

# THE SEMINARIAN

LUTHERAN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY AT PHILADELPHIA

Volume V

November 1940

Number 1

## IN THIS ISSUE:

### CONCERNING CONSCRIPTION

PAGE

Rollin G. Schaffer  
Morgan Edwards

2  
3

### STRICTLY THEOLOGY

George W. Forrell

6

### OUR CHAPEL SERVICE

Arnold Dahlquist

9

### IMPRESSIONS OF MT. AIRY

Arnold Dahlquist

10

Editor-in-Chief - - - - - Donald Pichaske

Associate Editors - - - - - Walter Bock  
 John McConomy  
 George Forell  
 Charles Harris  
 William Dudde

Make-up and Art - - - - - Russell Zimmermann  
 Oscar Weber  
 Harold Engle

From the Editor's Desk

With the presentation of its first issue the editorial staff of The Seminarian offers to you a sample product of what we purpose to publish for you during the academic year 1940-41. Those who are already acquainted with our little monthly paper will immediately notice a change in the outward appearance. We hope that they also perceive a change in its content. It is the aim of the editorial staff to place in the hands of the student body of the Seminary a medium for the presentation of their views and opinions concerning the vital problems of current interest to the Seminary student at the time of publication. Such problems may differ among the various classes. Yet the interest of all will be at the command of each as a result of the common purpose guiding all. The problems and questions may be aroused as a result of classroom discussions and bring about extemporaneous criticism there. We are asking you, in all fairness to yourself and those with whom you work and converse, to give such matters serious consideration and then present your conclusions to the student body through the means of The Seminarian. It is our hope that in such a way the paper will furnish the battlegrounds for any warfare of ideas. Briefly, we hope to arouse within the Seminary student a desire and an ability to express himself and his beliefs when called upon to do so.

Whether or not we succeed in our purpose depends entirely upon YOU, the individual members of our student body. Our beginnings this year are small in view of our aims. But there are no limits within which we must contain ourselves. Make the next issue your issue. Make its finest contribution your contribution. Let that contribution be only an idea, ~~let~~ it be a full article, it matters not. But let it be yours.

\* \* \* \* \*

# CONCERNING CONSCRIPTION

HERE I STAND - Rollin G. Schaffer

Fellow seminarians, our attitudes toward war and military training are influential, even while we are in seminary. Individuals ask our opinion; young people's groups call on us to speak; congregations see in our sermons reflections of our peace convictions or lack of them. Ours is a position of responsibility.

At such a time as this we dare not be uninformed. We dare not be indifferent to such things as the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940. True, we are exempt from training and service, under Section 5 (d) of the Act, but there are many of our friends who are not exempt. Have we the issues clearly enough in mind to help them to be honest with themselves in deciding whether or not to register as conscientious objectors? Whether to accept noncombatant military service or to insist on "work of national importance under civilian direction"?

This is no time to try and convert people to become conscientious objectors. Capitalizing on mixed motives would do violence to their personalities. But we can point out to them the alternatives, the possible outcomes, the issues involved. We can minister to them in whatever course they feel guided to follow.

My personal conviction is that war is a denial of the Way of the Cross. As pronounced at the World Conference at Oxford in 1937:

"Wars, the occasions of wars, and all situations that conceal the fact of conflict under the guise of outward peace, are incidents in a world to which the Church is charged to proclaim the Gospel of redemption. War involves compulsory enmity, diabolical outrage against human personality and a wanton distortion of the truth. War is a particular demonstration of the power of sin in this world, and a defiance of the righteousness of God as revealed in Jesus Christ and Him crucified. No justification of war must be allowed to conceal or minimize this fact."

And there are those who give sincere justifications for war. I can honor their conscientious decisions but I must identify myself with those (described in the Oxford Report) who "believe that war, especially in its modern form, is always sin, being a denial of the nature of God as love, of the redemptive way of the Cross, and of the community of the Holy Spirit; that war is always ultimately destructive in its effect, and ends in futility by corrupting even the noblest purpose for which it is waged. They are therefore constrained to refuse to take part in war themselves, to plead among their fellows for a similar repudiation of war in favor of a better way, and to replace military methods of active peacemaking.

# CONCERNING CONSCRIPTION

## THE CHRISTIAN CONSCRIPT - Morgan Edwards

Everyone agrees that a year of disciplined military life will do most American men some good, at least from the point of view of health. Conscription is a good method, in fact the best, for raising an army. The dictators have proved that. The equality of the American conscription plan cannot be questioned except in its exemption of vital defense employees, clergymen, and theological students. Even though an individual be entirely in favor of conscription it seems that there is nothing to be said in defense of conscription except the obvious.

Conscription is not like a new car, a new electrical device, or even a new thought which the salesman can honestly and conscientiously sell because he knows it will bring added comfort, luxury, or happiness to the purchaser. Conscription is rather the result of a need which has been imposed upon the people who still believe in freedom of speech, the press, and worship; who still believe that God is no respecter of race, creed, or color; who still believe that it is their duty to respect and defend the civil government which makes it possible for Christ's Gospel to be preached. This need has been imposed upon us by aggressors who openly deny these same divine prerogatives to their constituency.

No Christian is interested in defending conscription as a means of raising a huge army so that this nation or any other nation can become a dictator of the private lives or consciences of any other nation, or even of one single soul. A Christian would not be in favor of conscription even if it were the means of raising an army to impose Christianity on the world. There is nothing that can be said on the "pro" side in a discussion of conscription, from a Christian point of view, because a Christian is not concerned about raising an army for any reason.

A Christian is not even concerned with raising an army of conscientious objectors who want to force peace upon the world. The Christian can put forth no defense of conscription as a means of raising an army in and of itself.

The Christian's defense of and willingness to serve under the nation's conscription plan comes from another source. As long as our nation does not interfere with or prohibit the preaching of the Gospel of Jesus Christ and our free obedience to the will of God we are bound morally as well as by the words of our Lord to serve and defend that nation as its citizens.

Therefore the Christian must be a sincere and serious-thinking citizen. His life as a citizen is not dumb submission, or violent resistance to anything, but is a life of "thought-out" love. The Christian citizen will courageously submit when submission is the best way of showing Christ's love within him, and he will also courageously rebuke when rebuke is unselfish love.

All this to bring out what a serious job it is for the Christian to live and act according to God's will and love! All this to show that the Christian citizen must go beyond the obvious either to defend or oppose the conscription plan of the United States!

## THE CHRISTIAN CONSCRIPT - - - Continued

The case so far is this. The United States government not only permits but defends the individual rights to preach the Gospel and freely to obey God's Will. Therefore, our government deserves and demands our respect, loyalty, and service. Our courage to defend and to serve such a government must come from an unselfish love which is interested in bringing the Gospel of Jesus Christ to the greatest number of people.

Italy, Germany and Russia openly declare that the individual has no inalienable rights except those granted by the state. It is a dream that representatives of these countries are trying to break down the American system of free worship. These countries make no apology in declaring that their way is the best for the whole world.

Does it not seem reasonable that an unselfish love which springs from the desire to acquaint every man and woman with the saving Gospel of Jesus Christ will inspire courage and conviction enough in the Christian soul to want to protect a government conforming with divine standards (Rom. 13) against the threats of governments ridiculing and destroying the religious freedom of the individual man? Seventy-five per cent of the American people think that our conscription plan is the best and most democratic way of raising an army to protect our religious freedom from the aggressor.

The people in the United States who oppose conscription do not do so because of conscription itself, but because they are prejudiced by some previous loyalty. And it seems to me that the best defense of conscription is found in the unreasonable, weak, stupid, and treasonable arguments of those who oppose it.

For example, the foreign sympathizers and propagandists in the United States oppose conscription. They have no reasonable opposition to it because they favor it in their own country. They simply and seriously want the downfall of the American system of government for the establishment of their own system. This is treason!

There are also some foreigners in the United States who have a spark of devotion to their former fatherland or the nation of their hearts. Because they love their Germany, Italy, or Russia, they think that whatever these countries do is right, without an honest and reasonable investigation into the facts, and without testing the acts of their fatherland according to the divine standards (Rom. 13) of any government, or the requirements of unselfish love. Because of an emotional loyalty they simply approve whatever the fatherland does. This is stupidity!

The isolationists in the United States form another minority group who oppose conscription. The isolationists are represented by the men who reap the profits from building planes which can fly either the Atlantic or the Pacific to carry either Good Will emissaries or bombs of death; who export iron ore from the United States to build automobiles in Europe to be sold in South America; who live in the United States one year and in Europe the next. At the same time they propose that the United States build a wall around itself as a protection against the forces of hate and aggression in the world. Many of them say that they are Christians, and yet they propose that we live in, with and for ourselves alone. This is unreasonable!

## THE CHRISTIAN CONSCRIPT - - - Continued

The pacifists the most anti-conscription noise. They are probably making the most noise because they feel that they have the protection of the Gospel on their side, even though that is a badly distorted Gospel.

There are many kinds of pacifists. The cowards and escapists are pacifists because they can hide behind the protection of a manufactured gospel of peace. This is such a minority group that it does not make much difference whether they oppose conscription or not. They wouldn't make good soldiers either for the United States or for Jesus Christ.

There are the "ism" pacifists who are the vestiges of the psychological swirl of the "ism-ism" which nurtured and matured the political isms on the other side of the Atlantic. They misunderstand Christ's submission on the cross as a dumb submission to the Will of God. They seemingly never read the verses of the New Testament in which the word "peace" is found, because they have failed to recognize the qualifying conditions of peace according to God's word: "Peace among men of good will." "Think not that I am come to send peace on earth, I came not to send peace, but a sword" (Matt. 10:34). "Would that you too knew, even today, on what your peace depends" (Luke 19:42). "But glory, honor, and peace to every man that worketh GOOD" (Rom. 2:10).

According to our Lord's own words our peace will be the result of obeying Him and His Spirit working in us. Peace for us is conditioned by our acceptance of Christ and His Gospel. It is a gift from God, and a gift cannot be earned or coerced. Men do not become Christian because peace is forced upon them. Rather, they have peace because Christ worketh peace in them.

The pacifists do not get their gospel from the Bible. It is a product of the "ism" wave, their inability to think clearly, or their intellectual conceit blinded by an immature judgment.

I am in favor of conscription because I am bound by the Word of God to protect the government which permits me to worship freely. I am in favor of conscription because my conscience tells me that a nation which kills a Jew simply because he is a Jew, and which puts the state upon a par with God is a threat to be feared. I am in favor of conscription because I believe that the American form of government does not conflict with the divine standard of government and does not prohibit the working of unselfish Christian love. I am in favor of conscription because the opposition to it does not come from unbiased, clear-thinking, mature, reasonable men and women.

\* \* \* \* \*

"In curious and paradoxical relation to this tendency to place an undue premium on the physical life of the individual is a moral purism which hesitates to preserve a culture or a civilization because some absolute principle, absolute liberty, or absolute rationality, must be sacrificed in the process of defense.

"To be too virtuous to live is the characteristic moral perversion of liberalism."

# STRICTLY THEOLOGY - George Forell

By way of forward:

In accordance with its new editorial policy, The Seminarian introduces in this issue the first in a series of articles under the heading, "Strictly Theology." The subject of the first of these articles is "Eschatology." The reason for our choice of this particular subject is that we believe there is no better place to begin than with Eschatology, the teachings concerning the last things, if we really want to talk "strictly theology." Just as the Bible, both the Old and New Testaments, must be read from the end, i.e., in the light of the Cross, to become the Word of God rather than Jewish folklore, so the entire theology of the Church has to be understood in the light of Good Friday, Easter, and the Day of Judgment to become Christian theology rather than a philosophy of religion. At least, this is the opinion of the writer of these lines. If these statements and the following article should challenge some discussion, The Seminarian will gladly print any contribution to this subject in this column.

## THE IMPORTANCE OF ESCHATOLOGY FOR THE LIFE OF THE CHURCH

IN recent months, we have heard much talk about the inability of the Church to satisfy the spiritual needs of modern people. An editorial in Fortune magazine ascribed the cause for this failure to the unwillingness of the ministry to preach the objective truth of God and its tendency to preach pleasant generalities which the people are expected to like. In this month's issue of the Reader's Digest, Channing Pollock accuses the Church of being dead and occupied with "the preservation of symbols, doctrines, and a philosophy largely without meaning in our modern world." Of course, some of the accusations are far from being justified and lacking of even superficial understanding on the basis of the faith of the Church of Christ. Some seem contradictory and inspired by the desire to write a sensational article rather than the constructive desire to help the Church to deliver her message. But even if all that is taken into consideration, there still remains the fact of the actual waning of the influence of the Church, the willingness of people to take their Christianity seriously. This fact is perhaps best illustrated by recent developments in Japan. Three hundred years ago 40,000 Japanese Christians suffered death calmly for the sake of their Christian faith. In recent months, the Christians in Japan have quietly accepted the actions of the Japanese government reducing Christianity to the status of a minor sect within the Shinto nationalist cult. "The thirst for martyrdom has evaporated." (Time, Sept. 30, 1940.) And the events in Japan are by no means singular.

What is the reason for the death of the martyr spirit in the Church? Why is our reaction to ersecution so different from the reaction of the early Christians? If we want to answer the question, we shall have to investigate the reason for the fortitude and the courage of the early Christians. What made them face death with praying and singing, even offering prayers for their persocutors?

## STRICTLY THEOLOGY - - - Continued

The answer lies in the simple fact that the early Christians were aware of the nearness of Christ. "The Lord is at hand," wrote the Apostle Paul to the Philippians; "Surely I come quickly," says the Lord in the Book of Revelation. These and all the other statements of the New Testament which indicate the knowledge of the nearness of the Lord, were not mere words, but a source of strength and courage for the early Christians. They knew that they lived "between the times," between the Resurrection, when the glory of the Lord was revealed to all believers, and the "Parousia," when the glory of the Lord shall be revealed to all men, and time and history shall be fulfilled. The early Christians had an eschatological outlook on life, they saw value in life only if lived in the direction of Christ; therefore they knew that neither suffering nor death could separate them from their Lord.

Today, Christianity is almost without an Eschatology, and this seems to be the cause of the weakness of the Church. Of course, Eschatology is still a chapter in the textbook on dogmatics, it is still taught in the theological seminaries; but this Eschatology has little in common with that vital force represented in the early Church, that vital force which came as a result of the knowledge of the resurrection and the second coming.

What is the situation today? Two groups confront each other in the field of theology, Modernists and Fundamentalists. Each seems vehemently opposed to the other, and yet both have very little use for Eschatology. The Modernists look at Eschatology half ashamed and try to gloss it, deploring it as the historically conditioned apocalyptic superstition of the early Christians. The Fundamentalists also have no comprehensive eschatological teaching. They content themselves by explaining specific eschatological statements, conceptions, and pictures in the Bible. Some confine themselves to predict the exact date of the end of the world according to their understanding of the Book of Revelation and of Daniel. A third group which is able to appreciate only the aesthetic values of the Church, is shocked by the unharmonious and ugly apocalyptic "war-lord" conception of Christ. None of these groups feels that Eschatology is a vital part of the message of the Church. Some of them feel that it is simply a good instrument to be used to frighten people, rather than to inspire them with the faith and courage of the early Church.

If it is true that the "evaporation of the spirit of martyrdom" is a consequence of the disappearance of the Eschatology of the Church, then the solution to our problem lies in our rediscovery of the value of an eschatological outlook for theology. This value comes only as we rediscover the interrelation between the Cross, the resurrection, and the second coming of Christ. Not one of these has value without the other. The Cross and the resurrection are "faits accomplis" as far as our Christian revelation and experience are concerned. The "Parousia," the second coming, is our sure hope, but no "faits accomplis." The Cross and the resurrection do not have true and full value without a sure hope and convinced awareness of our Lord's "Parousia." For the Cross and the resurrection to have full and true meaning, we must become aware of the nearness of Christ. "The Lord is at hand."



In recent years, theology has rediscovered Eschatology. Men like Barth, Heim, and Althaus have shown the way. When using their works, the Church will have to avoid the pitfall of philosophical speculation. These theologians did not always succeed in avoiding philosophical speculations themselves, but they have shown the way in which Eschatology must again become a vital factor in the life of the Church. Only the risen Lord can be the basis for a rediscovery of Eschatology for the Church apart from all philosophical speculation concerning time and eternity. When the Church speaks about Eschatology, the Church speaks of the importance of the resurrection of our Lord for time and eternity. Let us realize that if we should be asked to suffer for our faith like many of our brethren in other lands, we can do it like the early Christians only if we are aware that the resurrection and the "Parousia" belong together, that the Lord is at hand, and also that this Lord is indeed a war-lord, or rather the Lord of all war and all peace.

\* \* \* \* \*

#### THOUGHTS TO BE REMEMBERED

Despise not any man, and do not spurn anything; for there is no man that has not his hour, nor is there anything that has not its place.

To judge human nature rightly, a man may sometimes have a very small experience provided he has a large heart.

Give me the money that has been spend in war, and I will clothe every man, woman, and child in an attire which kings and queens would be proud. I will build a school house in every valloy over the whole earth. I will crown every hillside with a place of worship dedicated to the gospel of peace.

To me it seems as if when God conceived the world, that was poetry; He formed it and that was sculpture; He varied and colored it, and that was painting; and then crowning all, he peopled it with living beings, and that was the grand divine eternal drama.

So long as we love, we serve. So long as we are loved by others I would almost say we are indispensable, and no man is useless while he has a friend.

God be thanked for books. They are the voices of the distant and the dead and make us heirs of the spiritual life of past ages.

Make yourself an honest man, and then you may be sure that there is one less rascal in the world.

Though reading and conversation may furnish us with many ideas of men and things, yet it is our own meditation must form our judgment.

\* \* \* \* \*

## OUR CHAPEL SERVICE

By Arnold J. Dahlquist

Synonymous with the idea of chapel are the ideas of worship and reverence, humble tributes to our God. When this relationship between the worshipper and God becomes extinct, the chapel becomes nothing more than just an assembly hall or an auditorium. Such was my experience at College.

Because of this the thought of attending chapel again as Seminary evoked some speculation in my mind. Would my day include once more one of those twenty minute periods during which an act of irreverence was generally committed to a hymn or two and the Lord's Prayer, a period during which those present were compelled to listen to an uninspiring talk with but a smattering of religion in it, and during which the students chose to air their dislike of compulsory attendance with practical jokes? But any such discomfoting thoughts have already been dispelled completely.

Instead the daily chapel service has become one of the most inspiring experiences my seminary life has thus far afforded me. And there are two reasons to substantiate the statement above. The most important of these, and on this point my vocabulary seems conspicuously inadequate, is the exultant sensation I receive in witnessing in the chapel atmosphere the young men who have chosen to dedicate their lives to Christ. Their sincerity, their deep reverence, their determination reach here a salience profound.

The second reason for my favorable impression has come from the noticeable attention devoted to the service, especially the reading of the lesson. For the first time I have felt that the service held a meaning for everyone present.

I can truthfully say that attending chapel is a vital part of my seminary curriculum.

\* \* \* \* \*

"We will fight you in Franco's way if necessary! Call this inflammatory if you will. It is inflammatory."

--Rev. Fr. Coughlin

"Singers enjoy a semi-priestly office; and as the office of the priest is not open to women, female voices should never be heard in church choirs, except in convents and girls' schools."

--Catholic Digest

"Most of our world, since the Protestant revolt, has become expert in reconciling moral principles with the needs of the moment."

--"Magnificent" by Bryan M. O'Reilly

\* \* \* \* \*

## IMPRESSIONS OF MT. AIRY

By Arnold J. Dahlquist

Throughout our lives many events and incidents occur which are the source of great stimulation and inspiration to us. And though we feel a spirit of elevation anew, though we wish to shout aloud praises to this new-found happiness, our tongue is stayed for want of fitting and true expression. So with the power that within me lies I shall try to explain the enjoyable experience which has been mine the past few weeks as a student at Mt. Airy.

My first favorable impression came from association with my fellow students, all of whom have appealed to me as genuinely friendly and, for the most part, quite gentlemanlike. And, although there is a diversity of opinion on many subjects, although there are rebellious individual differences, there is yet a recognizable sincerity of purpose which commands every student's best for one and the same cause.

The second contributory fact to my enjoyment of this Seminary experience is the relationship which exists between the students and the professors. Perhaps a material description of this relationship would be in terms of responsibility and trust. This responsibility has the effect of projecting the student to a limited degree into his day as a minister of the Gospel. He is more answerable to his own Christian conscience and convictions than to the faculty. Furthermore, I have no doubt that students look upon the members of the faculty not only as their professors, but also as friends who merit every ounce of the trust and confidence that is placed in them. The very fact that we are urged to state our own opinions, to raise our voices either in affirmation or dissension without fear of causing provocation, strengthens this relationship.

The third element influencing my opinions is the beauty of the campus. Nature has played a large part in making our stay here an inspiring one. And although most of the buildings are old, nevertheless their antiquity adds to their picturesque character if not to their greater utility. Certainly we enjoy every material necessity conducive to good study habits.

To try to find a single term to define my true feelings would be a hard task. However, I have repeatedly made the statement that we students enjoy an a small scale real Christian democracy.

\* \* \* \* \*

It is great and there is no other greatness--to make one nook of God's creatibn more fruitful, more worthy of God; to make some human heart a little wiser, manlier, happier, more blessed, less accursed.

\* \* \* \* \*