

## Federal Aid a 'Token'— But of What?

ELSEWHERE in this issue a member of the Chicago bar, Edward R. Lewis, points out the threat to the constitutional principle of separation of church and state implicit in the federal aid to education bills now before Congress. It has been enlightening to discover the grounds on which the Roman Catholic spokesmen who supported these provisions before the congressional hearings demanded federal funds for parochial schools. The most important of these spokesmen, whose argument has been extensively reported in the Catholic press, was Rev. William E. McManus, assistant director of the education department of the National Catholic Welfare Conference. Father McManus called on the Senate committee which has this legislation in hand to broaden the Taft bill to allow federal aid for parochial schools, in the form of funds for school lunches, even in states where state laws prohibit such use of public funds. Let the federal government give \$242,000,000 to the public schools, Father McManus urged, and then add \$7,500,000 for parochial schools "as a token." The *Register*, weekly of the Catholic diocese of Denver, in treating this as a front-page feature, headlined it: "Token Federal Aid Asked for Private School Pupils." The word to be noted, both in the text of Father McManus' proposal and in the headline, is "token." Token of what?

# Explains His Opposition To Anti-Catholic Stand

## Harold Stassen Reproved Southern Baptists' Action In Attacking Supreme Court Without Reason

*Religious News Service*

Minneapolis, Minn., June 25—

Former Governor Harold E. Stassen has revealed here why he decided to speak out against two resolutions adopted by the Southern Baptist Convention in St. Louis.

One resolution criticized the U. S. Supreme Court for upholding the New Jersey ruling permitting parochial students to ride in public school buses. The other attacked the appointment of a presidential envoy to the Vatican.

Mr. Stassen, speaking in reply to a question at a Republican meeting here, said when he arrived in St. Louis to address the convention he found the two resolutions had been widely publicized.

"As a Baptist," Mr. Stassen said, "it was my judgment that if I was silent it would seem by inference I approved them. I did not."

He admitted that his stand on the two issues "may have hurt me" politically.

Mr. Stassen told the meeting here that he "did not believe it constructive for any great body to attack the Supreme Court when the Court decided on the basis of facts

and its decision does not change the principle of church-state separation."

"The church," said Mr. Stassen, who is president of the International Council of Religious Education, "should go on and reach the one-half of all children in this country who have no religious instruction whatever."

Mr. Stassen said that "no one who reads the Supreme Court decision" could come to the conclusion that the barrier between church and state is broken down by the decision.

Regarding the Vatican mission, Mr. Stassen said he felt criticism of President Truman in that connection was ill-advised in view of present "turbulent" world affairs and because "we do not know all the conditions."

"As to my overall approach," Mr. Stassen said, "it is and has been that the great issues that affect this country come first and are above the political parties. Parties are second and individuals in parties are third. If you keep that in mind, you will understand some of the things I do and say."

RC.  
Brooklyn Tablet June 28 '47  
Official R.C. Journal of the  
Diocese of Brooklyn

# The Churchman

July, 1947

THE Protestant voter in this country faces a serious political situation. A skillful offensive by the Roman hierarchy is undermining the Protestant position in American public life. Rome has built powerful political positions in both major parties.

## The Protestant Voter's Dilemma

Today the Roman hierarchy swings millions of votes in elections, and political candidates are over-sensitive to Catholic support or opposition.

It was the mistake of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, as we know today, that he appeased the hierarchy and gave high political prizes for a support he got, though only half-heartedly, from the Roman Catholic Church. The result was that the Roman church gained enormously in political power, and that we in the United States are facing a serious threat to political freedom and to Protestant traditions.

The Roman forces are working for the establishment of a "Christian Corporate State;" that is, for a totalitarian Catholic dictatorship—a statement frankly made by Roman authorities.

Protestants are becoming aware of the danger. Nearly all great Protestant denominations are on record today as opposing this Vatican-directed plan to "make America Catholic," not only religiously but politically.

Protestants realize that the Roman tidal wave in American politics must be stopped. It can be done by making Protestant voices heard in both parties. If necessary, Protestants can muster a greater and more decisive voting bloc on important issues than any other group in the United States, though they have seldom acted in political affairs as an organized group. In the 1928 campaign there was a spontaneous, violent opposition among certain Protestant groups, mostly fundamentalists, against a Catholic candidate for the Presidency. It was generally ascribed to this Protestant reaction that the Democratic candidate, Al Smith, lost and the Republican candidate, Mr. Hoover, won.

But to what party and to what candidate can the Protestant voter turn today? President Truman is on record for close cooperation with the Roman hierarchy. The Democratic party is under the influence of Catholic city machines in the north. Roosevelt had to rely on these machines, though he tried to keep his domestic and foreign policy independent of Catholic pressure.

Roosevelt succeeded in his strategy to keep different forces together—the south, labor, liberals and middle-of-the-roaders, and also the Catholic city machines. This political tight-rope performance in election years gave him handsome majorities in spite of big business and reactionaries.

What is the situation today? After the congressional election last year, it was openly admitted by Republican spokesmen that Republicans had made

their gains by a deal with the Roman hierarchy which had swung millions of votes from the Democratic to the Republican camp. The Roman hierarchy expected the pay-off in form of federal aid for parochial schools and by the establishment of permanent diplomatic relations with the Vatican.

Many Protestant leaders recognized the new trend. Within a few months a powerful Protestant opposition was shaping up. But where is the *party* and where is the *candidate* for Protestant votes? Protestants and middle-of-the-roaders looked with hope to Stassen. But since Stassen's speech at the convention of Southern Baptists he is definitely out of the Protestant picture. Stassen openly opposed the Protestant program of no public tax funds for parochial schools and no diplomatic relations with the Vatican. Stassen received loud praise in the Catholic press for his stand, and that is sufficient reason for Protestants to ignore him as a Presidential possibility.

There can be no doubt that the principle of separation of church and state, and the unconstitutional Taylor mission to the Vatican, will become major issues in the coming election campaign. But, one will ask, how can these problems become major issues when both parties are in a race to appease the Roman hierarchy and thus secure the Catholic vote?

There are still 17 months' time in which Protestants can work out a strategy. On the issues mentioned there is no cleavage between conservative and liberal elements within Protestant denominations. The discussion during the last few months has clearly shown that Protestants are increasingly united and determined to act against Vatican control. This determination among Protestants is now so overwhelming that one wonders how the smart politicians in both parties could have overlooked it.

Which practical steps are open for Protestants? The Democratic Party of the Truman and Hannegan brand is so deep in Catholic politics that many matters in Washington today are handled according to the Vatican time-table. Likewise many of the Republican bigwigs have made secret commitments with the Roman hierarchy. But we should not forget that there are large sections in the country where Protestants can, as individuals, wield a strong influence on Republican party machines. It is necessary to find out quickly whether the Republican party is wise enough to ignore the demands of the Roman hierarchy.

If liberal groups in the Republican party are ready to drop Stassen and present another acceptable candidate with a definite program to uphold the principle of separation of church and state, scrap the unconstitutional relations to the Vatican, and shape up a domestic and foreign policy along the lines of the Republican Teddy Roosevelt and the late F. D. R., that would perhaps guarantee the Republican party a sweeping victory in the 1948 elections. But such a candidate and

which was the most Christian in the practical social work of our day.

You can imagine that it is a pretty hard thing for us Unitarians . . . those following Channing and Parker and their like . . . to take. As a friend of Mr. Fritchman's, a worker under him in the youth organization and contributor to his magazine, I am grateful to you for your voice in "putting in their place" our administration.

You can believe that the great tradition of Unitarianism is not entirely debauched, however. From travelling among the churches I am confident that the overall Unitarian sentiment is not that expressed by the decision of the convention, and I hope columnists and editors such as yourself will recognize the great mass of Unitarians who really were liberals, and who have fought for all the "fired" editors, in further articles. As a member, active, of the American Unitarian Youth, I am proud to say that the young people came out 100% better than the adults on almost every issue and certainly on the most important issues.

Congratulations on your splendid magazine. I have wished for a long time to write you a fan letter.

MARY ROSE ALLEN

#### COMMENDATION

TO THE EDITOR: I am glad to see in your Open Forum a commendation of *The Converted Catholic* magazine. The editor of this admirable publication is my personal friend, and I have a complete file of the magazine since he first took hold of it in January, 1940. It is edited with courage, knowledge and discretion, and contains much reliable information not to be found in the columns of the daily press. It is steadily growing, in power and influence, and has now, I understand, a monthly circulation of around 40,000 copies.

TALCOTT MINER BANKS

Williamstown, Mass.

#### WHAT I LIKE

TO THE EDITOR: I read every copy of *THE CHURCHMAN* from cover to cover, rejoiced to find that it is just as vital as ever. I honestly think that *THE CHURCHMAN* is the best religious journal in the United States. I like the firm stand you are taking on certain fundamental issues; especially the spirit of practical goodwill with which you handle controversial questions. Would that more would follow your example.

(Rev.) ALFRED R. HUSSEY

Plymouth, Mass.

#### MARC BOEGNER

TO THE EDITOR: I have just read the article by Captain Marcel J. Brun in the June 1 issue, renewing his attacks upon Dr. Marc Boegner, head of the French Protestant Church Federation, and one of the presidents of the World Council of Churches.

He does not name Dr. Boegner, nor

does he name me as the person who had transmitted the knowledge of his attempts to undermine Dr. Boegner. None of us who had any contact with the complex situation created by the German occupation has any illusions as to the difficulties confronting all persons of prominence in that period. If they ran away to another country, they were charged with cowardice. If they stood their ground and went to concentration camps, they were later subject to vicious attacks, as note the case of Martin Niemoeller. If they remained in office and sought to maintain the work of the church, they were charged with collaboration.

Those of us who have known and worked with Marc Boegner through the years feel that we are in a position to judge his conscience. We do know that those who were closest to him have a very high respect for him. He is still the chosen leader of the French Protestant Churches. History records the magnificent and uncompromising criticisms which he voiced of the policies of Nazism and of the Vichy Government. It seems to me that the sort of criticism which is implied by Chaplain Brun is without any serious significance, even though I do not doubt that he found many persons in France dissatisfied with their leaders. It seems to

be a chronic condition in France, as witness the whole political scene. It would be surprising indeed if the same mood did not affect the life of the churches.

HENRY SMITH LEIPER

Executive Secretary,  
World Council of Churches

*The article on the moral aspect of Protestant relief was an answer to several conversations with prominent Protestant leaders who bear the same anxiety concerning the tremendous and far reaching importance of these problems. I also stated that the French Provisional Government in Algiers considered these problems vital enough to send me over there to express the French Government's point of view.*

*At that time, as now, Dr. Leiper has seen nothing in it but "slandering remarks" and "personal attacks" against one of his colleagues of the World Council. He disregards the whole thing in saying that "this sort of criticism is without any significance." Everyone expects an executive secretary of the World Council of Churches to be more gravely aware of the seriousness and importance that relief bears on the whole question of Christianity in Europe. A mere conventional loyalty towards fellow members of the same organization is a poor substitute for unbiased and broad vision. We would not wonder if large sections of European churches are reconsidering today their affiliation with the World Council in being frightened by some dictatorial clerical-mindedness.*

*I can assure Dr. Leiper that I am in no way interested in judging Mr. Marc Boegner's conscience, but the fact is that the Protestant churches in America have lauded the movement of General de Gaulle and the French Resistance since 1940, while the Catholic clergy have expressed the highest praise for Pétain and organized religious services for his success. However, today I have heard time and again French officials saying that the attitude of the Protestant groups in America has never been of international consequence, while the other attitude seems to be labeled as the attitude of the whole American nation.*

*In facing the facts Dr. Leiper buried his mind in the sand and writes at random . . . "criticisms . . . attacks . . . and slander . . . chronic French conditions!"*

MARCEL J. BRUN

#### REASSURING

TO THE EDITOR: Am indeed proud to take *THE CHURCHMAN* and to stand behind its policy and its wonderful work in keeping America free. It is most reassuring to know that the churches feel a responsibility in this regard.

MRS. ELLIOTT DEXTER

Encino, Calif.

(Continued on page 19)

## The CHURCHMAN

425 Fourth Avenue, New York 16, N. Y.

An independent Journal published under the sponsorship of The Churchman Associates, Inc. to promote the application of the spirit and ethics of Jesus to every relationship of the social order.

Editor, GUY EMERY SHIPLER

Associate Editor, EDNA RUTH JOHNSON

Contributing Editor, WILBUR L. CASWELL

THE CHURCHMAN ASSOCIATES, INC.

W. Russell Bowie, President

#### TRUSTEES

MRS. RALPH SEWARD ALLEN; HENRY A. ATKINSON; DUNCAN H. BROWN; MRS. A. H. BURROUGHS; MADAM ALMA CLATBURGH; MRS. GAMMELL CROSS; BISHOP CAMERON J. DAVIS; HORACE W. B. DONOGAN; MRS. WELLS P. EAGLETON; MRS. BRUCE FORD; BISHOP ROBERT B. GOODEN; MRS. FREDERICK M. HILTON; LYNN HAROLD HOUGH; WILLIAM S. KELLER; BISHOP J. I. B. LARNED; MRS. WALES LATHAM; S. S. MARQUIS; THOMAS McCANDLESS; J. HOWARD MELISH; SCHUYLER MERRITT; JAMES A. MITCHELL; MRS. IRA NELSON MORRIS; H. M. MORSE; JOSEPH FORT NEWTON; GEORGE E. NORTON; BISHOP E. L. PARSONS; MRS. A. L. PERKINS; MRS. STANLEY L. RICHTER; STURGIS LEE RIDGLE; HOWARD C. ROBBINS; BISHOP LOUIS C. SANFORD; GEORGE PAUL T. SARGENT; BISHOP WILLIAM SCARLETT; WILLIAM JAY SCHEFFELIN; MRS. WALLACE M. SCUDDER; MRS. WILLIAM AUGUST SMITH; RALPH W. SOCKMAN; LYMAN BEECHER STOWE; SIDNEY E. SWEET; LUKE M. WHITE; LELAND FOSTER WOOD.

#### SUBSCRIPTION RATES

1 Year—\$5.00; 2 Years—\$8.00, Canada and Foreign—75¢ per year additional. Special rate for clergymen—\$3.50 per year. When ordering a change of address, give both new and old addresses. Two weeks' notice is required.

such a policy must be ready in the fall of 1947, not 1948. Protestants will not wait until both parties proclaim phony platforms.

Few Americans like the third party idea. But that suggestion comes up always when large sections of voters are made homeless by both major parties.

Of course the third party experiment would have a chance for success only if the candidate could attract the greatest possible bloc of independent voters, if a few great issues were presented squarely and courageously before the American public and, finally, if enough forces from various groups were willing to work and to sacrifice for a great common cause.

It is interesting to recall that in the 1912 three cornered election, Wilson received 6,286,214 votes; Theodore Roosevelt received 4,126,020; and Taft 3,483,922. As a candidate for the new third party, Theodore Roosevelt received 642,098 more than the candidate on the Republican ticket. This illustrates what a third party can do.

Many citizens have talked of a candidate who has the highest respect, often the deep affection, of nearly every American: Dwight D. Eisenhower. They are fully aware of the implication that to choose a professional soldier for the highest office in our Republic might seem to admit that our civilian political life has seriously deteriorated. But the campaign would be based, they say, not on the military achievements of a victorious general, but on a soldier of peace, who has persistently campaigned for peace and mutual understanding during the last year, when the political air in the United States has been filled with war-hysteria. They recognize the problem Eisenhower would face in attempting to eliminate certain brass hats from their political jobs.

Others who want a candidate representing an American middle-of-the-road fusion party, suggest drafting a man like Eric Johnston, who, they believe, has the ability to serve, like Roosevelt, as an arbiter between labor and management, and who also, they assert, would find the full support of the many factions who like a golden rule policy at home and in world affairs.

Still others suggest Henry Wallace as a possibility. His candidacy would be more difficult because the smear campaign has poisoned the mind of large voting blocs. But Wallace is not dodging issues; with a moderate social domestic program and with his vigorous campaigning for peace and international cooperation he would attract great numbers of Protestants.

Wallace supporters say that he hit the nail on the head when he recently pointed out that the Truman-Vandenberg bi-partisan policy has done tremendous harm by destroying the middle-of-the-road parties in all of Europe and in accentuating the Hitler strategy of giving the voter the only choice between the extreme left and right. To prevent such a situation in the United States, it seems necessary to great numbers of Protestants that all moderate factions and middle-of-the-road voters cooperate to press for a workable solution for 1948.

### *Totalitarianism Protested*

**M**EMBERS of the Protestant Episcopal Church can take pride in the recent action of the faculties of Kenyon College and Bexley Hall for a seaching and

courageous statement on "un-American activities committees." These committees, with unlimited powers of investigation and condemnation, are a dangerous threat to American democracy, as we have often said. A proposed bill to set up such a committee in Ohio inspired the action of the faculties of Kenyon, an old and well-known college of the Episcopal Church, and Bexley Hall, its theological school. The statement follows:

The faculties of Kenyon College and Bexley Hall protest against the proposed passage of (Ohio) Senate Bill No. 238, "To create a commission to investigate alleged un-American activities in all schools, universities, and colleges in the State of Ohio," as a violation of the principles of democratic government established by the Constitution of the United States and by the Constitution of the State of Ohio.

1. Through failure to define the term "un-American activities" the bill sets up a body with power to label any activity un-American of which for any reason that body does not approve.

2. It thereby empowers the proposed commission to interfere with the free discussion at any educational institution of any controversial issue, although the right of such free discussion is explicitly guaranteed by the Federal and State Constitutions.

3. It empowers the commission to conduct investigations and to make search and seizures, without legal check on its procedures, and with no provision for an appeal to the courts.

4. It thereby empowers members of the commission to indulge in unrestricted accusations, allegations, libel, and slander, with no legal recourse for persons or institutions so treated: a privilege clearly contrary to established principles of law.

5. In principle the proposed law goes on the totalitarian assumption that a small group of men may, by their own interpretation, dictate the political, economic, social, and religious teachings of the educational institutions of Ohio. Serious concern for the preservation of democracy in this state leads us, therefore, as American citizens, to protest against the law as itself wholly un-American.

We trust that our readers will not forget that various publications groups, and individuals throughout the nation have been propagating the slanderous statement that anyone who criticizes the House Committee on Un-American Activities is a Communist or fellow-traveler. Incidentally, that was one of the "tests" set forth by the Rev. Edward B. Wilcox, pastor of the Unitarian Church, Lynn, Massachusetts, against Stephen H. Fritchman former editor of *The Christian Register*.

### *America's Town Meeting*

**T**HE educational value of America's Town Meeting of the Air has never been better demonstrated than on the recent evening when the explosive subject, "Are Communism and Christianity Incompatible?" was discussed. Those who participated were Father Edward V. Cardinal, the Rev. William Howard Melish, Dorothy Thompson, and Dr. Jerome Davis. Much less heat was engendered than might have been expected, and the altogether fair handling of the subject is to be commended. Mr. Melish tried to impress upon the hearer the need for dealing with the Russians and Russian Christians as Christ dealt with men outside the fold in his own day. The Roman Father said you

couldn't deal with evil people because you might get soiled, but Mr. Melish pointed out that Jesus met with people with whom he certainly did not agree but in the confidence that he had could stand contact with them, and that he had the power of persuasion, if he could only talk with them face to face. We of the church, he said, must seek out Russians in the confidence that we have something that doesn't have to be supported by bombs and threats but has its own intrinsic value which men will want and will take on its merits, given a fair meeting and free interplay of minds and hearts.

Many churches today have genuine open forums, such as that represented by the Town Meeting of the Air. We have long believed that every church in America could make a masterful contribution to understanding and world peace through the use of such forums.

### *A Pointed Letter*

DR. W. RUSSELL Bowie of Union Theological Seminary faculty and president of The Churchman Associates reacted as thousands of Protestants did to the recent address of Cardinal Spellman charging that Protestants who criticized the Roman Catholic Church were "bigots." He sent a letter to *The New York Times* replying to the cardinal. It was returned to Dr. Bowie with the statement that it was not being printed because one letter replying to Cardinal Spellman has already been printed. Since Dr. Bowie makes some splendid points which were not covered in the letter referred to by the editor of the *Times*, we are printing it here for the benefit of our readers, as follows:

Dear Sir: The address of Cardinal Spellman at Fordham yesterday and the space and prominence given to it in this morning's *New York Times* inevitably calls for reply.

The cardinal is right and will win wide agreement when he says that tension between religious groups in America is deplorable. He will certainly not win agreement when he goes on to charge the Protestant church and Protestant leaders with this tension and accuses Protestantism of "bigotry." If this unpleasant word is to be introduced into discussion, one cannot help remembering the following facts: It is Roman Catholicism that claims to be the only true Christian church; Roman Catholicism which makes what to Protestants is the insulting demand that in any mixed marriage the Protestant person shall promise in advance that any children shall be brought up as Roman Catholics; Roman Catholicism that consistently refuses organized cooperation of religious forces even in community affairs; Roman Catholicism which in countries where it is sufficiently entrenched seeks privileged if not exclusive position; Roman Catholicism which reaches out for complete control of marriage laws and education as in Italy, Spain, and Argentina. If Cardinal Spellman thinks these facts represent the "fair play and tolerance" which he is advocating and that the determination of Protestants to preserve in this country the constitutional separation of church and state in education is "bigotry", then to say the least Cardinal Spellman has a curious idea of the meaning of words.

Effective desire on the part of the cardinal to remove the religious tension which he says he deplores can be tested in a very simple way. Would the cardinal be willing, together with a few other chosen Roman Catholics of the hierarchy, to sit down at a conference with representative Protestant leaders in the democratic equality of discussion which befits the American spirit in the name of

which he says he is speaking? If he would not do this, what reason could he give? W. RUSSELL BOWIE

### *A Notable Career*

IT is pleasant to note in the announcement of Dr. Charles Clayton Morrison's retirement as editor of *The Christian Century* the fact that he will continue his affiliation with that journal as a contributing editor. There are many reasons why we have high regard for Dr. Morrison as a journalist—reasons which have long been obvious in the periodical which he has so brilliantly edited. But what wouldn't be obvious to anyone who has not been connected with religious journalism is the fact that he has been the responsible editor of a religious journal for nearly forty years—and has kept his sanity! In the process he has produced a journal which has won an important position of leadership throughout the field of Protestantism. He has taken strong and unpopular positions, and stood by them during periods when too many others have given in to popular opposition. This has required both insight and courage—and we suspect that, in spite of multitudinous headaches, Dr. Morrison has had lots of fun. We salute him for a long and distinguished contribution toward the creation of the Kingdom of God, as well as for his notable contribution in raising the standards of the religious press.

### *What is Truman Supporting?*

A head-line in *The New York Times* for June 15, 1947, reads, "Truman reproves Soviet satellites as he signs pacts. Lauds Italy but calls regimes in Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria undemocratic and harsh." In the text of the story, there was this: "For Italy, Mr. Truman had praise and gratitude. He said ratification of the Italian treaty closed 'an unhappy chapter in Italian-American relations.' It marked, too, he continued, the beginning of a new era for Italy." In June 9 issue of *Christianity and Crisis*, Howard V. Yergin wrote: "Following the election, the Pope at once began a campaign to have the Lateran Pacts and Concordat included in the framework of the Constitution . . . the Pope won his point . . . True religious liberty will not exist when Allied forces are withdrawn . . . The fact remains that, . . . the religious liberty article, Section 14, is in direct conflict with Section 7, which incorporates the Lateran Pacts and Concordat. Our Evangelical and Jewish brethren of Italy are in the front line of the struggle for tolerance and religious freedom; we cannot fail them."

On June 9 a dispatch from Religious News Service came through from Rome to the effect that Italian Catholics were warned against joining the Young Men's Christian Association by Cardinal Schuster who said, "Although professing ecumenism, the YMCA has a Protestant character. Therefore, in Italy, where the majority is Catholic, it creates an atmosphere of serious danger for the population's faith."

Has President Truman, supposedly a Mason, taken to lauding the lack of religious freedom in a predominantly Roman country, and to deploring "measures of oppression," as he expressed it, in non-Roman countries?

## Declare Schools Are 'Vaticanized'

Argentina Law Makes Catholic Teaching Compulsory, Thus Rewarding Church for Its Support of Perón

BUENOS AIRES, May 23.—Never has a proposal in the Argentine congress given rise to more careful, prolonged and serious discussion than did the matter of approving the decree issued by the *de facto* military government making Roman Catholic teaching part of the curriculum of the nation's public schools. After three days and nights of debate, congress voted 86 to 40 to approve the decree. Several government members of congress absented themselves when the vote was taken, and the gallant minority opposing the introduction of priests into the public school system have put on record facts and ideals that will be valuable on a later day when revision of the unpopular law will inevitably be considered. Those Nationalist party members who obeyed Perón's orders to vote for the measure labored hard to defend their position before a country whose citizens are, by a large majority, against religious teaching in the schools. *La Vanguardia*, one of the few Buenos Aires newspapers still able to speak out, commented: "We have handed our public school system to a foreign potentate. . . . We are allowing the hierarchy to 'Vaticanize' the Argentine school system."

### Law Rewards Hierarchy's Support of Perón

Approval of the decree is a payoff for Catholic support during the recent election won by Perón and his military backers. It is estimated that the hierarchy swung 300,000 votes to Perón, thus enabling him to win by a majority of only 52 per cent of the total vote of 2,600,000. Religious teaching has been authorized after school hours by unpaid priests or church appointees since the present public school system was launched in 1884. The present law will make possible the teaching of Catholicism during school hours by paid priests or by teachers appointed by the hierarchy.

### Hierarchy's Textbooks Contain Insults to Liberals

Some of the textbooks prepared by the hierarchy for use in the public schools have been strongly criticized for their strictures against liberalism and civil marriages. On page 145 of the *Manual de Instrucción Religiosa* is this passage: "It is gross concubinage for a man and a woman to live together without receiving the sacrament of marriage. . . . The children of Christians who have been married only by the civil authorities are illegitimate. . . . Modern impiety does not wish God to reign in society, and to prevent it has invented two diabolical means: civil marriage and the public school without religious teaching." Because of these and other insults to liberals and Protestants, President Perón has indicated that he may modify the new law, re-

serving to the government the appointment of teachers and preparation of textbooks for the courses in religion.

### Priest Granted Right to Leave Robe at Home

In a preface to a book by a Nationalist party author, Father Castellani, a Jesuit priest, declares: "The Roman Catholic Church is tied to the army and its fortunes in Argentina." Father Castellani, who was himself a Nationalist candidate for office and has been active in support of the party, has been authorized by the pope to appear without the long black robe which all priests are compelled to wear when on the street. In Bolivia, the Maryknoll fathers, working in rural districts, were ordered by the archbishop to wear the long robe or return to the United States. Argentinians are asking themselves whether Father Castellani has been unfrocked or whether he has been given a special dispensation to permit him to mix more freely in politics.

### Peronists Seek to Muffle Voices for Freedom

The government press has been waging a violent campaign against Bishop de Andrea, one of the few members of the hierarchy who have not supported the present regime, and who a few months ago made a stirring address on liberty. The attack on the bishop has taken the form of editorials, articles of criticism and cartoons (such as no paper in the United States would dare to print) ridiculing him. The fact that Bishop de Andrea is greatly respected by certain sections of the labor movement is probably what disturbs the Peronists, since one of their chief claims is that they are labor's only friend and patron. Perón's minister of education has just ordered the banning in the public schools of *The Crime of War*, a book written 70 years ago by Juan Bautista Alberdi, one of this country's great men. In that book are the famous words: "A free government does not need the support of an army to govern." *La Prensa*, still free and courageous, replied to the announcement of the ban by praising the book as an "outstanding arraignment of militarism."

### And So Forth

Protestant schools in Uruguay and Argentina report the largest enrollments in their histories.

Union Theological Seminary of Buenos Aires, in which Methodists, Disciples, French Protestants and Waldensians cooperate, has 52 students from five Latin American republics enrolled this year.

At the Methodist annual conference held recently in Mendoza, at the foot of the Andes, plans for a five-year evangelistic advance were adopted.

The government is investing \$100,000 in a plant to provide steel "for defense."

Young evangelicals of the River Plate region are broadcasting weekly gospel messages over 10 radio stations.

Nearly \$50,000 has been raised locally in the campaign through which alumni and students of Ward College are seeking funds to build a modern gymnasium and auditorium.

GEORGE P. HOWARD.

written into the over-all treaty toward which the nations are working. There is still a difference as to whether the atomic authority shall *own* all materials and plants, and this difference may be decisive. But steps toward agreement, even if they are small steps, must not be discounted. It should be recalled that a couple of weeks ago our representatives made another concession when they agreed to turn over to the International Atomic Development Authority all atomic bombs in our possession when and if a general agreement is reached. We still insist that the I.A.D.A. shall be permitted to conduct research on the use of atomic energy in war after such research is forbidden to nations, and Russia disagrees with that position. No agreement has yet been reached on whether atomic criminals shall be punished by the nations of which they are citizens, or by the international authority. So there is still some distance to go. But recent progress seems to be in the right direction.

### Grain Deficit Means More Starvation

THE INTERNATIONAL Cereals Conference, which recently adjourned in Paris, warned that the world crop prospect permits "no other conclusion than a very serious deficit in grain." It recommended that exporting countries take every possible step to increase supplies and to provide for their export and that consuming countries tighten their rationing and divert every possible bit of land to grain production. But with every economy, the conference estimated that there will be a deficit of 18,000,000 tons out of the 50,000,000 required, assuming that shipping is available for all that is produced, which is assuming a great deal. What this means is suggested in the July issue of *Survey Graphic*, which contains a detailed survey of the hunger of the world. "Most of the earth's population today can think of nothing beyond their desperate need for food—and their children's," points out Beulah Amidon, author of the article. "Millions of men, women and children are hungry—too hungry to work or to hope, dying of starvation or of the diseases that ravage the undernourished. This is why no problem in the world today is so urgent as that of food." The article quotes an Austrian doctor, who tells what it is like to starve. "Hunger is numbing. You are sitting at your desk with a patient and suddenly you find you cannot keep your attention on what the child's mother is saying. You sit there until your strength creeps back and then you work a little longer. It is pitiful to see the old. When they walk they stay near the wall and press their hands against it for support. They move like ghosts. . . . You see the children grow thinner day by day. You gag when you eat your food, knowing that your children are hungry."

### Charge War Department Has Broken the Law

SECTION 201, title 18 of the United States Code prohibits the use of federal funds to influence legislation pending before Congress. The fourth intermediate report of the House of Representatives committee on expenditures in the executive departments, just published by the

Government Printing Office, charges that the war department, in its zeal to see the universal military training bill enacted during the session of Congress which closed last week, repeatedly and openly broke this law. In a unanimous report the House subcommittee that inquired into the matter (including that stalwart for military preparedness, Congressman James W. Wadsworth of New York) states that "the war department, its personnel and civilian employees have gone beyond the limits of their proper duty of providing factual information to the people and the Congress [concerning UMT] and have engaged in propaganda supported by taxpayers' money to influence legislation." The subcommittee has sent its findings, and an offer of access to its records, to the attorney general, with an inferential suggestion that some sort of action should be taken by the department of justice. The text of the subcommittee's report deals especially with the activities of two civilian propagandists, Alan Coutts and Mrs. Arthur Woods, hired by the war department at \$25 a day and expenses, to sell the UMT program to civilians. Mr. Coutts made speeches and radio addresses in seventeen states and the District of Columbia. Mrs. Woods seems to have specialized on women's groups, and the report intimates that she made especial "use of her connections with the Girl Scouts of America." Also illegal, in the eyes of the House investigating committee, was the use of approximately \$50,000 to put over a film, "A Plan for Peace," designed to boost UMT, and the designation of a similar sum to make and distribute a film glorifying the recent UMT experiment at Fort Knox. It is not likely that President Truman's attorney general will act in this matter, but when the propaganda barrage for UMT re-opens, after Congress convenes again, citizens may well remember that a responsible committee of the House has *unanimously* found that the method used thus far by the war department and the army to put over this type of peacetime conscription, has been illegal.

### Mrs. Roosevelt and the Supreme Court

ANOTHER distinguished American, Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, has taken issue with former Governor Stassen's contention that a decision of the Supreme Court should not be criticized by ordinary citizens. In the daily column which she contributes to a large syndicate of newspapers, Mrs. Roosevelt on July 25 referred to an article, inspired by the New Jersey bus decision, which contended that "neither this group [she does not identify the particular group she has in mind, but it is clearly a Protestant body of some sort] nor any other group should question a decision handed down by the Supreme Court." Then, in her habitual forthright fashion, Mrs. Roosevelt comments: "Although the court is made up of learned lawyers and patriotic citizens, its members are still subject to human failings, like all human beings. And when a decision is as close as 5 to 4, it seems to me that the citizens of the United States have a right to think it over and decide whether they agree with it or not." Nor is Mrs. Roosevelt content to drop the matter at this point. She goes on to affirm her loyalty to "our old-time theory of division between church and



state," and to insist that "private or religious schools of any denomination . . . should be on an entirely different basis from the public schools."

## Two Worlds at Amsterdam?

**B**Y THIS TIME next year the eyes of the Christian world, including Rome, will be centered on Amsterdam. There the delegates will be gathering for the first general assembly of the World Council of Churches. From all parts of the non-Roman world they will stream in, to gather in what is already sure to be one of the great councils of Christian history. Preparations which have been under way for a decade, which never wholly lapsed during the war years, are now being rushed to completion by church leaders on every continent.

As "Amsterdam 1948" takes form, many questions are rising in the Christian mind. Among these, few equal in importance those which concern the part Eastern Orthodoxy is to play in the composition and deliberations of the council. If this is to be in truth an "ecumenical" gathering, giving birth to an "ecumenical" body, there is obvious need for participation by the churches of the Greek rite. Some measure of Orthodox participation is, in fact, already assured. At last reckoning the patriarchates of Antioch and Alexandria, as well as the Church of Greece, have accepted membership in the World Council, along with the three American Orthodox communions—the Syrian Antiochan, the Rumanian and the Church of the Assyrians—which had joined earlier along with other American bodies.

Membership by these churches in the Amsterdam assembly is a promising omen for the future of the World Council as a true ecumenical body. Yet everyone knows that they represent only a small part of Orthodoxy, and by no means the vital part. The question as to whether Orthodoxy is to be a living factor in the world body is really the question of participation by the Orthodox churches of Russia and the Soviet orbit. The strength of Eastern Orthodoxy lies within the area of Russian political domination; will participation in a world church enterprise prove any easier to bring to pass than has participation from the same area in common political and economic enterprises?

The churches of the West want the churches of the East at Amsterdam. It is understood that, out of the glare of publicity, representatives from the Geneva headquarters of the World Council are now determinedly exploring the possibilities of getting some sort of participation by the Church of Russia and the churches of the Balkan states. Western churches wish these negotiations well. The difficulties, however, are staggering. So much so that one asks whether, aside altogether from the Roman arrogance which makes a full unity of Christians impossible at this stage in history, something in the Eastern conception of the nature and function of the church will preclude a true understanding with the other communions that will be represented in the world body.

Two weeks ago it was pointed out in these columns that

John Macmurray, the famed professor of moral philosophy at Edinburgh, believes that it is not, fundamentally, the difference between communist and non-communist ideologies which is dividing the Russian political world from the West but the difference in cultures. [See "The Clash of Cultures," issue of July 23.] Russia and the West, Professor Macmurray holds, simply do not speak the same language. Hence there can be no genuine communication between them. Hence, the "two worlds" which cast such a terrifying shadow across the future. Does the same deep-going division obtain between the churches of East and West? It is significant that Professor Macmurray uses the Russian conception of the nature and function of the church to buttress his argument that the crisis between Russia and the West is mainly cultural, and not to be solved on any level of political or economic action.

The West, says Macmurray, has always considered the Russian Church "highly political." It is not surprising that the Bolsheviks treated it as they did in the early stages of their revolution, for "had it not always been the willing instrument of political autocracy?" But how, in the light of such an explanation, account for Stalin's about-face on the church issue? Macmurray's explanation rests on the Russian view of the church:

The persistent defense of the Orthodox Church against the Soviet opposition has been this: that there was no ground for suspicion of the church by the revolutionary movement, *because the church in Russia had always been completely non-political.* This to us astonishing assertion should be taken together with the attitude of the Russian religious mind to the Western churches. It was well expressed by one of the greatest of the 19th century Russian theologians—a layman, like nearly all Russian theologians—when he said that God would destroy the Church of England because of the way it had dragged religion at the coat-tails of business and politics.

This Orthodox position, which Professor Macmurray is here reflecting, led a distinguished Anglican prelate, after a wartime visit to Russia, to pronounce the church there "the most Erastian in Christian history." From the Orthodox point of view, however, the issue of Erastianism simply does not arise. The church is one with the community. It is indistinguishable from the community. It discharges its own special functions in the community, and of course it expects to adjust itself to and live along with all the other agencies of the community, including the political agency, as they likewise discharge their functions. This conception, which has become ingrained in the Eastern mind by centuries of history, exerts its influence today even in Yugoslavia where an atheist head of state cannot see anything but treason in the refusal of prelates to display the same cooperative attitude toward his state, whatever its nature, that former regimes had been able to count on.

Along with this attitude of integration with the community, the Orthodox churches obviously run the constant risk of being used to forward the interests or intrigues of the political agencies of the community. The church may claim to be entirely non-political, but that does not save it from being used for political ends. Indeed, it can be plausibly argued that it renders it much more susceptible of being used in that fashion. That this is, in fact, the very thing now going on in eastern Europe and the Near East, as the political struggle for the domination of that region grows

Religious

July

And what was decided about Poland? In plain language, the Lublin government is recognized. It is officially called the "provisional government now functioning in Poland." That's the main thing. The rest is verbiage. What is the rest? The government should be reorganized. No new government is to be created. The Lublin group is to be broadened by including persons of whom an Allied commission in Moscow will approve. We have seen how the Allied Control Committee works in Bulgaria and Rumania. We have seen for a full year how London-Moscow cooperation works in Yugoslavia—London always gives way.

As for the rest, the Curzon line was officially recognized and it was agreed that land inhabited by several million Germans should be added to Poland. East Poland was taken away from Poland because it had minorities, and lands solidly inhabited by minorities were added! Three times as many people as there were in all the American colonies are to be uprooted by force in a deal involving a double compensation. And Americans are told they should try to base a brave new "broadly democratic" world on such arrangements!

For generations to come honest Americans will blush at having been made participants in transactions similar to those of the most ruthless ancient conquerors. As we see millions of men, women and children being shifted

brutally about in Polish lands, because territories are given to victors as compensation, we will recall the Jewish exiles taken in force across the deserts to Babylon, and we must hang our heads in shame to think that we Americans have joined hands with the Babylonians and Assyrians even as we piously invoke the Four Freedoms.

However, we must admit that Tsar Alexander went even farther when he disposed of Poland, for he quoted the Gospels themselves and even cited the words of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ. Any objective, honorable person, who loves common people, who is ready to make sacrifices for democracy, who respects truth, now looking realistically at these international deals regarding Poland will find few historical parallels for such a humiliating abuse of noble words like freedom and democracy.

And now what shall we do? Well, I urge that we do not give up, that we go to San Francisco and that we keep on working for a world organization. I hope we shall tear away the rosy-hued cellophane, face reality and do our utmost for world cooperation. We once went through the Valley Forge of war and won out. Now we are going through the Valley Forge of peace. But like Washington we must realize the full desperation of our situation, pray to God, take courage and press forward behind a standard of honest and candid dealing to which the wise and the true can repair.

## So This Is Good Will!

By Charles M. Crowe

SINCE June 18, 1944, large display advertisements have appeared each Sunday in the editorial section of the *St. Louis Post-Dispatch* and more recently in the *Globe-Democrat*, dealing with the doctrines and practices of the Roman Catholic Church. These advertisements occupy a preferred position; rarely is any other advertising carried on the page. They are sponsored by the Religious Information Bureau of the Knights of Columbus, 4422 Lindell boulevard, St. Louis, and are prepared under the direction of Charles S. Kelly, head of Kelly, Zahrndt and Kelly, Inc., advertising agents. Mr. Kelly is the state publicity chairman for the Knights of Columbus in Missouri. Incidentally, he is the man who developed the Lutheran Hour radio program to national proportions.

Using the *Post-Dispatch* campaign as a spearhead, the advertisements are now being syndicated to other papers with the announced intention of securing national coverage. More than a dozen newspapers in Missouri now carry them, with Fort Wayne, Indiana, the first out-state city to be reached. They began to appear there in December 1944.

The advertisements are cleverly written and easily read. They apparently are intended as bait to secure converts, as each carries an offer of a free booklet on some phase of Roman Catholic doctrine. Each also carries an appeal for funds to pay for the ads. Each ad in the *Post-*

*Dispatch* costs approximately \$150. The cost of the total campaign cannot be estimated.

During the first six months 170 non-Catholics were enrolled for religious instruction by mail as a direct result of the ads. In the same period, requests for the pamphlets came from 3,500 non-Catholics.

It may be said without fear of contradiction that these advertisements have created much ill-will among the Protestants of St. Louis, clergy and laity alike. Whatever good they may be doing the Catholics, their dogmatic tone and their attack upon non-Catholics have served to break down much of the spirit of interfaith cooperation and good will that liberal leaders had attempted to create in recent years.

### I

A survey of the content of these advertisements should be interesting. Their chief emphasis has centered about three ideas: the conception of the Bible, the origin and uniqueness of the Catholic Church, and the forgiveness of sins.

In an ad entitled, "But First Century Christians Never Saw the Bible," the argument is presented that since the Bible has been subject to differing interpretations as to the sacraments, confession and the person of Jesus, it is not to be trusted in religious teaching; further, that the existence of 400 different religious groups, each claiming

to be based on the Bible, indicates that the Bible is a source of confusion. "It should be perfectly clear to anyone that the Bible is not a safe guide in matters of religion, because it is not now and never has been accessible to all people; because it is not perfectly clear and intelligible to all; and because it does not contain all religious truth."

In another ad captioned, "The World's Best Seller—The Book of Disunity," we read: "The plain fact is that the Bible, like the Constitution of the United States, demands an authoritative interpreter. Just as the Supreme Court of the United States is the authorized interpreter of the Constitution, so the Catholic Church alone is the authorized interpreter of the Bible. Preserver and custodian of the Bible through the centuries, She interprets it in the name and with the authority of Jesus Christ, Who commissioned the Catholic Church alone to 'teach ye all nations baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost.'"

An ad with the title, "But How Can We Know What the Bible Means?" severely condemns the idea of private interpretation of the Scriptures. The Catholic Church is declared to be not only the mother of the Bible, "but the recipient and custodian of *All* of God's Revelation, much of which is not contained in the Bible. With Her fuller knowledge of all that God has revealed, the Holy Catholic Church infallibly interprets for Her Millions of children that partial Revelation which is the Bible. Thus, through the Holy Catholic Church . . . and through Her alone . . . can we *always know* exactly what the Bible means."

In advertisements having to do with the origin and uniqueness of the Roman Church, Matt. 16:18-19 is quoted time and again as authority for the exclusiveness of the Catholic Church. One headed, "To *Thee* Will I Give the Keys to the Kingdom," gives this comment: "If Christ meant what He said . . . and who could doubt that He did? . . . He certainly meant that He was establishing one particular Church for the salvation of all men. He certainly meant that *that* church was the Holy Roman Catholic Church. . . . What good then to seek salvation elsewhere? What good to read the Bible, to sing the praises of the Savior, to admit that salvation is possible only through Christ, *yet refuse to submit to the authority and the teaching of the one church founded by Christ and entrusted by Christ with all of the doctrines of the Savior Himself?*"

Another comment on the same text occurs in the ad entitled, "Upon *This* Rock I Will Build *My* Church": "Surely, if the Son of God meant what he said, He had founded only one Church for the salvation of all men . . . and the head of that Church was obviously St. Peter, the first Pope of the Holy Roman Catholic Church. To that Church . . . and *that Church alone* . . . Christ had given the keys of the kingdom of heaven. To that Church—and that Church alone—Christ had given the power to bind and loose . . . to forgive or deny forgiveness."

Likewise the ad, "What Do You Mean—*The* Church?" argues that it is no more reasonable to say that the many churches claiming to be Christian are from Christ than to say that two and two equals five or six or 108. "The Holy Catholic Church is *The* Church founded

by Christ Himself. . . . It is a visible organization that men can see and hear and obey without any doubt whatever. . . ."

In an effort to account for goodness outside the Roman Church, the following statement occurs in the ad headed, "But are *All* non-Catholics headed for Hell?": "Pope Pius IX stated the position of the Church very clearly when he said: 'We must hold . . . that out of the Apostolic Roman Catholic Church there is no salvation; that She is the only ark of safety, and whosoever is not in Her perishes in the deluge; we must also, on the other hand, recognize with certainty that those who are in invincible ignorance of the true religion are not guilty of this in the sight of the Lord.' . . . Because all of God's grace is distributed through the Catholic Church, Her membership includes not only all practical Catholics, but also those people of good will outside the Catholic Church. . . . Hence, the age-old teaching . . . outside the Church there is no salvation . . . is strictly true; but it does not mean that *All* non-Catholics are headed for Hell." In other words, what is good and godly outside the Roman Catholic Church actually belongs to the Catholic Church, and the salvation of any outside the Catholic Church is due only to invincible ignorance on their part.

One excerpt is all that is necessary to give the tenor of the argument of the ads on forgiveness of sins. In the ad, "What, *Me* Tell My Sins to a Priest?" appears this statement, also a commentary on the text Matt. 18:18: "Notice . . . that Christ empowered Catholic priests not merely to *announce* that sins were forgiven, but actually to *forgive* sins. And notice too that He did not tell them to forgive or refuse forgiveness indiscriminately, but according to their judgment of the just deserts of the sinner. And finally, note that this authority is not confined to any particular kind of sins, but extends to all sins without exception."

## II

The booklets offered by the advertisement are written by priests of the Roman Catholic Church and carry the imprimatur of one of the archbishops. This answers the question whether the ads are representative of the voice of the Catholic Church, for the arguments of the advertisements are taken directly from the booklets themselves and presented in condensed, popular style.

In the booklet, *The Catholic Church and the Bible*, it is said that Christ did not intend the Bible to be the method by which men should know him because he did not write it himself, because it is not complete, because it does not give Christ's teachings clearly, and because Christianity existed for 400 years before the Bible came into being. The means Christ did leave was an organization. "His organization, the Holy Catholic Church, has never gone astray. This is the means by which you are to know Christ's teachings with authority!"

In the booklet, *The Catholic Church is the Church of Christ*, it is held that the Roman Catholic Church alone has the marks of the true church, namely, unity, holiness, universality and apostolicity. "There is but *one* God. This God sent but *one* Redeemer. This one Redeemer taught *one* Revelation and instituted but *one* Church."

The booklet, *True Church Quizzes to a Street Preacher*, presents 91 questions and answers. Here are samples:

Question 27. Would you say that Catholicism is all holy and Protestantism is unholy? Answer: I cannot but maintain that Protestantism is devoid of that holiness which Christ appointed as one of the signs of the True Church.

Question 28. And so the Catholic Church is the only holy church? Answer: Yes. . . . Truth for its own sake compels me to say so. But today I see the Catholic Church as the one great guardian of morality and virtue. . . . No one leaves her save for a lower standard.

Question 32. What about good holy Protestants? Answer: I say that their goodness was not due to their Protestantism, but was due precisely to their refusal to follow Protestant principles. They were illogically good.

Question 33. Was Catholicism flourishing as a holy church when Protestantism began? Answer: Error and rebellion took the first Protestants from the Catholic Church. . . . But any goodness which the first Protestants took as doctrinal baggage with them was derived from the church they left. And any apparent goodness in the teachings of Protestantism is still to be found in the Catholic Church. Where, in the Catholic Church, cockle sown by the enemy is found here and there amidst the wheat, Satan was wise enough to allow some wheat here and there to remain amidst the cockle of Protestantism. And it is the presence of this wheat which accounts for the continued existence of Protestantism. It is a relic of Catholicism growing in alien soil. A Catholic is good when he lives up to Catholic principles. A Protestant is good when he unconsciously acts on Catholic principles, departing from those which are purely Protestant.

### III

An analysis of the Catholic propaganda under review reveals certain unmistakable characteristics running throughout:

1. It frankly utilizes the appeal to fear and ignorance. The Roman Catholic Church tells you what to do. If you do not do as we tell you, you will go to hell. We as a church tell you all you need to know for your salvation and we warn you at the peril of losing your soul against any free inquiry in religious thinking.
2. It magnifies the appeal of dogma and authority. The

entire theological argument is traced to and dependent upon a fundamental premise, that Christ established the Roman Church as the only church. When that major premise is not allowed the entire argument falls to pieces.

3. A half-dozen verses of Scripture are repeated over and over as the scriptural basis for the entire Catholic position. Take these verses out of the New Testament—which could be done without altering the essential gospel message—and the Catholic argument would have nothing to stand on. These verses, as students of the New Testament text know, are widely regarded by scholars as glosses on the original manuscripts.

The tone and attitude of the advertisements are arrogant, belligerent, controversial, intolerant, inviting rather than allaying criticism. It would seem as if the writers were trying to excite opposition. The Catholic position in almost every ad is set against a subtly perverted statement of the position of the Protestant faith and is designed to create antagonism and distrust.

The advertisements deal exclusively with theological, ecclesiastical and historical dogmas, and with expositions and defenses of Catholic ritual. There is no evidence in them of any desire to cooperate with other bodies of believers in the great social problems and evils of the day. There is no expressed concern for the preservation of the ideals of American democracy. There is no word of interest in world peace, or in guiding the forces of religion and righteousness in that direction. There is no challenge to the paganism of the times which is the common enemy of all faiths. There is nothing except a truculent and unabashed effort to establish the position of the Roman Catholic Church at the expense of other faiths and by means of belittling other theological and historical positions.

The observer profoundly wishes that the money and effort spent in this enterprise might have been directed toward breaking down barriers instead of building them, and in focusing the attention of all men of faith on the disturbing issues of modern life.

## V E R S E

### *Deployment*

WAIT on the narrow way;  
Savor the sun on the corpses  
Stripped by shell-fire, asleep  
In the withered clearing, lean on  
Your killing—fools laughing  
While the forlorn hope fares  
Up to the doomed assault;  
Smile at your swarthy friend  
Whose face you'll never see again.  
(They'll never find his body.)  
Wait your turn; savor your strength,  
Your pride, joy before battle,  
The sun on the rotting corpses.  
There is no barrier now  
Between the living and the dead.

HARGIS WESTERFIELD.

### *. . . As Well May Be*

I<sup>7</sup> JOY were all . . . and, surely, joy were much,  
Being bright, and fecund, and most sweet, and strong,  
An I quickening, and contagious to the touch,  
A swift and innocent righting, here, of wrong—  
Joy, shadowless and integral in might:  
The prospering sun upon the sun-warm wall,  
Among dark things, the unself-conscious light,  
Lessened by none, an increase unto all. . . .

Then had I sworn allegiance, and forsworn  
All that is joyless, as lese majesty,  
Regret forgot, and what it is to mourn—  
And taken for a sign the sudden tree  
In shadowless, white flower, the quickening Christ,  
Which would suffice—which, surely, hath sufficed.

DAVID MORTON.

# APRIL SURVEY OF BOOKS

## S. K. at His Best

EDIFYING DISCOURSES. By Soren Kierkegaard. Volume II. Translated from the Danish by David F. Swenson and Lillian Marion Swenson. Augsburg Publishing House, Minneapolis, \$1.50.

WITH MOST of Kierkegaard's work translated into English and his life presented in Walter Lowrie's monumental biography, the great Dane's name has become familiar to the American general public. But there is danger now that the reader should approach Kierkegaard from a wrong angle. His name has been associated with the names of modern theologians (e.g., Barth and Brunner) and philosophers (Heidegger, Jaspers, Unamuno) and thus the reader may easily transfer the resentment he feels against those schools of thought to him, who is claimed as their source and inspiration.

There is also danger that people should attempt to interpret Kierkegaard's work from the viewpoint of abstract ideas. While he is a giant among modern thinkers and an unsurpassed master in the art of dialectic, yet Kierkegaard is not primarily a theologian. He is not even a philosopher in the technical sense of the word, and those who interpret him that way will never be able to understand him. Throughout his life he was an earnest student of the Bible, and that made him a unique preacher of revival. No matter from which angle he approaches his subject, as a novelist or as a dialectician, as a teacher of ethics or as an expositor of Holy Scripture, he has always the same goal in mind: to persuade at least one soul that there is nothing more important in a person's life than faith. Thereby he means being confronted personally with the living God. In such an encounter a person realizes that the only way of living a meaningful life is by relying solely on the grace of God.

To reach his goal Kierkegaard employed two different methods, challenge and edification. In his pseudonymous writings he points to the contrast between that which is commonly regarded as faith and the real faith of the Bible. In his *Edifying* and *Christian Discourses*, he attempts by means of Bible exposition to deepen the reader's incipient faith by guiding him from the words of the texts to the divine and human realities pointed at by the words. In his philosophical and theological writings he proceeds in a more or less hypothetical way by indicating how a reformer such as he wants to be would challenge the complacency of the present-day church. In the *Discourses* a Christian brother puts his experiences at the service of his fellow Christians.

It is for this difference that those who want to become acquainted with Kierkegaard—and nobody will regret having done so—should approach him through the *Discourses*. Nowhere else—perhaps with the exception of his very last writings—does he give himself so directly and with such simplicity. Yet the *Discourses* are not "purely devotional literature" as distinguished from solid theological thought. As a matter of fact, all the leading ideas of Kierkegaard are found here no less than in the philosophical works, and he fathoms the abysses and penetrates the hidden recesses of the human heart with equal fearlessness and sympathetic understanding. But the purpose of his writing comes out more clearly here than in his other works, which are burdened with the inhibitions of one who feared lest he should act without due authority.

This second volume of the *Discourses* is, like its predecessor, based upon the preliminary work done by the late

Prof. David F. Swenson, the first American pioneer in popularizing Kierkegaard. His widow completed the translation and added a helpful brief introduction. The first discourse ("The Lord Gave and the Lord hath Taken Away") is a masterpiece of exposition. It develops the text by first contrasting receiving and losing, and then shows how the Lord's mercy is the bracket that connects the two opposites, so that faith will manifest itself both as humility before God and as gratitude to him. The second and third discourses expound the text James 1:17-21, already treated in the first volume. The repeated exposition shows how the genuine exegete is able without artificiality to derive different themes from the same text if only he appropriates the text by faith. The first of the two treatments in Volume II points out how no man is able to give good gifts; all the good things of life are imparted by God. The second shows how giving and receiving, if performed by faith, will remove the inequality that exists originally between giver and recipient. By humility and gratitude they are both brought into the presence of God. The last discourse is an especially fine specimen of Kierkegaard's irony. Dealing with the growth of patience, it excels in literary skill and dialectical ability. It makes delightful reading, but one has the greatest difficulties in following the author's lofty reasoning. That is probably what Kierkegaard intended. He wants constantly to tempt his reader to give room to his impatience that through such experience one may learn at least how difficult it is to be patient.

Two more volumes of the *Edifying Discourses* will soon follow.

OTTO A. PIPER.

## A Gospel of Grace

ACCORDING TO PAUL. By Harris Franklin Rall. Charles Scribner's Sons, \$2.75.

YOU READERS who have been looking for a book on Paul which unites the theological and the historical interests can now close the doors of your studies and with this book nestle down to several hours richly spent. The winner of the \$15,000 fiftieth anniversary Bross award has given us this Religious Book Club selection with a distinctive emphasis. He attempts to show Paul as a first century man who had a unique religious experience and yearned to share it with others.

Dr. Rall justifies another volume on Paul because previous researches "lost" Paul amid the detailed interpretations and in attempts to construct Pauline theological systems. Paul had a profound experience based upon salvation, which for him meant "the gift of life through the help of God, and deliverance from the evil which threatens and destroys life." It comes to men through grace, faith, love, the Spirit and the church. Man finds it through right relationship with God, whom we know through Jesus. "Christianity is an ellipse which moves about God and salvation as its two foci." This redemption Paul preached. His message was not a unified systematic theology but a gospel "according to Paul." The author continues to the end with the Pauline emphasis on salvation for all men—a free gift of God through Jesus Christ. This theme runs through chapters on the cross, Christ, the church, history, ethics, social ethics, and God. In the epilogue he discusses the Jesus-Paul relationship. Here he packs great truths into few pages.

The author turns age-old doctrinal discussion into simplicity as he holds up each teaching of Paul and shows every

the wrangling governments. Give the churches, give their local clerical and lay leaders, something to do that really matters, something that is within the range of their powers, something that they can really get their hands on, and the mood of frustration will vanish.

Are there such tasks now crying to be done? Certainly there are. We can name two which need doing this minute, and in attempting which any church will take on a new access of vitality. The first is arousing Congress and the American public to secure passage of the Stratton bill, now in serious danger of dying in committee when Congress adjourns next month. The second is increasing greatly the amount of material aid which the churches of America are sending to the devastated churches and to the needy generally in Europe and Asia.

The Stratton bill provides that during the next four years displaced persons from Europe shall be admitted to this country at the rate of 100,000 a year, over and above the 154,000 a year which can normally come in under the quota system of our immigration law. Hearings have been held before a House judiciary subcommittee in which the weight of responsible testimony from labor groups, farm groups, church groups, organizations dealing with war relief and from leading individual citizens has been overwhelmingly in favor of the bill's enactment. The moral duty of the United States to do at least this much to provide for a small number of the most needy victims of the war is hardly contested. Yet it now looks as though the Stratton bill will never reach the stage of congressional action before adjournment. Why? Simply because Congress does not yet believe that there is a genuine public demand for such action.

Clearly, therefore, the thing which needs to be done *at once* is to rouse public interest in the bill throughout the country. That means going into the local congregation first, and when that is thoroughly informed into the general local community, to explain the bill, meet the misrepresentations with which it is being fought, and stir citizens to press Congress for action. Does the bill mean that the labor market will be upset? William Green has testified that it raises no employment problem. Does it mean that the housing situation in American cities will be further complicated? Farm and church bodies have declared their readiness to see that those admitted under its provisions, most of whom have been farm dwellers, are located in rural regions where additional labor is badly needed. Does it mean that occasion will be afforded for an increase of anti-Jewish agitation? Eighty per cent of those who would be admitted are gentiles. Does it mean swamping the intent of the immigration law? Only 119,000 were admitted during the war years between 1941 and 1945; entries under the Stratton bill would not even fill up those unfilled quotas.

So here is an immediate task of education that needs to be done with the American public. If it is done in time, congressional approval may still be won before adjournment. If not, public education now can be made to register when Congress re-assembles in January, or earlier if a special session is called. When the public is informed as to what is at stake, and its will translated into law, the result will not only be salvation for some of earth's most

wretched souls but a demonstration of America's genuine good will that cannot help but have a healing effect on the bitterness now growing in Europe. The line runs straight from immediate labor for the Stratton bill in the local church and community to an increase of world understanding and mutual respect.

Likewise with regard to increased support of the church's program for overseas aid. The \$15,000,000 given through Church World Service, and the added millions given through denominational agencies, CARE, the American Friends Service Committee and similar organizations have already had a perceptibly heartening and healing effect abroad. But it is now clear that this coming winter will be a time of even greater need in Europe, China and Japan than was last winter. Church bodies are accordingly asking for \$60,000,000 for relief, half of it to be channeled through Church World Service. They need every cent of it. They could helpfully use twice that amount.

If these church relief budgets are to be met, however, approximately three times as much must be given in the local churches as was given this year. That means both larger and better plans, to reach more American church members with more information and to place the responsibility for greater generosity on consciences that have scarcely been stirred up to now. It is not a day too early to be starting such plans in every congregation. Clergy and lay leaders whose minds, at this time of year, normally might be principally engaged in wondering where the fish are biting most invitingly, now can be seeing to it that there is no diminution in relief contributions during the summer "off season"—there is no "off season" for starvation—and that the groundwork shall be laid for great increases in such giving during the coming fall and winter. This, too, will be a direct and practical contribution in the name of Christ to healing the world's wounds.

The fact that there are many Protestant churches which need to be roused to efforts of this practical nature is, of course, a reminder of another lack in Protestant leadership. If there had been a sufficiently continuous and insistent emphasis in the local congregations on the nature and implications of the Christian faith it would not be necessary to point out that there is a duty-involving connection between that faith and the present human crisis. Humanitarian deeds in themselves do not meet the deepest needs of Christians—or of the victims of our contemporary chaos—as they seek for answers which must pierce beyond the illimitable tragedy of our time into the realm of faith. But faith without works is dead, and the most direct road to recognition of a need for the undergirding of a reasoned faith is by the attempt to render resource-testing service.

To rescue the churches from the devil of frustration, therefore, let ministers and people tackle definite tasks that are within their powers, yet that will all but exhaust their powers. Let these be tasks with a clear world influence. The two that have been here pointed out—others might be named—are of that sort. In attempting to measure up to them there will be awakened a sense of need for deeper understanding of the present relevance of Christian belief. Out of the combination of practical effort and renewed study of the basis of faith our Protestant churches will create a mood in which frustration cannot survive.

# They Stand for Free Schools!

By Harold E. Fey

THAT an aroused public opinion is still able to block sectarian attempts to invade the public schools was proved in the Cincinnati suburb of North College Hill on June 17. On that night a state of affairs that had been designated by the National Education Association as "probably the most serious school situation now current in the nation" came to a dramatic climax. Before more than 1,000 citizens, the three-man Roman Catholic majority on the school board bowed to the will of the people and handed in their resignations. The Protestant minority, which had twice proposed this solution, also resigned.

This development at North College Hill throws the entire administration of the schools into the hands of Probate Judge Chase M. Davies of Cincinnati. Judge Davies' first act was to announce a public hearing on the appointment of a superintendent of schools. The Schools Improvement Association, which had backed the minority on the board in their defense of the integrity of the schools, urged the reappointment of Dr. William A. Cook. Dr. Cook's refusal to open his confidential files of teacher applications to the majority had been the occasion of their action to terminate his contract. This in turn brought about the resignations of 29 out of 33 teachers and a student strike lasting for weeks.\* Only the retention of Dr. Cook would keep the teachers, they maintained, or make possible reconstruction of North College Hill's ruined school system.

## *Superintendent Re-employed*

On June 23 Judge Davies announced his decision. It was to offer to re-employ Dr. Cook as superintendent of schools for a three-year term. Dr. Cook immediately accepted. The teachers who had resigned when the superintendent was forced out withdrew their resignations and were reinstated at salary increases of from \$300 to \$600 a year. A decision will be reached later as to whether the district's lease of the local parochial school from the Roman Catholic archdiocese of Cincinnati is to be renewed. It is expected that it will be terminated. If that occurs, the nuns will resign as public school teachers and henceforth will not be paid from public funds. Thus the school board's decision to resign opened the way for the schools to recover their integrity and for the community to reconstruct its shattered unity.

One important factor in bringing about the resignation of the Roman Catholic majority was the action of the National Education Association in blacklisting the school system of North College Hill. This unprecedented action followed a similar move by the Ohio Education Association, which also broke precedent when it declared that the local system was "an unprofessional place for teachers to work." The N.E.A. ban, which was announced on the

day the board resigned, was to continue "for as long as the present school board majority remains in control."

## *Taxpayer's Suit*

The national teachers' organization condemned the majority in an eight-point indictment. Standing first in this indictment was the majority's refusal to re-employ Dr. Cook, "an action unwarranted by Dr. Cook's record and standing." Also included were efforts to re-elect a former principal, "demoted for sufficient cause"; "secretive and tyrannical" conduct of school affairs; ignoring protests "of the great majority" of students and teachers and "strong demands" of parents and citizens. The N.E.A. charged the majority with thwarting community efforts at peaceful solution of the issue, causing wholesale teacher resignations and a strike of 700 pupils. In the final count it was charged that the Catholic majority had conducted "the affairs of the board in such a way that large sections of the community have been divided on religious grounds."

Another factor in producing these resignations was a taxpayer's suit filed in Common Pleas court. It seeks to enjoin the district from carrying out the contract entered into by the majority to pay Archbishop McNicholas of the Roman Catholic diocese of Cincinnati \$6,000 a year rental for the use of the local parochial school, which the church continues to use. One of the first actions of the majority when it took office on January 1, 1946, was to unload the parochial school on the public treasury. It not only incorporated the school into the public system but also signed an agreement to pay from public funds the salaries of the eight nuns who teach in that school. Concerning this the N.E.A. said: "This school enrolled only Catholic pupils and was taught largely by Catholic sisters, wearing the garb of their religious order. It was conducted as a sectarian school, but paid for out of public funds. Sectarian religious instruction was given each day as a regular part of the school program. The symbolic decorations of the building were of a sectarian nature. The sisters were paid from public funds under contract with the local board of education."

## *Test at Polls Coming*

It is rumored in North College Hill that Roman Catholic officials, who are widely believed to control the actions of their representatives on the school board, were attempting to secure the abandonment of the suit. I attended the meeting at which the board resigned, and was assured by officers of the Schools Improvement Association and by Edward Hoover, the attorney who represents the taxpayer, that no overture to get the suit out of court will be accepted. Behind the concern of the Catholic Church over this suit is its fear of the coming elections.

Next fall the whole issue in North College Hill will be fought out at the polls. In addition to its stake in this suburb, the Roman Church hopes to secure a majority on the

\*For an account of the development of the school crisis in North College Hill, see "Preview of a Divided America" in *The Christian Century* for May 28.

board of education in Cincinnati itself. This it can do if it displaces two Protestant members who are up for reelection. The agitation which has been created by the North College Hill situation has alarmed church officials, and they are in a mood to do anything in their power, short of abandoning their drive for control, to quiet matters down. Many who attended the June 17 board meeting believed that the majority would not have resigned except on orders from the archbishop, given for this reason.

#### *Ministers Take Up Fight*

A third factor leading to the resignation of the school board was the united action of Cincinnati Protestantism. On April 28 the Council of Churches of Greater Cincinnati held a meeting to discuss the situation which had developed at North College Hill. Of the more than 200 present, 60 per cent were laymen. Following presentation of the situation, which included a discussion of the taxpayer's suit, the council of churches voted to commend those who had brought the suit. It also authorized its headquarters committee "to initiate such action as it deems necessary to carry out the implications of aforesaid action." One of these implications, as the meeting recognized, would require the council to finance its opposition to the use of public funds "for the establishment and maintenance of sectarian religious schools or the teaching of sectarian religious belief or practice in public schools." This was approved unanimously. The council then issued a public statement which has been distributed throughout the Cincinnati area. It said, in part:

The principle of the separation of church and state was established on the basis that any state support, however slight, for any church or religious establishment would lead first to bitter wrangling between the adherents of different religions for tax favors and ultimately to that worst of all tyrannies, religious persecution. As President Madison pointed out in his famous 'Memorial Against Religious Assessments,' the first step towards church support, direct or indirect, from tax funds is the first step towards a return of the Spanish Inquisition. Recent disorders in North College Hill prove the soundness of the prophecy of bitter feelings when tax support for any church becomes a public issue. We dare not wait to see whether the rest of Madison's prophecy is sound. . . . The principle of separation of church and state is not a worn out slogan to be evaded by legal fiction. It is the keynote of our religious freedom. As such, it is worth protecting. For that reason, we shall support wholeheartedly the move to stop tax support for any church school, in North College Hill or any other place.

The Lutheran Pastoral Conference of Greater Cincinnati (Missouri Synod) commended the council for its action. The Cincinnati presbytery of the Presbyterian Church, U.S.A., had previously taken similar action. Dr. Edward W. Stimson of the Knox Presbyterian Church had a part in this, and in getting his influential congregation aroused to a realization of what was happening. The district conference of the Methodist Church, meeting on the same day as the council, voted to distribute a statement similar to that of the Presbyterians. On the previous Sunday Dr. G. Barrett Rich preached a notable sermon on "Protestants, Awake!" in his First United Church. This sermon subsequently was printed and is being widely distributed. In North College Hill, Dr. Robert W. Bockstruck, minister of the St. Paul Evangelical and Reformed

Church, rendered outstanding service. He supported members of his congregation who were active in the Schools Improvement Association. All five of the persons arrested on trumped-up charges after violence occurred in the April meeting of the school board were members of his congregation.

Dr. Bockstruck also pressed for and in May finally secured admittance into membership in the Northern Hills Ministerial Association of all of the pastors of neighboring Negro churches. This long overdue act of Christian fraternity may have important consequences in the coming election, since Negroes, with their 400 votes, hold the balance of power in North College Hill. Dr. Edward Jones, minister of the First Baptist Church in the Steele subdivision where the Negro population centers, is probably the most influential member of that community. He is a young man but highly competent, and is thoroughly committed to the defense of the public schools against sectarian infiltration or domination. Uniting all these and other efforts is the Council of Churches of Greater Cincinnati, whose executive secretary, Dr. Kemper G. McComb, and whose president, Dr. Ben M. Herbster, are providing a high quality of community leadership.

#### *Only a Partial Victory*

By forcing the resignations of the majority in the North College Hill school board, public opinion won an important victory in the struggle to preserve the schools from sectarian control. But this victory is only a preliminary and partial success. The decisive struggle will be won or lost in November at the polls. It will involve not only this suburban community but also metropolitan Cincinnati. Whether it will be won depends on the conviction, vigilance and hard work of Protestants in North College Hill and in Cincinnati. The issue has become a test of endurance between the forces of freedom in education and the archdiocese of Cincinnati. Whether freedom wins may depend upon the decision of a few battle-scarred and weary citizens. Several are now asking themselves whether they should not retire from the struggle and seek peace for themselves and their families elsewhere.

They would do well to take counsel from the experience of the taxpayer who has filed the suit to enjoin the school board from making further payments to Archbishop McNicholas. Several years ago Mrs. Frieda Reckman and her husband found themselves on the losing side of a controversy on the same issue in a neighboring town of St. Bernard. Seeking to forget the whole thing, they and other families moved to North College Hill. Recent events have convinced them that the hierarchy's designs include that community also. This time they are not moving away. They are taking their stand. Who stands with them?

#### *Amid the Void*

**B**OUNDLESS and measureless the reach of space,  
Where light-years crowd like sands, and leave no trace.

Yet the small stars, mere dust amid the void,  
Give flame and splendor to the heavens' face.

STANTON A. COBLENTZ.



# The Church as Exploiter

By John Bruce

THE CLASS DISCUSSION had veered around to the business practices of Christian employers. Joe Jenks accused them of being inconsiderate of the welfare of the workers. The middle-aged men listened with a tolerant attitude; Joe had shown regrettable signs of radicalism since his return from the army. But they were unprepared for the explosion from John James, president of the James & Paul canning company: "I don't claim to be a perfect Christian in my business or anywhere else. But I'm a better employer than the church is."

What had got into John? Everybody knew him as a good boss and he was no trouble-maker in church affairs. He paused as he watched their puzzled expressions. "When our church was looking for a pastor," he went on, "we wanted a man who would come for the same salary we had paid for ten years. He must be an inspiring preacher, a perfect pastor, an efficient organizer, a successful worker with young people—a person with all the virtues and no serious faults. Well, we agree that Dr. Noble fills the bill. And we don't have to pay much for all this."

They agreed. Dr. Noble was well liked. John resumed: "How we argued over that extra \$500. We didn't ask what he was worth. We didn't stop to figure in detail how much he would need to keep out of debt in this ritzy suburb. Did we give a thought to the fact that he will have to send three children through college? No. Our only worry was that this comfortable church would have to dig up \$500 more."

"Oh, don't be too hard on us, John," a fellow business man protested. "You know we're not complaining now; we're glad to pay it since we have him."

"Yes, there's that much to our credit," admitted the accuser. "And the new members he has added to our roll easily make up the sum. You know I've been on the board of trustees for only a year. I've learned a lot. I have a new understanding of what it takes to be a good minister, and of the variety of talents that Dr. Noble possesses. If he should ever want to quit the ministry I'd offer him a job as a trouble-shooter at the factory at twice his present salary."

## *Business Men in the Church—and Out*

Calvin Ives, attorney for the utilities company, declared that as a lawyer Dr. Noble could have gone to the top. "At forty-five he could easily have had an annual income of \$25,000 with a fat expense account. But you don't expect to pay ministers that well."

John nodded. "No, we don't, do we, Cal? We either don't pay some of them what they're worth or some of the rest of us are overpaid. Of course, when a man decides for the ministry he gives up all idea of wealth. And that's right, I suppose. But all that I'm saying is that business men in the church are less generous than these same men are when they're running their own corporations.

"But it wasn't of Dr. Noble that I intended to talk,

primarily," he went on. "As I say, I've learned a lot of things this year. Some of our church business practices worry me. For example, I discovered that we're paying Miss Ernest \$2,000 a year—less than our underpaid high school teachers get. She's one of the best directors of religious education in the state. If money were the important matter to her, she could pick up and leave tomorrow."

The chairman of the budget committee had been fidgeting for some time. He thought that "\$2,000 a year isn't so bad for a woman."

"How do we decide whether it is or not?" retorted the persistent new trustee. "She spent seven years after high school getting ready for her work. She has to live in a good neighborhood. We know the cost of room and board eats up a big part of her income. If she should begin to look dowdy you fellows would criticize her. She works day and night with the various groups of which we're so proud. And she receives less than \$40 a week. We have to pay more than that for unskilled workers in our factories and offices, and they work eight hours a day, five days a week."

## *Secretary Must Work Nights*

The men all admired Miss Ernest. She had put the church school and young people's organizations on their feet. But John had more to get off his chest: "Speaking of the help we employ in our offices, what do we employers pay for a faithful office secretary? I've been watching our church secretary (who doesn't?) and I think we have a jewel in her. Nobody knows how many loads she takes off Dr. Noble's shoulders. Does anything important ever slip up? You know the answer, and you know it's because Ann Abel checks on everything. Whenever we want help we run to her. We've seen lights in Ann's office night after night, but did that bother our consciences? Oh, no, that's what she's paid for! But she isn't paid to work nights."

"Come to think of it, what business has she working nights? We have a state law that limits women's working hours to forty-four a week. Couldn't we be hauled into court for violating that law?" This from Joe, the veteran, who often regretted that Ann was so wedded to her office.

Calvin Ives, the attorney, explained to the class that the law applies to almost every kind of enterprise except churches. This gave John James the opening he needed. "Yes, the law excepts churches. And we take advantage of that fact. The church doesn't even live up to the standards that are enforced on the rest of us. That's just the point I'm making. You'd think, wouldn't you? that a Christian church would do more for its paid workers than these so-called greedy business men do. You'd expect that a church would do it out of a sense of justice and not because the law requires it. But we let Ann work overtime, night after night, and think it's all right. We deny her a chance for normal social life and have no sense of guilt. We do, as a church, what not one of us can do in his own business. Or, maybe you think Ann's slow and has to work extra hours to get a full day's work done?"

able. And the pronouncements of their leaders were unequivocal on this question. In the sectional groups, whatever the assigned theme might be, the discussion came around with fateful frequency to the irrelevancy of our denominational churches and the imperative need of a united Protestant witness and action.

The goal of an ecumenical church cast its light upon every question faced by the conference. In particular, it clearly made necessary a changed emphasis in the education of the minister. The conference seemed to believe that we are near enough to some far-flung break in the walls of sectarianism to warrant the seminaries in beginning now the training of an ecumenical instead of a denominational type of minister. And how these seminarians responded to the suggestion of such a possibility!

The outlook for the young man who commits himself to a life of Christian service in the church is none too inviting under our sectarian system. To be cribbed and confined in the limitation of a small competitive sectarian parish in an overchurched community—a fate which awaits the vast majority of ministers—is felt by a Christian youth as hardly worthy of himself and the years of training he must undergo. Those who complain of the mediocrity of the ministry should marvel that the churches are able to command so many young men of high caliber as they do. But in a united Protestantism, the ministry would be lifted to a new plane of competence and excellence. It will not be strange, then, if these young men carry back to their seminaries some ideas of their own as to the kind of theological education they ought to receive.

This junior Oxford will surely leave its mark upon American Protestantism. The five volumes prepared in anticipation of the event and studied in the seminaries as preparation for it will now be reread in a new light by those who were present. These same volumes and the Oxford program that was based upon them could wisely be taken by the World Council of Churches as the pattern of the program of its own great conference to be held at Amsterdam next year.

C.C.M.

## Do Horses Like Sandwiches?

EDITOR THE CHRISTIAN CENTURY:

SIR: If you have ever asked whether horses like sandwiches, and left the question among mysteries unsolved, I can set your mind at rest. *They do.*

There is a mayor of a certain borough who in his civic capacity owns a horse, which grazes by a riverbank. Not long ago a citizen of that place was fishing on the riverbank. Seeing a horse approaching rapidly he ran to his luncheon basket, but arrived too late; the horse struck him on the head, which had to be stitched. And therefore at the end of an action against the mayor and corporation the urchin received not far from \$200 from his worship. Without question the horse had for his objective the sandwiches. It was made clear by irreproachable witnesses that this horse, though a beast of refined manners and high moral character, had one weakness: he could not resist sandwiches.

It is not recorded, but I have no doubt of it, that the lawyer who represented the mayor eloquently declared, "Neither can any of us." He may have quoted the lines,

Breathes there a man with soul so dead  
Who never to himself has said,  
"I must have sandwiches, or die"?

But the magistrates could not forget the sworn evidence: how that horse had chased a couple up the riverbank and returned to eat their sandwiches or on one morning had dragged a fisherman with his basket into the stream.

So by this one striking example preserved for all time it is at least made tolerably certain that the horse does like sandwiches, likes them greatly. What the sandwich is to his brother, man, that it is also to him. This story seems to make another bond between us: *so do we all.*

I can recall another river and another bank and another basket filled with sandwiches. And we, the party, climbed a hill to watch the river winding to the sea, and then returned for our lunch. But the sandwiches were gone, and even the gentlest of us said it was fresh evidence that things were not what they used to be. But this fact you must take into account: it was not a horse that ruined our picnic because of his insatiable appetite for sandwiches; it was Man, *Homo sapiens*, the heir of all the ages. But who can trust himself in the presence of sandwiches? We can only use the profound formula of the psychiatrist—*so are we all.*

You will be sorry for the mayor and corporation. But perhaps their loss may bid them to face reality. Either refrain from keeping horses with a pronounced taste of this kind, or supply them with a liberal store. Other mayors and other corporations may learn by this experience, and it will be cheap for \$200. Anglers, of all men the most harmless, cannot be suffered to have their heads split. The surgeon must not be kept busy stitching heads. The magistrates who showed that power of instant and courageous action must not be put to so great a strain again.

But the villain alone suffers nothing. Tomorrow, if he scents sandwiches from afar, his conscience will not trouble him. *He will do it again.*

And where is the charm of the sandwich? Two or more slices of bread, a few thin strips of cold meat—how dull and uninviting! But put them together cunningly with perhaps a cucumber called in aid and who, horse or man, can easily pass them by? But that is another profound problem, to be kept for quieter days.

Ever yours observant,

QUINTUS QUIZ.

## Lest We Feel Lost

WILL GOD, perhaps, grant us again  
Some well beloved thing  
We knew on earth—a star, a dawn,  
Or wheeling swallow's wing?  
Perhaps a fawn will steal once more  
Through fern before our eyes  
Lest we, new come, feel lost or strange  
In Paradise.

LESLIE SAVAGE CLARK.

# The Supreme Court—Is Stassen Right?

By E. Hilton Jackson

UNDER DATE of May 22, the Associated Press reported that Harold E. Stassen, avowed candidate for the presidency, had taken to task the Southern Baptist Convention for discussing critically the recent decision of the Supreme Court in the Everson case. In this decision the court had validated the use of tax funds by the state of New Jersey in reimbursing parents for bus transportation paid by them in conveying their children to religious schools, notwithstanding the fact that New Jersey provided for the use of all its children free public schools and free transportation thereto. In an address to the convention, Mr. Stassen is reported to have leveled this criticism at that body: "I do not consider it to be in keeping with the dignity or the standing or the teachings of my great religious denomination to attack a decision of the Supreme Court after it is made."

## *Is the Court Sacrosanct?*

It is surprising to the point of amazement that a man of Mr. Stassen's cosmopolitan background in public life and service should have fallen into such an egregious error. It is not believed that he could possibly have realized the full implications of what he was saying. To say that a final decision of the Supreme Court, or of any court, is sacrosanct to the extent that individuals or organizations may not discuss it critically, or favorably, is contrary to the common practice in the development of our system of government and to our precedents and practice in the perfection of our judicial procedure. In fact, it is at this very point when a decision of the Supreme Court becomes final that it is within the undoubted province of individuals and organizations to discuss it fully. Only through such discussion can its constructions and interpretations be revised and corrected, if erroneous, and only so can legislation on which it is based be altered or amended. Only by such discussion can the decision, if correct, be confirmed in public confidence.

In our system it is axiomatic that the law is the last decision of the last court, and that a mandate of the Supreme Court is the supreme law of the land and should be obeyed implicitly by individuals and organizations until it is revised or reversed. But that is a far cry from saying, as does Mr. Stassen, that it is not in keeping with the dignity and teachings of the Southern Baptist or any other denomination to discuss critically a final decision of the Supreme Court. His position is utterly untenable in the light of our history and judicial precedents.

## *Historical Precedents*

Mr. Stassen is also mistaken in stating that the dignity and teachings of the Baptist denomination are violated by discussing critically a final decision of the Supreme Court. The Baptists have been in the forefront of the struggle for religious liberty and separation of church and state since the early part of the seventeenth century. They made the first declaration in the English language in support

of complete religious liberty in 1611. They addressed to King James I an appeal for freedom of worship in 1614. They established the first community based on freedom of religion in Rhode Island in 1638. They secured a charter in 1633 from Charles II that guaranteed "full liberty in religious concerns." They demanded complete separation of church and state in Virginia in 1774. In fact, the historian George Bancroft said: "Freedom of conscience, unlimited freedom of mind was, from the first, a trophy of the Baptists."

Baptists were in the thick of the struggle, in support of Madison and Jefferson, to secure the adoption of the First Amendment providing a wall of separation between church and state. In the light of this long and valiant struggle, it was natural that Baptists should have been deeply interested when the Everson case in New Jersey for the first time presented to the Supreme Court for construction the provision of the First Amendment that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion." When the 5 to 4 decision was rendered, the majority opinion was discussed critically by the Baptist denomination and other organizations and by many of the great newspapers of the country, but by none more vigorously than by the dissenting judges of the court itself. Can it be said in justice that the Baptist denomination, in pursuing this course—a right generally recognized by the courts and by public opinion—violated its dignity or teachings, as charged by Mr. Stassen? If the dissenting opinions, the press, the law reviews, the lawyers and private individuals may discuss critically a final opinion of the Supreme Court, it follows that the Baptist or any other denomination may do so with the utmost propriety.

## *Minorities May Become Majorities*

In fact, such restrained, constructive criticism may be, and often is, a distinct form of public service. A final decision of the court on the meaning of a phrase in the Constitution often represents the difference between what five learned and patriotic men think it means and what four other equally learned and equally patriotic men think it means. If the interpretation of the five is sealed and sepulchered, immune from criticism and change, then our legal system is lacking in the requisite techniques for self-correction. Fortunately, ours is a living, dynamic law, evolved not revealed, and public opinion has a vital, legitimate place in this evolutionary process. The exercise of this undoubted right of critical discussion does not impinge in the slightest degree upon the dignity, or standing, or teachings of the Baptist denomination, as charged by Mr. Stassen. On the contrary, it but confirms the virility, the consistency and the sincerity of the denomination in its age-long struggle to keep high and impregnable the wall of separation between church and state.

The history of our highest tribunal is replete with cases in which the minority opinion of yesterday has become the majority opinion of today. Many recognized legal

principles, now well established in the decisions of the court, were once merely the expressions of the minority view. It is one of the crowning glories of the court that it has not hesitated, on further experience and analysis, to revise or reverse its decisions when fully convinced of its previous error. For example, Chief Justice Stone, lone dissenter in the case of *Minersville School District vs. Gobitis* (1940) 310 U. S. 586, saw his dissenting opinion in defense of the refusal of Jehovah's Witnesses to salute the flag become the law of the land in less than three years.

#### *Reversals of Opinion*

In another case, *Jones vs. Opelika* 316 U. S. 584 (1942), the majority opinion was law for less than eleven months. Examples of a revision or reversal of its opinions could be multiplied. All such actions are indicative of the fact that the court's decisions are not to be encased in vacuums as something sacrosanct and untouchable. Mr. Justice Hughes, in his *Columbia University Lectures*, published 1928, said: "A dissent in a court of last resort is an appeal to the brooding spirit of the law, to the intelligence of a future day, when a later decision may possibly correct the error into which the dissenting judge believes the court to have been betrayed."

What has been the attitude of the judiciary and public officials generally to criticism of final decisions of the courts? The courts generally have held that criticism after final disposition is clearly privileged, and may not be inhibited. Mr. Justice Holmes, in *Patterson vs. Colorado* 205 U. S. 454-463 (1907), said: "When a case is finished, courts are subject to the same criticism as other people."

#### *Judges Men of Fortitude*

Even when a case is still pending the Supreme Court has held (*Bridges vs. California* [1941] 314 U. S. 252, *Craig vs. Harney*, decided May 19, 1947) that the court will not punish for contempt the publication of criticism of a court unless there is a clear and present danger that such criticism will seriously impair the administration of justice. The court said: "But the law of contempt is not made for the protection of judges who may be sensitive to the winds of public opinion. Judges are supposed to be men of fortitude able to thrive in a hardy climate." In the *Craig* case, Mr. Justice Frankfurter, in his dissent, said: "Comment on what a judge has done—criticism of judicial process in a particular case after it has exhausted itself—no matter how ill-informed or irresponsible or misrepresentative, is part of the precious right of the free play of public opinion. Whatever violence there may be to truth in such utterances must be left to the correction of truth."

Abraham Lincoln said in 1858: "We think the *Dred Scott* decision is erroneous. We know the court that made it has often overruled its own decisions and we shall do what we can to have it overrule this." He further stated that he declined to abide by the decision when rendered. In 1861, in his inaugural address, President Lincoln said: "At the same time the candid citizen must confess that if the policy of the government upon vital questions affecting the whole people is to be irrevocably fixed by decisions of

the Supreme Court the instant they are made in ordinary litigation between parties in personal actions, the people will have ceased to be their own rulers, having to that extent practically resigned their government into the hands of that eminent tribunal. Nor is there in this view any assault upon this court or the judges."

Since the opinion in the New Jersey case was rendered by Mr. Justice Black, and has been subject to well nigh universal criticism, it is not without interest to recall an expression by Mr. Justice Black who wrote the opinion for the Supreme Court in the famous *Bridges* case decided December 8, 1941, as follows: "The assumption that respect for the judiciary can be won by shielding judges from published criticism wrongly appraises the character of American public opinion. For it is a prized American privilege to speak one's mind, although not always with perfect good taste, on all public institutions. And an enforced silence, however limited solely in the name of preserving the dignity of the bench, would probably engender resentment, suspicion and contempt, much more than it would enhance respect."

#### *Right of Criticism Conceded*

No comment on the question raised by the criticism of Mr. Stassen can be finally disposed of without reference to the mandate of the First Amendment to the effect "that Congress shall make no law . . . abridging the freedom of speech or of the press." It is significant that the mandate of the First Amendment with respect to the freedom of religion and of the press constitutes the only "thou shalt not" in the Constitution. While our government under the Constitution is divided into three coordinate branches, *to wit*, the legislative, executive and judicial, there appears to be only one branch whose act is not subject to review. Any act of an executive, whether state or national, may be held null and void by our Supreme Court, if it is in conflict with the Constitution. Likewise, any act of a state legislature, or of Congress, may be declared in a given case as violative of the Constitution of the United States, and hence a nullity. A final decision of our Supreme Court is not subject to review by any agency of the government. The only method for overturning such a decision is through an appeal to the bar of public opinion.

#### *The Mold of Beauty*

THE MOLD of beauty is the thought of God,  
 Unchanging, infinite and never lost;  
 The rhododendron searching dew and sod,  
 The rugged oak from sunlight and the frost,  
 Secure a substance which dare not betray  
 The ancient pattern. Ripening muscadines  
 Store in magenta vats the old bouquet  
 From orchards that no curious eye defines;  
 While matchless ivory brow, the sculptured breast—  
 More wonderful than marble, bronze or wood  
 Of Angelo—are wrought at love's behest  
 Within the dark, from surging, singing blood.  
 The mold of beauty is too exquisite  
 For finite minds to plumb or question it.

JOHN RICHARD MORELAND.

# Religious Freedom in Japan

By Ralph J. D. Braibanti

**L**ITTLE of what has transpired in the occupation of Japan has yet come to the attention of the American public. Much of what has developed will characterize the occupation as one of the most significant experiments in modern history. While it is becoming apparent that we have not been successful in fundamentally modifying the behavior patterns or conditioning the attitudes that have been molded by centuries of Confucian, Buddhist and Shinto philosophy, it is undeniably true that we have met with some success in changing the political, economic and social conditions of Japanese life. At least the way has been cleared of obstacles.

The new constitution, suffrage for women, reform in education, division of rural land holdings, revision of the police system and the breakup of State Shinto are among the conditions which the occupation forces have changed. What effect these changes in the structure of Japanese civilization will have on the grass roots of Japanese thought remains indeterminate at this time. Not the least among the accomplishments of the military government in Japan is the breakup of State Shinto. The problem of separating religion from state in Japan is made difficult chiefly by two factors.

## I

The first is the novelty of the concept to the Japanese people. There is nothing in the history of Japan to indicate anything but a curious Oriental intermingling of religion and government even though that relationship has not always been as pronounced as State Shinto of the past seventy-five years. Furthermore, Japanese history discloses no magnificent tradition of the persistence of religion in spite of persecution.

The second factor is continuance of the habit so characteristic of Japanese people, that of obeying and following directions without understanding the meaning or the spirit of those directions. It is this trait which makes the Japanese seem to many Occidentals a baffling people. Former Police Commissioner Valentine of New York exclaimed in despair after a few weeks of trying to reform the police that he could not understand the people. This ingrained obedience of the Japanese is deceptive, and hence makes it difficult to evaluate the progress of reform in Japan. No one who has worked closely with the Japanese during the occupation can say they are not obedient, compliant and tractable. But the obedience in no sense presupposes understanding.

Despite these two difficulties, some definite gains have been made in separating religion from state in Japan and in providing the underpinnings for a meaningful religious freedom.

The initial post-surrender policy of the United States for Japan, as transmitted to Japan by department of state radio on September 22, 1945, stated: "Freedom of religious worship shall be proclaimed promptly upon occu-

pation. At the same time it should be made plain to the Japanese that ultranationalistic and militaristic organizations and movements will not be permitted to hide behind the cloak of religion." Although a later directive made it clear that no religion would be permitted to affiliate with the government, the September 22 radio, at least by inference, referred to Shinto. It was apparent from the outset that the problem of separating religion from state in Japan was specifically a problem of separating State Shinto from its identification with the Japanese government and was not a problem involving either Buddhism or Christianity, the other two major religions of Japan.

The justice of this indictment against Shinto was obvious, for it was only State Shinto which all the people were compelled to support financially regardless of their own belief or church affiliations. Further, it was only Shinto theory which had been perverted into militaristic and ultranationalistic propaganda designed to delude the Japanese people and lead them into wars of aggression. This is not to say that Buddhist and Christian priests did not use their religious affiliation to justify Japan's war of aggression, or even to support it. There seems to be much evidence that they did. They were Japanese and Shintoists first and Buddhists or Christians second. Since no well defined official relationship involving compulsory financial support or compulsory attendance at services existed between the sects of Buddhism or Christianity and the Japanese government, those religions were not specifically mentioned in the edict.

## II

In an analysis of the over-all policy animating our program for separation of religion and state, the example which our occupation forces perhaps unwittingly set in their own attitude toward Christianity must be examined. It is generally considered that the only means used by the military government of Japan for carrying out policy is the written directive to the Japanese government. It is true that this is the principal administrative technique used in enforcing our aims in Japan. It is not too much to say, however, that many concomitant changes in the behavior patterns of the Japanese people derive from the example set by the American military government in Japan. That other forces there are under very careful and intelligent scrutiny by the Japanese people is perhaps the greatest challenge our democratic system ever faced.

The American army in Japan would not have done anything new in history if it had allied itself with the Christian church and had lent its aid in "missionizing" Japan. The fact that it did not make this alliance is one of the significant features of the occupation. Many of the Japanese people expected that Christianity would be made a compulsory religion in Japan after the surrender. Their greatest single source of knowledge about America was through the missionary, hence they identified Americanism with



# MINNESOTA HISTORICAL SOCIETY

Copyright in this digital version belongs to the Minnesota Historical Society and its content may not be copied without the copyright holder's express written permission. Users may print, download, link to, or email content, however, for individual use.

To request permission for commercial or educational use, please contact the Minnesota Historical Society.