The Story of the Religious Life in the Evangelical Synod of North America

Described by Pastor H. Kamphausen, Dr. Theo.

Editor of the

Magazine for Evangelical Theology and Church

Cleveland, Ohio

1924

Translated by

The Rev. John W. Flucke

Original Title

Geschichte des religiösen Lebens in der Deutschen Evangelischen Synode von Nord-Amerika

Dargestellt von H. Kamphausen.

Eden Publishing House
St. Louis, Mo.

TRIBUTE

This translation was made for the Eden Archives by John W. Flucke (1901-1988), who came out of the Evangelical tradition and embodied its spirit. He was born in Wellington, Missouri, attended Elmhurst Proseminar, graduated from Eden Seminary in 1925, and continued studies in Tuebingen, Germany and Norman, Oklahoma. He served churches in Kingfisher, Oklahoma (1926-1935), Clayton, Missouri (1935-1948), Inglewood, California (1948-1965), and San Bruno, California (1965-1969), and then retired in Claremont, California (1970-1988), where this translation was made in the last year of his life.

Typed by Clara Louise Flucke Wehrli

October 1, 1990

Dedicated by the author to

The Evangelical Faculty of the University of Gieszen

In respectful gratitude for

the honor bestowed upon him through

the degree of Doctor of Theology

NOTE TO THE READER

Many titles of German works cited in the original text are given in English in this translation and may cause confusion when trying to locate an item. Readers should consult *Geschichte des Religiöse Lebens in der Deutschen Evangelischen Synode von Nord Amerika* by Hugo Kamphausen (St. Louis: Eden Publishing House, 1924) for their original German titles. Kamphausen's book is located at BX 7915.K3 in the Luhr Library at Eden Theological Seminary.

CONTENTS

Foreword

Through this book Dr. Kamphausen has made a very significant contribution. The book is significant first of all because it deals with a subject which heretofore has been given little attention. In undertaking to set before us, as a precious heritage from the fathers, the inner spiritual life of the leading men of our Synod, sharing with us the witness of their spirit, the author has done pioneer work.

What painstaking study of the sources, for example, must have gone into his beautiful description of the theological teaching method of that deep-thinking, and withal pious, man of God, Andreas Irion. How carefully he follows the threads whereby he was bound to the theology of Germany and particularly of Gesz! How adept he has been in portraying how, as an independent thinker and constructive personality, he not only enabled his seminary students to comprehend the depths of the Holy Scriptures but at the same time taught them to be good preachers, leaders of worship, and teachers of confirmands, and in so doing exercised a strengthening influence on the spiritual life of the whole church. Or consider how he deals with the controversies surrounding the teachings of Professor Otto. Both the supporters and critics of Otto are allowed to have their say. The author sets before us a man whose critical approach fascinated his students and whose devout personal life became a demonstration of the gospel and an example of Christian character, yet at the same time a scholar who through his exegesis of the Fall and the doctrine of justification gave his opponents an opening for attacking him. Yet nowhere does the careful exposition of Otto's position become dry or dull. Rather one reads on with mounting suspense, experiencing once again in one's own soul the spiritual battles of the forefathers.

The book is by no means merely a history of the past but has to do with the living present. The burning present-day questions, such as found expression at the most recent General Synod, are discussed from their various points of view. In all this one greets with gratitude the author's rich resources: books, minutes, papers, tracts, polemics or pertinent quotations, or articles such as had appeared in the "Magazin".

The author traces the transformation of the Synod as brought about by its American environment. Considerable attention is focused on how much our services, our preaching, our liturgy, our congregational singing, our confirmation instruction, our attitude toward fraternal organizations, and, yes, even the curriculum in our educational institutions, were influenced by the use of the English language and our relationship with the Protestant denominations of America.

The author sets before us not only the lives of the pioneers in the work of the Synod but also those still living: men who because of their abilities and their trustworthiness were chosen for administrative or teaching positions. Many of these men are

mentioned by name as the author seeks conscientiously to describe their activities, their plans, their intentions and, in the case of our seminary professors, their teachings.

Not that I agree with him in everything; that would hardly be the case with any book, not even with regard to those one may himself have written. But the reader will have to admit that he is dealing here with a significant book, and this regardless of whether he happens to be concerned with our Church's position with regard to the important issues of our time, or whether he is interested only in finding new enthusiasm for the building of the Kingdom of God and of our own Synod. Our Church is blessed with men of God, strong in their faith, who despite their varying opinions as to the best methods for promoting the work of God's Kingdom, nevertheless are united in their love for the work of our Evangelical Synod and in the fervent prayer: "Hallowed be thy Name, thy Kingdom come."

F. Mayer, Ph. D., D. D.

Eden Theological Seminary
Thanksgiving Day, 1923
St. Louis, MO

The Occasion for This Writing

At the 22nd General Conference of the German Evangelical Synod, held in New Bremen, Ohio, from September 28 through October 6, 1921, a number of guests from our old fatherland were in attendance. Special attention was focused on one of their number, namely Pastor Licentiate Dr. Dibelius from Berlin, a member of the High Consistory of the Church of Prussia. In view of the distressing conditions in the German fatherland, and especially in the German church, the officers of our Synod had requested the leaders of the Prussian church to send a representative to our General Synod in order that we might counsel with him as to how we might best be helpful to our mother church in this time of emergency. The High Council had chosen as its representative Pastor Dr. Dibelius who had been in attendance at the German Kirchentag in Stuttgart and had come directly from there.

This was the first time that the highest governing body of the official church of Prussia had established such a direct relationship with us. It is true, of course, that during the early beginnings of our work there had been frequent contacts but never before had the High Council sent a representative to one of our General Conferences. Only the World War, which had had such catastrophic consequences for Germany, had brought about this change. On the Sunday afternoon of the Conference, Pastor Dibelius addressed us on the basis of Psalm 118: "I shall not die, but I shall live, and recount the deeds of the Lord." He burdened our souls with the portrayal of the German people, sick unto death, but also expressed the confidence that out of the extreme distress of the times a new German folk would arise.

The effect upon that great gathering was overwhelming. Suddenly the weight of our biological and spiritual kinship broke through and only the fact that this was a worship service helped us restrain our feelings. Our souls bled as the picture of physical and spiritual distress was held before us. Still our souls were touched as we realized what strong support was found through faith in God and in the future of the German people. Clearly, for a long time to come, German Christians would need to hold fast to that great word of Paul: "We walk by faith, not by sight."

For our guest the genuine concern for the German fatherland and its church which he found expressed not only at the General Conference but everywhere, wherever he went, naturally was most heartening. At the same time getting acquainted with widely varied church life of the Evangelical Synod--to say nothing of other church bodies of our land--was for him most interesting. The many ways in which our church life differed from that in Germany made a strong impression upon him. He felt that, especially in the rural congregations, he could still recognize in many things the church life of the old German homeland, namely that of a more Lutheran type. On the other hand, he could not

fail to notice the influence of the American environment as it affected organization, preaching, the liturgy, and church life in general. He found the more German-Lutheran tapestry somehow interwoven with Calvinism and Methodism.

Considerations of this kind were discussed personally, and later through correspondence, and eventually led to the suggestion, and the decision, to write a "history of the religious and churchly life of the German Evangelical Synod", tracing the development of these trends throughout the eighty years of the Synod's existence. In doing so, one would naturallly undertake to show how both factors, the German and the American, interacted with each other.

This is the task which the author has undertaken in this writing. In doing so he hopes, first of all, to be doing a service to his own Synod. Such a historical examination should highlight for us the essential nature of our religious and churchly life and should emphasize the importance of not giving up our distinctive character as we continue to move forward in the unavoidable process of relating to the American church. At the same time our undertaking should help interested circles in our German mother church to become better acquainted with our Synod. And, finally, we would hope to make some contribution toward helping the churches of our new homeland to understand a little better the development and nature of our own church life.

P A R T O N E

The German Evangelical Synod as the German Church It Originally Was (1840 - 1890)

Chapter I

The Origination of the Evangelical Synod as the "Evangelical Church Society of the West"

Bibliography: History of the German Evangelical Synod of the West by A. Schory, 1889. History of the German Evangelical Synod of North America by A. Muecke, 1915. "German Evangelical Synod" in Herzog's Realenzyklopaedie, Third Edition, Vol. XIV, under article, "North America, The United States," by L. Brendel, 1904. Adolph Baltzer (First President Biography by his son, Baltzer, M. D., 1896. Louis Nollau by A. Baltzer. J. Rieger, His Life Story. Three Hundred Years of German Life in America by R. Cronau, 1909.

A thoroughgoing acquaintance with the Evangelical Synod and her history is not to be assumed either among the Protestant church of America or in the old fatherland. The above-mentioned history of the Synod by Schory, 1889, apparently found little notice outside our own circles. The article by L. Brendel in the Realenzyklopaedie, of course, makes available to everyone the basic facts concerning the history and work of our Synod, but in no way relieves us of the necessity of providing our own description of the Synod's religious and ecclesiastical life. It is true, of course, that in 1915 our own distribution center (Eden Publishing House, in St. Louis) released a new work which exceeds in thoroughness and comprehensiveness anything that has heretofore been offered in this field. It is the above-mentioned history of the Synod by A. Muecke. This book, in its Introduction, presents a most interesting description of the nature and extent of German immigration to our land and goes on to portray quite factually and with sympathetic understanding the growth of our own church body up until the time of its 75th anniversary. Muecke's work, which deserves a wide circulation, will make it clear to all its readers that simple piety coupled with selfless devotion will, even in our day, contribute effectively to church building. Unfortunately, the book made its appearnace in wartime when throughout our land there was little interest in anything German in nature or of German origin. Already all intercouse with our German fatherland had been cut off. Thus the book suffered because of the unfavorable conditions and had to wait to find a wider acceptance for more favorable circumstances.

Consequently, it becomes necessary for us to deal also with historical matters and to describe briefly the founding and the outward development of our church body.

In order that the word "evangelical" may be rightly

understood, let me insert here a word of explanation. In Germany the word "evangelical" is used in contra-distinction to "catholic". Here in America this is not so. To indicate non-Catholic we use the word "Protestant". "Evangelical", on the other hand, is used in the German-American church scene to designate our Synod as "united", that is as being based on the principles of the (German) Church of the Evangelical Union. In this treatise the word will consistently be used in that sense. Among English-speaking Protestants one encounters a third meaning of the word "evangelical": it is used to designate that ecclesiastical movement known as fundamentalism, whose members are fundamentalistic in the sense that they hold fast to what they call "the fundamentals" of salvation, emphasizing the importance of conversion and of a Christian way of life.*

There have long existed in America Lutheran and Reformed church bodies. Such organizations of local churches are usually designated through the use of the word "Synod". The first Lutheran creation of this sort was the Synod of Pennsylvania, founded in 1748 by the famous pastor Henry Melchior Muhlenberg Such synods naturally were originally confined to the East. It was not until the second or third decade of the nineteenth century that they began to penetrate into the more western states, such as, for example, Ohio and Tennessee.

It was a time when in the United States the "Westward Movement" began to make itself felt. ("Westward goes the course of Empire," Lowell) In 1803 the United States, under President Jefferson, had purchased from Napoleon I the so-called Louisiana Territory, a huge land area extending from the Mississippi to the Rocky Mountains and from Texas to Canada. In 1807 Fulton constructed the steamboat, an invention destined to facilitate connections with the West by water transport. Soon thereafter, under President Monroe, the National Road, a system of highways was built across the Alleghenies, later to be extended from Wheeling, West Virginia, through Ohio and Indiana, all the way to the Mississippi. Thus a more complete penetration of the western states by land became possible.

It was little wonder then that in consequence the flood of immigration from Europe, and especially from the continent was renewed as many sought to take advantage of the opportunities af-

- - - - -

* See O. Baumgarten Religious and Ecclesiastical life in England (in Dibelius, Handbook of English-American Culture, B. G. Tuebner, Leipzig, 1922, under "V. The Evangelical Type." This type is essentially pietistic. It is greatly beholden to the "Keswick Movement," a movement for the promotion of sanctification, headquartered in Keswick, whose conferences are attended by many Anglicans as well as free church people. The movement is characterized by high standards of religion and morality as well as by missionary zeal. In America, as well as in England this movement constitutes an undercurrent of great significance.

forded by the opening of these vast new territories. The new opportunities became all the more appealing in view of the widespread poverty and economic stringency caused by the long Napoleonic wars. Also the reactionary trend in many European governments had caused great political discontent. Thus it was that the fever to emigrate laid hold of the masses, particularly in our old fatherland. Most of the emigrants were rural people who hoped to find in America an independent way of life. Others left their homeland for political reasons. They looked upon America as a land of freedom where with little work they would have prosperity and where also they would have a social order based on democratic principles. Among the latter were many who for a time at least believed in the possibility of establishing, somewhere in the West, a German state of their own. Many reports concerning the advantages of the new land and its glorious future found their way back to the German homeland. Especially influential were the writings of a Rheinlander, Dr. Gottfried Duden, who in 1824 had settled in Missouri, about fifty miles from St. Louis. After a three-year residence in Missouri he wrote enticing descriptions about this virtual paradise on earth. (See Muecke, p. 50ff.) The immigrants came from Wuerttemberg, Hessia, and the Rhineland, as well as from Westfalia and Hannover. They came by ship to New Orleans and continued up the Mississippi by steamboat, or they came to New York and proceeded inland partly by water and partly by mail coach.

St. Louis, at that time a city of 11,000 inhabitants, became the center for the German immigrants who spread out from there into eastern Missouri and, equally, across the Mississippi into St. Clair County, Illinois. A large number of German immigrants settled in Quincy, Illinois, 120 miles north of St. Louis.

The immigrants were not all of the same sort. The simple rural people who came from the well-churched regions of Westphalia, Hannover, and Wuerttemberg, had a strong religious need. Those from more educated circles, who had left the fatherland for political reasons,* were free-thinkers also as to religion. Not only that, they were for the most part indifferent, if not actually hostile, to the church and all it stood for. In the German press they carried on a bitter battle against the "Pfaffen" (as they called the clergy), whom they accused of keeping the people in ignorance. Many people, including also many "Latin" (i.e., educated) farmers willingly followed them. They had, indeed, several churches of their own served by so-called "free" clergymen. The latter, for the most part, were given not only to free thinking but also to a kind of loose living which caused people to lose even their last vestiges

- - - - -

* S. Faust, The German Element, Vol. 1, P. 442ff. Their leaders included the following who, following the Revolution of 1830, had become political refugees: Paul Follenius and Fr. Muench. Paul Follenius (Follen) was a brother of Carl Follen, professor of German literature at Harvard.

of respect for the clergy. Often they had received neither education not ordination. Usually they lived sumptuously until some especially offensive moral breach brought an end to their public career.

From time to time the Committee of the Basel Mission House received requests that they might accept responsibility for serving the spiritual needs of the neglected or poorly served Germans in the States. Swiss fellow-countrymen, and others who knew about the Mission House, turned there for help. Even American Christians in the East, aware of the moral and spiritual needs of the new settlers, had alerted the Basel people to the great need and had at the same time promised substantial help. At length the Committee decided to respond to the mounting urgent pleas. Although it could not be called a mission to the heathen, the Committee felt that this was, nevertheless, in a broader sense, a missionary responsibility. In its Annual Report for 1835 the Committee reported as follows: "Our Committee proceeded on the premise that any inhabited place, anywhere in the world, that could not be considered as within the domain and therefore the responsibility of some national church, must be considered as a part of the mission field worthy of the humane concern of the Mission Society. Therefore, we felt that we dare not close our hearts to the various appeals which recently had come to us, the more so since in responding to the need we would be able to provide suitable fields of service for some whom we had trained for missionary service. We felt, therefore, that in responding to several such appeals we were acting in accord with our commitment to evangelical mission work."

One cannot escape noticing that the Committee felt a need to justify what seemed like a departure from its original commitment to evangelization of the heathen. No mention is made of the need to serve German (or Swiss) compatriots, but the Committee justifies its new work solely on the basis of the fact that here was a "humanly inhabited place" in need of spiritual care. The Committee mentions additionally the opportunistic reason that these particular places perhaps provided better opportunities for service for some of their trainees than perhaps might be available elsewhere. And, finally, they noted that these assignments were to be considered as "exceptional instances".

For very similar reasons the Rhine Mission about the same time began to include the evangelical Germans in the state as a legitimate part of its work for the Kingdom of God. One gets the impression that the leaders had some trouble in convincing themselves that they could conscientiously substitute this kind of activity for the mission work among the heathen to which they had so long been committed. We know, too, from the personal testimony of some who came to America from Barmen that they looked upon their work as a kind of second class missionary activity. A certain big, husky Barmenite confessed that when Inspector Dr. Fabri told him that it had been decided that he should go to America he "faded dead away" because of the "let-down".

We do not intend by these remarks to denigrate in any way the work of the Mission Societies. "They builded better than they knew." They undertook a work destined to bear fruit a thousandfold. Through the work of their students in founding new churches they created a memorial which readily bears comparison with what was accomplished in the pagan world. Nor were they satisfied simply to hold the baby for baptism, but instead followed through with decades of care into adolescence and adulthood. The Basel Mission Society alone provided the Evangelical Synod with approximately 150 pastors. (See article by Krause in Theol. Magazin for Sept., 1919, p. 333.)

Moreover, it is true, as we shall point out later, that the Evangelical Synod in other ways also, was deeply influenced by the fact that this church was the fruit of the labors of Basel and other free missionary societies.

The first Evangelical (in the sense we are using the word, see p. 2 above) minister in Missouri was Herman Garlichs. Garlichs was born in Bremen in 1807. Following his ordination in Bielefeld, he married the daughter of Administrator von Borries of Herford, Westphalia. Influenced by the travel letters of Duden (see above), he felt inclined to go to America. Certain Reformed people from Tecklenburg induced him to discontinue his theological studies in Germany and to come to America to be their pastor. In 1836 he founded a congregation at Femme Osage, 50 miles southwest of St. Louis. The simple log cabin in which he lived is the oldest Evangelical parsonage in Missouri and, for that matter, in the entire Synod. (See Muecke, p. 54.) In 1835 Basel sent to America John Jacob Riess; he became the pioneer of Evangelical work in South Illinois. In 1836 two others came from Basel who also were destined to play a significant role in the history of the Synod, namely W. Wall and Joseph Rieger. The following year Louis Nollau arrived. Although from Oberlausitz, he had received his education in the Barmen Mission House. All these men found their first field of labor in St. Louis or in nearby counties on both sides of the Mississippi River. Being from the same or similar Mission Houses, and being brothers in the faith, they maintained fellowship with one another. The fact that there was strong opposition to positive Christian work among the Germans, as well as the difficulties associated with establishing new congregations, soon suggested the need for some kind of ecclesiastical body through which the pastors and congregations might find needed support. Especially Nollau seemed to understand that if their efforts were not to be splintered but instead were to lead to something permanent some kind of organization was imperative. They were aware, of course, that whatever they might do could be expected to have only very limited results but found comfort in the fact that the Kingdom of God is like a mustard seed, growing from small beginnings.

Thus it was that in the fall of 1840 Nollau invited his friends to meet with him in a brotherly conference in order that together they might consider what steps might be taken to further

the cause of the Evangelical church in this country. Nollau was living in the so-called Gravois Settlement, now Mehlville, near St. Louis. In his log cabin parsonage six pastors met on October 13, 1840. They were: Nollau, Riess, Garlichs, Wall, Daubert from Quincy, Illinois, and Heyer from St. Charles. These six men, following careful consideration and earnest prayer, banded together to form a society to be called:

"The Evangelical Church Society of the West"

From the twenty-four paragraphs of the by-laws we mention the following:

Paragraph 2: We commit ourselves with all our hearts to the symbolic writings of our Evangelical mother church in Germany.

Paragraph 3: The Society consists of ordained ministers. The pastors are asked to invite their respective congregations to send delegates. These delegates shall have voice and vote in the meetings.

Paragraph 5: The ordination of candidates shall take place at the meetings of the Society.

Paragraph 8: A committee is appointed to prepare and present an outline for an Evangelical catechism. (Wall, Garlichs, and Nollau formed this committee.)

Paragraph 9: Another committee shall prepare and present the outline for an Evangelical agenda (Book of Worship).

Paragraph 10: The Society will be concerned for schools and education.

Paragraph 11: It is recommended that when performing ministerial functions the members wear the customary clerical garb.

Paragraph 16: Every pastor shall report concerning his activities and shall give the secretary a statistical report.

Paragraph 18: Changes in the by-laws shall require a two-thirds vote of the members.

Officers were elected and the six members present signed the by-laws. Joseph Rieger, who at the time was on a journey, signed later; also John Gerber.

Some of those in attendance returned home that same evening. A young farmer accompanied them on their journey over barely passable roads through the dark night. (See Muecke, p. 101.) The Evanglical Germans endured great opposition. Who at that time would have imagined that in the course of time thirty congregations would be established there to hold aloft the banner of the gospel! Who would have dreamed that the tender sapling that was planted would develop into a tree in whose shade hundreds of thousands would rest! Yea, more, who could have surmised that this Church Society would one day become a denomination with congregations spread across the land from the Atlantic to the Pacific and from Canada to Mexico!

Chapter II

The "German Evangelical Church Society of the West", a Creation of the (Newer) Pietism

Bibliography: Article, "Pietism" by C. Mirbt in Religious Education, Vol. XI, pp. 774-815. See also "Pietism" in Social Teachings by Troeltsch, p. 827ff and other places. L. E. Nollau by A. Baltzer. Joseph Rieger by L. Haeberle. Adolph Baltzer, A Life Story out of the German Evangelical Church in North America, by Dr. Hermann Baltzer.

As clearly indicated by the foregoing, the leading men among the founders of the Church Society had been students at the Basel and Barmen Mission Houses; by far the great number were sent from Basel (see Chapter I). In Barmen, in 1837, there was founded "The Evangelical Association for the Protestant Germans in North America," also known as "The Langenberg Society." This society was closely related to the Barmen Mission and got most of its workers from the Mission House. A similar organization was formed a little later in Bremen. The first and most important support the Church Society received from the Bremen Society came in the person of Adolph Baltzer, who was destined to play an important role in the development of our church body. As early as 1846 two graduates of the "Rough House" became members of our Church Society and in later years Baltzer received from Wicherns substantial reenforcements from a subsidiary of Bremen, the "Johannesstift" in Berlin, more specifically from the "Sternenhaus", a subdivision of the "Johannesstift". In other words, before the Church Society trained its own ministers in its own institution, almost all its workers came from the German Mission Houses. It was inevitable, therefore, that the spirit and philosophy of the Mission Institutes should have a deep influence upon the Church Society. The Mission House spirit, of course, was that of Pietism as it had developed toward the end of the 18th and the beginning of the 19th century. (See Mirbt, p. 810ff.) One could call the Church Society a creation of Pietism.

The new Pietism must be seen as a movement in reaction to the rationalism of the Enlightenment. Left unsatisfied by the preaching of morality and rationality, devout souls turned to the Scriptures and prayer in their search for a life in God. Thus there blossomed in quiet souls in many parts of the land a new springtime of faith. Since the established church and its leaders seemed neither to understand nor to care, faithful people banded together to form societies of the faithful. The most influential of such societies was the "Society of German Christianity," which was established in Basel in 1780 (See article, "Christianity Society," R. E., Vol. III, p. 820) and later had branches in many parts of Germany, including Pommerania, Berlin, Ravensberg, Elberfeld, Bremen, and elsewhere. From this organization came also the Basel Bible Society, 1804, and later numerous others throughout Germany, including Crischona and the Basel Mission Society (1815). Of special interest to us is the fact (as pointed out by Mirbt, p. 812) that the Basel

Society was international and, despite its liberal confessional spirit, remained faithful to the organized church.

The Basel Mission Society was, from the very outset, in close relationship with Swabian Pietism, where the conventicles of the older Pietism were revived in the form of Bible study hours. Basel itself always had a kind of "spiritual hinterland" in Wuerttemberg, where it found many of its leaders. In Wuppertal "the Rhine-Westphalian Pietism experienced a revival through such people as the physician Collenbusch, Gottfried Menken, and the Krummachers (Mirbt). Also, Berlin became one of the centers of the Awakening, thanks to Pastor Jaenicke and Baron von Kottwitz (Note his influence on Tholuck). In Ravenburg the pietistic movement was associated with the great evangelists Schmalenbach and Volkening.

Such was the spiritual climate in which the founders of our Church Society grew up and got their education. And not only that, but the basic stock of our congregations, that is to say the elements which formed the basic spiritual character of our churches, came largely from pietistically-oriented circles, particularly from those in Westphalia, Hannover, Lippe-Detmold, and Wuerttemberg. The Rhinelanders cannot be included here since, due to early industrial development in that area, immigration from the Rhine Province was never very strong.

Any evaluation of Pietism is likely to be colored by the personal religious-theological orientation of the individual. Ritschl in his great work, "The History of Pietism," sees in pietism a renewal of Catholic devotional ideals and therefore sees it as a "misdevelopment" within Protestantism (See article, "Ritschl" in R. E., Vol. XVII, p. 25). Insistence upon a congregation of sincere believers is for him an unfailing sign of sectarianism and of a return to a monkish spirit. The "sect type" is for him Catholic and any trend in that direction represents for him a return to Catholicism and a retreat into the Middle Ages (Troeltsch, p. 745, footnote). As a matter of fact he insists that the Christian ideal of Calvinism represents a return to the ideals espoused by the Franciscans (Troeltsch, p. 745).

Troeltsch, while a student of Ritschl's, does not agree with him. For him sectarian religion is not exclusively Catholic nor does its appearance among Protestants necessarily represent a return to Catholicism. On the contrary it has at all times been for the church a justifiable and completely regular form of church life. One finds it even in the teachings of Jesus and in the early church, particularly in the teachings of the Sermon on the Mount and in the communal life of the early Christians. These two factors, the strong personal morality of the Sermon on the Mount and the picture we are given of the spirit-filled loving life-style of the first Christian congregations, suffice to keep it forever alive.

By way of contrast he depicts Paul, with his preaching about

objectively achieved salvation as the founder of the "church type". Jesus' Sermon on the Mount, looking forward as it does to the coming end and the Kingdom, gathering and unifying the believers while sternly rejecting the children of the world, moves in the direction of the sects. The Apostolic Confession, looking back as it does to the miracle of the redemption and to the person of Jesus and living by the power of its heavenly Lord, has back of it something completed and objective by which it gathers and assures the believers, moves in the direction of the church. The New Testament serves to build both the church and the sects. (Troeltsch, p. 377)*

So far as Troeltsch's thesis concerning the origin of the sects and of the church is concerned, we cannot agree with him. He makes the New Testament responsible for both: the preaching of Jesus for the sects and Paul for the church in its institutional character. We find it impossible to hold our Lord responsible for the excesses and narrowness of the sects. Nor can we hold Paul responsible for the compromises which the institutional church has made with worldly ways and worldly powers. We seem to have to do here with a school of modern theology which sees a conflict between Paul and Jesus. (See Wrede in R. E., Vol. XXI, p. 506 ff.) Wrede is the forerunner of those who insist that Paul made of Christianity something entirely different from what we are given in Jesus. Jesus, it is said, put the emphasis on the moral character of children of the Kingdom. Paul replaced this with the dogma of redemption through Jesus Christ. Paul, it is claimed, considered as fundamental to religion the saving deeds of God in the incarnation, the death and the resurrection of Jesus. In so doing he became, as it were, the second founder of Christianity and, at the same time, the founder of ecclesiastical orthodoxy. To all this we can only say that one must, of course, recognize progress and change between Jesus and Paul but would point out that it is based on the intervening acts of the death and resurrection of Jesus. We

---

* As regards these two learned men we perceived that Ritschl opposes the sects while Troeltsch insists that both church and sect are equally valid. Ritschl, of course, was the Lutheran churchman, the man of the people's church. For such an one the norms for morality and faith must not be set too high. Meanwhile the official church must be regarded as the keeper of the precious treasure of divine forgiveness. Troeltsch, on the other hand, contends for the equal right of church and sect (and mystical types) because in so doing he makes room for his own theology which he considers as belonging to the mystical-spiritual type and as within the bounds of the several equally valid religious types.

These remarks are, of course, a kind of excursion and may be considered a digression from our theme. They may, however, serve to remind us that no matter how academically-founded our conclusions may appear to be, they are always influenced by personal factors.

would point out further that even the first believers, having received the outpouring of the Holy Spirit, proclaimed God's saving grace in the death and resurrection of Jesus and in so doing preceded Paul. (See Acts 2.)

Troeltsch obviously takes his stance from Wrede. It cannot be denied that the ethics of the sects are based in part on the Sermon on the Mount. At the same time it would be difficult to say that their faith is to a lesser degree founded on the great deeds of salvation which Paul, the supposed founder of institutional Christianity, considers to be the Alpha and Omega of his apostolic preaching. To cite an example: who makes more of the Sermon on the Mount than does the pacifistic sect of the Mennonites? Yet what church emphasizes more strongly the deeds of salvation than these same Mennonites? Or take the Methodists who regard it as their mission "to spread the contagion of holy living throughout the world" and to be a church of sanctification. And is it not Paul's teaching concerning justification that kindles their zeal? One recalls how the Wesleys associated with the Moravians and, particularly, how John Wesley was influenced by Luther's introduction to Paul's Letter to the Romans. Also their ideal for Christian living with its emphasis on conversion, on growth in sanctification, is based on Paul's teaching concerning the Holy Spirit and of Christ in us. The same must be said for Zinzendorf and his Herrnhuter (Moravians). The cross was at the very center of his theology and his emphasis on love for Jesus and for one another as the outgrowth of the experience of salvation.

The same must be said for the entire movement of German Pietism from beginning to end. The origin and development of Pietism is based on the teachings of Paul no less than on the gospels or the Sermon on the Mount. Pietism has to do with conversion, true faith, the second birth, and a Christian way of life: all concepts mediated by Paul (in part also by John) not only by the Synoptic writers, much less by the Sermon on the Mount. And yet the Pietiests were the strongest critics of churchly Christianity.

It appears, therefore, that Troeltsch's thesis that the sects are based on the Sermon on the Mount while the institutional church is based on Paul must be greatly limited or rejected completely. It appears that the Sermon on the Mount comes into the picture largely because of its apparent rejection of oaths and of self defence. Nor can it be said that the Synoptic view of Jesus produced the Protestant sects. On the contrary, they owe much to the Pauline writings and the Book of Acts which, of course, is based on the Pauline deeds of salvation. The ideal of the sects for a holy and living church has always been, or should be, the ideal for the church, even though it is seldom realized.

The emphasis in the Protestant churches has always been on Paul. Recently there has been a reaction with the slogan: Back to Jesus! This has happened partly because of sociological mo-

tivation. There is a desire that our common life be permeated by Christian social teachings. In part, the movement has been inspired by scientific-critical theology. There is the attempt to roll back the theological, metaphysical Christianity of Paul to the religion of Jesus, that is to his trust in God and love for others.

Contrary to both Ritschl and Troeltsch, traditional Christian theology represents neither a return to Roman Catholicism nor a sectarian brand of Christianity. It sees in Pietism a re-awakening of biblical Christianity. Spener and Francke take their stand unreservedly on the gospel of Christ as proclaimed by Paul. The way to salvation is through repentance and faith. In this they agree completely with Luther. Even when, in contrast to the dead faith of orthodoxy, they demand a faith that manifests itself in daily living, they know themselves to be completely in line with Luther. Certainly no one has protested more vehemently against a false Christianity of the mouth or pleaded more earnestly for a genuine faith of the heart that should be a "living and powerful" thing than has Luther.

What was new (in Pietism) was that, with James, it emphasized the need for faith to find expression in works. Like their Master the Pietists never tired of preaching that hearers of the Word must become doers and that a tree is known by its fruit. That this emphasis can easily, and often does, result in a legalistic Christianity of works is, of course, true. Spener himself often insisted that he had no delight in the subtleties of orthodox theology but preferred rather to concentrate on "the fundamentals on which our salvation and faith rest." (See Mirbt, p. 781.) He was interested only in those aspects of the teaching which seemed important for religious living. It is understandable that this could lead to a narrowing down of interest in critical theological study.

The two Pietistic movements in the German church, at the time of Spener and in the early 19th century, both were reactions against intellectualism in religion. The first was a reaction against the unthinking acceptance of the dogmas of orthodoxy and the second a reaction against the rationalism of the Enlightenment which sought to equate religion with certain moral and intellectual concepts apparent to everyone. Over against this was the felt desire of many for a life of fellowship with God through Christ. The demand for personal spiritual experience at length asserted itself. The distinctive thing about pietism is its emphasis on the practical. While religious feeling sometimes led to excesses, in the end this tendency was overcome and the pull toward the ethical emerged victorious. As a consequence Pietism became deeds of love and of creative good will; it, however, made no correspondingly important contribution to scientific theology. It was not until in the 19th century when Pietism became an important factor in the religious awakening, that it influenced the development of leading theologians so that in their works an undercurrent of pietism becomes discernible. The orthodox group with its emphasis on the divine deeds of

salvation and the importance of personal religious experience owes much to Pietism. The current tendency toward the ethical and the evaluation of doctrinal teachings in the light of their practical worth for daily living fit in with the age-old emphases of Pietism.

This is not to deny the fact that in many respects Pietism still stands in need of both curbing and fulfillment. Pietism has never found a healthy easy-going relationship to the world, its culture, and its economy. It has not been able to set up a system of social teaching that might help to shape our political and social life according to a Christian pattern. In this area others have taken the lead and it will take a bit of doing for Pietism to relate to these larger areas of our social life and to make its influence felt.

The Pietism which became the founder of the Church Society had already given up many of the idiosyncracies which characterized the old Pietism. They (our pioneer pastors) were not instructed nor did they seek to found congregations consisting solely of converted or born-again Christians. Although they had been educated in free (non-church-related) institutions they were never anti-church. It would be true to say that their preaching concerned itself mainly with repentance and faith and that, with Zinzendorf, they could say: "I have only one passion; it is He." It may be admitted that so far as the things of the world were concerned they were often a bit narrow. They were not overly impressed by the importance of secular things. They paid little attention to the culture and its problems as manifested in society. Educationally they were poorly equipped to do battle with the "educated despisers of religion". But they were men of living faith, of love for people, of unlimited energy. They were men of practical common sense and of great adaptability. It was a combination of gifts and abilities which in this country, given the people with whom they had to work, was unconquerable. With God's blessing they have overcome the obstacles and difficulties by which they were confronted. Their work has not attracted the attention of the world, for it was carried on in limited areas and always with humility and in lowliness. But it has taken root and in the course of time has become outwardly noteworthy to the extent that future generations will look back upon these pioneers and honor them for their faith.

We shall now take a brief look at some of the leading personalities to see if the word "Pietism" can properly be applied to them.

Chapter III

Founders and Leading Men in the "Kirchenverein"

Bibliography: Remembrances of H. Garlichs: with Historical Dates by P. Wossidlo, 1865. In Remembrance of E. L. Nollau, by A. Baltzer 1869. Joseph Rieger, a Portrait, Published by L. Haeberle, Joseph Rieger, a Pioneer of the German Evangelical Church, by Ed Huber. A. Baltzer, A Portrait by Dr. Herm. Baltzer.

As one considers the life stories with which we are here concerned, one cannot escape their captivating charm. The fascination lies not only in the fact that as members of the Synod we see them as our spiritual forebears and therefore have an interest in their experiences and their work as members of our family; it lies not only in the primitive nature of the surroundings under which they worked as true pioneers. It lies rather in the strongly pulsating life of faith which resulted in the fruits of trust in God and love for humankind. Their hearts were filled with humility, simplicity, and purity. Their material needs were minimal.

In their dealings with others we perceive unbelievable patience and a tenacious perseverance. With the simplest means and without diplomacy they achieved enduring results. The general impression is one of having been transported into the springtime of the young church. Here are men such as from time to time in the great epochs of awakening have sprung forth from the believing congregation. To them were given specifically those gifts of the spirit which were required for evangelical seed-sowing in stony soil.

It cannot be our purpose here to present complete biographical sketches of these men but simply to highlight those traits in their lives which would seem to support our thesis that they all were generously anointed with the oil of Pietism. Very briefly we would describe a pietistic spirtual leader as one who holds to a "deeds of salvation" theology, who insists on conversion and sanctification, and who tends to dissociate himself from worldly ways even when they are not directly sinful. For him religion is a matter of feeling and experience which must prove its genuineness in practical Christian living.

H. Garlichs from Bremen was not only the first Evangelical but also the first German preacher in Missouri. Among the founders of the "Kirchenverein" he rates as probably the most knowledgeable theologian. Although not a product of the Mission House he was in relationship with the Langenberg Society and was in close contact with the Christian circles in Wupperthal and in Ravensberg. His wife, as mentioned in Chapter II, was the daughter of government official, von Borries, in Herford where Garlichs earlier served as a tutor. He served for thirteen years (1833-1846) as pastor of the congregation at Femme Osage which he founded and from where he went out to start a number of other

congregations.

He had already been in the ministry for some years when a personal experience awakened in him a vital faith. In his "Remembrances" (p. 31) he has this to say about it: "For my own spiritual life, as well as for my ministry, the year 1839 proved extremely important. I had come to the point in my thinking where I realized that there was indeed an eternal and divine truth and that it must be available, if anywhere, in the sacred scriptures. I faithfully accepted the truths of holy scripture as written, and preached and taught accordingly. Still much was needed to give me the clarity and certainty which only God's spirit can give. The scriptures exercised my reason and touched my heart but had not yet become for me a matter of spirit and life. I earnestly yearned for the truth which is in Christ but somehow could not escape the sad realization that I had not yet found it. Thus I came to the unforgettable month of October, 1839. My brother pastor in St. Charles, with whom I had a friendly relationship, persuaded me to attend a meeting of the (English) Evangelical Lutheran Synod which was being held in Illinois. We rode there. And it was there during a sermon on Daniel 2:44 ("In the days of those kings the God of heaven will set up a kingdom which shall never be destroyed") that it pleased God to open my eyes and to let me taste the powers of the world to come. All at once the nature of the Kingdom of God, which I had sought to serve without understanding its nature, became very clear to me so that I saw it as with my bodily eyes and at the same time found it within myself. One after another I got answers to problems which hitherto had seemed dark and confusing. As if going out from this central point I received inner light, meaning, and certainty for all things. The love of God was poured out into my heart, which so shortly before had been poor and empty, and I quickly resolved: 'I and my house will serve the Lord.' I had studied Christianity long enough. Now, at long last, I would begin to practice it; I learned to pray and preach and act. However, as my zeal and Christian activity increased I began to feel a resistance and a spirit of opposition which I had not sensed before."

Here then we have a graphic and moving description of an inner change and enlightenment corresponding in many ways to similar experiences on the part of those who believe in "awakening" and "conversion". Here, without a doubt, we have a clear indication of where Garlichs must be placed among pastors.

In 1846 Garlichs left Femme Osage. He later settled in Brooklyn where he joined a Lutheran Synod and so withdrew from membership in the "Kirchenverein".

E. L. Nollau was born in Reichenbach, Oberlausiz, in 1810. Growing up in a God-fearing family, he early felt the pull of "prevenient" grace. "The Christian life and witness of an aged, earnest Christian, a member of the Church of the Brethren, made a strong impression on the six-year-old youngster." "I heard much about the grace of God and conversion to Christ. The Lord

knocked, seeking entrance to my heart, but I was not ready to receive the gift of forgiveness of sins and a new heart." In his seventeenth year he entered the military and was garrisoned first in Glogau and later in Erfurt. Here in Erfurt his restless soul finally found the Lord and his peace. He himself reports as follows: "Already in the summer of 1830, and specifically while in church on my birthday, my heart was strangely moved. The sermon went to my heart. I felt a strong desire to follow Christ and heard with excitement the invitation to come to Jesus. But no one told me how a poor, anxious sinner must flee to Jesus with a repentant heart praying for the Holy Spirit and forgiveness of sins and a new heart. Driven by the spirit of God I sought the company of several true Christians and had an opportunity to read several spiritual books, including Woltersdorff's Psalm Hymns. Earlier I had read The Imitation of Christ (Thomas a Kempis). Though I read it with human eyes, I found in this book what my heart was seeking. I found the way to the sinner's friend, Jesus Christ. . . It was hard at first to believe that he would accept even me for I realized for the first time what a sinner I really was. However, I took heart, fell on my knees and cried out, 'Lord Jesus, Son of David, have mercy on me.'

"My relatives, noticing a change in me and that I now seemed to prefer to associate with true despised-by-the-world Christians, rather than with them, warned me not to go insane. But it was just this blessed insanity that I sought. After I had prayed day and night for a week, seeking grace and forgiveness, a heavenly comfort came into my heart; I was assured of the forgiveness of sins. Life and blessing came into my heart. Now, at long last, I began a new life, the life from God. Twenty years I had served the world and sin, but now--a child of God, redeemed through Jesus Christ, and heir of salvation and grace!"

"There awakened in him a strong desire to preach the Crucified One to those who were still walking in darkness. He got in touch with the Berlin Society and, when it seemed they could not help him, later turned to the Barmen Mission. He withdrew from military service and enrolled in the Barmen Mission House to prepare himself for a career as a foreign missionary. In 1837 he was sent to America to begin a mission to the Indians. This plan could not be carried out. Instead, divine leading brought him into the work of ministering to the Germans living in Missouri, first of all, as we have seen, at Gravois Settlement, south of St. Louis where his ministry was richly blessed. From there, as we have seen in a previous chapter, he issued the call to other Evangelical pastors which led to the founding of the "Kirchenverein" (Church Society).

In 1845 his conscience impelled him to once again place himself at the service of the Barmen Mission Society. He was sent to Africa where he served until 1849. Then he returned to America and served until 1860 as pastor of St. Peter's Church in St. Louis.

With regard to the nature of Nollau's preaching no material

is available. We can safely assume that in a simple, earnest manner he proclaimed Christian salvation pointing others to the way in which he himself had found peace for his soul.

His special gifts, however, lay not in preaching but rather in the field of Christian benevolent work. In the spirit and faith of the great forefather of Pietism, Francke, he founded first the Good Samaritan Hospital and later the Evangelical Orphanage, both in St. Louis. Amidst the many demands he had his share of troubles so that work and fatigue were his daily bread. But a strong body and a quiet nature coupled with constant communion with God through prayer kept him going. In pastoral work he was untiring. In his public appearances he radiated always a quiet dignity. As Baltzer says, "He never sought just to be popular." He died in 1869 having spent the later years of his life living wholly for the institutions he had established, which, indeed serve as his abiding memorial. He was a typical representative of the Evangelical cleric of those early days, though his achievements tower far above the average.

Joseph Rieger among all the founders of the "Kirchenverein", is the one in whom pietistic tendencies are seen most clearly. However, we note that in his case German feeling, humility, and love for people are combined with American legalism and Puritanical practicality.

Rieger was born a Roman Catholic and his development reminds one in many ways of Luther: hard work, strict discipline, a strong emphasis on monastic devotional practices, the experience of salvation through faith. The freedom and joviality of Luther he never attained. He remained always strict and a bit severe. Even his picture reminds us more of the typical Puritan than of the good-natured German Reformer.

Born at Aurach, near Anspach (in Bavaria) he was sent to a monastery school and early steered toward a monastic life. As a choir boy he had an opportunity to observe the moral laxity of the clergy. Orphaned by the death of both parents he was sent to Epinal, in France, to live with relatives. His uncle was a strict disciplinarian, his aunt an unbeliever. Upon returning home, he declared his determination not to enter the priesthood. At seventeen he heard a Catholic clergyman speak on John 3:16. "Every word sank deep into the soul of the young man, moving him to tears. Returning home he sought solitude, asked the Lord to forgive his sins, thanked him for his love and promised to dedicate his life to his service." Thus it was that he found faith in the Catholic church but was, nevertheless, convinced that he must leave that church. He made the mistake of declaring his intention to leave the church before ever he had become of age and, as a consequence, was forced to flee from Bavaria. So he went to Switzerland where for a time he plied the trade of a tailor. When he became 21 and was given permission to leave, he went to Basel and entered the Mission House. His fellow-students there were not as conscientious as he and often took offense at this strict adherence to what he considered right. This so

depressed him that, as he said, he never laughed once throughout his first year there.

Although he later realized that in this world one needs to feel and act like a human being, it appears that his inclination toward legalistic ways was strengthened when, coming to America, he was befriended by friends of the Mission in New England. A black suit, white tie, a smooth-shaven face, and a high top hat seemed to him essential for the well-dressed clergyman. The informality and free manners of some of his German brothers always offended him. On the other hand, he had little interest in confessional differences, and dogmatic interpretations and limitations, as sometimes applied to Christian teachings, were of little interest to him. In other words we see in him the old pietism in its original form! Christ my Saviour! This was his complete statement of faith. On the basis of that, and nothing more, he was ready to extend a hand to every believer. All that matters is the heart; the questing mind never came into its own. But with it went a strong self-discipline in worldly things and a strong insistence on proper formalities. In the course of time, many things changed. He came to have a greater appreciation for denominational differences; but on the whole he remained himself. He was the first of our pioneer pastors to introduce the use of the English language in the conduct of worship in the Evangelical church, for he saw no future for the use of German.

In referring to some of these peculiarities we do not mean to detract in any way from his pure-gold devoutness. One need only to read his diary to get an insight into his amazing unselfishness, his love for people, his perseverance, and his spirit of adventure. His journal and his description of various experiences, as later edited by L. Haeberle are picturesque, and probably the most interesting writings of this kind which we have available to us.

After a long period of itinerancy, Rieger finally settled in Holstein where he founded a congregation which he served as pastor for thirteen years. He missed the first meeting of the "Kirchenverein" but a year later, at the second meeting, he was elected as secretary of the "Verein". In his congregation he insisted on Christian living and opposed strongly all unChristian ways.

We cannot here trace his later life until his death in Jefferson City in 1869. In other connections we may have occasion to refer again to his participation in the ongoing life of our Synod. Enough has been said to give some insight into the spirit of the man and to support our basic thesis concerning the strong role which Pietism played in the founding and development of our church.

Adolph Baltzer did not come to America until 1845. He joined the "Kirchenverein" in 1846 and so, strictly speaking, was not one of the founders. But no one man exercised such a lasting influence on its development and continuance as did he. He was

born in 1817 as the sixteenth child of the master shoemaker, John Engelhardt Baltzer, in Berlin. Orphaned at an early age, it became necessary for him, while still a boy, to help earn his keep by manual labor and tutoring. He received his classical education at the Gray Cloister "Gymnasium" (college). From the beginning he distinguished himself as a well-disciplined, diligent, and conscientious student. Since he had to continue working even while a student, he must be counted among those who have to bear the yoke even in their youth. The strain to which he subjected his young body sounds almost unbelievable. Often he studied all through the night so that one is reminded of the lines from Faust, roughly translated as follows:

"O that by moonlight
You saw just once again
The midnight pain
I endure here at my desk."

Baltzer, of course, was not aware of the pain Faust endured in his fruitless search for the truth. Nor was he aware that his own lot was unusually hard. Difficult as his outward circumstances were, his biography makes no mention of hard inner struggles such as those endured a few years earlier by young Wichern, whose story in some ways reminds us of Baltzer. He was almost sixteen when he was confirmed by Court-preacher Theremin. The instruction he received from this man must have influenced him greatly for even in old age he often referred with gratitude to how the teaching and example of this man of God had become for him the rule of life. Having graduated from the "gymnasium" (college) with honors he attended the Berlin University where he was strongly influenced by Professor Neander. Later he attended the university in Halle where rationalism still held sway although it was already being undermined by the teachings of Tholuck. Strangely enough, there is no evidence that Baltzer ever became an enthusiastic follower of this teacher who was so popular with many other students. As a matter of fact his biography has little to say about the religious development of young Baltzer. His struggle for daily bread continued. Consequently Baltzer found it impossible to participate in the social life of the students. Moreover, fraternity life in those days was strongly regulated by a gruesome political regime which tended to stamp expression of freedom as criminal. Since Baltzer had neither the inclination nor the money for political activity he had no need to chafe under the prevailing restrictions. After four years of study (1835-39) Baltzer left the university to accept employment as a private tutor.

One cannot help noting the contrast between the educational career of young Baltzer and the development of the founders of the "Kirchenverein" heretofore described. They all, except Garlichs, were educated in the mission institutions, where the emphasis was on practical training and personal piety. Baltzer, on the other hand, was educated in universities which emphasized scientific studies. By the same token, one fails to find in Baltzer's life story any reference to the personal religious experiences which played such an important role in the lives of the others. In the case of Baltzer one hears nothing about a

long struggle with repentance and forgiveness of sins nor about the happiness of finding salvation. While with the others feeling, or religion as a matter of feeling, plays such an important role, with Baltzer feeling takes a back seat while the rationality of the theologian, bringing into play all the faculties, comes into its own. His developing years are not marked by the sharp crises experienced by the others. Growing up in a Christian home he gradually and unnoticed came into possession of personal faith. Although, like Luther and Paul, he experienced difficult studies and hard labor, he seems not to have gone astray into the ways of works-righteousness and pharisaism. Throughout his life he hated pride, self-righteousness, and human boasting, and himself practised an unrelenting self-criticism.

There can be no doubt that in the "Kirchenverein" he exercised a wholesome counterbalance to the one-sided pietism of many pastors and congregations. Still we do not hesitate to count also Baltzer as a representative of a sound Pietism. Consider his future development. After six years as a private tutor he turned to the Bremen Society for German Protestants in America and volunteered for service among his German countrymen in America. Responding to his offer, G. S. Treviranus, head pastor at Martini, wrote to him on behalf of the Society: "A chief requirement of those to be sent out is that they have a firm faith in the Word of God and in its Kernel and Star, our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ. Only such faith can give them the courage to choose poverty and hard work in a foreign land. For the Lord's sake the missionary must be willing to serve his poor brothers in love. The doctrinal standard of the 'Kirchenverein' is the Augsburg Confession; its ecclesiastical practice that of the (Evangelical) Union."

One notes the emphasis on personal faith. Baltzer accepted these conditions. The Bremen Society, like all the other mission societies, was a product of the Pietistic awakening. The work they did was an outgrowth of the newly awakened life of faith. Those who went out under their aegis, whether to pagan lands or to America, were, almost without exception, spiritually akin to them. Going to America to do pioneer service required a spirit of sacrifice and service such as is characteristic of a heroically-accentuated life of faith. Pietism was the spring that had sent such streams of living water into the church.

In later years Baltzer himself emphasized the difference between pastors who were merely dutiful and those who were men of faith. The redeeming acts of our Christian faith were for him the self-evident foundation for Christian living and teaching. No one insisted more on the validation of faith by works, no one applied a more stringent moral standard, no one applied the ax more ruthlessly in cutting down all hypocrites and Christians--in name only. Still, he was free from the narrowness of those who measure Christianity only by externalities. Higher education had lifted him above the limitations of pettiness and "splinter judgments". He was not one to strain out gnats while swallowing

camels.

Baltzer joined the "Kirchenverein" in 1846 and, as already mentioned, soon became one of its officers. But that was not all: he soon became the leading personality in the Church Society. And this was not due merely to his academic education--Garlichs and others also were well educated--but to his spiritual gifts and his character. His very presence commanded respect. He himself once said with regard to the relationship of a pastor to his congregation: "A minister in the pulpit or at the altar stands in the place of God and is seen by the laity as a man of knowledge and authority whose pronouncements and claims must be believed and followed. Therefore, every word he speaks must be well contemplated and thought through. Otherwise, his poorly considered utterances may mislead individuals and congregations to destruction." (See his biography, p. 45) This high concept concerning ministerial dignity found expression in his very being. It allowed him at all times, and particularly later as President, to be both impressive and representative.

Baltzer was the born leader and churchman. He possessed in full measure what others often lacked: a feeling for the importance of law and order, the ability to properly evaluate individual incidents, and the need for a strong organization. In Baltzer the young "Kirchenverein" found the helmsman who with a strong hand was able to steer it safely past the cliffs on which it might have shattered.

So much then by way of brief portrayals of the personalities of the leading men of the "Kirchenverein" during its first decade. All of them, in one way or another, partook of the family trait of pietistic devotion. But Baltzer had the qualities which enabled him to restrain and prevent the one-sidedness and stultification to which an unrestrained Pietism might easily have led.

Chapter IV

The Union Principle of the Church Society of the West

Bibliography: Article on "Union" by Hauck in Religious Education, Vol. XX, p. 253ff. Article, "Lutheran Church" by A. Spaeth under "North America, United States," in Religious Education, Vol. XIV, p. 184ff. J. L. Neve, "The Lutherans in the Movement for Church Union," 1921, esp. chap. 6, "The German Evangelical Synod" by Muecke; also Schory.

Having shown in the previous chapter that the "Kirchenverein" was a creation of Pietism and that its founders were legitimate children of that movement, we should be able now to predict with considerable certainty where this Society would go in adopting a confessional statement for the new church body. It would most certainly adopt a very positive statement of Christian faith but with regard to points of difference would take a neutral position. This assumption finds complete vindication in that part of the society's constitution which deals with its confessional statement. The Society took its stand firmly on the principle of union. The confessional statement, as formulated at the meeting of the "Kirchenverein" (in October, 1840) is amazingly simple. It reads: "Upon motion of Pastor Nollau, and after careful consideration, it was voted unanimously: That we accept wholeheartedly the symbolic statements of our Evangelical mother church in Germany." While the motion may have been carefully considered, because of the shortage of time, it did not immediately lead to definite results. So we learn that the very next year at the second meeting of the Society, held in St. Charles, Missouri, a new approach was undertaken. The paragraph now reads: "The members of the Society acknowledge the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments as the Word of God and as the sole standard of faith. They commit themselves to the interpretation of the Holy Scriptures as set forth in the symbolic books of the Evangelical-Lutheran and Evangelical-Reformed church of Germany, insofar as they agree."

It is evident that the members of the Society recognized that it would not do to simply accept the "symbolic writings" of the mother church in Germany without recognizing the differences between the Lutheran and Reformed confessions. At this time they took their stand on that which both churches held in common without however taking a stand with regard to the disagreements. But it was impossible to avoid facing this issue. At the meeting of the Society in 1848 (in St. Louis) where a revision of the statutes was undertaken they gave the following answer: After stating in the first paragraph that the purpose of the "Kirchenverein" would be to work for the establishment and outreach of the Evangelical Church, they go on to say in the second paragraph: "We understand by the Evangelical Church that communion which recognizes the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments as the sole and reliable standard of our faith and commits itself to the interpretation of the Holy Scriptures as given in the symbolic books of the Lutheran and Reformed Church, the most

important of these being the Augsburg Confession, Luther's Catechism, and the Heidelberg Catechism insofar as they agree. With regard to the points of difference we fall back solely on the pertinent references in Holy Scripture and avail ourselves of the freedom of conscience prevailing in the Evangelical Church."

This is the form in which the confessional statement was finally adopted and as it still stands in the Evangelical Synod.

We call attention to the fact that, as previously mentioned, the expression, "Evangelical Church," is used in the sense of "Church of the Union" and that, among the other Protestant denominations of our land, it designates the church which is built on the union of Lutheran and Reformed teachings and is not used in contradistinction to Catholic.

Let me further explain that in the Evangelical church (relative to confessional differences) the "prevailing freedom of conscience" is to be understood as meaning that every individual, regardless of church status or background, is free so far as the Eucharist is concerned to hold either the Lutheran or the Reformed interpretation.

In America the attempt to form a denomination which would be "Evangelical", i. e., "United" in the sense that in it people, whether Lutheran or Reformed, could belong and worship together, had not previously been made. This was something absolutely new.

The reason, in part, lies in what was discussed in Chapter Two. The founders of the "Kirchenverein" were for the most part children of the Pietistic movement. Pietism from the beginning took a dim view of confessional controversies. What is more, the movement had little understanding or appreciation for the differences between Lutheran and Reformed confessions. Spener (see Chapter Two) desired that in church people should concentrate on the fundamental teachings concerning our salvation and faith. The Church of the Brethren, a very special outgrowth of Pietism, offers the best example of an actual "union".

The new Pietism arose as a counter movement to rationalism (Chapter Two). Instead of "head religion" it advocates a "heart and feelings religion". In place of a formal religion of reason (God, virtue, and immortality) it offers God's revelation in Christ for human salvation. It is not indifferent to teaching insofar as it relates to the supernatural, the divine, the revealed, the historical, as over against a natural religion derived from reason. But when it comes to elaborations of differences between Lutheran and Reformed teachings, it regards these as of little consequence. In such matters it falls back on the dictum of St. Augustin: "In necessariis unitas, in dubis libertas, in omnibus caritas." It values the intensity of faith more than absolute correctness, the fruits of faith more than its doctrinal basis, its power more than conceptual accuracy. Personal piety and love for people were so much of the essence that Pietism was ready to forget even the differences between

Protestant and Catholic. It spoke of the Catholic Church as a sister church and practiced an intimate spiritual fellowship with men like Bishop Sailer. Still it did not neglect conversions. Converts like Stolberg must be reckoned to the account of Romanticism, not Pietism.

In the mission houses at Basel and Barmen the idea of church union found fruitful soil. This was true not only because the resumption of missionary activity was not only the result of a non-confessional Pietism of which the mission houses were the true offspring, but also because in the very nature of things, Basel and Barmen depended upon Unionism. They received their support from Lutheran and Reformed regions in which the geography as well as spiritual kinship were conducive to working together. Basel is situated on the border between Reformed Switzerland and Lutheran Wuerttemberg. Here the mild Lutheranism of Swabia had formed a natural union with the practical Christianity of the Swiss. To the best of our knowledge serious confessional differences never found expression. Regarding C. C. Blumhardt, the first Inspector at the Basel Mission House, under whose aegis both Rieger and Wall, leading men of the "Kirchenverein", received their education, we read in R. E. (Vol. III, under "Blumhardt", p. 264): "The spirit in which he carried on mission work was as much one of personal piety as of ecclesiastical broadmindedness. Although by inner conviction he was a Lutheran, he felt perfectly comfortable in associating with the practical Christians of the Reformed Church." In other words, the complete principle: While holding to your specific confession you nevertheless feel united with those who hold different views because of agreement with regard to the essential matters of faith.

The Mission in Barmen was supported by the Reformed (in practice, United) churches of the Rhineland and by the definitely Lutheran churches of Ravensberg. This situation was not as favorable for harmony as that in Basel. At first, while the newly-awakened spiritual life permitted overlooking confessional differences, the work was easier. But, as with the passage of time, the old differences once again asserted themselves, the situation became so difficult that a break appeared inevitable. (See the article, "Fabri", in R. E., Vol. V, pp. 724-25.) Already Inspector Wallmann, under whom L. Nollau and other Barmenites from the early days of our church body had studied at the Mission House, felt that separation from the Lutherans was necessary. Under Fabri's leadership the conflict flared up openly. Finally it was agreed that in the various mission territories one person of the Reformed, Lutheran, or United type should be recognized as leader, depending upon the confessional stance of the missionary or missionaries who had begun the work in that particular region. Thus peace and cooperation were maintained. In Wallmann's time Barmen, while itself completely inclined toward Unionism, still had in its midst certain people whose further development, confessionally speaking, continued to hang in the balance. For instance, Louis Nollau was sent to America at the same time as Johannes Muehlhaeuser. Muehlhaeuser

made his way to Milwaukee where, in 1849, he founded the Wisconsin Synod. He and other members of that Synod were supported for twenty years by the Langenberg Society. Then both Langenberg and Barmen withdrew their support. One can conclude from this that while Barmen valued Lutheran zeal and was willing to recognize Lutheran differences, it still insisted on the Union principle as an essential requirement for its mission activity.

Since, therefore, the mission houses in Basel and Barmen, both by conviction and through geographical necessity, definitely held to and fostered the Union idea, one could hardly expect otherwise than that their graduates in forming the "Kirchenverein" would make the confessional statement of the Evangelical Union the foundation for their undertaking. We have seen that while at first they simply recognized the symbolic books of the Evangelical mother church, they later enumerated these and recognized the points upon which they were in agreement, and finally, with regard to the differences, allowed every individual the freedom to accept either the Lutheran or the Reformed views concerning the Lord's Supper. "We hold only to the pertinent passages of Scripture" (namely with regard to the points of difference.) As to why they refrained from adopting a specific Union confession of faith will come to light more clearly when we consider the work of the newly-arrived A. Baltzer.

The Confessional Paragraph was formulated already by the real fathers of the "Kirchenverein"--specifically by Nollau, Rieger, and Wall. It did not, however, receive its complete form until 1848, two years after A. Baltzer came to America and was received into the Church Society. Since Baltzer, from the beginning, was elected to serve as secretary, since he was more highly educated theologically, and since, by virtue of his personality, he immediately attained a position of influence, we may assume that he played a decisive role in working out the final form of the statement of faith. The Bremen Society which had commissioned Baltzer had given him the following instructions relative to a confessional statement: "Since we are convinced that the blessing of Evangelical preaching is not necessarily bound up with strict adherence to an ecclesiastical confession, we desire that our emissary promote and build the Evangelical church, that is to say, wherever Lutheran and Reformed gather to form a congregation it should not be his purpose to convert either group to the confession of the other but should seek rather to unite both in truth and love. Should a formal confession be required we suggest the use of the Augsberg Confession which belongs to both churches."

It was a Union-oriented instruction. Entirely apart from personal conviction or inclination, Baltzer was officially obligated to promote the Union program. So far as we know no such definite instructions had been given to any of the other men mentioned above. If they, nevertheless, favored the Union principle, they did this out of inner impulses. Baltzer, on the other hand, had, in addition, some clear ecclesiastical guidelines. It is, indeed, a little difficult to reconcile with

the commitment to Union which was laid upon him, the instruction that should a congregation demand a formal statement of faith he offer them the Augsburg Confession "which belongs to both churches". This reference can be applied only to the Confession of 1530, in which the teaching concerning the Lord's Supper is Lutheran. The varied version of 1540, on the other hand, would not serve the requirements since it changes the statement regarding the Eucharist and, therefore, as well as for other reasons, would be unacceptable to the Lutherans.

We find not the slightest evidence that Baltzer made any attempt to have the Augsburg Confession used as the Society's confessional paragraph. On the other hand, we probably are not missing the point if we attribute to Baltzer's influence the inclusion of the statement, "the passages of Holy Scripture to which we hold relative to the points of difference." We find in it a declination to attempt the formulation of a statement expressing the "consensus" among Lutherans and Reformed relative to the "points of difference." It is well known how long theologians and churchmen labored to formulate such a statement. The union of 1817 (See the article in R. E., Vol. XX) was meant to be only a federation of the two churches for purposes of worship and celebration of the sacrament without the surrender of confession of faith on the part of anyone. In the course of the lively discussions which followed the friends of Union were frequently accused of not having any definite confession of faith. They took this charge to heart and, in an effort to correct the perceived lack, worked hard at the seemingly not hopeless task of finding a form that would summarize satisfactorily and in such a way as to satisfy everyone, the substance of the two confessions. Especially Karl I. Nitzsch worked diligently at this task (See article in R. E., Vol. XlV, p. 133). It was in vain; such a formula was not found then and has not been found to this day.

With such effort, carried on throughout the 40's Baltzer, who came from Berlin in 1846, was, of course, thoroughly familiar. He was in a position, therefore, to advise the fathers of the "Kirchenverein" and to point them in the direction of a proper solution. The solution was found in simply falling back on the pertinent passages of Scripture while definitely declining to give any further explanation.

It would be necessary, of course, to give definite explanations regarding the meaning of the sacraments in a catechism to be used in the "Kirchenverein", but this task was left for the future. At least so far as the constitution of the Society was concerned, such things were kept out.

So far, in considering the coming into being of the "Kirchenverein" on the basis of the Union idea, we have concerned ourselves only with the pastors. We feel prompted to ask: How about the laity? How did they stand with regard to the Union principles? Or, were they even asked? The answer admittedly is "No, the whole matter was decided by the ministers." For years

the meetings of the "Kirchenverein" were attended only by ministers, this despite the fact that from the outset lay delegates were envisioned. Especially during the early years, while the constitution and confessional statement were being formulated, no lay members were present. So, if the "Kirchenverein" was called into being as one representing Union, the pastors alone bear the responsibility.

It is understood, of course, that the clergy in organizational meetings and during confessional considerations always kept their people in mind. Naturally, they constantly had to ask themselves: "How will my people receive the 'Kirchenverein'? Specifically, how well will they understand the Union idea?" In another connection we shall give attention to the religious and ecclesiastical concerns of these pioneer churches. So far as the idea of uniting Lutheran and Reformed is concerned the idea seemed at the time to be favorably received. Both Rationalism, on the one hand, and Pietism, on the other, had tended to take the edge off confessional sharpness or perhaps had even made for a degree of indifference. Moreover, many of the members came from those regions in which confessionalism had never been particularly strong. Here in our land confessional differences in the German churches were in a fluid state. They could be completely eliminated or they could become hardened, depending entirely upon external influences. If the leaders were Union-oriented the people followed them into the Union camp. If the leaders were strongly Lutheran, their congregations tended to become strongly Lutheran. Thus, we see, for example, that while in St. Louis the Union "Church Society of the West" was being founded, the strictest form of Lutheranism at the very same time experienced a resurrection in the formation of the "Synod of Missouri" (founded by Walther at a first assembly held in Chicago in 1847) and composed of people from the same general religious heritage.

Opposition to the Union principle on the part of lay people never made itself felt. It came entirely from the fanaticism of the old-Lutheran clergy. C.F.W.Walther, who not only founded the Missouri Synod, but also stamped it with the spirit of Lutheran exclusivity (See R. E., Vol. XX, p. 844), sensed in the Union "Kirchenverein" a dangerous foe. He, therefore, severely attacked the Church Society, and especially its confessional paragraph. In The Lutheran, during the year 1845, he denounced the Union idea as anti-God and unwholesome, as making people indifferent toward pure doctrine, as suffocating the confessional spirit as unfitting people for the necessary battle for the precious treasure of the pure truth. He further charged that in this country Unionism lived mainly by plundering Lutheran congregations. It was, therefore, an unmitigated evil to be avoided at all costs. (See Muecke, p. 106ff.) L. Nollau replied to Walther's diatribes in a conciliatory manner in a publication entitled, A Word Concerning the Good Work of the Union. He emphasized that the Unionists were confessional Christians who held fast to the fundamentals of the Christian faith and were not at all interested in forming a union with rationalists. He pointed

out that the union of Lutherans and Reformed was an established fact in Germany which deserved to be recognized. He said that members of the "Kirchenverein" were, for the most part, people who had grown up in the Church of the Evangelical Union in the fatherland. Therefore, he insisted the work and the principles of the "Kirchenverein" were wholly justifiable. He asked that Lutherans cease their attacks and their bad-mouthing and instead work with the "United" in cooperation, or at least in peace to do the Lord's work and to combat unbelief. Both writings breathed the spirit which in the years to come was to characterize the conflict-manner of the two church bodies: on the one hand, the spirit of conflict-theology of the 17th century, and, on the other hand, the spirit of Pietism which holds to the essentials, sees no life-or-death significance in the differences and practices mildness and moderation at all times.

To fully understand the church situation at the time of the founding of the Church Society we need to consider the relationship of the various confessions toward one another among the German churches in this country as it prevailed at the time. We have already said that things here were in a state of flux, that is to say, in a period of transition. The article by A. Spaeth entitled, "The Lutheran Church in America" mentioned in the bibliography at the beginning of this chapter, gives a good picture of the situation. Spaeth describes how in the Lutheran Church in America, as originally founded by the famed Muehlenberg (Synod of Pennsylvania, 1748) a mild Lutheranism prevailed in which, even without creedal statements one took a stand on the Lutheran confession. During the Revolutionary War, because of American relationships with France, a spirit of free thought came in which down-played creedalism. Indifferentism, subjectivism, even sometimes an outspoken rationalism, made themselves felt. Lutheran catechisms, books of worship, and hymnals often were displaced by other products designed to meet the supposed "needs of the growing generation." In many places efforts were made to unite with the Reformed people. In baptismal, eucharistic, and ordination formulas, a decline of Lutheran teaching was noticeable. Influential sources in 1819 insisted that "just as in Germany Lutherans and Reformed are united in an Evangelical church, so also it should be in our country."

Especially in the Lutheran General Synod the unionistic element in this country gained the upper hand. The movement found its inspiration in the union circles of the Fatherland and perhaps also in the new world Puritanism and Methodism (sometimes referred to as "the American Lutheranism"). In the end, however, American Lutheranism, which did not consider the differences between Lutheranism and Reformed doctrine as of fundamental importance, was pushed aside and the principle of Unionism was overcome. But at the time of the organization of the "Kirchenverein" the Union movement in the older Lutheran Synods was still going full tilt. Lutheran and Reformed Germans visited each others' conferences. In founding new congregations names like "United Protestant" and also "United Lutheran-Reformed" or "United Evangelical" often were used.

However, a spirit of change had already set in. Already in the thirties and early forties of the eighteenth century many congregations quarreled severely over names, teachings, services, and the Eucharist. The coming to St. Louis and vicinity in 1839 of many Lutherans from Saxony, together with the arrival soon thereafter of the acerbic and uncompromising Walther, a strong leader, heralded the beginning of a new development. Nevertheless, the fathers of the "Kirchenverein" had succeeded in launching their project, modest though it was, and although the Lutherans never stopped their attacks they were not able really to interfere with the work. The real question was rather whether the house they were building had sure foundations and whether or not the builders had the wisdom, the faithfulness, and the perseverance to see it through. It remained to be seen whether or not they would be able to adjust to the new conditions in a new world in such a way that their new kind of church would continue to be viable. While leaving the soundness of the foundation--the Union principle--and the matter of capable leadership for later consideration, we shall go on now to discuss the last-mentioned point, namely the matter of adjusting to American ecclesiastical forms. By the very nature of things it seemed inevitable that the "Kirchenverein" would have to take on the form of a free church.

Chapter V

"Die Kirchenverein des Westens" as a Free Church

Bibliography: Troeltsch, Freikirche, p. 733, 738ff, etc. In R. E., Article on "Kongregationalisten," Vol. X, p. 680ff. G.P. Fischer, History of the Christian Church. R. E. Article on "Nordamerika," Vol. XIV, p. 165ff (by Philip Schaff and L. Brendel.)

Under the circumstances the organization of congregations took place almost automatically. Everything was in a state of becoming, not only new church organizations, but also new political entities. So far as the simplicity and the absence of complicating cirumstances were concerned the missionaries could feel reminded of apostolic times. Like the apostles, they were laying foundations where no one had worked before. As in the case of the apostles, resistance was not lacking: like them they endured the mockery of the wise ones of this world and the blatant materialism of the common herd. In other ways, however, theirs was a different kind of world from that which Paul confronted. The church, even here in the new world, had a centuries-long history. The church had long established the ways in which here in America agressive church work could be pursued. There was, of course, no established church. All the existing churches, or denominations, were free churches in the sense that they were completely independent of the state and in no way amalgamated with it. They were religious fellowships of which one became a member by joining. The free church system is here looked upon by the natives as so understandable and natural that no one ever questions its origin or its justification. That the church and state are completely independent of each other is considered a self-evident fact. Just as in political life there are various parties, so in the field of religion there are different denominations all of which have the same political rights. The idea of religious tolerance is basic to the American view of life. Since there are so many different churches one can be considered as belonging to one or the other only by personally deciding to join. That in the churches the members of the congregation make the decisions lies in the very nature of the situation, though it must be said that the influence and authority of the congregations is not the same in all denominations. Just as in political life, despite the equal rights and voting privileges, issues are decided not by the individual but by many factors involved in representative government, so also in ecclesiastical life the individual congregations, except in those denominations which practice congregational autonomy, the local churches are bound by the decisions of their denominational judicatories. In ecclesiastical, as in political affairs, the democratic principle prevails. The political congeniality between political and ecclesiastical circles was strong already in those days and, let it be remarked, continues to grow stronger.

Troeltsch (see bibliography) says that the free church

movement developed more or less logically from Calvinism (p. 733). We have found little to agree with in what this savant has had to say about Pietism and in this connection with his utterances about Jesus as the originator of the sect-ideal and Paul as the originator of the church-ideal. (See chapter 2) On the other hand, his elucidations about the influence of Calvinism on the social arrangements in church, state, and economic life are most interesting. His judgment on Lutheranism in this regard is much less favorable. He says that Lutheranism, because of its indifference to political issues and its one-sided teachings, has been largely impotent in social matters. Lutheranism, he says, has taught its adherents to be dutifully obedient to political authorities, it has had a preference for patriarchalism and has never worked hard for social change. (Lutheran leaders have objected to this judgment, but I am not prepared just now to discuss their objections.) Calvinism, on the other hand, according to Troeltsch, has from the beginning been concerned to improve economic conditions. It laid the foundations for the political independence of the people it has influenced, and now finally has entered into a partnership with the modern democratic movement which has given it a ruling position in the world. Calvinism has, of course, come to terms with the capitalistic system in ways quite different from Lutheranism and yet, here also, it has been responsible for the strongest efforts to improve the lot of the working class. We find we must agree completely with these judgments. However, we are interested here primarily in the connection between Calvinism and the free church.

Troeltsch shows that Calvin did not advocate a free church but rather a kind of theocracy, i.e., a church which would have a determining influence on the state. Where, however, the outward circumstances made a Reformed state church impossible, Calvinism's strong trend toward independence, and the high regard in which it was held, were certain to lead to a similar kind of constitution for the church. Robert Brown and Henry Barrows were the creators of the free church system, so-called Congregationalism. Unlike the Uniformity Acts under Queen Elizabeth they demand the autonomy of the congregation, freedom from state control. (The state, it was said, had the responsibility for enforcing the commandments of the second tablet--6 to 10--but should not be concerned with the first tablet--1 to 4.) Barrows became a martyr to his convictions. Surprisingly, Troeltsch does not mention John Robinson, the real father of the congregational concept ("Independency") as an organized system. Robinson was the man who took his independent congregation first to Holland and then, in 1620, to America: The father of the Mayflower Pilgrims. Troeltsch, however, does not fail to mention the principle of religious tolerance which should have been basic for Congregationalism but really was first introduced and carried through in Providence, Rhode Island, by Roger Williams. Until he came along the Middle Age Old-Protestant concept of state-church had continued to dominate and had continued to reassert itself even in new situations. One calls to mind the religious intolerance of the Puritans of Massachusetts who, for the sake of

freedom of conscience, had left their fatherland in search of a place of freedom for their faith. Still, we must forgive these men their inconsistency when we remember that there are still in Europe state churches which, while supported by everyone's taxes, still do not guarantee equal rights to dissenters.

Concerning all these matters, the fathers of the "Kirchenverein" probably thought very little as they gave themselves to their successful undertaking. The founding of congregations went forward as circumstances permitted. The task required no special wisdom, deep thinking, or creative genius. While they gathered their congregations, other clergymen and churches were gathering theirs. They did only what many others were doing and in the same way. By the very pressure of circumstances they were forced into the free church system. One thing, however, should be emphasized. While going about their work they were not aware that they were in fact founding a new denomination. The idea was entirely foreign to their thinking. They saw themselves not as apostles, or for that matter as in any way special, but simply as emissaries of the societies and institutions which had sent them out. These societies and institutions were free organs of the church in Germany. Moreover, they saw the people whom they had gathered into congregations as people who, although now living in America, were by language and origin Germans and, therefore, churchwise, united by a spiritual bond to the German church. So in gathering these people to form congregations they were simply transplanting the German church to American soil; it was simply a new shoot from the old trunk. And that is the way the congregations of the "Kirchenverein" viewed the situation. The second paragraph of the "German Evangelical Church Society of the West" reads: "Decided that we hold fast whole-heartedly to the symbolic writings of our Evangelical mother church in Germany." L. E. Nollau in his reply to Walther's attack on the Union, mentioned above in Chapter 4, wrote: "We wish to be regarded as a part of the Evangelical mother church in Germany and with this church from which we have come, and which by virtue of emigration has been transplanted to this part of the world, we want to continue to be bound up." (Muecke, p. 110) As late as 1865 (on August 18) the then General President, Dr. G. Steinert, in a communication addressed to the pastors in Baden, who had demanded the removal of Pastor D. Shenkl as director of the Seminary, wrote as follows: "We agree unanimously with your protest. . . convinced that you will be encouraged to know that your <u>daughter church</u> across the ocean with you holds fast to the confession of hope. . ."

That is how the fathers thought and how they saw their mission. That with the passage of time and through its increasing interrelationships with American institutions and movements, the Synod's sense of independence and of indigenity have grown stronger is, of course, true and easily understandable.

This interpretation precludes from the outset that the "Kirchenverein," or the Evangelical Synod, into which it

developed, could ever be looked upon as a sect. Since the "Kirchenverein" saw herself as a part of the great German mother church, it could not be considered to be a sect. Nor did it ever cherish the sectarian idea about the church as consisting solely of the born again nor separate itself so completely, as do the sects, from worldly and social concerns. It must be admitted that as the church grew, in later years more of the world got in than in those early years. It is true that in the beginning the fathers were more one-sidedly interested in "religious" matters than in later years, but for forming a sect they had neither mind nor inclination. Their connection with history and culture prevented going astray in this way.

In thus emphasizing the close relationship between the "Kirchenverein" and the Evangelical "mother church" in Germany, we must, however, not forget that the relationship was from beginning to end a purely spiritual one. These relationships were not of an official nature; they had nothing to do with church government. The pastors of the Church Society had been sent out by free societies or mission institutions, not by the German church or its official judicatories. They might feel their kinship in faith and spirit with the German church but they had no relationship whatsoever with the governing authorities of that church. They received no instructions or decisions of any kind from the German church nor did the growth of the Society depend upon that church. The significance of this fact becomes clear when one considers the history of the German church in Brazil. (R. E., Vol. III, p. 359ff., by A. Goess.) There also the Rhenish Mission sent many workers, but for many years the Prussian church government provided supervision and support. Academically-trained pastors were sent who assumed leadership of congregations. Hymnals and other supplies were provided for the churches. As a consequence the Brazilian congregations did not readily achieve the same degree of independence which characterized ours. They never became accustomed to raising the large sums of money required. They failed to educate their own pastors. For many years they had no synod of their own; no indigenous entity for self-government. When the catastrophe of World War came the very existence of the German church in Brazil was threatened. It must be remembered, of course, that the German population in Brazil was not nearly so large as in the United States; also that the situation in that Catholic-dominated land posed special difficulties for the Evangelical church.

What we are saying is that the founding of congregations by the fathers of the "Kirchenverein" proceeded according to the principles and methods of a free church, independent of the state, and dependent upon the members' joining of their own free will. In this process the autonomy of the local church is over-emphasized, the sense of being a part of the larger church may sometimes be almost completely lost, so that instead of getting a connectional relationship we get a lot of individual congregations only loosely related to one another. Instead of a whole, one gets a lot of atomic parts lacking any bond of unity. That is the kind of church life congregationalism had created.

As a reaction to ecclesiastical bondage and the monarchical nature of the state church, congregationalism went to the opposite extreme of complete independence of the local congregation. On the basis of example provided by the first century apostles in their experience here and there in their pagan world, it was hoped the spirit of the one faith would provide sufficient cohesiveness. If the first century congregations did not need any kind of church government to hold individual congregations together, why should we? It was an idealistic conception which in the long run did not prove viable amid the hard realities. In the end, Protestantism, as a whole, did not follow the congregational way.

Our Church Society people had grown up in an atmosphere which did not create confidence in the congregational way. They were children of the state church system. As over against the complete individualism of the Congregationalists they felt the need for historical connections and their idea of the church called for the ordering of individual congregations to form an ecclesiastical organism of the whole. We have seen how they gave expression to their sense of historical interconnection in declaring that the "Kirchenverein" considered itself a part of the Evangelical mother church in Germany. On the other hand, it was clear to them that as pastors and congregations in the new world they must somehow band together as Christians of the same sort with the same ethnic background and the same Evangelical (i. e., United) faith.

In his call which led to the founding of the "Kirchenverein," Nollau stated as the purpose of the meeting that the ministers might learn to know one another better, that they might together take counsel concerning the welfare of the Evangelical church in this country and so be strengthened "for the welfare of the congregations entrusted to them." But in the constitution they adopted they decided to include an invitation to the congregations to send their delegates to the meetings of the Church Society. And in the revised constitution (in 1848) one read in paragraph 3 (Muecke, p. 119) that voting members of the Society (in addition to all pastors) should include all congregations who by accepting the confessional paragraph declared themselves to be a part of the Evangelical church.

Thus, from the beginning, the need for the local churches to be bound together was clearly recognized as indispensable, however loose the bonds might be. The pastors realized full well that the congregations themselves were not at all convinced of the importance of this. Again and again we get reports to the effect that the congregations felt a great disinclination and suspicion toward any kind of synodical authority (See Garlichs, p. 36; Rieger, Life Story, p. 46; Nollau, p. 27, 30). We shall return to this later in considering life in the congregations. Here let us simply remark that it evolved upon the pastors to keep the idea of "church"--in the larger sense--alive, and that, even in the face of opposition from the congregations, they did not fail to do so. In doing so they were completely free of any

hierarchical interest. They simply felt that they needed the support of a larger body and that without a duly constituted church organization no useful or lasting work could be done. History has proved them right. The so-called free-lance pastors (without denominational connection) have played no significant role in the American church and "independent" congregations by the hundreds have in the course of the years joined denominations, or at least have allowed themselves to be served by them.

At first, however, the founders of synods (or denominations) had to proceed cautiously always exercising a due regard for the weakness of the people in regard to this matter. We see their tact finding expression even in the selection of the name, "Kirchen<u>verein</u>" ("Church <u>Society</u>"), indicating, as it does, that this was to be a very loose connection to be joined of one's own free will. It was only later that the word "Synod" replaced "Society", indicating, as it does, a stronger form of organization with a more authoritarian character. Even then it was clearly stated in the revised constitution that with regard to internal matters of the congregations, the synodical authorities were not to interfere. Thus it appears the fathers, while holding fast to the principle of connectedness, exercised a due regard for the feelings of the people and, in so doing, showed great wisdom.

The second thing every free church, like any other, needs for its existence is a confessional statement. We have seen (in Chapter 4) that the "Kirchenverein" at its inception did not undertake to write a new statement of faith but instead committed itself to the three--especially named--historic statements of the Lutheran and Reformed church. With regard to the points of difference the Society claimed freedom of conscience, to be limited only by reference to the pertinent passages of Scripture.

If we now return once again to the confession, we do so in connection with the free church. Wherever official or state churches are replaced by free churches, one is certain, in due time, to have a great many of them, as the history of our land shows. All of these churches, of course, have a confession, or statement of faith, and professedly, in every case, it is based on the Scriptures. Since, however, the confessional statements differ--otherwise, of course, there would not be all these different churches--how is one to reconcile their multiplicity with the claim that they embody <u>the truth</u>--the biblical truth? Since they all make this claim are we to conclude that there is more than one truth?

Troeltsch (in his oft-quoted book, p. 741, 758ff.) says that the free church system necessarily leads to a different <u>concept of truth</u>, namely to the concept of the truth as something relative, to the giving up of the claim to having the absolute truth. The old Calvinism, he says, emphasized strongly being in possession of the absolute truth. This view led to intolerance toward so-called heretics. But the development of the church

proved how very unChristian such intolerance could be and eventually led to giving up the claim to absolute truth. Roger Williams, in his small state, was the first to establish the principle of tolerance. He was the first to forego using carefully formulated confessions to fence off his faith from that of others and to rely instead on the Christian consciousness and spirit.

"That the free church system rests on a different concept of truth than does Calvinism (or, for that matter, Catholicism or Lutheranism) is clearly pointed out," says Troeltsch, by the Swiss theologian Vinet in the following words: "If the state church system were to abolish or prohibit all (non-state) churches, I should not rejoice in this triumph but rather bewail it. For such a triumph, it is clear, could be achieved only by doing violence to human nature and religion, neither of which would will such uniformity. In this area life and diversity go hand in hand. Where there are no sects there is no life. Uniformity is a sign of death." "Truth that is not sought out is only a half-truth. The seeking is as important as the possession. This admittedly is the artery and heart of our theory (regarding free church, that is)."

Such a view concerning the concept of truth does not match well the understanding of Christian truth which we have even in the free churches. Spaeth in the already-mentioned article (Chapter 4) concerning "The Lutheran Church in North America" emphasizes (See Vol. XIV, p. 193) that especially for free churches "consciously holding fast to a confession becomes all-important." Lacking the authority of the state church and finding themselves surrounded by many different sects, the only remaining bond of a common confession dare not be loosened. For him the Lutheran Church is in full possession of biblical truth while Unionism--which certainly is not without the saving truth--is something inwardly untrue. Of course, the Lutherans, for whom nothing is essential or non-essential but everything completely related to the saving truth, must find it inwardly embarrassing to contemplate that there are in this country 16 to 18 independent denominations of Lutherans all of whom claim to be in sole and complete possession of the absolute truth. Yet Troeltsch's suggestion for surrender of the claim to sole proprietorship of the absolute truth would have met with a definite rejection from all. The Calvinistic churches, on the other hand, have become more ready for confessional statements. They do not attach to dogmas such an overwhelming importance. While generally speaking orthodox, they are above all practical in their orientation. Their points of difference often have to do with constitutional questions which have nothing to do with absolutism.

Nevertheless, Troeltsch's suggestion, in the form he expressed it, would no doubt have been turned aside also by them. The free churches definitely had not given up the claim to be in possession of the truth. They claim that in Christ they have the truth of salvation in its absolute form, but they have learned that human formulations of the great truths of faith are never

absolutely perfect or eternally valid. Besides they have come to recognize more and more that Christian churches, despite many deep differences, may often be able to work together in a practical way for the causes of God's kingdom and should strive for the closest possible working relationship.

The "Kirchenverein", having taken the necessary steps to establish itself as a free church by adopting a constitution and confession of faith, began almost immediately to take the necessary steps for its own growth and development. Just as an individual, once on his own feet in a favorable environment, may often do surprising things, so also the "Kirchenverein" entered upon an epoch of great creative activity. In part this was due to the American milieu: "America, thy name is opportunity." The new conditions of a big, fruitful, forward-looking country, are prone to produce in almost every area unheard of potentialities. In part also it was due to the freedom, in the free church system, from all unnecessary restrictions. Finally, we must not underestimate the importance of the personal factor. Men like Rieger, Baltzer, Nollau, and others, had an entreprenurial spirit, perhaps more American than German, which found its driving power in their faith and love. It seemed to them that the first great task of the Church Society would have to be to establish a Seminary for pastors and teachers. We say "and teachers" because from the outset the "Kirchenverein" focused its attention on the need to establish Christian parochial schools in which their children might be instructed in the Christian faith. Such instruction could not be included in the public school curriculum. It must be said that in the coming years the "Kirchenverein" and the "Evangelical Synod", into which it developed, was less successful in establishing church schools and in training large numbers of parochial school teachers than in the training of pastors. Still, for decades the matter was accorded much attention and concern.

The decision to establish a thological seminary was made in the important gathering of the "Kirchenverein" held in 1848. This meeting was especially important also because in this meeting the constitution was revised and completed. The seminary was erected near Marthasville, Missouri, fifty miles west of St. Louis. It was built on a site of some 59 acres donated for the purpose by members of the congregation, and was occupied on June 28, 1850. Pastor Binner was the first and (for a time) the only professor; initially there were six students. The erection of the seminary, in view of the small size of the "Verein" and the limited willingness of the congregations to give (See Baltzer, pp. 35-36) proved to be no small undertaking. Still, for the progress of the "Verein" and faith in its future, the success of this enterprise was of inestimable importance.

In the very same year, 1850, on New Year's Day, there appeared the first issue of the "Friedensbote", a monthly, edited for the time being by Binner. This church paper, intended for the congregations, was from the very beginning of immeasurable value for the "Kirchenverein." It has always been the most

faithful co-worker with the pastor. Besides evoking and furthering a feeling of denominational solidarity, it has helped remarkably in raising necessary funds. Later, at an appropriate place we shall say more about it.

Already on October 5, 1847, an Evangelical Catechism had been readied and 2000 copies printed. Up until this time a revision of the Lower Barmen Catechism had been used. Most of the work on the new Catechism was done by Baltzer. It continued in use for some 15 years until 1862. At the annual conference in 1850 it was felt that an Evangelical hymnal was urgently needed and a committee to prepare one was named. An Evangelical Book of Worship was not printed until 1857.

That all these important things came into being almost at the same time bears testimony to untiring energy of the fathers, to their courageous faith, their independence, to their recognition of the uniqueness of their new church body and the consequent need for suitable resource materials. They were years which for their spiritual productivity and creative power were seldom, if ever, equalled in the years ahead. The circumstances of course called for all these things but that the demand was so promptly met must continue to evoke the wonder of succeeding generations.

While acknowledging that they were done under favorable circumstances, we find the explanation for all these things largely in the nature of free church system. This prompts us to say a word about this system as compared to others, particularly the state church set-up. When as a result of the lost war and the German revolution the rulers lost their authority over church as well as state, many here in America believed that the German church possibly might decide for the free church system. Influential church leaders went so far as to offer to help the German church in making this transition. While such offers were certainly well meant, many, who were better acquainted with the German situation, realized that the development of a free church system in Germany was only a remote possibility. History has proved they were right. Germany faced so many serious problems that it could not give consideration to so thoroughgoing an experiment. Because so many revolutionary changes were under way, it was felt better to continue to count as belonging to the church (at least for tax purposes) everyone who had not definitely stepped out. This plan recognized individual free will only to the extent of recognizing the right of every individual to withdraw from church membership. Much as it left to be desired, this may have been the only plan that was practically feasible. The point concerning confession plays an important role here also. Many say: One could choose only between the confessional church and the Volkskirche (people's church). Others, eager to serve both church and nation, want to have only a minimal statement of faith. We do not wish here to get into that argument. We want simply to ask: Does the free church, as compared to state church, have only advantages or also disadvantages? That the free church has advantages cannot be

denied. Thus far we have not concerned ourselves with the nature of the laity in a free church, but only with the pastors. The congregations, their character and activities, will not be discussed until we get into the next chapter. But everyone will understand that a member who has made a personal decision to join a congregation will, as a rule, be a better member than one who has become a member only by accident of birth. Of the former much more in the way of life and service can be required than of the latter. From the person who is a member by choice it will be expected not only that he live a Christian life but also that he help with the building up of the congregation. Like the pastor, he is obligated to help win others for the congregation. It is impossible here to enumerate the differences between the two systems. Only a few things can be indicated. The role of the pastor--in a good situation--is that of being a personal friend to every member. His field of labor is limited and is one of supervision. In his role as pastor he has no "superiors" but only "brethren". Even in relationship to the highest official in his church body he has the democratic feeling of equality. Bureaucracy is non-existent; official communications are reduced to a minimum. German pastors who have come over to join us have experienced all this with a great sense of relief.

However, the picture also has its dark side. If the pastor is virtually independent of the influence of ecclesiastical overlords, he is at the same time more dependent upon the congregation and this dependence can eventually become more oppressive and permanent. In a small congregation one man--or one woman--can make life miserable for the minister. His position in and of itself will not save him if he does not have the personal traits of tact, firmness, and understanding of human nature and geniality. Since the congregations are often small, the minister's salary is likely to be small also. Pension conditions are miserable, seeing they are regulated not by some large body that can afford to be generous but by small denominations which have to put up with the penny-pinching of small calibre members. Especially the old ministers are likely to find themselves in deplorable conditions. Congregations, as a rule, prefer younger ministers and try to get rid of older ones, and since the minister is not elected for life it becomes easy enough to do so. Congregations find the free church system to be the most favorable for them. The ministers, on the other hand, may often experience personally the system's most serious lacks. If they are not strong personalities they may often lose the feeling and condition of blessedness in service.

Besides, it is of course obvious that membership in a national church with millions of members can offer points of view and awaken feelings which are impossible in a small denomination. If, for example, one undertakes to celebrate the Festival of the Reformation, there is completely lacking the depth of resonance which in certain sections of Germany would cause the individual soul to vibrate in unison with the soul of the nation.

Moreover, while the feeling of solidarity with the people in

a great national church naturally would tend to effect a more far-reaching participation in solving national problems, in a free church one would more often limit one's interests to the concerns of the local church while looking upon everything else as outside interests.

It becomes difficult to evaluate lights and shadows justly and even-handedly. Work in a free church is more satisfying, less frictional, and more hopeful. Generally speaking, the free church system seems more conducive to the promotion of religion than does the state church. The youth, whose religious instruction with us depends almost wholly on the Sunday School, is more likely to find a place in church among us than in the German state church, despite the fact that the German youth have received better instruction in Bible. Actually, certain classes of immigrants excepted, hostility toward the church is seldom found in our country.

So it appears that the shadows are more over there than over here. We say this wishing to avoid any pharisaic self-righteousness and readily acknowledging that conditions in the old world make church work more difficult there than in the new.

CHAPTER VI

Parish Life During the First Two Decades of the "Kirchenverein"

Bibliography: "Friedensbote" from 1850-1860. Baltzer, Life Story. Remembrances of Nollau. Rieger, Life Story. Remembrances of Garlichs.

It is time now to turn our attention to the life in the congregations of the "Kirchenverein" during the first decades of its existence. Thus far, by the very nature of the situation, we have been concerned almost exclusively with the pastors. The German church, as is well known, has often been accused of being a church by and for ministers. This in large measure is a justifiable criticism. Particularly in Lutheran regions where there has been little emphasis on organization and great emphasis on doctrine, it has usually been considered that everything was in order so long as the Word of God was being preached and the sacraments properly administered.

Under such circumstances the laity, while very necessary, were usually assigned a very passive role. Under the territorial system, prevailing throughout the German Empire, the princes had almost complete authority, and Luther, since he had no other channel, made the territorial rulers "emergency bishops." Their influence, as we know particularly from Prussian history, reached into even the most intimate concerns of the church. The pastor under this system actually became a state official. His responsibility toward his superintendent or church consistory was like that of a junior official toward a higher authority. On the other hand, and this was the favorable side of the arrangement, with regard to his congregation he was completely independent. The congregation could not dismiss him nor withhold or reduce his salary. The congregation could not even force him to fulfill his obligations. If he was spiritually inclined and conscientious, he might be a true caretaker of souls and a spiritual father to his congregation. If, on the other hand, he was only a dutiful professional, he would be content to do only what was unavoidable. The natural consequence, of course, was that no relationship of trust and love was formed between pastor and people. The only good to come out of it was that a minister, if so inclined, could preach the unvarnished truth without fear and that, giving only minimal attention to parish duties, he should have plenty of time for private study and so should become a competent theologian. That was equally true in England where a similar system prevailed. It is safe to assume that many pastors in the Lutheran Church, inclined as it was toward an educated ministry and doctrinal preaching, earned their academic spurs while enjoying their rural leisure. Pastors in the German Lutheran church have verified that this condition, creating situations in which often the thornbush towered over the trees, continued to prevail up until the time of the revolution, and that it contributed no little to the unbelievable alienation from the church in the Lutheran provinces.

In the Rhineland and Westphalia with their presbyterial organization, their predominantly Reformed population--Lutheran Westphalia was strongly influenced by the Reformed Rhineland--and their strong accent on the laity things were always quite different. The pastor was seldom looked upon as an official of the state, he could count on the cooperation of his church council, and the indifference of the congregation was never so pronounced. The pastor was not so beholden to the elected superintendent and worked with his church council through persuasion and not like a commanding officer. All this only served to prove that congregational organization was not so completely a matter of indifference, nor the preaching from the pulpit quite so wonderfully effective, as the Lutheran Church tried to claim. It also proved that the Reformed Church in taking the congregations into account was right, as evidenced by the greater participation of the people in church affairs. Years ago a church official in Berlin, commenting on the presbyterial system of church organization wrote: "With you in the Rhineland it may work, but we in the east must issue commands." Now we see the results of this unfortunate mistake.

It was fortunate that the fathers of the "Kirchenverein" came from the Mission houses which were operating more in the spirit of the West. Baltzer alone came from Berlin where a different spirit prevailed. He was influenced by his (Prussian) environment to the extent that he believed "one must have obedience". As a counterbalance to mildness and laxity this was good. The "Kirchenverein" needed men with energy and a penchant for law and order. Generally speaking, however, they were people who by nature and training were inclined to want to work in cooperation with the people in their congregations. Moreover, the free church system, which, as we have shown in the previous chapter, was more or less "a given" would have made any other mode of operation impossible. The climate pervading church life was not conducive to hankering for little popes.

This is true not only generally of American and free church conditions, but it was especially applicable to the German-Americans of that time in the middle-western states: they were not only unchurched, indifferent, and this-worldly, they also had a senseless dislike and fear of <u>synods</u>. This is attested to unanimously by all available reports. For instance, in "Rieger's Life" we read: "Only men of unadulterated faith and great courage dared to breast this tide of opposition. They not only had to withstand the deep-seated mistrust of things ecclesiastical on the part of Christians and endure the mockery of enemies which poured out from so-called educated sources in the form of disdainful newspaper articles and from the rabble in derisive shouts and epithets of reproach hurled at them on the street corners, but they were often attacked with fists and cudgels and, on occasion, even threatened with pistols. The parishioners of Pastor Wall once found it necessary for a period of two weeks to provide an armed bodyguard for their now sainted pastor, who was repeatedly threatened by fanatically excited opponents." And again (p. 35) "A German paper in St. Louis whose

very name (Der Antipfaff--The Anti-Cleric) flouted its prejudices, made it its particular business to libel faithful pastors, to arouse suspicion against them, and to warn all Germans not to allow themselves to come again under the clerical yoke (i.e., by the organized church) and its stupidity. Yes, the Antipfaff deliberately stirred up actual opposition. But the Lord guarded his little flock in a wonderful way so that not one suffered physical harm. On the contrary, the attacks in the Antipfaff on occasion called attention to the presence of a minister so that people inquired about him and such inquiries sometimes led to the founding of new congregations." Page 46: "As was the case in every western city there were among the Germans many who opposed every minister because they saw in him another 'Jesuit' determined to bring people once again under the yoke of ecclesiastical bondage. So it was that Rieger, too, in his early days in Burlington encountered such opposition on the part of certain people. They gathered evenings over beer or whiskey in their favorite saloon where they vented their dislike of preachers and tried to outdo each other in saying scandalous things about the local parson."

There follows the description of an incident involving the saloon brotherhood whose members one night made their way to the parsonage to bash in the windows. One of their number, more inebriated than the rest, was beating on the door only to fall into the minister's arms when the door was suddenly opened. Rieger took him in, cared for him like a Good Samaritan, and eventually got him started on a new and better way.

In Baltzer's life story we read (pp. 24-25): "Of the educated German business men and farmers many had gone through the universities. But perhaps their most conspicuous character trait was their irreligion and a determined rejection of any form of ecclesiastical confession or churchly fellowship. Indeed, our country was seen by these rationalistic theologians as a veritable eldorado of ecclesiastical freedom. Many immigrants belonging to this class used their new-found freedom to play 'Pastor'. Not infrequently such a 'pastor' would go so far as to baptize little children in the name of Freedom, Equality, and Brotherhood."

"To such rationalistic leaders the appearance of the pastors of the 'Kirchenverein' became a thorn in the eye. The very fact that our pastors referred to themselves as being 'united', i.e., as belonging to the Church of the Evangelical Union, became for these agitators a reason to warn their clientele against them, suggesting that they had come to America only to bring people again under the strict ecclesiastical discipline of the Prussian church government."

Similar statements are found in the memoirs of Garlichs and Nollau, particularly expressions of the opposition of those Germans to the synodical organization. They smelled (in the newly-formed Church Society) hierarchical plans and, despite every effort of the pastors to explain, continued to oppose every

kind of synodical organization with closed-mindedness, bitterness, and determination such as we today find it hard even to imagine. This resistance exists to this day in hundreds of congregations. When it comes to churches, the average American is very discriminating, not every denomination suits him. But once he has made a decision and has joined a particular group, he generally has no objection to denominational organization or regimentation. He is used to this from political and social life. One could say there is something of the herd about him; he wants to be led; he is not overly critical or independent; foreigners often are amazed and make fun of how much he will take from his elected leaders. He seems to accept that certain people are destined by nature to be leaders. So he follows them, accepts their program as his faith commitment and accords them a child-like dependence and hero-worship. It would be easy to cite well-known examples from recent history to show how people continue loyal to their standard-bearers even when, according to others, they have proved themselves unworthy leaders.

The German is an individualist, a loner, unwilling to be regimented. Always he suspects hidden motives and has so many "ifs" and "buts" that he finds it difficult to work together with others. The Germans here are divided in many ways and for many reasons--political or ecclesiastical. Because they lack a solidarity of interest they exert little political influence and this despite what one might expect from such a large number of citizens of German descent. The Irish, on the other hand, form a compact mass. Therefore, they govern our big cities and newspapers, and politicians take care not to hurt their feelings.

One other thing must be mentioned which made church work among the Germans during the first decades of the "Kirchenverein" exceptionally difficult and continues to this day to be a great hindrance. The German was often <u>religiously indifferent</u> and churchwise completely <u>uninterested</u>. Church people to him were prayer brothers. The church existed to bury the dead and perhaps to confirm the children. The creeds to him were mere relics of antiquity and the Bible stories fairy tales. We are speaking here not of socialist workers who looked upon the materialistic orientation of their leaders as their "worldly gospel". Such were not around at that time. No, we are speaking of the spiritual children of German rationalism, who had emigrated to America by the thousands. Political reaction had prompted many, even before 1848, to emigrate to Missouri and Illinois. Later came the "48ers" who at least had political ideas and spiritual ideals and who, to some extent at least, have had considerable political influence. Outstanding among these was Carl Schurz, of whom all German-Americans are proud, but there were also many others. Dean Howells, for years the leading American novelist, in many of his works has such an idealistic German play a typical role: a popular trend, to be sure, but also full of ideals and political convictions, very feeling-full, especially when fortified with a bit of wine or beer, a glowing admirer of the American Union and of political freedom, a strong opponent of slavery, and always an admirer of German poetry and depth of

feeling.

However, political freedom for the German--then as now--included religious freedom. Among the "48ers" there was no founding Christian congregations; these "Latin farmers" knew little about farming and even less about church life. The raw masses, on the other hand, delighted by the crazy fulminations of a radical press, hated church, synod, clerics, praying, and Bible-reading, no less than Satan hates holy water. They made life difficult for our fathers. We must remember that most of our founders, having been educated in pious institutions, had a strong aversion to rationalism and the ways of unbelievers. They, perhaps like Rieger, were unbelievably patient and practised a disarming love for their enemies, but they witnessed strongly against all unbelief and to the need for repentance and conversion. Moreover, being generally pietistic, they had little appreciation for art, science, and ways of the world. Their interests were entirely religious. Religion to them was not one aspect of life but the whole of life. There were, consequently, few points of contact. In the end they lacked the sophistication which a German respects even in his opponent; they were simple preachers of the gospel who knew nothing else and cared for naught else. Little wonder then that they related to their opponents like water to fire and that our older ministers complain so much about the hostility, contempt, and unapproachability of the rationalistic Germans that they almost preferred the Americans, who despite their foreign ways, at least were not enemies of the church nor worshipers of reason.

The second decade in the history of the "Kirchenverein", however, brought an important change in the situation. With the 1850's a mass immigration of Germans got under way. Most of the new immigrants came from Hannover, Westphalia, and Lippe-Detmold. Their coming is not directly related to the revolution of 1848. They did not leave their homeland for political reasons. Naturally the great spiritual upheaval which led to the political changes shook the foundations of society and created a ferment which created unrest even among those not politically involved, often leading to unusual decisions and unprecedented actions. It weakened the sense of rootedness, freed the farmer or farm laborer from the feeling of attachment to his acres and led him to consider the unlimited opportunities of far away places which promised a better kind of existence. The most adventuresome individuals made the break and soon emigration fever swept across entire regions. But the motivating forces were wholly <u>economic</u>. For the classes concerned, living conditions in Germany at the time were unbelievably bad. Old men who came from Ravensberg have told us that farm workers were generally paid thirty cents a day, and if, here and there, an employer offered forty cents, workers did not hesitate to walk for hours mornings and evenings in order to get the better wage. The people who came to America from this area into the region of the "Kirchenverein" were <u>church-minded</u> and mostly from a Lutheran background. Most of them belonged to the "awakened" Christians who had been influenced by the preaching of the great (already

mentioned) revivalists Volkening and Schmalenbach or had been reached by other revival preachers such as the oft-mentioned pastors Weibezahn of Osnabrueck and others like them. The memory of a great number of such spiritually awakened pastors was cherished by many of the older ministers of the "Kirchenverein" and later of the Synod and was perpetuated in the lives of thousands of early members of our congregations. Warm-heartedly and with grateful joy they cherished the memory of those men who had sown the seeds of faith in their lives. The years lent enchantment and they were idealized in the afterglow of "first love". Those spiritual leaders of long ago were transfigured to become not only heroes but virtually apostles.

With their strong emphasis on the importance of religious feeling and personal experience, these elements were <u>not narrowly confessional</u>. True, they came from good Lutheran regions. A live liturgy, an altar with crucifix and candles, frequent participation in the solemnly conducted Eucharist had become, as it were, a very part of their flesh and blood. It is true, as we have already pointed out, that eventually old-Lutheran ministers found a fertile field among them, for the simple reason that they emphasized Lutheranism and touted the outward forms of Lutheran church life which they were prepared to offer. With some cleverness coupled with genuine piety and personal conviction it was not difficult for the followers of Walther to find in the same circles out of which our Church Society was built, men and women who could be made into good old-Lutherans or so-called "Missouri Synod" Christians. Walther himself was a domineering personality, a man of strong faith, well-grounded in the Scriptures, firmly and decidedly Lutheran. Nor do we wish to question the sincerity and faith of his associates. So we see how in the course of time the "Missourians" were able to transform the once pietistic, big-hearted, doctrinally-tolerant (except only for the essentials, especially conversion) immigrants into narrow-minded, often fanatical, exclusive believers in the "true doctrine" and "unadulterated Lutheranism".

But that was the result of long cultivation through the pulpit, the press, and the parochial school. Generally speaking, the spirit of Lutheran conflict theology is more likely to be found in the pulpit than in the pew. Nor did it exist in the beginning. Our Lutheran immigrants from the Ravensberg region came to America at the same time as the Reformed people from Lippe-Detmold or Tecklenburg. Both groups joined our "Kirchenverein" and were one in their faith despite points of difference and church customs. The writer knew personally many older Christians from both regions who knew themselves to be one in the faith and, though they were conscious of difference in geographical origin, they felt no sense of separation as to church.

It was from among these people that our "Kirchenverein" recruited its members seeing that geographically their area of recruitment was very limited. There were in addition, of course, also immigrants from Wuerttemberg who were very much like those already mentioned. There were also, of course, immigrants from

Baden, but their number was smaller and they were, so to speak, a different breed. Later there came to Ohio people from the Palatinate and from Rhine-Bavaria. They came to America in large numbers during the 1850's. We have today many congregations in which stock from the Palatinate predominates. They are a different kind of people both temperamentally and churchwise. They are inclined to be more emotional, more superficial than those from Ravensberg and not at all pietistic. Historically they were predestined for the Church of the Union. The formal liturgy of the Lutherans does not appeal to them. In our church life they are not so steady and dependable an element as some others. They would not have been the ones to give permanence and dignity to the "Kirchenverein"; this was to be the contribution of people from Westphalia, Hannover, etc.

The second decade became for the "Kirchenverein" a time for a definite upturn. The "Friedensbote" during those years carried many, many notices concerning the organization of new congregations and the dedication of new church buildings. Most of our denominational historians made it sound as if all this was due to the arrival of Baltzer. Naturally Baltzer, unlike any other, was a driving force in the "Kirchenverein" but the real reason has been mentioned above. The situation had changed. The real explanation lies in the great wave of immigration and in the character of the immigrants. With the material available to our founders during the first decade not much could be done, but those who came in the second decade belonged to "the good soil" (mentioned in the Parable of the Sower).

To attempt to describe the life of our congregations, especially to attempt to do so on the basis of the lives of individual lay members, is most difficult; their character sketches are simply not available and the "Friedensbote" for those years, which is our main source, reports primarily the activities of the pastors or reports on congregational happenings. Life stories concerning lay members appear very rarely and then only in the briefest form. If the "Friedensbote" had been more like many parish papers of our own day, it would have been made much easier for us to get a picture of what the "Evangelicals" of those days were like and what wonderful individuals they must have been. As it is, we are forced to read between the lines, or we must rely on the reports of church celebrations to arrive at some conclusions as to what the congregations and their individual members must have been like. An outsider not in touch with life over here would be amazed at how much space (in the denominational journal) is devoted to describing the mission festivals. Look at a church publication or a church history sketch put out by an English denomination and you will find little about mission festivals. You ask, whence comes the popularity of mission festivals and why are they so important? A two-fold answer immediately comes to mind: 1) because the "Kirchenverein" was founded by emissaries who, though not working in the pagan world, nevertheless have a strong interest in missions, and 2) because the members who during its second decade joined the "Kirchenverein" had become accustomed to mission

festivals from home, and the mission festival had come to be an important event in their lives. One must have lived in the Ravensberg area in order to know what a warm spot mission festivals such as those held, for example, in Buende near Herford or the Festival Week at Wuppertal, hold in the hearts of church people. Those who came from the old country to become American citizens brought the custom of mission festivals with them. And as they were accustomed from over there, and as also the circumstances required, on mission festival occasions, ample provision was made for the physical needs and generous hospitality prevailed.

Allow me to share several brief reports: In 1850 the three Evangelical congregations united for a joint mission festival celebration. The church was crowded, the mission offering: $400. Mission Festival in Quincy, Ill. (Pastor Jung): All the various church organizations had contributed. Many women and young women had learned to sew and knit mainly in order to make something for the mission field. Following the mission talks, which were most impressive, people gathered in the parsonage. Pastor Jung, the report says, "knew how to move as a pastor among his people. No superficial talk or pretense, as so often is found on the part of those who would make something of themselves even though the Lord, perhaps, has not made something out of them."

Mission Festival in Gravois Settlement (1854): Report by "Philipp" (probably Pastor Philipp Goebel) to "Simon" (probably Pastor Simon Kuhlenhoelter). Philipp reports that the speaker had a big abscess so that one side of his face was quite swollen, "but it did not seem to hurt him. That made the mission festival." The speaker said mission societies were nothing special because the whole congregation should be a mission society. "Simon, I cannot fault him for it, for did not our Lord, in his last words, command his followers to be missionaries? Pastor Kopf preached about David and the giant Goliath. David is the little mission band which with its slingshot goes out to meet the great giant of paganism; the smooth stone is the Word of God. Simon, I sincerely believe it will come to pass." "The speaker then went on to tell several wonderful stories, and I cannot share them with you, for my letter would get too heavy." He goes on in this simple manner reporting that then there was a talk by dear Brother Wall of St. Louis. "It was already 1 o'clock, but it would not have been right with most of the people if he had not spoken." "I can tell you, dear Simon, he really captivated us. Many people say: 'Leave the heathen in peace.' But what kind of a peace is it when they eat one another up? When thousands of children are murdered, etc." In such a free manner he gives his heart free rein. We may smile at all this, but this "Philipp" and this "Simon" were people who made a place for themselves in the history of the Synod. We may think of the members as being thus joyous and free in the Lord's work. Philipp tells that among the guests there was one man who had been looking forward to the Mission Fest for a whole year but had feared he might not live to see it. To his joy, Philipp reports, he saw the man's gray head

among the many guests.

Mission Festival in Fort Madison, Iowa, April 6, 1856. "There was a large attendance. It was a lovely sight to see the Christian Germans gathered for such a purpose. All felt: May the spirit of Christ unite us and bind us together in Christian brotherhood. Pastor Schmeiser from the rural congregation near Burlington preached on Revelation 22:1-2. He told stories from the heathen world to show how the leaves from the tree of life were for the healing of the nations and how the pure stream of living water found its way to fill the hearts of the pagan peoples. We Germans, unfortunately, stand out among the people in this country as those who want nothing to do with the coming of the Kingdom of God, thus light-heartedly squandering the precious heritage of the fathers. We should give the Americans an example of good old German faithfulness by holding fast to the Word of God. The unity of the spirit becomes the melting pot of the hearts of the people as was evident that very day (the service was being held in the English church). Although we did not know one another in the old fatherland, here we are all one in support of the Christian mission."

One notices the difference between this address and the others. This was an appeal to the German consciousness interwoven with Christian ideals.

Almost as numerous as the mission festival accounts are the reports of church foundings and church dedications. What with the strong wave of immigration, new churches in those days were springing up like mushrooms. Not much money was required, for the new buildings, according to the reports, were quite simple. Also, to start a new church did not require many members. Twenty families were enough for a new start. The minister's salary was small, usually around $150 a year, seldom more, often less. Usually he served several congregations and what was lacking in dollars was made up by means of produce or other commodities. Demanding our pastors were not. Living conditions were simple, living was inexpensive, and styles were not in vogue.

There were, of course, still problems with the "liberal" element, which usually was also the saloon element, but this was considerably less than during the first decade. A new factor had entered the church development process which tended to counteract carefree attitudes and licentious living.

In connection with the erection of a new church in Waterloo, Illinois, in 1856, we read: "Pastor Binner came to this community in 1846. At first all went well. Besides the worship services he also taught school and many young people 18 and over came. In addition to other studies they also were diligent in studying the catechism and did well in the final examination. However, opposition arose when it became known that Pastor Binner was among those who adhered strictly to the Bible as the Word of God. Opposition came more from the beer parlor than from academia. Had it not been for the school many would have been

glad if Pastor Binner had left. Nevertheless, the better element moved steadily toward the building of a church, this despite the fact that there seemed to be more opponents than helpers. Twelve families signed the constitution for a new congregation. The unbelievers sought through mockery to alienate from the church completely those who were undecided. Several allowed themselves to be influenced by silly talk to the effect that they would become vassals of the King of Prussia (an oft-heard argument against joining the Synod, used sometimes by rationalists, sometimes by anti-Union Lutherans). Pastor Binner was succeeded by Pastor Steinert. Meanwhile however, there appeared on the scene an unexpected interim preacher speaking mightily to many hearts and consciences, shaking like a mighty stormwind many who were not yet stone-dead in sin, driving them to the one thing needful. That preacher was the cholera. The plague stirred to action. Both the church and the school were built. Then suddenly a new kind of storm swept through the land filling town and countryside with a mighty roar. A veritable flood of blasphemous writings flooded the region. Many, indeed, believed the senseless, wicked lies against the Word of God. But the congregation only huddled more closely around their true Head."

Another excerpt pictures for us the dedication of the church at Horse Prairie, Missouri, on September 7, 1850. "Members of the congregation stood shoulder to shoulder in and in front of the parsonage. Then came the procession led by the church council members and pastor of the congregation. Next came three of his brother pastors, carrying the Bible, the chalice, and the Agende (Book of Worship). A long retinue of men and women in their Sunday best formed the rest of the procession. A beautiful picture, this festive procession. Through green meadows and shaded forest they marched the half-mile to the little church which, with its lovely little tower and metal cross, was a delight to the eyes. It is amazing that such a small congregation found it possible to build such a lovely church. With the words: Let us open this new house of God in the name of the Lord, acknowledging as we do so that the gate is narrow and the way is small that leads to life and that Christ said, 'I am the Way,' the church council members unlocked the door to the new church. Opposite the door stands the pulpit built of solid black walnut. The builder had avoided the custom, too often imitated by the Germans, of making the pulpit like a lectern. In front of the pulpit stands an altar on which are seen a simple black cross together with communion ware and a baptismal bowl. The pastor (Birkner) spoke on the church's historic confessions pointing out that, as the age-old statements and symbols of the church, they must ever be held fast and dearly cherished. Then followed the confessional prayers in preparation for the Holy Communion. In the afternoon Pastor Baltzer spoke on the text: 'I am not ashamed of the Gospel of Christ.' Tears glistened in many eyes."

Such a report is significant in many ways, not only because it emphasizes the church confessions, which, considering the times, was in itself important, but especially also because of

the dignified church dedication ceremony and the special mention of the church furniture and holy artifacts. We have here testimony to the fact that the fathers were determined to hold fast to the churchly customs and dignified worship forms of their home church.

The Americans are a people virtually without a history. Those, especially living in the newer (western) regions have very little appreciation or use for the past. In New England, of course, it is different. There in many circles the age of the early Puritans is considered very special. Naturally too, throughout all America the original English character, its civilization and its institutions, continues to exert its influence. Yet in a thousand ways here in America new ground was broken and the immigrant was required to leave old ways behind and become Americanized. With regard to churchly things a puritanical Calvinism had declared war on culture and liturgical forms insisting that the place of worship be a simple "meeting house". Methodism, arriving later, exerted a tremendous influence on all church life through its emphasis on feeling, its enthusiasm for evangelism, and its boundless energy. It gave its church an enduring and effective organizational structure, but for custom, for the historical process, and for dignified forms it, too, had no appreciation.

Confronted by these strong influences the immigrant often had a hard time. More often than not he gave himself to the overwhelming flood without resistance. We have known pastors who upon arriving here, particularly in the rural regions, simply let themselves go with regard to dress, manners, and life style; isn't this supposed to be a free country? If such things are done in the green tree what shall one expect from the dry? It seems the German is the one who most readily worships strange gods, giving up the ways, language, and customs of the fathers. Custom is, after all, something indigenous. It comes about under the influence of factors which remain the same, requiring for its development continuity of time and place. How then can we expect a custom, even a churchly one, to maintain itself in the face of different peoples, races, and tribes all jumbled up together?

And yet our fathers knew how much educational, stabilizing, steadying power can lie in churchly custom. That is why they held fast to the altar, the pulpit robe, the church year, holy days and seasons, and to the liturgical service. Excepting the Anglicans, one is likely to find a beautiful, meaningful, solemn liturgy only with the Lutherans. In regions where the immigrants were mostly Lutherans, the effort of our church to maintain good liturgy usually succeeded. How things went in other areas we shall see later.

That the living conditions of our forebears often were in need of refinement and that the church on occasion pointed this out in a drastic manner, appears in an article which the "Friedensbote" copied from another publication and published in 1850. We read concerning the practice of chewing tobacco:

"People should not soil the church floor with spitting. Also they should not clean out their pipes right outside the church. If a person must chew in the church let him spit into his hat and take what is his home with him. Those who use snuff should not touch their snuff-box or nose while in church. To pass or surreptitiously slip the snuff-box to a neighbor during worship is a sin."

What the "Kirchenverein" required of its members in order that things might be done decently and in order appears from the following Model Constitution which was published in the "Friedensbote" in 1853 and includes the following provisions: "No one should be received into membership unless 1) he is a baptized Christian and obligates himself to participate in the worship services of the congregation, the faithful use of the sacraments, and the conscientious use of the sabbath for the strengthening and growth of his Christian life, 2) he must be faithful to the Evangelical church and avail himself of baptism, holy communion, and Christian marriage, 3) he must not by his life give offense to others, 4) in all meetings of the congregation he must be subject to Christian teaching and instruction, 5) upon being received, unless prevented by poverty, he must make an appropriate pledge to be contributed later toward the expenses of the congregation. Paragraph Two: In case a member violates these ordinances he shall be admonished (Matt. 18:15). Causes for dismissal, in addition to those indicated above, shall include: blasphemy, ridicule of the Holy Scriptures or its teachings, deception, lying, violence, adultery, fornication, thievery, profanation of the sabbath, despising the sacraments, neglect of Christian education of the children."

Several of the last mentioned regulations seem rather severe and we do not know whether they were or could always be enforced. However, some 30 years ago we were privileged to get a glimpse into the life of congregations which had developed under such care and in this spirit. Of course, it may not have been the same everywhere, but we do know that in many places groups with a similar kind of spiritual discipline had been formed; cities set upon a hill letting their light shine. By that time the fathers had already grayed, seeing they had come to this country forty years earlier. Their children, and especially their grandchildren, had not always grown up in the spirit of the elders. The latter had brought their religious life with them from across the sea and had nourished it under favorable circumstances here. They often spoke of the great Christian witnesses of their youth. Still one could not blame them too much for not having succeeded in imparting a full measure of their own spirit to their offspring who had grown up in another land with another language. Still the life in the congregations was flourishing.

To us, who came from different circumstances, it seemed like coming into a promised land. The pastor was a beloved friend to every family. Usually when he came to visit all members of the family gathered for family worship. Nor was this a mere form,

but members of the family eagerly looked forward to it, and an atmosphere of spiritual understanding prevailed. In the country the pastor seldom was allowed to go without partaking of a meal. And the spiritual nuggets which the pastor always left as a tip were always much appreciated. With these old timers one felt one's self transported to Herford, or Osnabruech, or even Lippe. Many had real character faces with long locks, like in the old country. Churchwise they were mostly Lutheran, sometimes with a touch of Reformed piety. On Sunday the church was filled for morning and evening services; during the week there were two meetings for prayer and Bible study. Lay people, too, prayed, sometimes with poor terminal facilities, but always with real feeling. Came time for mission festival and the congregation really celebrated. People came from near and far for the three Sunday services all of which were well attended. Always there was a generous offering for missions. One was reminded of mission festivals in Ravensberg, though the atmosphere was less rural and there were no outdoor pulpits, but the spirit was much the same. One asked one's self, "Can it continue to be like this once the old-timers have died? How lovely it is to hark back to such periods of flowering in German-American church life! Much necessarily changed with the passing of time but cannot the spirit continue even when it must take on new forms?"

CHAPTER VII

Establishing of the Union Principle and Its Appeal

Bibliography: Friedensbote, 1850-70. Theologische Zeitschrift, 1878, 1880. Muecke, Geschichte. . . (History of the Evangelical Synod of North America, 1915.

The "Kirchenverein" was founded, as we have seen, to provide a spiritual home for Lutheran and Reformed Christians. In many ways the need had arisen for these two branches of Christendom to bury the axe. This need was felt all the more strongly wherever the subjective life of faith sprang to life and people began to look upon the objective church life and its forms as being of secondary importance. Such feelings had nothing to do with spiritual pride; they came rather from the wellsprings of the personal experience of salvation. It is from this orientation that we learned to interpret the position of the fathers of the "Kirchenverein" as over against the doctrines that divide. Coming as they did from the background of Pietism, they found it difficult to understand why differing interpretations of the Lord's Supper should divide Christian believers from one another. Did not the Apostle's word apply: Paul or Apollos or Peter, all are yours? Should not both Luther and Calvin, similarly, belong to the whole church?

It is doubtful that our early pastors really understood how obstinate the Lutherans could be in clinging to old doctrines and forms of worship. The Lutherans we say, for although the Reformed under certain circumstances and with the proper heritage can at times also be stubbornly orthodox, they generally are more concerned about life than about doctrine and pay more attention to the by-laws than the liturgy. Many who have grown up in the Church of the Union simply cannot understand how reasonable Christian people can make such a to-do about the "it is" or the "it signifies" in the communion liturgy.* That it is not enough that our souls are nourished through receiving the body and blood of Christ, that instead we need to emphasize what it is we are receiving "by mouth" he simply cannot understand. Nevertheless, we cannot deny that there are devout people concerning whom it cannot be said that they are not true Christians, do not have clear judgment, or are not peaceably inclined, to whom the doctrinal differences between Luther and Calvin are of such fundamental importance that they must never be surrendered. It is not simply the literal word of Scripture that stirs them to do battle, but rather the consciousness that in the sacraments we have to do with objective means of grace whose efficacy does not depend upon our faith, at least not upon our conscious faith.

- - - - -

* I do not wish to deny that also in the Evangelical Synod, in many regions, the Lutheran character of the congregation has remained well preserved. In such a situation, of course, the difference between "it is" and "it signifies" cannot easily be overlooked.

they do not want to surrender the comfort derived from the assurance that our Lord, in view of the unreliability of our feelings, the limitations of our spiritual growth, and the need for spiritual assurance uninfluenced by human psychology, transmits the precious treasures of salvation and seals them to every individual sacramentally. One cannot avoid the assumption that our Lord, in instituting the sacraments of Baptism and Holy Communion, sought to meet the needs of our human nature by making the precious gifts of his grace visible. On the surface this simply means that in so doing our Lord was using picture language, that the sacraments are objectified parables, parables in the form of ceremonies in which we are to see deep spiritual truths. But for those inclined to look for deeper meanings, such an interpretation will not suffice. To him it seems like a demeaning of the sacraments ill befitting either 1) their solemn institution--the one as his final bequest (and command), the other "on the night in which he was betrayed" or 2) the exalted position they have always held. Through them real gifts of grace and power must be mediated. The Catholic church in its concern to link individual salvation to the institution of the church placed an extreme emphasis on the sacramental element in the church. From the cradle to his last breath the good Catholic is dependent for salvation upon the church. The church alone is the guardian and custodian of that salvation. Through this sacramental guardianship and her organization, the church achieved world dominance. Luther, on the other hand, insisted that what really made the sacraments effective was "worship in spirit and in truth". Setting over against the institutional church the gospel of Christ, he broke down the wall of partition between the individual and his God. In defending and establishing the rights of the individual as over against the demands of an institution led by self-serving considerations, he inevitably introduced into the creation of his church a subjective element. At the same time he was conservative and in formulating his doctrine concerning the sacraments introduced an element of objectivity so strong as to make a break with the other reformers inevitable. His position with regard to the sacrament has been staunchly maintained to this day by the church which bears his name. Following what may have appeared temporarily like softening, the Lutherans have steadfastly returned to the typical old doctrine. Even more than anywhere else that has been true in this country.

The confessional differences began to exert themselves soon after the founding of the "Kirchenverein". We have already noted how strongly Walther, from the very beginning, opposed the "Kirchenverein". To this day his church has maintained this hostile attitude. Through the decades our professors and directors of publications have repeatedly had to match swords with the "Missourians". In doing so they have, of course, gained increasing clarity as to their own position. Whether the controversy helped in any other way I shall not attempt to say. Paul says: A heretic, once you have admonished him a time or two, you must simply avoid. That would seem to be good advice whether inspired or otherwise. Whether in this case we were the

heretics or the "Missourians", Paul's recipe might profitably have been used.

But the walls of Zion needed to be defended not only against the Lutherans but also against the influences coming from the English-Calvinistic environment. Most of the English-speaking churches did not attach great importance to the sacrament. Of course, the Baptists as opponents of infant baptism placed great emphasis on the sacrament of baptism, but for them baptism was primarily an act of confession, something which man did, not God. The Methodists baptized children or adults, as preferred. The Lord's Supper was for them a feast of remembrance. The same held true for most of the other denominations.

Besides, the pastors and members of the "Kirchenverein" were by no means in agreement among themselves as to the points of difference in the doctrine concerning the sacraments. They held differing views depending upon which church they had attended previously, whether Lutheran or Reformed or the Church of the Union. To gather all these "under one hat", as it were, knowing the biblical teaching and understanding the sacrament on the basis and in the spirit of the Union, required decades of teaching on the part of the church. We cannot discuss here the education of seminarians nor of the confirmands in the pastors' classes, but the contribution to the educational project made by the "Friedensbote" during those years and later--for pastors the Theologische Zeitschrift (Theological Magazine)--deserves special mention.

We find in the "Friedensbote" frequent essays concerning Luther and the Reformation but also concerning Melanchthon and Calvin. In 1850 we read that Luther never attacked Calvin but said that a man so talented and so admirable must be held in high esteem. Moreover, we are told, Luther never issued a polemic against Calvin, not even in the publication, Small Confession Concerning the Lord's Supper, issued two years before his death. In this publication he inveighs strongly against other opponents of his teaching, particularly the "Fanatics and Opponents of the Sacraments" but never criticizes Calvin.

The sacraments are often discussed in order to pave the way for a generally accepted evaluation. Concerning baptism we cite the following from 1850: "Through baptism one is received into fellowship with God and is made a new person. Many insist that people are not 'born again' through baptism, seeing they often sin after baptism. Nevertheless, we may say that the grace of God rules in a special way over those who have been baptized, even when they do not become converted, which is only seldom the case. Baptism is, indeed, the bath of re-birth. Its effect is three-fold: 1) The baptized person continues in baptismal grace, 2) following a walk in sin he is awakened to a new life or 3) falls into the ways of the flesh. But, we may ask how can mere water do such great things? It is the Word of God. Our baptism becomes for us a star whose light does not fail even in the darkest night, a precious promise assuring us of our Lord's

faithfulness even when his face seems to be turned away from us. When in a time of affliction you are denied Christian experience and your faith beset by doubts is found wavering, there stands this fact, this thing that was done, quite apart from your own doing, that is quite independent of your faith, whether weak or strong. But what has been done stands fast. There is not to ask, 'Will you believe?' or 'Can you believe?" but it is so! The great fact is: You have been baptized and God has not only promised you forgiveness but God has forgiven you."

What we have here is the complete Lutheran interpretation of Baptism. It can only reflect the view of the (Lutheran-educated) editor, Pastor Binner. Our catechism, of course, says* that in baptism, "a germ of the new life is planted." This hardly includes all the great things mentioned above. The explanation in the catechism leaves room for the "freedom of conscience" mentioned in our confessional paragraphs and probably few of us derive from the simple fact of our baptism all the comfort which the editor of the "Friedensbote" attributes to it. The passage reminds us also of the booklet, "From the Life of One Unconverted" (published by Bertelsmann-Guetersloh about 10-15 years ago) in which the author, born in Wuppertal, says that try as he would he was never able to base his faith on his own conversion experiences but only on baptismal grace.

Concerning infant baptism we have this (also 1850): "The blessing of baptism is in no way tied to human understanding. Baptism is able to be and achieve in children all that we have attributed to it in the case of adults. The sermon of a good example is effective with them before they come to understanding. Just as impossible as it would be to determine the moment when a child for the first time understands its mother or for the first time consciously ponders its father's will, so impossible would it be to determine the moment when God begins to work in the heart of a child. The Holy Spirit does not wait for this or that moment, but works wherever it happens to be for it is spirit and life." Again a Lutheran view.

Concerning holy communion the "Friedensbote" of the first decade has much less to say and this despite the fact that it was especially our teaching concerning the Eucharist that our chief critics most frequently attacked. It seems that our leaders were more concerned to guard against an under-emphasis of the sacraments, as was and is common in the English-speaking denominations, than to guard against an over-emphasis. Some of our leaders, of course, were undoubtedly partial toward the Lutheran interpretation of the Lord's supper simply by reason of their own religious heritage. But they seldom, if ever, went to the extremes of the old-Lutherans in emphasizing the actual eating and drinking as the means of receiving the body and blood of Christ. Few, if any, would have agreed with the old-Lutherans that even the unbeliever, in eating and drinking, received the

- - - - -

* In the expository part.

sacred body and blood. But because of their personal views, as well as the Union principle, they did not fight the Lutheran interpretation. The Union, let us remind ourselves, does not set over against the Lutheran or Reformed teaching some new teaching of its own. It allows these forms to stand as they are. It simply insists that difference of interpretation should not be allowed to stand in the way of fellowship in worship and communion. Again and again the writers of the early times come back to the subject of the Union endeavouring to show that it represents a God-pleasing and the only practical solution to a centuries-old conflict. Still the old tensions remained and the wording of the confessional paragraph was repeatedly subject to criticism. As recently as 1878-80 the question arose: "What shall be done with congregations which in their own constitutions designate themselves as 'Lutheran' or 'Reformed' but seek to be received into our church body?" That always brought up the old problem once again. W. Behrendt, in 1880, proposed that there be no confessional statement in the constitution at all. But Pastor Dresel in the Theologische Zeitschrift (Theological Magazine), 1880, insisted that the confessional paragraphs be retained. To omit any mention of the symbolic statements would mean to remove completely the boundary line fences of our Synod which are already light and weak enough. It would mean to make the Synod a "Commons" on which everyone, stranger or native, would be free to do as he pleased. The freedom of conscience granted to members of the Synod did not, he insisted, guarantee to every member free range to believe and teach whatever he pleased even though it might be contrary to the confessions of the churches named or the general consensus. The individual believer, he insisted, has the right to follow his individual conscience only with regard to the points of difference. "Since it will be difficult in view of the continued growth of the Synod," he wrote, "to build a peaceful, cooperative working body on the basis of the present confessional paragraphs, it might be good to discontinue giving a choice between the two catechisms (Lutheran and Heidelberg) and to mention only the Augsburg Confession." The Augsburg Confession he felt was, from the standpoint both of church history and secular history, the simplest and clearest, also the mildest and most in accord with the spirit of the gospel and of the Reformation church. It had, in the course of the years, been accepted by many Reformed people, particularly in Germany, and had even been signed by Calvin himself. The German Evangelical Kirchentag, after careful consideration, and upon the warm recommendation of Reformed-United theologians like Dr. F. W. Krummacher, had accepted it as the common confession of the German Evangelical Church.

In the same issue of the same periodical Dr. Schory warns against continuing to tinker with the confessional statement. Seeing that for forty years the Synod has made do with the confession as it stands he opines, "It will serve the Synod well also in the future." If every individual were to require that the Synod adjust its statement of faith to suit his own individual beliefs at every point, where would that lead us?

Thus for some years the discussion continued, back and forth, but the confessional statement continued to stand, including the naming of the symbolic books. Both Lutheran and Reformed congregations were received into membership so long as they agreed to basis for the Evangelical Union. The meaning of the "freedom of conscience" clause in the Synod's confessional statement was gradually clarified. A good statement concerning Freedom of Conscience by J. Gruenert appeared in the Theologische Zeitschrift under date of November, 1878: "Where the center of gravity in Christianity is placed in the rational mind, in "pure doctrine", one can guarantee only a puny kind of freedom of conscience. There one cannot tolerate open questions since they might threaten the so-called "fundamentals". Such a church is destined inevitably to become one of dead orthodoxy in which everything is dogmatically decreed and faith finally means nothing more than assenting to the church's doctrine. On the other hand, a movement that places the center of gravity in the individual's feelings is destined to end in subjectivism, superficiality, lack of principle, or an artificial piety in which the same method of being saved is forced upon everyone. Real freedom of conscience means the unhampered development of every individual life as derived from faith in the world savior Jesus Christ. This might indeed appear to throw open the door to every kind of arbitrariness. However, faithfulness and obedience toward the Holy Spirit, who builds the church, require us to hold in high regard the confessions of the churches, and to submit ourselves to them. When we do so there will remain many open areas, where the explanations offered by the churches differ. It is in these areas then that the right to form and hold personal convictions comes into play.

Then, too, the name "Evangelical" which our fellowship has claimed from the beginning has been challenged. Already in 1864 (See "Friedensbote", Jan 1) the Methodist Apologete complains that the "kirchenverein" claims the name "evangelical", as if it alone had a right to it. But the Methodists, too, are evangelical. To this charge the "Friedensbote" responds that the word "evangelical" is used in two different senses: 1) it is applied to all the church which sprang from the Reformation and 2) as a simple designation for that church fellowship which seeks to express the inner unity of the Reformation churches also outwardly, as distinguished from those churches which insist upon their own particular confession.

Many times our use of the name in this particular way has been challenged both by other churches and by our own pastors. The Synod, however, refused to be influenced by such complaints. It kept the name and used it for self-identification. In contradistinction to other denominations it designates "the church of the Union on American soil". (See our comments on the subject in Chapter I.)

In discussing the union principle of the "Kirchenverein" and the many struggles that had to be gone through to finally establish it, we have already jumped ahead to the 80's. The

Union principle, however, demonstrated its drawing power much sooner. Ten years after the "Kirchenverein" was organized, ten pastors, who were serving a total of twenty-five churches in Ohio founded the "Deutsche Evangelische Kirchenverein in Ohio" (see Muecke, p. 155). The Ohio Society sent students to be educated at our seminary in Marthasville. It adopted as its own the constitution and by-laws of the older "Kirchenverein". It also sent delegates to the annual meetings. Finally, in 1858, in Cincinnati the union of the two church societies was completed.

Soon this Eastern District of the "Kirchenverein" grew in size when the congregations of the United Evangelical Synod of the East at their conference in Mansfield, Ohio, in May, 1860, decided to unite with it. For six years this little church society had existed and just as long had sought a closer link with the "Kirchenverein des Westens" (Church Society of the West). (Muecke)

In 1866 in Evansville, Indiana, the "Deutsche Evangelische Kirchenverein des Westens" (the German Evangelical Church Society of the West) met for the last time--under that name. It was felt the time had come, and that it was necessary to change its name by substituting for "Kirchenverein" the universally recognized name "Synode" (Synod). Consequently from that time on our church body was called the "Deutsche Evangelische Synode des Westens" (German Evangelical Synod of the West). The membership at that time consisted of 122 pastors and 68 congregations. Naturally, the number of congregations being served was larger, since many congregations had not officially joined.

On May 19, 1859, twelve pastors, meeting on church business in Chicago, organized the "Deutsche Evangelische Synode des Nordwesterns" (German Evangelical Synod of the Northwest). They had withdrawn from another church body because of its rationalistic orientation. In their confessional statement they said, "we recognize the validity of the Lutheran and Reformed confessions, namely the Augsburg Confession, and the Lutheran and Reformed catechisms. The points on which they differ do not appear to us to be essential to salvation. With regard to them let everyone be assured in his own faith." They go on to enumerate the "fundamental teachings" of the Christian faith as the basis for their church fellowship.

The Synod of the Northwest grew, especially in Illinois and Michigan. Its relationship to the "United" sister synods was always friendly, especially toward the Evangelical Synod of the West. Its president, P. K. Haas, of Detroit, Michigan, took it upon himself to lead his Synod toward union with the larger, older Synod of the West. The fact that both synods had the same statements of faith and the same mission made this seem desirable. The wish was destined to be fulfilled in August of 1871. At that time at the Melanchthon Seminary in Elmhurst (near Chicago) which belonged to the Synod of the Northwest, the authorized delegates adopted the following resolution:

1. The Synod of the Northwest herewith becomes the fourth district of the Evangelical Synod of the West.

2. The Synod accepts, in place of its present constitution, the statutes of the Synod of the West.

3. The Synod approves arrangements for the transfer of the Melanchthon Seminary to the Synod of the West.

The ratification of this agreement followed in June, 1872, at the General Conference of the Synod of the West in Quincy, Illinois. At the same General Synod a union was established with the "Synode des Ostens" (Synod of the East) whose delegates had come to the meeting to ratify the agreement. The Synod of the East had its congregations mostly in the state of New York. Its confession, constitution, and ecclesiastical practice also were like those of the Synod of the West. So the United Evangelical Synod of the Northwest became the Northwest District and the Synod of the East the Northeast District of the Synod of the West. The combined synods had 276 pastors as members. Until 1877 it continued as the German Evangelical Synod of the West. In that year it changed its name to become the German Evangelical Synod of North America.

We have seen how in the several midwestern states at various places small church groups, at first independent of one another, were formed on the basis of the Union principle and how they felt the need for fellowship with one another. Since, due to its age, and goal-conscious leadership the Church Society of the West had more prestige it was only natural that it should attract the smaller synods to itself and absorb them. It was a triumph of the Union principle. It proved that the time and circumstances were right for the experiment which the "Kirchenverein" had undertaken. It gave the Church Society (or Synod) the feeling that its time had come and awakened the brightest hopes for its future development.

CHAPTER VIII

Preaching and Worship Services in the Evangelical Synod of North America during the First Half of Its History

Bibliography: Muecke, Geschichte. The previously mentioned life stories of Garlichs and Baltzer. Schory, Geschichte, etc. H. Haupt, Die Eigenart der Amerikanschen Predigt (A. Toepelmann's Verlag), 1907. Articles: "Kirchenlied" and "Kirchenagende" in R. E., Vol. 10.

In 1872 the German Evangelical Church Society of the West had as members 193 pastors and 94 congregations; in addition, it served 125 non-member congregations. Following the joining of the church bodies mentioned in the previous chapter, the number of pastors grew to 282 and the number of congregations (member or "served") came to 337. A period of rapid growth now set it. In 1877, when it adopted the name, German Evangelical Synod of North America, it had 324 pastors and 440 congregations (both kinds included). Its continued growth was accentuated by a new wave of German immigration, especially from Wuerttemberg, in the 80's. In 1888 there were 566 pastors and 762 churches. The Synod had now grown to adulthood and had had time to take on its own individuality as a church body or denomination. Up until that time--the 80's--the American environment had had little effect. The language used in church was almost exclusively German. There was little interrelationship with the English-speaking churches. The projects which in recent decades have brought the Protestant churches of our country together had not yet emerged. The Synod from time to time had been in conflict with other church bodies on account of the Union principle. But these were other German synods, groups who had insisted on raising the banner of starkest Lutheranism. The Synod had found it necessary to warn its members against Methodist zeal and Baptist proselytizing. But as for any feeling for constructive cooperative work with anglo-American churches, this it had not yet sought nor had it been invited by the others to consider. The denominational walls were still too high. Besides the Synod was too much engrossed in living its own life. It, of course, was not unacquainted with the idea of the "melting pot" according to which all things foreign were to be melted down to become one homogenous American amalgam. However, it did not understand this to mean that one must give up one's Germanism in language and character but rather that in faithfulness to one's heritage one would use one's special gifts and powers to serve one's adopted land. The task of Germanism, and of the German church, seemed to consist in contributing to the American future as special gifts something of German depth of feeling and conscientiousness; and in order to be able to do that it would be necessary first of all for the German lifestyle to be nurtured for several generations and to really take root in American soil. For how could it make any impact on the development of America if it were to be cast aside as soon as possible? There were some, of course, like Rieger, who considered German a lost cause from the very outset. But there were others, not a few, who felt that in church life they would

be able to do without English for a long time to come.

Then, too, the German-born pastors usually were not competent in the English language. Even many who were born here, while they knew enough English to get by in their daily life, would not have been competent to preach an English sermon. In the seminary during the first forty years no instruction was given in English. Not until around 1890 was this seen as a shortcoming and feeble efforts made to correct it. English classes when offered were taught by English-speaking help. In the Proseminary* instruction was offered in English, but all other subjects were taught in German. So it is understandable that until the beginning of the 90's most of the pastors, for personal reasons, were not inclined to favor the introduction of English into the worship services. So if we thus take a look back over the past 40-50 years what we see is a church body that is definitely a German church.

This was especially noticeable in the preaching. Three characteristics particularly serve to distinguish American preaching from German preaching: 1) American preaching is not related to the lectionary, nor the church year; sometimes not even to Christmas or Easter. 2) It is seldom given over to the exposition of a text, at least not in the German sense of exposition. The preacher first chooses a theme or a topic and then looks for a text to express the idea of the topic. The text is then used loosely with little regard to what its original meaning may have been. There are exceptions of course. Often, too, the preaching was based on whole books of the Bible, especially for evening or mid-week services. In those cases the sermon usually became a kind of homily. An especially noteworthy representative of this style of preaching was the well-known Bible expositor, A. Barnes, pastor of the First Presbyterian Church in Philadelphia, who died in 1870. (See article, "History of Preaching" by Schian, R. E., Vol. XV, p. 742.) 3) Finally, an outstanding feature of American preaching is that it abounds with illustrations. Word pictures from nature, human life, the Bible, history, and other areas are regarded as indispensable. The need to speak to the public in a clear, understandable, and interesting manner, coupled with American practicality makes for this type of religious discourse. Instead of arguing in an abstract manner, like the theologians, one prefers rather to use the lively, imaginative approach of the public speaker.

With regard to all these points the fathers of our Synod held fast steadfastly to the pattern of German preaching. Naturally they were not about to give up the church year. The church year is so intertwined with the German soul that even the most

- - - - -

* The Melanchthon Seminary, taken over from the Synod of the Northwest was, in 1872, converted into a "Proseminar" (PreSeminary) with the dual purpose of preparing students for the seminary in St. Louis and of training others as parochial school teachers for the Evangelical congregations.

unchurched individual would not forgive the minister should he fail to take proper notice of it. To preach during Lent a sermon about the birth of our Lord would seem to him like an unbearable anachronism. And, of course, the people who constituted the core of our congregations were as a result of their churchly habits much more deeply steeped in the church year than men and women of the street. So our old pastors had not the slightest provocation or inclination to depart from this long-established practice. The festival half of the church year, particularly, was dedicated to the celebration of the great deeds of salvation. If the German churches here in America were not tempted to use the pulpit for moralization or learned lectures or personal whims, the church year, with its great festivals, must be given the credit. From Advent to Pentecost the preacher found the way clearly laid out before him. He could not pass up Bethlehem and Golgotha and Joseph's tomb. The great events in the life of Jesus were always the major events for the Christian proclamation. The church year, of course, has been observed elsewhere also and there is no evidence to indicate that it resulted in less spiritual preaching. It must be admitted that it was not the only reason for good preaching in our Synod, but it <u>was</u> one reason.

Our pastors never suffered from tyranny of the lectionary, but our church-oriented congregations <u>did</u> want to hear "the gospel lesson for this Sunday". Occasionally a certain preacher might allow himself more liberty in selecting his sermon texts. But if then another came announcing as his text the gospel lesson for that particular Sunday, an after-church remark was likely to be: "Today we heard a real sermon again." Moreover, the evening service afforded the preacher an opportunity to preach on texts of his own choice. Elsewhere (chapter 6) we have commented on the many services some congregations were wont to have. Generally speaking, it can be said that rural churches as a rule did not hold evening services. Even in the cities the average German, even though well-churched, usually considered one service a Sunday all that was necessary. Still, due to the influence of the American environment, and depending upon the religious spirit of the congregation, evening services became popular in many places. Prayer meetings, on the other hand, which in American churches are almost a universal Wednesday evening institution, were seldom introduced and, if so, usually took the form of Bible study hours. As for the text and the manner of treatment in the sermon, the German custom of having regard to the lectionary often influenced this, too. Although the lectionary did not necessarily provide the text, it often did and, if not, something related was likely to be sought out. In any event the text was usually the starting point, not the theme. The sermon usually took the form of an exposition of the text. It would have offended the conscience of the seminary-or-mission house-trained minister to have used the text merely as a handle while going on to speak after everything else under the sun. As a rule, there were no "topical sermons", as Americans call them, in which the topic is the main thing and the text only incidental. Instead the German sermon was usually an exposition growing out of the

biblical text. A whole passage of Scripture was selected or a Bible story was read which gave rise to a coherent main thought which then was elaborated usually under three points.

The custom of using sermon illustrations sometimes commended itself to our fathers in preaching and many did it well. Certain individuals had a gift for using fresh-from-life experiences to liven up their sermons. Generally speaking, commendable as the practice may be, they did not become masters of the art.

Following these generalizations the reader will expect us to cite examples in support of the judgments we have made. This is possible only within limits. The material one can offer is scarce. We have no printed sermons with the exception of such as have been included in the memoirs or biographies of certain leaders of the Synod. Also available are the sermons preached at General Conferences. On such occasions the most capable preachers were likely to be the speakers. On the other hand, it is impossible to offer samples of the kind of preaching the people in the congregations would have heard "on the average". In the "Friedensbote" we have only short excerpts of the talks given at mission festivals.

Even so it is not as if our characterization of the Evangelical sermon had just been grabbed out of the air. We are able to draw upon memory for sermons we ourselves heard years ago. Then, too, there are still among us ministers relatively unaffected by the changes of time who continue to preach the way our fathers did.

If by some fortunate happenstance a collection of Evangelical (in the sense of Chapter 1) sermons had been printed, they would not constitute a "library of modern sermonic eloquence", nor would they constitute a collection of pearls of spiritual wisdom from silver-tongued pulpit orators. It would be foolish to expect anything like that. The educational level of pastors and congregations would preclude it. Their daily lives, often fraught with hard physical labor in the struggle for survival, were hardly conducive to literary artistry. Besides, apart from all that, eloquence is a gift not often given to the German who often lacks creative imagination, lively fantasy, high-soaring spirit, and beautiful forms of outward expression which are indispensable for eloquent public address. The German seldom has the gift for facile pleasant speech so commonly found in the American. He is likely to be heavy and phlegmatic. He is more concerned about the substance than about the outward form. He is strong in logical thinking but weak in intuitive contemplation. While delving deeper into the subject he often leaves out of consideration entirely his hearer's ability to comprehend. The art of effective public speech is to him a closed book. About appropriate gestures, good voice modulation, and dramatic delivery he knows nothing and wants to know nothing. With Faust he holds that:

> Reason and good common sense
> With little help will get across.

How much he could learn from the Irishman who with less substance and common sense has with his facility of tongue not only established a reputation for eloquence but often in public life makes himself heard with emphasis and approval.

The Seminary at Marthasville, where our older pastors received their training in homiletics as well as their general theological education, has done its best. Before we had the preparatory school at Elmhurst, the Proseminary, the Seminary itself often had to do double duty in that it had to give the student both his "classical" as well as his theological education. That the result in working with students who often were wholly unprepared could only be piecework is not to be wondered at. Rather one must often marvel that so very much was accomplished. Without great conscientiousness and deep dedication on the part of the professors it would not have been possible.

In the early years many students naively imagined that their good intentions were all that really mattered, that studying was secondary. That was why Professor Binner (the first professor) spoke as he did at the first commencement exercises. Said he: "There are those who imagine that uneducated preachers are more like the God-anointed witnesses, that too much learning could be bad. But the Bible nowhere warns against too much education. Rather it admonishes us to grow in understanding. Knowledge is unfruitful only when it is only of the mind and puffs up and not also a knowledge of the heart that enlightens heart and life. If many say that all the apostles knew was that Jesus was the Savior and that is all that the preachers need to know, such people should remember that for growth in Christian living much more is needed. As our Lord anointed Paul when he sat at his desk and wrote his letter so also he must anoint the preacher in his study."

Professor Binner also had some words of wisdom about the importance of continuing education for ministers after Seminary. At the time of the installation of Professor A. Irion, in 1853, he said: "How can the brethren (pastors) be content during their years in the ministry to read a chapter in the Bible daily, for sermon preparation to read a few sermon books, to look up a few hymns in the hymnbook, and in preparation for the mission study hour perhaps to cull a few spiritual blossoms from several mission publications? They once committed themselves to become "studiosi theologae" (students of theology) and to remain such to the end of their days. Most, however, will renounce the pledge, not in words but in actuality, giving a variety of excuses, preferably and most often that they do not have time. Or, they fall back on selected Bible verses which, rightly understood, have their place but which are used to get out of studying, and so the fruit and blessing of study also is lost. Such neglect cannot but result in damage to one's life as a pastor. Impoverishment of one's thought life, self-limitation to certain emergency rations from God's word accompanied by a corresponding limitation of the congregation to these puny rations are the inevitable immediate consequences. Verily, considering the

limited education for the ministry which we are able here to give and the outward circumstances which seem not only to facilitate, but even seem to recommend the neglect of study, it behooves us to take to heart doubly the admonition: Remain a studiosus theologae as long as you live!"

We can discern from these words how clearly the professors of that time recognized the problem they confronted given the limitations of the students with whom they worked and how earnestly they sought the solution for their problem. The professors of that early period distinguished themselves alike by their strength of Christian character and by their academic excellence and our ministry, as indeed our entire Synod, owes them thanks both for their moral and spiritual strength and for their competence.

We have said that the printed sermons which have come down to us from that period come from the most capable men our church had to offer and, consequently, rank far above the average of what was offered in the churches on a weekly basis. Nevertheless, we dare not forego describing a few of them in order that our readers may perceive what lofty winds of the spirit stirred and what spiritual food was offered the worshipers by their gifted leaders. Our only regret is that limitations of space compel us to be so brief.

Garlichs (see chapter 3) was one of the best preachers the "Kirchenverein" had, and it was a great loss when already in 1846 he moved away. In the little book, "Erinnerung an H. Garlichs" (Remembrance of H. Garlichs) we have a number of his sermons. By far the best of these is the one he preached in Femme Osage on February 19, 1843, based on Luke 17:20-21 ("The Kingdom of God is not coming with signs to be observed. . . for, behold, the Kingdom of God is in the midst of you.") One is reminded of the incident in his life (chapter 3, p. 13) when, while hearing a sermon on Daniel 2:14, an inner change took place and he received an amazing enlightenment concerning the spiritual nature of the Kingdom of God. In this sermon in Femme Osage he was preaching on his favorite theme,"The Inward Kingdom of God." The fact that the sermon was based on his personal religious experience no doubt accounts, at least in part, for its excellence. In the first part he explains that the Kingdom of God does not come with outward sign. "Many await the coming of the kind of kingdom they have in mind, a kingdom coming not from heaven but from the earth, not of divine but of human wisdom, a kingdom of science and art, of culture and life styles, of new discoveries and laws, of steamships and railroads, and who knows what all besides. Therefore, they greet with enthusiasm every new discovery of human technology that promises to make life easier, and every new light from human science as a sure and certain indication that the kingdom they have so long imagined is indeed approaching with giant steps." "Even church people do not always understand the nature of the Kingdom nor the character of those who belong to it." "They themselves avoid gross sins, and conduct themselves irreproachably. In the eyes of the public they are honest

stewards, good neighbors, patriotic citizens, lovers of the fatherland, following an honorable vocation. No one can say anything bad about them; therefore,they conclude blindly they belong to the Kingdom of God." "Others base their right to participate in the Kingdom of God on their adherence to the true teachings of Christ and his apostles; and since they are able to talk about the Kingdom biblically and in an edifying manner, they think it should be self-evident that they belong to it." Then after exposing the error of localizing the Kingdom with the Jews, with a particular denomination or in some small circle, Garlichs goes on in part two of the sermon to show that the Kingdom came into the world with Christ and finds entrance in the hearts of the believers. Eloquently and with noticeable reliance on his personal experience (see above), he describes the "blessedness of that moment in which a person awakens for the first time to a consciousness of the Kingdom of God and finds within himself that which until now he has sought all over the world."

It is heartening to note how carefully this solitary preacher "in the bush (backwoods)" works out his sermons, clothing his thoughts in such pleasing form; how he takes pains to tear away the decorative garments of hypocritical would-be Christians and will settle for nothing less than complete surrender of the heart to the Lord. It is no wonder that Garlichs' sermons were talked about far and wide and that his preaching on special occasions always drew many hearers.

His biographer mentions the notable fact that by nature Garlichs had a heavy tongue which he never quite got rid of but in his preaching this was never noticeable.

Of the sermon by A. Baltzer, first president of the "Kirchenverein" and later for many years president of the "Synod of the West" many sermons have been preserved. He was not only a gifted administrator and executive but also a born speaker. His personality, of course, contributed much to the impressiveness of his discourses, but he always prepared his sermons very conscientiously. We have already taken note of this in referring to his life story (see above). Even when he was busiest with administrative duties he did not neglect his studies.

In the good old German manner, he always did full justice to the text. He explored its deepest thoughts, but he was equally strong in applying it practically to the conditions in the congregation. Baltzer's sermons are for the most part quite long (16 pages printed, small format) and must normally have required an hour for delivery. But the hearers were used to that in those days. Henry W. Beecher in those days preached equally long and it probably was no different in Germany. Life was not yet so fast-paced as today.

Especially good is the sermon on I Thessalonians 2:9-12 which Baltzer preached as Synod president at the opening session of the annual conference of the Evangelical Church Society of the West held in the Zion Evangelical Church in St. Louis in May,

1856 (see Life Story, p. 52ff.) Paul, in defending the uprightness of his apostolic office cites his irreproachable conduct while in Thessalonica. Accordingly Baltzer asks as sermon theme the question: "How can we ourselves insure that our proclamation of the Word shall be fruitful?" He replies: "1) through sacrifical unselfishness, 2) through irreproachable living, and 3) through a holy earnestness in witnessing." Under 1) he insists that, especially today, when most of their parishioners have a hard time making ends meet, the pastor must be willing to live modestly trusting in God with a joyous heart, without complaining and without scheming to improve his own difficult lot. "We gladly forego many comforts and conveniences. One great concern rules our daily life! Not the concern for a comfortable retirement in the evening of life--the best days await him who dedicates himself to serving the Lord faithfully--not the concern for the future of wife and children--we confidently entrust them to the care and keeping of great Father of Orphans and Widows enthroned in heaven--no, the concern to win souls for the Lord through his Word." Under 2) he is glad to be able to say for the pastors of the "Kirchenverein" that they have avoided giving offense through gross scandal in Christian living. He admonishes them, nevertheless, to examine themselves and to be severe in their self-judgment. They themselves are, after all, in a sense the public conscience of the congregation. Under 3) he says: "When we consider the Apostle's fatherly care for souls we can only smite our breasts in shame, saying, 'Oh, that the power of love were stronger in me' and go on to pray, 'Lord, kindle a fire in us!'" There follows a description of pastoral concern with apostolic earnestness.

In everything that Baltzer says one feels the heartbeat of his conscientious concern. He seldom praises but often reminds his hearers of how far they fall short of the ideal. He portrays the individual, even the Christian, always as being small, never as being big. Of the American ability, even in doubtful situations still to acknowledge some good, Baltzer inherited not a smidgeon. Garlichs, of whom we spoke for all that he had definite convictions was always gentle, not so Baltzer. He attacks the old Adam with mighty strokes. He makes no concessions, leaves no room for even a shred of self-praise. His preaching must often have irritated his hearers, but then there must have come the reconciling thought: He is only preaching what he himself lives. The strict standard he applies to us he applies also to himself. He knew how to preach the height, depth, and width of God's great saving love, but above all he was in his element when describing the fruit of salvation, that is when preaching about sanctification. His preaching was always thoroughly ethical.

The Synod has never had another preacher like Baltzer; with regard to this all will agree: so highly gifted, so powerful and impressive, so self-giving, so completely dedicated to the Lord's service, so ready to be consumed, and carrying such a load--and with all this so undemanding, so completely without personal interest, a servant of the Lord and of the Lord's church.

His memory remains with the Synod as a holy legacy. The times have changed and other problems preempt the foreground, but the Synod will do well to recall often and long the incorruptible love of truth and thorough-going seriousness of a Baltzer.

It would seem in order to mention here also A. Irion, who as professor at the Seminary from 1853-1870, wielded a deep influence in the lives of those whom he helped prepare to become the future ministers of that period. From him we have a sermon which he preached during the Civil War (in 1862) at the opening session of the General Conference in Cincinnati (see Muecke, p. 161ff). The text is Matthew 13:24-30 concerning the tares among the wheat. It deals with "the opposing forces which, working deep within, make themselves felt in the existence and development of the kingdom of God as also within the life of the individual." It looks down into the dark abyss of human sinfulness and sees "back of all human striving the hidden but all-penetrating influence of Satan." It looks up, into the sunshine of divine grace, and sees there in human hearts and circumstances a ladder of divine grace, the good seed that redeems what in itself would be a lost cause. In view of all this, the sermon encourages the hearers to "daily spiritual activity which consists not only in uprooting and destroying but also in nurturing and building, not in judging and separating but more especially in cooperating with forces of grace and in availing one's self of all the opportunities for pastoral care." Irion says: "We are too easily inclined to tearing up and destroying and often destroy what God has sown. We want holy fellowships and think we can achieve them by separating out certain individuals or groups. Have we succeeded in thus reaching our goal? Our Lord did not separate out. . ." One sees that sectarian ideals have from time to time sought to take over in our churches. But one sees also how they have been held in check by biblical standards.

Irion's sermon is more that of the gifted professor of dogmatics while Baltzer represents the practical churchman in the pulpit. Irion's sermon, while not in the nature of a learned lecture, nevertheless is directed mainly toward the hearer's thinking while Baltzer's address the will. Irion was, of course, the dogmatician and in considering the relationship of the Synod to theological learning we shall encounter him in his own field of expertise.

In the foregoing we have taken a quick look at the best that was offered in the Synod during the completely German epoch of its history. The average sermon undoubtedly fell short of the standard of excellence here represented but it was offered in the same spirit. The sermon moved between the poles of sin and grace; it called for repentance, led to faith and required that faith be evidenced in Christian living. It was geared always to the hearers' powers of comprehension. It seldom rose to the heights of eloquence. The preacher, having come from the ranks of the people, spoke to the people as one of his own number. He

was understood and he fed the congregation with the home-baked bread of the simple gospel. Summing up, we conclude that the spirit of preaching by our fathers was essentially like that which was prevalent in Germany during the same period.

Although the sermon is the focal and climactic point in the Evanglical worship service, the liturgical ordering of the service is also very importnat. In the churches of the several states in Germany, the liturgy tended to follow the forms outlined in the Agende (Book of Worship). In keeping with the state church idea the churches of the realm tended to become centralized and to provide fixed forms for every situation. Personal choice and subjectivism were not tolerated. Likewise, the worship life of the congregation tended to be regulated by directions from central headquarters. In the Reformed Church, which recognizes a greater independence of the congregation, the principle of uniformity in the worship services was never carried out so strictly. In the Lutheran Church, on the other hand, the individual was allowed little or no freedom. Like its founding reformer this church had a great appreciation for the historical, for that which had been from of old, for that which was hallowed by long usage and authority. Therefore, it resisted every attempt on the part of individuals to introduce new ways or to make improvements.

Pietism was little appreciated for the historical, or outward form, for objective arrangements. So one might have expected that the pietistic people of the "Kirchenverein" would have availed themselves of the "freedom of conscience prevailing in the Evangelical church" in planning their worship services (just as they did in interpreting the meaning of Holy Communion), the more so since the English-American churches of the time were almost completely without liturgy. This, however, was not so. On the contrary, in the very first session, which led to the founding of the "Kirchenverein", a committee was appointed to prepare a draft for an Agende (Book of Worship). Although a Book of Worship was not completed and printed until 1857--meanwhile worship guides imported from Germany were used--the need was recognized from the beginning. Unrelenting as they were in stressing the importance of personal piety, as we have previously pointed out, the fathers were completely church oriented and convinced of the need for both organizational and liturgical order. With at first only a loose organizational structure a uniform order of worship must have been perceived as a valuable bond of unity. If they were ever to become a church (denomination) a common Book of Worship seemed an important item of outward educational material. Probably these early pastors, so recently called from behind the plow and quickly trained, needed nothing so much as to be able to lean on the old patterns of common worship and dignified liturgical forms.

Finally the Agende of 1857 became a reality. Its use was not obligatory. The individual minister was guided by his own preference or the custom of his congregation. His own or the congregation's original religious heritage, whether Reformed or

Lutheran, played an important role. Where this had been Reformed the liturgical part of the worship service was likely to be spare and lacking, where Lutheran richer with congregational participation in written or sung responses, more alive and inviting. Here and there the worship service was more elaborate but in general it was limited to opening sentences, prayer, scripture reading, and confession of faith. There probably were few occasions when the Agende was not used at all. The personal leadership of the pastor was limited usually to the free prayer following the sermon though frequently the more formal prayer from the altar took its place. Complete uniformity of a worship order in all congregations was never achieved. There was, however, general agreement as regarding the major elements.

Baptism and communion services were conducted in such a way as to be consistent with the Synod's Union stance. The words spoken in distributing the communion elements were those from the words of institution (not "This is the true body. ."). The significance of the sacraments as means of grace was, of course, steadfastly maintained. In many churches the cross and candles were seen on the altar. In others, after the Reformed manner, a communion table took the place of the altar.

At least as important as a Book of Worship, arranged with knowledgable liturgical taste is a church hymnal that can provide good hymn texts and melodies for a dignified service. For a time the "Kirchenverein" used song books imported from Germany (especially from Wuerttemberg). Later a book, titled "Gemeinschaftliches Gesangbuch" ("Common Hymnal") found wide acceptance. It was published by a private company in Philadelphia and designed for use in churches representing the Union principle. "They sound a note of rhetorical proclamation with calm, joyous good sense, plain and simple, but without deep poetic power, many of the lyrics being somewhat wooden." This judgment expressed by Hering regarding the hymns by Gellert (see R. E., Vo. X, p. 425, in article on "Kirchenlied") could also be applied to the "Gemeinschaftliches Gesangbuch". Especially Baltzer, therefore, pressed for its replacement by something better. His wish, like that of many others, was finally fulfilled in 1861, when a committee, appointed for this purpose presented its draft for a new hymnal. This "Evangelische Gesangbuch" ("Evangelical Hymnal") was printed the following year. It contains, as the foreword says: "A collection of songs which singly and together bear powerful testimony to the power and unity of the faith always available in the Christian church. They provide a living and appropriate expression of the Evangelical spirit and confession and meet the needs of Evangelical worship services as well as family devotions." "The Hymnal, however, does not limit itself to presenting a collection of the songs that have come down to us from the unity of the faith as the richest fruit of the blossom time of the sister churches of the Reformation, but thankfully includes songs which most recently have commended themselves to the Lord's church by reason of their inner worth."

With regard to the selection, ordering, and version of

hymns, the Hymnal owes much to the "Deutsches Gesangbuch" (German Hymnal) published by Philip Schaff in 1859. The revision of hymn texts by Schaff did not, in our opinion, always result in improvement of the original. The revisions often sacrifice the impact and fervor of the old texts to the demands of smooth modern poetic expression. In the communion hymns the "Evangelical Hymnal" avoids crass Lutheran expressions. For example, it says: "Oh, how I thirst for the drink (not the 'blood') of the Prince of Life!" The Hymnal has now served our Synod for sixty years. A revised edition appeared in 1907. It leaves out many old, less singable hymns and includes many newer ones, but the old version is still used alongside the new. The Hymnal has served our Synod well. Attuned to "people, church, and hearts" it has made a place for the German church hymn in the churches and homes of our land. It was W. Baur, General Superintendent of the Rhine Province, who used the expression "people, church, and hearts" in his characterization of the Evangelical church hymn. What he meant was that in the Evangelical hymn the deep feeling of the German folksoul, the complete confession of the church, and the personal faith of the individual human heart, all find expression. If it could be said of Luther that his songs did more to win him followers than did his sermons, it can likewise be said that the German hymn did more to bring the members of our Evangelical Synod into a unity of faith than did the preaching of the pastors. Through the decades the German hymn has been a strong factor in helping to preserve the German character type.

CHAPTER IX

The Religious Education of the Youth

Bibliography: Muecke, Geschichte . . .; Schory, Geschichte . . ; Article on "Schule und Kirche" by Dr. Geyer in R. E., Vol. XVII, pp. 739 ff.

The Christian public school is a daughter of the Reformation. The old (Roman Catholic) church had made Christian education the business of the family; all other forms of education were a private concern. During the Middle Ages there were Confession Schools in which people were drilled in the baptismal confession and the Lord's Prayer. When the Reformation substituted for the authority of the Pope the authority of the Bible, a higher level of common education seemed necessary. The Evangelical Christian needed at least to be able to read the Bible and to know about the varying interpretations of the Lord's Supper. So Luther proclaimed: "All children should be kept in school." Even so the results were, generally speaking, quite minimal. Sexton schools were instituted which originally taught only the catechism and church hymns; later reading the other elementary subjects were added. For more than two hundred years they remained the educational opportunity for a major portion of the population (Geyer). Following the Thirty Years War Pietists, particularly A. H. Francke, revived the public (folk) schools and made to serve the cause of religious education. The renewed folk schools were then taken over by the state and legally required, first of all in Prussia, in 1763, and then in other states. Once the modern state took over the responsibility for education, efforts began to be made to make the schools independent. The church was not favorably inclined toward this trend because it feared religious education would no longer be central. At the time of the founding of the "Kirchenverein" little had been heard about the secularization of education. Religious instruction was considered central and no one could have imagined a school without the Bible and the catechism. But now these German immigrants found themselves in a new country in which the schools were completely without religion. Of course, the general public was not hostile to religion and most public school teachers were faithful members of their own particular church, but in the curriculum of the public school there was no place for religion. Here and there a teacher might begin the school day with the Lord's Prayer or the reading of a psalm, but that was all. It is understandable that people who knew how important their own (German) people considered the teaching of religion in the schools would feel that the religionless public schools of America would not suffice for the education of their own children.

So we read (in Gert Goebel's "Longer Than a Lifetime in St. Louis") that already the first German farmers to settle in Missouri generally built a school right alongside their church, and that if they could not afford to hire a teacher their minister doubled as school teacher. At the very first meeting of

the "Kirchenverein", on October 15, 1840, Garlichs moved and the group voted: "The Society declares it to be its duty to take responsibility for education." In the by-laws, as revised in 1848, the third purpose of the Society is stated as the training of teachers and preachers. The by-laws go on to say that "Tested school teachers who, in accordance with Chp. I, Par. 1, confess membership in the Evangelical church, may be received as advisory members of the Society." More important is the statement made by Prof. A. Irion, a teacher in the seminary, in his catechism explanation (p. 220) concerning infant baptism. After pointing out that through baptism the children become partakers of all the spiritual blessings which other Christians have, he concludes from this that the church is obligated to see to it that the baptized children are brought up in accord with the vows made at their baptism. He goes on to say: "Church schools are a necessary consequence of infant baptism and an unavoidable obligation of the church. Emancipation of the school from the church is finally nothing less than a denial of baptism and a disruption of the bond of union with the church into which every person enters through baptism." With these sharp, clear words he was only stating what must have been a universal conviction, but the fact that for 17 years a man in authoritative position taught this must have made a deep impression on the consciences of the students.

So our congregations in those decades almost always had church schools. Only in isolated instances did these schools have teachers; usually the pastor had to do this work. There were no laws to stand in the way of these parochial schools. The pastor did not need a teaching certificate. The hours and the class schedule were usually quite simple. Major attention, of course, was given to the teaching of religion, just as the custom had been in Germany. Little attention was given to teaching English. The language of instruction was inevitably German. But it would be wrong to conclude that the preservation of the German language was the main motivation for having the schools. As the words of Irion indicate, the real incentive was the conviction that the religious education of the youth was supremely important and the fact that it was lacking in the public schools. The reason for using German was that the parents were German and spoke German with their children.

So it was that, at least in winter, four or five days of the pastor's time had to be given over to teaching responsibilities, leaving little time for traditional pastoral responsibilities such as visiting the sick and sermon preparation. Spring and summer, when the children were needed for work in the fields, were less strenuous for the minister. Then it was that he found time to take care of things too long neglected, such as making the rounds of the parish and catching up on theological reading--unless, of course, by that time he had lost interest. It was not, however, the view of the "Kirchenverein" that the minister always and in every situation be expected to do double duty as pastor and parochial school teacher. The Society intended that the seminary in Marthasville should graduate teachers as well as

ministers. When, on October 1, 1851, an appeal went out to the congregations for the first time to observe Reformation Sunday with prayers and a special offering to undergird the seminary, the people were told: "You know that we are concerned to do all we can to help relieve the shortage of teachers and pastors. That is why we built the seminary at Marthasville." This two-fold purpose was often stressed in the early days. But achievement of this double purpose was beyond the Society's power. Pastors were, of course, an absolute necessity. So in the end the seminary concentrated on providing ministers and the ministers then had to substitute for the missing teachers.

Still, there was the feeling that the church without a corps of trained professional teachers was failing in a crucial area. In 1864 Pastor Christ Schrenk, of Evansville, Indiana, issued a call for the founding of a training school for teachers. He pointed out that the Evangelical Church, while engaged in both foreign and homeland missions was forgetting its own young people. Christian education, he insisted, was the real foundation for both the church and missions. Mission, he said, had its beginning in the parochial schools. These, he said, often became preparatory schools for future ministers. Should the minister be forced to neglect his pastoral duties and his preaching responsibilities simply because the Synod would not establish a seminary for the education of capable teachers? "Evangelical Church," he concluded, "provide able teachers. You owe it to yourself!"

The appeal did not go unheard. The General Synod meeting in Louisville, Kentucky in 1864 resolved, "to allow Christian young men to enroll in the seminary at Marthasville to prepare themselves for the calling of teacher and in so doing to lay the foundation for a teachers' seminary." The promising resolution, however, was never carried out because the directorate of the seminary did not consider it wise to have the two institutions housed together on the same campus and advised the General Synod to establish a teachers' seminary elsewhere. Accordingly, in 1866, a teachers' seminary was established in a rented house in Cincinnati, Ohio--a most modest beginning. In 1870 this institution was relocated to Evansville, Indiana with instructions that it should be converted into a Pro-seminar (pro-seminary) with a department for students preparing for the teaching profession. During its final year (1869-70) 23 young men were enrolled in the (Cincinnati) institution. On January 17, 1871 the proseminary, with 10 students, was opened in Evansville. But that same year the German Evangelical Synod of the Northwest" united with the "Synod of the West" (see chapter 7) and turned over to the latter the former Melanchthon Seminary in Elmhurst, Illinois to serve the merged fellowship. It was decided to relocate the Proseminary from Evansville to Elmhurst. Elmhurst lies 17 miles west of Chicago, i. e., near the growing "metropolis of the West" and in the midst of a large cluster of Evangelical congregations. There could hardly have been a better location for the new institution. The relocation from Evansville was completed before the end of 1871. The new property of the

Synod in Elmhurst was developed and enlarged, and it was there that the Proseminary since that time has sought to carry out its two-fold assignment, to prepare students for the seminary and teachers for the parochial schools.

There followed a considerable improvement in the matter of parochial schools, seeing Elmhurst was better able to meet the demand for teachers. In 1873 the church school teachers founded the Evangelical Teachers Society which had as its purpose mutual encouragement of its members and the promotion of their common interests. At the General Synod in 1883 the Society was officially recognized as "based on the same confession and having the same goals" as the Synod itself. In 1886 the Society had 70 members. Despite the increased number of teachers now available, only a small portion of the need for teachers could be met. In the rural areas, generally speaking, the pastor still had to do the teaching himself.

As a matter of fact it became increasingly evident as time went on that, despite Elmhurst and a temporary period of seeming prosperity, the parochial school was not well established on a sound foundation. True, for years it made a commendable contribution in the field of Christian education. It is true, too, that for years the Synod made every effort to provide the necessary teaching materials for all the various elementary subjects. Still, the parochial school never succeeded in getting all the children of the congregation. Also, it never aspired to carry through in the educational process beyond the age for confirmation. Intermediate, secondary, and academic education it was never able to provide--except in a few isolated instances. What success it deserves to be credited with lay in other areas. Although it was seldom able to hold the children beyond the fourteenth year, children quite generally did attend the parochial school for at least two years before confirmation. This requirement was frequently emphasized. As a matter of fact, in many places the parochial school was pretty much limited to the two years preceding confirmation so that it became, in effect, "confirmation school". In other places congregations made do with "summer schools," i. e., schools which operated only during the summer months.

Already in the 80's it became noticeable that the parochial schools were on the decline. The General Synod of 1886 adopted the following resolution: "Since the flourishing of Evangelical congregations depends in no small measure upon the continuance of Evangelical parochial schools, and since the Sunday School cannot serve as a satisfactory substitute for such, the Synod urges all pastors and congregations to see to it that existing parochial schools are maintained and that where none now exists every effort be made to establish such." The resolution, however, was little more than beating the air. The very next year Phil Goebel, Inspector of the Proseminar, 1880-87, comments as follows in his final annual report: "It is not an overstatement when I say that already the Proseminary is bearing the consequences of the Synod's sin of omission in failing to deal in a timely and

proper manner with the educational problem. I refer to the fact that we discontinued the seminary for teachers, which had so auspiciously begun, and that since 1870 we have pursued the business of parochial schools and of teacher preparation only in a very perfunctory manner, as is plainly seen. It is no wonder that today, with three times as many pastors and congregations, we have fewer students preparing to become teachers than we had 17 years ago when we rejoiced in the existence and growth of a seminary for teachers whose annual report showed 23 students as compared to only 17 today."

From the declining number of students for the teaching office, Goebel concluded, quite rightly, that things were going downhill. This decline, however, was coupled with the discontinuance of many parochial schools. One asks: How did it happen that the Synod was not able to maintain the parochial school on a high level? The reason was not so much that the schools were expensive. Where the pastor himself served as teacher the monthly tuition charge was a mere bagatelle. The main problem was the interference with, or interruption of, the public school instruction which attendance at the church school caused. Usually children who enrolled for the "confirmation school" lost at least a year from public school and frequently were unable to continue with their original class in public school.

The church schools probably reached their high point in 1888 when 240 pastors and 128 teachers staffed schools operated by 762 congregations (see Schory, p. 136), for a total teaching personnel of 368 persons. People in the know were beginning to feel that the tree, while still healthy looking was beginning to suffer internal decay. The younger generation of ministers were not greatly perturbed about this. They placed their hope in the Sunday Schools. In the second part of our work we shall dedicate a chapter to this institution. The older ministers, let it be said, were sorry to see the church schools begin to fade away. They feared that with the schools fundamental instruction in religious truths, the Evangelical spirit and German ethos, too, would go.

We ask ourselves how did it happen that our Synod was not able to maintain its parochial schools when, as is evident, not only the Catholics but also certain Lutheran bodies, particularly the Missouri Synod, have kept them flourishing unto this very day. We can leave the Catholic Church out of consideration for the simple reason that it has resources at its command which the Protestant Churches do not have either in Europe or in the New World. Making use of these resources it has built an educational system which provides for a great portion of Catholic youth not only elementary education under church influence but also good colleges and universities for their higher education. But why has the Missouri Synod been more successful than we? The Missouri Synod is like the Catholic Church inasmuch as it awakens and fosters in its adherents the belief that it is really the only true church--that it alone has the full biblical truth. It

considers it its duty to maintain the pure doctrine unadulterated and in all its purity. Its people are taught to believe that for the Lutheran so long as he lives there can be no church other than the Missouri Synod. This Middle Ages concept it is able to maintain in its members only if, like the Catholic Church, it cuts itself off from the rest of the world and its influences as completely as possible. Therefore, also it cuts itself off from any kind of cooperation with other church bodies. Especially the youth must be shielded from outside influences because the youth, more than others, are likely to be susceptible to influences either good or bad. If one can convince the youth that this church alone is in possession of the truth, one has won the game. If one allows the youth to come under the leveling influence of the public school every effort to convince them that their church alone is the true church is likely to be in vain. The spirit of the Middle Ages must give way to the modern spirit and the delight in controversial theology must yield to "seeking for peace with everyone". Therefore, the Missouri Synod pastors preach that a Lutheran school is as important as a Lutheran church and their members in the end are unable to free themselves from this belief.

The Evangelical Synod is in spirit and on principle committed to Christian unity. It believes that Christians should cooperate and unite whenever possible, always holding fast to the essentials, but always conciliatory in matters less essential. It lacks the spirit of harsh rejection so characteristic of Lutheran orthodoxy. It is milder, softer, more hospitable to outside influences. It allows more room for subjectivism, for individual interpretation and for personal differences. Therefore, it allows more room for personal freedom. It has never achieved, nor sought to achieve, the strict disciplinary control over pastors and teachers which the Missouri Synod practices.

Such a stance, while more sympathetically received by moderns, has its disadvantages. One of these is that the Synod has never found it possible to convince its congregations that Evangelical education under the auspices of the church is so important that the people should be willing to make the financial and other sacrifices required to establish and maintain a church school system. Nevertheless, during the first 50 years the church schools made a significant contribution to the religious education of our youth.

CHAPTER X

Theological Education in the Synod

Bibliography: A. Irion, Explanation of the Small Evangelical Catechism, published by F. Kaufmann. Theologische Zeitschrift, 1880. Konference Protokolle (Conference Minutes), 1880. Ott., Epistle to the Romans, Explained for the Congregation. Muecke, Geschichte . . . Neve, Lutherans in the Movement for Church Union, ch. 6. Article by Gess in R. E., Vol. 6. Philip Schaff in R. E., Vol. XVII.

Having in the previous chapter concerned ourselves with religious education of the youth on the part of the church, let us now take a look at the kind of theological education which was given to those who were becoming pastors during the first period of our Synod's history. In doing so we shall be throwing light on the theological position of the Synod generally. It is obvious, too, that the kind of education given to theological students will greatly influence their later ministry and, therefore, the religious life of the congregations. If it is education in the spirit of strict confessionalism that spirit will find expression in the life and ministry of the pastors who by continually harping on the importance of "pure doctrine" will build a spirit of exclusiveness in their congregations. If the instruction is directed primarily toward the mind the students will be chiefly concerned about being "scientific". Such clergymen will then acquaint their congregations with all the "problems" of modern theological thinking but will fail to offer anything solid or positive and will soon come to see that the church cannot live on problems. The instruction given in our seminary has always been "positive", or, if preferred, "orthodox". But it has always been permissive of individual interpretation and development. In one instance this freedom went so far that the Synod felt called upon to take a position against it but even in that case, as we shall see, there was visible resistance. Our firm stand for Christian unity simply left no place for a narrow confessionalism. Two names stand out as stars of the first magnitude in the firmament of our seminary heaven: Andreas Irion, professor from 1853 to 1870, and Emil Otto, from 1870 to 1880. To these two men, more than to any other, the pastors of this early period owe their theological education and their theological position. Irion was more traditional, Otto more free, although mainly only in the exposition of the biblical text; both were equally true to the gospel.

Andreas Irion, born amid simple surroundings in Thuningen, Wuerttemberg on November 17, 1823, had received only the customary elementary school education when, at the age of 22, he enrolled in the Mission House at Basel for a six-year course of study. His theological teachers were Hoffmann (later General Superintendent in Berlin) and Gess. He became especially indebted to the latter. In 1852 the Basel Committee sent him to America where he became a teacher in the seminary at

Marthasville. However, it was not until 1857, when Binner left, that he took up the teaching of dogmatics, the field for which he was by nature best qualified. When one remembers that he received his entire vocational training in the six years he spent at the Mission House one marvels at the serious content of his writings. The "Kirchenverein" was extremely fortunate when it appointed this man as a teacher in its seminary. The editor of the "Friedensbote" must have had Irion in mind when, in the summer of 1853, he reprinted an address in which Bishop A. Potter, of Pennsylvania, strongly recommends the calling of German professors for our colleges, seminaries, and universities. The address was given on June 7, 1853, for the installation of a German professor at the opening of Franklin and Marshall College in Lancaster, Pennsylvania. (This college was later relocated to Mercersburg and Philip Schaff was called to become its president.) Although the address is quite space-consuming, it is so surprising in the refreshing openmindedness with which it evaluates ethnic characteristics that I want here to share it at least in essence. Having taken note of the fact that a German had been elected as professor he goes on to say: "I wish that this example might be followed by others. In almost every country in Europe there are gifted men, amazingly well educated, capable of teaching advanced students who are forgotten and left to languish. Such talents exist in Germany in such abundance that the field of higher education is literally over-filled. Here the situation is very different. Activities of a competitive and overly-materialistic nature claim the energy and enthusiasm which with diligent serious-minded Germans are dedicated to scientific endeavors. We are receiving thousands of their working class people. From all the countries of continental Europe we are importing language teachers, why should we not also bring in some of their famous scholars and seekers? Where can there be found a better field of labor or a better opportunity for pecuniary reward?

"This idea commends itself from various angles and there are special reasons why it should originate in Pennsylvania. This state has a special characteristic which, until recently, was peculiar to it but which more and more seems to be becoming a characteristic of our nation. I refer to the many different nationalities which make up its population. Not only old and new England but also Germany, Scotland, Wales, and Sweden have long had colonies of their people within this state. This will soon be the case in every state in the United States. Population elements which in the past have been looked upon as not belonging together, as being incompatible, now are simmering in our great national melting pot, and we confidently expect that they will become one harmonious whole all permeated by the one American spirit. This result will be achieved surely and soon to the extent that the education we give the growing generation magnanimously values the contribution each ethnic group has to make and wisely blends into a unified whole the different contributions of the various homelands. From whence could such a suggestion come more naturally than from Pennsvylania?

"There are, however, other good reasons for allowing the German element to bring its influence to bear in the field of higher education. That country has given the world the open Bible, the primary school, and the printing press. Where these gifts are utilized fully the result is certain to be a vital and thinking people. Combined with a free political system and an unusually vigorous economy, such as we have in our country, one gets a nation of leaders, a nation of workers, and, to a certain degree, a nation of thinkers. Our individual activity is zealous and varied and concentrated largely on practical living but the main drive of life, as it is developing among us, is presently not favorable to advanced learning or to the deeper, more fundamental, interests of life. We have a literature, of course, but are lacking in a mature, inclusive, well-educated culture. We have philosophy but it is worked over all too little and remains poorly grounded and limited. Erroneous ideas and gross follies, both with regard to speculative subjects and practical matters, circulate throughout the land and, for lack of a strong habit of independent thinking and diligent study, are accepted and spread, much to the disadvantage and dishonor of our national character. Let the Germans add to their many gifts one more. Let their scholars teach us the patience, the thoroughness, the untiring zeal and the high enthusiasm with which such (scientific) investigations need to be undertaken and then let them teach us the courageous freedom and boldness with which the results should be proclaimed. Let them help us find the right weapon with which to unmask with a single thrust all unfounded sophism, and all one-sided, unprincipled half-knowledge.

"Still another wholesome result of this practice is to be expected. The instruction in such an institution will always be the result of serious thinking and deep study. It is time to banish, once for all, the idea that less highly educated men make the best teachers. This is an idea that has been disseminated all too widely throughout our land. The result of this misconception has been not only to reduce the quality of instruction but also to inhibit the continuing education of our professors. It robbed them of the incentive for daily effort toward continuing freshness of thought and persevering investigative zeal which they should have had. The German universities constitute an effective practical denial of this gross misconception. Their most dearly beloved teachers have always been their best thinkers and those most thoroughly educated. They have demonstrated--and the same is true to some extent of the Scottish universities--that a gift for clear, easily understandable teaching goes well with the inclination toward serious, difficult study, and that in fact the latter facilitates the former."

These precious words spoken by the bishop still warm our hearts even today. Had we always dealt accordingly a better understanding would have been built and we might never have had the break we have come to know as World War I. He was no doubt thinking that German professors would come to this country, learn our language and our customs, and introduce German scientific and

teaching methods in our English-American educational institutions as, in fact, Philip Schaff did in later years. A. Irion's mission had narrower limits. He was supposed to serve a German-American seminary with his theological knowledge and his teaching ability. The "Kirchenverein" found it necessary to import its professors from Germany. It would be quite some time yet before the Synod would be able to raise up its own professors. Besides dogmatics (and other subjects) Irion was also supposed to teach Catechetics. He, therefore, availed himself of the use of the Evangelical Catechism which had been issued by the "Kirchenverein" in 1847 (see Muecke, p. 117). This catechism needed improvement in inclusiveness (92 pages) and form. Irion worked for years at the job of catechism revision. By 1862 he was ready with a revision and in that same year the "Kleine Evangelische Katechismus" (Small Evangelical Catechism) was published with Irion as its chief author. This catechism is still in use. In 1892 it was translated into English and issued as the "Small Evangelical Catechism". A revised edition came out in 1896 under the title, "Evangelical Catechism" (Muecke, p. 300). The numbering of the commandments is that of the Reformed Church (or Old Testament) but otherwise it follows pretty much Luther's outline and in the teaching concerning the Lord's Supper, Irion's Lutheran bent is clearly noticeable.

Irion died with unexpected suddenness in 1870 in the 47th year of his life. He had not yet published his "Dogmatics" and although a posthumous publication of the volume was planned (see in Muecke, p. 71, the note by Kaufmann: "The Systematic Theology" by Prof. A. Irion will be published in due time") the plan never materialized. We have, however, a substitute for it in the "Explanation of the Small Evangelical Catechism" mentioned in the bibliography at the beginning of this chapter, which was published by Kaufmann in 1870. In it we are given a running exposition of Irion's "Small Catechism". This is not simply an explanation of a catechism in the usual sense but a rather exhaustive treatment of the content of our faith. The author in this work presents a completely independent treatment of Evangelical doctrine. Could he have published his "Dogmatics", it would undoubtedly have been a more systematized work. He would not have begun with the ten commandments but, instead, would undoubtedly have used as his outline the three articles of our (The Apostolic) creed, perhaps with a foreword concerning his apologetics, as was customary at the time. But his explanation of the Catechism gives us the essence of his theology. Kaufmann labels it as intuitive and speculative. This is true in the sense that Irion drew upon his own faith experience and subjects the biblical concepts to critical examination but not in the sense of Rothe in going from the concept of absolute being to the concept of the person (see Frank, "Geschichte der Neueren Theologie"--"History of the New Theology"--2nd edition, p. 147). The "Explanation" is consistently good, even in its more practical expression. Especially good is the first part dealing with the attributes of God. Here Irion's speculative powers are at their best.

The Holy Scriptures always speak of God in anthropomorphic terms. There must be a reason for this rooted both in the nature of God and in the nature of man. Since only like can comprehend like, we learn something about the divine nature. And we learn something about the nature of man (and the world) inasmuch as the world as a whole and man as an individual made in God's image is able to see in himself something of God's inner nature and yet cannot comprehend God's inner nature in its fulness. Wherefore also there can be in man neither the ability nor the need to see God otherwise than in the raiment and image of his manifold creation. (See chapter 4 above.)

The omnipresence of God does not mean merely a cold, lifeless, passive ubiquitousness defined in terms of being everywhere at the same time. It has to do rather with God's continual activity in the All and in every individual. It means, first of all, God's permeation of the All and, secondly, such a permeation of the All that the All is the continual result. The whole being of God is continual activity, both his being in the world and his being within himself. God rules in creation at every point and at every moment. And although God completely encompasses and completely permeates the whole of creation this, on the other hand, does not mean that God is encompassed by or locked in within creation. God's omnipresence is not the necessary (unfree) ubiquity of pantheism which speaks of God as the so-called "world principle". His is rather a living omnipresence which is God's free action from his filling of heaven and earth all the way down to his presence in the tiniest unit of the creation. As eternity represents the free ethical being (existence) of God within himself so God's omnipresence is God's free, ethical being (existence) in the world.

It is impossible for us here to describe in detail Irion's theology. However, if we were able to do so, it would become clear that he was endowed not only with the philosophical bent so common among the Wuerttembergers but also with the ability to make even the most difficult philosophical concepts clearly understandable. Still he never departs from the faith of the church. In connection with the Second Article of faith he says: "Christ in his being existed from all eternity; still if he was to be manifested as a human being in the midst of existing humanity he would need to be generated (produced, raised) which can mean nothing less than that he would need to be translated from his divinely perfect existence into the nature of our present human existence." (Chapter 8) It has been said that Irion was greatly influenced by Gess. He was not, however, like Gess, a Kenotic. "The Son of God in his incarnation did not lay aside or leave behind his divine attributes, but all he was in his essence and all his relationships with the Trinity and with the world, like all his divine attributes, were simply translated into the human realm."

In his suffering and death Christ bore in our stead the anger of God against sin. The anger of God, according to Irion, is in principle, the eternal punishment of hell.

With regard to the sacraments Irion, as we have already mentioned, was thoroughly Lutheran. Already in answer to question 124 we are told: "A sacrament is means of grace, instituted by Christ himself in which through visible signs and means God imparts and maintains the new life." In the "Explanation" he says: This action, i.e., the offering of the new life, is always there whenever and wherever the sacrament is observed, for the sacramental nature of the sacrament cannot be made dependent upon anything human. The sacrament is real whether the participant believes or does not believe. Only in the one case the sacramental action is positive: the communicant comes into a true unity with Christ; while in the other case it is negative: the communicant comes into alienation and hardening of heart against God.

In baptism the new life is given to the human being. He is made into a child of God. "However, this divine sonship is only something objective, inasmuch as it has not yet entered our will, consciousness, and feeling; this must and can come about only through conversion. Everyone who is baptized needs at some later time to be converted if he or she is to be saved. Baptism is only a divine act which from our side needs conversion."

Regarding infant baptism he says (Question 98), "The ability to be transformed into the new life is greater with children than with adults." Since the new life can come into being only within the old natural life of the human being and this life is completely bound up with the unethical condition and materialism, the Holy Spirit can create the new life in us only by material mediation. Since the principal element of material creation is water (All created things begin with water; all that we see in the created world was first water); therefore, only water can be the carrier through which the Spirit of God works in us created beings. Irion's biological views, as indicated in the foregoing, we must, to say the least, label as out-dated.

As we have already mentioned, Irion felt that infant baptism makes the church school a necessity, since it is in the church school that the germ of the new life is enabled to grow and develop. "In confirmation instruction our principal aim should be to help the child appropriate in faith that which was received already at the time of baptism. This free conscious appropriation, or conversion, cannot be achieved or forced by human instruction, but the church should do all that is possible by way of preparing those who are coming of age for this great event so that when, sooner or later, the awakening comes the necessary human pre-conditions will have been met." If nowadays even in Christian circles efforts are made to force children prematurely to make a decision for Christ, Irion sees this as "a sick trait and merely an expression of the same spirit that in other areas of life wants to make men in children's shoes." One sees from these words that Irion, while a genuine Pietist was not a Methodistic spiritual manager.

With regard to the Lord's Supper, too, Irion comes through

as definitely Lutheran. He says, of course, in the answer to Question 132 that the new man at the Lord's Table receives the body and blood of our Lord as nourishment for his life, but he also goes on to say, "Naturally, the inner man cannot receive the real gift of the Lord's Supper except through the medium of something material given to the outer man." This spiritual nourishment is received corporeally; it is a substantive reception of Christ into the new substantive being. "Bread and wine are the substantive carriers of the body and blood of Christ. In the Lord's Supper the new, godly, normal life is nourished by the body and blood of Christ." In the sacrament forgiveness of sins, life and salvation are not merely held before us or promised to us, but are actually shared with us in the body and blood of Christ.

Irion's strongly Lutheran conception of the Lord's Supper, therefore, is quite clear. The Reformed teaching, which seeks in the sacrament visible signs and seals of salvation, is definitely declined. According to the Union principle it is, however, equally clear that Irion's teaching concerning the sacrament could be nothing more than his private interpretation. The Reformed church members could not and cannot appropriate it for themselves. Since, however, the great majority of church members came from the Lutheran background, the teaching caused no controversy.

Irion's book must be regarded as a pearl of deep independent thinking regarding the faith of the Christian religion. Although many matters which are in the foreground of our thinking today are not touched upon, the book still merits serious study. To its own generation of our pastors it rendered a significant service. Irion did not create his own school of theologians; he was not able to establish a generation of Irion scholars; not even a single scholar followed in his footsteps as his disciple perpetuating his gift and his art; still he gave to our pastors in an inspired way the ancient faith, leading them to think, while at the same time making them aware that faith has to do with living not merely with holding opinions.

It was a heavy blow for our Synod when Irion died on July 25, 1870, in consequence of a rapidly-developing abdominal infection. He could still have accomplished much, much more. Nevertheless, the memory of his personality as well as his teaching, made a deep impression upon his contemporaries. And, as it happened, the man was already at hand who, although in a very different manner and spirit, would carry on his work. For the immediate future Irion's work as "Inspector" of the seminary was turned over to Pastor J. Bank (who served from 1871 until the fall of 1872) but then the position was given to Professor E. Otto whom we must now give closer consideration.

Karl Emil Otto was born in Mansfeld on January 7, 1837. As the son of the rector of the Mansfeld school he received his secondary education in the public high school at Schulpforta (near Naumburg a.d. Saale). To this school in which Latin was

the daily conversational medium of the students, he owes his philological education. Later he studied in Halle under Tholuck, Julius Mueller, and Hupfeld. After that he served first as a private tutor and later as an assistant instructor in an orphanage belonging to the Franks. In 1865 the Berlin Mission Society sent him to America. Here he was at first connected with the Wisconsin Synod Lutheran church, founded by Muehlhaeuser. In 1866 he left the Wisconsin Synod because of its conservative confessional stance and was directed by Pastor L. von Rague, then a pastor in Wisconsin, to the "Synod of the West". In 1870 he was elected to serve as professor of dogmatics and related subjects at the seminary and following the resignation of Bank in 1872, he succeeded him as "Inspector" (Director) (see Muecke, pp. 109-200). With the arrival of Otto an entirely new spirit began to take over in the teaching methods in the seminary. Although deeply grounded in the basic truths of the gospel, Otto was nevertheless a child of modern times. Whereas Irion was by temperament a Pietist and theologically a thoroughgoing mystic, Otto was a critical theologian. Irion was in all respects the legitimate product of his Wuerttembergian home: a combination of childlike religious feeling and speculative reasoning. Otto, as a North-German, was indeed a Christian believer but was less pietistic. He had gone through the school of historical criticism and had made its positive contributions his own. His strength lay in exegesis. Of course, he also had to teach dogmatics, but this was never the field of his greatest contribution, nor, unfortunately, did he ever put his lectures into print. Throughout his career he devoted himself chiefly to Old and New Testament exegesis which was always what he loved most. His very last contribution, published posthumously in the "Magazin" was in this field. He was university-educated. Irion came from the Mission House and this largely accounts for the fact that Otto's way was beset by so many more thorns. The practical, old orthodox spirit of the Mission House just seemed better suited to the "Synod of the West" than was the critical approach of study in the German university.

On the other hand, if Otto's critical approach evoked opposition this was not the reaction of his students. He was an outstanding teacher and had an unparalleled ability to inspire his students to enter enthusiastically into whatever research was being undertaken. Never before had they been introduced to such thoroughgoing exegetical study. Irion had been wonderful in expositing the biblical concepts. But here was a teacher who was so proficient in the original languages of the scripture, especially Greek, that it seemed almost as though he were dealing with his mother tongue. Still he did not limit himself to philological explanations but was able to make available to his students the true bread of the living scriptural thoughts. Everyone agreed that here was a teacher who could not only share with his students the knowledge they needed but was able also to get them to do their own thinking and to engage in their own independent research. In so doing he achieved the highest goals of the true teacher. In view of the obvious enthusiasm of students and the genuine humility of the professor, no one objected

to the fact that the windows of the classroom were open to the winds of modernity. Nor did the professor ever deny or try to conceal the fact that the windows were open. For remember, Otto was never a pussyfooter; he was always outspoken, open and above board. For he was convinced that he was on the right track and that it was necessary for the Synod, and especially for the pastors, to go forward with the times. He felt that with us theological study was still in its swaddling clothes, and that any pastor who did not go forward in his theological thinking would not be able to meet the needs of the times.

But when the students on vacation left the seminary halls to return to their home churches, there to talk with the older pastors about what they were being taught and about specific theological viewpoints of their famous professor, there were some lifted eyebrows. It seemed to them as though the ancient faith was no longer being taught quite after the manner of the fathers. There was considerable unrest particularly among those of the old school who as watchmen on the walls of Zion now felt it necessary to defend the faith. The leader of these discontents seems to have been the former "Inspector" J. Bank$, who, after leaving the seminary, served as pastor first in Cleveland and then in Buffalo. Otto had published in the "Theologische Zeitschrift" a number of essays about death as the wages of sin, about original sin, and about justification in which (according to Bank$ and others) he had promulgated certain unbiblical teachings. In a communication addressed to the directors of our educational institutions by Bank$ in 1880, Otto in an essay on Romans 5:12-19 had sought to prove that death, as such, was not the consequence of sin but was rather a perfectly natural occurrence and had said that "all theories that explain a particular sin by reference to Adam's sin are going beyond what the text justified. The text says absolutely nothing about how Adam's sin spread and was perpetuated in future generations of humankind for that is a speculative not a religious question. Our text says simply that where there is sin there is death--only that and nothing more." Otto's position was that in view of verse 15 it was impossible to maintain that "many died through one man's trespass" (5:15). Accordingly death could be said to be the wages of sin only indirectly. (See Minutes of the General Conference in 1880, p. 19ff.)

Otto was well aware of the prevailing dissension. Indeed, he knew that opposition to his teachings had spread throughout the denomination and would in all likelihood be voiced at the next General Synod. But he did not rein himself in; he took nothing back. On the contrary, between April and June he published in the "Theologische Zeitschrift" a series of articles based on the Temptation Story (Genesis 3) and this really got the ball rolling. These articles were of great importance for the Synod inasmuch as they were destined to lead to the loss of a valued teacher. But they were important in other ways, too. The writer has for thirty years been well acquainted with the "Zeitschrift" (later called the Magazin) and can say without hesitation that he never saw in this journal exegetical or

biblical-theological studies which could equal these articles for thoroughness of exposition, independence of thought, or clarity of presentation. Nay more, insofar as the present writer is acquainted with the theological literature of Germany he makes bold to say that Otto's articles have not been excelled by anything produced in the fatherland.

Having first of all discussed in a wonderfully clear way the allegorical, literalistic, dogmatizing, and philosophical interpretations of the Temptation Story and having shown through cogent argument why they all must be rejected, we regret that space prevents our presenting his genial and convincing line of argument--Otto gets around to the symbolical explanation which he accepts as alone valid for dealing with this biblical story. He says that elements in the story make it clear that a literalistic interpretation is out of the question since it would result in crass anthropomorphism. "To say that the eating of a piece of fruit, or other material things, could cause God to withhold our partaking of eternal life, as if God having once been robbed would be determined to guard all the more carefully what he still had left, makes for an utterly impossible scenario. Just as the angel with the flaming sword is obviously a symbolic figure, so also the expression 'tree of life' must be seen as purely symbolical. The 'tree of life' is an expression for life itself. To know good and evil is in itself no sin but such knowledge becomes sinful only when it is attained through personal participation. Such partaking of evil is sin because it represents a sinking to the level of doing what comes naturally instead of giving obedience to the indwelling conscience, the moral law. The individual wants to follow his drives and natural instincts but finds he can do so only by disregarding the inner voice. Just as the tree, so also the serpent is symbolical. The conversation of the woman with the serpent is essentially conversation with herself. The punishment is to be understood as meaning that God lets man go his own way with the result that the consequences of his sin become for him partly punishment but also partly education and purification. Our text does not say that as a result of man's fall into sin there was a change in the external manner of life (either for the serpent or for humans)." Such, in essence, were the results of Otto's exegetical studies. One may question, of course, whether he does justice to the simple understanding of Genesis 3. He gives his own explanation but not necessarily that of the biblical story-teller, just as in Romans 5:12-19, he does not necessarily say what Paul himself meant but gives us his--Otto's--own interpretation. Today we would be likely to say: "This is the simple, childlike way in which the biblical writer conceived the matter. We find in the story the following meaning: --at which point we perhaps would make use of Otto's symbolical interpretation. But if Otto had done this at the Synod meeting, it is doubtful that he would have helped his cause. He would undoubtedly have been told that he was placing himself above the scriptures, as if he were trying to instruct the biblical writers.

Threateningly the wolves were gathering about Otto as if to

devour him. President Baltzer, who might still have been able to protect him, had died at the end of January. On various occasions, in making his annual report to the Districts, he had expressed his concern about conditions in the seminary where in consequence of friction between students and professors disharmony had arisen. Once indeed, the dissatisfaction had been so great that the entire Senior Class had gone on a strike. The strike, however, had nothing to do with Otto's teaching but rather had been the result of a strong dissatisfaction on the part of the students with the second theological teacher, who had made himself so unpopular with the seminarians that they demanded his resignation. When the Seminary Board sought to retain him until a new professor could be employed the students left the institution. Later 22 out of 26 returned. (District Minutes, 1879)

Otto had given up the Inspectorate in 1879 already when the office was conferred upon L. Haeberle. Finally, being a man who would rather surrender his position than his conscience, he announced that he would also resign as professor.

Nevertheless, it seemed for a time as if a solution to the dilemma would be found. The Board of Directors at its meeting in the spring of 1880, gave the Otto case careful consideration. After having thoroughly informed itself with regard to Otto's teaching regarding such subjects as the reconciling death of Jesus, human death, the miracles of our Lord, and particularly concerning the Stilling of the Storm and the Sacrificing of Isaac, and having been <u>completely</u> <u>satisfied</u>, the Board adopted the following resolution:

1. The Directorate is convinced that the doubts expressed by some concerning the teaching of Prof. Otto are groundless. Therefore, the Directorate desires that he continue teaching.

2. That Prof. Otto be asked to forget the past and to continue happily in his teaching assured of our complete confidence. (District Minutes, 1880)

C. Siebenpfeiffer was chairman of the Board of Directors and also President of the Synod. It appeared that everything had turned out for the best and the Districts rejoiced to know that Prof. Otto's services would be retained.

Then, however, Otto's series of articles concerning the Fall of Man (Gen. 3) appeared in the spring and summer issues of the <u>Theologische Zeitschrift</u> as mentioned above. Thereupon the storm broke open anew and with greater fury and it became necessary for the General Synod, meeting in September, to take a stand. The Committee on Educational Institutions took the position that Otto in his teaching had deviated from the position of the Synod and demanded a promise that he would not again do so in the future. Especially Pastor Banks' objection to the distinction Otto made between the kernel of the story of the Fall of Man as being serious disobedience to God, and the shell which

had to do with the tree and serpent and what it said. Otto defended his position. He took his position, he said, firmly on the confession of the church. With regard to details of exposition and doctrinal interpretation, a teacher, he insisted, must be given freedom. He desired recognition, he said, not for a liberal but for a neological (i. e., modern) trend in scripture interpretation. He considered the General Conference not competent to decide the issue. He requested that a committee of truly competent Bible scholars be appointed to investigate the matter and to hear his defense. The Synod voted 47 to 9 to reject any and every neological teaching or scripture interpretation and to insist that in our seminary, even as in the German Evangelical church, the teaching must be positivistic. (General Conference Minutes, September, 1880)

Otto thereupon resigned from his teaching position and as a member of the Synod. We have described the "Otto Case" in some detail because it is typical. It is the only case of this kind the Synod has ever had. It indicates that the Synod demanded strictly orthodox teaching. It was admitted that a certain freedom in teaching might be allowed to prevail but that this freedom must be limited by the general theological position of the Synod. (The same Minutes) It is also evident that Otto was allowed to remain for years despite the fact that there were those who opposed him. Nor can one overlook Otto's inflexibility in such matters, which allowed for no compromise and his strong self-consciousness which, while justifiable, sometimes became irritating.

Moreover--the Unitarians excepted--there was at that time no American denomination which would have tolerated Otto's type of scripture interpretation in its educational institutions! Today, of course, a symbolical interpretation of many parts of the Old Testament is accepted as understood and regarded as a small matter as over against those critics who would deny completely the revelatory nature of Scripture. But we must take into consideration how the times have changed.

Following Otto's resignation the waves of controversy in the Synod abated. While regretting to see him leave, many members of the Synod readily recognized his human qualities and professional abilities. A single article appearing in the Theologische Zeitschrift continued the discussion on "The Temptation Story". Sub-titled "A Witness from the Synod for the Synod" it was submitted, strange as it may seem, by a namesake of the ousted professor, namely by M. Otto, of Princeton, Illinois. In printing it the editor stated that further articles of this nature would be declined (Theologische Zeitschrift, February-April, 1881).

Considering the entire incident one gets the impression that Otto believed that so long as he held fast to the revelatory nature of scripture he could feel free in teaching, even in the seminary, to proceed with all the freedom of a German university professor. This idea, as the outcome makes clear, was not at the

time an acceptable one.

Once before already, the Synod had in an unusual manner made clear its rejection of all liberalism in theology. That was in 1865 when those attending the District Conference voted unanimously to support the German pastors in Baden who had demanded the resignation of Professor Schenkel as a teacher in the theological seminary in Heidelberg. (See Muecke, p. 159) Schenkel had caused a great uproar in the Evangelical Church with his book, The Person of Jesus, in which he seemed to be attacking the divinity of Christ. (See R. E., Vol XVII, under Schenkel) The resolution of support was transmitted to the Baden pastors in strong language by the (then) Synod President Steinert. It was an unusual step which in the future was never repeated. That it happened is to be explained by the fact that many of our pastors at that time were from South Germany, many even from Baden, and so were greatly concerned about the unrest in the church of their homeland. In any event it was a sign of the theological sensitivity of the Synod. In this connection we need to mention also a resolution adopted by the General Conference in 1870 which reads as follows: "With regard to the Protestant Society and its adherents in the old and the new fatherland we declare and confess that we reject its basic principles as absolutely nefarious and forever unacceptable since they seem to unite truth and falsehood, light and darkness, Christ and Beelzebub." General Conference Minutes, 1870, pp. 10-11)

So far as the theological expertise and contribution of our pastors during this early period is concerned, let it be said that they should not be compared with others who graduated from German universities. Before the Synod acquired the Proseminar (Pro-Seminary) at Elmhurst the students at Marthasville, for the most part, had to be given their preparatory work as well as theological studies. A letter from Baltzer to Wichern written about 1866 (See Baltzer, "Life Story", p. 106) has this to say: "The course of study for seminary students entering poorly prepared lasts five years. In the first two years they really receive no theological courses. Bible study, explanation of the catechism, German language, geography, history, and in the second year Latin are for the most part the subjects studied. In the third year, Greek and church history are added. In the last two years the course of study includes exegesis (based on the original text), dogmatics, homiletics, including preaching, in short, almost exclusively theological instruction. Thus far we have not had courses in Hebrew. In the 70's, when the Proseminary had taken over the matter of classical education, the situation in the seminary improved. But, understandably there still was a great difference between our seminary and a German university. It could hardly be expected that the invigorating spirit of the free, untravelled pursuit of knowledge should prevail in the seminary where every effort had to be made to prepare capable men for the practical work of the parish ministry. A vital faith coupled with a selfless desire to serve were considered most important. And as things stood maybe these were really of greatest importance. The church members, simple,

uneducated folk that they were, would not have had understanding or appreciation for academic learning. How well their pastor knew his church history, or the history of Christian dogma was for them a matter of indifference so long as he preached "loud and clear", was congenial, and knew how to help in practical situations like, say, old Pastor Rieger, who for all his piety still knew how to help his farmers not only with advice but also by practical example.

Comparing the education of our pastors with that of other pastors educated in American seminaries of the time, the Synod found no reason to be ashamed. Our pastors compared favorably with the best of the lot.

Theological productions or scientific research should not be expected from the pioneer pastors of those early times. Their first opportunity for public theological activity came with the founding the Theologische Zeitschrift ("Theological Periodical"), the first number of which appeared in January, 1873. It came out monthly and the first editor was the oft-mentioned Pastor J. Bank. All subjects relating to the theological disciplines were to be dealt with; also practical local church and synodical questions. For many years the publication proved to be a real headache. The pastors sent in few subscriptions and even fewer articles for publication. The need for public theological expression first needed to be awakened. Generally speaking, few felt the need for continuing education following graduation from the seminary or, if they felt the need, found little oportunity for it amid the pressures of parish duties. So, there were frequent changes in editorship, seeing those who undertook the job received little appreciation.

Everything in its time! First of all provision must be made for the physical needs, then for the spiritual. America was pre-occupied with the physical conquest of a continent. This enterprise completely preempted time and abilities leaving little time or energy for scientific or literary pursuits. (See address by Bishop Potter) In this important work of conquering nature our people made their chief contribution in the field of agriculture. While its importance cannot be overestimated, while they were engaged in it people had little extra time, inclination, or money for spiritual things. So it is not surprising that our pastors sought to minister to the obvious immediate spiritual needs of the people, but left the more theoretical academic pursuits to others.

CHAPTER XI

The Constitution (Organization) of the Synod*

Bibliography: Muecke, History . . . ; Schory, History; A. Baltzer, Life Story; Synodical "Handbook".

Although what we have already written may seem to be more directly related to the religious life of the Synod than does the organization which we shall undertake to describe in this chapter, it requires only a little contemplation to make one realize that the outward organization can, indeed, have a very great influence on the development of the ecclesiastical and religious life of a denomination and its members. Elsewhere already we have expressed the conviction that the Lutheran minimization of organization was a mistake which all too often led to subordination of the church to civil authorities. As a result also Lutherans generally have not participated as freely and creatively as they might have in the secular realm and Lutheran lay people have not been encouraged to participate actively in the life and work of the church. In civil life, too, the nature of social organization can be an important factor. Certainly no one would say that as regards social development, it is a matter of indifference whether the government is autocratic or democratic.

The founders of the "Kirchenverein" had no autocratic ambitions. The very nature of the outward situation forced them to proceed as democratically as possible. In the annual conferences it was considered important from the beginning that lay representation equal that of the clergy and that laymen should have the same rights as pastors. Still it took years before congregations actually joined the "Kirchenverein" and began to send delegates. In the beginning, and for some time, the "Kirchenverein" was really a society of pastors and for quite a while, even after lay delegates began to attend, the clergy vote tended to be determinative. Of course, the clergy could not use their influence to gain economic advantages for themselves, nor did they wish to. They used their predominance only to keep the church life and teaching true to the biblical faith. Even today they continue, both numerically and influentially, to be the determinative element in official church meetings. Yet they have never taken advantage of the situation to dominate the life of the congregations. To do so would be foreign to the very spirit of Protestantism and, especially in America, would be unwise and dangerous.

The form of government in our denomination is, generally speaking, patterned after our civil government. Just as the sev-

- - - - -

* Since the Constitution of the Synod in the second part of its history remained essentially the same, being amended only at certain points, we do not limit ourselves in this chapter exclusively to the first period of the Synod's development.

eral states have legislatures to govern their respective states and just as the Congress in Washington makes the laws for the nation, so also the Synod has its District and General Conferences. This is not to say that a deliberate effort was made to make our church government conform to the civil government. It just naturally worked out that way. So long as our church body remained small the representatives met in conference annually. When the denomination grew larger, districts were formed and as growth continued their number increased, and gradually they tended to conform with the boundaries of the states. At present the Synod has nineteen districts covering the nation from Canada to the Gulf of Mexico and from New York to California. The districts meet in conference annually and every pastor, every delegate, and every parochial school teacher has a vote. The leader of a district is the District President. He is elected annually and may not serve more than four successive years. His office is essentially like that of a Superintendent in the church in Germany except that, as mentioned, his tenure is limited. The district has the responsibility for ordering matters within its own borders such as: the reception of pastors and congregations into the Synod, the appointment of pastors to fill pastoral vacancies, the dismissal or expulsion of pastors from the Synod, the supervision of teaching and life of members of the district (See "Handbook", 1901, p. 26). As a basis for business at the district conferences annual reports are made by officers and boards of the Synod.

Every four years (formerly every two, then every three years) a General Conference is held. It consists of delegates from the district conferences which send one pastor for every 12 (formerly 6, then 9) pastors and one lay delegate for every 12 congregations. Instead of "General Conference" this national meeting was frequently called the "General Synod". The term "General Conference" is undoubtedly an accommodation to the prevailing custom among the English-speaking denominations. The General Conference is the highest governing body. It has responsibility for those matters which have to do with the entire denomination: denominational by-laws, representation to other bodies, the creation and supervision of denominational boards, the creation of districts, regulation of the judiciary, acquisition of property, etc. (See Handbook, p. 5)

The top official of the Synod is the Synod President. While the Synod was small it lacked the funds to make this a paid position. Not until 1866 did the presidency become a paid position. In that year Adolph Baltzer, who for years had held a unique position of leadership in the denomination, was elected as General President. He was elected for an indefinite term and he held the office for 14 years until his death in 1880. The position is one of great influence. He represents the entire Synod both to its own constituency and to the outside world. He attends all district conferences in person or, if unable to do so, sends a representative (Vice-President, Secretary, or Treasurer). He has the right to veto any resolutions of the district conferences which he does not like. A candidate for

ordination can be ordained only with his approval. If the Synod President happens to be a man of strong personality and convictions his influence can be practically irresistible. This was true especially with Baltzer. He was not subject to re-election, had exceptional executive ability, was a convincing speaker, and was impressive in personal appearance. Consequently, he was often accused of being an absolute monarch, or to put it more ecclesiastically, was said to have "episcopal tendencies", in other words to be inclined to act like a bishop. (See his Life Story, pp. 157-159) Such tendencies, however, were not really his. Following his death Professor Otto wrote of him in the Theologische Zeitschrift for March, 1880: "For the past fourteen years he served as President of the entire Synod. A certain publication wrote that his position was like that of a bishop. Had he read it he would have laughed. He was a servant of the Synod and saw himself as such. That at the denominational meetings, which he seldom failed to attend, he was accorded greater deference from year to year is, of course, true, but this was due less to the prestige inherent in the position than to his personal dignity. His unusual skill in presiding, his ability to keep his cool in the midst of the hottest debate, his sound judgment, his clear presentation, his readiness to put into the balance the earnestness of his personal convictions--to elaborate on all these in tribute to him goes beyond the limits of my present assignment."

After Baltzer's death the "Verein" reverted to the practice of electing a Synod President at every General Synod though always the incumbent was re-elected time after time. Thus John Zimmermann served from 1882 until 1901, when he died, and Jacob Pister from 1904 until 1914.

The Synod's chief boards are: the Seminary Board, the Publishing House Board, the Boards for Homeland and Foreign Missions, the Board for Christian Education, the Board for Invalids, Widows, and Orphans, the Church Building Fund Board, and the Board for Budget and Finance. Other boards, established more recently, will be named in Part Two. The names of the boards indicate their respective fields of activity. We need not go into detail. All boards give an accounting of their stewardship by means of reports submitted to District Conferences and the General Conference.

In addition, we should mention the district judiciaries and the Synod Judiciary. The District Judiciary, elected by the district, adjudicates those controversies arising within its district, which the district officers have not been able to settle. The supreme Judiciary, elected by the General Synod, is the court of last resort with regard to decisions made in the district courts. It deals also with complaints brought against Synod officers or boards and with any resolutions passed by the General Synod which may be unconstitutional. These two kinds of courts obviously parallel the corresponding state and federal courts. While it appears that the Synodical Judiciary has to deal with gravely important matters, actually it functions very

seldom, so that its importance is more theoretical than practical. If it possessed the awesome power of the federal court in Washington (U. S. Supreme Court) which often declares unconstitutional and invalid many important pieces of legislation passed by the Congress this would create an intolerable situation for the General Synod.

As the foregoing has served to indicate, there is definitely a kinship between the way our denomination is organized and the way our civil government is organized. The latter has its three branches: the legislative, the executive, and the judicial, which have their respective functions and are supposed to hold each other in check so that individual liberties are not threatened because one branch of government has become too powerful. In our civil life the judicial branch has, unfortunately, in the course of time arrogated to itself rights which while protecting the individual activities of the powerful tend to work to the detriment of the economically underprivileged, thus delaying progress toward equal justice for all. In our church life the situation has been entirely different. Here, of course, there was no interest in maintaining an existing order favorable to a particular class. Our church courts had to do only with maintaining formal justice which was never in great danger. So, as it turned out, our judicial apparatus was seldom activated.

On the whole the organization of our Synod has been very democratic. The danger lies not in too much centralization but rather in too much individualism. Our officers have too little power rather than too much. One often hears the complaint that "everyone does what seems right in his own eyes". One can imagine that when at a District Conference the District President, or at a General Conference the Synod President, in keeping order declares, "So-and-so has the floor", the danger of absolutism is not great. The individual pastors are nominally under the supervision of the District President but this supervision is extremely mild, coming into play only in extreme cases of transgressions of law and order or of moral delinquency. In seeking a new pastorate, the pastors are supposed to turn to the District President. To do so is to go through "the proper channels". Frequently, however, this is not done. The "Evangelical freedom" we like to talk about is very broad. The obverse side of this is that the District and Synod President often do, and can do, very little to protect the pastor from unjust treatment by a congregation. If a congregation wants to get rid of its pastor it can easily do so. Three months' notice must be given. Beyond that the pastor has no assurance that he will be allowed to stay other than his own tact and good nature and the common decency of his congregation.

If we now ask what is the effect of this kind of organization on the religious life of the people, it must be admitted right off that it has its disadvantages. There is strict discipline neither in the local church nor in the denomination. The pastors know that in the final analysis they are on their

own. So, generally speaking, they do not seek the help of their superiors but "make their own bed". They rely on their own God-given gifts to bring the outward life, often also the inner life, of their congregation to flower. This requires constant activity and militates against running hither and yon. Often they may have to do many things which go against the grain particularly in appeasing the demands for social activity on the part of the youth. This is not to say that they allow themselves to become errand boys for the congregation. On the contrary, of most it can be said that they maintain their personal dignity and tend to develop self-reliance and personal independence. The whole scheme of organization tends to require the maximum development of the individual's personality. Initiative, zeal, activity, love of hard work, and striving for success become indispensable qualities of the pastoral office. More and more the "synodical spirit", as we call it, that is the spirit of acceptance of and cooperation with the norms established by the Synod, begins to assert itself in the life and work of the congregation. Thus also the position and influence of the spiritual leader provided for them by the Synod become established.

The constitution and by-laws give the congregation so much freedom that it is often abused. Local churches often fail to meet the support goals set for them by the various boards of the Synod. Nevertheless, many who have grown up in the various state churches of Germany would be surprised to learn how much even small congregations contribute for current expenses and other causes. What, for instance, would they say if the current writer were to report that a small congregation of only 75 families, all of modest means, had voted recently to build a new church at a cost of $50,000 (or between $600 and $700 per family)?

The spiritual life of a congregation is not, of course, directly dependent upon the church constitution. Still the constitution can either hobble or spur its development. Our system may be lacking in strict discipline but it has served well the cause of personal Christianity and genuine neighborly love.

A word needs to be said about the big contrast visitors from Germany find between our church conferences and those held in Germany. One visitor (as reported in the "Friedensbote" under date of May 17, 1922, pp. 346-347) writes: "If you were to attend a Synod meeting in Berlin you would find yourself in a long hall with seating on both sides of a central aisle. On the left you would see all the liberals, on the right all the positivists. Anyone not belonging to either party would look in vain for a place to sit. In the congregations, as in the Synod meetings, generally speaking, people are concerned about the one difference that pervades German life: the 'old believers vs. the modernists', the confessing Bible believers vs. the friends of culture and criticism, the positivists vs. the liberals. In Synod meetings on the higher levels the picture gets more complicated." Then he goes on to show how in such meetings the delegates segregate themselves into groups called by such names as: "Confessionalists," (or "Confessionalist Friends"),

'Positivistic Union," "Associations," "Evangelical Union," 'Protestant Society," and "Friends of the Christian World."

Instead of all that, they find in our General Synod eetings--to say nothing of District Conferences--no mention of arties at all. The visitor thinks this must be due to the fact hat in our relatively small gatherings the delegates for the ost part know one another personally. The real reason, however, lies elsewhere. Even in Methodist General Conferences, the lar- est Protestant denomination, where the delegates come from all ver the world, and therefore do not know one another, as also in he "General Assemblies" of the Presbyterians where the situation is similar, there are no parties. Their absence is explained by ther things. First of all, the American, unlike the German, does not feel the need to identify his religion with a particular orld view. It is for him rather a matter of feeling and of ractical living. Secondly, his decision, relative to religious rientation, comes about long before his election to be a synod elegate. His decision is made when he first joins a church as a ember. If by education and custom he is conservative (confessionalistic) he becomes a member of a Lutheran church. If his orientation is like that of the "Positivist Union" he joins the Evangelical Synod. If he stands somewhere in the middle the Disciples of Christ stand ready to welcome him and may even excuse him from adult baptism by immersion. The "Association- alist" becomes a Methodist or a member of a holiness sect. The fellow-traveler with those of the Protestant Society might join the Unitarians, and the Friend of the Christian World, of course, could go to the Ethical Culture Society, since they need only ethics and no doctrine.

Since then everyone has sought out the church of his choice at the time of joining, when he attends a General Conference he no longer needs to look for seating either on the "right" or on the "left" but needs only to look for the poster that indicates where delegates from his district or state are sitting. Then he is in the right place and finds himself surrounded by "a united folk of brothers". At these great general conferences in America parliamentary procedure is not considered nearly so im- portant as in the German synods, but our meetings are definitely more brotherly, though, of course, at times differences of opinion or shortness of temper may threaten to disrupt the spirit of unity.

CHAPTER XII

The Home Mission Work of the Synod

Bibliography: Muecke, Geschichte . . ; L. von Rague, "Lebensbilder" from the Home Mission Field (published by the Orphans Society in South Illinois); W. von Polenz, Land of the Future, 1903 (the first chapters); Von Bischof Bashford, The Oregon Missions, 1918.

When people in America and others in Europe talk about "Inner" or "Home" Missions, they normally do not mean the same thing. In Germany the term "Innere Mission" is a term coined by J. H. Wichern and used to describe a particular kind of Christian work which Wichern pioneered. The term is used to designate a form of mission work which circumstances forced upon the church when they made it necessary to confront with a living evangelical witness the rampant paganism within the homeland itself. It has to do with Christian faith mercifully taking upon itself the burdens of the miserable poor and reaching out to them through works of saving love. (See article "Innere Mission" by Rahlenbeck in R. E., Vol. XIII) Stimulated by Wichern, the movement expressed itself in many different ways, including: Homes for Neglected Children, Servants' Homes, Journeymen's Homes, Homes for the Homeless, Worker Colonies, City Missions, and many other institutions through which Christians sought to prevent or alleviate human suffering. In works of this kind America sought only years later to follow the European example. The reason for this was that physical poverty among the lower classes was not nearly so prevalent in America. Also class differences are less noticeable here. Many of the services offered through "Innere Mission" would be utterly impossible here because human dignity on the part of our poor would simply not tolerate them. Also the church in our country had other priorities. Other needs claimed its attention and had first claim on all its surplus energy. For one thing the church was constantly challenged to establish new congregations to keep pace with the fast-growing population. America's western frontier was a moving one which was never the same but kept moving westward, ever westward, until it reached the Pacific Ocean. And when, after 1848, the discovery of gold in California and the opening up of Washington and Oregon with their rich lumber, fruit, and fish resources beckoned thousands westward, there were new states west of the Rockies from Idaho to Arizona, as well as east of the Rockies, from Montana to New Mexico, to be settled and developed.

Polenz, in his Land der Zukunft ("Land of the Future", p. 26) says concerning this westward drive: "With the winning of California the Union, like a tree whose branches had long unconsciously been stretching toward the sun, reached the Pacific Ocean. America's goal, 'our manifest destiny' as many said, to conquer the continent from ocean to ocean, thus establishing the connection between Asia and Europe while at the same time setting the precious keystone for the protection of her own frontiers, had at last been reached." Concerning the importance of the

above-mentioned Rocky Mountain states Polenz writes: "This region affords unlimited agricultural potential. Farm economists had a dream the realization of which would convert the entire 'arid West' (including most of California, New Mexico, Arizona, Nevada, Colorado, and all the way to Utah and Idaho) into one great fruitful paradise. The name of the dream: irrigation. It is a word to conjure with, for the reality it represents is destined to play an important role in our world economy." Again, in a similar context he writes: "The difference between the American and the European economy is that while we conserve the American develops. We are limited to a small area of limited resources. Our greatest heritage is that which we have received from our fathers which we seek to preserve and use to the uttermost. Over there it is just the opposite. From the past little has been received. There is little of the old that is worth preserving. But the richness and extent of the land confront people with responsibilities which challenge entrepreneurship and promise great gain." With regard to the influence of the Middle West, which, of course, opened even before the Far West, on the American character Polenz has these remarks (p. 21) which seem to be to the point: "Here on the horizonless, virtually treeless plains was born the concept which perhaps more than any other impressed itself upon the American's soul influencing like no other both his thought and feelings, namely the concept of endless space. The sea provides a farther horizon than do the hills; the dweller in a narrow valley is likely to have a more limited concept of the world than the son of the steppes or of the marshes. The children of the American West were born with the consciousness that there are literally no limits to the possibilities for expansion and progress. The economic development of a great area which hitherto had been used by the red man only as hunting grounds, its transformation into productive farmland, the springing up, seemingly out of nothing, of large cities seemed like miracles happening before one's very eyes. It was easy for those who experienced these things to lose any sense of the limitation of possibilities."

The foregoing quotations characterize masterfully American expansionism and the genius of the American people for the outward, materialistic conquest of a continent. And the economic opening of the area was followed in due time by the formation of new political units (states) to be joined to the existing federal union of states. The Anglo-Saxon quest for democracy and the American faith in the future of the Union celebrated simultaneous triumphs.

But wherever the American founded a city, he built not only a court house (government building), a bank, and a school, but also a church. The religion of the American may be more external than that of the well-churched German; it is practical and certainly not melancholy. But it too plays an important role in public life. The American takes it with him wherever he goes and even if financial gain, mines, or oil wells may seem to be the only purpose for founding new cities, it invariably follows that before long religious needs begin to assert themselves and people

become concerned to provide for Sunday school and worship services.

What the churches did to provide for the spiritual needs of the new territories is no less miraculous than the wonderful achievements in the economic realm. Especially the Methodists have shown a spirit of adventure, a persistence, a spirit of self-sacrifice, a heroism, and a statesmanlike vision of the future that the pioneers in the realm of economic progress have not been able to exceed. With them the religious enthusiasm and organizational talent of a Wesley teamed up with the American flair for doing things on a grand scale. The simple organizational style of the Methodists was well adapted to the circumstances. Their strong appeal to the religious feelings found favor not only with simple farmers but also with the rough and ready inhabitants of mining villages. Nor were they lacking in leaders who knew how to exert an influence in the political arena and were able to make the church an indispensable factor in community life. One need only to read a book such as that published by the Methodist Bishop Bashford in 1918 and entitled, "The Oregon Missions", to see what an important role the church played in the worldly expansion and political development of the western states. In this well-documented treatise Bishop Bashford shows that the Methodist "missionaries" (itinerant preachers) together with the government of the United States and the government of Canada established the boundary lines between the two countries. The Methodists circulated the first three petitions urging the United States government to extend its authority to include the so-called Oregon Territory. Also the services of the Presbyterians, especially of their Dr. Whitman, who braved the snowdrifts of winter, to journey to Washington, D. C. to confer with government authorities concerning the incorporation of the northwest territory and the protection of the missions deserve to be acknowledged.

This is only one illustration among many to show how the church from the outset was on the job along with the settler in search of independence and well-being and the adventurer, and how the church worked creatively hand-in-hand with the government in establishing the institutions and social structures essential to the common good. We cannot go further into detail concerning the role of the church in the development of the West. The work of founding new congregations in new communities the American church called "home missions". In our Synod this work was first referred to as itinerancy and later as "Inner(e) Mission". It could just as well have been called Homeland Mission ("Heimat Mission). Instead people latched on to the term coined in Germany giving it an enlarged and somewhat different connotation. Our fathers must have been aware that they were modifying the meaning of the original terminology but the specific reasons for doing so are nowhere elucidated. They founded themselves confronted by an emergency which was essentially of a spiritual nature. Their fellow church members were not living in great industrial centers--which at that time hardly existed--but were widely scattered in newly-settled rural districts, in primeval

forests or on the treeless prairies. They were eking out an existence but their spiritual needs were not provided for, and their children were receiving no Christian education. Already at the First General Conference of the "Kirchenverein" held in Louisville, Kentucky, in 1859--(Until 1857 meetings of the "Verein" were held annually. After that there were districts which held annual meetings while the General Conference was scheduled to meet only every two years.)--there were more requests from congregations wanting pastors than there were pastors to fill the vacancies. (Muecke, p. 156) It was, therefore, decided not to delay any longer the appointment of itinerant preachers nor the establishment of a "Fund for Homeland Mission" to support this work. The "Kirchenverein" really had no choice in the matter. The great need really forced it to undertake this work and in this particular form. Nor did the "Verein" undertake grandiose plans like those of some other American denominations, which had more adequate means and had to deal with larger numbers of people. Plans were undertaken step by step, more in response to specific needs than to personal predilections. Not much could be accomplished immediately and the Civil War, which erupted in 1861, brought the whole enterprise to a halt. Meanwhile (according to Schory, p. 133) the "Kirchenverein" grew between 1859 and 1863 from 83 (synodical and served) congregations to 138, but the real work of "home missions" as defined above really did not take shape until after the war.

The work of a home missionary really demands special talents. Not so much the gift of eloquent speech. Our most successful home mission workers were only moderately well qualified in this particular field. With the Methodists, so favorably mentioned above, the situation was otherwise. The Methodists--zealously copied by many other American denominations--worked largely through revivalistic preaching. Upon arriving in a new field the preacher immediately faces the need of finding a body of hearers. When, by whatever method, he has drummed up an audience he gets up before them as an evangelist. He must lead them to faith and to conversions; for this he needs the gift of facile utterance. Without eloquent preaching there will be no "revival". Those whom he has been able to inspire he then gathers to form an organized congregation and Sunday school. First, as "probationers", they are given six months or more of systematic instruction. After that they are received into full membership.

Our denomination, unacquainted with "revival", proceeds differently. Basically, it uses the momentum received from the German mother church. Instead of revivalistic preaching aimed at conversions, our church relies on the method of thorough instruction of the youth leading up to and climaxing in confirmation. With regard to the adults who are gathered to form congregations, it is assumed that they already have experienced an introduction to the Christian life. At the time of reception into membership they are asked to make or renew their profession of faith and to promise to lead a Christian life. Then they are

admitted to membership in the hope that they will live up to their profession and that through their association with others in the life and work of the congregation they will grow in their spiritual life. In preaching they will often hear an emphasis on the importance of a genuine conversion of the heart. Our "missionaries" responding to the call to service thus were led by the thought that those whom they were to bring into the fold would be people who had already tasted the Christian life and had a need for the church but who, because of spiritual neglect, had perforce drifted into indifference and irreligion. The need was to look them up and through the offer of spiritual care to reawaken and strengthen in them the dormant spiritual interest. What was needed was personal work requiring faithfulness, untiring effort, persistence, a knowledge of human nature, and tact. Whoever had the ability to talk with these people on a down-to-earth, human level was likely to get along best with them. Also essential for success in this work were practical common sense, initiative, good humor, and an indestructible optimism together with some ability for giving attention to organizational detail. Schools and Sunday schools had to be set up and the pastor had to be willing, if need be, to serve as a teacher. His sermons needed to be uplifting and popular but were seldom an outstanding oratorical artpiece or a heaven-storming appeal. Such the people would not have expected nor have been able to appreciate.

Among the workers in Home Missions who were outstanding in contributing to the growth of our church, Pastor Louis von Ragué must be seen as standing in the front ranks. He was born in Oelde, Westphalia, in 1828, as the son of the former Horse-captain Karl von Ragué and was early left an orphan. He was taught by Pastor A. Braem in Newkirchen (near Moers) and by Director Engelbert in Duisburg. Later he was adopted by an aunt in Muenster from whom he learned the confectionery business. His religious interests were awakened early and from his early years he preferred to move in Christian circles. Wherever his work took him, whether to Bremen (Pastor Mallet) or to Saarbruecken or to Nonnenweier (Frau Jolbeck, the Deaconess mother) he sought the company of "the quiet ones". Although he himself was a man of actions and not of feelings, wherever he went he found his friends among those of a sound pietism. From 1859 to 1864 he was a student in the Barmen Mission House. Following his graduation the Langenbergerverein sent him to America where the then president of the "Kirchenverein", Dr. Steinert, commissioned him as a Home Mission worker in Wisconsin where the "Kirchenverein" desired to gain a foothold among the many immigrants. In his "Lebensbilder" (see bibliography) he describes very vividly his arrival in his first field of labor, called Town Rhine, but which was not a town at all but simply a gathering place for those who lived in widely scattered farm homes. Because he came with so much baggage the old farmer to whom he had been directed to go, first mistook him for a peddler. However, when he brought greetings from Pastor Nollau in St. Louis and explained that he himself was a pastor, the old man led him triumphantly into his log house where he introduced him to his wife with the

announcement: "Mother, the Lord has finally answered our prayers and has sent us a pastor!" After supper the host explained that they had already built a church and a parsonage to which he would be taken in the morning. That was for Rague a pleasant surprise. The next morning while hitching the horses to the sleigh, the old farmer pointed out the church off in the distance. But Rague could see no church but only a little log cabin. The so-called parsonage was a tiny frame house consisting of two rooms one of which was to serve as a kitchen, the other as living, room, study, bedroom, and guestroom. When the old farmer noticed what Rague was thinking he gently placed his hand on his shoulder and said, "God dwells not in temples made with hands. He can give us rich blessings even here when tomorrow we hear from your lips the beautiful Christmas story. May the dear God let this little church become the stable in which the Christ is born in our hearts." It is obvious that this farmer although living "in the woods" had not fallen into paganism but kept alive here in America the faith he had found in his native Ravensburg. And so it was also with many others--even if sometimes in lesser measure--and it only goes to substantiate what we said above concerning the material with which our home missionaries had to work, namely that in founding new congregations it was necessary only to offer help to make people ready and willing to found a congregation and build a church.

It was here in Town Rhine that Rague began his missionary work. He established a school in which, of course, religious education was given primary emphasis. And through the children he won their parents. They did not want their children to be without the advantages of school and of confirmation instruction and, therefore, when the pastor invited them to join the congregation, gratitude, if nothing else, made it impossible for them to decline. The young home missionary had only one purpose, by day or by night: to build up the congregation so that very soon it would stand on its own feet and be self-supporting. The pastor's cash salary was always very small and gifts of farm and garden produce often came only in moderation. Rague tells that a brother pastor, S. K., once received from a well-to-do farmer three heads of cabbage by which to remember the farmer's three children, whom he had confirmed. On another occasion the same pastor was given a jar of molasses as the honorarium for a wedding he had performed.

In the vicinity of Town Rhine Rague in the following years established other congregations, as also, later, in Milwaukee and in St. Paul, Minnesota, and in many other places. The members were for the most part so-called "Low Germans" from Westphalia and Hannover. He often socialized with these people in Low German, and since he knew most of the pastors from whose congregations they had come and had a natural talent for story-telling and a good sense of humor, he soon had them all on his side. He never rested until he had organized a new congregation and had a new church under roof. Then, usually, the Synod would send him to another community, giving him the opportunity to use his exceptional talents by repeating the process. His first en-

deavor, always, was to establish a school (it was still the time for parochial schools), a Sunday school, and a "Frauenverein" (Women's Society). Once he had accomplished this the rest was easy. So it was that he spent the first ten years of his labors in America in the self-sacrificing but all-important work of home missions before moving on into the work of pastoring already-existing congregations. It would be tempting and highly interesting to go on recounting stories from the memoirs of this unusual, hard-working, highly successful man. His remarkable memory, which with amazing faithfulness, stored up all his life experiences, qualified him to reproduce them vividly and with accuracy, but we must forbear to recount them here. His little book ("Lebenserrinnerungen") belongs to the most charming things which ecclesiastical autobiogrphy in miniature has produced.

As a man of advanced years Rague founded two more congregations. The material with which he worked in doing so was very different from that which he found in the primeval forest. But there also his labors were not unrewarded and the two congregations continue to grow and flourish. Rague died on April 30, 1910. As a home missionary he had not his equal. During his life-time he established twenty-six congregations! As the hunter pursues his quarry and will not be thrown off his track by its wiles nor by the impenetrableness of the forest, so Rague pursued the goals of his spiritual ministry. He seemed to have an uncanny sense for tracking which served him well both in the urban and rural environment. Once found he pursued his quarry until it was safely in his net. What he continued to do in following up new members even while suffering from the infirmities of age is truly amazing.

The General Synod of 1870 committed the work of starting new congregations to a special Board to be known as the Board for Home Missions. During the 1870's and 80's interest in this particular phase of our work continued to grow. In 1881 we got a toe-hold on work in Texas and as early as 1888 the Texas District was organized with 14 pastors and 21 churches. In 1883 our first congregation in North Dakota was organized. In 1884 Salem Church in Denver, Colorado, was organized. In 1885 the westward drive of our denomination reached California where our first congregation was St. John's Church in San Francisco. The following year the first congregation in Los Angeles, in southern California, was formed. The so-called Pacific District was formed in 1894. It should be mentioned, in passing, that a district with fewer than twelve congregations was called a Mission District. The president of such a district was appointed by the President of the Synod, in conference with the Board for Home Missions (See Handbook, par. 37). In 1904 a congregation was founded in Portland, Oregon. In 1909 the Washington Mission District was formed. In 1910 we undertook work in Canada; in 1910 in Montana. Work of a special nature was undertaken by the Home Missions Board in cooperation with the Board of Directors of our Educational Institutions in 1914 when a so-called "Evangelical Academy" was opened in Fort Collins, Colorado, where German-Russians could receive a general education and special

training for the Christian ministry. The Director of the Academy was Pastor J. Jans.

Generally speaking, one could say of the mission work in the Far West that it was accompanied by special difficulties. One reason for this was that the population in the Rocky Mountains area was widely scattered. The people whom we sought to serve were, first of all, those of German origin who were too few in number to allow for the forming of large congregations. Consequently, the mission worker usually had several cluster-congregations often separated from one another by a hundred miles or more. This meant, of course, that he could visit them only every few weeks. This, of course, was not conducive to rapid growth. In the Pacific states, particularly in California, with its sunny skies and continual influx of new people, bent partly on pleasure-seeking and partly on material gain, there prevails a spirit of superficial materialism which often takes precedence over spiritual concerns. Consequently, our churches there grow slowly.

While thus far we have spoken about full-time mission workers, still much in this area was accomplished by pastors of established congregations who felt impelled to lend a helping hand with the starting of new congregations. Often a pastor will serve a congregation over a period of years and become very popular among the Evangelical Germans throughout the area. His city grows and members of the congregation move out to the new suburbs making it more difficult for them to continue attending the downtown church. Thus arises the need for forming a new congregation in which process the beloved pastor can be very helpful. Such cases have arisen in practically every large city. We mention, for example, Pastor K.W.F. Haass who served St. John's Church in Detroit for nearly forty years so that his church became, as it were, the "Evangelical Center" for all of Detroit (see Muecke, p. 190). The same holds for Pastor Joseph Hartmann at St. Paul's Church in Chicago (1851-1886). Pastor J. U. Schneider, who has been the pastor of Zion Church, in Evansville, Indiana, for many years, has contributed greatly toward making Evansville a strong Evangelical center. The same could be said of several pastors in St. Louis. Pastor G. A. Schmidt, for many years the pastor of Salem Church in Denver, Colorado, deserves much credit for the establishment of new congregations in that city and throughout the Colorado District. This list could be lengthened greatly but since it would be impossible to name everyone we will be forgiven for naming only a few.

For a time great hope was held out for the work of Home Missions in the Far West. An effort was made to spot "strategic points" and to occupy them. These might eventually unlock for us a field of labor of undreamed proportions and of unlimited opportunities for development. These hopes have not been fulfilled. In recent years we have been less sanguine. The best we dare hope for is that there may be a sound development of what exists without plans for "great new work" but with a readiness to make the most of existing opportunities.

The great wave of enthusiasm for the West, meanwhile, has ebbed and one now frequently hears the warning: We must care for and develop what we already have and especially in the big cities must work for the establishment of new congregations. (See Minutes of the General Conference of 1917, p. 17-18.)

In this chapter, as also in the one dealing with our organization, we have not limited ourselves to the first part of our denominational history but have purposely taken a look at the total development of our work. After all, the work of Home Mission during the second period was essentially the same as during the first. A new development during the past decade has been an increasing dependence upon the Home Missions Council, a division of the Federal Council of Churches, the organization which represents the total work of the Protestant churches of our land. Our Board for Home Missions has joined the Home Missions Council (See Minutes of the General Conference of 1921, p. 72-73). The purpose is that in occupying new fields there should be comity arrangements with other denominations, so that new work is begun only where it is really needed and where there is the prospect for success. Through cooperation it is hoped that unnecessary competition often resulting in too many churches in one place and too few in another, may be avoided.

City missions in the sense of Wichern's settlement houses, have not been undertaken to any great extent. However, promising beginnings have been made in St. Louis and in Chicago. On the other hand we have made significant contributions in the field of caring for the sick; we have 13 Deaconess homes and two institutions dedicated to caring for epileptics. In this field our denomination, considering its limited membership, ranks first among the Protestant denominations of our country.

CHAPTER XIII

The Foreign Missions of the Evangelical Synod

Bibliography: Muecke, Geschichte . . . , p. 219-247; Fuenfzig Jahre Evangelischer Arbeit in Chattisgarh' (Fifty Years of Evanglical Work in Chattisgarh), Publication for Golden Jubilee of Evangelical Mission, 1918. Women's Work of our Evangelical Church in Chattisgarh, India by H. H. Lohans, 1920; Frauenarbeit an Frauenseelen in Chattisgarh, India (Women Working for the Souls of Women in Chattisgarh, India), No. 4 in Historical Series published by Foreign Missions Board.

Muecke begins his portrayal of our mission work in India with the words: "No other German synod in America, with the exception of the Church of the Brethren, has from the date of its birth worked with as much love and zeal at foreign missions as has our German Evangelical Synod." That seems like a strong claim to make, but if we remember the role representatives of the Basel and Barmen Mission Societies played in the founding of our Synod it is, after all, not so surprising. We saw (chapter 1) how hard it was for the mission societies to deflect workers from the foreign field and to send them, instead, to America to work among the Germans. We saw also that Rieger, even after his arrival in America, still wanted to work among the American Indians and that Nollau actually gave up his pastorate in order to work for a time among the pagans in South Africa under the auspices of the Barmen Mission Society. So it is not hard to image that, beyond the ministry to their own parishes, nothing seemed more important to our Evangelical pastors than the foreign missions enterprise. This is clearly evident in the annual reports written by our pastors during the early decades. The annual Mission Festivals were the highlights of life in the congregations (chapter 6). Beginning in April, 1852, every issue of the "Friedensbote" carried news from the mission field in a special column headed "Mission Messenger". (Muecke, p. 220) Yes, the pastors were so successful in promoting foreign missions that Synod officers sometimes complained that they were channeling resources away from urgent homeland needs. At the General Conference in Louisville, Kentucky, in 1870, President Baltzer reported that in a single year approximately $5,000 had been given for the mission houses in Basel and Barmen and wonders in that connection whether we had our priorities straight considering only a few thousand dollars more had been contributed for the support of our own educational institutions. For homeland missions only $690 had been received that same year! (Muecke, p. 221) Nor did the situation change very rapidly, for in the report of President Siebenpfeiffer given at the General Conference in St. Louis in 1880, we read that for every $1,000 given for homeland causes the churches had given $2,000 for overseas work. Siebenpfeiffer asks: "Would not something nearer a 50-50 division be fairer?"

It was only natural that gifts for foreign missions in the early years should flow into the coffers of the Basel and Barmen

Mission Societies. But as the Synod grew stronger and the spirit of independence grew stronger, the idea that we should have our own overseas mission field began to be heard more and more. The way this dream finally became a reality has always seemed to our church as definitely the working of God. On March 19, 1865, representatives of various German denominations, meeting in New Brunswick, N. J., founded a Mission Society for Work Among the Hindus in East India. Impetus for the founding of this Society had come mainly from Dr. Seibert, editor of the "Deutsche Volksfreund" (German People's Friend) and from Pastor Oscar Lohr. Lohr had previously been in India as a representative of the Goessner Mission Society but had been forced to leave India because of the Sepoy Rebellion in 1857. Since then he had been working as pastor of a church in New Brunswick, N. J. He had urged Dr. Seibert and others to arrange for this meeting in New Brunswick. The cause prospered and by 1867 the Society felt it was strong enough to commission Pastor O. Lohr to go to India. He found a promising field near Bisrampur (Chattisgarh Division* in the Central Province of India) where he would work among the Satnamis, a despised class of the Chamar caste. Here Lohr bought a piece of real estate and opened the first mission station. The year was 1868.

The increasing costs of operating the mission station soon exceeded the financial capability of the little mission society. So the Society turned for support to other German churches and found a ready interest particularly in the Evangelical Synod. Churches of the Synod had up until this time given priority to the support of the Basel and Barmen Mission Societies, but many were ready to support still another. Indeed, more and more were saying that we should be supporting a mission work of our own. Naturally the pastors who had come from Basel and Barmen were often fearful that this could only lead to their dear Basel and Barmen societies being relegated to second place. Consequently, they were sometimes inclined to protest the proposal. Years passed without a definite decision being made. Then it was that Pastor C. Bechthold, of Mascoutah, Illinois, who himself had formerly been a missionary, read a paper at his district conference entitled: "What Right and What Obligation Does our Synod Have to Conduct an Independent Foreign Missions Enterprise?" He shows how among the early Christians even individual congregations carried on mission activities and how the church as a whole was a missionary enterprise until entanglements with the state constricted this effort. He goes on to show how the renewal of faith had led to the renewal of missionary endeavors carried out through voluntary associations. He concluded by showing how particularly the free church has the ability and the duty to invest its resources in the foreign missionary enterprise. His paper was widely distributed and got the stone a-rolling. True, the next General Synod, in 1880, turned down a proposal to take certain definite steps, but at the General Conference of 1883 (in St. Louis), two missionaries, com-

- - - - -

* The chief city of the Division is Raipur.

missioned by the above-mentioned mission society, appeared urging that the Synod take over the missionary work in India. The proposal was accepted almost unanimously, and in the following year, on May 20, 1884, in New York, the transfer of the India work to the Evangelical Synod was completed.

O. Lohr, born in Schleswig in 1824, who during long years in Russia had learned the apothecary's trade, having experienced a spiritual awakening in Tauroggen, Lithuania, was commissioned by the Gossner Mission Society in Berlin to go out as a foreign missionary. We have already told about his first term of service in India and how he was sent out from America for a second term. The Satnamis in Chattisgarh, in whom he had placed his greatest hope, soon turned against him and his preaching. So Lohr had turned to the deeply despised (leather-workers) Chamars. They are remnants of the aborigines and are greatly oppressed by the Hindus. Consequently, they are spiritually, morally, and socially on a very low level of the social scale. With them Lohr found a good reception, particularly because of his knowledge of medicines which enabled him to serve them in their many illnesses. In 1879 Pastor Andreas Stoll, of Philadelphia, was sent to India to assist him. Stoll opened a second mission station in Raipur.

Such was the situation in Chattisgarh when the Evangelical Synod took over the work. Bisrampur, where the mission had large real estate holdings, amounting to 1600 acres, had from the beginning been a Christian colony. Converts to Christianity often rented a plot of land from the Mission and settled in Bisrampur. This had both advantages and disadvantages. It gave the new converts a hold on the land and made them economically independent of the pagan village owners. However, it removed them from their communities and mitigated against the possibility of their becoming a leavening influence. (See "Fifty Years", p. 17) Consequently our mission soon abandoned this procedure and began establishing mission stations in pagan communities.

In 1886 work was begun in Chandkuri. Missionary Jost had entered the work in 1885. (I shall mention only those associated with the mission work over a long period of years.) A. Hagenstein followed in 1890, K. A. Nottrott in 1892, Jacob Gass in 1893. The founding of Parsabhader (fourth station) took place in 1893.

Our mission work was greatly influenced by the great famines of 1897, 1899, and 1900. The missionaries naturally did what they could to help relieve the physical needs of the stricken population. As a result the number of those asking for baptism grew by the thousands. When it was no longer possible for the missionaries themselves to do all the work, a seminary for catechists was established in Raipur. An orphanage was established; also a leper asylum (in Chandkuri). The leper asylum, established by Nottrott, and later greatly expanded, had 448 patients in 1914. With the exception of the asylum of the Gossner Mission Society in Purulia, it is the largest institution

of its kind in India. Missionary Anderson carried on a very fruitful work there from 1905 until 1912.

In 1900 our missionaries baptized no few than 1912 persons. Naturally there was some chaff with the wheat of the newly-converted. Despite extreme care on the part of the missionaries, not all who were baptized proved faithful and during the following year 420 persons had to be dropped from the membership. Work among the women ("Zenanawork") was started by Mrs. Gass. Miss Uffmann, the daughter of the Gossner Missionary in Purulia, was the first to devote full-time to this important branch of missionary work (1902 to 1906). She was followed by a number of others whose names we cannot mention here. Mrs. Enslin Sueger has been our worker among the women since 1911. In 1907 Mahasamudra was opened as a new (fifth) mission field; Sakti (the sixth) in 1909.

At home the following persons gave significant service as leaders of the Foreign Missions Board: John Huber, former missionary to India, from 1884 to 1895, and Ed Huber (1895 to 1901), also W. Behrend (1901 to 1909); the latter also served 13 years as editor of the "Deutscher Missionsfreund" (German Missions Friend). P. A. Menzel who since 1909 has been Chairman of the Mission Board has now been chosen to be its executive secretary. In 1914, prior to the outbreak of World War I, twelve men and five women were serving as our missionaries. We had, in addition, at our six mission stations: 70 catechists, 157 teachers at 63 schools with an enrollment of 3514 pupils, 1566 Sunday school scholars, and 3563 members of congregations. The annual expenditures of our mission came to $45,000.

The Edinburgh Missionary Conference, held in 1910, seemed to have drawn the Christians of many lands closer together. The General Conference of 1913 authorized our missionaries to unite with missionaries of other denominations in cooperative work in the fields of Christian education and higher education. Then came the World War and our beautiful ideas regarding world brotherhood suddenly became mere dreams. Missionary Jost was deported. Missionary Nottrott journeyed home for a sabbatical, barely escaping being taken prisoner. During the war no new missionaries could be sent out and the work suffered, particularly also because of the embitterment which overcame many mission supporters. Not until the General Conference of 1921 could the sending of new missionaries be authorized. It was done by means of the following resolution: "The General Conference accepts the principle that the expansion of our overseas mission work must be kept in proper relationship to the growth of our church in the homeland and instructs the Mission Board to provide sufficient workers for our field in India to insure that the planned evangelization of our entire field shall more and more become possible." Dr. Gass, a missionary in India for 28 years, was on this occasion awarded the honorary degree of Doctor of Theology by the faculty of Eden Seminary.

Looking back on the development of our mission work in India

over a period of twenty-five years, Nottrott in his book, "Fifty Years. . " (p. 15) says: "Chattisgarh formerly was one of the backward districts of India and the Chamars were looked upon as criminal outcastes. How does it look now? In every respect there has been a change for the better. The educational system is highly developed. Agriculture is greatly improved. The same must be said for clothing and general living conditions. In all these areas our mission plays an important part. Among the 19 mission societies working in Central India our work, while far behind in the number of foreign workers, ranks high in the number of baptized Christians and in many other ways." In other words, our mission, like the German missions, has with fewer workers and a relatively limited budget ($76,000 in 1920) been able to accomplish more than the English and American missions to whom generally more money and more workers are available.

P A R T T W O

The Transition to English (Beginning in the 1890's)

CHAPTER XIV

Reasons for Anglicanization and Why the Nineties Must Be Seen as the Turning Point in this Development

Bibliography: F. Kapp, The Story of the German Immigration in America, Leipzig, 1868. A. B. Faust, The German Element in the U. S., Boston and New York, 1909 (two volumes). W. von Polenz, Land of the Future, (Second edition), Berlin, 1902. J. L. Nuelsen, The Germans in America.

Our whole presentation is governed by the premise that the religious life in our Synod has been significantly influenced by the interaction of English and German, of America and Germany. Already in the first period of our history, which had to do basically with the original German nature of our church, we noted the influence of the American environment. The simple fact that our church came into being as a free church was grounded in her having been a transplant to American soil. It was this circumstance, too, which led us to establish several institutions for the education of pastors and teachers. In Germany this was taken care of in state institutions. And, of course, the seminaries we have established differ like heaven and earth from German universities. Also our stance toward theological learning, which is, basically, strongly orthodox, grew out of this situation. In Germany the theological professors are teachers appointed by the State. Consequently, the theological faculty is one of the four faculties (of a university). The theological faculty is closely related to the other faculties and shares with them the scientific approach. With us the professors are servants of the church and their main responsibility is not the nurture of scientific knowledge, but the more practical task of turning out spiritually-minded pastors fit for service to the congregations. One can see quite readily what a difference this might make in the nature of instruction here and over there. Furthermore, the program of home missions, as described in Chapter XII, is a definitely American expression of church activity.

But while in so many ways our church had to adjust itself to American conditions its spirit and character were essentially German. Our church knew itself to be a part of the Church of the Evangelical Union transplanted to America. The theology of its outstanding teachers of theology was German theology. The immigrant from Germany, attending the services, immediately felt "at home". And while it saw itself as a daughter of the German mother church, it felt no connection with the other denominations of this country. It felt unrelated even to the other churches of German heritage, despite the fact that they, too, used the German language. From the Anglo-American churches, however, it was

separated by a much deeper cleavage. To them, like Luther to Zwingli, it could have said, "You have a different kind of spirit." This spirit seemed to it as strange as if they had belonged to different hemispheres.

What separated our Synod from them was, of course, the language, but also a different way of thinking and feeling. There is, after all, a difference between the earnest, contemplative, more slow and passive German way and the genial, somewhat superficial, noisy, self-conscious, aggressive, and practical American way.

This isolation from external church influences could only be maintained as long as the difference in language provided a protective dam. Were this dam to be broken there would be an overwhelming flood of English. And wherever, here and there, in consequence of the constant lapping of the waves the water seeped through, one immediately sensed the threat of serious danger, and every effort was made to close the break. For we must remember that our congregations were always surrounded by the waves of the national life and that economically, politically, and to some extent socially, there was, perforce, a constant exchange. In rural areas, where the population was predominantly German it was possible to maintain a relatively pure German culture; in the cities this was obviously more difficult and a certain intermingling of cultures became inevitable. And if it came to intermingling there could be no doubt as to which element would eventually prevail.

Luther says: "Language is the shield which holds the sword of the spirit." The language was the means through which the English life style had its influence on our German church. Let no one think that the language of a church can be changed while leaving the nature of that church untouched. Our own experience, like that of other churches, teaches beyond all doubt that with the English language, English i.e. American, views and methods gained ground. The Catholic, and to a lesser degree, the Lutheran churches, seem to be an exception. The Catholic church has from the beginning endeavored, and to a certain degree has been able, to maintain a supra-national stance. All around the world it is the "una catolica ecclesia" and, regardless of language difference, is immediately recognized as such by every Catholic. Nevertheless, there is a great difference between a Catholic church in America and, for instance, a Catholic church in Italy.

The Lutheran church with its strong emphasis on "the pure doctrine" has been more resistant than others to the coming in of foreign elements. On the other hand, its relatively long history provides us with many examples of how a change in language has helped to soften exclusiveness and uniqueness. In all other churches the reception of English has resulted in thoroughgoing changes. The many secular societies in our country have had the same experience.

One must come to terms with the fact that the American

nation, founded by the English, has from the beginning been permanently endowed with the Anglo-Saxon spirit. Over against this Anglo-Saxon spirit no other has, in the long run, been able to assert itself, least of all the German so lacking in national consciousness. If any nationality had the opportunity it should have been the German. Professor Faust (see bibliography) says: "One may safely say that there are in the United States some 18 or 19 million people of German heritage, in other words, approximately 27-1/2% of the entire population. (According to the census of 1900 the number has since then increased significantly.) The German element is more than twice the size of any other non-English element. On the basis of numbers, no other immigrant group had a better chance to make the influence of its language and distinctive nature felt. Yet it could not do so." The reasons for the failure are to be found in the nature of the immigrants as much as in the circumstances by which they were confronted.

Among the many published works dealing with this problem we know of none to equal W. Polenz' book, The Land of the Future. Entirely apart from his brilliant style, the author exhibits in this book powers of observation and of sound judgment, which in view of his limited acquaintance with the United States, are truly amazing. Polenz, first of all, describes in a most gripping manner the outstanding feature of the American character: patriotism. ("The Yankee, whether sleeping or waking, whether eating or drinking, or whatever he may be doing is first of all, and above all, a patriot! The first cry of the newborn infant is, as it were, a song of triumph in praise of America.") He describes in a beautiful way (p. 60) the return of the American tourists, i. e., their feelings as they approach New York harbor and "more and more come under the spell of their great land." As one reads this section one feels that it is as true as it is uplifting. He next describes the optimism of the American, his unbounded energy, and his sense of humor. Finally, he turns to the German immigrant (p. 375ff.): "The German-Americans are permanently lost to their old homeland, politically completely, and culturally almost completely. The dream that the Germans beyond the great ocean could establish in the new world a New Germany has long since been given up forever by every sane-thinking person. This same idea was strongly expressed in the late 80's by Fr. Kapp. We may lament that it is so but the fact is that German in America is a noble cause doomed to extinction. Knapp says: "What we call the German element in America consists of very little more than the latest wave of immigration which is already dying to itself." The real reason that the Germans, for all their ability, never received in American society the recognition to which they were rightly entitled is that in America they bumped into a people who, politically, were their superiors.". . . "With what could the sons of the German farmer who for the most part had not yet mastered the official "high German" of their own country oppose the language of the New Englanders and their flesh-and-blood Anglo-Saxon devotion to the principles of the Magna Carta, the Bill of Rights, and English Common Law?" . . . "Nor must we overlook the innate German faults

which even in the new world were given up by only a few: disunity, pessimism, heaviness of spirit, stubbornness. And since in the early years the immigrants mostly came from lowly stock they lacked the weapon of self-pride with which to oppose foreign influences. The little man seldom found it in himself to stand up for himself; he was glad enough to be able to find a leaning post or a place to hide."

"Confronting the bigness, the strangeness, and the brutality of circumstances in the new world the plain honest German all too often felt quite helpless. In the homeland, with its many boundaries, divisions, and guilds, he could always feel that he was at least a little Somebody. In America he was a Nobody, a stone among stones. It was as it a tiny tree had been transplanted from a tiny over-crowded garden into the midst of a huge forest. The poor immigrant stands as if paralyzed confronting a big, strange, unfriendly world in which everything is different than it was at home. Upon the Yankee the consciousness of the bigness and wonder of this great continent has just the opposite effect. He feels excited to think that he is a part of all this bigness. His strongest characteristics: optimism, enthusiasm, energy, largely spring from this consciousness. The German feels frightened by the bigness of the continent. He prefers to huddle together for safety with others of his kind and to be accepted by his fellow-countrymen. German-Americanism has only a present, but no future. It is like a huge iceberg which, drifting into southern waters, immediately begins to get smaller and smaller and eventually melts away completely."

All these are for the most part correct, even if uncomfortable, observations. Fr. Kapp, it is true, is overly pessimistic. We must remember that after an extended period in America he returned to Germany but was allowed to play a role in the growth and expansion of the new Germany. All of which only helped to emphasize for him the limitations and powerlessness of the Germans in America. He is not correct in saying that the German element in America consists only of a single generation of living German-Americans. Under favorable circumstances one can count on two or three generations, that is, where they are present in sufficient numbers. There are four factors which guarantee to German language and culture a greater longevity. They are: the German press, German societies, German churches, and German schools. All of these presuppose a continuing German immigration of considerable strength. Of these factors the least important is the German society and the most important the German church. Polenz readily acknowledges this. He says (p. 384): "The greatest contribution to the continuation of Germanism in America has been made by the church." In this he distinguishes himself from many other writers in the field who, because of their own religious indifference, hardly mention the influence of the church.

But even the church is not able, in the long run, to stop the process of Anglicanization. The church must be more concerned about religion than about language. If the church is not to lose

her influence, especially with the youth, it must adjust to changing times. The old churches, mostly Lutheran churches of the East, with more than a century of existence behind them, have all in the course of the years become English. While America was still young and immigration continued as a steady flood, it was possible for the German language at least to hold its own. But as the Union grew and the feeling of national self-consciousness and national unity were sharpened, interest in preserving the national heritage brought to our shores from many lands steadily declined.

In our Synod we have set the beginning of the second period, that is of the epoch in which the English language increasingly asserts itself in the life and work of the church, as having occurred in the 1890's. Earlier, of course, English had been used here and there, and from time to time, in conducting worship services or official acts (such as weddings and funerals). But these were exceptions. Generally speaking, in 1890 our church was still a German church. To this the writer can bear personal testimony. It was at that time that the writer began his first pastorate in a church belonging to the Synod. He asked the advice of an older minister with 30 years' experience as to what he should do about studying English. The older brother replied, "Don't bother. I never did and have gotten along very well without it." The author did not take this advice, but the answer nevertheless indicates how matters stood at that time. That particular minister, the pastor of a large city church, could not have given that response--wrong as it was--if the German language had not been the dominant language in the Synod at the time. The author, once in the practical ministry, soon realized that the older brother simply did not want to read the signs of the times. In dealing with the young people, especially in confirmation instruction and in the parochial school, it was absolutely necessary to use English, at least as an auxiliary language. At funerals an American minister was frequently asked to give a talk in English. If a minister did not want to be all alone, playing the role of a foreigner and outsider, but instead wished to participate in the national or at least the church life of the American people he simply could not do without English.

But it would not be fair to judge the language question of that time simply on the basis of one's personal experience. Rather far-reaching laws of historical development were making themselves felt. According to general observation it is practically impossible for immigrants to hold on to their native language longer than through the second generation. With the grandchildren, usually, the language of the country becomes the only medium of conversation. Now the "Kirchenverein" had, of course, been founded with recruits from strong waves of immigration which had come during the years 1831-1840, (See Faust, The German Element, Vol. 1, p. 583ff) but the basic stock for our Evangelical Synod came rather from the mighty wave of German immigration which came in the 50's* reaching its peak in

- - - - -

* See Chapters I-VI.

the year 1854 when 215,000 people came to America from Germany. (See Faust, p. 585) These people by the 90's had become grandparents and the Synod found itself dealing with third generation Germans. The parochial schools, it is true, had in many communities still equipped these grandchildren with a needed knowledge of German, but their language in daily conversation was mainly English. If one wished to get close to them, perhaps to elicit their comments and to solicit their cooperation, one needed to converse with them in the language of the country.

It is true, of course, that the prospect for German would have been even more unfavorable, had it not been for the strong wave of immigration which came in the 80's. This wave reached its peak with 250,630 in 1882 (Faust, p. 586). An unusually large contingent came from Wuerttemberg. And since the people from Wuerttemberg always were more or less moderate, confessionally speaking, our Synod received from them strong reinforcements of South German. (See chapters II and IV.) Where the congregations received a large contingent of these immigrants the use of German in the worship and work of the church was greatly strengthened. But this was not always the case. Many of these immigrants went to the industrial centers, others to the Western states where cheap land was still available. Many communities were hardly affected at all by this later wave of immigration and it was there that the need to resort to the use of English was most keenly felt.

The immigration of the 80's soon began to decline. There was a temporary increase to 125,000 in 1891, but after that there was a rapid decline to a low of only 17,111 persons in 1898. Between that date and WWI it seldom exceeded 20,000. There were two reasons for this almost complete drying up of German immigration: 1) the marked improvement in industrial and commercial conditions in the old fatherland, and 2) the days of cheap land in the American West were definitely numbered. Just as the immigration began because of economic conditions, so also it ceased when economic conditions changed.

So it was that in the 90's the viewpoint of the "third generation" and the cessation of immigration and the demise of parochial school education all worked together to bring about a flooding in of English so universal as to cause a definite change in the life of our congregations. It was not as if our American-born pastors, educated in our denominational schools had deliberately introduced the English language without having had a definite reason for doing so. Naturally the younger ministers always showed a greater inclination for English ministry than did the older ones. But bear in mind that <u>until 1890 the complete course of instruction in our seminary was given in German</u>. Only then did one make a beginning to give also some instruction in English and that only through assistant instructors modest in number and in qualifications. The work with the youth of our congregations forced us to begin to make use of English in personal conversation and in Bible teaching. There were reasons based on the needs of our congregations which led us to this

change in tactics: It was not a preference for English or the love of English on the part of individuals which brought English into our churches.

This explains why it was that the first English publication to be distributed by our publishing house was the "Small Evangelical Catechism" published in 1892; a revised edition called "Evangelical Catechism" appeared in 1898. A Christian Sunday school paper called the "Evangelical Companion" first made its appearance in 1899.

We see that although the process of Anglicanization began in the 90's, the transition really proceeded very slowly. Those who lived through that era will remember well what great efforts were made to keep the Synod German, what battles were fought to maintain the parochial schools, how in the congregations, district conferences, and educational institutions one sought to make to the strange guest and spirit only such concessions as were absolutely necessary.

But to those who knew the history of our country and were familiar with the development of older churches of German background, there could be no uncertainty as to what the future held in store. It might come with great anguish of spirit, but it was inevitable that the gradual permeation of our church life with English language and culture would proceed with the relentlessness of any natural process. They felt that all the Synod could do was to guard against giving up anything truly essential and to see to it that the old wine, though stored in new wineskins, would not be diluted.

In what follows we shall try to show to what extent they were successful in this endeavor.

CHAPTER XV

The Theology of the Synod

Bibliography: W. Becker, Guide for Instruction in the Evangelical Theology, Eden Publishing House, 1903. Baumgarten, Religious and Church Life in England, 1922.

It seems only right that we should next take a look at the doctrine of the Synod and its theology. Do we see here any evidence of the intrusion of the American spirit? Of course, the Union principle of the Synod, as set forth in the doctrinal paragraphs, must, on principle, remain beyond the pale of our consideration. This the Synod could never give up for in doing so it would have been giving up its very self. As things stood in our country at the time, this also would proably have been the last point on which the Synod might have been attacked. But were there other areas in which perhaps our teaching was affected by the prevailing winds of doctrine?

Reviewing the various theological trends prevailing in Germany during the past forty years: Ritschlianism, mediation theology, the historical criticism school, and similar liberal trends in theological study, one might have expected to find something comparable in America. It is safe to say, however, that our church has remained completely untouched by such movements. This is no doubt very remarkable and cannot simply be explained by saying that denominational seminaries tend to cater to the pious feelings of their students and in so doing avoid both the dangers and the stimulation which might accompany the uninhibited scholarship of a state university. One needs rather to take into account the general nature of the spiritual life in our land. The American, even more than the Englishman, is a practical person, also in matters of religion. O. Baumgarten in his book on the religious and church life in England (See bibliography) insists that the Englishman, even the English philosopher, does not insist on having a thorough, wholly consistent, world view, but is content rather to deal with the elements of practical reason. "While our German theological leaders are prone to go far beyond the realms of practical experience into the abstract ether of pure speculation, leaving their students struggling in vain to find a bridge to practical living, the English religious leaders constantly stay in touch with the practical and experiential so that their teaching is immediately applicable to the problems of daily living." (P. 54)

These words, so well said, apply even more to the American theologian. Our land--Jonathan Edwards excepted--has not produced any independent theological leaders. What our theologians have done best has been in the nature of popularizing (the teachings of others). Their chief concern always has been to make their teaching understandable and attractive. Their aim was not to be respected by their colleagues but to be understood by the people. The masses, however, are neither competent to evaluate nor interested in receiving abstract speculation. They

want rather to be shown the value of religion for practical everyday living. For many decades this has been the direction theology has gone in our country.

Consequently, the predominant type (of religion) in America has not been Lutheranism with its striving for pure doctrine but rather Calvinism with its emphasis on moral living, effective organization, and the influence of the church in the social arena. Such soil is not conducive to the growth of theological research. The old Calvinism was strong in the defense of its specific Reformed teachings. It emphasized not only a strict morality but also sound doctrine. But this old Calvinism had long since vanished having had appeal only for kindred spirits.

In one respect, of course, "American Christianity" was not without influence on our own denomination. Although the New Calvinism has not been theologically productive in our land, it has nevertheless been strongly orthodox. To this day all our denominations--with the exception of a few small free-thinking sects--hold fast unshakably to the basic teachings of Christianity. This has undoubtedly had the effect of establishing our church even more firmly in the doctrinal direction which has been ours always.

So far as our leading theologians are concerned there is not the slightest evidence of their having come under American influence. This is to be explained not only by the fact, already mentioned, that there was no independent American theology, but also by the fact that all had come from Germany. In previous chapters we have already discussed two of them, namely, Andreas Irion and Emil Otto. We have seen how different they were. Irion was the typical Wuerttembergian pietist, with a strongly Lutheran orientation, but equipped with an unusual gift for speculation--within definite limits--great especially in the development of concepts, but beyond that completely orthodox and not given to making any concessions to the new theological learning of the day. Otto, on the other hand, was a critical theologian. He was well versed in historical criticism in the field of exegesis; he was an outstanding philologian; he was a sharp dialectitian, completely knowledgeable with regard to the problems of modern thinking. Both men were strongly-grounded Christians; both had a great influence on their students. It is unfortunate and an irreparable loss that these great teachers were not encouraged by their church to leave an outline of their theological thinking in printed form for the benefit of future generations. Plans were made for the publication of Irion's dogmatics (See Chapter X) but the proposed publication never appeared. We are fortunate to have at least his thorough explanation of the Catechism. From Otto we have nothing except his exposition of the Epistle to the Romans. Had he been allowed to retain his position and had he been encouraged to publish a volume of Biblical Theology, or even one on Christian Dogmatics, we should in all probability have received a work of lasting value. Instead he had to content himself with the teaching of Greek grammar at Elmhurst. (He was a professor at Elmhurst from

1890 until 1904.)

The third theological professor, who deserves to be ranked with the two already mentioned, is W. Becker, who died on June 16, 1919, at the age of 79 years. He began his teaching career at the seminary in 1883, the year the seminary moved from Marthasville to its new location in St. Louis. Becker was born in Baden, Germany, and received his secondary and university education in Germany. His field was that of Biblical Theology and (since 1894) Church Dogmatics, subjects which he taught during the next quarter century, until his death. Almost a whole generation of our pastors got their theological education from him. His 94-page Guide for Instruction in Evangelical Theology is the only writing of this sort which--by direction of the Seminary Board--was ever published by our Synod.

Becker gives evidence in this little volume that he was a complete master of the materials covered: not in the sense of one going his own way but as one who has independently worked through the available materials to make a well-ordered professional presentation. Following the manner of earlier professors in the field he begins with a brief apologetic in which he explains the nature of religion and of revelation and goes on to elucidate the relationship between the Scriptures and the teachings of the Church. Next he presents in outline a brief history of Christian dogmatics from the earliest times until the Schleiermacher School whose adherents make personal religious experience the point of departure for their theologizing in contrast to the biblicists who take the Holy Scriptures as their starting point and proceed to elucidate the sacred text as given guidance by Holy Spirit. (In this connection he mentions especially J. T. Beck and R. Kuebel.) He does not say which school he personally is inclined to follow. It appears obvious that he could only have joined the biblicists although, unlike Beck, he does not present a biblical theology but rather proceeds to deal with the dogmatic development of the text.

It seems regretful that Becker does not give us any "golden thread" for his Dogmatics (as does, for instance, Frank, who takes as his theme: "The Coming into Being of the People of God" discussing a.) The Ground of their Becoming, and b) The Realization of the Same, and c) The Final Goal.)

True to the time-honored form, Becker then discusses the Three Articles of the Christian Faith:

1. The teaching concerning God (God's attributes, the Trinity), the teaching concerning the world (Creation, Providence), the teaching concerning human beings (Original Goodness, The Fall into Sin, The Punishment for Sin).
2. The teaching concerning Salvation through Christ (God's Purpose, Preparation for Coming of Christ); The Person and Work of Christ.
3. The teaching concerning the Appropriation of Salvation (The Way to Salvation, The Church, The Scriptures, The Means of Grace), The Final Consummation (Eschatology).

Becker's position is always positive and in keeping with the time-honored teaching of the Church, yet taking due cognizance of modern advances in theological learning. Concerning verbal inspiration he says this: "This theory concerning the origin of the New Testament could not be carried through even by its original advocates (P. 78, Par. 110) As the original record of the good news of salvation the Bible is the Word of God. But with regard to sacred Scripture we must differentiate between its two sides for according to its essence it is divine, but according to its presentation it is always human. (P. 76) Concerning the death of Christ he writes (P. 59, Par. 81): "The suffering and death of Christ represents the free surrender to the will of God for human salvation. It is, in other words, a reconciling sacrificial death. Through it there is created a new relationship with God based on faith in the crucified Christ and his sacrificial death. The substitutionary death of Christ is effective because it is in harmony with God's righteousness and with the doing of God's will and not in opposition to it. It is not to be looked upon as representing God's reprisal."

"Justification is not simply a formal declaration of righteousness but rather represents God's bestowing upon the believer of God's own righteousness through Christ as the foundation and empowerment for the new life." (P. 70, Par. 99)

"The rebirth is to be seen as belonging to one's spiritual life, not as something lying outside the realm of human consciousness." (P. 69, Par. 98)

He does not deal at all with the concept of conversion.

With regard to the sacraments, unlike A. Irion, he comes closer to the Reformed rather than the Lutheran interpretation. Irion says: "God alone creates the new person through Holy Baptism." (P. 219) Every baptized person is according to him actually reborn. It remains for the individual to accept the gift already bestowed through the act of conversion. (P. 219) Becker: "In Holy Baptism the treasures of the Kingdom of God are offered the person being baptized and are received by him or her in whatever measure possible." (P. 81, Par. 114) Concerning the Lord's Supper Irion says: "Bread and wine are the material bearers of the body and blood of the Lord." As the outer and inner person are bound up together so the material elements in Holy Communion are bound up with the true essence of the sacrament. (Pp. 237-238) Becker: "The elements are signs of the body and blood or of the person of Christ given in death on the cross. They are not empty signs but fulfilled signs, i.e., by virtue of participation in the sacrament which takes place in partaking of the elements, the believing Christian enters into communion with Christ." (P. 84, Par. 117)

Seen as a whole Becker's dogmatics (or rather his "Leitfaden" (guide) to dogmatics) is a work which bears eloquent testimony to his mastery of the subject and to his keen logic,

thus indicating that he was well qualified for the high position which he held among us for years on end. Unfortunately, he was not given the gift of popular presentation or of interesting lecturing. Unlike Irion he was not able to combine rich thought content with perspicacious clarity nor was he able, as was Otto, to challenge his listeners to active cooperation in research. His style was always readily understood by his colleagues on the theological faculty. Compared to what earlier German professors had offered it was in fact "as clear as day," but his lectures went over the heads of most of his students. Many of them had only a limited knowledge of German and, consequently, often were unable to follow their professor's thinking. Knowing full well that they were listening to a master theologian, they allowed his eloquence to go over their heads convinced that it was not given to them to discern the meaning of what was being said. Thus it was that the investment of rich capital returned only limited dividends. If so many of our parish ministers today indicate no real interest in theology, the fact that they studied under Prof. Becker may be one of the reasons--along with many others.

From what we have said it appears that it seems apparent that the theology in our Synod did not change materially but remained pretty much what it was in the beginning. Irion and Becker were very different, both in character and in their theology, but this difference had nothing to do with the influence of the American environment. The theological views of our pastors, with the possible exception of the most recent decade, were deeply rooted in German soil.

However, at this point we must hedge a bit. About 25 years ago, as the use of English began to assert itself more and more, certain individual students felt the need, following graduation from our seminary, to spend an additional year of study at an American institution. The English instruction they received in our seminary was little more than a stopgap in an emergency situation. The normal language of instruction in all the major subjects was still German, so many went elsewhere in search of what our own seminary was not yet offering. Mostly they went to Presbyterian or Congregational institutions, seldom to Methodist, and even more rarely to English Lutheran seminaries. I mention this as indicative of certain elective affinities which were destined to assert themselves in the years ahead and to which I shall have occasion to refer to again later. The institutions most frequently chosen were McCormick Seminary (Presbyterian) in Chicago, Hartford Seminary (Congregationalist) in Connecticut, and sometimes also Oberlin, in Ohio; less often graduates went on to Princeton, Yale, or Harvard, famed Eastern institutions. At such institutions our young pastors encountered theologians who for the most part were no more learned than our own--at least than our best. But these schools greatly exceeded ours in resources. They had larger faculties and instruction frequently was given in a more popular style so that, by comparison, our own institution suffered. Frequently, comparisons were made which resulted in the disparagement of Eden. The writer himself went to McCormick Seminary and his judgment, in retrospect is that,

with the exception of one or two, the theological learning of the professors was not all that great and that the best they have to contribute usually had been gotten in German universities. But the young theologians, newly-arrived from Eden, were enthusiastic and gladly gave themselves over to the influences of their new environment with all their hearts. It cannot be said that they were strongly influenced theologically by the teachers of these institutions, but the spiritual atmosphere was that of American Calvinism which was quite different from Lutheranism in matters of doctrine, the Sacraments, and worship liturgy. It probably is not an overstatment to say that this additional year of study on the part of Eden graduates in other institutions contributed its share to developing in many of our younger pastors a preference for the American Calvinistic type of church organization and worship.

For these and other reasons it became necessary for Eden to employ immediately at least one professor to teach in English. This took place in 1908 when S. D. Press was called to become a member of the Eden faculty. Press, after studying at Eden and spending a few brief years in the parish ministry, had spent several years at German universities where he was greatly influenced especially by Kaehler in Halle and by the young Karl Heim--now in Tuebingen. These men, one a leader of the biblicists and the other with a gift that enabled him to influence young theological students and to lead them to faith in the historical Jesus had exerted a strong influence on Press's theological education and had introduced into his thought system the note of personal experience of salvation. As a new professor at Eden, Press went about his work with great dedication and had the satisfaction of finding universal acceptance among the students in a very short time. With all this, although the first English professor, he was always a devotee of German theological learning. So he was especially capable of carrying over our old traditions and of giving to new generations in the new language the heritage of faith received from the fathers. W. Baur, since 1904 a professor of Church History and related subjects, distinguished himself through thoroughness and outstanding classroom work and also became a strong supporter of the old faith as well as of a carefully crafted theology.

Putting it all together, we could say that also in the new period our theology maintained a strong feeling for that which was best and most positive in German technological learning. On the other hand, it cannot be denied that in many ways bridges were being built to the nurturing centers for Reformed Christianity.

CHAPTER XVI

Worship

Bibliography: L. Haeberle, Evangelische Zeugnisse (Evangelical Witnesses), 1902. F. Mayer, Der Evangelische Pastor (The Evangelical Pastor), 1921. M. Schian, "Geschichte der Predigt" (History of Preaching), in R. E., Vol. XV, pp. 623-747. H. Haupt, "Die Eigenart der Amerikanischen Predigt" (The Character of American Preaching), 1907. M. Schian, "Die Entwiklung der Evangelischen Predigt in Deutschland im 20. Jahrhundert" (The Development of Evangelical Preaching in Germany in the Twentieth Century", Theologische Magazin, Mar., 1923. D. Irion, "Die Wuerde und Bedeutung des Evangelischen Predigtamtes" (The Dignity and Meaning of the Evangelical Pastoral Ministry), Theologische Magazin, July, 1921. Th. Kugler, "Moderne Evangelische Predigt" (Modern Evangelical Preaching), Theologische Magazin, Jan., 1921.

The religious life of a denomination finds expression most naturally and definitely in its worship services. It is true that attendance at worship services cannot in itself be taken as a measuring rod of the religious life of a congregation. Still if the church is consistently empty who would not come to the conclusion that something is wrong with the pastor and congregation? Furthermore, who would not be able to discern from the services of worship something concerning the nature of the congregation and the church body to which it belongs? Therefore, if we wish to trace the development and note certain changes in the religious life of our Synod we must direct our attention to the worship services. At the heart of Protestant worship is the proclamation of the Word of God. Let us therefore take a look at the preaching in the second period of our Synod's history and let us compare it with the preaching in the earlier, almost exclusively German, period, as described in Chapter VIII.

1. Preaching

The use of English in the worship services, which began around 1890, grew rather slowly until 1900, after which it grew ever more rapidly. Naturally, it happened more rapidly in certain districts than in others. In those areas which had a high percentage of Germans and where German immigration still continued, there was less room for English. In those districts where the German influx had happened earlier the reverse was true. Thus it is that in an annual report from the Ohio District for 1910 we read: There is hardly a vacancy to be filled in which the requirements call for German only. On the other hand, during the same year North Illinois District reported only 325 English worship services as compared to 5709 German services, in other words only 6%. (Two years later the English services had increased to 10%.) In 1920 only one-third of the services in Ohio were still conducted in German; only four years earlier half were still German. The change came with equal rapidity in the Indiana, New York, and Pennsylvania Districts.

Obviously this switch in languages was not made without a significant effect on preaching and the worship services. This is not to say that with the introduction of English an American style of preaching immediately took over in our pulpits. On the contrary, fifty years of German history and education had not been without impact. It must be noted also that in our seminary practical theology continued to be taught by German-educated professors. L. Haeberle had become a professor in our seminary as early as 1879 and continued teaching homiletics and practical theology for 23 years until 1902. A whole generation of Evangelical pastors got their homiletic tradition from him. Born in Wuerttemberg, but educated in our own seminary, he very early gained a reputation as a good pulpiteer. For sixty years he was a popular preacher. His Evangelical Witnesses (See bibliography above), a collection of sermons, indicates that he was a simple but forceful preacher of the age-old gospel. His effectiveness lay less in a logical amassing of reasoned argument, such as Baltzer's, than in a clear, easily understood exposition and cogent practical application of the Scriptures. His clear voice and personal sincerity strengthened the impression he made in the pulpit. When he left the seminary several professors shared the subjects he had so long been teaching. Professor Mayer, currently the homiletics teacher, in his book, The Evangelical Pastor (See bibliography above) holds pretty much to the old German patterns of pulpit speaking.

The church year continues to stand in high regard among us (See Chapter VIII above). We have already said that the church year with its great festivals virtually compelled our preachers at certain times each year to proclaim the great acts of God for our salvation and perhaps saved them from too much moralistic preaching. H. Haupt in his book on American preaching seems to regard this as a disadvantage pointing out (p. 8) that the church year becomes conducive to dogmatic preaching inasmuch as it seems to call for sermons on the Virgin Birth, the Meaning of the Cross, etc., subjects which he feels do not belong in the pulpit. American preachers, not under compulsion of the church year, are less inclined to preach dogmatically. We suspect that Haupt looks unfavorably upon doctrinal preaching simply because he does not like the doctrines. One who does not consider the supernatural birth of Jesus or his substitutionary death on the cross as being of the essence is not likely to make them the subject of his sermons and is more likely to feel under compulsion when the great festivals of the church year raise expectations on the part of the congregation to which he might need to respond. On the other hand, one who sees in such events the high points of the gospel message will be glad that ancient custom has prepared his congregation psychologically to be more receptive to his preaching. Moreover, it is entirely possible to speak on such subjects without becoming overly doctrinal or dogmatic.

Haupt's comment reminds us of a fact which perhaps has great significance for the development of church life and particularly for preaching. It is a comment which reveals the author's per-

sonal theological predilections. In our old fatherland there are a number of different theological "directions" which exist and come to expression side by side in the church. They have a deep effect on the content and nature of preaching. Schian in his above-mentioned, extremely meaningful article on preaching, "The History of Christian Preaching", describes the various kinds of preachers encountered during the last third of the 19th century and still existing in the 20th century. He speaks of five groups: 1) strongly confessional, 2) mildly confessional, 3) revivalistic or biblicistic, 4)mediation theology, and 5) "world view" group (more humanistic than Christian). He describes all thse groups in a most interesting manner and names their chief representatives.

In that regard we find ourselves here in America in a wholly different atmosphere. The confessionalists, of course, we have in our Old Line Lutherans. But as to the central doctrines of the Christian faith, we seem to have general consensus. It cannot be denied, of course, that in many churches one finds a considerable softening as over against orthodox teachings: that, for instance, some otherwise believing pastors look upon the Virgin Birth as not essential to faith, that they hold various theories with regard to the reconciling death of Jesus, that they find it possible to reconcile their Christian faith and the theory of evolution. Still they all stand fast in the belief that Christ has objectively accomplished our salvation, and that the sacred scriptures are the reliable original source of revelation. The church year itself is disregarded by most Americans. Of course, they have learned from the Germans about the celebration of Christmas; also Holy Week and Easter are generally observed and that is about all. Advent as preparation for Christmas and Lent as a time of preparation for Easter remain unobserved. Ascension Day and Pentecost come and go unnoticed. To the extent that they are observed among us one cannot help noticing the difference between here and over there. All the religious festivals have far less drawing power here than in the old fatherland. Even thirty years ago it was still customary to hold a worship service on the second day of a great feast day (Christmas, Easter, or Pentecost). This custom has now gone by the board and on the whole we have to admit that the celebration of the religious holy days lacks something of the psychology of sacredness by which they are surrounded in Germany. Needed for this is the participation of the entire populace and this we do not have and cannot get, try as we may. So we must admit that in this regard we have to record a minus with regard to the worship services during the second period of our Synod's history. As we have said, a change in worship customs does not imply that the great truths of the gospel are less valued than before. Both our original doctrinal position and our American ecclesiastical environment have guarded us against this, but a certain barrenness in our worship services has nevertheless resulted and will no doubt continue. Our Sundays tend to become more like Sundays in the English churches where they are all very much alike. The monotonous sameness and sobriety which affect so many areas of American life is creeping into our church life also.

The many "special Sundays", such as Mothers' Day, Father-and-Son Day, and the national holidays, Thanksgiving Day, and many others, are for the most part arbitrary creations. They lack the religious sanction and certainly cannot take the place of the church year. The church year comes from a time and situation in which state and church were bound together to create a great wholeness of life and when church customs affected the public consciousness as well. The fall of the state church system struck at the very root of the church year. In a land of free churches the church year is robbed of the very essence for its existence. With its demise much poetry and feeling, much of life's magic and charm are irretrievably lost. Anyone who knew our Church thirty years ago or who in this regard compares it with the mother church must become painfully aware that the American environment is robbing it of color, is depriving it of much that was not only beautiful but also of great value.

As regards preaching on the lectionary this is not the place for a lengthy discussion. Many still turn gratefully to the use of the lection texts (See Chapter VIII). Many of our younger ministers, educated in this country, declare their independence of the lectionary and in so doing only increase the weekly agony associated with selecting a sermon text. Also they deny themselves the major means which could guard them against arbitrary text selection on the basis of their own momentary mood or personal need. Still, many of the younger ministers, too, have come to recognize that a certain dependence on the lectionary can give balance to their preaching while at the same time contributing greatly to a sense of Christian unity.

The difficulty of text selection, however, may be ameliorated only slightly by recourse to the pericopes. In many city churches two services are held every Sunday and it is not an easy task to select different texts which nevertheless indicate a similarity of subject matter. Many ministers, consequently, allow themselves considerable freedom with regard to the Sunday evening services. From these they often take their themes from current events dealing with domestic or foreign affairs, literature, or sociology. Men like Cadman, for example, like to speak on topics like "Anglo-American Friendship", or "The Church, Not Politicians, will Establish Peace", or "The Forthcoming Election". Others use topics like, "Interpreting Our Own Day" (Luke 12:56), "Browning on Immortality", "Our Country and Its Future", "Grow a Command from God", or "Priesthood and Modern Spirit" (the text was Melchisedek, the Priest of the Most High). Of course, also in the English churches, how much freedom the minister has in text selection, depends largely upon the nature and educational level of his congregation.

It is well known that American preachers try all kinds of things to attract large crowds. Sensational sermon topics are much in vogue. Soon after former king of Greece had been bitten by a monkey a minister in Cleveland (the author's home town) announced the topic: "The King that Died from a Monkey Bite". The big church was packed and the preacher, using the announced topic

and a favorite text, spoke about the fact that "small causes often have great consequences."

It is not necessary to belabor the point, for our church, to date, has not imitated such practices. This is due to the fact not only that we have a sense of what is appropriate in church, but also that our congregations for the most part consist of simple folk who would have no taste for such things. Our pastors, generally speaking, are expected to treat the pulpit as a place for religious discourse. Still another consideration must be mentioned. The American pastor normally thinks of the members of his congregation as converted Christians. Therefore, his job is mainly to nourish and upbuild the individual's Christian life. For this reason he so often resorts to moralizing from the pulpit. The call to repentance and faith often is relegated to the so-called evangelistic services which are held from time to time. We, on the other hand, deal with our people quite differently. We know that many of our people are only nominal Christians, much in need of an inward change. Although we may know ourselves to be standing "in the presence of the believing congregation" (See Mayer, p. 32), and our preaching cultic rather than missionary, we nevertheless keep in mind that the individual's personal faith stance is essential to progress and so tend to emphasize faith quite as much as morals. And, of course, our teachers in homiletics and our seminary textbooks have always insisted on the old German requirement of faithfulness to the text. So it is that Mayer writes (p. 41): "The entire content of the sermon must lie in the text and emerge from the text. A sermon in which the text is only a pretext and slogan is no sermon and will not evoke faith." The latter is a strong statement and could be argued. The former is a true German guideline in homiletics, from which American preachers have long since declared their independence. For the German, on the other hand--at least in times past it was so--the sermon is essentially exposition of the Scriptures and must, therefore, adhere to what is in the text. The American preacher is much more concerned about the people sitting in front of him and seeks to meet their needs. For the German the text is in itself the Word of God; for the American it is only a means to an end. The former concerns himself with exposition, the latter with application. The German is in danger of getting stuck with the Jews of Jerusalem or the Christians of Corinth; the American is so conscious of his hearers and the limits of his preaching time that he often forgets his text completely. He first selects a topic, then a text; the German must find his topic in the text. Therefore, the American prefers a short text while the German prefers a complete story or an entire section.

The younger generation among us has gone over completely to the American way. The books on preaching which they read--our own Synod has only recently published one in English--all follow the American pattern. The historical setting of the text is almost completely ignored. Possibly in the introduction a word may be said about the historical setting or the wording of the text but in the formulation of the topic or its exposition little

attention is paid to the original meaning. It is understandable that a trend so general among our younger generation would be hard to resist. At the same time one perceives that over and again the old way still asserts itself.

We present herewith several examples from preaching at District conferences as gleaned from the District minutes. They will serve to illustrate what has been said:

1.) Text: Rev. 3, 7, and 8 - The Glory of the Church of the Gospel.

1. The Evangelical Church has the name and the message. Do not desert it.
2. The Evangelical Church is an open door. Do not close it.
3. The Evangelical Church: The Lord knows its work. Do not forget it.
4. The Evangelical Church: The crown of life awaits. Do not lose it.

2.) Text: Acts 4:29 - Boldness is natural in preaching the gospel because:

1. Clear conviction is its basis.
2. Deep love the motive.
3. Forward action the object.

3.) Text: Phil. 2:15a-16a (A sermon for a Men's Brotherhood) "Brotherhood"

1. Its origin
2. Its purpose
3. Its field

4.) Text: Matthew 22:42 - What think ye of Christ?
Our opinion of Christ is the measure of 1) our joy, 2) our service, 3) our character, 4) will fix our destiny, and 5) determine what God thinks of us.

5.) John 15:5 - The Mission, Message, and Motive Power of the Christian Church.

6.) John 12:19: "Behold, the whole world goes after him' That is:

1. A vexatious word for his enemies.
2. An encouraging word for his friends.
3. A word of praise for the Lord.

7.) A List of Sermon Themes, submitted by one of the best-known preachers of our Synod. They illustrate the preference for short texts and brief, practical, catching topics. Sometimes the text takes the place of the topics.

1. I Thess. 5:19-20: "Quench not the spirit." (Reformation Sunday.)
2. 2 Cor. 9:6-15: "Adequate Returns."
3. (No text given) "Why give?" (Pledge Sunday)
4. Hebrews 12:1: "How to Win the Race."

5. Neh. 8:10: "America's Thanksgiving." (Thanksgiving Day.)
6. Isa. 40:3 "Prepare ye the way." (Advent.)
7. Job 31:17 "If I have eaten my morsel alone."
8. 2 Tim. 3:17 "How to obtain complete manhood." (Religious Education Sunday.)
9. Luke 2:14 "The World's Greatest Love Story." (Christmas.)
10. Rev. 3:3 "Remember how thou didst receive." (Old Year Night.)

An examination of the foregoing examples seems to indicate that in general the material offered was pretty much in accord with the texts. Although we may not be able to adduce specific proof in the nature of drastic examples, our general observation is that the text no longer plays as strong a role in preaching as was formerly required by good homiletic practice.

What is more, Professor Schian-Giessen claims that this is true also in Germany. In an article entitled, "The Development of Evangelical Preaching in Germany in the 20th Century" (see Theologische Magazin for March 1922), he writes that in the second half of the 19th century a classical homiletic style was generally followed (following the introduction came a carefully worded theme followed by an outline of the proposed parts, then a careful treatment and application of each part), in the 20th century this has been more and more disregarded. "The sermon becomes more and more conversational in style. A topic is announced but the several parts are seldom mentioned or, if so, only briefly. Frequently, the sermon instead of having parallel parts flows on in a continuous narrative style. The tendency is to disregard the demands of a formal style and to maintain a fresh flowing movement adapted to each specific situation." He says further that instead of adhering to the central themes more special subjects are selected and instead of doctrinal subjects more topics related to practical daily living are the vogue. He even goes so far as to say that--mirabile dictu--with the modern preacher the text serves only as a motto with little relevance to the content of the sermon.

Just as in America! Except that in our case our ministers have taken their cue from the American examples and not because of German influence. This new development in Germany was news to us seeing our contact with the fatherland since 1914 has been very minimal.

If we were to make a generalized observation concerning preaching during this second period in the history of our Synod it would be that--many notable exceptions granted--it has attained no remarkable heights. Preaching among us has ditinguished itself neither by intellectual profundity nor by oratorical excellence. It has seldom grappled with the problems of modern thinking or current world views. This is to be explained, as has often been said, by the general character of our country. The sermon seldom deals with the central truths of

our faith; nor is the sermon revivalistic in nature except, of course, that it often stresses the importance of personal Christian living. The sermon is content to preach the age-old gospel--more assertively than argumentatively--and beyond that to seek to do justice to the demands of Christian living in the family and in business.* In individual cases the sermon tends to have a social gospel emphasis.

If one wishes to classify our preaching psychologically, one would have to say that it is seldom exclusively feeling-oriented (Methodistic) nor mainly directed toward the rational faculty (modern or scientific) but rather is directed toward the will. There is a strong emphasis on doing the word. There is a strong emphasis on the ethical in religious development. If it seems strange that on the whole preaching seems to be so average and "middle-of-the-road" we need to remind ourselves that our people have no great appreciation for oratorical excellence. The personality of the preacher matters more to them than does his pulpit ability. For that matter, our ministers themselves, consider their pastoral ministry and Christian education work as of greater importance than their pulpit activity.

The strongest influence in the future will undoubtedly come from the American environment and from the example set by English-speaking preachers and their churches. We cannot expect that in the long run these will be counter-balanced by German methods and ways.

2. Liturgy

Bibliography: P. Crusius, "A Standard for English Services", Theologische Magazin, January, 1923. Book of Worship.

Our church has always had a more or less well-developed liturgy. In Chapter VI we referred to the fact that the ministers during our simple early period, serving as they did congregations composed of heterogenous elements, often had great difficulty introducing and maintaining really dignified worship practices. However, they made the effort and not without success. If they were not as successful as, say, the old Lutherans, the reason lay in our Union character. While members of the Reformed heritage were always a minority, their presence, nevertheless, always made it impossible for us to insist on a full-Lutheran liturgy. The Reformed people of that period were more accustomed to a simple, often even barren service rather than to more artistic and symbolic forms including participation by the congregation. Our Union principle caused us to apply

- - - - -

* There is not lacking a strong emphasis on positive Christian witnessing. Just as in Germany over against the liberal theology there is strong emphasis on confessionalism, so also here in America the so-called "fundamentalists" make it their business to emphasize the essential Christian doctrines. In this regard our Synod in preaching remains strictly ("altglaeubig") orthodox.

"evangelical freedom" not only doctrinally but also in other matters and this freedom sometimes resulted in arbitrariness. Consequently by the 90's we had not achieved any kind of uniformity in the form of worship services throughout our Synod. Certain essential elements were universally prevalent, but beyond that a great diversity prevailed. Nevertheless, we could be counted as being among the "liturgical" churches, to use a phrase prevalent in America. It was to be expected that with the introduction of English the influence of the mostly non-liturgical American church practices would be felt. There are other churches of German origin in our country which give evidence of having been more heavily influenced by the American church type than we; for instance, the Reformed Church and the Evangelical Association and, naturally, the German Methodists and Baptists. But even we cannot claim to have resisted liturgical change with the toughness of the old Lutherans. In matters other than confessional, we lack the strong organization and strict discipline which is able to hold the line against individual idiosyncracies. So it was that with the introduction of English services many of our pastors went their own way. It was not so much a matter of choosing their own paths as it was a matter of taking over prevailing American customs, particularly with regard to Sunday evening services. They laid aside the pulpit robe and instead wore a "Prince Albert", or simply wore a jacket or, perhaps, (in summer) a light-colored suit. In time these habits sometimes were carried over also into the morning service. The Agende (Book of Worship) frequently was not used. Instead of the slow heavy chorales, they introduced the use of the light, singable, and popular English gospel hymns. The people now were asked to stand for the hymns and to remain seated for prayer as is customary in the American churches. The announcements were made before the sermon rather than after. And with the making of all these changes went the assumption of the label "progressive".

The reaction was sure to come. "Where are we going?" many asked. Are we about to discard our identity like an outworn garment? Is a thing good simply because it is new? Do we not have traditions that are worth maintaining? Do we not have an eccesiastical individuality that deserves asserting? Do we not have a peculiar talent which we are under obligation to contribute to the total church life of our country? D. Irion and P. Crusius, to mention only two more recent voices, wrote articles for the "Theologische Magazin" in which they stressed the right and duty of our Church to assert its individuality. Our church should not give up its liturgical character they insisted. Rather we should develop, enrich, and enliven our liturgy. Let our ministers appear in their pulpit robes. In doing so he will underscore the importance of his message and enhance his dignity as a Servant in the Holy Place. The use of the same Agende (Book of Worship) will serve to establish our identity as member of the Synod. We should hold fast to the precious heritage received from our mother church: our time-honored, meaningful, classical chorales. (See Point 4)

It is safe to assume that such admonitions will not go

unheeded, all the more so in view of the fact that similar longings are being expressed in large English denominations. Specifically, in the oldest denominations of our country, the Congregationalists, Presbyterians, and also the Unitarians, the pulpit robe is being used more and more, and one notices a definite effort to give the worship service more dignity, beauty, and objective meaning by means of a better developed liturgy. The influential Episcopal Church, of course, has long since sought to lead the Protestant churches in this direction. Our younger ministers, particularly, are easily influenced by the American churches. Many are greatly drawn by the Presbyterians, much less by the Methodists and Baptists, or, for that matter, by the Episcopalians. They are more easily influenced by the example of other American denominations than by all kinds of arguments based on our own traditions. Since, therefore, we see in American churches a growing interest in liturgy, it is to be hoped that with better education and a growing appreciation for art and religious symbolism, we may also look forward to improved worship practices and more uniformity.

Naturally, people coming from Europe and attending our services will immediately sense a kind of strangeness. We ourselves are well aware that many things are different than they were 30 or 40 years ago. Ever more rare are the congregations which still fit the pattern described by Polenz (in his Land of the Future, p. 384): "I found most heart-warming the German-Americanism as expressed in the churchly West. The worship services, where Evangelical, are distinctly German in character. It does one good anywhere in the South or in the North, to enter a simple house of worship and to find in progress there, in the middle of great America, a strictly unadulterated celebrative German worship service. One recognizes the heads, unmistakably those of farmers, just as in one of Cranach's great paintings. A distinctly peasant atmosphere prevails. One is impressed by the slow tempo of the singing, the earnestness of those participating in the service, the old-world clothing, the quiet dignity of a congregation that leaves everything pretty much to the minister. Withal the deep meditative mood of this people who, for all their outward phlegmaticness, are inwardly, nevertheless, deeply involved. It all is so unAmerican that one gets the feeling of being on an island on which, despite all the new-wordly surroundings, something purely German has been preserved in all its pristine originality."

True enough, one is likely to find in our worship services more reverence than in many American services. The House of God is more of a "holy place" where people come together to worship God. Only in exceptional instances--one hopes--is it unnecessarily used for worldly purposes or profaned by conduct more befitting a public auditorium or a concert hall.

3. Administration of the Sacraments

Bibliography: Die Agende der Deutschen Evangelischen Synode. The Book of Worship, 1916. The German and English Catechisms.

The Explanation of the Catechism by A. Irion, 1870, and by D. Irion, 1897. Evangelical Fundamentals, Part II, J. L. Neve. The Lutherans in the Movements for Church Union, 1921.

Let us keep in mind that in this section we shall be dealing with the question as to whether since the 1890's anything has changed as regarding our interpretation and administration of the sacraments due to the influence of other denominations and our closer relationship with them. We have already seen (Chaps. X and XV) that in the past our theological leaders had their differences relative to the sacraments. A. Irion held views which were essentially Lutheran. He taught that through Baptism a child is born again although it may later still stand in need of conversion. Concerning the Holy Communion, he says that in the Lord's Supper, "essentially through the substance of the body and blood of our Lord we receive forgiveness of sins, life, and salvation." (P. 239) Becker says that in Holy Baptism "the treasures of the Kingdom of God are offered to the person baptized and received to the extent he or she is able to appropriate them." (P. 81) Concerning the Lord's Supper he says: "In the Lord's Supper we partake spiritually of the body and blood of Christ (P. 83) and that by virtue of partaking of the elements the believer enters into communion with Christ." (P. 94) We see the difference. In the Small Catechism we read that "in Baptism the child is given the new life" and that in Holy Communion "the new man receives the body and blood of Christ as the nourishment for his life. In the Catechism Explanation by D. Irion as Neve seeks to show (P. 180ff.) one perceives a definite approach toward the Lutheran interpretation. For instance, when Irion says that in the sacrament God works in the physical body to influence the spiritual life, concerning this statement Neve says that if our Synod were to be consistent in allowing itself to be guided by this view, the way to union with the Lutherans would be open! (P. 180, Note 17) However, Neve was not unaware and to us it is abundantly clear that our Synod stands on the Union principle and, therefore, cannot take an official position either with the Lutheran or the Reformed teaching. If it did it would be denying the freedom of conscience guaranteed in its confessional statement. Therefore, also our Agende (and likewise Book of Worship) in the communion forms for the most part use only such language as could not be offensive to either side. We need not here adduce specific proof.

In the new period the development has been in the direction of making the Lutheran type of worship service somewhat more bland. True, theologians like Irion, and others have stood their ground and the service in certain congregations in strongly Lutheran regions may still be as Lutheran as ever, but, in general, the sacramental character of our church is less pronounced. The baptism of children often is postponed for years and their parents for this neglect are never subject to church discipline. Baptisms frequently are done in the homes, a custom which does not contribute to the solemnity of the act nor does it serve to underscore its churchly significance. Although baptism

may be called "the bath of rebirth", no one really believes that the child through baptism is really "born again". For the most part baptism is only an honored church custom signifying that the children belong to Christ and should receive a Christian education. But almost no one looks upon baptism as "the bearer of the new life". Very often, indeed, all kinds of superstitious ideas are associated with Holy Baptism as if it were some kind of magic desirable for physical blessings ("From the moment of baptism on our sick child got better!") This situation often causes our younger pastors some anxiety and qualms of conscience. They do not know what to make of Holy Baptism and ask for pamphlets clarifying what baptism really is so that they may make use of these in strongly and confidently confronting the spirit of the times. They ask for help in interpreting HolyBaptism much more frequently than with regard to the Lord's Supper. Everyone sees in this matter the influence of our English-speaking environment. Almost all of the English churches look upon infant baptism as a symbolic act and custom through which the parents are reminded that it is their duty to see to it that their children receive Christian education. In the case of adults baptism becomes a confession of faith, in other words something that we do, not something that God does. For us, Holy Baptism is a "means of grace", but to explain how and why is not so simple. Mostly, probably, we try to do so by saying that in baptism the child receives the seal of salvation and this, of course, has important meanings both for the parents and the child.

Our congregations have shown little inclination toward adult baptism. It simply is too contrary to their whole church tradition. Moveover, they note that the Baptists will baptize children only ten years of age which would seem to indicate that they do not take too seriously that the individual must have reached "the age of discretion".

As concerns Holy Communion our congregations continue to adhere strictly to the Union principle. The "It is" or "It represents" becomes important only for congregations with a strong Lutheran heritage.* For the most part, however, our people continue to honor the sacrament even as they, or their parents, were taught to do in Germany. It is not for them, as it once was for the Reformed people, the "Mysterium tremendum", but it indeed is for them the highpoint of their worship experience and they insist on receiving it at the altar instead of having the elements passed through the pews as is customary with the Presbyterians and Congregationalists. Although many now use the individual cups (instead of the common goblet) they nevertheless maintain the dignity appropriate to handling that which is high and holy, something hardly possible when the celebration is repeated on a monthly basis--as is customary in American

- - - - -

* We are, nevertheless, assured by certain individuals that in many regions of our Synod the Lutheran interpretation and appreciation of the sacrament of the altar is fully as strong as in many Lutheran congregations.

churches. On the whole, we have here a situation in which the American influence is unmistakable but in which, nevertheless, an effort is being made to adhere to the old traditions as much as possible. It cannot be denied that with many of our younger pastors their thinking with regard to the sacrament is in a state of flux and that they are beset by a kind of fogginess or uncertainty. However, this is more true with regard to Baptism than with regard to Holy Communion. In the case of the Lord's Supper, while fully tolerating the Reformed interpretation, an effort is made to maintain the reverent dignity of the Lutheran tradition.

4. Congregational Singing

Bibliography: Hymnal of the Evangelical Church, 1899. The Evangelical Hymnal, 1917. Elmhurst Hymnal, 1921. Christian Hymns, 1908. P. Crusius, "A Standard of English Morning Services", Theologische Magazin, No. 1, 1923.

If one of our old fathers, for instance, the now sainted Baltzer could be an invisible guest in one of our present-day worship services or Sunday school sessions, he would be made aware, particularly in the singing, of how the times have changed. Doubtless he would be somewhat critical of the fast tempo and distinctly American character of the hymns. He might not be displeased with "Nearer My God to Thee" and "Rock of Ages" but what would he say to "Throw Out the Life Line" and "There's a Church in the Wildwood"? At the least he would shake his head doubtfully.

When in the 90's the parochial school began to decline and Sunday school became a more important part of congregational life, the long held-back flood of English ways broke through overwhelmingly. The Sunday school is in its very origin and nature English-American. For its development and resources it is indebted to the English church. With its growing influence the English language more than ever began to take over. Once our youth got caught up in this current, no power on earth could have stopped the "Americanization" of our congregations and our worship services. Our Synod, however, at the time, had no English song books. Since 1882 we had had a "Liederbuch fuer Sonntagschulen" (Songs for Sunday school) edited by A. Berens which contained a selection of sprightly and meaningful German melodies, as well as several English tunes, but our first edition of an English songbook for Sunday schools, called "Christian Hymns", did not appear until 1908. Therefore, one was dependent to meet the need upon outside sources and a flood of American songbooks flooded the thirsty land: A whole series of editions of "Gospel Hymns" (including also a selection in German translation by W. Rauschenbusch), a continuing series of "Pentecostal Hymns", Songs of Praise (many editions), "World-Renowned Hymns", "Best Hymns" (various editions), "Songs of Help", "Special Songs", "Songs of Hope", and many others, found a ready reception. All these, for the most part, had little in the way of musical excellence. The words were regarded as wholly

unimportant: Hardly a grain of wheat in a bushel of straw. Most of these songs were revival hymns, of Methodist origin, designed to work on the emotions: mass-produced, inappropriate and altogether worthless. Unbridled individualism had free reign. Of objectivism with regard to Christian faith there is no trace. As an expression of our common Christian faith such hymns are wholly useless. Naturally no cognizance is taken of the church year. A great percentage are completely other-worldly ("When I shall see him face to face") expressing an unhealthy and false yearning for heaven which not one in a hundred of the singers really feels. Characteristic nearly always is the refrain in which a single phrase is simply repeated again and again, e.g., "I need thee, oh, I need thee" and many others.

Nevertheless, these songs are very popular because they are easy to sing. Their effect, however, is to destroy any appreciation for good church hymnody. And from the Sunday school they found their way into the congregation's worship service.

Our Synod found it very difficult to withstand this trend. But let it be said to our denomination's credit that it fought, and continues to fight valiantly, for a better kind of church music. In 1908 our Synod published "Christian Hymns" for use primarily in Sunday schools and young people's meetings but used also in evening services. This songbook combines the best from the many songbooks used in the English-speaking churches with a selection of the best German melodies in German songbooks like "Missionsharfen" (Missionary Harps) and Christian youth hymnals. In 1899 already came the big English "Hymnal" containing more than 900 hymns gathered chiefly by Chr. Haas. It contains the best of our German chorales (many translated by Cath. Winkworth as early as 1858) together with the best from English church music. Many reputable hymnologists have praised the "Hymnal" highly. But it was a bit too voluminous, including, as it did, many hymns almost completely unknown. So, in 1917, a smaller volume containing 449 hymns and entitled, "The Evangelical Hymnal", was issued (by D. Bruening) which thoroughly preserves the German-American tradition in church music while making reasonable concessions to the spirit of the times. This hymnal is enjoying an encouraging popularity. Also deserving of mention in connection with this movement is the "Elmhurst Hymnal" issued in 1921 (by C. F. Crusius and a group of co-workers). We shall say more about it later. Here we wish to mention only that this book, while intended primarily for Sunday schools nevertheless maintains a high standard yeilding not at all to ordinariness or windiness in content. It definitely remains true to the highest traditions in good hymnody while undertaking the difficult task of cultivating better taste and understanding on the part of the youth in our Sunday schools and young people's societies. Also, proper cognizance is taken of the church year.

Considering all these things, it must be said that the Synod continues to be aware of the need to swim against the current in opposing the prevailing trend with regard to good taste in church music. It is true that our youth do not like the "heavy" style

of German church music and often say so. Nevertheless, the determined effort of our Synod will in time bear fruit, particularly also because in the English-speaking churches, too, there is a growing reaction against "doggerel" and "trashy music".

We may summarize by saying that although the popular English style of church music confronted us with the temptation to surrender our churchly tradition at a very important point, awareness of the danger led to a new appreciation of the gift which has been given to us with the result that thus far the official Church has faithfully done its duty in safeguarding this precious heritage.

CHAPTER XVII

Christian Education of Our Youth

Bibliography: Muecke, Geschichte. For the second section: Shick, "The Christian College", in Theologische Magazin, Sept., 1920. Crusius, "Has Elmhurst Changed?" Ibid. Mayer, "Bedenken in Bezug aufs Proseminar" (Reflections on our Proseminary), Theologische Magazin, March, 1921. R. Neibuhr, "Shall the Minister Have an Education?" Theologische Magazin, May, 1921. Bauer, Codex M and N, Sept., 1921. Hansen, "Streiflichter auf the Elmhurster Lehranstalt" (Searchlight on the Elmhurst Educational Institution) Ibid. Mayer, "Proseminar oder Proseminare" (Proseminary or Proseminaries), Theologische Magazin, July, 1921.

1. The Sunday School

During the first period of our history Christian education of our youth was rooted chiefly in our parochial schools. Even during that period we were not always able to introduce and maintain this institution. We have described the situation in Chapter IX, noting that P. Goebel in resigning his post as Inspector for the Proseminary in 1887 had charged the Synod with a serious sin of omission in not having established a single teachers' seminary and in not having nourished the parochial school as an important part of congregational life. (See Muecke, pp. 185-186) In 1888 (according to Schory, p. 136) we still had 337 parochial schools with 14,400 pupils in which 240 pastors and 128 teachers taught. At the time we had 762 congregations. Thus it appears that more than half of our local churches had no parochial schools. In these congregations Christian education was carried on exclusively in the Sunday schools of which there were 585 (apparently 180 local churches had no Sunday schools.)

In the 90's the parochial schools began to decline, first slowly, then more rapidly. In 1890 we had at Elmhurst 32 students who were preparing to become parochial school teachers. (Muecke, p. 288) During the school year 1892-93 the number rose to 43, in 1897-98 there were 21, in 1899-1900 only 10. From there on the number declined rapidly. The year 1911-12 once more recorded 16 but in 1914-15 there were only five. Then came World War I which put an end to our parochial schools entirely. Thus the matter was finally decided. In Chapter IX we explained why Catholic and Lutheran churches were more successful in this matter than we, namely, because their members are taught that they alone are the true church or have the pure doctrine and that this faith can be maintained only by their isolating themselves from outside influences and particularly by educating their youth in church schools and church institutions. Our principles prevented us from taking such a position. Consequently, the public schools had a better opening with our people.

The American considers education supremely important and is inordinately proud of his country's educational system. Nor is his pride unfounded, for, although methods of instruction have

been borrowed from Europe and much of his pedagogy has been learned from Germany, the amount of money raised for public education is tremendous. In this he is guided not only by the importance attached to intellectual development but also by the consciousness that the public school, which is there for everyone, is one of the major factors in instilling into the children of immigrants the American spirit and in bringing them up to become intelligent, patriotic citizens. Therefore, he considers it vitally important that the influence of the public school should be unimpeded. Consequently, the American is not favorably inclined toward parochial schools, especially when they are conducted in a foreign language.

Our parents for their part considered it a sacrifice when they were asked to send their children to a confirmation school, not so much because of the extra expense involved but more especially because it meant interrupting their children'a public school education and putting them at a disadvantage over against other children upon returning to public school.

So for twenty or more years we have watched the decline of our church schools everywhere and the question has arisen: How do we give our children religious education and also how do we give them a knowledge of German? With regard to the second question the answer seems clear: They must be taught German at home by their parents or they simply will not learn it at all. As for the first question the answer seemed to be that our only resource--aside from confirmation instruction--would seem to be the Sunday school. One can imagine, then, how important, under present circumstances, this institution has become. For a time an effort was made to include in the Sunday school some education in elementary German but this was not tenable. Obviously, the purpose of the Sunday school was Christian education, not language teaching. Since many children learned German at home or (before the War) even in the public schools, it was possible during this period for our Sunday schools to use the German language and German teaching materials. As late as 1920 (according to the report on the latest General Synod, p. 193) we had 198 German Sunday schools, 225 with German and English, and 612 which were exclusively English! One can see in this report the fateful effect of the War not only for the German language but for the cause of Germanism generally. We cannot here describe in detail the development of the Sunday School enterprise in the United States with its immense literature and its steadily growing resources for teaching. We cannot even undertake to describe what our Synod has contributed in this field, in English, where, since 1912, H. Kattherjohn has taken great pains to provide for our churches our own teaching materials. We remind ourselves that, unlike A. Muecke, we are not undertaking to write the history of our Synod but simply attempting to describe the religious and church life of our denomination. We need, therefore, to show to what extent the Sunday school in displacing the former parochial schools affected the life of our churches and of our church people.

First off it must be clear to everyone that the Sunday school movement created a certain sense of unity among all the Christian churches throughout our land which make use of the Sunday lessons materials published by the International Sunday School Committee. This committee selects the materials for the so-called "Uniform Lessons" in which they attempt every four years to cover the entire Bible. Naturally the treatment of the lections in the teaching materials is done by members of the various denominations and from time to time their special teachings find expression, e.g., Baptist views with regard to baptism, or Episcopal views relative to apostolic succession. We ourselves strive, insofar as possible, to promote understanding of our own church and its special principles. But it cannot be denied that the whole system tends to exert a kind of spiritual leveling influence and may easily awaken in scholars the impression that it doesn't really matter to which church one belongs. The Sunday school thus tends to become for all Protestantism one of the chief homogenizing influences. This has advantages and disadvantages, and we leave it to the individual to draw his own conclusions.

As we have already described in Chapter XVI (Section 4) it was the Sunday school which furthered the trend toward light, popular, weak, and meaningless religious music. But we will not gainsay the fact that for years now the best resources have been employed to create a preference for better music and to improve the quality of worship in the devotional part of the Sunday school hour.

Also, until now religious instruction has been done almost entirely by lay people who, of course, have had no pedagogical education of any kind,* and, consequently, do poorly as teachers. In general, what is learned in Sunday school is very little--memory work is neglected completely. What the children remember of Bible stories, golden texts, and hymn verses is as good as nothing. A systematic knowledge of the Christian faith cannot yet, in the nature of things, be imparted to them. All this may seem like a completely negative judgment. But we must not forget that the personal influence of the teacher, however lacking he or she may be in ability to teach, may still, in fact often is, very great. Also, thanks to the Sunday school the younger generation remains in touch with the church even though their participation in the worship services may be minimal. And classes for adults may serve to increase religious interest for many for whom otherwise it might become impoverished.

While in recent years we no longer have the parochial school which did help to lay some religious foundations for those not yet confirmed, we have in the Sunday school an institution for

- - - - -

* In recent years there have often been "Teacher Training Classes" for Sunday school teachers; also Summer Training Schools (Institutes) especially in Elmhurst, Illinois, and in Dunkirk, New York.

religious instruction, which, at least potentially, reaches all age groups. While at that time we were interested only in our own denomination and our concern for it perhaps was deeper and more earnest, we now have become interested in the world around us. We are more versatile, but also more superficial; more active, more progressive, but also more prone to fall for anything new; more American, less German; more active, less contemplative; more optimistic, often also more frivolous; we have distant goals but often find that our feet will not take us to that distant point upon which our eyes are fixed.

Confirmation instruction is emphasized as much as ever. But it becomes increasingly difficult to enroll the eligible children ("In other churches they don't have to learn the catechism"). Those who have been confirmed are gathered in to young people's societies which, while they may not do all they should, nevertheless do serve to keep the youth in touch with the church.

2. Higher Education

We ask: What has our Synod done to enable its young people to obtain a higher education in its own institutions-- aside from education for becoming a pastor or teacher? Most other denominations have seen this as a responsibility and some have great achievements to their credit. Regretfully, we are forced to admit that our efforts in this regard have led to very little success. It is true the fathers, especially Binner and Baltzer, considered this matter from the beginning and made great plans. Their plans came to fruition with the establishment of the "Missouri College" (in connection with the seminary in Marthasville, Missouri). Unfortunately, the "college" existed only from 1858 to 1861 (See Muecke, pp. 148-151). Since then we have not succeeded in establishing a college or institution of higher learning of any kind.*

The most we can do is to encourage our young men to go to Elmhurst and enroll there as so-called "college students". As a matter of fact, Elmhurst has been nothing more than a preparatory school for Eden Seminary and a school for the education of teachers. Eventually, there came a desire to raise Elmhurst to a higher educational level partly in order to give future pastors a better education, partly to provide a denominational college for other young people also. Already at the General Conference in 1917 it was decided to develop Elmhurst into a full-fledged college. With that in mind the Elmhurst Board was directed to see to it that the Proseminary would become at least a "Junior College" by 1921. (General Synod Minutes, 1917, p. 42, Par. 4) Consequently, every effort was made to move toward that goal, although in doing so great differences of opinion surfaced.

- - - - -

* Just recently, in 1921, our Synod took over the Robinson Academy at Waco, Texas as a preparatory school for Elmhurst and to serve as a "high school" for the Evangelical youth of that region.

There were those who feared that with the change-over to college rank the requirements for science subjects would lead to the neglect of the classical languages and history. Others feared that the Anglo-Saxon spirit would displace the German or that a greater emphasis on knowledge would be nurtured only at the expense of an emphasis on faith. In general, the professors at Eden favored maintaining the traditional character of Elmhurst, as a "college" emphasizing the humanities. A lone voice favored making Elmhurst a secondary school with emphasis on the exact sciences. Professor Mayer of Eden, while supporting the idea of emphasis on the humanities was of the opinion that instead of developing colleges our Synod ought to establish more preparatory schools for Eden. He pointed out that the Missouri Synod which had followed this plan now had 400 theological students at Concordia Seminary, making Concordia the largest seminary in America. Whereas in 1888 they had had no more theological students than we, now they had four times as many! All this can be documented by reading the pertinent articles in the Theological Magazine for 1920 and 1921. The General Conference of 1921 resolved the matter as follows: "The General Synod rejoices in the development of Elmhurst into a Junior College and instructs the Elmhurst Board to make Elmhurst into a full college as soon as possible, i. e., a standard A. B. College" (i.e., a college entitled to grant its graduates the "bachelor of arts" degree.* The General Synod, in other words, sided with Elmhurst.

This all seems to indicate that in the future more emphasis will be placed on the exact sciences and no longer will the emphasis be exclusively on the humanities and "spiritual" subjects. This represents a departure from the previous practice. But remember that the same change has been made in the educational system and the higher schools of Germany. So while the change represents a modification of our previous practice it cannot be said that the present development in any way separates us from twentieth century Germany except of course in one respect, namely that the language of instruction in Elmhurst will be English and not German for German at Elmhurst is fast dying out.

- - - - -

* This goal was to be achieved by the fall of 1924 (See Report of the Board, p. 36).

CHAPTER XVIII

The Stance of the Synod with Regard to Important Questions of Modern Times

1. The Woman Question

The so-called "woman question" is of English-American origin. It grew out of the struggle of women for complete equality with men in economic and political life.

It is not necessary here to trace this movement in detail. What concerns us is how the movement influenced the place of women in our church life. That, according to German concepts, woman's place was subordinate to that of men is a well-known fact. But in America women were from the beginning seen as having equal rights. It cannot be denied that in some respects the American man placed the woman on a kind of pedestal. For an adult male brought up in the German tradition this went against the grain. Of course, he, too, looked upon the woman, the mother, as the guardian of the religious life and, therefore, reserved for her a place of preeminence in the religious education of the children. But as in the course of time it became a burning issue whether women should have the right to vote in church meetings, men offered no little opposition. We remember well that in those days--say 25 years ago--many good old German men vigorously opposed the new trend. "Once women get the right to vote men will have nothing to say any more." At most, widows might be allowed to vote. Also, it was true of course, that especially in the cities the women were largely responsible for keeping the churches going. In American circles this was readily admitted. It was said that in the Boston area, for example, three-fourths of the churches would have to be closed if women were to withhold their support. And, naturally, one drew the proper conclusion. And although the German prejudice continued for a long time, eventually the principle of equality gained recognition without special battles. The activities of the Ladies Aid Societies were everywhere such a blessing, and contributed so significantly to the existence of the congregations that hardly any congregation existed, or could have existed, without such an organization. Men's organizations as a part of the church came along much later and up until now have not played nearly so important a role in congregational life.

Where English became the church language, or at least one of the languages used, the right of women to vote was generally recognized without delay. This was all the more true when later the practice of individual membership was introduced. With the emphasis on the obligation of individual support the difference in equality of the sexes definitely vanished. Since June, 1921, the women's societies of our Synod have been federated, that is banded together in a denominational organization, an action sanctioned by the General Conference of 1921. Thus far we have not heard of women serving on church councils nor have they served as delegates to church conferences. Still the constitution of our

Synod interposes no obstacle and in due time this will undoubtedly come to pass. On the whole the integration of women as equal members has taken place without friction.

The place of woman in marriage and family life naturally will also be influenced by this general development. In the wedding formula the Scripture text: "Women, be subject to your husbands as unto the Lord" still is used. However, in the question addressed to the bride she is merely asked if she will "be faithful to" or will "love and honor" (not if she will "obey"). In fact, no one feels that the wedding ceremony in any way subjects the wife to her husband. Complete equality of husband and wife is silently taken for granted.

With us, too, there are enough divorces, although it appears that on the whole they occur less frequently with us than among the English-American population. (Statistics with regard to this are completely lacking.)

So we must say that during the second period of our history a change with regard to the status of women is definitely recognizable. The woman was from the beginning the soul of the religious life in home and church, but she now has more rights and steps forward with greater self-confidence. She commands greater respect and, as she slowly learns the ropes with regard to parliamentary procedures in church life, is making a place for herself in public life.

The whole process has come about solely as a result of American influences and as a consequence of the adoption of the English language and of American customs. Germany had no part in the matter since the changes began in Germany only with the Revolution, even if, since then, the Germans have in many respects caught up with us.

2. The Lodge Question

Bibliography: F. Bente, American Lutheranism, Vol. II, pp. 207ff, ("Attitude towards Lodge").

The lodge question and the attitude of the church toward the lodge presents us with a specifically American problem. In Germany, too, of course, one hears recently about ministers joining the Freemasons, and the question is asked, "How can they reconcile this with their Christianity?" Years ago it would have been an impossibility. The writer remembers well how he secretly shuddered when as a boy it was whispered to him concerning a new church attendant: "He is a Freemason!"

In America the lodges have prospered tremendously and have become very popular also with German-Americans. Earlier the latter preferred their own German societies. These were mostly song or gymnastic societies. Such societies really had nothing to do with church life. But then, as a matter of fact, they were supported mostly by the liberal element. In general, they were

pervaded by an anti-church spirit stemming from the 48'ers (and even from the "anti-reactionaries" among earlier immigrants, see chapters 2 and 6). These people also had the German American press on their side. Until recently the German papers were the guardians of religious free-thinking and anti-clericalism. Nuelsen (in his "Germans in America") calls their leaders "infidels". In recent years they seem to have realized that it does not pay in America to associate one's self with irreligion. The members of their societies came to be so well known as being anti-church that their adherents were often called "Society Germans" to distinguish them from "Church Germans" and thus to highlight their anti-religious character. Naturally, this was true only with all kinds of exceptions.

These societies, however, are in decline--especially since the War--while the lodges or "secret societies" whose purpose is social fellowship and support in case of sickness or death continue to increase, since no one could object to that. However, they have also adopted as a part of their program the cultivation of humanity and of a general religiosity (belief in a high being), i.e., of the ideals of rationalism. They use certain liturgical forms in their meetings, make use of solemn vows in initiation services, and have their own funeral rites for their members. Generally speaking, these religious rituals are not specifically Christian and smack rather of a kind of universal religion.

It is at this point that the church takes offense. True the American churches have long since dropped their opposition. With them it is quite permissible for their members and pastors to join the lodges. With the Methodists, particularly, it is almost the exception if a pastor is not a lodge member. They often appear at lodge funerals wearing their short white aprons of Freemasonry to perform the lodge ritual. At lodge memorial services they are often chosen as speakers. That there is a great gulf between Christianity and lodge religion never seems to enter their consciousness. On the other hand, the minister may on such an occasion proclaim the unadulterated gospel, and the hearers consider this both expected and acceptable.

For the German it is not so easy to make the leap across this chasm. Consequently, the Lutheran church as from the beginning, so long as it continued to be German, sharply opposed the lodge. Especially the Missouri Synod has from the outset been adamant in its opposition and continues so until this very day. No member is permitted to belong to such a secret society. Other Lutheran bodies, who with the English language, also accepted English customs, have greatly modified their position. (For proof see Bente, Vol. II, p. 207ff.) With the "General Council" (Lutheran) the opposition has hardened appreciably and when it, in November, 1918, united with the "General Synod" (Lutheran) and the Lutheran Church of the South to form one body, the hope was expressed that the lax position of the General Synod with regard to the lodge question would in the future give way to a more stringent position.

Our own Synod also was not favorably inclined toward the lodges. However, we did not ever go so far as to forbid lodge membership for our lay members; the Synod did forbid membership on the part of ministers. In Paragraph 5 of the Statues (See Handbook, second edition, p. 10), we read: "For a minister to be received as a member of the Synod it is required that he not hold membership in a secret society." Concerning secret societies it is said: "There are those that practice a special ritual and obligate their members life-long by a special oath."

In our first period it would have been unthinkable that a minister would have acted contrary to this paragraph. But the times have changed. For years in certain Districts the proposal has been made to drop the "Lodge Paragraph". It is argued that to permit lay members to join a lodge while denying ministers to do so is contracdictory. The Districts in which this issue arises are always those that have become predominantly English, such as Indiana, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and New York. In the German Districts the situation is different. Especially in the North Illinois District the sentiment against lodge membership for ministers is overwhelming. Moreover, the Synod as a whole seems not inclined to depart from its age-old practice. When in the General Synod of 1921 overtures from several Districts to cancel the "Lodge Paragraph" were referred to a meeting of the clergy present the proposal was turned down by a majority vote.*

Nevertheless in many circles of our clergy the sentiment is completely otherwise; for them, therefore, the "Lodge Paragraph" is a dead letter. What the future will bring is hard to say. Probably much will depend upon the attitude of the individual minister. At any rate we have to do here with another area in which the language and customs of our land have created a definite break with regard to the attitudes and practices of our past.

3. Prohibition

Bibliography: Chas. Stelzle, Why Prohibition?, 1918; many other writings on the same subject.

For the members of most English churches there has not been for years any question more important than the temperance issue. Especially the large and influential Methodist Church has for decades waged a relentless war against the saloon and the liquor traffic. The women, organized to for the "Women's Christian Temperance Societies", have been pioneering crusaders in this matter. Almost everywhere they could count on the support of the

- - - - -

* However, the tone of the denial was not nearly so sharp as e.g. at the General Synod of 1905 where it was voted: (See Minutes p. 37, Par. 14): "The Synod emphasizes strongly that ministers and teachers who join a lodge are to be considered as excluded from membership in the Synod." Hence, the milder tone must be seen also as a sign of the times.

churches. For a time the Episcopal Church took a more or less neutral position. This, however, is true no longer. The Sunday school became a strong and promising ally in the continuing effort to get the younger generation to reject intoxicating liquors. Pastors, and especially special temperance speakers, have had a strong influence on public opinion. Thus it has finally come about that in the United States the manufacture and sale of alcoholic beverages has been declared illegal. It was a long battle which began in the 1870's, and one which did not culminate in victory for the Prohibitionists until fifty years later. From "local option" laws with which only an individual county was made dry, the movement progressed to state-wide prohibition, and in 1918, with the adoption of the "18th amendment" Prohibition became the law of the land.

We cannot undertake to present even in outline form the story of the introduction of Prohibition. We are concerned only with the position of our own denomination and with how in the course of time our position changed, for it can be documented that a change actually did occur. For most Germans the "temperance movement" originally went against the grain. The German was willing to take a lot of things from the Americans, but when they wanted to take away his beer he felt his personal freedom was threatened. It must be remembered that temperance was never promoted as meaning "moderate usage" but always as meaning "total abstinence". The American churches would have nothing to do with proposals for regulating, restricting, or reforming the saloon; they were concerned to completely abolish this "den of iniquity".

During the early period of our history our Synod had no occasion to be concerned about Prohibition or to take a stand with regard to it. In the second period it was otherwise. Of course, the great majority of our pastors and members continued now as before in objecting to Prohibition on principle and to favor instead moderation in the use of alcohol. But as the English language came into use and as the American religious atmosphere began to be felt, a change became perceptible. One sees this in reading our church periodicals. The German periodical, the honore "Friedensbote" (Dr. A. Jungk, editor since 1898)* cultivated our German traditions. Obviously one could not become a defender of the saloon, but also one did not need to advocate Prohibition. One was inclined simply to ignore the matter. In the English publication, The Evangelical Herald, a different spirit prevailed (Editor J. H. Horstmann since 1906). This publication always took a stand with regard to temperance more in line with the American church papers, without, however, sharing their fanaticism, and since the adoption of the 18th amendment has been quite ready to point out the blessings attributable to abolition of the saloon. In doing so the editor did not need to be afraid that his readers would cancel their subscriptions, for it is an observable and often-mentioned fact that when a congregation changed over to the English the

- - - - -

* Since his death on Jan. 2, 1923: O. Press

temperance spirit soon began to take over.

Officially, to the best of our knowledge, our Synod never took a position for or against Prohibition, even if President Pister, in his typical temperamental manner, sometimes leveled a barb at it in his annual reports. Also the previous editor of the "Theologische Magazin" (L. Haas) from time to time criticized the people who tried to improve their neighbors by means of legal restrictions.

Nowadays, the old German traditions have their defenders only in the western German dailies. German-Americans know little about the temperance movement of the past two decades in Germany and are not influenced by it. Also the support of Prohibition on the part of many in our Synod cannot be traced back to any German influence but is due solely to the way in which the tremendous wave of Prohibition sentiment in the English churches has engulfed our people also.

4. Social Concerns

Bibliography: (Drawn from our Synodical Circles and published in the "Theologische Magazin"): Hahn, "Religion in the Corporate Life of the World", September, 1920. Jagdstein, "Recht und Unrecht im Sozialismus", March, 1921. H. Niebuhr, "Alliance between Labor and Religion", May, 1921. Hahn, "The Social Problem a Challenge to the Church", January, 1922. Vieth, "Relation of the Church to Civilization", May, 1922. H. Niebuhr, "Christianity and the Social Problem", July, 1922. "What a Minister Ought to Know about the Social Question", January, 1922.

In Germany Stoecker was the pioneer for social (in the sense of social-political) concern within the church. It began with the "Ice Cellar Meetings" in 1877 (See D. von Oertzen, Lebensbild von Adolf Stoecker, Vol. II, Chapter 6). Later--following the attempts to assassinate Kaiser William I--Bismarck promoted social legislation which attempted to apply Christian principles to the social life of the nation. Both movements sought to free the workers from the grip of socialism and to win them for loyalty to the church and the state. As we know now that goal was never reached.

In America socialism took root much later and with greater difficulty than in Germany. This was due largely to the more favorable economic conditions and better working conditions; also to less rigidity in social stratification. Only the increasing industrialization, accompanied by the concentration of capital and the rise of the labor union movement and the growing surplus of immigrant labor, eventually brought about a change and confronted the church with the problem of how to prevent the masses from becoming infected by the socialistic hostility toward religion. It was really W. Rauschenbusch who, with his book, The Church and the Social Crisis, published in 1907, finally opened people's eyes. Since then the social question has become a burning issue in the religious life of our country. For a long

time our Synod distanced itself from the social question (as described above). It was our heritage and nature to limit ourselves to the preaching of the Word and the religious education of our members; we strictly avoided involvement in public, and particularly, political life. This position was due in large part to a strong Lutheran heritage. The Lutheran Church, true to its great reformer, has always been happy so long as no one confronted it with any obstacle to the preaching of the Word. For it this preaching was one of faith and salvation focused on saving the soul of the individual. So long as this freedom was assured, one was perfectly willing to let the state take care of the living and social arrangements of the people. It was a matter of giving to Caesar "that which is Caesar's". It was a Christian's duty to adjust as best he could to laws of the state.

This position is generally speaking upheld to this day by American Lutheranism, though, of course, not all local congregations go equally far along these lines. Only a few years ago the then president of the Missouri Synod, Pfotenhauer, in a public address concerning social work emphasized that it was the duty of the Church to preach the Christian gospel but that it was not the duty of the church to be concerned with changing the social order or with social legislation. The Lutheran Church insists on strict separation of church and state. The Church's preoccupation is with matters ecclesiastical or dogmatic; for social ethics it has neither calling nor gift.

The Evangelical Synod came to grips with this social question for the first time at the General Conference of 1913 (Louisville, Kentucky) when a social-action-minded pastor accused our Church of having no understanding for the rights of labor (General Conference Minutes, p. 21ff). This charge was vehemently denied by the then President Pister who called attention to our 30 benevolent institutions in which, he said, a great deal of social work was being done. (One notes that Pister interpreted social concern as having to do with the practice of benevolence.) Based on the President's report the Synod adopted the following resolution: "The Synod strongly warns its members against the dangers of socialism and protests against the accusation that our Synod does not care about the poor and needy, that is the workers, but believes that it is entirely appropriate that its pastors should acquaint themselves with the economic problems of socialism." Moreover, at the same Conference, following a paper by J. H. Horstmann on "The Gospel of the Kingdom and Its Task in the Twentieth Century" it was voted to create a Commission for Social Welfare which was to study the social problem and report annually to the Districts. (Minutes, p. 305) This Commission made its first report to the General Conference at Pittsburgh in 1917. The report states: "The whole meaning of the religion of Jesus is summed up in the concept, 'The Kingdom of God'. The church of Jesus Christ must strive for a social order whose basic law is the will of God. Already in the past the church has been concerned with the plight of the needy. In the future the church must focus on the prevention of poverty. In various ways pastors and congregations in these days

of social contradictions must be made aware of our social problems."

In all this one recognized clearly the influence of the teachings of Rauschenbusch who was asked by the Commission to give a lecture on social concerns at the seminary on January 19, 1917. (General Conference Minutes, 1917, p. 159-161.) The Commission's name was changed to: "Commission for Christian Social Work." Provision was made to see to it that this whole area of concern would be dealt with also in the Districts and in the periodicals of the Synod.

J. H. Horstmann, editor of the "Evangelical Herald," deserves full credit for bringing this whole program into the foreground of our attention. He has since, in a leading article in his periodical, done yeoman service in clarifying fully this matter still so new to many of us. For a time he devoted a full page every month to the discussion of Christian social concerns. The special editor for this page was Wallis of Chicago. By contrast, the "Friedensbote" continued, now as before, to limit itself to the reporting of religious and church news, although this too, on occasion, touched on interesting items concerning capital and labor. The difference between the two periodicals in this regard is readily explainable. The "Friedensbote" upheld the traditions of German church periodicals while the "Herald" was following the lead of the new movement which makes the Kingdom of God in a social sense its guiding principle. The "Friedensbote" was simply recognizing the fact that up until now our congregations have had little understnaidng or concern for social problems.

The same was not true in equal measure for our pastors. True, very few had taken to preaching social gospel sermons but many gave evidence of an interest in the underlying problems. This is plainly indicated by the appearance of frequent articles on social issues which have appeared in the "Theological Magazine" in recent years. (See bibliography) Outstanding among these have been the articles by Professor Niebuhr and Pastor Hahn. Another forward step was taken at the General Conference in 1921. It was voted to create a "Commission for Social Service". The earlier Commission for Social Work, meanwhile had become inactive. Also the so-called "Social Ideals" of the Federal Council (more later) were adopted. These asked for such things as: worker protection laws, adequate wages, shorter working hours, prohibition of child labor, etc. Leadership in this matter was given by the Ohio District.

In general it must be said that while our Synod is officially obligated to work together with the other English-American churches in matters of this sort, the majority of our pastors and congregations are still following the old patterns and it will take some time before the spirit of social Christianity completely permeates our denomination.

It is, however, significant that both our most recent

English hymnals, the "Evangelical Hymnal" of 1917 and the "Elmhurst Hymnal" of 1921 have introduced a new section of hymns entitled, "Social (or Christian) Service and Brotherhood" which breathes the spirit of a new day. Good examples are F. M. North's "Where Cross the Crowded Ways of Life" and Gilman's "God Send Us Men", the second verse of which reads:

"God send us men alert and quick
His lofty precepts to translate,
Until the laws of Christ become
The laws and habits of the state."

In view of the ever closer relationship of the life of our Synod with that of the whole American people, it is not difficult to predict what the future development will be. In this field particularly one sees how the typical American pattern is being woven into the old fabric of our denominational life.

CHAPTER XIX

Efforts toward Church Unity in New Times

Bibliography: The Progress of Church Federation to 1922, by Charles S. MacFarland, 1922. The Churches Allied for Common Tasks, by S. McCrea Cavert, 1921. Christian Unity, Its Principles and Possibilities, by the Committee on War and the Religious Outlook, 1921. The Problem of Christian Unity by various writers, 1921. The Call to Unity by Will T. Manning, 1920.

Protestantism brought with it the emancipation of the conscience of the individual. Under certain circumstances it was forced to drive the principle to extremes. In those countries in which, through dependence on the government, a state church was maintained, it was possible to avoid this danger. Where, however, freedom of religion was more strongly expressed, the formation of sects and the development of splinters from the state church followed. This was especially true, and in fact unavoidable, in Calvinism with its strong emphasis on the autonomy of the local congregation. Thus it is that we see in England the founding of new church groups such as the Dissenters and the Nonconformists. In America where, in the absence of historical limitations, the free church found fertile soil, the movement for the formation of sects grew like weeds. Even today, despite the reaction which has already set in, we count no fewer than 202 denominations (See Official Census Report, "Religious Bodies", 1916, p. 14.)

Such a proliferation of religious corporations, which all too often based their origin on completely arbitrary discretion and resulted in the wanton squandering of resources, both personal and financial, could not be allowed to continue indefinitely. The question was bound to arise: Why this wasteful over-lapping? Also the faith in one universal Christian Church was bound to militate against it. True, it took a long time for the counter movement to become effective enough to inhibit this growing evil, but the last 25 years clearly indicate a turn of events.

So long as doctrinal supremacy remained unchallenged, there could be no hope. So long as every jot and tittle of one's particular belief and churchly practice was considered essential and indispensable, the divisions in the body of Christ could only go from bad to worse. Eventually personal experience and the common will demanded that essentials be separated from non-essentials and that a distinction be made between the divine treasure and the earthly vessels. People began to perceive that according to the teaching and spirit of Christ, Christian living consisted not in ritual and customs that, while doctrine and understanding might be important, loving attitudes and actions were more important. So as time went on denominational differences seemed less significant. It was recognized that while with regard to many things Christians might differ, in important matters they

ould work together.

This understanding led to certain creations which are common to all denominations, as, for example, the Y.M.C.A. and Y.W.C.A., the Christian Endeavor Society, the International Sunday School Association, the Student Volunteer Movement, the Temperance Societies, etc. Particularly in the field of Christian missions the need for consolidation was felt. Both in world missions and in homeland missions the denominations began to coordinate their efforts.

Finally the spirit of brotherhood broke through in the denominations themselves, eventually finding expression in a new organization which now encompasses 30 denominational bodies, namely, the so-called "Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America." The conference at which the first constitution for the Federal Council was adopted took place in New York in 1905. After this provisional constitution had been approved by the denominations concerned, the final organization of the Federal Council was completed in Philadelphia in 1908. (See "Progress of Church Federation", p. 30ff.) According to the constitution the Federal Council (see p. 31) has essentially a practical purpose, namely to unite the denominations more closely in order that they might exert a stronger influence in public life and thus make their work more fruitful for the Lord and for the world.

"The Federal Council has no authority over the several churches which constitute its membership. It wishes only to counsel and help, never to order or command. It has no power to adopt a creedal statement, nor church polity, nor service liturgy, nor in any way to limit the autonomy of the denominations." Thus while the Federal Council in no way affects the creeds of the various churches it nevertheless has a certain doctrinal basis. According to the "preamble" it unites the churches which "believe in the essential unity of the churches in Jesus Christ, their divine Lord and Savior" (p. 32). Accordingly it holds fast to the divinity of Christ whether or not this is interpreted after the manner of the Nicene or Athanasian creed. Consequently, the Council has no room for the Unitarians who according to their chief representative, Charles Eliot, the former president of Harvard University, claim to have excluded all "ancient" dogmas, including, according to Eliot, original sin, substitutionary atonement, resurrection of the body and, of course, the Trinity. (See Eliot, "The Road to Unity among the Christian Churches," 1920) While adhering to general Christian foundations, the work of the Federal Council is directed toward practical goals. Its work is carried out by special commissions, as e. g. the Commissions for Evangelization and Recruitment, for Christian Education, for Social Welfare, for International Relations, etc. (See Cavert, "Churches Allied for Common Tasks," p. 32ff.) Also the Federal Council is concerned to prevent unnecessary competition in the establishing of new congregations in America and to seek to bring about more cooperation between the missionary societies of the denominations in their overseas work. This is done through the so-called "Home Missions Council

(established 1908) and the "Foreign Missions Conference of North America" (established 1895). Both these organizations were founded independently of the Federal Council but both are now in close relationship with the Council.

Our Synod has from the beginning been supportive of this movement for friendly cooperation among the denominations. Its basic principles would seem to have required such support. Anything and everything directed toward interdenominational unity was given a friendly reception. So long as no essential parts of the Christian faith were being given up, we were ready to accept differences in non-essentials all the more since the principles of the Federal Council in no way affected the teachings and practices of the several denominations. So it was that our Synod was represented at the initial meeting in New York in 1905 and also at the constituting convention in Philadelphia in 1908. At the General Conference in Burlington, Iowa, definitive action was taken for our Synod to become a member of the Federal Council "on the condition that should the Council receive into membership any denomination which denies the divinity of Christ or the Holy Trinity our officers be authorized to declare the withdrawal of our Synod." (Minutes, p. 215) The condition attached to the Synod's action indicates clearly that we were not willing for the sake of unity to accept any detractions whatsoever from the revealed truths of salvation.

At the meeting of the Federal Council in Chicago, December 4-9, 1912, our delegates presented a resolution, which was adopted, calling for the general celebration of the quadricentennial of the Reformation in 1917. Our General Conference in 1913 took cognizance of the Council's action and again, with regard to the new interdenominational agency, adopted a resolution stating: "We consider it to be a great blessing that our church, having as its motto Ephesians 4:3-8, has declared its willingness to strive for and cultivate unity with those church bodies which take their stand on Hebrews 13:8." (Minutes, p. 34) No one could have guessed that the cup of joyful enthusiasm would so soon become the cup of bitterness.

By the time of the General Conference of 1917 (September 25-October 5) our country was at war with Germany. The American churches, generally speaking, had from the beginning been anti-German. So the atmosphere at the General Conference was tense and unfavorable toward the Federal Council. The Synod President in his address voiced the feeling of many members of the Synod but was of the opinion that nothing was to be gained by withdrawing from the Federal Council. By so doing we would only lose what influence we might have. So things stayed as they were but the earlier joy and confidence were gone. Likewise, at the General Synod of 1921, our membership in the Federal Council was retained, but the rift was still unhealed and many would have favored parting company with the Council. In the following chapter we shall have occasion to discuss the effect of the war on our Synod.

The uniting of denominations in the Federal Council is, as we have seen, rather loose. The Council has no legislative or judicial control over the individual denominations. It is simply a medium through which the several churches are kept in touch with one another and through which, by mutual exchange, their work can be better planned and become more effective. As a result of united efforts during wartime the churches had been brought closer together and had begun to sense a kind of solidarity such as they had not experienced before. What was possible in time of war should also be possible during times of peace. Why not grasp the opportunity to let the heat of wartime enthusiasm weld all the churches of the land into a larger unity? Such feelings and wishes were in the air and they found expression and release in the so-called "Movement for Organic Union" (of the Churches). In December, 1918, a meeting was held in Philadelphia for the purpose of promoting organic union of the churches. Nineteen denominations sent delegates. Our Synod, too, was represented. The goal was to be a real union of all the Protestant denominations of the land, not merely a federation such as existed in the Federal Council. The vision was of a united church body similar to the union of states in the United States. Individual communions, like the states in the Union, would retain certain rights of self-government while delegating certain other responsibilities to the total church. Expectations ran high, especially among Presbyterians, with whom the plan had originated. But soon the good wine of high hopes was diluted with water when the Methodist Church declared itself in favor of cooperation but opposed to organic union. The whole matter had been conceived too idealistically and no practical steps toward realization of the dream were ever undertaken. Our officers mention the matter in their reports to the General Conference of 1921 but no resolution concerning the proposal was adopted, this despite the fact that idealists among us surrendered the dream only with the greatest reluctance.

The matter of union of the churches is one of vital interest, especially for the Episcopal Church. However, its concern is not simply for a union of Protestants but of Catholics also. With undefeatable optimism the Episcopal Church will not consider even Rome as lost in looking to future goals. It feels that of all the churches it is the Episcopal Church which, by reason of its nature and history, is best qualified to bring the separated churches together. It believes that it incorporates within itself both the principle of personal freedom essential to Protestantism and the authority and dignity of Catholicism (See Manning, "Call to Unity"). Therefore, it issued a call to a Conference "On Faith and Order" which met in Geneva in 1920. The Roman Catholic Church naturally declined the invitation. The Greek Catholic Church, on the other hand, accepted most cordially; also the Protestant churches were strongly represented. It soon became clear, however, that the program proposed by the Episcopalians was unacceptable to other Protestant churches. The Episcopal Church can countenance great doctrinal diversity but stands adamant with regard to the apostolic succession, the importance of ordination, and the

emphasis on the worship liturgy. If there is to be a real church union with worshiping and taking communion together, and not merely cooperative work, it will be necessary for the clergy of other denominations to be confirmed (re-ordained) by the Episcopal Church, as the church of unbroken episcopal succession. In other words, to become members of the one Christian Church all must enter by way of the Episcopal door. This Protestantism will never agree to do. So long as the Episcopal Church will not depart from this position it cannot hope to be the mediator for church union.

Our Synod did not participate in the Geneva Conference.

The above-mentioned strivings toward church union constitute an important chapter in the history of American Protestantism. Their effect on us makes very clear that our Synod has entered a new epoch in its own development. Note the contrast between the exclusiveness of our first period with our present relationship to the other churches of our land! Far be it from us to praise the present at the cost of the past; we are simply stating a fact. It was necessary and natural that the first decades of our existence should be dedicated to our own development. Under the existing circumstances the concentration on our own interest was inevitable, and the language difference only served to deepen the chasm. But as one generation followed another and we found ourselves responsible for a generation of young people to whom the language of their parents had become a foreign tongue, the time was at hand for us to make adjustments to the changed conditions. But when this generation had grown to adulthood and began to share responsibility with their elders a big step forward had to be taken. What was incipient already in the 90's has become a reality in this twentieth century. Had the process not been interrupted by the war and its unfortunate disruptions of the feeling of unity, the process would be even further along and the alienation of a substantial portion of our membership would have been avoided.

Today it is clear that the future for us cannot be limited to closer relationships with other churches and to membership in the Federal Council. The thought of organic union has been with us since the beginning. We have, however, entered into a federation with churches representative of American Calvinism, i.e., with churches not content simply to preach the gospel but determined, instead, to have a strong, often determinative, influence on our public life, its laws, and institutions.* This means a remarkable deviation from our more Lutheran past as also from the Pietism of our fathers. The Lutheran Church has seldom sought to influence the state or public life, and Pietism preferred to withdraw from the world rather than to try to change

- - - - -

* In speaking about a rapprochement to Calvinism we, of course, are not thinking about Calvinistic dogmas, but rather about its ecclesiastical system which has a reforming influence on the organized life of the world.

the world. Even today the great majority of Lutheran churches in our land takes this position. The Missouri Synod Lutherans are not considering joining the Federal Council of Churches. They have moreover definitely declined, as a church, to take a stand with regard to social legislation. In our Synod, too, there are many who are not interested in trying to bring about a new order in social relationships, but would rather limit their concern to the customary matters having to do solely with the church.

Our relationship with the other churches of our land holding membership in the Federal Council has, however, forced us to take a position with regard to questions pertaining to social and public affairs. At the General Synod in New Bremen we made important and significant decisions relating to such matters. We declared ourselves in support of the so-called "social ideals" of the Christian churches which work for the protection of labor and toward social justice (See Chap. XVIII). The General Synod, moreover, authorized its officers to work for the adoption of uniform marriage laws in all the states (Minutes, p. 38) and, finally, directed a strong appeal to the President of the United States to place the full influence of the American nation behind the movement for the universal disarmament of all nations. (This had to do with the proposed call to a Disarmament Conference to be held in Washington.)

These things serve to indicate the direction in which our development is going. They show that one cannot give up one's isolationism without becoming subject to the temper of the times. They remind us that we shall have to do in the future many things which would never have occurred to our fathers. The conservative and thoughtful sector of our fellowship often confronts these things with real concern. Our progressive members, and especially our youth, believe they are smelling the fresh morning air of a new day to which they look forward with glad anticipation.

CHAPTER XX

The World War and Its Effect on Our Church Life

Bibliography: The voluminous war literature of the usual sort is not considered here. "The Churches and the Moral Aims of the War" series (5 numbers) printed for the National Committee on the Church and the Moral War Aims. Federal Council's Report of Special Meeting, May 6-8, 1919, Cleveland, Ohio. "Der Krieg", L. Haas, Theologische Magazin, January, 1915. "Aug der Schwelle einer Neuen Wolt", H. Kamphausen, Theologische Magazin, 1919. Krause, "Relationship of the Evangelical Synod to the Evangelical Church of Germany," Theologische Magazin, Sept., 1919.

When in August, 1914, Germany's war against the Allies broke out there were in foreign lands few enclaves of German-speaking people more deeply affected than were the German-Americans of the Evangelical Synod. We felt, instinctively, that this war would have for us the most tragic consequences. Should the Germans win one could expect a strengthening of Germanism around the world. Were the war to end--as seemed likely--in a military defeat for Germany, it was bound to have unhappy consequences for the German cause also in America. From the outset there could be no doubt as to where the sympathies of most English-speaking Americans lay. True, President Wilson in his first address to the American people spoke freely about absolute neutrality, not only in deeds but also in words and attitudes, but it soon became evident that this would remain idle talk. Almost immediately the public press launched a strong campaign of propaganda favoring the Allied cause. The invasion of Belgium by Germany provided from the outset an especially strong argument that Germany was in the wrong. Bethmann Hollweg's clumsy defense of the invasion, including his unforgivable labeling of the Belgian neutrality pact as nothing more than a "scrap of paper", greatly worsened the situation, giving the enemy a strong talking point. Soon there were huge munitions deliveries and financial support for the Entente; American financiers who had financed the Allied cause determined the politics of leading organs of the public press. In a short time propaganda took over the headlines. Under the influence of propaganda the general public soon began to feel that right was on the side of the Entente and that Germany was obviously in the wrong. The Anglo-American, let it be said, has never had much understanding or sympathy for German institutions. By history, politics, thought patterns, and a common language he felt bound to England. Now, however, it became clear as daylight to him that Germany was militaristic and was bent on economic domination of the world while her opponents stood for freedom and self-determination and that, therefore, the battle was one between might and right.

President Wilson never did love Germany; he loved and honored the "classical lands of political freedom, the mother countries of our own political institutions." He sought, of course, to maintain a kind of diplomatic evenhandedness, but his protests against Allied violations of our neutrality were always

mild and benign while his notes to Germany were sharp and threatening. When the Germans made the big mistake of sinking the Lusitania it seemed a break was inevitable. That the sinking did not immediately lead to war was due to the position taken by the then Secretary of State, W. J. Bryan, who was thoroughly pacifistic.

German-Americans suffered greatly under these circumstances. Encouraged by Germany's heroism and battlefield victories they did their best to sway public opinion. Because of their own disunity and lack of expertise in political affairs their political influence had always been minimal but was at least noticeable. Up until the time of Wilson's re-election in 1916, public sentiment, on the whole, opposed America's entry into the war.

In our Synod the great majority, during those years, were on the side of Germany. This was evident from the lead articles in our German publications, the "Friedensbote" and the "Theologische Magazin". On the part of those born in America there was, undeniably, a certain ambivalence. The daily reports of German "atrocities" and the one-sided judgments expressed in the daily papers had begun to do their work. Already there were divisions and they were destined to become worse.

So we came to the presidential election campaign of 1916. That Wilson campaigned under the slogan: "He kept us out of war", indicates clearly where public sentiment stood at the time. Wilson's opponent was Charles E. Hughes. The majority of German-Americans supported Hughes. Despite Wilson's high-sounding campaign slogan, they did not trust Wilson. It may well be argued, of course, whether or not Hughes was any more friendly toward the Germans. But the fanatical hatred which Wilson later showed and his complete failure at Versailles, would not have been expected from Hughes. Hughes, of course, was completely under the influence of Roosevelt, who favored war, but even Roosevelt, we believe, could never have sinned so grossly against humanity as did Wilson.

Once Wilson had been elected, the decision came quickly. In February, 1917, the Germans announced their unlimited U-boat warfare. Soon thereafter the infamous telegram of Dr. Zimmermann, Germany's Secretary of State, to his ambassador in Mexico was made public by our government. In this telegram Zimmermann sought to win Mexico for the German side by promising that in case of a German victory Mexico might expect to get several American border states! It is doubtful that anything quite so foolish was ever perpetrated by a Secretary of State. The effect of the announcement was like that of a spark falling into a powderkeg. It immediately inflamed public opinion. It is a well-known fact that even at that time the majority in Congress still opposed war. If a declaration of war nevertheless came this was due solely to the work of Wilson. As we have said a massive propaganda campaign had had its effect. Many univeristy professors, editors of big city dailies and periodicals, as well

as many influential clergymen had long been beating the drums for war. But it would not have led to war had our President opposed it. His ability, by reason of his overpowering personality and his eloquence in public address, to influence people's thinking had become immeasurable. This one man was more powerful than Congress, and this one man was for war. It has often been debated whether Wilson up until the time of his re-election really was determined to maintain the peace. It is known that the German ambassador, Bernstorff, believed in Wilson's love of peace (See his "My Three Years in America"). He declares that Wilson wanted to be acclaimed by history as The Peacemaker and that the German U-Boat war frustrated his ambition. Others have judged otherwise, concluding that Wilson's peace talk was pure hypocrisy. We shall not try to decide the issue. Suffice it to say that America's decision to enter the war was the work of Wilson. Without him, and in opposition to him, America would not have entered the war.

On Good Friday, 1917, Congress adopted a resolution, declaring that a state of war existed between the United States and Germany. It was the darkest Good Friday in German-American history! During the early years of the war German Americans had frequently and strongly taken a stand, particularly also in the public press, in support of Germany. Now that America had identified itself with the Allied cause, this would not be forgotten. Americans became obsessed by a stupid and unfounded but none-the-less virulent fear of spies. And every German-American was looked upon as a potential spy and enemy of America. If he had been for Germany earlier he no doubt still was, so it was said. His sympathies, it is true, were still with Germany. But it was not true that he was an enemy of his adopted country. On the contrary the German-American knew what his duty was and did it. He gave his sons to fight in the American armed forces. He placed his money on his country's altar. That he did not do all this as gladly as the Anglo-American was of course true. How could it have been otherwise?

There was directed against him, however, the senseless fury of a whipped-up highly incensed public opinion. Throughout the land, in the cities, and particularly in the small towns, people took out their hatred on their German-American neighbors. The despicable work of hatred was carried out by the common people, but their passions were inflamed by spirited public speakers at public meetings, from church pulpits, and the news conferences of a war-mad press. Only seldom did the higher-ups seek to quell the excesses of the masses.

The German churches were a favorite target for the hate attacks. Worship services were disrupted, churches were broken into, German books thrown out and burned, and church property damaged in other ways. German papers or church periodicals could no longer be sold publicly. Many German-American citizens were openly reviled. The Germans lived in an atmosphere of hatred under the vigilant eyes of suspicious neighbors. Things became even worse after the infamous espionage act was adopted. Now

written and oral expressions were subjected to censorship and severe penalties provided for such as were deemed indicative of disloyalty. Hardly a word could be said or printed which was not subject to misinterpretation by evil-spirited individuals always with the threat of dire consequences for the person concerned.

How did the American churches conduct themselves during this critical time? Were they the shining exception to the prevailing attitude? Did they at least raise their voices in a plea for justice, reasonableness, and common sense? One regrets to have to report that they in no way rose above the low level of the prevailing hatred. On the contrary, those who wore ties and black coats were all too often the very people who helped stoke the fires of hatred. We need only to mention Dr. Hillis, of Brooklyn Tabernacle, Evangelist Billy Sunday, and the Presbyterian pastor H. Van Dyke (for a time our ambassador to the Netherlands) and immediately one gets a picture of how the pulpit lowered itself to the low level of the prevailing passions.

But how was it, you ask, with the Federal Council, described in the previous chapter as the representative of thirty Protestant denominations? Well, it must be said that the Council in its official utterances never stooped to the low level of the preachers of hate, but it must also be said that it never openly criticized or opposed the clerical hate-mongers. From the outset, the Council placed itself completely at the disposal of the government. The churches of other nations, of course, did the same thing. German war sermons were often quoted in which the war was described as a holy crusade, and as a war for the achievement of the will of God. In general that was not the tone of German preaching. On the average the interpretation was simply that this was a war of self-preservation, a war in defense of the fatherland and of the German home and hearth.

For the Council this did not suffice. It would of course have been difficult to say that we had to defend our borders or that our national existence was threatened. The simple turning aside of the U-boats or the support of the Allies in and of itself would not have been a sufficient call to arms. With Americans one needed to appeal to higher things, to ideals. So Wilson succeeded in coining the extremely effective phrase, "To make the world safe for democracy", as expressing our real war aim. And the Federal Council picked up and used this significant phrase with great enthusiasm. This war, in other words was no ordinary war but a holy crusade. We were fighting not for the Allies, much less for territorial gain or economic advantage but for an ideal, for democracy, for the freedom of peoples, for international law. (See "Moral Aims of the War", No. 1, p. 6) This was to be a war to end all wars and a League of Nations, to be created, was to be the instrument for achieving this glorious goal. Now the Council had found truly high ground on which to stand. The war had been lifted above the low level of other wars and had become a war of right versus wrong. It had to be fought, to be sure,with earthly weapons, but it was a war for noble, even spiritual, principles. One issue after another of the "Moral War

Aims Series" came out seeking to strengthen the faithful in the assurance that Jesus Christ, the great prophet of genuine democracy, was really our highest leader in this great conflict. A collection of war texts was put together and sent to the pastors. Most were from the Old Testament, reminding people that Jehovah was for the ancient Hebrews the God of Battle; this despite the fact that earlier German theologians had often been criticized for demeaning God in this way. Several passages from the New Testament were unfortunate choices, e. g., Peter's word, "Here are two swords," and Jesus' word, "It is enough"; also that other word from Jesus: "I have not come to bring peace, but a sword."

Such mailings came regularly also to the pastors of our Synod. They were statements in themselves quite understandable but which never once had anything good to say about the enemy but instead saw in him only wickedness and inhumanity while the Allies incorporated all things good and noble and Christly. Naturally those among us who knew and loved Germany felt deeply aggrieved. They left behind a sting which to this day has not been removed.

It is readily seen that our own church's position had to take into account a variety of conditions. Under the circumstances it was not to be expected that we should be able to present a united front. Even before the war there were those among us who had been strongly influenced by the Allied propaganda. After the war this was even more so. Wilson's beautiful speeches, his enthusiasm for the ideal of a worl made safe for democracy found acceptance also among us. Most of our older pastors received his emphatic assertions with great skepticism and on occasion said so publicly. Many among them paid for their boldness by being arrested. All German churches suffered greatly during the war years because of the raging epidemic of hatred. Our churches perhaps more than others because before the war we had often spoken of the Evangelical Church of Germany as our "mother church". We sometimes claimed that we represented the Prussian Church of the Union transplanted to American soil. Consequently we now were accused, especially by the Lutherans, of being "The Kaiser's Church". Our president, consequently felt called upon to reject this accusation and to emphasize that our denomination, historically, constitutionally, and temperamentally was a thoroughly American institution (See Schuetze, Evangelical Church Politics, "Theologische Magazin", January, 1919, p. 20ff.) Many thought he had gone too far in his disclaimer and did not hesitate to contend that our Synod was a legitimate offshoot of the German mother church and had no reason to be ashamed of this heritage. They urged that our church remain true to her heritage even now. (See Krause, Relationship of the Evanglical Synod to the Evangelical Church of Germany, "Theologische Magazin", Sept., 1919, p. 330ff.) Our pastors and officers found themselves in a very delicate position and often needed much wisdom, self-discipline, and courage to always steer the right course. Those who had strong pro-German sympathies often became embittered with the result that here and there per-

sonal relationships were strained or even broken publicly.

Then came the Peace of Versailles and with it the greatest disillusionment the world had even known. The empty promises of the Allies were revealed. The "secret agreements" came to light, and it was soon evident that from the beginning the aim had been robbery and exploitation. And Wilson signed this product of shame and hatred! It turned out that those who had never trusted him had been right, and that those who had looked to him as a kind of world savior had been shamefully deceived. The years following the "peace" have completely unmasked the victors who during the war years masqueraded so effectively as world liberators. One would have thought that in the light of post-war developments, the American people as a whole would have recognized their mistake and would have angrily turned away from those who had so long deceived them. That they did not do so is a painful experience for all lovers of truth and, at the same time, evidence of how uncritically the masses allowed themselves to be misled by the press and how completely the poison of a slanderous propaganda had penetrated the nation's soul.

In our Synod, on the other hand, the love of a people for their old fatherland could once again find full expression. Most of them now saw for what it really was, the idealism of their enemies. It pained them to see how Germany was ravaged and with what deception she was treated. A great Relief Program was undertaken to help the suffering and impoverished people of Germany. By the time the General Conference met in New Bremen (end of September, 1921) the amount contributed in money and material gifts came to 20 million marks, (at that time a dollar was worth 100 German marks) so that the total contributed came to $200,000. The relief program has been continued and, in response to the increasing need, has been accelerated.

The effects of the war on our church life have been profound. This is seen particularly with regard to the language question. The use of English began to spread very rapidly and little could be done to resist the trend. The change is especially noticeable in our Sunday schools. In 1913 595 Sunday schools were still being conducted in German, while 284 used the English and 252 used both languages. By 1920 only 198 Sunday schools used German, 612 were English and 225 mixed. (General Conference Minutes, 1921, p. 193) The change-over to English was, of course, most evident among our young people. But our worship services also were deeply affected by the war. In many states the use of the German language in worship services was absolutely prohibited. This was, of course, unconstitutional, but during the war years who could be bothered by such details? In other places German services were dropped because of the pressure of public opinion. After the war in many places German simply remained dead. At the General Conference in 1921 the president of the Indiana District reported that only eight congregations in his district still used German exclusively. The situation was very similar in the New York, Pennsylvania, and Ohio Districts. In these four districts at this time English became the official

language. From then on the business of the District conferences was conducted in English.

It came then as no surprise that at the General Conference of 1921 a resolution was proposed to delete the word "German" from the name of our Synod. It was alleged that in many places this part of our name hindered the progress of our work. The proposal sparked a debate which went on for two days, resulting in bitter divisions. Those who opposed the resolution argued that to drop the word "German" at this time would be seen as a betrayal of the German cause. Finally, it was decided that as of November 1, 1922, the word "German" should be dropped. Following the Conference those who had opposed the change appealed to the denominational judiciary and this body a year later ruled that the action taken had been unconstitutional. So--for the time being--our name remains as before. Whether the decision of the judiciary stands or falls will, in the end, make no difference. The conversion to the use of English will be unstoppable and will come rapidly. And pastors who are not able to function bi-lingually will be greatly disadvantaged. With the English language will come changes in other areas and, increasingly, there will be a take-over of the English-American spirit which differs from the German in lack of depth but also in greater initiative and aggressiveness.

Our church periodicals also were greatly affected. The "Friedensbote" lost thousands of subscribers.

But while the German language faces a struggle for continued existence, it can also be said that there has awakened a new love and understanding for the German cause and the German people. At the General Conference of 1921 we welcomed as an honored guest and as a representative of the High Council of the Prussian Church, Dr. Otto Dibelius of Berlin. His description of the need in Germany touched our hearts, and we rejoiced to have in our midst for the first time a representative of our German "mother church". The bond of love with the German Evangelical Church was strengthened, and we promised not to grow weary in well-doing towards those whose faith and heritage we share. A number of leading German theologians have agreed to share in the work of our "Theological Magazine" by contributing scholarly articles. We anticipate that their cooperation will continue into the future.

The war, of course, did nothing to create closer ties between our Synod and the other American denominations. The Federal Council during the war took a fanatical anti-German position, accepting uncritically all the lies about the German army and the German people--and what is even worse--the Federal Council thus far has not publicly condemned the Versailles Treaty as the unChristian, and satanic thing that it is, something individual clergymen and especially liberal secular periodicals like "The Nation" and "The New Republic" and "La Follette's" and

others have done from the beginning.* This is a great sin of omission for which the Federal Council must be held accountable. So, while we have not severed our connection with the Federal Council, a certain degree of alienation has resulted which make a genuine spiritual communion with the Council impossible for us. The Federal Council has among its several commissions one for International Justice and Good Will which has as its purpose to build bridges between the nations that were enemies during the war, but this Commission, thus far, has done nothing that would make for just treatment of the Central Powers, and especially of Germany!

Another movement spawned by the war which has had a considerable influence upon our church is the "Interchurch World Movement" which had its beginning in 1918 (See "Christian Unity", p. 140) at a meeting of mission workers and leaders of various charitable organizations. The need at home and abroad seemed to these big-hearted people to be so great that what the church was doing was like a drop of water on a hot stone. It was necessary, they said, to forget all differences in confronting these world-wide tasks and to undertake this work with new programs and with greatly increased means. A period of time was designated during which all the churches, working together, would undertake to raise 40 million dollars for this cooperative work. Although the intention was good and the plan comprehensive, the money did not come in and the entire movement had to start over on a new basis. Nevertheless, the movement did much good in calling attention to the great challenges confronting the church and in stirring up people who want to do something. In our own church it led to the organizing of what came to be known as "The Forward Movement", which caused us to set higher goals and, through its organized promotional efforts, resulted in greater means being made available.

In concluding this summary of the war years we can say, in retrospect, that despite all the idealism with which we undertook the conflict, we achieved none of the great things which were promised us but on the contrary witnessed the destruction of much that was good and noble both here and abroad. The German cause suffered irreparable damage. It accelerated for us the process of anglicization and all that goes with it. In the end it helped us to recover and value as never before our love for our old home and church and so to bring mother and daughter into a new love relationship that should prove to be a great blessing for both. Should this relationship develop in the way we hope, it will lead to an increased influencing of each by the other which may have many, perhaps, lasting good consequences.

- - - - -

* This despite the fact that the Federal Council had solemnly promised "to keep ever before the eyes of ourselves and of our allies the ends for which we fight," and "to hold our own nation true to its professed aims of justice, liberty, and brotherhood". (See "Report of Special Meeting, Washington, D. C., May 7-9", p. 23)

CHAPTER XXI

The Synod's Future

Bibliography: F. Mayer, The Future of the Evangelical Synod of North America, 1913. Niefer, Preserving the German. R. Niebuhr, "Where Shall We Go?", Theological Magazine, March and July, 1919. W. Henninger, "Why Go at All?", Theological Magazine, May, 1919. C. Schneider, "The Theological Problem", Theological Magazine, Nov., 1921. J. H. Horstmann, "Lutheranism and Calvinism", Theological Magazine, July, 1919-January, 1920. Neve, Lutherans and Church Union, 1921 (especially Chap. VI, "The German Evangelical Synod).

Our discussion of the war and post-war years has brought us right up to the present. We have reviewed the development of our church over a period of eighty years. We have seen the driving forces in the contrasts between German and English (or American) and between Lutheran and Reformed. During the earlier period of our history we were a German church, more Lutheran than Reformed, but holding steadfastly to the Union principle and practice. During the second period the English language took over with telling effect on religious life and churchly practice. There came an intermingling of various elements which changed considerably our original character.

It remains now for us to look into the future and to ask ourselves: What is the future of our Synod apt to be like? Since we are not prophets we can undertake to forecast the future only in terms of the probable consequence of where we have been and of our present situation. Therefore, let our look ahead be preceded by a look back and a look around.

1. Retrospect

To avoid repeating what we have already written let us briefly review the several phases of our Synod's development in relationship to the personalities of our Synod presidents. This seems justifiable because these leaders seem to be representative of the period in which they respectively lived and gave guidance to our growing church.

A. Baltzer was our president from 1866 until 1880. Under his leadership our church developed from "The Evangelical Church Society of the West" (1840-1866) to become "The Evangelical Synod of North America" (1877). Already during the days of the "Kirchenverein" Baltzer was the guiding influence and for a time president. But when in 1866 the "Verein", joined by other groups, became the "German Evangelical Synod of the West", Baltzer was elected to be General President. He held the office until his death.

Already in Part One we paid tribute to the great accomplishments of this outstanding man. We noted how as a man, and as a Christian, as pastor, leader, and speaker, he gave the

church invaluable services. During these early formative years with their many battles and difficulties, but also of rapid growth, it was he who more than anyone else gave our church its distinctive character and permanent foundations. He was especially concerned always about the religious growth and development of the pastors and congregations. As Professor Otto so appropriately wrote at the time of his death (See Theologische Zeitschrift, March, 1880) Baltzer was not the "theological spokesman" for our Synod. His articles in the "Friedensbote" instructive as they were, tended to be of a practical rather than critical nature. His personal interests were more ethical than dogmatic. He did not, for example, become involved in the controversy known as "the Otto case".

In this regard Baltzer stands in sharp contrast to Walther, the founder of the Missouri Synod, whose strength lay in doctrine and in Lutheran theology and whose primary concern was to emphasize in his church the pure, unadulterated doctrine. Our church has always attached greater importance to Christian living than to doctrine. Our Synod, it is true, has always stood for right beliefs but even more for genuine faith. It has never developed its theology to the extent that the Missouri people have done but one needs to remark that the Missourians have continued to take their stand with the conflict theologians of the 17th century and so can hardly be said to have made any contribution to a living theology. So Baltzer can be said to be a classical representative of that formative period in our history during which our people were content to rely on the simple gospel and on putting faith into practice in daily living. Baltzer represents that period in the history of our church which sought to avoid all Lutheran-Reformed controversy and which--despite the thoroughgoing work of A. Irion--never became theologically fruitful. Baltzer himself searched seriously both in the Scriptures and in human hearts, but intellectual problems were never a major interest for him.

K. Siebenpfeiffer, Baltzer's successor, was forced to resign his office for health reasons, in 1882 already.

He was followed by J. Zimmermann, who was president of the Synod from 1882 to 1901. He was a native Swiss educated at the Basel Mission House and was true to the best traditions of that institution manifesting throughout his long life a practical pietism and steadfast love for the work of God's Kingdom. Unlike Baltzer, he was not a dominating personality but one who sought to achieve his goals with gentleness and in humility. He was typical of the genuine, simple, sincere Evangelical (in our sense of the word) pastor who made an impression by his dignity and wisdom and qualified, as if by his very nature, to be a reconciler of conflicts. If not particularly creative his personality, nevertheless, mirrors well the quiet growth of our Synod during those years.

Jacob Pister, a native of the Palatinate of the Rhine, and a German theologian, was the next Synod president, serving from

1901-1914. He was as different as imaginable from his predecessor, Zimmermann. He exuded self-confidence, was a polished public speaker, had for years served as a pastor of large congregations and was by experience well-qualified to preside and lead. Under his leadership we see the Synod leaving its humble past to take its place before the general public as a respectable body deserving to be reckoned with. It developed in many ways. Its Anglicization preceded space. Pister himself was throughly German but he understood how to do justice to the demands of the time. He was an able theologian, but his conflicts with ultra-liberal elements in the congregations only served to sharpen his positive stance. Often in his official reports he took issue with anti-Christian positions, thus representing well the church body he headed. Rome, too, found in him a militant opponent. The outbreak of the Great War broke his heart.

He was succeeded (1914) by John Baltzer, a son of A. Baltzer, who currently serves as President of the Synod. Eminently qualified as a public speaker, as leader of the General Conference, a skilled parliamentarian, he represents the new day into which we have come. True, he is deeply rooted in the German past but he is fully supportive of the new movements looking toward church union. He is not in favor of our hiding our talent in a napkin, as in the past. (See General Synod Minutes, 1917, p. 20) We like to emphasize that our church, although of German background, is a thoroughly American institution. (General Conference minutes, 1921, p. 34) So in important ways he is a good representative of the new movement demanding openness, progress, expansion and consolidation.

As we thus consider one by one the personalities of the various presiding officers who have served us, it is easy to see in them the nature and progress of the times. We see how in the first the foundation-laying character qualities find expression which work themselves out more fully in the second. In the third we see a certain inclination toward participation in the cooperative work of the churches. In the last the transformation is completed. The hands outstretched toward us by others are eagerly grasped as the Synod earnestly desires to take its rightful place in the totality of American church life.

2. The Look Around

As we look around at the situation in which we currently find ourselves, the question arises: Has the way in which we have sought to carry on our church work under the changing conditions of the second period of our history justified itself? Perhaps statistics will provide the best answer. Let us compare where we were at the end of the first period with where we were at the time of the General Conference of 1921.

According to Schory (Schory, "Geschichte . . .", p. 136ff.) in 1888 we had 431 member congregations plus 331 others we were serving, in all 762 congregations. These congregations had 654 churches and 315 school houses. Their membership consisted of

35,883 families in the member churches, plus 19,129 in the served churches for a total of 55,012 families. Confirmands in 1888 numbered 9093, communicants 135,651. We had 585 Sunday schools with an enrollment of 57,446 pupils and 5800 teachers. In addition we had 357 parochial schools with an enrollment of 14,400 pupils and 128 teachers (240 pastors were doubling as parochial school teachers.)

For the support of our educational institutions our people gave a total of $21,442.47; for home missions $5,961.70, for overseas missions $10,033.71, for other funds $26,287. In all, our people contributed for the work of their Synod and benevolent institutions $69,064.31.

In 1921, according to the reports of our Synod officers we had: 1073 pastors, 1023 member congregations, 1229 church buildings, 822 parochial school or Sunday school buildings, 928 parsonages, 519 cemeteries. The total value of these properties came to $23,352,070.96. We were serving a total of 376,955 souls. (One notes that instead of counting families, as in the early period, we were now counting individual members, a custom we had taken over from the American churches.) The number of German language services was reported as 41,784; English services 30,317 (German still predominated). The number of communicants was 274,800. There were 3037 German confirmands compared to 8532 English (the rapid take-over of English is most noticeable among the youth). Our Sunday school reported 152,196 pupils who were being taught by 12,404 teachers. In the parochial school there were 1699 children who were being instructed by 77 pastors and only 13 parochial school teachers. The decline of the parochial school and the consequent decline in the number of parochial school teachers is especially to be noted. W. Schlinkmann, a strong proponent and friend of the parochial school, reports that in 1900 we still had 127 church schools with 18,680 pupils who were being taught by 127 parochial school teachers and 498 pastors. During the next several years, thanks to summer and Saturday schools for lay leaders the number of teachers rose to 875 and the number of pupils to 26,000. The work continued on this high level for several years until enthusiasm ebbed and the Sunday schools began to take the wind out of the sails of the parochial which now began to die out completely. Still in 1921 we had 4648 pupils in summer schools where they were taught by 229 teachers (pastors and lay teachers); also 3607 pupils attending Saturday schools with 164 teachers (mostly pastors).

Our church organization flourished greatly during this period. The reports for 1921 indicate that 279 men's organizations with 15,267 members, 1046 Ladies Aid societies with 66, 179 members, 702 young people's societies with 30,473 members, and 103 mission societies with 5555 members.

The "Friedensbote" had 22,822 subscribers, the "Evangelical Herald" 6183. The number of "Friedensbote" readers was declining albeit slowly, while the number of "Herald" readers was growing, also slowly. For building programs and debt payments our congre-

gations raised nearly $1,500,000, for current expenses $1,861,000. For the Synod budget (educational institutions, homeland and overseas missions, pensions, building fund, and Synod treasury) $159,000 were given, for general benevolences approximately $720,000, for the local churches and Kingdom work in general, approximately $4,000,000.

Comparing the statistics we learn that during the recent period the number of ministers nearly doubled while the number of congregations increased by only 260. It appears, therefore, that many congregations which were formerly affiliated or yoked, have now become independent, having their own pastors. The practice of having several congregations served by one pastor is declining more and more. The number of confirmands rose from 9,093 to 11,569, a gain of only 2476. This indicates clearly that many members are no longer having their children confirmed, despite the fact that church rules require that they do so. In this we see the influence of American church ways.* Parents, and especially the children, think that what is not necessary for English-speaking families should not be necessary for us. If Sunday school suffices for their Christian education, it ought also to suffice for us. Our Synod ordinances, generally speaking, are enforced too laxly to mitigate this evil. The resulting lack in Christian education is bound to have dire consequences. The number of communicants has doubled. The number of Sunday school pupils in 1921 is almost triple what it was in 1888. On the other hand, the number of parochial school students is not even one-seventh what it formerly was. Nothing indicates more clearly than this fact how the times have changed. Here we see most clearly how we are adopting the methods of our English-American churches. Our Synod is, of course, well aware how poorly the average Sunday school meets the real needs for Christian education. Real efforts are being made to get more educated and better-trained teachers. But the results fall far short of the goals.

The work of our church societies appears to be flourishing--at least outwardly. The statistics for 1888 do not even mention church societies. There were, of course, church societies, especially women's societies, in 1888 already. The fact that they are not even mentioned in the statistical reports is very significant because it seems to indicate that there was still prevalent the old idea that the establishment of church societies could only lead to a splintering of the congregation and that anyway all the needs of individuals and various age groups in the congregation should be fully met by the congregation as a whole. That, of course, was an idealistic concept which did not work out in practice. Eventually a Ladies Aid Society ("Frauenverein") was established in virtually every congregation, and came to be con-

- - - - -

* In this connection it must also be taken into consideration that families today are not nearly so large as they formerly were, say 30 years ago. The effect of this change must not be underestimated.

sidered indispensable. Of all the societies the women's societies were by all odds the most helpful. The young people's societies merit more muted praise. They are probably necessary but to make them a factor contributing to the religious, moral, and spiritual life of a congregation can often be difficult. The Christian Endeavor Movement sought in its time to help with this situation but among us had only limited success. The young people, for the most part, get together only for social fellowship. Their limited interest in spiritual things makes it difficult to lift their societal life to a higher level. They seem to like best to be allowed to help in the raising of funds for various church purposes. The men's societies are the most recent creation in this whole field of church activity. Only a small beginning has been made and the work is not easy, but in our estimation this is a field which holds promise for the future. If more men can be found to participate in men's organizations this could with time become an institution as fruitful for the life of the church as our women's societies.

In recent times all these various societies have been banded together to form District and denomination-wide federations designed to help give them direction and a sense of solidarity.

The contributions given for church and benevolent purposes during 1921 when compared with the amount given in 1888 tell a significant story. They show that financial support for church work in recent times has increased greatly as compared to the old days. In part, this is of course explained by the greater prosperity of the members and the decreased purchasing power of our money. This, however, is not the complete explanation. Probably the main reason for the improvement is the individual membership system emphasizing, as it does, the individual responsibility of every member, even of every confirmand, for financial undergirding--a system we, of course, got from the English-American churches. In 1888, with 135,651 commicants our Synod's receipts for synodical work came to $69,064.31; in 1921, with 274,860 communicants $159,000 with an additional $720,000 for general benevolences. The last-mentioned item in 1888 came to less than $10,000. The increased giving is entirely out of relationship to the increase in membership which was only 100%.

The value of church property, the amount spent for building and current expenses are not given in the tables for 1888, so that we cannot make comparisons, but a great increase in the grand total may be assumed. If we wish to compare our record with that of other American churches we can best do so by means of statistics provided in 1922 by an interdenominational agency known as the United Stewardship Council and which we must assume are reliable. The giving figures for 1921 are as follows:

	For Mission & Benevolences per Member	For Current Expenses per Member	No. of Members
Seventh Day Adventists	$22.42	$100.24	98,715
United Presbyterian	15.56	23.55	162,780
Moravians	11.67	13.38	17,326
Evangelical Association	8.50	17.55	126,346
Northern Baptist	7.16	15.48	1,167,721
Congregational	6.36	19.13	838,271
Methodist Episcopal	6.23	15.74	3,773,160
Presbyterian (North)	5.46	19.07	1,717,846
Lutherans	4.28	10.38	1,041,091
Evangelical Synod	4.06	14.34	228,713
Missouri Synod	3.77	10.95	673,321

The good showing of the Seventh Day Adventists reflects the fact that all their members are required to tithe. Our Synod ranks twentieth; among those reported only five denominations rank lower than we. Of course the list is not complete, nor does it indicate that as compared with earlier years our giving has increased considerably. The statistics indicate that our giving for current expenses and benevolences amounted to $18.40 per individual member per year. The figures do not agree in every respect with our own statistical reports for 1921, yet the total of $4,200,000 differs from our own report of $4,000,000 by only $200,000. The figures for the united Stewardship Council are for the year 1921, ours for 1920.

Looking at statistics for 1921 we learn that the number of our ministers has increased greatly while the increase in the number of congregations has been less. The number of communicants showed a marked increase. This indicates that while fewer new churches have been founded our existing churches have enjoyed a normal growth and, accordingly, report a larger number of communicants. Aside from Sunday school, confirmation classes are our only means of religious instruction for our youth. Church societies have shown such a rapid growth that it seems reasonable to predict that in the future they will constitute an important part of church activity. The growing awareness that every individual member has a responsibility for the support of the local church and of the Kingdom of God has contributed greatly to the significant improvement in giving. These are some of the conclusions we draw from a study of the church statistics. In general, they reflect the influence of the English-American

churches which will more and more determine our future.

3. Prospect

The character of the second period in our denominational development was largely determined by the introduction of the use of the English language. The language question has consequently become a burning issue among us. This question will continue to engage us in the future even though the final outcome has already been determined in favor of the English.

a) The Language Question

That the German language could not hope to be maintained indefinitely among Americans of German heritage has long been evident. Some, it is true, under-estimated its tenure. Thus F. Kapp in chapter 14 (of his book) says: "What is referred to as 'the German element' in the United States consists of hardly more than those who have themselves been immigrants and who, of course are dying." This statement is strongly contradicted by our denominational statistics which indicate that after 80 years of existence the total number of German worship services held in our church in the course of a year was still 41,784 as compared to 30,317 conducted in English (See reports of our denominational officers for 1921). Nevertheless, it is evident to even the supporter of the German that Kapp and Polenz, and many others, were right in insisting that the German language could have no future in America. Before the War many clung to the hope that the German cause was not yet lost. Thus, for example, H. Niefer in his "Preservation of the German" (See bibliography), both point to the influence of the German universities on American education and mention the fact that German scholarship is held in high regard by educated Americans. Also they point to strong German rural congregations as indicating that German could hope to have a long future in our land. However, all such still-cherished rays of hope were completely destroyed by the War. In many states German in the public schools was prohibited by law. Also most high schools dropped it from their curriculum. War hatred, anti-German propaganda, the unfriendly public opinion toward everything German, had a strong influence on our young people, greatly strengthening an already existing disinclination to occupy themselves with German. Many advantages we formerly had in this regard have so been lost to us. We can no longer hope to win our youth for the German--and to youth belongs the future! While in the past we often held on to the German Sunday school and services too long, thus losing our young people, we have now, in many places gone to the opposite extreme. Out of conformity to the trend of the times we drop the German too soon. Many congregations, which formerly were completely German are introducing English services with the result that pastors unable to preach in English feel their existence threatened. What shall we do with our older ministers? We have often asked the question in view of the sad state of our pensions system. Now we have this additional concern for pastors who feel themselves threatened by this disfavor for the German language--and many

among them are not all that old. They are, of course, being asked: "Why didn't you learn English long ago?" But who could have guessed that a World War would so soon make the use of English indipensable? Besides, for many it will be difficult as adults to master a new language well enough for acceptable use in the pulpit.

But the process which has started will not be stopped. This is admitted even by those who have been and still are the strongest protagonists for the German. One District after another is introducing English as the official language of the District; one congregation after another increases the number of its English services. In 1920, 620 Sunday schools were being conducted in English, 225 were mixed, and only 198 were still German. It is safe to say that more than 80% of our Sunday schools are now English. In our societies and in official business meetings English has more and more taken over.

All these observations make it clear that the language question has been decided in favor of the English and that we are on the way to becoming an English-speaking denomination. In certain localities, where the circumstances are favorable German will continue to be spoken for decades but our Synod as a whole will become English-speaking territory. What that will mean for our church life we have already discussed in several connections. It would be foolish to claim that the true gospel and pure Christianity cannot be maintained and practiced in English, but it indicates a lack of insight not to realize that our church life in the future will be different than it has been in the past. This simply is a fact which our consideration of the second period in our history has already made clear to us.

b) Our Relationship to Other American Denominations

The course of our development during the second period of our history has brought us out of the isolation which characterized our earlier period and has led us into fellowship with the other churches of our country. This course of events is symbolized by our joining with other denominations to form the "Federal Council of Churches". It has already been mentioned that the Union principle which we espouse prepared us as a church body for such a rapprochement. The War deeply disrupted the relationship causing in many hearts a sense of alienation which led many to want to break off the relationship. This has not happened and it seems to us that our church will not, and should not, return to its former isolationism. A uniting with other communions will, however, lead to a mutual exchange of influence. Cooperative work will be undertaken, methods will be proposed, resolutions adopted which to one or the other body may seem strange. And since the Federal Council includes thirty denominations most of which are larger and more influential than we, their influence on us will be great while our influence on them, predictably will be very small. Therefore, caution and decision will be in order. As we look at American church life as a whole we can see three driving forces at work. The first is

Methodist revivalism, the second is a weakening of theological concern, the third a movement toward a program of social reform such as espoused by all the Calvinistic churches.

1. Methodist Revivalism

The Methodists are the dominant Protestant denomination, not so much because of their prosperity or prestige, but more especially because of their enthusiasm, aggressiveness, and numerical strength. They have from the outset been satisfied with nothing less than visible success. Their appeal in religious work basically has been to the emotions and this appeal has been so successful with the American people that Methodist revival methods have been adopted by practically all denominations. True, these methods have more recently been criticized by some of their own number, but their "revivals" continue to be very popular. Our own Synod, too, has taken a position with regard to them and has recommended "evangelistic" services especially during the Lenten season. Naturally such services should be dignified and sober and "evangelical" in our own true sense of the word. It appears that our official endorsement of such services has had little effect. Several of our pastors have the gift to work as evangelists and all should attempt from time to time to preach revivalistically. Lent, however, is set aside for meditating on the sufferings of Jesus while for evangelistic gatherings short texts (single verses) are best suited. Moreover, with evangelistic services there is always the temptation to strive for immediate success and this can make it difficult to avoid the pitfalls which the method carries with it. Generally speaking, revivalism will not become our forte even in the future.

2. The Weakening of Theological Concern

Quite in contrast to the Methodistical revival methods which presuppose the simple faith of our fathers, are the liberalizing tendencies of the newer theology. Representatives of the movement are to be found in practically all denominations, most particularly with the "Disciples of Christ", the Congregationalists, and the Episcopalians, perhaps least with the Presbyterians. It is the theology which has come under the influence of biological science, takes offense at miracles, and seeks to apply the teaching of evolution also in the field of religion. For if God is the loving father of all people who in order to forgive does not need the sacrifice of the Son. Christ is the one who in his person completely reveals and exemplifies the nature of God. Christianity essentially is a state of mind. Aside from the teaching of the "Universal Fatherhood of God and the Brotherhood of Man" dogmas are eschewed. Christ is primarily a teacher and an inspiring example. Preaching tends to have a moralistic tone. On the basis of these general rationalistic truths, the several denominations ought to reach out to one another the hand of brotherhood.

Against this widespread movement a reaction has recently set

in from the so-called "Fundamentalists", who as their private doctrine strongly emphasizes the Second Coming of Christ but otherwise, in general, defends the Christian fundamentals as the unabrogable essence of faith.

Our church in the past has, as we have shown, never been open to liberal or compromise theology. In this regard it probably will not change in the foreseeable future. Insofar as one may judge by public statements there has also not been much interest in evolution.

3. The Program of Social Reform

The social question has long been in the foreground of interest both in secular and in ecclesiastical circles. In the field of religion it has been taken up as a part of the church's program chiefly by Reformed and Calvinistic churches. Already in the First Part (Chapters II, IV, and V) we have discussed the differences between Lutheranism and Calvinism on which the difference in their stance toward state and society is based. Luther was primarily concerned to proclaim the gospel of justification by faith. Where this doctrine was preached faith and the fellowship of believers would result. Calvin looked upon the communion of believers as the fruit of preaching. The congregation must be kept pure and free from the world. Under favorable circumstances this would lead to dominance of the church over the civil organization. Under less favorable circumstances the outcome might be opposition to the civil authority or emigration to new countries. At any rate in Calvinistic churches there developed a sense of freedom over against the state and the pressure to create something new; among Lutherans a sense of dependence upon the secular order which God either had created or permitted to be in authority.

Luther looked for faith; Calvin saw in the new life, the fruit of faith. Faith is an inner, invisible mystical power and Lutherans on the basis of this principle have been enabled to develop greater depth and a richer spiritual life. The new life, however, has to be lived in this world. It seeks to affect the world and to have society conform to God's Word. Like the leaven in the dough the new life should permeate and transform the mass. This is the social gospel and it has found fertile soil in the Reformed, i. e. Calvinistic, churches.

It is true that Stoecker's social welfare work in Berlin--in the Lutheran Church--predated church social work in this country. But Stoecker's work was undercut by Bismarck's anti-socialistic state. In our country, on the other hand, where the workers were better situated, the movement for social reform, developed freely only later. In Chapter XVIII we referred to the social program of the churches pointing out that our church also, in accepting the "Social Ideals of the Churches" at the General Conference in 1921, had committed itself to this program. We also pointed out that this branch of church work was for us a new one in which we should need to find our way.

As a member denomination of the Federal Council we shall be encouraged to go forward in this new way on which we have set our feet, learn more about it and contribute as we are able to the solution of the great problem confronting us.

c) Our Relationship to the Church in Germany

While our closer relationship with the other denominations in America has developed during the two past decades, the fact that we have been drawn closer once again to our German mother church has come about only because of the War. Our ties to the church had been growing looser and were at last completely severed during the War. But when the Versailles Treaty revealed the unbelievable perfidy of Germany's European enemies and completely destroyed the lofty war-time ideals, our sense of justice was aroused over against those who proceeded with such violent injustice against our old fatherland. What we were able to do through the written or spoken word to influence public opinion was little, but the call to undergird German relief work captured our hearts. The invitation not to grow weary in this work of love but to do more is renewed every day and becomes ever more urgent. May it engage all our powers.

The German church on her part affords us an opportunity to enrich our religious life and church activity through a closer acquaintance with her theological work. We referred only a moment ago to the rationalistic trend in our American churches. This will be nothing new to one acquainted with German theology. In the German churches liberalism has long since had its day pursuing its goals, for good or ill. It has been demonstrated that for all its praise-worthy nurturing of theological research it has been impotent church-wise and has not been able to stand the test in difficult times. In this regard its fate should serve as a warning to us in our own situation.

Still we cannot afford to be out of touch with the theological investigations of our own day. The old Lutheran church in our country has completely cut itself off from the influences of theological research. As a result it has remained immune to all liberalizing tendencies, but as a result has fallen back into outworn dogmatic positions of past centuries. How could we even think of doing anything similar! Old Lutheranism represents still today the unbroken Lutheran orthodoxy of the 17th century. As is well known this old orthodoxy led to a religious intellectualism that made commitment to the pure, unadulterated doctrine the chief hallmark of the Christian. This called forth, on the one hand, the reaction known as Pietism, and, on the other hand, the reaction referred to as The Enlightenment. Then began the epoch-making work of philosophical research which questioned the very foundations of human knowledge and came to the conclusion that one could not logically prove the existence of God nor divine providence nor immortality, but that man as a moral being could not do without these and therefore had assumed them. Religion for this philosophy became essentially morality. Then followed speculative philosophy which granted to

the believer only a symbolic understanding of the divine but claimed for philosophical understanding complete, true comprehension. Schleiermacher makes a religion independent from philosophy inasmuch as he locates it in the feelings and not in the intellect. The new life of faith, as a result, finds its fountain of certainty in Christian experience which is made the foundation for the dogmatic superstructure. This experience is had in relation to the Word and is the common treasure of the believers. Scripture and church, together, guard the individual against subjectivism and misconception.

Theological research, however, has not always allowed itself to be guided by the experience of salvation. It has chosen to strike out on its own way and has subjected Christian faith to sharp criticism often surrendering the divine revelation latent in the original sources. A destructive criticism thus has for many robbed Christian faith of its very lifeblood. But should we, therefore, fail to be thankful for historical Bible study which has brought the Word of God closer to us, humanly speaking, than ever before? Shall we in this twentieth century still hold fast to the doctrine of verbal inspiration?

In the second half of the nineteenth century natural science has made tremendous progress and has had a strong influence also on the science of the mind. That many have, as a consequence, been driven to skepticism, just even into unbelief, is regrettable, but who will not be glad that we have in some way been closer to knowledge of the truth? Who today can get along without some knowledge of biology or of the lately so popular field of human psychology? Or who today will eschew the study of sociology?

In all these areas German theology can provide leadership for us even if in certain fields English or American science may have outdistanced it.

One could wish nothing better for our church than a greater love for theological study. We have had excellent theologians, but they have not founded a school. The field lies virtually barren. Comparing the curriculum of Eden Seminary for 1922-23 with that of the 50's as described by A. Baltzer (in his letter to Wichern) one notes a tremendous improvement. Similarly the current offerings at Elmhurst tower high above those of the early years. But scholarly thinking in our Synod continues to be a rare commodity. This is an area in which professionally we need to strive for definite improvement. The fruitful fall-out for our church work would be of great benefit; impetus and guidance could come from our mother church.

Whither Bound?

The feeling that the future will bring great changes in our church work and in our relationship to other denominations is widespread among careful observers. When some years ago the idea of organic union of the churches was publicly proposed, it

aroused a lively interest also among us. R. Niebuhr (in the Theological Magazine, March and July, 1919) posed the question: "Where Shall We Go?" Organic union of the churches seemed to him to be yet a long way off, but he sensed a trend toward the unification of certain groups. Denominations with similar doctrine and polity would, he felt, unite. There was a possibility he thought that Lutherans on the one hand and Reformed churches on the other might unite to form two great closed corporations. In such a case what should we do? Should we allow ourselves to be demolished between these two great millstones? Seeing we had from the beginning advocated the Union principle should we now simply remain on the outside? To him it seemed advisable that we should join one or the other of these two groups. And since the Lutherans seemed inclined to take in only Lutherans, our only alternative would seem to be the Reformed group. The Reformed group in that case would be glad to allow us to hold to our distinctive teaching and practice.

W. Henninger in the May (1919) issue of the Theological Magazine raised objections to this proposal. He asked, "Why Go at All?" Our Synod is very well able to stand alone, as heretofore. He personally felt more strongly drawn to Lutheranism than to Calvinism, despite the fact that the Lutheran Church on American soil, because of its strong confessional stance, was not inviting. J. H. Horstmann in his essays on "Lutheranism and Calvinism" (See bibliography) traces the development of the two churches, describing effectively the distinctive qualities of each. He comes to the conclusion that it should be possible to unite with either on the basis of a simple confession of faith in Christ the divine Redeemer and in the spirit of love which is able to bear the differences. Such a unification would be the work of the Spirit and was not something to be contrived. Our Union principle, he felt, was as old as Christendom and could well serve as a bridge for overcoming differences and attaining to unity in the Spirit. The process he was willing to leave to future development.

In Chapter XIX we told how our church decided to go along with the idea for Christian unity through a Federal Council of Churches. This was simply a plan whereby the churches would unite in doing certain kinds of church work. The plan neither presupposed nor required agreement in doctrine, polity, nor practice. Organic union seems to be for our church a pious wish but no present possibility.

Even if the Lutheran and Reformed in America remain as far apart as they are at present and our Synod desires to join neither, does that mean that our church union program has become a fiasco? Neibuhr seems to think so. He says: Our Union principle may have served a good purpose originally, but for present needs it is neither comprehensive nor practical enough. Therefore, we ought to give it up as outgrown and follow the afore-mentioned advice (P. 127). This interpretation, however, rests on a misunderstanding. Our church has never even dreamed of being able one day to unite all the Lutherans and all the

Reformed of America into one body. It has always been modest in accepting the limitations which under the circumstances seemed to be placed upon her. The aim was to offer a church home to those who either were "United" from home or to whom the Union principle seemed to be right for our times. It is within this framework that it has developed its own particular individuality. Viewed from this perspective our 80-year history must be seen as having been crowned by God's blessing.

This, of course, is acknowledged without reservation. But what has our church contributed to the sum total of Christian life in America? This question is responded to with answers surprisingly different. F. Mayer in his "Zukunft der Synode" ("The Future of the Synod") goes so far as to say (p. 21): "If there is to be any help for our land it must come through the influence of the German Evangelical Church. He is thinking about our faithfulness to the gospel, our system for confirmation of the youth, our dignified worship services, our administration of the sacraments, our insistence on changed lives, etc. Niebuhr says: "We have failed to make any very distinctive contribution to American religious life." "We cannot claim to have left the impress of our personality upon the religious thought of our country" (p. 126). These highly disparate judgments can be understood. Our Synod has not been accorded the public recognition which its size might have warranted. That is due largely to our name. "Evangelical" as the name for a church body is to the American quite incomprehensible. We have pointed this out before. To him it designates a movement within Protestantism which strives for sanctification. In the sense of "united" the term is simply unknown. The American knows what is meant by Lutheran and what is meant by Reformed, but what our name signifies requires a long explanation. To the average American we are simply a special brand of Lutherans. This continues to be so even after 80 years of history. So we must admit that our name, while perfectly good and appropriate in the historical situation in which it was chosen, has in this country been a stumbling block, preventing us from receiving the recognition which we might otherwise have been given. On the other hand we must admit to Dr. Mayer that in the several respects he mentions the Americans could learn a lot from us.

To try to find and adopt a new name now that we are nearing the end of our first century could only be love's labor lost. Whatever may be in the mind of the average American, in the churches belonging to the Federal Council we are known. We must stay with our old name. Should we then change our course? Are our plans in the old sense--for union of Lutherans and Reformed--no longer feasible? Neve in his excellent book, Lutherans in the Movement for Church Union devotes a long chapter to our position. For understanding and clarity of exposition it is unsurpassable. He is especially solicitous concerning Lutherans whose leaders have from time to time commented about us, and finally expresses the hope that our Synod, whose membership is predominantly of Lutheran heritage might one day take its stand firmly on the Augsburg Confession and so become a representative of a moderate

Lutheranism. He is, of course, aware that our young clergy often manifest a preference for Calvinism (both as to polity and teaching) which preference may play a role in determining our future. But he hopes and wishes that any change of direction on our part will be toward Wittenberg and not toward Geneva. Neve forgets that our Synod could never stand unconditionally on the Augsburg Confession without surrendering its basic principle of unionism--something it would never do. Rather it would be easier to unite with the Reformed, for it must be remembered that today's Calvinism is vastly different from that of Calvin, both cultishly and doctrinally. His doctrine of predestination especially never took hold in the Reformed Church of Germany. Also, it is easy to get along with the Reformed people while Lutherans always set as a pre-condition that one must become Lutheran.

Still, it is useless to speculate. Our Synod may indeed seek organic union whether here or there. In any case it has already established a place for itself in American Protestantism. Since it did not give up its place either during the War or later when its hopes that the German cause would receive just treatment from the "Federal Council" led to bitter disappointment, it is not likely that it will give up now. We have shown how the development which began with the flooding in of the English language, and found effective expression in our joining the "Federal Council", greatly modifying the nature of our worship services, our youth education program, and our social action program, deeply influenced the very nature of our church. Will the change help or hinder our growth? Many among us--often in positions of leadership--looked upon our entering the mainstream of American church life as a definite step forward from which would greatly enhance our power and influence. We look upon these hopes as having been unfounded. On what would such hopes be based? In doctrine we have done nothing creative. On the contrary, we have sadly neglected theology. Also it must be acknowledged that the Union principle, good and beautiful as it was and is, carries with it a certain danger of laxness in teaching and practice. A Union church cannot be as strict and authoritative in its educational program as can a confessional church. Should it enter into a union with another body it would be more likely to be changed than to effect change in the other.

Let it be remembered that the big American denominations, which dominate the Council far exceed us in size, wealth, influence, and self-consciousness, that, therefore, when we go in with them we may at best play the role of the wolf or the fox but never the role of the lion. Once the process of anglicization has had time to run its course we shall be like the river that has poured its water into the ocean. A few miles from the shore one may still see its distinctive color but farther out one sees only the blue of the ocean and nothing more.

Or, to change the symbolism, in the melting pot of American church life even the precious metal which we contribute will become simply a part of the amalgam. In the pure tones of the

bell which is being cast and at last comes forth from the mold no one will hear the special sound of the Evangelical Church, but it is there nevertheless and is contributing its bit to the harmony in praise of our Redeemer. This is not to say that in the foreseeable future or in the end there will no longer be an Evangelical Synod. It is surprising how tough the life of even a small church body can be. It is rather our view that, in time, through the use of the language and the increasing closeness of our relationship to the American churches, our church will become more and more like the others until finally little other than our name will distinguish us from them. An example may be seen in the English branch of the Reformed Church in America which has indeed retained its name but otherwise has completely adopted the spirit and methods of the others.

Such would seem to be the fate which the future holds in store for us. If our contribution to the Protestantism of our country is to be of value, it behooves us to recognize what our treasure is, and to nurture and guard it faithfully. In this we can be helped by the study of our own history. From it you, oh Evangelical Church, can learn what you have received as a heritage from your fathers; through your own thinking and pondering you will appropriate that heritage and make it truly your own. The place that you will hold in American Protestantism will in the end be determined by how true you are to yourself and to the precious treasure God has entrusted to you.

The End

17,
Buffalo 94
Ev. Cat, 37