a sus-

pect, are instances of the overmastering impulse for vengeance which may seize upon men ordinarily respecters of law and devoted to order. In neither the Tennessee nor the Missouri case will the members or the leaders of the mob be arraigned by law. They represented public feeling, and that sentiment still effectually indorses and upholds them. At the bottom of things, they represented also justice, if not law."

As far as we remember, this is the first time that the public press has so openly defended mob violence. This same paper, a short while ago, supported the measure abolishing capital punishment for the State of Missouri. Here is a sample of the reliability of the public press. Capital punishment inflicted according to due process of law seems to them a relic of barbarism, but the burning and torturing of a suspect by a frenzied mob "represents public feeling," and "at the bottom of things represents also justice."

If these people are the moral and political leaders of the nation, whither will they lead?—Lutheran Witness.

---

#### FRAGMENT

I hear Hope singing, sweetly singing,  
Softly in an undertone,  
And singing as if God had taught her,  
"It is better farther on."

Still farther on! Oh, how much farther?  
Count the milestones one by one.  
No! no counting, only trusting  
"It is better farther on!"

---

#### THE FOLK DANCE

Rev. Ira O. Nothstein.

Where is the folk dance leading us? Like a modern dancing mania it is sweeping over our land, and we wonder what the end will be? The folk dance is presumed to be an innocent substitute for the lewd modern dances. But is it? Those who have lived in countries where these "games," as they are sometimes called, are old institutions, know how they lead to abuses. They have given rise to no end of lewd variations and additions. They give license to the most shameless liberties, and are all the more dangerous because they take place at any time, in any place and without sufficient supervision.

When the pious forefathers came to America and established the Church here, they brought with them all that was best in the culture and civilization of their country. Why did they not bring the folk dance with them and teach it in their parochial schools? They knew that that was one of the things of this world, and they did not wish to "be conformed to this world."

To-day, however, it seems to be different. We are in the hands of a class of people who are determined that our children must dance. Benevolent women's clubs start gymnasium classes, to which young girls from our churches go, and these classes all seem to include instruction in dancing. As a pastor we have had the sad experience of losing a number of valuable workers from our church societies, who dropped the church work because the club gymnasium classes were held on the same evening and proved more attractive. The public schools force the children to learn the folk dances whether they or their parents desire it or not. Oh, yes, we know the cry will be raised that these are only "games," and innocent gymnastic amusements; but who will draw the line between the dance and the folk dance for most of these children? In a certain high school the dancing fever is at such a height that a certain element of the students are fighting with every energy to have the ban on dancing lifted,—a measure which was taken a year ago to prevent the dangers to which the exercise of the privilege had brought the pupils. To cap the climax, we find that the gymnastics in some of our Lutheran colleges are tending the same way.

A certain Lutheran college in the East advertises in its catalogue that instruction in folk dancing is given. What will the end be? "Be not conformed to this world." "Blessed are the pure in heart." Investigating committees, converted dancing masters and former patrons of the dance all testify that purity of heart is impossible to those who practice this diversion, and yet we are apparently raising up a greater proportion of lovers of the dance than ever. Let us take warning.—The Lutheran Companion.

---

#### NOTICE

The attention of young Lutherans from our circles sent to the Great Lakes Naval Training Station, Great Lakes, Ill., is hereby called to the fact that the only Lutheran church within reasonable distance of the Station is the church of the undersigned, Lake and County Sts., Waukegan, Ill.

R. O. BUERGER,  
916 Belvidere St., Waukegan, Ill.

---

#### 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.