

# The Northwestern Lutheran

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

Vol. 6.

Milwaukee, Wis., June 29, 1911

No. 13.



Dr. August F. Ernst.

## FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF PRESIDENT ERNST, Ph.D.

On the 19th day of June, the fiftieth anniversary of the president of Northwestern College at Watertown, Wis., Dr. August F. Ernst, was duly commemorated. It is altogether fitting and proper that due reference be given to this notable event in the columns of the *Northwestern Lutheran*. It is fitting and proper, because our celebrant not only has devoted his untiring services to the Church body, whose interests our paper is serving—the Evangelical Lutheran Joint Synod of Wisconsin, Minnesota, Michigan and other States—but has also been instrumental in its organization and of which body he has been elected its first president, holding that important office for three subsequent terms, from 1892 to 1899.

Augustus Frederic Ernst was born in the kingdom of Hanover, Germany, on the 25th day of June, 1841, as son of a distinguished Lutheran clergyman. Reared

under the most auspicious conditions and influences, he received the best of educational advantages, having had as instructors such men of international fame as Saupe, Lotze, Ernst Curtius, Ewald, Dorner and Wiesinger, at the University of Goettingen.

As a young man of twenty-two years, in 1863, Professor Ernst came to the United States, and established his residence in the city of New York, where he was engaged in ministerial work, as a zealous and devoted member of the Lutheran Church. He had charge of a congregation in the national metropolis until 1869, after which he held for ten years a pastoral charge at Albany, New York. It was there that Rev. Ernst met the Rev. R. Adelberg, who later on was called to the pastorate of the Lutheran church at Watertown, Wis., and through whom the attention of the authorities of the Wisconsin Lutheran Synod was directed to him in their search for able teachers for their college at Watertown, long known as Northwestern Uni-

versity, but now bearing the title of Northwestern College.

It will ever be gratefully remembered in the annals of the institution as a specially benign dispensation of divine Providence that the attention of the proper authorities had been called to the man, who by the grace of God has presided over its destinies for fifty years, with consecrated zeal and devotion, and under whose efficient administration Northwestern College has from so humble beginnings half a century ago advanced not only to a high place among educational institutions of Wisconsin, but has been a fruitful nursery for the Lutheran Church throughout the Northwest in preparing hundreds of young men for the ministerial and other professional callings.

Professor Ernst was 28 years old when he was called to Wisconsin to become a member of the college faculty; it was in 1869, and shortly after his arrival, he was elected president of the institution. Despite his youthful age, and the unusual conditions confronting him, his administrative ability soon proved on a parity with his high intellectual attainments and earnest devotion to educational work. Endowed with a keen intellect and with a tremendous working capacity, unceasingly engaged in adding to his own knowledge by keeping abreast of the advance of science, reinforced by rare ability to impart his profound knowledge to others, he was an inspiration to his students and colleagues alike during the whole period of his supervision.

It is principally as an educator at and head of a *Christian* institution that hundreds, even thousands of Lutheran youths of our land look to our venerable celebrant with love and esteem. Aside from the fact that President Ernst is known as one of the most influential and honored figures in the Wisconsin field of education; aside from the fact, furthermore, that incidentally he has exerted a larger influence on the life of the state than many men whose names more frequently appear in the current press, his name being prominently identified with the history of this commonwealth for half a century—it is to the cause of Christ and His Church that he has devoted his indefatigable labor.

Naturally much of his time was occupied with the teaching of Greek and Latin, as well as mental and moral philosophy. Realizing that a classical education of universal scope based on a thorough knowledge of the ancient languages is indispensable for the coming ministers of the Gospel, as well as for other callings in the scientific line, President Ernst has to this day maintained the high standard of the institution to this effect, notwithstanding modern tendencies to the contrary. As far back as 1870 he wrote in the synodical paper—the “*Gemeindeblatt*”: “The college aims to provide its students with a thorough general education which should enable them to turn to any of the highest scientific professions successfully. In this de-

partment stress is laid on the study of the ancient languages, for they are the media to convey the most advanced mental discipline; it must not be supposed, however, that the exact sciences such as mathematics and natural science are neglected.” He furthermore says: “It is an undeniable fact that our present institution is of incalculable service to our synod, to our church, indeed, to the German population of the whole Northwest.” Again he says: “We are now a purely synodical institution, which is supported by the church exclusively. And, to the glory of God, we may say with due modesty that our service for the church is not in vain.”

It particularly devolved on the president, as the traditional class teacher of the seniors, to instruct them in mental and moral philosophy. Indeed this branch of study was more in agreement with his personal preference, philosophy always having been his favorite field. Thus it was on the strength of his eminent philosophical attainments and efficiency in teaching metaphysics that the theological faculty of Concordia Seminary at St. Louis, Mo. conferred on him the degree “Doctor of Philosophy” at the golden jubilee of Northwestern College in 1915. Being a master of analysis, of reason, of logic, it was natural that he should become and remain to this day the teacher of psychology, logic, and metaphysics, and these recitations have always been the delight of the seniors privileged to attend them, as undoubtedly they have given them, so to speak, the finishing touch to their mental make-up, as far as liberal education is concerned. No one who has grasped the import of these recitations can estimate the value derived from them for the whole of his subsequent work in whatever calling, and for his mental freedom to look at things as they really are.

But over and above all human knowledge and science there is one thing our venerable Doctor has ever propounded—the Gospel of the Grace of God through Christ. This has always been his contention: “earthborn knowledge must be transfused by the Spirit of Light from on high; without the Word of God, through which the Spirit teaches, learning, and teaching cannot bring true happiness.” Every theory, every system in the whole realm of science and history not in harmony with the fundamental principles of Christianity must, therefore, be repudiated as false and pernicious, no matter how plausible they may seem to human reason. Hence the Doctor would take up arms against everything that he found to be false or unworthy of Divine truth. Who will not remember how unrelentingly he would lay bare before his students the fallacy of so many a modern theory within the province of religion, of science, of philosophy, or the pernicious theories of evolution, of pantheism, the fallacious systems of absolutism and positivism, etc? Over and against all man-made systems and theories he would hold to the revelations of God exhibited in

the book of Holy Writ, leading his pupils not only to a clever conception of these, but also to a realization of their imperishable worth and validity.

It has been said that the Professor assigns too great a value to the practical side of life and its success, that he is often too optimistic as to results. That he places great value on success, is true; it distresses him to see his pupils "making a mess of life"; he has always wished them to take their part in the work of their calling with energy and effect. He dreads listlessness and indifference on the part of students, often intimating that he has little liking for those who fail in life. That young men should go from college without a purpose, idle dreamers, only to fail in life was what he most wished to prevent. He had seen enough of wasted life and duties neglected in the pursuit of ill-chosen ambitions. And yet if there are men in this age of material success mainly, who live in the light of ideals, it is our beloved teacher. It is through ideals he has sought to educate and elevate others—ideals drawn above all from the source of all true ideals—the Bible, as well as from the lives of those, who, like Luther and other great and godly men, have been instrumental in the hand of God in giving the world the highest ideals conceivable and the greatest of blessings possible. In his view the ideal and the practical are not to be separated; ideals without practice bear no fruit, while practice without the ideal, followed by success, often not only comes dangerously near to success-worship, but is like a helpless wandering of one who has lost his true aim in life. With the conception of the ideal and the practical, such as this, our beloved teacher would impart to his pupils the kind of education which enables them always to work with the ideal in mind, above all the Christian ideal which not only subordinates all earthly matters and interests to the supreme purpose of life, but holds forth to them that knowledge and wisdom, of whose excellency St. Paul says: "I count all things but loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Jesus Christ my Lord."

From such premises on the outset it naturally follows that the work which President Ernst has been graced of God to do has borne blessed and lasting fruit. Looking back upon his public career as educator and head of a Christian institution for a period of half a century he may well feel gratified that under divine grace his work has been abundantly blessed for the Church of Christ to which he has devoted his life work, for the synodical body, which has entrusted him with the care and guidance of its higher institution of learning almost the entire length of its existence.

In commemorating the golden jubilee of the President of our *alma mater* there is one thing which, we feel, would be unfair to overlook. It is the co-operative work by which he was ably assisted on the part of his colleagues. Among these there is especially one man whom we can hardly separate, in our mind, from the

activity of our revered President these many years; a man eminently gifted, a philologist of the highest rank, possessed of a remarkable faculty for teaching languages, a worthy co-laborer who, with the president, has been, so to speak, a co-ordinate factor in the up-building of Northwestern College. That man is Dr. F. W. A. Notz, who has retired from his labors in recent years. Indeed it is to these two veterans of our *alma mater* that thousands of able men all over the country give credit for their early training in life.

To conclude. As loyal scholars, as members of the Lutheran Church whom for half a century he has so nobly served we invoke every blessing upon the venerable head of our institution. As a faithful and able instructor and leader of the youth he has been these many years in *loco parentis*. Devoted, as he always was, to his task, his charge certainly resembles the father's care in this, that we can measure neither the cost to him of the efforts he has made, nor the depth of gratitude we owe him.

J. J.

#### COMMENTS

**He Decided To Remain** "The University of Minnesota made Professor Christiansen a very flattering offer to induce him to become a member of the university faculty. Altho the appointment would secure him a much larger salary, less work and more time at his own disposal, he put it aside and decided to remain at St. Olaf College." — *Lutheran Church Herald*.

It would be well if all church members would stop to consider for a moment the reason why this professor at a church college declined an appointment which offered him so many advantages. Our interpretation of his action is this, Professor Christiansen is a Christian who knows that there are things of greater value than money, honor and ease. He regards himself as a steward over the gifts, abilities and accomplishments with which the Lord has endowed him and wants to use them as directly as possible in the service of the Lord for the good of men. And there is no doubt in his mind that he is in a better position to do this as a Christian educator in a Christian school than as a professor in any secular institution. He considers it sufficient honor for any man to be permitted to serve the Church and trusts the Head of the Church to keep his servant from want and to provide him with the necessities of life.

In this Professor Christiansen is not the exception. The spirit which prompted him to decide as he did is the spirit that prevails among the professors in our church institutions, many of whom could easily gain greater recognition and material advantages elsewhere. We should honor this spirit wherever we find it—and be careful not to abuse it.

The *United American* comments: "But the church people should not play with fire. Our college salaries

**The Northwestern Lutheran**, edited by a committee, published bi-weekly by the Northwestern Publishing House of Milwaukee, Wis., at \$1.00 per year, by mail in Milwaukee at \$1.25 per year, in the interest of, and maintained by the Ev. Luth. Synod of Wisconsin, Minnesota, Michigan, and Other States.

Entered as Second Class Matter Dec. 30th, 1913, under the Act of March 3rd, 1879.

Acceptance for mailing at the special rate of postage as provided for in Section 1103, Act of Oct. 3rd, 1917, authorized Aug. 26th, 1918.

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

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

Send all business correspondence, remittances, etc., to Northwestern Publishing House, 263 Fourth St., Milwaukee, Wis.

are woefully inadequate. Our men cannot give us the best that is in them when they are constantly worrying about how to make ends meet in a financial way. They cannot improve themselves nor keep themselves abreast of the times when there is not a cent left at the end of the month. The average station agent in our Minnesota villages is now drawing a salary that is \$300 more a year than a St. Olaf professor is getting."

The best way of honoring this spirit in others is to show it ourselves. This professor's decision means an annual contribution of several hundred dollars on his part, to say nothing of the additional burden of work he is willing to bear. And that from a man whose salary will, perhaps, amount to \$1,200 a year. Now, if every church member with the same income would make a proportionate contribution for the work of the church and be willing to sacrifice some conveniences and luxuries, would the church not be in a position to extend its work in every direction?

Finally, the church needs men. It cannot get them in sufficient numbers as long as young men and their parents will continue to look upon life with the eyes of the materialist, who considers honor, power, wealth and ease the only things worth while, for these are things which service in the church does not offer a man. It is only the spirit that considers the welfare of the church paramount that will bring us enough men and men of the right kind.

If you have admired the spirit of this professor, cultivate it in yourself.

J. B.

\* \* \* \* \*

**The League of Nations and God** There is general uneasiness regarding the proposed League of Nations. Originally America was practically undivided in its desire to see an international agreement of some kind put into operation. But now that we have a concrete attempt in the proposed League prepared by the Paris conference, the unanimity is becoming less evident.

Many who stoutly maintain their friendliness for such a league have serious doubts as to particular points made by this covenant. Some are outspoken against any limitation of national sovereignty by international super-government.

But occasionally one finds a certain objection raised that is very pointed. Upon examination it will be found to emanate in every case from sources that are Roman Catholic. This objection has been publicly stated by The Reverend F. X. McCabe, president of De Paul university. In a public address, quoted by the newspapers, he attacked the League of Nations covenant because of "the atheistic manner in which it was drawn."

The meaning which he attaches to the expression "atheistic" in this case becomes plain when we follow his remarks: "When those representatives of Christian nations gathered at the peace conference to solve the human problems of the world, they as much as told the Almighty to take a seat on the side lines. They didn't want Him. They cast Him out. There was no mention of deity and not an opening prayer, as far as we can learn.

"I say nothing but chaos is bound to result when deity is so shamefully insulted. Our congress, conventions, and patriotic meetings open with prayer, but the greatest meeting of all history was not."

The Reverend Father also paid his respects to England; asserting that English policies were far too predominant in the affairs of the conference.

Taking up the question of the godless covenant by itself, it is evident to every Christian that an agreement reached by men without the counsel of God cannot determine anything. Even when such counsel and blessing is undeniably present (as in our congregational and synodical meetings) there is still so much wayward humanity in us and our children that the best resolutions come to grief because they are not carried out. Legislating for a world, for all its inhabitants for years to come, is indeed so vast an undertaking that God alone could plan and direct it. When men do it under the authority which they have as governors, all other men must instantly realize that their handiwork will be no better than any other that leaves the hand of man. It will have its faults—fatal faults, perhaps—and if it endures for some time, it will endure no longer than God permits it to function. God does not await an invitation to any conference. He is there whether He is wanted or not.

Were the world, as Father McCabe implies, composed of Christian nations, and were the so-called Christian nations truly Christian, then it might be possible that men united and inspired by a common faith would undertake their task with a sense of responsibility to their Lord which would seek expression a little more emphatically than by a perfunctory opening prayer. But the nations are not of that uniform faith,

and probably they never will be. If they were, a catastrophe like that of the last five years would be unthinkable.

Meeting in France it was natural that devotional formalities were omitted from the meetings of the peace conference; those from other lands conformed to the customs of the land in which they met. France has established the principle of separation of church and state quite logically. Perhaps they arrived at their conclusion from the side of unbelief. However arrived at, it agrees with our own view that church and state should not be confused. It is folly to expect the church to sponsor so foreign a thing as the League of Nations covenant. A casual reference to God interspersed here and there would be almost a sacrilege in an instrument that is built on man's ideas alone.

Are, then, the members of the conference to attack their work as heathen? Not necessarily. If any there be that feels he is acting under God, let Him call upon God in the faith which is his and let him act upon his convictions.

We are rather pleased than displeased with this omission of phrases that would have to be meaningless under the circumstances. We can only wish that the practices in America which Father McCabe cites as our custom, regarding prayer at public meetings, would be changed to agree with the French style. We would then practice what we preach concerning the separation of church and state and our public acts would not be one whit less sanctified by the omission.

It was not that omission, we feel sure, that exasperated the learned Father McCabe; we know that in principle he must agree with the practice of the Paris conference in this respect. The Paris conference did something else that has been taken as an affront by the whole Roman Catholic world: it ignored the pope. It was not so much God that was deliberately ruled out as His self-appointed representative at Rome.

The whole peace program would have been so splendid an opportunity for the pope to renew his claims to the spiritual headship of the world—and now he gets nothing out of it. As far as known the Paris conference has not even consented to re-examine the pope's status in Italy. He had such high hopes that he might regain the sovereignty wiped out by the Italian state. Now he finds that he must continue to pose as the prisoner of the Vatican or give up that somewhat melodramatic role.

On this score we refuse to grant Father McCabe any sympathy whatever; on the contrary, we feel rather offended that he uses such indirect means to endanger whatever good there may be in the covenant.

From what we know of the Reverend Father, there is another matter which agitates him; he refers to that also rather indirectly. But here we find that our sympathy could be gained more readily. He is an

Irishman. The Irish question has been treated quite cavalierly by the Paris conference. The preponderance of British influence will surely prevent the conference from taking any action that will relieve the Irish patriots of their anxieties. If that be a reason to condemn the whole League of Nations the question could be discussed on its merits, always bearing in mind that Americans of Irish descent should now be no less exclusively American than the Americans of German descent were expected to be during the late unpleasantness. And this question has nothing whatever to do with the omission of any reference to God in the resolutions of the conference. H. K. M.

\* \* \* \* \*

**"A Pertinent Question"** "A State superintendent of missions was recently approached by representatives of a fairly strong church in a thriving city in the Middle West. The church needed a minister. The superintendent told them frankly that it would be a difficult task to secure for them the kind of minister they were demanding. These representatives were inclined to be impatient. They felt that they deserved relief. Their work was suffering. They had had no pastor for several months. The superintendent explained to them the situation we now face with an altogether insufficient number of trained men to minister to our churches, and turned to the speaker and said: 'How many men has your church ever sent out into the ministry? You have had a pastor for the greater part of the time for many years. Have you done your part?' The man was thoughtful for a few moments and replied, 'As far as I can recall, we have never sent out a single minister. By what right can a church expect to have constant pastoral service under such conditions?'—*The Standard* (Baptist).

The situation the writer presents is not an unusual one in our circles also. We have even heard of congregations whose impatience misled them to threaten that they would apply for a pastor to some body with which we do not fellowship, if relief were not speedily granted. And it is entirely likely that they were congregations that had never sent a student to college to prepare for the ministry and had perhaps paid little attention to the fund for indigent students. The churches that want pastoral service must furnish the men for the ministry and for the parochial school. It should be considered part of the work of the congregation to encourage boys to enter college and to support them, if their parents are not able to do it. In this the minister is to lead, but what a fine thing it would be if the members of the church would give this matter their personal attention! J. B.

\* \* \* \* \*

**Does This Apply To Us Also?** A Baptist minister, ordering copies of the convention numbers of *The Standard* for those of his people that do not take it, states his reason for doing this as

follows: "Pastorless spells and no denominational information among the great majority of our people, together with an occasional pastor who knows almost nothing of our church news and therefore never speaks of it in public or private conversation, are some of the things which have caused us to lose out in this part of the state. I think the great thing we need now is the placing of good, current news, the appeals, financial and other, and choice expressions of denominational interest, about loyalty and beliefs, expressions and passages on daily living, the inspirations of the Christian life, etc., in the hands of every Baptist constantly."

Does this apply to us also; and are we willing to try the remedy this Baptist minister employs?

J. B.

### RELIGIOUS FREEDOM ENDANGERED

(Continued.)

#### III. Definite Areas of Danger

To proceed, let us not overlook that even as matters now stand the constitutional guarantee is not so iron-clad as most of us would fain believe. Congress enjoined from making laws restricting the "free exercise of religion." But are you aware that there is no law defining what constitutes a "religion," the free exercise of which is guaranteed? It would seem that it is every citizen's privilege to decide for himself what shall be his religion and the proper exercise thereof. But is this quite true? Suppose a citizen should claim the privilege of committing murder, arson or fornication under the plea that such practices are part of the exercise of his religion? You will say that acts of this kind are universally recognized as crimes against society and cannot rightfully be brought under the head of religious practices. Should your attention then be called to the records of history which tell us that such practices have actually been considered not only compatible with religion, but as being the very expressions of high religious ideals, not by savages, but by almost all civilized nations of olden days—you would probably demur by saying that those were not Christian peoples. But do you not see that you stand on dangerous ground with your demurrer? Does it not imply that, say in our country, the Christian religion is officially recognized as the standard of state morality? If our laws prohibit such practices because they are against the religious convictions of Christian people, does not that mean that the Christian religion is an accepted principle of law in our country? We must not, however, pursue the line of thought here opening out before us, lest we stray too far from our present argument. Enough has been suggested to make the thoughtful reader see that the "free exercise of religion" guaranteed by the first amendment is not quite the definite standard of measurement which we may have supposed it to be.

Then at once there enters a disquieting thought. Who will decide what shall be considered religious practices of the kind which may be freely exercised under the constitution? In view of recent experience when we witnessed the bewildering versatility with which an excited popular opinion accepted quite arbitrary standards of loyalty and patriotism, without a shadow of law to justify them, and how the mob enforced them here and there with even less of law to back the action, and how those who were set to enforce the law seemed powerless to do so, we may well pray that the fair shield of American honor may never be blotched with the stain of anarchistic violence against the exercise of religious practices altogether within the law. But we need even stronger and more assiduous prayer against efforts now being made to prevent certain religious practices by process of law.

There is such a thing as *constructive crime*, that is, crime which is crime only because the law designates it as such. Thus it is not a crime according to God's law to make alcoholic beverages and to use them temperately; but such acts are criminal in some places by force of human law. In fact there is no crime in law except what the law distinctly defines as a crime. The basest and vilest act cannot be punished as a crime or felony unless the law has declared that it belongs to that class of sins against the welfare of the state. What limit in this direction does the law set to the powers of legislative bodies? None whatever excepting the bills of rights embodied in the national and state constitutions, and we have been rudely jolted by the discovery how precarious even this restraint may prove to be in times of great emotional perturbation. At any rate, Congress and the state legislatures may declare many acts to be criminal which true Christian morality does not even class as immoral. Let us hasten to say that the same Christian morality grants the state full right to make such definitions, and requires all children of God to abide by them unless they are in open contradiction to divine law. But we all know, for example, how closely all extreme prohibition legislation trenches upon the guaranteed freedom in the exercise of religion. To be sure, the laws at present carry a proviso that wine may be made and used for sacramental purposes; but who will guarantee that the same blind fanaticism which has branded the manufacture and use of alcoholic beverages as a crime *per se*, may not sweep away even that slight concession to what is often considered a mere whim of some religionists? So it surely behooves us to be watchful in regard to other "exercises of religion" which we now claim as our right, lest misguided legislatures suddenly put them in a class with murder, fornication, and treason.

As for instance *the Christian education of our children*. No one will question the propriety of calling *Christian* training of children a religious practice. The term itself implies that, since the Christian faith is generally recognized as a religion. And if you listen to the voice of

some flamboyant orators you will even get the impression that American children are universally educated to be Christians; for must not by far the greater number of our citizens be Christians by conviction since we are constantly told that this is a Christian nation? Would that it were true! Would that all parents who are affiliated with Christian churches, not to mention the pastors of those churches, were to apply their high theoretical standards of education to real Christian education! No one would for a moment consider that a satisfactory education even in the most elementary branches of knowledge which might only be acquired by a bare hour's instruction given once a week by untrained teachers, and under circumstances which are almost prohibitive of lasting results. Yet that is a fair characterization of the alleged *Christian education* most American children of Christian parentage are favored with. No sane educator would dare to stultify himself by offering as an *education* in any science what is grudgingly granted to many thousand children as the only "Christian" education they can have.

We see our duty toward our children in a different light. Just as we are satisfied with nothing less than a thoro training in the three R's, not to speak of history, science, literature, etc., so we know that Christian parents are not true to the Master unless they furnish their children thoro training in Christian knowledge. But while this understanding of the Lord's will in itself calls for *daily* religious instruction, it carries us beyond this demand almost immediately. Christian faith, which is created in the heart by the Gospel of Salvation, cannot grow and increase in strength daily in a school atmosphere which is pervaded and controlled by the spirit of this world, the spirit of evolutionism and materialism. All spiritual effects of the Gospel are at once jeopardized in the child's heart if that child is compelled to submit to determined onslaughts upon its faith in the school which it attends. Hence our *religious* practice of establishing *Christian day schools for Christian children*, schools in which all educational work is pervaded by the spirit of the Gospel, so that even science, geography and history are taught from the viewpoint of — Jesus Christ.

We deny emphatically that the Christian school (called parochial school because its financial support is furnished by the parish) is a *German-Lutheran* idea. We regret to admit that, as far as American Protestantism is concerned, it does stand out as a peculiar *Lutheran* crotchet. Reformed churches have long ago discontinued their efforts to give their children an education worthy of the Christian name. There are even many Lutheran churches which have disavowed in practice what the fathers of the Reformation looked upon as a primary duty of the Church in its Gospel work. Nevertheless we are convinced that it is the only *Christian* way of taking proper care of Christian children. We know that the Christian day school is the only institution by means of which we can comply at once with the school laws of the states and

the commandment to rear our children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord. This is a matter of *conscience* and is not open to argument at all under modern conditions. For this reason it should not be considered a debatable question whether our government should graciously *permit* us to have our own schools and to arrange our curriculum as we think it ought to be. If we are guaranteed free exercise of our religion, the religious practice of having Christian schools should be secure against interference by state or federal government.

Is it? No one who is slightly conversant with the history of American school legislation would answer this question in the affirmative. For many years parochial schools have been the objectives of vicious and malevolent attacks, sometimes launched with cynical openness, but more often concealed under a more or less transparent mask. We need not here study the underlying and hidden causes of this enmity; enough for the present that we know it to exist and have even found it to be extremely persistent in its efforts. Just now the excitement and general feeling of insecurity affords this hostility an opportunity which is not to be slighted. The attack is conveniently and effectively masked as an effort at Americanization. Its proximate aim is to get parochial schools under government control; the ultimate aim is their extinction by due process of law and administration. Being in need of a catch phrase to beguile the gullible, the agitators have boldly filched a beloved leaf from the book of the socialists, whereon is graven the high-sounding motto that "children belong to the *state*," — which, being interpreted, means that no parent has a right to determine freely, how this child shall be educated. Of course, we are all familiar with the activity of *female* busybodies who put this principle into practice without taking the trouble to enunciate it. Mrs. Smith, who has no children and does not want to have any, feels entirely justified in telling Mrs. Jones, mother of six, how *she* must rear her little flock. Mrs. Smith may be an individual, doing her pernicious work from house to house personally, or she may be a club working in the same spirit via the mayor's office or the chamber of the city council. In either case she acts on the presumption that her right to determine the educational fate of Mrs. Jones' children quite supercedes and obliterates any parental right which Mrs. Jones may claim in the premises. This feminine meddling with sacred rights was truly bad enough and belonged to the evils from which we earnestly pray to be delivered. But now come *men*, vociferously protesting their undying effort to embody that principle in the law! The particular *form* of the interference built upon that principle is the plan to put all parochial schools under state supervision. What does that mean? Nothing less than that the parent may not personally direct the education of his child. He must not only send it to school, but may send it only to such a school as the state will permit to exist. In other words, he must submit, in this as in matters of purely civic concern, to the will of

the majority, i. e., that group of his fellow-citizens who can enforce their will.

But it means even more than that. The leaders of this campaign are always willing to swear that they have not the least intention to interfere with religious convictions. Nevertheless they insist that it is the state's business (whoever the "state" may be!) to make sure that every child is made a good American by the simple process of making him learn the English language. They appear to believe or, at any rate, they want the citizens to believe that this does not interfere with religious liberty. At the same time, the laws which they propose usually make it a serious misdemeanor to teach *anything*, including religion, of course, in another than the English language. A parent, therefore, who would consider it necessary for the spiritual welfare of his child that it become familiar with the language, say of the German Bible, would find himself deprived of this religious right. It must not be objected that such an opinion of the parent may not be well founded. If religious freedom means anything at all, it must mean that the citizen is at liberty to decide for himself what his religion demands of him, and to act accordingly. No one but the individual may determine for him what religious convictions are well founded. Moreover, it is obvious that the proposed supervision may, and surely will, become a weapon ready to the hand of those to whom the *Christian* education of children is obnoxious. Who will prevent the supervising officials from ousting *all* religious instruction from all schools under the plea that the entire school time is needed for Americanization purposes? We may not be able to stave off this threatening calamity, largely because of the traitors to Christ's cause in the churches; but that is no reason why we should not raise the cry of danger and call upon good Americans of all classes to assert and maintain the fundamental principles of Americanism. J. SCHALLER.

(To be concluded.)

#### DEDICATION OF CHURCHES

The Grace Lutheran Church at Dalton celebrated the dedication of a new church building on Sunday, June 1. One German and two English services were held. Rev. W. Heidtke of Manchester preached at the German and the Revs. E. B. Schlueter and Gerh. Pieper at the English services. The congregation was organized in 1915 and by the Grace of God has been enabled to dedicate the first Lutheran church at Dalton.

W. E. PANKOW.

On Sunday, the 11th of May, Trinity English Lutheran Church of Watertown, Wis., dedicated its first own place of public worship to the service of the Triune God. It was a day of special rejoicing and profound gratitude for the infant Trinity congregation. Sooner than anticipated were we permitted by the rich grace of God to have and dedicate our own church. "The Lord hath done great things for us; whereof we are glad" Psalm 126: 3.

Favored by beautiful May weather, Trinity congrega-

tion and its invited guests congregated in great numbers on the above date at their church edifice to set it aside for the service of Jehovah. Three services were held during the course of the day. The director of our seminary, Prof. J. Schaller, the pastors, L. C. Kirst, H. J. Diehl, and J. Klingman preached the sermons, and the choirs of Trinity and St. Mark's congregation as also the students' chorus of our Northwestern college sang appropriate psalms of praise and thanksgiving.

The church, beautiful in situation, was erstwhile a large stately residence. Under the masterly and able supervision of Mr. J. Dreger, church architect, the necessary changes and alterations were made in the building, making it now a well-proportioned, spacious church. It has a seating capacity for about 300 people.

The plan of having a separate English Lutheran congregation at Watertown had its inception with St. Mark's congregation and its pastor, the Rev. J. Klingman. Believing this the best way of solving the question of services in both languages and of ministering also to the spiritual needs of the English speaking Lutherans here, they, in co-operation with mission board, decided to call a pastor for the purpose of organizing an English Lutheran congregation. The undersigned was called in the summer of 1916. In November of that year an organization was perfected with ten members. The congregation has enjoyed a steady growth ever since. The services, previous to the acquiring of its own church home, were conducted in the auditorium of St. Mark's parish school. The Lord, our God, be with us in the future as he was in the past, and graciously bless all who come to this house to call upon His name and hear the precious gospel of the remission of sins thru Christ Jesus.

F. E. STERN.

#### CANDIDATES ASSIGNED

The Commission on Calls met June 10th in Wauwatosa. The candidates graduated from our Seminaries in Wauwatosa and New Ulm were assigned as follows:

##### 1. For the Ministry

- 1.) Theodore Bauer—Mission, South Dakota (Nebraska District).
- 2.) Gervasius F. W. Fischer—Savannah, Ill. (West Wisconsin District).
- 3.) Philipp A. C. Froehlke—Clayton, Wis.
- 4.) Wm. G. Fuhlbrigge—Cornell, Wis.
- 5.) Edward C. Hahn—Tutor, Northwestern College.
- 6.) Wm. R. Huth—Ellensburg, Wash.
- 7.) Benno F. Kupfer—Phelps, Wis.
- 8.) Henry C. Nitz—Globe, Ariz.
- 9.) Martin C. F. Schroeder—Nichols, Wis.
- 10.) Walter W. F. Sprengeler, Cibique, Ariz.
- 11.) Roy H. Vollmers—Altamount, S. Dak.

Candidate Oscar A. W. Rockhoff will be assigned his field later.

##### 2. For the Parochial School

- 1.) Theodore Boettcher—Kaukauna, Wis.
- 2.) Miss Erna Albrecht—Emmet, Minn.
- 3.) Miss Clara Buenger—Grace Church, Milwaukee, Wis.
- 4.) August Dierks—Tawas, Mich.
- 5.) Martin Garbrecht—Waukesha, Wis.
- 6.) Miss Munding—Sparta, Wis.