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## Spnodens ordning og medemmer.

Den Morffe ©unode af ben Smerifatife Coongelife Zutherfte Sirfe jantledes til fit fiortende ordentlige fonodemøde i Bethant Evangelife Rutherffe mentiged paa Bethant Sutheran College
 fl. 10.30, ben 18be jumi 1931.

 naar talgnanden fommer, fom jeg fat fende eder fra Faberent, fandhedens aand fom hogaat fra Faberen, hat ffal vibne om mig. Men ogfaa $\mathfrak{s}$ fal bibne; thi $\mathfrak{z}$ har beret med mig fra begbndeljen." Wajtor Emil $\mathfrak{y}$ anjen, Maybille, $\mathfrak{i l}$. D., forrettede altertjeneiten.
 frem og ubtalte bet onfife at jandhedens amo matte vare ibland
 Give jande bioner on frelfan i Sriftes selus. Derpaa ubuconte
 og $\mathfrak{J o h n}$ Sendricts jamt reprejentant $\mathfrak{Z}$. $\mathcal{J}$. Madjen fra Bor Frel= fers menighed, ßrituceton, Minnejota. Denne fomite bleb fenere giont permanent. Stebets preft, פr. S. (S. Minisafer, onffebe for= famlingen belfomment, og bad affe fole fig gjemute under mobet.
ceftermidbaghmødet aabnedes med andagt ledet bed paftor ©5. it. Gutlixion. Sefretaren oplaite nabneliten ober famfundets ftenme= berettigede preiter og fuldmagtifomiteen rapporterede de anmelde reprejentanter. Derpaa erflerede formanden det fjortende ordent= lige fyodentooe fon fat i den Treenige ©uss nabu.
 Yemmer:

## 30 ftemmeberettigede prefter



 S. ©. Ree, Bed. S. Riflegard, 92. It. Madjon, (5. M. Morbitad, צ. ㄱ.


 bisafer, ธ. ©. Ylbignter.

## 41 reprajchtanter

（Cht．Mnderjont fold：Fred Эolniont．

Mortiz $\mathfrak{D a l e s}$ falb：Carl Stenerfon．

®．S．Gfuttebe fald：Dle Saugan．
Emil §antenz fatd：Martin 5 ．Tveden．


M．N．Madjons fald：ㄱ． $\mathfrak{F}$ ．Madjen．
（6．N．Molditass furd：Naton Dljon．
§．9．Molditads fatd：5ilmer Sarion．
 ne马，Chrift Bredejont．
（6．凡．ßeterfonz falb：5．D．Sringlebotten．
（5．ฐ．Duillz fald：Rere Spangelo，Mrbert Exfingion，Zeron §off，Molph Weteriont．

ふ．R．刃unholts fald：Elmer butlet．
Steplyen Santee fald：ふobn T．̃ohnton，sifbert Mortenjon．
Nffert Strands fald：M．S．Sang．
 Wellem，Dtto §jernagel．
$\mathfrak{\Im}$ B．Unjethร fald：豸ent efpland．

 $\mathfrak{B u}$ โinin．

## 2 belegnter

Clmer Wrewers fals：Sans ßeterion，Sans Schoneman．

## 10 tandgivende atedlemmex

 Thoen．Srofesjorerne M．§．Statuig，E．§．Dnjtad，fand．theol． （seorge 豸utlityion．

Raadgivende for bette mødc：ßajtor M．Winter，

 Syu．）；ftud．teol．Montad（6ntlerud；loter Selferman of Mantato．

## （bjeiter

 and．

Bode，Jowa：Glabyz Mambeint．
Forejt（Cith，Foma：Mabel Mojtcr，Corrine $\mathfrak{D a Y e t}$ ，Maric $\mathfrak{D a}$ ． Tet，©．©．Mure．
 Mre．S．E．Mellem．
 Zubvig，Martit Rubbig，Gfuitab Somjel）．



Scarbille，ঞowa：Relz Faugitab，Nrunld Faugitab，গelz $\mathfrak{D}$ ．
 Signe Steplont．
 nagel，Mehemiaz ঞjernager．

Summer，Soma：Selen Horn．
Ihor，ぶowa：ふoln solion．
Shornton，Sowa：Sena Schoneman，Mr马．Sant ßeterion．
Waterbille，Şowa：Eibind Unjetly．
 Duta，Grant Sutil，Mr马，Mels Spangelo，Muna Spangelo，Mora Spangelo，Mr．og Mrs．M．S．Duill，Mre．Jens Sobland，Jeanette Sobland，elarence effingon，Mabel extigjon，Wernice Exingion，

 Emtua $\mathfrak{x y z i m}$ ．
 §o．t，Jenette 5olt，Mabel Solt，（bhtitite Flont，Manda Jacobjon， Mre．Fred 豸oluton，ebna Đabidjon，Mas．R．Monjon，Martit 凡．

 Sampion，Marian §egoal，Wertine §egoahl，§ans §egbat，funt ほegdah．

 Emmone，Mint：Murs．Fete かymbe，Setora Sumbe，Fernice かunbe．
（Ganlorb，Minn：Mrs．Wifian Sfar，May Melle Briard．
Geneba，Mimu：Mr．og Mits．Sigherg．
（Sablord Mimi：Mr．og Mre．©．R．Swention，Beatrice Smelt＝ jon，Marie ©wenfon，Setwin Swenfon，Mas，Win．Briard．

乌artand，Minut：Mre Cari Gulfondjon．
 Mator．

Rewisuilfe，Mimu：Rotana Boelmer，Drene Boelmer．
Matheiter，Mima：Mir．og Mis．Dsar Reegarb．





Marfhall，Mitm：：Tbella Dabidion．
 Sangen，反exene Weterion，Miella Seterion，ફelga Šagen，Mornta Sagen， $\mathfrak{s a r r i e t ~ M a d e i t a d , ~ \Im e a n ~ B r o n j o n , ~ © f t y e l ~ B r o n j o n , ~ M r s . ~}$


 Mr．听 Mre．M．Rroon，Mamie Reno，Sacry Reno，Elbect $\mathfrak{Z}$
乌ecfier．


 Madiont，Satold Teigen．
 ふ．Sata，Solbeig $\mathfrak{B}$ ．תaaia，Elarice $\mathfrak{Q}$ ．Fanja．







Bernon Senter，Mimu：Geetha Batp．
Wood Rafe，Mimt：Mife Timu．


 big，Ytle Suanoe．
 Ruboiph Stron．


## 〇ptagelficr $\mathfrak{i}$ Eynuben

Menigheder：1．＂Gental Eb．ミuth）．Shurch of Dututh，＂


 תamidat：George ©uflixjou．

## Hubjuylduiuger

 Feterien， $\mathfrak{b} . \mathfrak{A}$ ． $\mathfrak{T y}$ yeite．

For fraver：ほaftor（5）．（5ulferg．
Forafreife for modets flutuing：Sajon ©mil sant「ea，reprajentant Selz Spangelo，paitor $\mathfrak{g}$ ．Situebrition，paitor Sande．

For iffe at fabe fendtreprejentanter：＂Woiton Ev． $\mathfrak{Z u t h}$ ．mentiges＂；St．sauli menighes，Eljicago，sff．

＂Since it is the duty of every congregation of the Synod to be represented at the annual meeting，we recommend that the secretary of the Synod be instructed to address a letter to every congregation that is not represented and has not been excused， and remind it of this duty．＂

## Zabningsprcedifen.

$\mathfrak{B e d}$ paftor $\mathfrak{S}$. ©. Thoen.

$$
(\Im \mathfrak{\Im} \mathfrak{G} .15,26-27 .)
$$

Drbent $\mathfrak{i}$ bur tefit er eu bel aj en af Jein troitetaler til bijctp= Yente. Soorfor maatte hat troite bem mu? Sant havoe fogt bemt at Gan ffulbe gaa bort, og de ffitlde iffe je lyan mere. Men iffe bet alene, lyan havie ogjaa fagt bem hoorledes bet ffulde gaa dent $\mathfrak{i}$ berden. IF verden ffulde de have fors og trangiel for hans nabns ffinlo. Berden bi, be bade og forfalge dent, ja, bet ffulde endog gaa foa wiot at be fom flog dent ifjel ffulde mene at de berved gjorde Gub en durfelje. Dette Gedrobede ben. Meat be forftod Geller iffe hoad hanz botgantg betad. Engang jagde han til bem: "Sg byor jeg gaar bent, bite $\cong$, og beien bide $\Im \mathfrak{s}$. Toma弓 figer til ham: $\mathfrak{B i}$ bide iffe hoor bu gaar hen; og hoorledes funte bi ba vide veien" ( $\mathfrak{s o h}$. 14, 4-5). Da han jagde bem lige ub at han ffutbe lide bobent, fog झeter ham tiljibe og begunote at iretteleette hant og Fagie: "Serre, jpar big felo! Dette ffe big ingenlumbe!" De foritod not ordene ban talte til bent, at han fulde gaa til Faderent, og naar han-jagde at hat finlde da, ba bleb de bebrovede fordi de mente at bet bar forbi med oprette"fen af riget fom han lyabo talt ont, og at ban oa iffe fumbe fomme til bem igjen. Det bar mangel paa tro fom giorde at de iffe forftob hans ord, og faa bat be 1 u bedrøиede.

Men han trajter den og figer: "Šer bil iffe forlade eder fader=
 Yeber. Saar farifaerne beffildte bem for at be iffe holbt loven og jobernes anorbninger, faa forfoarebe han bent. San bar beres mejter og larte dem, foarede paa deres fpongmad og aabentarede (Subs rigeß Yemmeligheder for dem. 乌an bil fende $\mathfrak{A}$ (mben, fom ffal bare beres talemand og beileder naar hant gaar bort, men lybur loes handen fulde wore deres tarsmand foritod de fffe enomu.

Men i forbindelfe med hanz trøfterige lafte ont at give dent Nanden, figer han dem ogian hoad deres Yivgeald fal være. Manden ffulde vibne on bam, og de ffulde bidne. Be bar fiffede til at bidue ont han, thi be habde baret ned fra begundeljen, men det
bat iffe blot af den grund at bet bar bereß fald $\mathfrak{i}$ livet at bidne

 bi. De $\mathfrak{i f f e}$ vedfiente fig ben jon iffe gionde det. "Derfor, hoer Sen jom bil beffende ntig for memuefene, han bil ogjan jeg beffende for nitu faber font er $\mathfrak{i}$ gintlene. Mien buojombelit der bil fornegte nieg for memeffene, $\mathfrak{h a n}$ facl ogian feg fornegte for min fader fou er i Yinulene" (Mat. 10, 32-33). Det bar altian iffe blot fordi de
 gjeminger, at de ffulde bidne om fom, men det bar ent troekjag. De ffulde bare bibner fordi be bar friftue, fordi be trocie par ham.

Det er altjan den friftnez pligt $\mathfrak{i}$ veront at vidne ont תritup. Tet er for at forbande ont Deme bor pligt fon fritule bi er for= janlede $\mathfrak{i}$ disje dage. Rad os betragte:

## Den fritucs vibueehuro mut תrituz.

1. Fyuad bet er.
2. §borledee det ffer.

## I.

$\approx$ vore bage er der mange meninger ont hyad vibnejandet om §ritus er. Der er mange fom mener og figer: "Oa, bet er iffe faa goot at vide hoad bette vibuezhite er. Bit man alfe opgipre bor egen mening betont, forbi bi fan iffe alfe foritaa bet ligt. Wi maa bibne ifølge det $\mathfrak{l y s}$ og den apfatning entiver har. Det han foler og tror er ret, Det man han bidne." We mener attjaa at enthoer Gitiber falig bed fin tro. Sobedjagen er iffe hom man lerer, nten at nant er cerlig og oprigtig ínt befjendelij. Sf Sen grimo maa bi hetler iffe bamme nogenta lare effer mening. Befjentoerjen af Sritus beftan for en bafentlig ber deri at bi anerfienter alfe jom
 mener de.

Shbre menter at bet former iffe an par mubens Gefjendelie, men par livets befiendelic. Sriftus er bet fore ideal og efsempel og hobedjagen er at di folger i hans fodipor. Zor disje giatber bet ogjaa at enfber man folge תriftus fajom lout jerb forftan ham.
ghtore igjen mener at vidueefurdet ont Sriitut er ret enthobed= jag, og den jont iffe itadig viduer on hant fan iffe bare bans sifipel. Men deme befjendelfe beitant iffe yobedfagelig deri at bi forthnder ben rette lere bun ham og bons gjerning, men dert at bi fortafler andre ont bor egen perfontige erfaring og forfold til tam.


 iamfund. Wi man fortalfe ben uombende fonder lyor forferdeligt det bar for pe da bi bangnet til en ret ertiende.je af bor fondige tifitand og suide brede ober fonden, lyiffen ffraf og angeit bi
 og jaa fyour ipot og goot det er at hape ndficumpet og fate fig frefft. Dette, mener De, er det rette bibuesburo onr תeriftiz.
$\mathfrak{S b a d}$ far bi ba jige? Stal bi opmuntre lynermbre til at dame os egne meninger om Sritus og til en arfig og aaben befjendelie af den? ©ather bil foritan at Dette er iffe at bione on firiitus, ment at bithe out fin egen mentimg om fom. Bi ffat tare bet bi mener og oprigtig trow, men wor oprigtigfed og cerlighed gjor iffee
 $\mathfrak{h e d e n}$, og jatobeden on siriftus er iffe memefeers meninger ogs tanter ont gam, men (5nds nabenbate.fe. Yefu apoitle bar arlige og oprigtige mamis, nen fyor ofte matte gom iffe irettefotte dem for beres falife meninger og touter om hom og hans gjeruing. Tet bar iffe deres egne, tanfer ag meninger on ham de ffulide for=

 lib og tale, fordi de havie beret med hau fra beghndefen. Ten Giituriffe fondhed om begivenfederne i Gans lib den tio de ban=

 ning til menneffets frelfe og falighed, fan bar de iffe ifig jelo dog= tigere til at bebibne ben fandige and aubre fondere. $\mathfrak{D e}$ fom iffe tif erfjendelien af deme fondige bed egne aplebelfer og tautfer, ment alcne bed saudens bidneghut.

Sein figer $\mathfrak{i}$ bor tefft: "Men naar talentonden fommer, jom
 Faberen, Yan fal bibne om mig." Standen fanl vione om Sriftus.

 Gouls bafen. Det er iffe mentiger og opfatuituger og fattninger han bioner, men fandgeden, bet virfelige, bet jont ar jan og foul iffe
 tur iffe vere mere cut én. $\mathfrak{D e r}$ er iffe mange forffieffige flage fand= heder om Sritus, men fim den ene fandhed fom jondfedens annd
 nitg til menteffene frelje er paalide igt，thi han nogaar fro fa＝ berent og Somten，hant ex ett med dent．

Difciplene fal bione janmen med sanden，ment fal be bibne janmen med lyan，jaa naa de bibue det jamme．De ffal iffe bidne bet font de felo finder for goot og ret，ment det jom $\mathfrak{H}$ anden loure
 jende i mit nabn，ban fal leete eder alt og minde eder ont alt lyad jeg har jagt eber＂（ $50 \mathfrak{y} .14,15$ ）．Det fon Randen loute dem，det ffulde de bione．Mien goad er bet for noget？Det figer šius i fin fibjte Gefaling til difciplente：＂（anar bort i al berben og probifer enan＝ gefiet for al ffabutigen＂（Mart．16，15）．＂Exomgeliet＂fand de prex＝ bife．§ dette ene ord，＂ebangeliet＂，indbefattes at（Budj rand til



Sejus lyold fit lofte ont Nandens gabe．Sean jenote bem jants＝ bedens aand，jont hogaar fra Faberen．Saar apoftlente babde faat Gandens gave，lyad gjorde de ba？De begniote ftrats at predife evangeliet．De bionet om find og naade．De talte om memeftet
 naturen bredens bom，at boben or fundens jold og at ingen fan frelje fig je． at（Sut bil ingent jindec：dob，men at junderen fat onvente fig og leve：＂ $\mathfrak{2 h}$ i Gub elffebe verben jaa at han hengav fin ion，ben ent Gaatue，for at hoer ben font tror paa han iffe fatil fortabee，men
 Gerer veront junto．De fortalte ont 豸efu fobjel，lib，lidelje，døo og opitandelie，og bibnet at ber bar tefe frelie i nogen anten．We＝ trub figer：＂颙ex er iffe frelje i nothen andent＂Pautua：＂Jeg

 dens fold for alle，toet han figer：＂Derjon ent dode for alle，ba er De alle bobe；og han booe for alle＂（2 ふor．5，15）．Mrlt bette talte $\mathrm{og}_{\mathrm{f}} \mathrm{ffreb}$ de，efterfon $\mathfrak{H}$ anden gab dent at tale． $\mathfrak{W i} \mathfrak{Y a r}$ bette bidute $=$ byrd om Sriftue i bor bibel．Det er $\mathfrak{A}$ andens bidneßbyrd wed apoit＝ Yene．Det er Dent frifnes bibuesbyro om ふuifus og intet andet． Sin bette fal bi fut forbande ned huerandre．

## II.

Men hoorledes ffer bette bibnewhid? Stal bi afle lobe fra mennefe til menneffe med wort bibnesbbro? Met, friftis har op= rettet ordets tjeneite, howned alle falal prodife ebangeliet, vibue for al varden. (sjentem menighedente, fom ganden bat famlet bed ordets forfundelje, falber han Cerere og prebifanter og bed bent ffar bibnesbytoet gaa no i al betom. Men berfor er ingen fri= tagen for bet perionlige bibuesurd. Entuper fat bione $\mathfrak{i}$ fin noer= meite ontiredz, i fin omgang med menneffene. Det offentlige entbede fal bi ftotte og opholbe bed bote gaver, nen bi fal ogjaa af=
 jom apoitlent bioner om han for ben jom bi er fanment med, hoor bi er. Det offatfige vibuegutrd frembærer di giemnen det offentlige
 ftus for memeffene, ber font lyat bil at srifus fal betjende bam for fin faber jom er $\mathfrak{i}$ Gimfene. Dertil gives oce tupither anlednit= ger i bet bagrige lib.

Men det er beifer iffe blot med numbent at bi ffal bibut ont Sriftus. Bort lit fal ogfar bione om ham. § bor baglige outs giangelje med andre fal bet bife fig at bi er iffe af verden, bmend bi er i den. Det maa bije fig at bi uffe har lyit til bente berden, thit "Derjom nogen elffer berden, er Faberent fixutighed iffe i ham" ( 1 Goly. 2, 15). Si ffal bidne om ふritus bed bor cobultighed, naadeholdented, fommelighed i tale og handing, taalmodighed, jagt= modighed, jatboruhed, retferdighed og tiaulighed mod afle. Sand= hedens ants fal beilede og og furfe os til alle friftelige Dhocr, fan
 fafter yons bibmeabyrd i ordet. Derfor man bi beffitte oz paa at Yode Gubs ord bo rigelig ibland og. (6ub give $\mathfrak{g}$ fraft og naade bed fint aano til at bibne og lebe fao at bi befindes. tro! Nmen.

# formandens fynodaltale． 

Bed paitor 5 ．M．Tientagel．

2 Song．6，17：＂らerre！Dpiad hans pinte，forat ban maa je！＂ $\mathfrak{M e d}$ bemt Gøn bil wi begunde bet fiotende oudentige funodentooe． $\mathfrak{B i}$ beder Serren optade entyver prejt og ntedtente，entoer larets og dijcipets，enthber fare og entjoer more pie，at be maa je．

Det bar profetent elifa jom engang bad jactedes for fin tjener． Sbrient fonge bar paa friģiti imod Şane．fonge，men bet bifte fig fnart at hanz lemmeligite plater var ljenote for §szael̉ fonge． San futtet fig ba til at ber war formexe i yans ber og fammen＝ falde berfor fine tienere og jagbe til Dent：＂隹ille $\mathfrak{F}$ iffe give ntig tiffiende，lybut af bore ber er med Jsuate fonge？＂ $\mathfrak{D a}$ joarede en

 taler i bit jengfammer．＂

Berpan gav fongen ftrats befalitg at de fifube fan rede paa hoor profeten bax，＂forat jeg fant fende bud og lade ham lyente＂． Fongen fif puart beffed om at profeten bat i Dotant，og lyan jenote hefte og vogre og en for har berigen，fom onuingede ftaden under fitul af nattent mørte．

Wen najte ntorgen，ba dilias tiener fod aarle op，og ba ban gif ub，fe da omringede elt lyar ftadent，baade hejte og bognt．§ for＝
 Ganfle rolig joarer Efija：＂Frugt iffe！Jhi be jom er med ob，ex ffere end de jom ar med dem．＂Sua er det profeten Geder：＂Serre！ Splad hant pine，forat lym maa je！＂Dg hbad ffer？＂＂Serren op＝ lod brengent piate，og han jaa，og fe，bjerget war fuldot af gloende bejte og bogute trindt om ©fija．＂

Bar bette noget jaregent for extia og hans tiener at be fom bar med den bar flere end de font bar innod bem；at den magt jom bat trinst ont dem bar langt mere beldig end deat magt fom bar dem imos？ぶngentute．Saalonge den almogtige，fandorue ©ud troner i bimlent ffal．Det bere jane ebes for hoert enfelt memeffebarn font gixn og Yader，fom antuiber og forforer i Den leere Bebaoths nabt． Stabntiger，belbige i magt og legioner i mangde，bar befaling til at bebare big，bare en bagt on big paa alle bine beie，dut fom
 Iuffic પovers mumb, gipre jomgers gift ubirfon, jente brod pat ramue binger fil ben jom angrer med fit pumb i ben lebende ©hiss tiencite.

Enten bet ar Clifa elfer ©fios, Ratfer efler Roỉ, en ufjendt wreit efler ent fremragende teolog, at uferb far efler en fattig ente,

 (Bud er igaar og idag, ja till ebig tid den jamme; Yos $\mathfrak{G a n}$ er der iffe formorints cifer fitugse af onififtelie; Gou mijer iffe perioner.
$\mathfrak{D}$, hoorfor frugter bu da? §ixare foct, gborior er but bange,
 fer. Saar bjebelen argriber big og bine niegjerniuger Stgger fom et $\mathfrak{h a b}$ foran dig, fao jer dut tife han ion fan, ja Gar banet bei for Sin foo gijentum $\mathfrak{k}$ gabet og magtitjanyet fienden. Forjag ba iffe, men
 hant legioner, berdige i magt.

Men Det er iffe bare ben cufede findoctungede finder fom i fin Glindhed ofte fim fer fiendens farer ofs fur egen himelpelpefed og Derfor raaber: "§ebas fal bi giore?" Bore mentigheder, ofte fmaa og betrengte, frijteß ofte til forfagtged og miknow. De jer ben gud= Ibje verbens fore farer mod iig, religionsbianderi, fager og beilig at je til og med homingijose ord om fred og ro og lafter on feicr over bet oude, fom ioger at treeffe fil fig og int i tidens alt= flutgende mafitwin: ligeguldighed for hoad der ftan ffrebet.

 til bet fore og glintebe for piet fom derbed opntanes. Waant og ipot, ffieldsord og timuge domme uiflytiges mod ben jont bil berne on "rent lexe" og Derbed forityrte dent iøde fted.

Fertil foumer andre itore og populare bebegeffer, fanfom Yoge= wefenet $\mathfrak{i}$ alfe bets forgrentinger rige til $\mathfrak{B o y}$ Scouts, iom bore me= niglyeder man heficompe. att nobiatte jig noget jaa fort og maegtigt intes Iigeja fanfengt for formuften fom at bilfe jtamie Gabets ebbe ofg flod elfer at byde formen tie. Forflarlig nof, derfor, at det ftore flertal af lutherffe menigheder i bort Yand, for iffe at tale on de reformerte, har hewet fin bitfonme moditans og at vore menig= heser ofte fuffer: "aft, hoad fal bi gjore. San bi blibe fanembe mod en jaaban obermagt?"

תicere prejter og delegater, fan og tør bi lade ben hilfen og

Det bubitab jom exija troitet jut tiener med, nogan til vore mentg= heder fra bort mode lyer, idet bi figer: "De jom er med os er flere end be jom er med dem?" 豸on, og atter, ja di fan og tor, og det ffal
 bighed gaar ஞubs crinder.

Den menigiged, for effer liden, iby efler pan land, jout izeju
 den foragtede Mazarcer, er onringet af ©uds noberbindelige lyor.
 pocrite Scout Mafter er intet i gerlighed og magt fammentignet med en af bore fman bameffoler med en af bore friftelige lerere elfer Imerinder fom anforece. For entber fom iffe erfjender bette Geder bi: "Şerve, oplad hans wine forat han maa fe!"

Ment at føre Secrens frige i seju nabu og med bans baaben intod jund og Satans rige beftar iffe alene deri at man befjender grove finder i gienting, facfom hor, mord, tyberi og oruffenffab, og at man gaar tilfelde mod Satmb fraffic, abbenbare antreb mod Seju Srifti ebatgeliunt. Man utan ogjaa med be faume baaben,

 lem fandhed og niandyed-Iigeledes junergisme, baode den grobere,
 fom har facet indpas bos mange jom et "goot foryots" elfer "art= foar for namonts antanunelie" efler jont en af Gub medbelt effer indgydt fraft, lyourved dent uigentoste jattes til at beelge bet gode og vrage det onde.
 og baretogt jon fragter og adwarer imod den lifle furdeigz ftil= Ietto lige jaa meget jom de grobere jndere tomationt, og huis alpha og omega, ifite og fole, bytte og hus er delt fors= foitede og gienopitanone Gubs ion; bois motto er gegraptaider ftaar fexevet-og hots hadb er jola gratia-naade alente.

Wen menighed fom for timelig vindinge og gore befits fifis beifer til folfegunit og fortier on iffe mere end én erfjenot jombs hed og er setida bilje ulydig, bet bere fum $i$ ett ityfte, for ingen bimnelff bagt on fig. Den fon figer: "9ei, foo ftreng or vel iffe bor bimmelffe faber", bor erinore at bore forite foredores find be= ftod i él Hitbighed mod ©ub.
§iare forjomlede entbeberwore og menighede deltagere, ber $\mathfrak{g i =}$ bes ingenting mer magthaniggenoc for en menighed og et fant=
fimo, fanbelion for bent enfelte perfon, end heninntiaz fidighed $i$ leere og lib mod ©fus adbenbarede bilije.
 martt $\mathfrak{i}$ martt, lutter loablajhed, og man figer: "Der er ingen frentiod for os", nen da gixelder det at faa fe med troen马 pie. Faar
 med os, er flere end be font er med Dem", og at "biergene er fulto of $\mathfrak{g l o m b e}$ gefte og bogne trindt omfoing". Stmen, i sefu nabn!

## formandens indberetning.

Det ex jelbinoxyente at ent prejt jom far mere ent not ar= betoe $\mathfrak{i}$ fite mentgheder, fun faare margelfulbt fon impoefomme formandsembedets pligter. Selit bed jtedfortreebere hat jeg jogt at Hofore det arbeibe jom iffe funde giares hjemme fra fontoret. De prejter jom med Geredwilfighed og ongtighed har mofart be over= bragne lyverb, taffes herved. Šeg lyanber at bore prejter ogjan $i$ det tilfommende aar villigen bil tjene famfutbet paa beme maade. Det er ent dobbelt tjeneite jon berved yoes idet formandens ar= beide i mange, om iffe $\mathfrak{i}$ alle, tilfeelder bliver bebre ndiprt pat ben maade, og hanz mentigeder undgaar altjor for forjonutelfe bed byppige frabcer.

For at funte have et nogentumbe tilfrebsifillente overblif ouer: jamfundets forffelfige arbeidsgrene, lyar jeg bibnanet en del af de bigtigite fomiteers møder. Fomiteente, faajom indremisfiontiomi= teen, Boatd of Regents, Ehutch Extenfon, Financeforniteen opb, bil frentregge fildige rapporter, for indot. We rejpetion arbeides fomiteer bedes omjorgjfuld at overbeie bisje rapporter jaabe.jom andre fager fon maatte overorage ben og fonmte med bel over= veiede inditiminger til Smoden, Sajtwerte inditianger bor tffe ind= leberes. Tiflad mig enobidere at fige: medrentefab i en arbeibs= fomite er et anjoarafuldt tillidehberb og bar jaaledes betragtes af delegater jaaveljon prefter.
§eg bar i embebsntefor giont en bel reijer. (frundet paa egute iagttagelfer, og effers, fan jeg fige at frengangen $\mathfrak{i}$ det bore paa en de: fteder er god, paa andre fiteder er ber tillbagegang, nebens be fleite fteder bifer ftilitand huad befft i medlemsantal angaar. Med heninn til ben indre betit lyar bi ©ude spter at horbe os til jaalcenge vort arbeibe beitaar $i$ at fortbuto ofitis ord purt og rent og at forbalte faftomenterne efter: §errens inditiftelje og alt gionce efter ben orden ofg paa ben maade han felb har bejtent. Nmebegne how dette ffer bil Tevende fene fries til dent bugning hots hoved=


Det er et opmuntrende tegn paa inbre belit og jumot lio at firfetugt mere og mere øbe弓. Sbor finder i lare og lib faar gaa $\mathfrak{i}$ foang it mentiged, gibes aarjag til at (Bubs nam beipottes
ibland be ubenforftanende iftedenfor at bringe bem til at are bor fader jom er i bimlene.
 Derintot har indremisituranitecn fundet bet bedit at lade "the
 innoden. Singen uthe arbeidere er $i$ det forlofue aar udiendt, ment


 farbet bides endmu iffe.

To ab bore villige arbeidere, pretterne $\mathfrak{R}$. S. Madfon og $\mathfrak{C}$. $\mathfrak{F}$ Duitl, lagde, paa leegars beitente raad, fit arbeide ned til entio.
 heder elfer jamimb, elfer enthedifubire vil igien frite beat til at arbeibe ober ebue.

 af paftor $\mathfrak{R}$. ©. Guttebx Den 26be oftober 1930. Whuterft §ect. faldet Gleb Ievigt derved at paitor $\cong$ s. ©. Thoer antors det til ham af fant fumbet uditedte falto til at obertage redaftionien af "乌utherfit $\mathfrak{T}=$ Dende" og "Rutheran Sentinel". Saftor ©. ©. Ylvisuter bleb af
 Colfege og antog anfatteljen. Şan bleb indfort of mig ber 29de oftober 1930. Bed hane forfinttelie bleo Madijon faldet Yedigt.
 fort af fin formand $\mathfrak{i}$ embedet ben 260e oftober 1930. अajtor Efnter
 den 26de oftober 1930 fon paitor ફ্aritade eftermand deritess, medens pafor $\mathfrak{F}$. $\mathfrak{F}$. Torgerion bled ben fammes eftermand $\mathfrak{i} \mathfrak{B e t h}$ = any mentighed bed ©tory ©ity, §uma, ßaftor ßrewer betiener frent deles Foreit ©itn, men mu fra $\mathfrak{T h}$ ornton.

ITf bette ants fuld ai teologifife itumenter ftod to fro Contcorbia Semitar, ©t. Routz, fanbibaterne ©fulixion og Wiefe, og on fra Concorbia Seminar, ভpringfield, §f, findibat $\mathfrak{a r j o n}$, burt fam= fund til tieneite. Singen af dem lyar fant fald fra wort famfumb. $\mathfrak{Z o}$ menigheder begicerer optagelfe $\mathfrak{i}$ jomfubet.

 fund af friftelige grande og begjerer optagelfe hos os. Soffoticer Gar weret holdt med dem og jom reifultat anfefales begge til ops
 fales de jom jfiffede til preitegjentingen iflando os.

Fournen de fedvanlige og tontine forretuing jager fou bette made man befoule, vil der fremlauges begiaring fra dem af bore ftuserembe jom til boiten agter at aptage bet teologife findium, oun at Gegbride et teologiff furfus ved vort college. Deguben bif der fomme anfefaling fra bort Woard of Fegente on at gjpe profes.
 det betanfes at profesfor $\mathfrak{V}$ (bisater er balgt til heitner for et be ftemt antal aar, men bons fatus fou loerer er wheitent.

Saalcenge bi iffe har vor egent Mormal Scyool Gør Dettil fifif fede angont opmuntres til at bempte fig af bore fifter fonodecs
 rere end bi mener, fa, er fanfe her ma, at bi har mangel paa bet= woruftede lerere for vore folfer font, lovet were (5sud, itadig vofjer i antal.

Dette aars oriftemivituing jummenfignet med indtegt bijer en iffe ubetnoclig mberbalance. Forboldstegler bor tages og iagt= tages ja at giceld iffe leegges til giald. HDen jatomue forfoldos. regler bil bet gea famfund favelfon indidiber ilde.
 for fin fasferers regufabshager fant for berbipapier og fontanter, fon, for lengere effer fortere tid, man fero paa hans fontor.

Det er' pulfucurdigt at alle jon éll bil aniftenge figy for at be=
 taler, ijoer om mindre vajentlige ting, jaa at wore lerefporginiant, "Subendeljen" og "Modecuisu" fan faa jaa fyldig bebandiny jon multig. Sad alle fomite=rapporter og alle font agter at tale $\mathfrak{i}$ en jat Geflitte fig paa at bere jaa bel forberedte foum omftandigheserne til= 1ader. Derved vil megen tideppilde funt forcbaggee.
orto bor faaende menighedsifolefinte foreligger rapport, og en Dertil beitemt del af modete tio vil fpecielt viee bore foter. Эeg fumbe derfor lade ben jag uberort her, men jeg bat lyit til at fige nugle ort.
att faa oprettet utenighedsifoler er ingentumbe en Yet fag. At $\mathfrak{h o l d e}$ de oprettede ffoler gaamode er iffe lettere. Dipuelen baver af
 morgen til aften $i$ tugt fawelfom underbỉning. Det er mig farte
 Hedlagbe. Detimod er ett ny oprettet paa dent maabe at vor mentig= hed $\mathfrak{i}$ Manfato $\mathfrak{G a r}$ truffet oberensfontit med en iqiter menighed af Wisturfin Synoden fan den fan fene fine born til fidintmente ifole.
 wifle, $\mathfrak{n}$. Dati, bed nafte folenars begnndelfe.

 der jnart maa pleie ben $\mathfrak{i ~ e n t i v e r ~ a f ~ b o r e ~ m e n i g h e d e r . ~}$

Silifut vil jeg fremfonme med jpørgsmaalet on bet puntit it innogubbiffingen iblant os er naaet at engelfe bor exflores at ocere det officielfe furog ved oure moser. Wed officielt iprog mener
 finte rapporter og formanden fin innobaltale og intoberetning.

Ghit beffigne bort fiortente aaremode $\mathfrak{i}$ צefu nabn! Ymen.

## Modernism.

By Rev. Geo. O. Lillegard.

Introduction.

1. The writer of the Epistle of Jude says to the Christians of his day: "Beloved, when I gave all diligence to write unto you of the common salvation, it was needful for me to write unto you and exhort you that ye should earnestly contend for the faith which was once delivered unto the saints. For there are certain men crept in unawares, who were before of old ordained to this condemnation, ungodly men, turning the grace of our God into lasciviousness, and denying the only Lord God and our Lord Jesus Christ" (vv. 3-4): And the apostle Peter writes in his second epistle: "We have not followed cunningly devised fables, when we made known unto you the power and coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, but were eyewitnesses of his majesty. We have also a more sure word of prophecy; whereunto ye do well that ye take heed, as unto a light that shineth in a dark place, until the day dawn, and the day star arise in your hearts; knowing this first, that no prophecy of the Scripture is of any private interpretation. For the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man; but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost. But there were false prophets also among the people, even as there shall be false teachers among you, who privily shall bring in damnable heresies, even denying the Lord that bought them, and bring upon themselves swift destruction. And many shall follow their pernicious ways; by reason of whom the way of truth shall be evil spoken of. And through covetousness shall they with feigned words make merchandise of you; whose judgment now of a long time lingereth not, and their damation sluinbereth not" (1:16, 19-2:3). And the great apostle Paul says to Timothy: "Continue thou in the things which thou hast learned and hast been assured of, knowing of whom thou hast learned them; and that from a child thou hast known the holy Scriptures, which are able to make thee wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus. All Scripture is given
by inspiration of God and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteonsness; that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works. I charge thee therefore before God, and the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall judge the quick and the dead at his appearing and His Kingdom; preach the word; be instant in season, out of season; reprove, rebuke, exhort with all long-suffering and doctrine. For the time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine; but after their own lusts shall they heap to themselves teachers, having itching ears; and they shall turn away their ears from the truth, and shall be turned unto fables" ( 2 'Tim. $3: 14-4,4$ ). "O Timothy, keep that which is committed to thy trust, avoiding profane and vain babblings, and oppositions of science falsely so called; which some professing have erred concerning the faith" (1 Tim. 6:20, 21).
2. We note that all these inspired writers set the revealed truth of God over against the heretical speculations of men. From the very beginning, then, the true prophets and ministers of God have had to contend with false prophets, men within the ranks of the elect nation or the Christian Church, who spoke "great swelling words of vanity" (2 Peter $2: 18$ ), contrary to the Word of God at the same time as they claimed to be His true representatives. The early Christian Church had to engage in a life and death struggle with a proud, intellectual system of speculation which styled itself the true "Gnosis," that is, knowledge, or science. This "science falsely so called," as St. Paul termed it, assumed numerous forms, but was, in general, an attempt to blend with Christianity the science and philosophy, as well as the mythologies and religions, of the non-Christian world. It was especially the deepest thinkers in the pagan world who became the leaders in this "boldest and grandest syncretism the world has ever beheld" (Kurtz). Many Christians were influenced by it or adopted it, and Gnosticism threatened for a time to submerge the true Church of Christ in many places. The storms of persecution that had raged against it from without had only seemed to strengthen the Church and make it spread out to ever new fields. But the insidious attacks of this enemy within the gates weakened the Church and helped toward that degeneration which
set in openly when Christianity became the state religion of the Roman Empire.
3. These Gnostic systems of "scientific religion" were, indeed, eventually forgotten, conquered by the sword of the Word as wielded by those champions of the faith whom we know as the Church Fathers. But this did not mean that the pretentions of "science falsely so called" to an authority equal with, or superior to, that of the Revelation of God were permanently repelled. The enemy simply found subtler ways of corrupting the Church. Down through Church history, the authority of Holy Scripture has been set aside in various ways and degrees in order that the authority of man or human reason might find place in the Church. In the Middle Ages, human tradition, transmitted and controlled by a centralized church organization, and defended in elaborate systems of theology by intellects as keen as any that ever lived (Thomas Aquinas, etc.), claimed equal authority with the Bible. Since the Bible was held to be unclear and in need of "scientific, rational" defense, this meant that, in practice, tradition was set above the Bible ; and thus was built up that religious despotism which survives to this day in the Roman Catholic Church. Protestantism was fundamentally a return to Scripture as the sole authority for faith and life. But in Protestant circles, false prophets soon arose who made man's innate reason, or his will, or his subjective feelings and emotions, the real source and criterion of religious teaching. Since no two men will of themselves think, or will, or feel exactly alike, the logical result of such principles was the religious separation and sectarianism which for centuries have cursed the Protestant world. To place the seat of authority in one man, the head of a despotically controlled church, meant religious tyranny. To place the seat of authority in the "divine reason," or nature, of each and every individual meant religious anarchy. And so, between the two, it would seem that but a comparatively small part of the Christian Church has at any time "held fast the form of sound words" ( 2 Tim. 1:13) and kept the liberty of the Gospel. The history of the Christian Church, as a matter of fact, has been the history of Israel over again-repeated falls from grace, with but a "very small remnant" (Is. 1:9) returning in sincere repentance to con-
tinue the true Church of God on earth against all the powers of Hell.
4. It need not surprise us, then, that also in our day false teachers continually arise in the Church, "who privily bring in damnable heresies, even denying the Lord that bought them." On the contrary, we should expect it. We should never deem ourselves safe from the attacks of the enemy, or consider our own particular Church so orthodox that no false prophets could arise within its ranks. We should, instead, be prepared at all times to use the sword of the Word against every man, be it a brother in the faith or a pagan profligate, who in any manner wrests the Word of God or denies its all-sufficient authority. And therefore, too, we should study and watch closely that phase of this perennial attack on God's revealed Word by human reason and authority which is known as "Modernism." We should not be deceived by the Christian cloak, the sheep's clothing, which these modern false prophets use to cover and hide the ravening wolf that is their real nature. We must learn to see beneath their Christianized vocabulary and the hypocritical veneration paid to Christ and His Word, to dissect their "cunningly devised fables" and "oppositions of science falsely so called" and to uncover the true character of their "profane and vain babblings." If we do that while the wolves still are outside our fold, we will be better able to detect their presence when they appear as brethren, perhaps even brilliant scholars or theologians, within or very near our own flocks.

We shall, then, first consider in general:

## I. What is Modernism?

5. The Bible teaches us how this world came to be, how and for what purpose man was created, and how God prepared salvation for men when they sinned against him; and gives detailed directions as to how men may gain this salvation. This teaching is repugnant to the mind of natural man. Therefore unregenerate men, whether they are within or without the ranks of the Christian Church, cannot accept the Bible's teaching, but must ignore, deny, attack, or try to change that teaching in some way or other. In casting about for weapons with which to attack the Word of God, men have always been quick to seize upon popular ideas or
trends of thought and generally accepted beliefs. And so it is natural that Science has been called upon to furnish the ammunition for the modern attack upon the Bible. For our age is characterized by an astounding faith in "Science" (with a capital " S ") and its ability to know and accomplish all things. Where men in earlier ages believed in some kind of god or gods as the source of knowledge and power, they today believe in Science. This faith in Science has been built up during the last century largely through the remarkable advance that has actually been made in the study of nature, its laws, and properties, and through the discoveries that have revolutionized life and made possible the development of modern civilization. The mind of man has in a comparatively short time accomplished so many wonderful things that many people believe implicitly in its ability to unravel all the mysteries of life and death and to conquer all things. They may admit that the ignorance of man is as yet far more profound than his knowledge; but they will not admit that there is any field that must forever remain unknown and unknowable. They may, indeed, like Herbert Spencer, proclaim themselves "agnostics," as regards certain things; but only to write whole books about "the Unknowable," thus revealing that they have very definite ideas about this "Unknowable" after all. Or at least they look forward in hope to the time when that which is now secret will be revealed through the labors of generations of scientists to come.
6. This almost universal faith in the omniscience and omnipotence of Science is, thus, the first thing to be taken into account when we would explain the character of that attack on God's revelation which is called Modernism. Dean Shailer Matthews says in "The Faith of Modernism": "Modernists are Christians who adopt the methods of historical and literary science in the study of the Bible and religion" (p. 31) and who "accept the results of scientific research as data with which to think religiously" (p.29). Science comes first in modern thought; the Word of God comes second. Therefore leaders in the Church proclaim openly their adherence to "the facts of science" rather than to the facts recorded in God's Word; therefore they insist on using "scientific methods" in their study and practice of religion, and consider the old theological or philosophical methods
of religious approach out-of-date, unsuited for the modern world, however satisfactory they may have been in their own day and age. So strong is this "scientific spirit" that few, if any, educated people escape its influence. This explains also why so many people who still believe in God's Word have felt it necessary to compromise with Science in some respect or other. If they cannot succeed in harmonizing the findings of science with the Word of God, they either re-interpret Scripture so as to force it into agreement with Science, or else reject the objectionable parts of Scripture and retain only that which they are able to harmonize with Science. And all too many, even of those who have had every opportunity to experience the power of God in His Word, succumb to the proud attacks of Science on their faith, or are left with but a crippled, trembling belief on Jesus as, after all, their only Savior.
7. There is this difference, then, between Modernism and the earlier attacks on the authority of God's Word, that it lays claim to being based on scientifically established facts, rather than on human authorities or on man's innate reason alone. And yet there is no essential difference in reality, as we shall see in a later section of this paper.
8. There would, indeed, have been no ground for Christians to fear this modern scientific trend and spirit if Science had remained true to its name and stuck to actually known facts. For the real basis of Modernism is not to be found in that which scientists have discovered or learned in the field of concrete scientific or historical facts; but in the theories by which the great majority of scientists seek to explain and systematize the facts which they have gathered. Although these theories are almost as numerous in form as there are writers who advance them,
'some, like Bertrand Russell, even advancing a new theory about every time they publish a new book, there still is one idea that runs practically through them all. That is the idea of evolution, of a developmental process by which all things are continually undergoing change. The great majority of evolutionists have assumed that evolution progresses in general in an upward direction, producing even higher and better forms. But others, and their number is increasing, are pessimistic and find in this process of change, for the present at least, mainly a tendency towards
dissolution, a "retrograde evolution," which will culminate in the destruction of the world. Both classes accept "the transformation principle, the principle of continuity, of monism in Nature that Evolution represents"; (Kellog in "Darwinism Today," p. 20), however much they may differ as to the how and whither of that evolution. So true is it that the principle of evolution is the generally accepted principle in all the Sciences, that "Science" has become but another name for the "Theory of Evolution"; the "scientific spirit" is the equivalent of looking at everything from the evolutionary point of view; the "scientific method" is a synonym for the "evolutionary approach." From the science of biology, where it has its alleged scientific basis, the theory of evolution has been carried over into all other departments of human learning. In Social and Political Philosophy, it appears as Socialism; in its most consistent, Darwinian form, as Marxian Bolshevism. In Philosophy it may appear as Monism or Mechanistic Materialism, In Psychology it may appear as "Behaviorism." In History, Sociology and Pedagogy also, as well as in the natural sciences, the theory of evolution has now for two generations reigned supreme.
9. It is not strange, then, that it should be applied also in the field of theology; and that has been done-in a thousand different forms. It is this principle of evolution applied to Christianity which we call Modernism; and this is about all that can properly be called Modernism. For there is no such thing as a standard creed in Modernism. It takes as many different forms as there are writers advancing it. The University of Chicago has published "A Guide to the Study of the Christian Religion," composed of papers by leading Modernists on the various branches of theology, as an initial attempt at systematizing the teachings of Modernists. But in the introduction they were forced to say: "There has, of course, been no attempt to secure absolute uniformity of views. The only common presuppositions of the various portions are the acceptance of the historical method and the belief that the interpretation of Christianity nutst be in accord with the rightful tests of scientific truthfulness and actual vitality in the modern world. If certain diversities of opinion appear, the volume will only reflect the spirit of freedom which prevails in theological scholarship today as well as in other fields of re-
search" (p. vii). It is, in fact, of the very essence of Modernism that it cannot rest in any fixed form, but must be continually developing, evolving, changing, adapting itself to its changing environment and the changing needs of changing human beings. There is only one thing permanent about Modernism, and that is its implicit, not to say pathetic, faith in the principle of evolution. The ways in which this principle is explained and presented and applied may change, yes, must change with the increase of human knowledge; but not the principle itself. The Modernist or Evolutionist accepts as his slogan, "The only unchanging thing is change."
10. We shall adduce here a few quotations from prominent Modernists which bring out the importance of "scientific" evolution as the essential thing in Modernism, and which incidentally indicate other characteristics of the "new theology." Dean Shailer Matthews says: "When the Modernist finds experts in all fields of scientific investigation accepting the general principle of evolution, he makes it a part of his intellectual apparatus. He is cantious about appropriating philosophies, but he is frankly and hopefully an evolutionist because of facts furnished by experts" (Op. cit. p. 29 f.). And in "A Guide to the Study of Christian Religion" he says: "The use of the term 'evolution" in connection with religion is subject to at least two objections. On the one side are those who insist that religion is the gift of God, and therefore has no historical development. And, on the other hand, the biologist may object to the use of the term in any such general sense as a student of social science must adopt. To the first critic it may be replied that, when he asserts or implies that religion has not developed like other elements in human experience, the facts are against him. Whatever may have been its origin, religion exhibits phenomena akin to those observable in social institutions to which the term 'evolution' may legitimately be applied. The old distinction of the Deists between natural and revealed religion has been outgrow.1. All religions are phases of religion. To the other class of critics it must be replied that if biologists ever had a monopoly on the term 'evolution' their exclusive rights have long since expired. The conception given to the word by the 'Origin of Species' and general biological usage is a particular phase of a view of the world as old as reflective
thought. Whatever precise definition may be given to the term 'evolution,' there is a large measure of similarity betweet certain processes in social history and certain others in the building up of cellular organisms. Outside of the strictly biological sciences the word must be used in a large sense,* but it is not identical with mere change or growth" (p. 30-31).
11. President Wm. H. Perry Fannce of Brown University says in the same "Guide" quoted above: "The method by which men of science approach all problems, the intellectual process by which they discover truth, can and must be made thoroughly familiar to any man who would teach the modern world. And the method cannot be learned from books; it can be learned only in the laboratory, through actual experiment and research in the world of material facts and laws. For the future preacher, whose message is to be 'life more abundantly,' biology, the study of the forms and methods of life, is supremely important. The concept of evolution, now accepted by nearly every teacher in northern colleges and denounced by nearly every evangelist, has come to mean, not a theory or dogma, but a point of view, a mode of conceiving the world. We see the world no longer as a fact established by fiat, but as a process, an unfolding of the indwelling spirit. We ask of the Bible, How was it put together? or of the Church, What have been its stages of development? This historical approach is characteristic of all intellectual effort today" (p. 7 ff .).
12. J. M. Powis Smith, Professor of Hebrew at Chicago University, says: "We cannot shirk the task of making a religion for ourselves. Ready-made religion, from whatever age it may come to us, will not fit our spiritual needs, however well it may have fitted the age in which it originated. The twentieth century world needs a twentieth century religion, and it is part of its task to make that religion for itself. Progress cannot cease at any point if religion is to remain a vital force in the lives of men. As long as progress is characteristic of other phases of human activity, religion, too, must grow. It cannot remain static while all else is dynamic. 'An unchangeable Christianity would mean the end of Christianity itself. There has never been such an unchangeable Christianity and never can be so long as it belongs

[^0]genuinely to history' (Ernst Troeltsch). It is the task of the leaders of the religious life of today to see to it that the religion they teach and embody shall be one suited to the needs of the modern world" ("A Guicle," etc., p. 157).
13. Dr. E. Gates of the Disciples’ Divinity House, Chicago, says: "The term 'modern Christianity' is used in this treatment in a special sense, and refers to the principles, tendencies, or movements which have sometimes been called 'progressive Christianity,' 'the new theology,' or 'modernism.' It has not taken institutional form in any organized denomination nor received anthoritative expression in any system of doctrine. It is rather a religious attitude, a mode of thought, or a principle of action manifesting itself in all denominations and Christian movements. Since modern Christianity is not an organic movement nor a formulated system of doctrine, it can be summarized only in terms of certain peculiar principles or tendencies, and these cannot be stated definitely or exhaustively, but only suggestively." (Some of the distinctive elements that he lists are):"1. The element of liberty. In its genoral theological phase it is the right claimed by the modern religions thinker to be free from the control of authority, or the disposition to subject all authorities, whether the Bible, the Church, tradition, or a priori 'reason,' to the test of rationality and experience. 2. The element of scientific veracity. It is the spirit of veracity in religious belief and in moral conduct which has compelled the appeal to experience as a source of authority. Hence both theology and ethics have become experimental in method. 3. The element of rationality. The development of modern Christianity has been characterized by an increasing tendency to appeal to reason as a criterion of the truth. 6. The element of secularity. A greater appreciation of the worth and sanctity of the present natural order enters preeminently into the attitude of the modern Christian. The result has been a two-fold process-a secularization of the religious and the sanctification of the secular. 9. The element of catholicity. The modern Christian mind has grown more tolerant toward the religious beliefs of other Christians and more appreciative of the religions of non-Christian people. Christian co-operation and union are taking the place of sectarian ostracism and controversy. The resemblances to Christian teaching found in
non-Christian religions are no longer waved aside as false imitations of Christianity or the inventions of demons, but are considered genuine attainment of the truth under different forms by the most inspired spirits among the heathen. The study of comparative religion, and a closer contact with the East through foreign missionaries and international commerce, have had much to do with this new attitude; but the decisive change has come through the rationalizing influences of philosophy and science. The modern mind has discovered new principles by which to interpret and unify the facts of the universal religious consciousness, the most significant of which are the principles of evolution and of the relativity of knowledge" ("A Guide," etc., pp. 431 ff .).
14. Thus we must say that wherever the principle of evolution is made basic in theology or religion, there we have Modernism. Where that principle is made determinative for any particular religious teaching, there we have Modernism in that doctrine, although other doctrines may be left uninfluenced. by that principle. In this paper, the term, Modernism, is used to denote those systems or types of religious teaching in which the dogma of evolution is applied to fundamental Christian doctrines, so as to subvert the central teachings of the Bible. The adjective, Modernistic, is used to describe those teachings which have been shaped more or less under the influence of the belief in evolution, even when they are held by otherwise fairly orthodox Christians.
15. What Modernisn is will be brought out more fully in the following sections. However, we shall not try to describe it in all its phases, but shall concentrate our attention on examining the validity of its fundamental theories and assumptions, under these captions: Is Modernism Christian? Is Modernism Scientific? Is Modernism Modern? Are We in Danger of Modernism?

## II. Is Modernism Christian?

16. The Modernist not only clains the name, Christian, but represents his teaching to be the highest development to date of the religion historically known as Christianity. He not only claims it to be a legitimate shoot from the original roots of the Christian tree, but the fairest product that has yet appeared upon it. He may grant that the future will disclose more beautiful and
perfect teachings and life than he has produced, but he has no doubt whatever that his religion is immensely superior to any that has gone before. He claims that his attacks on traditional Christianity are simply a new reformation of the Church, by which numerous alien excrescences are being lopped off and the essential elements of the teaching of Christ are allowed to flourish unhampered. He is simply the latest of the reformers; and Lather is as often as not his hero, although he regrets that Luther did not live in a "scientific age," so that he could have done a more thorough job of it than he did.
17. Is this clain justified? Since we have defined Modernism as the application of the theory of evolution to the field of theology and religion, our question resolves itself into this: Can the theory of evolution in any way be harmonized with Christianity? It is obvious that everything will depend on how we define the terms "evolution" and "Christianity." We shall, then, take Kellog's definition of evolution, quoted above, as the most general and inclusive: "Evolution represents the transformation principle, the principle of continuity, of monism in nature"; that is, that everything changes and develops by a law of change which runs through the whole tuniverse from its smallest constituent part to its guiding spirit or controlling force, in such a way that everything is connected with everything else, matter with life, life with spirit, in one continuous, "monistic" stream or chain. There are other definitions of evolution, but since it is the most general aspect of evolution that concerns us in the field of theology, this definition should be acceptable to all. Cf. Dean Matthew's statement above, (par. 10): "Outside of the strictly biological sciences the word (evolution) must be used in a large sense."
18. Christianity we define as the only true religion, that definite, fixed system of eternal truth which is revealed in the Bible and expounded in the Lutheran Confessions. We realize that this definition would only arouse ridicule in "scientific circles." Even a Latheran theologian, Dr. Stolee of the Norwegian Merger, is so "scientific" that he refers to similar statements as made "from a narrow viewpoint" ("The Genesis of Religion," p. 2). However, we hold it to be a fact, capable of scientific, historical proof, that the religion taught in our Lutheran Symbols is the same in
every detail as that which was taught by the first apostles, and that it was this religion which was first called Christianity by its enemies, and which thus is primarily entitled to that name. To apply the name, Christianity, to anything else is to apply it wrongly, just as to apply the term, Lutheran, to anything else than the teachings of the Lutheran Confessions is to apply it incorrectly and without due warrant.
19. Thus defined, Evolution and Christianity stand fundamentally opposed to each other and can never be harmonized. For the Bible claims to be the divinely revealed Word of a God who never changes (Mal. 3:6), but is always the same (Ps. 102: 12, 24-27; Heb. 1:10-12), in whom there is no variableness, neither shadow of turning (James 1:17) ; the Gospel of a Savior, "Jesus Christ, who is the same yesterday, and today, and forever" (Heb. 13:8). Therefore this divinely revealed truth cannot change either, but is "forever settled in heaven" (Ps. 119:89, 152). It shall never pass away (Luke 21:33; Matt. $5: 17-19$ ), but endureth forever (Is. $40: 8$; I Peter $1: 25$ ). Its one great subject, from beginning to end, is Jesus Christ, the Savior of the world (John 5:45-47; Luke 24:44-47: Acts 26:22-23), so that every part of it teaches the same fundamental truth. Therefore it is sufficient for men at all times and places (Lake 16:29-31; Is. 8:20, etc.). Thas there can be no change in this revelation itself, however much change there may be in the attitude of men at different times and places to it, or in the degree of knowledge and appreciation of its truths that different individuals may acquire.
20. The Bible teaches, indeed, that many things change in this world. The fixed and permanent, eternal nature of divine truth is often contrasted with the transitory, corruptible nature of earthly things. (Cf. Ps. 102:11, 26; 1 Peter 1:23-24, etc.). This universe that we now see is not to endure forever, having been "made subject to vanity," (Rom. 8:20). but is to be destroyed entirely at the Last Day. and a new heaven and a new earth are to be created in their place (Is. $65: 17 ; 2$ Peter $3: 13$; Rev. 21:1). And there is an infinite variety in nature. Since God created the first man and woman, no two individuals have existed who were exactly alike in every respect. The lines in the fingers are so different in each individual, that finger-prints are
an absolutely reliable method of identification. In fact, no two living things are exactly alike, not even two blades of grass. Even in the inanimate world there is a similar variety. No two snowflakes appear alike under the microscope. The pieces of colored glass in a kaleidoscope will fall into innumerable different patterns, just as the few notes in the musical scale can be arranged into an apparently inexhaustible number of different melodies. But obvious as this fact of variation in nature is, it is no more obvious than the fact that the variation takes place only within certain limits, as the Word of God tells us. God made "the earth bring forth grass, the herb yielding seed, and the fruit-tree yielding fruit after his kind, whose seed is in itself" (Gen. 1:11). A fig-tree has always been recognizable as a fig-tree from the beginning to the present day, even though no two trees could be found exactly alike. God made "the waters bring forth abund-antly-every living creature that moveth-after their kind, and every winged fowl after his kind" (Gen. 1:20-21). Pigeons have been bred, and records kept of the many varieties produced, now for over 2000 years-which ought to be sufficient time for the pigeon to change, or at least begin to change, into something else, if the evolution theory is correct. But pigeons have remained pigeons to the present day, and revert to the original parent form as soon as they are allowed to return to their natural wild state. God made "the earth bring forth the living creature after his kind, cattle, and creeping thing, and beast of the earth after his kind" (Gen. 1:24). A horse has always been a horse, and recognizable as such in the earliest drawings and descriptions, as well as the alleged still earlier fossil remains, even though there may seem to be an indefinite number of varieties of horses and no two can be found that are exactly alike. And man has always been man, separated by an unbridgeable gulf from the nearest beast, even though many scientists still are looking for the "Missing Link" between men and monkeys, and apparently "know everything about the Missing Link, except the fact that he is missing," as Chesterton has said. Forgetting in the foolishness of their boasted wisdom that "that which is wanting cannot be numbered" (Eccles. 1:15), they not only assume the existence of the many missing links required to prove their evolution theory, but build their theories in reality on that which is missing
instead of on known facts. Noting the fact of variation, which however, is within certain limits, they disregard the fact that there are limits, in order to work out a philosophy of change which knows no limits of any kind. That is just as little reasonable as it would be to note the fact that there are limits to the variation in nature, and then disregard the fact of variation in order to work out a philosophy of the absolute permanence and identity of all things. Both these things have been done by philosophers, as a matter of fact, from the time of the early Greeks to the present day. The Bible alone sticks to facts and presents the whole truth, that things change but only within the limits which God has set. "While the earth remaineth, seed time and harvest, and cold and heat, and stummer and wwinter; and day and night shall not cease" (Gen. 8:22). "The Lord giveth the sun for a light by day, and the ordinances of the moon and of the stars for a light by night. He divideth the sea when the waves thereof roar" (Jer. 31:35). "Thou, O Lord, hast established the earth and it abideth forever" (Ps. 119:90). "He laid the foundations of the earth that it should not be removed forever; He has set a bound that they (the waters) may not pass over ; that they turn not again to cover the earth" (Ps. 104:5-9). Cf. Ps. 147, 148, etc. That is, there is something that remains fundamentally the same through all the 'variations and changes in nature and the history of the world. This is so much the case that it can truly be said, "There is no new thing under the sun" (Eccles. 1:9). Since it is the changeless God who created the universe, and who still preserves it, corrupted and cursed though it is through the sin of man, there must needs be this element of permanency also in the work of His hands. It is that which makes it possible for us to speak of the "laws of nature"; which makes it possible for us to recognize identity of being or substance through a thousand changing forms ; to know truth as distinct from error. A universe really so subject to change as the evolution theory, consistently carried out, would have it be, would be a lunatic world, where anarchy reigned and neither rational thinking nor valid ethics nor true religion would be possible. And so we find, as a matter of fact, that where the evolution theory dominates thought, there there is no rational thinking or real knowledge, but only a vast skepticism concerning all things; there there is no valid, binding ethics, but only a shift-
ing, changing code of morals which merely describes the "mores," the customs of a certain people at a certain time and place; there there is no true religion, but only "agnosticism," that is, complete ignorance concerning all things divine and religious.
21. But fundamentally opposed though the Evolutionary Philosophy and Biblical Christianity are to one another, there still are those who attempt to harmonize them. They fall into two classes: (A) Those who, assuming Evolution to be the primary truth, seek to explain Christianity on evolutionary lines. (B) Those who, assuming Christianity to be the primary truth, seek to interpret Evolution on Christian lines, or to embody it in their theology.

## A. Evolutionizing Christianity.

22. Christianity is a fact which stands out in the history of the world as one of the most remarkable phenomena in it. The person of Jestus Christ is central in history. Therefore evolutionists must try to explain Christ and Christianity on evolutionary lines, or else admit that their theory does not fit all the facts. But every attempt that they have made to do so shows only that it is impossible to retain the Christ of the Bible and historic Christianity along with the principle of evolution. Christianity is "a stubborn fact" which simply cannot be fitted into the evolutionary scheme of things without being distorted and misrepresented entirely. We can here only sketch briefly the results of trying to interpret Christianity in accordance with the dogma of evolution.
23. The Bible is, according to its own claims and the faith of historic Christianity, the inspired Word of God, given to men to teach them the way of salvation. For evolutionists, the Bible has become at best the record of the religious experience of men in ages past; but also an unscientific, superstitious, immoral, unhistorical, and inaccurate compilation of, in the main, deliberately falsified documents by a set of unknown impostors, parading under the names of great prophets or apostles. The "Higher Critics" have turned the history of God's chosen people upside down, assigning that which the Old Testament places in earlier ages to later periods and vice versa. The text of the Old Testament has been broken into bits, arranged and rearranged to suit the fancy of the arranger. This the "Critics" have done in order that the evolution theory might be applied to the events there
recorded and to the doctrines there taught. The prophets who so scathingly denounced all false prophets are themselves alleged to have written their "supposed prophecies" of future events after those events had already taken place. The "assured results of Higher Criticism" are, indeed, not so assured that any two Critics can be found who will agree as to just what those results are. But each and every Critic will, for all that, confidently announce that what he teaches is "an assured result" of the labors of Higher Critics in general. The New Testament is treated in the same way as the Old Testament. The Gospels and most of the other New 'Testament books are said to be composite documents, palmed off upon an uncritical age by falsifying impostors as the work of the apostles. Some of the letters of St. Paul have resisted the attacks of even the most wildly anti-Christian Higher Criticism. But then Paul himself is put under the microscope of modern religious psychology and found to be only a neurotic invalid, subject to epileptic fits, or even quite mad-with the Governor Festus as one authority for that contention! (Acts 26:24).
24. Having disposed of the historical sources of Christianity in this way, they still are not quite through with the person of Jesus Christ, that "head stone of the corner," that "rock of offense" and "stone of stumbling." In the Bible, and in the historic creeds of Christendom, he is the Son of God and the Son of Man, the only Savior of men ; true God, begotten of the Father from eternity, true man, born of the Virgin Mary. To the evolutionist, Christ was only a man, divine only as we are, or can become, divine; the bastard son of an unfaithful woman; at best, a great religious teacher, who has taught men to call God their Father and has shown them how to live a life of self-sacrificing service ; but also a strangely unbalanced character, who imagined himself to be a Messiah and King. The more logical and consistent evolutionists subject also our glorious and risen Lord to the analysis of that modern abomination, religious psychology, and adjudge Him, even more than Paul, to have been insane, with the "much misunderstood and maligned Pharisees" as prime authorities for that theory! (Cf. John 10:20). But most Modernists, with characteristic lack of logic and consistency, combine with a complete rejection of every claim made for Christ by the Bible
an alleged reverence and respect for Him and His teachings. These, however, only reveal that they themselves are children of the father of lies, Satan, by the way in which they praise him while still making him really a liar or deluded fanatic; for only liars could retain any respect for a person who was such a deceiver or self-deluded leader of deceivers as Christ, on their theories, must have been. The Modernist Christ is, in short, an impossible being, whether we consider the caricatures of him presented by many modern theologians or the "manly Master" of Fosdick and his smooth-tongued ilk. He is a religious and ethical monstrosity that could have been even imagined only by a theology that is itself a hybrid monstrosity, the unnatural product of unnaturally combined opposites.
25. With such a view of the Bible and the Christ who is its theme from beginning to end, we can understand that the Modernist way of salvation must be something quite different from that which the Bible and historic Christianity teaches. The Bible says that Jesus Christ is the only Savior; that there is "none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved" (Acts 4:12). The Modernist may, indeed, call Christ a Savior; but there are many other saviors, too; in fact, every man must work out his own salvation by following in the footsteps of Christ and the other great religious leaders of men, Buddha, Confucius, Mohammed, etc.; Christ saves men only by showing them how to save themselves. This is possible because men are not so bad after all; they all have the immanent God dwelling in their hearts. They need, not so much to be saved from sin, as to recognize that they are essentially good and divine themselves. In fact, that which the Bible calls the fall of man was necessary in order that, as the serpent said to Eve, men might themselves become divine through knowing both good and evil. Good and evil are relative terms. That which is the good of today may be the evil of tomorrow, or vice versa. The Ten Commandments are essentially an outgrown moral code. Though not many Modernists will go so far as the mad philosopher, Nietzsche, and condemn the ethics of the New Testament outright, they are at one in assuming that we now need a more modern system of ethics to fit our modern age; that, hence, the ethics of Christ must, in certain respects at least, be superseded
by a "scientific ethics," worked out by the "experimental method." There is no such thing as permanent, fixed truth, either in theology or in ethics, according to them. Therefore there can be no such thing as sin either, in the absolute sense. The sins of men are as much the mistakes of the immanent God as they are the errors of men; for he is thus by the experimental, trial-and-error method working out the more perfect universe to come. Therefore there is no doctrine which Modernists hate more than the Bible teaching concerning the substitutionary death and blood atonemient of Jesus Christ. On it they visit all the scorn and ridicule they can express; over it they pour the vials of their alleged righteous wrath. For it is just that doctrine that brings out most clearly • the awful, eternally horrible and destructive character of $\sin$ in God's eyes, since it takes the death and blood of the Son of God Himself to atone for it.
26. Furthermore, Modernism has no use for salvation in the Biblical sense, because the belief in a Hell and a Devil from which men need to be saved has been completely discarded. There is even little faith in a future Heaven to which to be saved. At any rate, the Modernist centers his attention on this life and on making it heavenly for himself and others, leaving the next world, if there is one, to take care of itself. This explains the emphasis on what is called "Social Christianity." Modernists are not interested, according to Dean Matthews, in rescuing brands from the burning, but in putting out the fire. They hope by social reform, by legislation, and by education to improve conditions so that happiness and content will be the general lot, instead of poverty, crime, and suffering. A theory which leads presumably intelligent men to trace crime and moral degeneracy to poor eyesight or adenoids will also lead them to believe in the possibility of a general reform by purely natural means. The Modernist may discourse eloquently about the Kingdom of God, but he means a kingdom of this world, where Prohibition laws are enforced, thus incidentally improving upon Christ and his scandalous (!) conduct at the wedding at Cana; where Modernists dictate legislation and capitalists meekly" obey their commands or, perhaps, "give all their goods to the poor" and help to establish a Socialistic State, a lá the Marxian Bolshevist Paradise.
27. This is a very incomplete sketch of Modernism; but it
should be enough to show that it is something entirely different from Christianity as we know it. But that does not prove to the Modernist that he has no right to the Christian name. We have seen a famous university professor, during a discussion of the Resurrection of Christ, become quite excited when a speaker said that those who denied the resurrection could not be called Christians; he claimed that the name, Christian, was not copyrighted, and so he could call himself a Christian, too, no matter what he believed about Christ! The explanation for this attitude is simply that the name, Christian, has come to stand for everything good, noble, and true; and the Modernist claims to be good and noble - and true, too! The Modernist, of course, admits that his Christianity is not the same as that of the first disciples. Yes, more. he insists that modern Christianity must be different from the old, or it is no longer Christianity. A tree looks quite different after a hundred years from what it did when it first took root. Only a dead stick would look the same, after a century, as at first -if it has not decayed away. And so, the Modernist says, it is only a dead Christianity which remains the same-static, unchanging. The Modernist uses the familiar vocabulary of the oldfashioned Christian, partly in order that his new teachings shall not shock the congregations into open opposition before they have had time to absorb his views more or less unconsciously; partly, as Dr. Gerald B. Smith says, because "the inertia of theological thinking tends to conserve terms which have had a vital significance in relation to realities of former days, but which are artificial in our own, day" ("A Guide," etc., p. 524) ; partly because he must use at least some of the old terms if he is to demonstrate that his teaching has any "genetic connection" with original Christianity, as he claims it has. But he has no hesitancy about affirming that his religion is very different from the religion of Paul or Luther, and must be different, since the modern world has discovered so many facts of which Paul and Luther never even dreamed.
28. In order to understand this attitude on the part of Modernists, we must remember that all their thinking is based on a theory which derives life from dead matter, men from the monkey or a lump of jelly, which can gather grapes of thorns, or figs of thistles, which knows no dividing line between any of the many
different forms of life, but makes all things one. Any kind of Dualism is abhorrent to this theory. Therefore, there can be no real dividing line, on this theory, between the different forms of religion either. They are all one-the lowest heathenism, the pagan idolatries, the Christianity of Paul, the Modernism of today. Andi so at the same time as Modernism claims a true historical connection with Christianity, it also most frankly and openly claims a similar connection with all other religions. There is no such thing as true religion distinct from false religions. All religions are but more or less successful gropings after a truth which consists, not in somé objective, metaphysical being or system of teaching, but only in a correct adjustment between changing individual and changing environment, their proper adaptation to each other. (Cf. par. 10 and 13, lit. 9, above).
29. There is thus only one way by which to prove to the Modernist that he has no right to the name Christian. And that is to show that his basic theory is the fundamental opposite of Christianity from beginning to end, at every point, from the doctrine of creation to the doctrine of the Final Judgment. The Christian who hesitates to draw the line sharply or leaves any room for the theory of evolution at all, might as well give up his case first as last. In the battle between Modernism and Christianity, the doctrine of creation therefore becomes fundamental. Any concession or weakness at that point opens the door for the whole series of Modernist blasphemies. . So we need to review briefly here the contrast between the Bible and Evolution as regards the origin of the universe; or to compare the science taught in the Bible with the science based on Evolution.
30. The first page of the Bible introduces us, without any attempt at philosophical explanation, to the Lord God, who by His almighty Word creates the universe and its myriad forms of matter, force, and life, with Man, a living soul, the breath of God in his nostrils, as the crown and head of His creation. The last page of the Bible tells us how this same God will create a new heaven and a new earth in the place of the first creation, which sin had corrupted, and will grant all those who have been redeemed by the blood of the Lamb, the second Adam, the right to reign and rule with Him in all eternity. Everything between the first and last pages of the Bible is permeated by the belief in this
same Creator as the one who sustains, governs, and controls the destiny of His creation. Any attack on the first page of the Bible constitutes, therefore, logically an attack also on the last page of the Bible and everything between. Teachings which deny the existence of God, and make Matter (Materialism), or some impersonal "Idea" (Idealism), or an Unknowable Something (Agnosticism), the ground and origin of all things, are plainly con-trary to the Bible. For the existence of a Creator God, who is a personal Being, is assumed throughout in it. All those who deny His existence are simply called "brutish men who know not, fools who do not understand" (Ps. 92:6) ; and that is the end of the argument. (Cf. Ps. $14: 1 ; 10: 4 ; 53$; etc.). But teachings which rule God out of His universe after He once had created it (Deism), or identify Him with it so that He is bound up in it and by it (Pantheism), are just as contrary to the whole tenor of the Bible. "God spake and it was done; He commanded, and it stood fast" (Ps. 33:9). "Every house is builded by some man; but He that built all things is God" (Heb. 3:4). It is the Creator and His creation that thus are contrasted; the inventor and his machine. To identify God with the universe is as absurd, in the light of the Bible teaching, as it would be to identify Henry Ford, the man, with one of his "Fords," the car. The case stands no better for those who teach that God was through with His universe after He created it, and that it since the beginning of time has run of itself, by its own laws and inherent forces, like a clock wound up. No machine runs itself, but requires to be periodically supplied with new power and repaired and attended. And so, too, with the "machine" that is this universe. The Bible teaches from beginning to end that God is continually watching over His creation; that it depends every moment upon His support for its existence. "In Him we live, and move, and have our being" (Acts $17: 28$ ). Without God, the universe would simply collapse and be utterly destroyed. (Cf. Matt. 6:26 ff.; 10:28 ff.; Col. 1:17; Heb. 1:3, etc.). Read the book of Job and the Psalms again!
31. Most Modernists are Pantheists and have no use for a transcendental God, but speak continually about the God who is immanent in all nature. Rev. Charles F. Potter, e. g., says: "God was existent in the spiral nebulae from which this earth was
formed. He was existent in the matter which gradually cooled and which formed until this earth became more like what it is now. He was immanent in the dust and slime in the early stages. He was immanent in the first forms of animate life which came directly from the inanimate matter which existed before. He was immanent in every reaching upward of the earlier forms of life. He was immanent when our last animal ancestor became gradually conscious of himself and of this difference from the beasts which had preceded him. God has been present at every progressive development of mankind since that day". ("Evolution vs. Creation," p. 29). This is nothing else, in reality than the old Pantheism which in India prevents insect pests or poisonous reptiles from being destroyed, because, forsooth, God is also in them! If anyone wishes to learn what the fruits of such Pantheism are, let him go to India, or read Miss Mayo's book, "Mother India."
32. But there are also Modernists who call themselves "Theistic Evolutionists." They include many people who, perhaps, belong properly under our second class: Those who, assuming Christianity to be the primary truth, seek to interpret evolution on Christian lines, or to embody it in their theology.

## B. Ciristianizing Eivolutton.

33. Infidel evolutionists and radical Modernists reject the Bible in blind unbelief, and are to be pitied for their unbelief. But those who claim to believe in Biblical Christianity and who still try to harmonize Evolution with it deserve only condemnation. If men who are blind to the sun of God's revelation seek to find out God by the flickering candle light of Science, they are all wrong; but they are at least not as foolish as those who know and see that sun and yet think to discover eternally valid truths by the spluttering, ill-smelling flame of a man-made Science. It is one of the saddest chapters in Church History, this, which records how ready and anxious Christian Church members and leaders often have been to cater to the wisdom of this world and absorb its vaunted knowledge into their own theology. The Gnostics of the early Christian era, the scholastic theologians of the Middle Ages, the Rationalists of the 18th century, and the Modernists of today, all have numbered in their ranks many Christians who by no means went to the extremes of their radical
leaders, but who gave those heretical movements the best possible support by their weak concessions and compromising attitude. There may be Christians among such compromisers today, because they have illogically retained certain fundamental beliefs in God and Christ together with their faith in Evolution. But we cannot, therefore, call their compromising doctrines Christian. For that same "happy inconsistency" by which they themselves can still be Christians becomes a most unhappy inconsistency, when we consider what effects their illogical, un-Biblical teachings must have upon the minds of those who associate with them. A logical mind is not necessary in order to be a sincere Christian. But it is highly essential in these days when the science of Logic has been relegated to the scrap-heap and theological and philosophical muddle-headedness is the order of the day, that those who would be teachers of Christianity should observe at least some of the elementary laws of reasoning.
34. The theory of Evolution is fundamentally an attempt at explaining the origin of the world as we see it without the intervention of a Power existing before or beyond the world. But many people claim that they believe in a personal God and still can accept Evolution. They look upon Evolution simply as the nethod by which God created the world and by which He still governs it. In other words, they consider evolution a divinely established law, which is operative throughout in life, in the world, and in society. Without identifying God with this law in pantheistic fashion as most Modernists do, they consider it unreasonable to hold that God should change His own laws arbitrarily for the benefit of one person or race, or even break and contradict them, as He must have done, if, for example, the sun stood still at Joshua's command, or iron floated on the water for the prophet Elisha. God would not be God, they say, if he should thus interfere with, or capriciously set aside, the marvellous laws which He Himself has put into His creation. The miracles recorded in the Bible they thus either reject, or explain as the operations of higher laws not yet known to us, but which may eventually be discovered, so that men could duplicate those miracles.
35. God is, indeed, a God of order. But the Bible nowhere represents Him as being in any manner bound by the laws which

He has made. He does that which is good in His own sight. He is from beginning to end presented as a God who is intensely personal, and who, therefore, like every other person, is continually interfering with "natural law," in accordance with the dictates of his own free will. To imagine a God who is bound by His own laws is to make Him no longer a free, independent person, but the slave of forces which He could create, but not thereafter control or destroy. But we all know that men are continually starting and stopping, repairing and remodeling, changing and destroying the machines which they make. We can think no less of God's ability over towards the "machine" He has made, if we really look upon Him as a truly personal being, just as distinct from His creation as we are distinct from the machines we make. Indeed, according to the Bible, God is so entirely free that His acts could be described as arbitrary, were it not for the fact that He is also Love and Righteousness, so that everything He does has a loving and good purpose and character. "Whatsoever the Lord pleased, that did He in heaven, and in earth, in the seas, and all deep places" (Ps. 135:6). "He doeth according to His will in the army of heaven, and among the inhabitants of the earth; and none can stay His hand, or say unto Him, What doest thou?" (Dan. 4:35). Thus the Bible represents Gocl. Read Job 9, Ps. 104, Isa. 29 and 45, Rom. 9, etc. Strictly speaking, then, to say that one believes in God at all, and at the same time to bind Him by his own "natural laws" is to talk nonsense. It is interesting that a scientist, L.T.More, Professor of Physics at the University of Cincinnati, should express himself most strongly against those who thus seek to combine evolutionary science and Christianity with the result that they satisfy neither. He says in "The Dogma of Evolution": "To admit the existence of God in any sense of the zord* is to admit the possibility of the miraculous. To say that natural law was instituted by a Power and to deny that natural law may be suspended or changed is to accept the greater mystery and to deny a less. If God instituted the laws by which the solar system moves, then I see no reason, so far as physics is concerned, why the sun may not have stood still at the command of God through Joshua. To say that it would have deranged the solar system is an argument which should

[^1]have no more weight than to say that a man who had made a machine could not stop it and start it again without deranging its mechanism. The disbelief in such miracles comes from the conviction of so steadfast a reign of law that the purpose ascribed to the miracles is not commensurate with the infraction of the law. But believing, as I do, in free-will, which is contrary to scientific law, and that man can comprehend imperfectly the laws of the universe, it seems reasonable to assume that he also to the same extent comprehends the creator of the laws" (p. 357).
36. The "Theistic Evolutionist," then, comes no closer to the Bible teaching than the outright Pantheist does. Neither cloes his view of the matter please the orthodox Evolutionist any more than it does the orthodox Christian. He is forever halting between two opinions, "ever learning and never able to come to the knowledge of the truth." The same must be said about "the pathetic attempts of modern (Christian) apologists to reconcile Genesis and Darwinism," as Dr. George B. Foster puts it. ("A Guide," etc., p. 747). The great Gladstone wrote a book which he entitled "The Impregnable Rock of Holy Scriptures"; but he himself allowed a considerable number of dents to be made in that rock by conceding as fact things which were, after all, only arbitrary assumptions on the part of too cock-sure scientists, as, e. g., when he made the six days of Genesis 1 into long periods of time, in order to make room for the alleged "facts" of Geology. And so with a host of "conservative" writers down to the present day, who forget that one Word of Godl is more true, scientific, and certain than all the experiments and observations of a thousand scientists could ever make the simplest event or phenomenon in nature. The plea of these "conservatives," of course, is that the Bible does not pretend to teach Science, but religion; that hence, where the Bible statements seem to contradict the findings of modern science, there we must interpret the Bible in a new way, or explain its statements as an "accommodation"" to the "unscientific, simple-minded views" of the people of that day. Thuts Otto Lock, in "Theological Forum" of the Norwegian Merger, says: "It is very important that we should avoid the common error of assuming that a miraculous revelation of detailed scientific truth was ever designed by God in His Word. The account of Creation is given in popular language" (Jan. 1931, p. 46).

And so on this theory, when God said "Let there be light," we must not think of that light as being created within an ordinary day, in immediate response to His almighty Word. No, we must think of God as making a long, laborious speech, requiring extended periods of time, corresponding to the geologic ages of "Science," and thus gradually, with much patient labor, producing light out of nothing! That is "modern" and "scientific," and it is also, we submit, sublime nonsense, as so many of the other "pathetic attempts at harmonizing Genesis and Science" are, even though it is sponsored and advanced by some great names in the Christian theological world. It is most certainly true, as Mr. Lock points out, that a revelation of the whole "mystery of crea-tion-in scientific details" would have been of little "benefit to early man." If it had, the Lord would undoubtediy have revealed it to him. But we object to his naïve assumption that "Science" has been able, or ever will be able, to find out anything about that mystery in "scientific details," all the while we know that scientists, as Thos. Edison says, "do not know one-minillionth part of one per cent about anything"! All too many "conservative theologians" make this mistake: They assume that scientists by their researches have added to human knowledge, when the fact of the matter is that they have only, by their discoveries, extended immeasureably the boundaries of their ignorance and plunged themselves still deeper into that complete mystification with regard to nature and its laws which is so conspicuous in the latest scientific and philosophical writings.
37. And this is not a mere "glittering paradox." To give an example of how new discoveries increase the ignorance of man rather than their knowledge; or, in other words, add only to their knowledge of their own ignorance: There was a time when scientists thought they could give a true definition of matter. But physicists today have, through their researches, arrived at the stage where they must frankly admit that they do not know what matter is. The more they learn about the properties of matter the less they understand it. Thus Dr. W. R. Whitney, "a world figure in science," says, as quoted in Literary Digest, (Nov. 22d, 1930): "The best scientists have to recognize that they are just kindergarten fellows playing with mysteries-our ancestors were, and our descendants will be. We move from one theory to
the next, and always there is something that does not fit in with the other evidence. Take the atom. Yesterday it was whirling particles, infinitesimal solar systems. But that is outmoded now, and today the atom is described as a wave in space. Tomorrow it will be something different. The theory of relativity is not final. It won't stand still. No scientific concept can stand still. All is in motion. The will of God, the law which we discover, but cannot understand or explain, that alone is final. No cut-anddried bundles of words made up into a scientific formula will suit; they simply cover up the investigator's ignorance. In the last analysis, everything operates by the will of God, and there is no formula which will explain that." *
38. This scientist is wise in that he makes God the real explanation for all the phenomena of nature, as the Bible does. But most scientists prefer to try to cover up their ignorance by learned theories, expressed in technical language or mathematical formu1las which few can understand. Still they conclude by calling themselves "Agnostics"; and that after all is simply the polite Greek word for ignoramus or "greenhorn"! The average scientist's procedure is described correctly enough in Literary Digest, (Aug. 10th, 1929): "Quoting that ancient definition of metaphysics as 'looking in a dark room for a black hat that isn't there,' Mr. Chesterton confronts us with some of the theories that have gone the way to the scrap pile, and says that the physical scientist, however, 'actually announces that he has found the hat, handled the hat, worn the hat, weighed and photographed the hat, all by way of leading up to the announcement that it isn't there','." And so modern scientists are repeating the experience of "The Preacher," who says in Ecclesiastes: "When I applied mine heart to know wisdom, and to see the business that is done upon the earth, then I beheld all the work of God, that a man cannot find out the work that is done under the sun; because though a man labor to seek it out, yet he shall not find it; yea, farther, though a wise man think to know it, yet shall he not be able to find it" (Eccles. 8:17). "God hath made everything beautiful in His time ; also He hath set the world in their heart, so that no man can find out the work that God maketh from the beginning to the end" (Eccles. 3:11). In short, God has so ordained that

[^2]men will never be able to explain His creation at all except, to a certain extent, by faith in Him. "Through faith we understand that the worlds were framed by the Word of God, so that things which are seen were not made of things which do appear" (Heb. $11: 3$ ). We can study nature only as it now is, "the things which are seen." But these things "were not made of things which do appear"; that is, their origin, their fundamental nature is to be found in something that does not "appear" to our senses, so that it cannot be known or made the subject of scientific study at all. To argue back from what scientists now see and observe in nature and assume that the world has originated by the forces or the laws that now are operative in it, (as Lyell did, e. g., in Geology), is as foolish in reality as it would be to explain the origin of a gasoline engine by demonstrating how the completed machine operates. Scientists who have done this should confess with Job: "I have uttered that I understood not; things too wonderful for me, which I knew not" (Job 42:3). Read Job 38-42.
39. Instead of assuming, then, that Science has given us an insight into the "mysteries of creation" which the first men did not possess, true Bible Christians should say with the famous author, Jean Paul Richter: "The first leaf of the Mosaic record has more weight than all the folios of the men of science and philosophy combined." And wherever Science contradicts the least jot or tittle of God's Word, we should remember the words of the prophet Isaiah: "Thus saith the Lord, thy Redeemer, and He that formed thee from the womb ; I am the Lord that maketh all things; that stretcheth forth the heavens alone; that spreadeth abroad the earth by myself; that frustrateth the tokens of the liars, and maketh diviners mad ; that turneth wise men backward, and maketh their knowledge foolish" (44:24-5). For it is not true that the Bible does not teach Science. It tells us all that we can really know concerning the creation, government, and preservation of the universe. The scientist who attempts to go beyond this knowledge and to penetrate deeper into the mysteries of life and the world, while leaving God out of account, will find only that he "is turned backward"; his "knozoledge is made foolish." So true is this, that many of us here can expect to see the day when scientists will be ridiculing the theories that now have been popular, with even more devastating irony than our
most "scientific" Modernists or humorous scientists today can ridicule the theories of the so-called "pre-scientific ages." The Bible, indeed, does not give us detailed descriptions of the many forms of life and matter; it is the privilege of a reverent and Godfearing science to observe, and to gather facts concerning, the wonderful world which God has created. But Science can never penetrate into the secrets of nature so as to understand its laws or explain its processes; it cannot explain even a blade of grass or a lump of dirt, much less the mind or soul of man. The very best it can clo is to say that they exist "by the will of God." No man can read God's Book of Nature aright if he in unbelief rejects the Book which is His direct revelation to men. And even those who accept that Revelation must confess the truth of the Preacher's words: "As thon knowest not what is the way of the spirit, nor how the bones do grow in the womb of her that is with child; even so thon knowest not the works of God who maketh all" (Eccles. 11:5). Thus Lord Kelvin, a Christian and one of the greatest scientists of modern times, says: "One word characterizes the most strennous of the efforts for the advancement of science that I have made perseveringly for fifty-five years. That word is failure. I know no more of electric and magnetic force, or of the relation between ether, electricity, and ponderable matter or of chemical affinity, than I knew and tried to teach to my students of natural philosophy fifty years ago in my first session as professor."
40. It is only "a science falsely so called," then, that pretends to do more than record the facts of nature which it has observed. For the word "science" means "knowledge." But most of that which today is called science is not knowledge at all, but pure spectulation, fanciful imaginings, the wild dreams of men who know not God and who therefore can do nothing better than to "give heed to fables and endless genealogies, which minister questions rather than godly edifying which is in faith" (1 Tim. 1:4). It is like the "Gnosis," the knowledge or science, which Patul condemned in his day; and its advocates can well be described in his words to Timothy: "If any man-consent not to wholesome words, even the words of our Lord Jesus Christ, and to the doctrine which is according to godliness; he is proud, knowing nothing; but doting about questions and strifes of words,
whereof cometh envy, strife, railings, evil surmisings, perverse disputings of men of corrupt minds, and destitute of the truth" ( 1 Tim. 6:3-5).
41. Those, then, who seek to incorporate Evolution into Christianity can succeed no better than those who try to fit Christianity into their evolutionary scheme of things. Whether they yield little or much to evolutionary Science, they bring an alien theory into that system of divine truth to which Genesis 1 is fundamental. Whether they reject the whole doctrine of a Creation out of nothing by a divine fiat or reject only the six days of creation and seek to convert them into the indefinitely long periods of evolutionary Geology, they convict themselves of folly; they exchange the certainty of divine revelation for the uncertain theories of human Science, a Science which has become so foolish that it will determine dogmatically how long the world must have existed, even while it is unable to explain the simplest phenomena of nature as we see it today! Both the extreme Modernists, then, and their compromising "conservative" brethren succeed only in contradicting true scientific facts as well as the Bible, and in destroying faith in the only saving religion: Biblical Christianity. Therefore we say that Modernism in any form is not Christian, but anti-Christian ; that any compromise with it or its fundamental theory is compromise with falsehood, heathenism, and Satan.
42. Butt there are many who are so convinced that Modernism and Evolution are based on scientific facts that they will rather give up the name, Christian, than their faith in Science and Evolution. We need, therefore, also to discuss the question:

## III. Is Modernism Scientific?

43. We cannot go into detail on this question here, but can, we believe, show satisfactorily that Modernism has no scientific validity whatever, but is purely and simply a false religion, the blind, unreasoning, and generally unreasoned, faith of the (from the Christian viewpoint) unbelieving world; no more reasonable or helpful to mankind than the pagan abominations in which it has its real roots.
44. The Bible makes two assumptions which we are required to make with it, if we are to believe its teachings: (1) That
there is a personal God. (2) That this God reveals Himself to men in order to win lost sinners back to Him. These are in themselves perfectly reasonable assumptions to make. But we cannot demonstrate scientifically that there is a Gocl, although we can, by faith, become entirely certain that He exists. We cannot prove scientifically that God would reveal Himself to men in the way which the Bible teaches, although we can, again by faith, become entirely certain that He would do so and did so so in the Bible. If we make these two initial assumptions, and believe in God and His Holy Word, then all the rest follows with logical certainty and necessity. The more Biblical a system of theology is, the more logical and self-consistent it proves to be. There is no more consistent and clear teaching to be found anywhere, in the whole history of human thought, than in the theology of such orthodox Christian scholars as the famous Lutherans who prepared the first complete Book of Concord.
45. Biblical Christianity, then, frankly states that it requires faith and can be proven true only to those who are born again of the Spirit, so that they have new spiritual powers with which to apprehend and comprehend divine truth. But Modernism claims that it doubts all things until they have been scientifically demonstrated to be true. It refuses to believe in the Bible as God's Word to men, or even to believe in the existence of God, unless these beliefs can be made reasonable or can be harmonized with the findings of Science. It assumes, however, the validity of a theory, that of Evolution, which never has been, and never can be, proven true. It assumes also that God and true religion can be discovered by scientific methods, an assumption which is directly contrary to the Bible as well as to the facts of history. Here is where the contrast between Modernism and true Christianity shows itself most clearly. Christianity starts with faith in the eternal God who is Life and Truth, and thus begets certainty of conviction and a steadfast hope of life eternal. Modernism claims that it starts with definite knowledge, but is in reality based on faith in an unreasonable theory which is utterly incapable of scientific proof; therefore it can only beget doubt and skepticism and lead men into a morass of spectulation and uncertainty about everything from the origin and nature of the world to the future fate of man and the universe.
46. Modernism can certainly be no more scientific than the so-called "scientific" theory on which it is primarily based. But Evolution is admittedly only a theory, and not scientific fact at all. We shall quote first, in proof of this, a few statements by a confirmed evolutionist, Dr. Vernon L. Kellog, Professor of Zoology at Leland Stanford University. He says, in "Darwinism Today": "All the millions of kinds of animals and plants can have had an origin in some one of but three ways: they have come into existence spontaneously, they have been specially created by some supernatural power, or they have descended one from the other in many-branching series by gradual transformation. There is absolutely no scientific evidence for either of the first two ways; there is much scientific evidence for the last way. There is left for the scientific man, then, solely the last, that is, the method of descent. The theory of descent (with which phase organic evolution may be practically held as a synonym) is, then, simply the declaration that the various living as well as the now extinct species of organisms are descended from one another and from common ancestors. It is the explanation of the origin of species accepted in the science of biology. If such a summary disposal of the theories of spontaneous generation and divine creation is too repugnant to my readers to meet with their toleration, then, as Delage has pertinently said in connection with a similar statement in his great tome on 'Heredity,' my book and such readers had better immediately part company; we do not speak the same language" (p. 10-11).

47 This is dogmatic language, indeed, as dogmatic as any that can be found in the most hidebound system of orthodox dogmatics. And what is the evidence on which this evolutionist bases his dogmatism? He is forced to refer "to the curiously nearly completely subjective character of the evidence* for both the theory of descent and natural selection. Biology has been until now a science of observation; it is beginning to be one of observation plus experiment. The evidence for its principal theories might be expected to be thoroughly objective in character; to be of the nature of positive, observed, and perhaps experimentally proved, facts. How is it actually? Speaking by and large we only tell the general truth when we declare that no in-

[^3]dubitable cases of species-forming or transforming, that is, of descent, have been observed; and that no recognized case of natural selection really selecting has been observed.* The evidence for descent is of satisfying but purely logical character." (p. 18-19). In other wordls, the "evidence" for the evolution theory has been spun entirely out of the nore or less-mostly less, cf. par. 48logical minds of the evolutionists thenuselves. Prof. Kellog also lets another interesting, and certainly nine-lived, cat out of the bag when he gives Darwin the credit for establishing the evolution theory on a scientific basis; and still at the same time admits that Darwinism is now discredited in the scientific world: "The theory of descent, long before it was fully set forth by Darwin in 1858 together with a definite and wholly plausible causo-mechanical explanation of it, had been foreshadowed and even fairly explicitly formulated by various philosophical naturalists. Even in the far older writings of the Greeks, most conspicuously perhaps in the pages of Aristotle (350), may be found phrases foreshadowing those of Lamarck, Wallace, and Darwin. But it was not until Darwin backed, up the formulation of the descent theory with that wonderful accumulation of illuminating and explaining facts, and with those always ingenious but ever candid and supremely honest tryings-on of the theory to the various fact-bodies, that the Theory of Descent began to be spelled with capital letters in the biological creed.* Nor was it merely goodfortune that led to the quick and wide acceptance of the theory of descent when proposed by Darwin, while the same theory when proposed twenty years earlier by Lamarck found practically only rejection. It was because to the old descent theory the new Darwinian theories were added. It was because of that explaining Dorwinism,* which today is being so rigorously re-examined as to its validity, that the theory of descent took its detinite place as the dominant declaration in the biological credo* (p. 11-12). Still Kellog must admit: "The fair truth is that the Darwinian selection theories, considered with regard to their claimed capacity to be an independently sufficient mechanical explanation of descent, stand today seriously discredited in the biological world. On the other hand, it is also fair truth to say that no replacing hypothesis or theory of species-forming has been offered by the

[^4]opponents of selection which has met with any general or even considerable acceptance by naturalists. Kurz und gut, we are immensely unsettled"' (p. 5). In other words, the Darwinian theories gave the evolution dogma its start in the modern world. Darwin is one of the canonised saints of such slavish followers of Evolutionary Science as Fosdick, whose "Cathedral" in New York has Darwin's image, along with that of the apostles and the Lord Himself, carved above the doorway. Many people believe his books infallible. But Darwinism now stands completely discredited in the scientific world; the observations and experiments that have been made since Kellog's statement was writter (1907) have completed the work of destruction that had then been well begun. As Dr. Dwight, Professor of Anatomy at Harvard University, says: "We have now the remarkable spectacle that just when many scientific men are all agreed that there is no part of the Darwinian system that is of any great influence, and that, as a whole, the theory is not only unproved, but impossible,* the ignorant, half-educated masses have acquired the idea that it is to be accepted as a fundamental fact . . ." (Quoted in Lunin's "The Flight from Reason," (1931), p. 88). Still, with its Darwinian basis entirely gone, and nothing else to take the place of Darwinism, the evolution theory is being held all the same as "the dominant declaration in the biological credo." That is, it is confessedly an article of faith and nothing more-a "working hypothesis" which men hold to, mainly because they refuse to accept the reasonable view of the matter taught in the Bible.
48. And in other fields of human knowledge, evolution is held still more firmly, even in its Darwinian form-not least in religion and ethics, i. e. Modernism. It has taken to itself wings, and needs no longer the solid foundation of scientific fact on which it was allegedly built up. It has had the bottom completely knocked out from under it; and all the labors of thousands of scientists have not availed to give it any other or better foundation. But it soars on arily all the same on the wings of faith-a faith so credulous, so illogical, so unreasonable that it is increasingly becoming the target of cynically-minded philosophers or independent thinkers. Thus, Prof. More says: "The most

[^5]discouraging feature of the whole problem of biological evolution, to one who has been trained in the exact phraseology and rigorous logic of the physical and mathematical sciences, is the loose language and the still looser reasoning of the evolutionists and of the biologists. Up to a certain point, their language and methods are those of science and then comes the relapse into the methods of the untrained thinker. Professor Bateson carefully knocks down every prop to natural selection, to the inheritance of acquired traits, and to evolution in general ; then he concludes by asking us to apply the doctrine of evolution to the thoughts and actions of men because he still has faith in evolution, and some day biologists may find its solution:* We can leave to the biologists the hope that some day they may enter the temple of life through the doors of evolution, but the collapse of the theory of natural selection leaves the philosophy of mechanistic materialism in a sorry plight. Those who are trying to use its corclusions as a guide to social polity and ethics will find themselves without any ground on which to stand if they address themselves to a real study of biological evolution" (Dogma of Evolution, p. 236 ff .).
49. The science of Paleontology (the study of fossil remains) is supposed to furnish the evolution theory with some of its best evidences. But scientists now admit that these evidences do not prove the theory at all. Darwin had to assume that the evidences he sought in fossil fields were lacking because they had been lost, like pages torn out of an old book. But then it is remarkable that the "pages" which remain prove the truth of the Bible teaching at every point, and never furnish a single proof for the theory of evolution! Prof. More, after reviewing the present state of this science, says: "The more one studies paleontology, the more certain one becomes that evolution is based on faith alone; exactly the same sort of faith which it is necessary to have when one encounters the great mysteries of religion. The changes that are noted as time progresses show no orderly and no consecutive evolutionary chain and, above all, they give us no clue whatever as to the cause of variations. The evidence from paleontology is for discontinuity; only by faith and imagination

[^6]is there continuity of variation" ("Dogma of Evolution," p. 160-1).
50. But the fact that the evolution theory is based solely on faith does not put it on a par with Christianity which is also based on faith. For the Christian puts his faith in an omniscient, omnipotent, eternal, and perfect God, who guarantees for him that what He teaches is eternally valid Truth. But the evolutionist puts his faith in the observations and spectulations of his own mind, which according to his theory has been developed by gradual changes out of the mind of an ape or some still lower form of life. And so the can hardly have much faith in them! As Charles Darwin himself confessed: "Butt then with me the horrid doubt always arises whether the convictions of a man's mind which has been developed from the mind of the lower animals, are of any value or at all trustworthy. Would anyone trust the convictions of a monkey's mind?" (Quoted in Lunn's "The Flight from Reason," p. VI). The validity of our faith, then, on the Christian assumptions, is guaranteed by God Himself. What guarantee has the evolutionist, on his assumptions, for the validity of his faith?
51. We cannot take the time here to give further quotations from recent scientific writing on Darwinism and evolution. We can only allude to such criticisms of evolution as Prof. Arthur W. Lindsay's "The Problems of Evolution," and Henshaw Ward's "Builders of Delusion," both published this year. So general is this attitude of criticism becoming that Modernists like Cadman, ever alert to be on the band-wagon, are joining the critics. In 1922, he wrote an unqualified defense of Darwinism. (Hom. Review, June, 1922, reprinted in "Evolution or Christianity?" 1924, by Dr. Wm. M. Goldsmith). In 1931, he writes an appreciative foreword to Lunn's attack on "the Victorian heresy," as this same Darwinian Evolutionism is called in "The Flight from Reason." Apparently it will not be long before the world of scholarship will be agreeing with Prof. George Frederick Wright that "the Evolution theory is one-tenth bad science and nine-tenths bad philosophy." According to their: own theory, of course, evolutionists should eventually change so much that they could not believe in evolution any longer! And that they will do, as soon as they can find some other, or presumably better, excuse for their
refusal to believe in the Tri-une God of the Bible. For althongh some may by the grace of God come to a knowledge of the truth in Christ Jesus, and others may jump from the anarchistic rationalism of Modernism over to the despotic, absolutist rationalism of the Catholic Church, most of them will be only confirmed in their skepticism, by the breakdown of their old faith in Evolution; so that they will join the growing ranks of atheists and Bolshevists who are raging so wildly today against the Lord and against His anointed. Rather than admit the existence of the Creator they will, with Kellog, be satisfied to confess that they simply "do not know" how the varions kinds of life have originated, or what anything in reality is; and to say with him: "Nor in the present state of our knowledge does any one know, nor will any one know until, as Brooks says of another problem, we find out. We are ignorant, terribly, immensely ignorant. And our work is, to learn. To question life by new methods, from new angles, on closer terms, under more precise conditions of control ; this is the requirement and the opportunity of the biologist of today. May his generation hear some whisper from the Sphinx"! (Op. cit. p. 387). "Some whisper from the Sphinx;", that is all the "knowledge" that Science can give men, even to hope for in some dim, distant future!
52. In fact, no Science, however sane and exact it might be, can ever properly be made the basis for religion. For it is not true, as the Modernists assume, that God and eternal truth can be discovered by the methods which Science uses in its study of nature. God is a Spirit who can be seen neither with the microscope nor the telescope; but who can be apprehended by faith alone. "For he that cometh to God must 'believe that He is, and that He is a rewarder of them that diligently seek Hin"" (Heb. 11:6). As Luther says: "The world seeks in innumerable ways, with great industry, cost, trouble, and labor to find the invisible and incomprehensible God in His majesty. But God is and remains to them unknown, although they have many thoughts about Him, and discourse and dispute much. For, God has de-, creed that He will be unknowable and unapprehensible apart from Christ." The historical person, Jesus Christ, can indeed be submitted to historical, scientific investigation. But the chief, most vital fact concerning Him, that He is the only begotten Son of

God, is again something that men can understand and accept only by the power of God, the Holy Spirit working faith in their hearts, as we confess in Luther's explanation of the third article. This is not only the teaching of the Bible; it is also the teaching of human experience. Apart from faith in the Christ who is revealed to us in the Bible, no man has ever been able to arrive at a knowledge of the true God. The unbeliever has succeeded instead only in making gods in his own image and in demonstrating the foolishness of his wisdom and the vanity of his manmade idols. "Professing themselves to be wise they became fools" (Rom. 1:22). "Hath not God made foolish the wisdom of this world? For after that in the wisdom of God the zoorld by zeisdom knew not God, it pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe" (1 Cor. 1:20-21). Thus St. Paul summarizes the experiences of men in their search after God. "The Lord knoweth the thonghts of the wise, that they are vain" (1 Cor. $3: 20$ ). And so He has not left us to stumble about in the darkness which the wisdom of this world creates, but has given us His gospel which the veriest child can believe. If we had to wait for Science to find God or to make up its mind about who and what God is, we would never learn to know Him. As Mr. Lunn says: "It is a great mistake to associate enduring truths with the passing scientific fashion of the moment. I think theologians should refrain from basing their apologetics on the third (the latest) version of the quantum theory. It is a great mistake to hitch one's wagon to a shooting star" ("The Flight from Reason," p. 295-6). Indeed, scientists change their theories so quickly, and often unexpecteclly, that it leaves the confiding public as bewildered as though it were really being dragged about by a shooting star. Mr. Einstein gained great fame through his theory of relativity. But now he blandly announces that his theory was all wrong and proposes another. When one observes the manner in which he, on his American visit, hobnobbed with the comedian, Charlie Chaplin, one suspects that Einstein may be the greater humorist of the two, and that he has simply been offering us another example, by his theory of relativity, of "how one manages to lead a whole generation by the nose," as the German biologist, Driesch, said of Darwinism. And it is not only the Bible that condemns the wisdom of this world's wise men. They can be trusted
to do that for each other also. Thus Mr. Lunn says: "One thing is certain: Very clever men are capable of talking very great nonsense. The Victorian heresy itself (i. e., Darwinism) might be described, as Professor Broad has described 'Behaviorism,' a modern variation of that heresy, as an example of those theories which are so preposterously silly that only very learned men could have thought of them!'" (op. cit. p. 318-9).
53. A theology or religion like Modernism, then, which is based on modern science, has in reality as unsubstantial a foundation as could be imagined. And since the Evolution theory lacks any scientific basis even in those departments of human knowledge where it was first given some appearance of validity, it should be clear that its application to other fields of study or research is entirely without warrant. To apply the jargon of Biological Evolution to theology, as Henry Drummond did in his "Natural Law in the Spiritual World," is bad enough, even when it is granted that there is some justification for believing in evolution in the strictly biological sciences. But when there no longer is such justification, Modernism clearly stands convicted of being un-scientific as well as un-Biblical and un-Christian.
54. Since scientific theories change so rapidly, Modernists have great difficulty in keeping 1 p with the times so as to appear really scientific. And, in fact, most of them are at least 25 years behind the times. Thus Rev. Charles F. Potter in his debate with Rev. John R. Straton defended the evolution theory with arguments which had been abandoned 30 years before in advanced scientific circles. And so he fully deserved to be beaten in the debate as he was. Modernists no sooner get their theology worked out on a "scientific basis" than they have to start all over again, or else be convicted of an unreasoning dogmatism. Personally, we fully expect to see Modernism cave in as a result of losing its breath, so to speak, in the race to keep up with Science-even though it has some glib-tongued representatives, like Fosdick, who can contradict himself several times in a single sermoin, and still apparently "get by" with the American public, from John D. Rockefeller down to the Negro Bolshevist on the New York Bowery. The explanation for the success such Modernists have had to date, in spite of the illogical, unreasoning, and purely negative, destructive character of their teachings, is to be found in
the circumstance that our modern generation has "itching ears and cannot endure sound doctrine," but would rather listen to "fables." Like the people of Athens in St. Paul's day, they "spend their time in nothing else, but either to tell, or to hear some new thing' (Acts 17:21). Anything called new, modern, or up-to-date is sure to attract attention. Anything old is by that fact alone discredited, considered out-of-date and unsuited to the "modern world." Modern false prophets harp continually on this string, whether they come with new "divine revelations," like the Mormons, Christian Scientists, Russelites, etc., or appeal to "modern science" in support of their attacks on the old faith. But thus the question arises:

## IV. Is Modernism Modern?

55. The wise "Preacher" says: "The thing that hath been, it is that which shall be; and that which is done is that which shall be done; and there is no new thing under the sun. Is there anything whereof it may be said, See, this is new? It hath been already of old times, which was before us. There is no remembrance of former things; neither shall there be any remembrance of things that are to come, with those that shall come after" (Eccles. 1:9-11). "I know that whatsoever God doeth, it shall be forever; nothing can be put to it, nor anything taken from it; and God doeth it, that men should fear before Him. That which hath been is now; and that which is to be hath already been; and God requireth that which is past" (Eccles. 3:14-15). Especially in the field of ethics and religion is it true that there is nothing new under the sun. The same sins afflict the race of men today as afficted them in the earliest times on record. The same moral principles and laws are required to instruct men and curb their passions as in the very first ages. The world has never risen to higher views of religion than Moses and the prophets proclaimed; and the same Gospel is needed for us today as Adam and Eve required to be saved from their sin against God. The Lutheran slogan: "The Changeless Christ for a Changing World," then, grants a little too much to the popular theory that everything changes in this world. For the changes take place only in minor things, in external appearances, and not in the great essen-
tial things, in the fundamental realities. "There is no new thing under the sun" is as true today as it was in the clay of the Preacher of Ecclesiastes.
56. Applying this truth to the question before us, we must say: In its fundamental assumptions and attitudes, Modernism is as old as the first apostacy. from the revealed truth of God. In its chief features it is readily recognizable to the church historian as a re-hash of old heresies, resurrected and presented as new by men who think they are new mainly because they are unfamiliar with the old. As we have just heard from the Book of Ecclesiastes: "There is no remembrance of former things; neither shall there be any remembrance of things that are to come, with those that shall come after." Thus Prof. More says concerning the leading evolutionists: "The predominating trait of the leaders of evolution was an intense egotism and self-confidence that in them lay the truth. They brushed aside the work of earlier philosophers and teachers of ethics, or rather they made hardly any reference to them. Darwin had a naive ignorance of the work of even his immediate predecessors; Spencer read no book whose fundamental ideas differed from his own; and Huxley was the strenuous opponent of classical education" ("The Dogma of Evolution," p. 320). And Modernists who proclaim their teachings to be something modern could be characterized in the same way as Prof. More characterizes these patron saints of Modernism. They reveal their ignorance of the Bible and orthodox religion every time they open their mouths; and for all their professed learning, their ignorance of church history is equally great. What else can be expected when they devote no real study to either the Bible or Church History, but waste their time instead in frtitless attempts at harmonizing evolutionary science with Christianity? They present these old heresies, indeed, in new ways, with a different vocabulary than the aucient heretics used, to a large extent. 'But that does not prove that they are essentially anything new. We Lutherans preach and teach the same eternal truths that Paul and the apostles did; yet our method of presentation may be quite different, in fact, everyone of us has a method, a style of his own. In this; as in the world of nature, there can be infinite variety of form or expression for something that remains always fundamentally the same.
57. It is significant that Modernists themselves recognize that their teachings have a "genetic connection" with other religions than Christianity. And the fact is that it is in anti-Christian religions and philosophies alone that their teachings have their real roots. For Biblical Christianity never has been the syncretistic product of all kinds of heathen religions that the Modernists claim it is. It has always been rigidly exclusive, from the time when Abralian was commanded to leave his home and his people and go to a land which the Lord would show him, down to the present day. The Modernist attempt to connect Christianity with other religions is, therefore, in itself the strongest proof that Modernism is not Christianity, but that very same false "synthetic" religion, that syncretistic Baal-worship and idolatry, which the prophets and apostles denounced.
58. The basic principle of Modernism, the evolution theory in the general form which here alone concerns us, is nothing new, but is found in the most ancient philosophies. Empedocles in Greece was an empiricist who came with a "clear prevision of Darwin's philosophy, that fit and unfit arise alike, but that what is fit to survive does survive, and what is unfit perishes" (Prof. D'Arcy W. Thompson in "Legacy of Greece," p. 157). The idea of an evolutionary development of the universe is found in practically all heathen philosophies and religions, sometimes in a mythological form, as in the Chinese myth of the giant Pan-ku, whose body developed into the world as we see it, while the lice on his body became men, etc.; sometimes in abstruse philosophical discussions, (as in the Chinese "Book of Changes"), that are fully as learned and unintelligible as the most "scientific" writings of modern times, from Darwin to Einstein. The heathen world knows of no Creator who created the world out of nothing. Therefore it necessarily has replaced him by evolutionary theories of various kinds. "In both the Egyptian and the East Indian mythology the world and all things in it were evolved from an egg; and so in the Polynesian myths. But the Polynesians had to have a bird to lay the egg, and the Egyptians and the Brahmans had to have some sort of a deity to create theirs. The Greek philosophers struggled with the problem without coming to any more satisfactory conclusion. Their speculations culminated in the great poem of Lacretius entitled, "De Rernm Nature," writ-
ten shortly before the beginning of the Christian era. His atomic theory was something like that which prevails at the present time among physicists. Modern evolutionary speculations have not made much real progress over those of the ancients" (Prof. Geo. T. Wright, "The Passing of Evolution," in Fundamentals, Vol. VII., p. 18-19). The fact that Modernism adopts such heathen theories of the origin of the universe is thus prime proof that it is only a revamped paganism and not a modern form of Christianity at all.
59. The most interesting parallel to Modernism is found in the Gnosticism that flourished in the second century of the Christian era. Like Modernism, it sought to clothe pagan theories and beliefs in Christian language; to combine these two opposite systems of belief into one grand system of thought. Like Modernism, "it appeared only as a system of teaching, and formed no church organization" (Lövgren, Church History, p. 41). In the following, we shall quote Prof. Kurtz's characterizations of Gnosticism, from his Church History, (Vol. 1, p. 99 ff.), and point out the similarities to Modernism: "In most Gnostic systems Christianity is not represented as the conclusion and completion of the development of salvation given in the Old Testament, but often merely as the continuation and climax of the pagan religion of nature and the pagan mystery worship." So Modernism represents Christianity as the evolutionary product of the religions prevailing in the Graeco-Roman world after the time of Christ, rather than as a continuation of the only true religion of the Old Testament; and the pagan mystery religions are credited with being the chief source of many fundamental Christian teachings. "The attitude of this heretical Gnosis toward Holy Scriptures was various. By means of allegorical interpretation some endeavored to prove their system from it; others preferred to depreciate the apostles as falsifiers of the original purely gnostic doctrine of Christ, or to remodel the apostolic writings in accordance with their own views, or even to produce a Bible of their own after the principles of their schools." This might serve as a description of what Modernists have been doing to the Bible. "With the Gnostics, however, for the most part the tradition of ancient wisdom as the communicated secret doctrine stood higher than Holy Scripture.". Put the modern faith in the "eso-
teric wisdom of Science" in place of the "secret doctrine" of the Gnostics, and this applies directly to Modernism, as we have seen. "In solving the problems of the origin of the world..., the Gnostics borrowed mostly from paganism the theory of the world's origin." So Modernism rejects the Bible's account of the origin of the world and goes to an infidel Science or the heathen world for its theory of that origin. "In working out the theosophical and cosmological process it is mainly the idea of emanation that is called into play, whereby from the hidden God is derived a long series of divine essences, whose inherent divine power diminishes in proportion as they are removed to a distance from the original source of being." Put Spencer's "The Unknowable" in the place of this Gnostic "hidden deity," and the term "evolution" in place of the term "emanation," and we have essentially the same teaching in both. Gnosticism is, however, both more logical and more intelligible than Spencer's theory and the theories of most pantheistic Modernists. Gnosticism also recognized the need of redemption from this evil world, while Modernism is so foolish as to believe in a redemption of this present world, by its own powers. But they are alike in that the Gnostic "redemption consists in the conquest and exclusion of matter, and is accomplished through knowledge (gnosis or science) and ascetism. It is therefore a chemical, rather than an ethical process." Thus Modernism hopes to redeem and conquer the world by Science, knowledge, and to save men from sin by improving their diet, removing their adenoids and bad teeth, and by the enforcement of prohibition laws! In general, Gnosticism was an alleged "scientific religion," a synthesis of all the knowledge that the "best minds" had been able to produce to date ; and so is Modernism.
60. There are many similarities, too, between the Rationalism of the 18th century and present-day Modernism. Rationalism was, indeed, more logical and self-consistent than most Modernism is. For Modernists follow Darwin and evolutionists in general in being thoroughly muddle-headed in their reasoning and logic-and rather pride themselves on it, mistaking their opaque thinking for philosophic depth of thought, or a mystical communion with the Absolute, or something equally absolutely "abso-lute,"-if you know what that means! (Cf. Webster on Absolute
and note on "The Philosophy of the Absolute"). The Rationalists made their "Reason" the judge of truth. Modernists make scientific experiment or experience the chief test of truth. That which works out right is considered true, whether it may seem reasonable or not. But in reality both principles come to the same thing. For our experiments and experiences will always be interpreted in accordance with the "mental spectacles" through which we view them, the theories or assumptions which we apply. The old Norwegian "bondekone" may have been entirely certain that she had seen "trolde" or "huldrer"; her "experiments and experiences," interpreted by her reason, proved it satisfactorily to her. The Negro porter may be "scientifically certain" that he has seen ghosts or that his rabbit's foot has brought him good luck. His experiments and experiences, colored by his "reason," prove it to him. And so Modernists, although their method may seem quite different, are in reality basing their religion, like the old Rationalists, on their own subjective reason and not on objective facts at all. They are only less logical than the old Rationalists were, because they claim to be guided by objective facts alone rather than by preconceived theories or "a priori reason," while they in reality are not. And so they disregard the historical facts of Christianity entirely in order to put in their place their own subjective theories and fancies and speculations, and then call them "scientific fact"!
61. Then, Modernists like Rationalists are more interested in this world than in the next. Just as the old Rationalists preached on how to raise potatoes or improve the breed of domestic animals, so Modernists today are instructed, in Theological Seminaries like the University of Chicago Divinity School, in the application of "Social Christianity" to agricultural problems in country districts. In many details, their arguments and their criticisms of the Bible and orthodox Christianity may sound exactly alike. Modernism, in short, is an improvement upon Rationalism only from the standpoint of its originator, Satan, in that it is less honest and outspoken, more unscrupulously deceptive and hypocritical than the old Rationalism ever was, and hence also more dangerous to the Church. Thus Modernism is nothing new in reality, but the old familiar anti-Christian teach-
ings in a newly patched-up dress; it is only a new variety of the same old species that has existed from the time when Eve listened to the first lie in the Garden of Eden.
62. The Gnostic syncretism, however, was in due time sloughed off by the Church. The pagan superstition and rationalistic traditionalism which had crept into the Catholic Church met its death blow by the work of Martin Luther. The Rationalism of the 18 th century was overcome in the revivals of evangelical religion which inaugurated the "century of missions" and brought Christianity out to the farthest isles of the seas. We can believe that this modern Christianized rationalism, this NeoGnosticism, with its alleged scientific basis, will also go the way of these earlier heresies. For theories and heresies come and go, they have their little day and disappear. But "the Word of God liveth and abideth forever"; as the work of God it "shall be forever: nothing can be put to it, nor anything taken from it; (Eccles. 3:14).
63. This does not mean, however, that we are in no danger of being affected by Modernism. For the movement may not yet have reached its highest point, although it has captured most of the Reformed Churches and many of the Lutheran Churches in Europe, and has made serious inroads upon the membership of the Catholic Church. We need, therefore, to consider also our last question:

## V. Are We in Danger of Modernism?

64. The Lutheran Church in America has hitherto been signally blessed in that it has been almost entirely saved from Modernism which has rent the Reformed Churches asunder. But there are many signs which point to an increasing spirit of apostacy also in its circles. The English-speaking United Lutheran Church is honey-combed with, and hag-ridden by, Lodgery. And the Lodges do for their members what the "Higher Critics" and "scientific theologians" do for pastors and students. They familiarize them with such Modernistic, pagan principles as "the Fatherhood of God and Brotherhood of Man"; the essential validity of all religions and systems of belief ; the reliance upon human reason rather than upon the Word of God. They inoculate them with the virus of idolatry and paganism as effectively
as most Universities and Reformed theological schools today inoculate their students with pagan skepticism and false religion. Modernistic principles have also been given expression in books published by, or within, this church. It has for years been connected with such Modernist-controlled organizations as The Federal Council of Churches, the Foreign Missions Conference, etc. Its president, Dr. Knubel, is to appear as one of the radio preachers of the Federal Council, in company with such Modernists as Dr. Sockman, Cadman, Fosdick,, etc. Even if his own sermons are entirely orthodox, he helps to make confusion only worse confounded by thus appearing as a representative of ath organization which sponsors such unmitigated paganism as Fosdick, Cadman, etc., continually preach.
65. The Swedish Augustana Synod welcomed the noted Modernist, Bishop Soederblom, with open arms as a brother in the faith. And other Lutherans in these circles have fraternized with such aggressive Modernists as Fosdick, apparently without meeting any serious criticism from their own brethren. In the Norwegian Lutheran Church, articles have appeared in its official organs which show, either that some of its leading men have acquired the "modern, scientific spirit" themselves, or at least that they have become so confused in their thinking that they no longer can distinguish properly between light and darkness, truth and error, Christianity and Modernism. Thus in the articles referred to above, as well as in an article on "Confucianism and Christianity," which appeared in the Theological Forum, 1930, and in Prof. Stolee's book on "The Genesis of Religion." Another article in Theological Forum bears the significant title: "What Concession, if Any, must We in the Interest of Truth Make to the Evolutionists?" Although the author, Rev. Byron C. Nelson, takes a more conservative stand than many in his church, thus even accepting the six days of Genesis 1 , he still confuses the issue by labeling as "concessions" things which Christians "conceded" long before there was any danger of attack on their faith from Evolutionists; and by accepting Darwinism as valid "within limits," while the only teaching that can properly be called Darwinism at all is that "causo-mechanical explanation of adaptation and species-transforming" (Kellog, op. cit. p. 2), which gave the theory of evolution its modern form and impetus. And
that Darwinism was pronounced by competent scientists on its death-bed over 30 years ago; so that now even the attempts to revive it have ceased.
66. It has been reliably reported that Evolution is taught in some of the colleges of the Norwegian Merger. St. Olaf and President Boe were subjected to a public attack in "Lutheraneren,", for the anti-Biblical teachings that some of the teachers at that leading Norwegian Lutheran institution were bringing their pupils. President Boe's answer was not such as to remove suspicion from his school. The Norwegian Merger has also affiliated with Modernistic churches and organizations, especially in the Foreign Mission work and fields. Undoubtedly there are many in that church who still are contending against Modernistic influences in every form. But the Merger, being, itself a umionistic organization, has no principles by which it can separate the truth from the error taught openly within its ranks, with the result that even the most conservative become dulled and soon are quite satisfied to fraternize indefinitely with men who depart ever more and more boldly from the rule of the Word.
67. The modern union movement, as pointed out in the quotation from Dr. Gates above (par. 13-9), has received its chief impetus from that religious indifferentism which no longer distinguishes between truth and error. ("The modern Christian mind has grown more tolerant toward the religious beliefs of other Christians and more appreciative of the religions of nonChristian people. Christian co-operation and union are taking the place of sectarian ostracism and controversy.") Wherever, then, unionism becomes rampant, there the way has already been prepared for Modernism. The Lutheran Churches outside of the Synodical Conference have frankly joined the ranks of those for whom Union is a chief objective in church work. Not satisfied with ever widening schemes of Union here at home, they must reach out to all the world and spend time, money, and energy on a "Lutheran World Union movement," which may increase the worldly pride of Lutherans, but never their real strength. Thus they are opening the doors wide in the American Lutheran churches to that Modernism which has practically engulfed the European Lutheran churches. And, but for some miracle of

God's grace, it is only a question of time till these Lutheran churches will find themselves in the same situation as most European Lutheran aid American Reformed churches do now.
68. With Modernism already at such close quarters, it would be folly for us to imagine that we are not in danger from its insidious influence. The radio is bringing Modernistic preaching into almost every home. Newspapers, magazines, and books dish up evolution and Modernism to our people day after day, year after year. Our friends and relatives, perhaps, are affected by it, or may even be devotees of this modern paganism. It may be that we in the Synodical Conference are in more danger, as our church opponents say, of going the Roman Catholic road and of setting up an external authority in the church which, in practice at least, is credited with virtual infallibility in all matters of doctrine and life. But we cannot deny that we also are endangered by the anarchistic Modernism of our day. The Synodical Conference has not been unaffected by the modern union spirit, as its recent history proves, which unionism is the entering wedge of Modernism. We have been closer than most people may realize to establishing connections with the Modernistic organizations which control the Foreign Mission enterprise of Protestant churches. We have not in all places taken a clear-cut stand against the Lodges, those modern successors of "the mystery religions" of the ancient heathen world. We have not always borne clear witness against the syncretism and compromise with heathenism that prevails in such heathen lands as China and India. In short, we also stand precariously on the verge of going the same Modernistic road as other Protestants. It is not for us, at any rate, to thank the Lord too loudly because we are not as other men are. We need humbly to recognize our shortcomings and to pray God keep us in His Word and Truth, steadfast and strong against all "the oppositions of science falsely so-called," willing to "count all things but loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus, our Lord."
69. There are especially two places that we must watch for the first outcroppings of the Modernistic spirit. The one is, our higher institutions of learning; the other, the foreign mission fields. It is history that modern, as well as ancient, apostacies have made their entrance into the church from the top down;
they have begun with leaders in the church, and through these leaders the masses have been misled. These false prophets have, indeed, often found the way prepared for them by the ignorance and indifference of the people, who knew little about the Truth of God and cared less. But still the main responsibility for the heresies that have afflicted the Church of Christ has always rested upon the leaders. If our Church is to be saved from such false prophets, we must, like Luther, be ready to take up arms against them, whoever they may be, to "stand in the gap before the Lord" (Ezek. 22:30), and cry out against those "who divine lies and say, Thus saith the Lord, when the Lord hath not spoken" (Ezek. 22:28).
70. It is also history that much of the unionism and indifferentism of the day has been bred on the foreign mission fields, and from there has spread to the home churches. It is surprising how many there are who lose their bearings when Foreign Missions are being considered, or who advocate and carry out policies and teachings there which they would never think of applying in the work at home. It is surprising, too, how many there are, even of those who would never think of yielding a disputed point to other Christians or to fellow-Lutherans, who become very conciliatory and ready to compromise when they deal with heathen religions and beliefs. Missionaries, who could see little good in other church denominations, find so many remarkably fine things in Confucianism or Buddhism or in their ancient gods! Note, e. g., the high praise given Confucianism by a Norwegian Merger Missionary, in the article, "Confucianism and Christianity Compared," before referred to; and how Prof. Stolee finds a "pure monotheism" in that same religion. (Cf. his "Genesis of Religion," Ch. 14). As our Foreign Mission work grows in extent and importance, we can expect to find similar influences being exerted on our church by many of its missionaries and most ardent mission supporters.
71. Yes, we also are in danger of Modernism. We can be saved from falling into it only by observing the admonitions to diligent use of God's Word, given in sutch Bible passages as those quoted at the beginning of this paper; and by "earnestly contending for the faith which was once delivered unto the saints." Let be that we are few and of no account in the world! That
does not excuse us from raising our voices, and this with every ounce of strength that is in us, against the false prophets who cry "Peace, peace," when there is no peace. Only by exercising our faith can we grow in faith; and it is by contending for the faith that we are to strengthen our own hold upon it. We shall, therefore, "preach the word; be instant in season, out of season; reprove, rebuke, exhort with all long-suffering and doctrine." If we live daily in Christ, we will by the power of His Holy Spirit be enabled to do this, weak though we may be in ourselves. St. Paul says to the Colossians: "As ye have therefore received Christ Jesus the Lord, so walk ye in Him; rooted and built up in Him, and stablished in the faith, as ye have been taught, abounding therein with thanksgiving. Beware lest any man spoil you with philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ. For in Him dwelleth all the fulness of the God-head bodily. And ye are complete in Him, which is the head of all principality and power" (2:6-10). Complete in Christ-not seeking any light or wisdom or power in the rudiments of this world, its philosophy and vain deceit, but satisfied to live His life, to walk the narrow path, to carry the cross He gives us, to be despised as narrow-minded and "unscientific," to be persecuted as disturbers of the peace, to be "cast out of the synagogues" as stubborn sinners who would teach when they should be taught (John $9: 34$ ),-thus may we by the grace of God be given strength to "hold fast the form of sound words," even while better men than we are fall a prey to the "cunningly devised fables" of modern unbelief. For Christ promises us: "If ye continue in my Word, then are ye my disciples indeed; and ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free" (John 8:31-32), free from the power of sin and all the "damnable heresies" that false teachers bring in to the Church of Christ. And to such freemen in Christ there is nothing impossible. For it is not weak man, but the Almighty God who will accomplish it; "not by might, nor by power, but by my spirit, saith the Lord of hosts" (Zech. 4:6). "With might of ours can naught be done. Soon were our loss effected. But for us fights the Valiant One, whom God Himself elected."
72. Then let us not in a false humility cringe before the
proud attacks of an infidel science upon the eternal Word of God. Let us not, in defending that Word, do it apologetically and blushingly, as though it stood discredited by Modern Sciencelike we might defend some discredited and guilty friend; thus in reality damning it as much by our faint praise as the enemies of God do by their abuse and ridicule. Let us rather boldly and confidently use the sword of the Word, its science as well its ethics and religion, against anyone and everyone that attacks or denies or perverts it, be he pagan, Pope, Turk, or Modernist, friend, foe, or unionistic compromiser. Then shall we, having taken on the armor of God, be "able to withstand in the evil day, and having done all, to stand" (Ephes. 6:13).

God grant our Norwegian Synod and everyone of its members the grace to so to do, for His mercy's sake. Amen.

Boston, Mass., June, 1931.

ERRATA.
Page 23-12th line from bottom: "separation," read "separatism."
Page 26-3d line from bottom: "even," read "ever."
Page $27-9$ th line from bottom: "introduction they were," read "preface the editor was."

Page 30 - 6 th line from bottom: "and the sanctification," read "and a sanctification."

## Omvendelfen．



## Duthendelfen ex fynderens tilfogevenden fra Eatans magt til（Gut．

Droet ombendelje er，jom jelve orbet antiober，en＂ombreining＂， ent benden ont，eller an tilbageventen．I antolig forjtand er bet en Gortbenden fra Satan og lyas rige og ent tilbagebenden til ©itb． Stabt $\mathfrak{i}$（subs billede bar menteffet $\mathfrak{i}$ famfund med sud，det ftod $i$ ent inderlig forenintg med（Sub og var liffeligt og jaligt．Da Det
 og fom under bjedéens magt og gerredømme，fom feriften bebidner， nant ben figer at bi er dent tjencre，huip bilje bi gipre（\％inn． 6 16）． Menueffet giorde bjeuclent bilje og blev banz tjener．

ぶølgen of at menteffet ved juben overgav fig til bjcebelen bar， at bets foritano bled forntorfet，det弓 bilje forvendt，fiendif nuod seto og alt gubdonmeligt，oberbobeiet，at det fom $i$ ben torite ambelige fordervelfe．Mana bet figes at memuefet naa ombende fig fra Sa＝ tank magt til © ba fom feriften og bor befienoelfe larer，at＂alfe memtefer efter Sbant fald，font fobes paa naturlig unade，fobes med jund，det er， uben gudgivgt，ubent tillid til（anto og med ond begjartighed＂，jan befinder alfe menneffer fig af naturen i ben bubeite forbervelfe．Sut Den memmefelige natus dube fordorvelje figer bor Befjendelje Glatot andet：＂For det andet vioner Gubs ord at det naturlige，nitugjent foote menneffes foritand，bjerte og bilje er i guddommelige ting rffe alente ganfe og aldeles bortbenot fra gitb，men ogian ghi imot， benot til alt onot og aldeleふ forvend．Frembeles，at memaffet iffe aleme er foagt，afncegtigt，hoygtigt og oøot til Det gode，men ogjaa bed arbejunden faa jammerlig forbenot，heltigjemem forgiftet og forbervet，at det af beffaffentiged og natur er ganfe onbt，gjenitri＝ bigt mod Gud og lam fiendfe og altfor fraftigt，Yevende og bitfiont til alt hoab der mizhager Guto og er ham imud． 1 Mot．8，21：＂Ment neffets bjertes tonfe er ondt fra bans ungoom af．＂（ Fontorbief．gr． Fortl．8，II．）

Bed falbet og ben naturlige fordorbelfe er menneffet ogjaa bjent＝ falot til ftraf，til bøo，og til evig fordømmelfe og befituber fig i ent overmaade ultufelig og elendig tilitund．Seronn beder det i Roufor＝

Sieformelen gr．§orfl．10，IV：＂\｛ytuefnident ftraf og plage，jom
 ebige forommolie，ogiaa anten legentig og annoelig，timelig og evig elendighed，diabelent thrani og Gerredmmme，at dent mente＝ ffelige natur er underfajtet djabelent rige og given fen under djene＝ Yent nagt og fangen under hank rige．＂

Stal mu menteffet frelfes ud af fandan elendighed，ffal det naa maalet hoortil Det blev feabt－hinilea og jaligheden－aaa maa det fonme tilbage til fin retntesfige Serre， $\mathfrak{t i}$ ：（Sud，og bet er netop om＝ bendelfen马 maal．Itp．gi．26， 18 heder det：＂Forat oplade dere马 pine， at de máa ombende fig fra morfet til fajet og fra Satans magt til
 fig for ombendelfen－morfe，©atans magt－men ogiaa maalet foor＝ til det ved onvendelfen fifal fomme，nemitig，til Yyfet，til（Gud．Strif＝ tent pleier io overthovedet at bejfrive onbendeljen fom innderens tili＝ bagevenden，nemlig fra fnnden til（Gud，fom Det Geder §er．3，12： ＂Wento Dog tilfage，סu frafaldue，豸̛⿰ucel：＂

Bar menneffet før fin ombendelfe i en $\mathfrak{u r y f f e l i g}$ og elendig tit＝ ftand fordi det bar ffitit fra（sub，fom er det fyiefte gode og ben bejentitge falighed，fan fommer det ved ombendelfen it on oberntaade falig．fants．§ar memeffet vendt tilbage fra ভatans magt til ©ido ba eier det en god jambittighed，det nyder fres med（Gud og har et bift haab om ebig falighed．Men Yeraf føIger det da，at omvendelfent iffe fan bare blot en forandring i det ydre bajen．Wed profeten gael figer §erren：＂乌̧ender om til mig med Gele eders hjerte og med fafte og hted jannertiage og innderriber eders bjerte og iffe eders floeder．＂ §jertet bar bet jo fornemmelig fom font under Satans magt derfor er bet fremfor alt $\mathfrak{i}$ Gjertet forandringen inaa foregan．鸟jertet maa onventes og betbe et（Gubs tentel．Derfor heder bet $\mathfrak{i}$ Ronforbie＝
 at der $i$ den fande ontuendelfe maa feen forandring，ent nit rørelfe og Gebwgelfe $\mathfrak{i}$ foritand，bilije $\mathfrak{g g}$ gjerte，faałedeß nemlig，at hjertet erfjender funden，frygter for ©uds brede，bender fig bort fra finden， erfiender og modager forjcttelfen om naaden i srifue，har gode aandelige tarfer，et frifteligt forcoet og flio og jtriber mod fipoet． Thi foor intet af bette ffex elfer findes，der er ber helfer ingen fand onnentelfe．＂§er bebioner ogja $\mathfrak{B e f j e n d e l f e n ~ a t ~ o m b e n b e l f e n ~ e r ~ e n t ~}$ Gjertets forandring．Simbendelfen er iffe，fom mange tantier，tim ent forbeoring $\mathfrak{i}$ det $\mathfrak{y d r e}$ ，en ubuiffitit fra noget good til noget bebre， iffe helfer en forandring $\mathfrak{i}$ ntmeffets moraffe grundfatninger，jaa
at on et memuffe beguider at gixre andre gjenninger end forlyen, ibet det bender fig fra de grove ibinefaliontio finnoer og lafter, faa= fom Druffenfab, banden, utugt, beorag ojo., og farer et cerbart leb= net, det dermed er bleben onvends. Menneffet bar jo iffe blot i dette og gint ftyffe bendt fig bort fra (Gub, men gelt og holbent i alle bele. Derfor maa onvendelien bare en fulbitendig venden out fit ©ho, ell bjerteformbring.

## 

$\mathfrak{D a}_{\text {a }}$ ombendelfen er noget font fornemmelig foregaar i bjertet, er at bertets foranoring, faa fan dens bajentlige foffer ogjan fun vere faabanue font angear heertet.
$\mathfrak{O}_{\mathfrak{g}}$ bet førite ityffe $i$ onvendelfen er angeren. Denne indbefotter forit exfienweljen ab at memueffet befinder fig dan afbeie, at man be= finder fig $\mathfrak{i}$ ©atant nagt, og dernceft forifteeffelfe, Gedrøvelfe derover.
 Yorer med til en fanto ombendelif, nuar ben f. efs. til de ord: "§eno

 12. 13); : og til De ond hos profeten §oel: "Senber om til nig", og=
 fonderrivelfe end forferdelfe, fuerte og bedroveffe over de erfiente fonder? St en iaadan erfijendelje af og forfardeffe ober innden harer nted til omvendelien dijes
 belfe thoelig foritanes of hans geberder og ord ( $\mathfrak{R u f}, 18,13$ ), fange=
 mid at gixre?" Det fomme bar tilfoelte med den jom Gleb ombende
 fling gientent hiertet." Sfriften beretter de pgiaa hbilfe †ofelfer innoserfienvelfen vitfede hoz de Geifige, fon ifandled bled ontwendte,
 ieg frogter for Dine Domme" (Sal. 119, 120). "Sagte bil deg bandre alle minte ant efter mint fifels bitre fmerte" (ej. 38, 15).
 for at fare be fromme jantuittigheder ho af disic jofiitente irgange faftiat to jthffer i boden eller ombendelfen, nemitig fonderfinfelje og
 Mrt. 12: "Men' 'ooden beitaar egentlig af disie to ftuffer: Det forite er โønderfmifelfen efter den fract fom indjuges fanvittigheden bed
jondens erfiendelic; det andet er troen jont wotanges af evangeliet
 trajter jannbittigheden og frier den fra firceffen." ©fferat det er fagt
 boden ogjaa gicliber onbendeljen.

Rogen fand ombendelfe er altian utanfelig won en forudganemse oprigtig anger og forferbelip ober intben. Singen vil bende omi igien fra en bei jon han lyar faat ind paa, faalange han iffe har erfijendt at det er en gal bei. Mener lyau at Yan er paa den rette bei, gaar Gan frimodig og ubefinmet bidere; thit han mener jo at lant fal naa mane than har fat fig, eller derjom tan intet egentlig maal har, fortjatter han iblinde. Merfer han derimod at han har flaat ind paa en falft bei, og jtabig fommer laengere bort fra maulet ijteden= for at opnaa bet, og har det gaat op for ham at forifigelie af Demte bei bil fore lian ifordervelfe-ba gribes han af frygt og for= fardelie. Slig er Det ogfaa i Det aandelige. Sfal et memeffe blive omvendt, fac er det førite Dette, at Gan erfjetider: Yeeg er en wom= bendt, jeg befinder mig iffe paa Den rette bei til falighed, nen paa en farft bei. $\mathfrak{F}^{0}$ longere jeg fortioetter paa beme bei deito langere fjenter jeg mig bort fra ©sub, beito elendigere Giber min tilitand.
 forfarbes. Wean forferbes ober fin tilitand, Yan bliber bange; thi han bed at han er paa en wei paa hbilfen yan lybert pieflif fan ithrtes i afgrumben.

Men angeren maa ogjaa bere Den rette anger. Der er ingen ret
 grumber fig paa erfiendelfen af menneffets dnge forberbelfe bed arbe= innden og iffe blot paa erfiendelfon af entelte aabenbare fonder. It demne erfiendelfe fremfor alt harer til den rette anger loerer den hel=
 anger og tro. Derfor bebidner den for det førite: "Merneifets hientes
 befjende: "Se i misgiernity er jeg føot og i finti lyar min moder unto fanget mig" (Salme 51, 7); "NIt vor retféerbighed er fom et be= fnittet Eledeplag" (ㅌ․ 64, 5).

Sanlenge man blot erfiender eufelte grove feil hos fig, noget Fom ogian be mejt ugudelige og egenretforbige fan gixre, og maafe figer: $\mathfrak{D a}$ jeg end har dente eller hin feil, jaa lar jeg dog et goot Gjerte, fommer man iffe til den rette anger. Mei, menneffet maa gaa bybere, bet maa gaa fra treets futger til bets roboer og je at
det af naturen i butu gg grumb er ond. Wet mar erfiende at det intet fan uben at frembringe fondent onde fugter. - Cry branter efler et ellers laftefuld memeffe fom har mijtet jin cere og leelfe ofo., og er bedrobet derober, gar fun berdenz bedrovelje, og iffe den rette anger; thit bed den forftraffes menteffet fornenmelig for (3uds brede, dø0, hévede og fordømmelfe.

Med henfyn til fondens exfiendelic og bedrbuelie over fonden, da er disije ogian ved den rette anger iffe altio og boe alfe lige ftor. Begge er jo (Subs gierning imennefet og man tor iffe foreffrive Gud hoor dybt han bit lade bet enfeite menneffe fite ind $\mathfrak{i}$ jit for= Derbelfens dnb. §yer hander han efter fin egen bizoon. Ext Davib Inder han ja at fige, foømme $\mathfrak{i}$ taater ben hele nat (Salme 6, 7), en anden, fom $\mathfrak{f}$. efs. raberen paa forfet, innes iffe at habe bavt jaa ftor, iaffald iffe fan languarig en anger. Fitldfommen $\mathfrak{i}$ forbold til Tindens ftorrelfe fan angeren aldrig blibe, fom bi jer af Salme 19, 13; 90, 8. Memafet merfer iffe hoor ofte det feiler, det har mange
 Suther figer ogian at derion et menneffe fan alle fine fynder paa én gang, ia jtod bet iffe till, at reboe. "En joag anger fan ware en jand anger, ligejandel jom et ibagt menteffe er et janot memefte, lipejaa= bel fom troen er tro, 的abenten den griber Rriftus fom en foag barne=, Gaand elfer ned en fert Samionthand." Sytgerena heufigt er iffe at fremvirfe fonderens forlabelie elfer paa nogen made at gixve foldocit for finden og at fortjene nade, men at gipre fjertet noobtageligt for


Ehr. Scriber figer: "Selo om nogen till rante fin Yevetio $\mathfrak{i}$ jot og affe, med faften og beden udgigd fan mange taater font ber er branger i regnen, ja jelo on hant greed hlow eller piffede fig jelb tiffiods jaa bilde ban dog dermed iffe fyldeftgipre for fin funto, og det gjeetber
 11, 6; © Bal. 3, 2.

Det andet 0,3 bigtigite fithffe effer moment $\mathfrak{i}$ ontwendejen $\mathfrak{e r}$ troen. Derfor forntaner ©itis ord til ombenbelfe med de ord: "Snt=
 ftue, fan feal bu borbe fatig, but og bit luta" (Atp. gi. 16, 31) , $\mathfrak{F}$
 fig til நerren. פeres ombendelfe beitod altian deri at be blev tro= ende. $¥ \mathfrak{Y}$ oh. 2031 figee der at de fontror, fal have libet i $\mathfrak{x u t i f i}$ najn, og $\mathfrak{m i}$ er ombendelfen netop den handing foorved det andes. Yig dobe faar libet, hoiffet ffer derbed at innoeren fan troent.

Iroen er bet bigtigite ityffe $i$ onventionen, thi wed angeren fom= mer jo intet menucife tillage til ©nio, ei yeller ex den et trin tillage

 elfer Saule fonderfurjelie iffe, fordi troen, jont tilegner fig jnndernez forladelje, fifionfet for Ærifti ffyld, iffe fommer til Den." $\mathfrak{D o g}$ man nuan beller iffe $\mathfrak{i}$ onvendelfen fifle anger og tro fra Yinanden, thi faa bigtigt og rigtigt det er, at intet menneffe Gituer ombenot bed angeren, ligejaa bigtig og rigtig er bet at der iffe gives nogen fand onvenbefje uben foreganende anger, jom אontordieformeten figer. "ভantedes er ber da iffe hogen fand faliggionente tro hos dem fom er uben anger og bedrovelje og thar bet onde foriot at frite og frem= ture $\mathfrak{i}$ funden, men fand anger gane fornd og jand tro findes fun $\mathfrak{i}$
 fe lyuilfen elendighe det foree med fig at Gave forlabt ફerren, og tiflige forferdes for han brede for han fan bende tilfage og finde fred $\mathfrak{i f r i f i t i}$ forldginig. "De farife lyar iffe lege behob, men de jom lyar ondt" ( $\mathfrak{L u f}$. 5, 31).

Menneffets tilfagebenden til ©fub fer berfor ene og alene bed troen, idet nentig det i angereu fanderfnult bjerte griber ©
 vantro; Derfor beitant jo ombendelfen, memeifets tilfagevenden til (Bud i troen. Frafaloet beitod jo iffe narmeit deri at. Mitam og Eba tog og and af den forbitine frugt; bet var meget mere en folge af det
 toil paa (sud og Gubふ orb. Sfar derfor et menteffe hlive ombenot, maa der af en bantro blive en troende; nogen anden ombendelfe gibes der iffe. Men en fandan tro ev iffe blot en foritandens erfiendelje af jandigeden, og at fonderent fifimfier denne fit Gifald, nuen fornem= melig at han ioetter fin tillid og forturinting til (6ubs naade i friftus og atbeluffer al tillid til fin egne gieminger. Troen er derfor iffe blot en almindelig erfjendelfe af og jantyffe $\mathfrak{i}$ at Gito har effet berbent, men en joregen perforlig tillio og fortupitning, $i$ hbilfen dent troenbe for fit bedfommende er forvigite om at (5utb er ham nandig og for תrifit ffyld forlader ham fonten, og giver gan bet ebige lib. "Iro," figer Ruther i fin fortale til Romerbrevet, "er en Cevende, frimodig fortubitning til ©uds naade, faa biz at man tufende gatige ffulde dø derpaia. $\mathfrak{Q g}$ demte fortrgitning til og erfijendelfe ab ben gub= dommelige naade gipr en glad, freibig og bel tilmode for (fud og alfe ffabninger, 战iffet den §elliganto virfer $\mathfrak{i}$ troen."

En fandan tro, Der onvender menteffet $\mathfrak{p g}$ bringer det tilbage til Gub er alt tilitede foor bent farte bebogelfe, et fut, en longjel
 neffe fant gnfie fig troen toen at den selligano alt har birfet den $i$ ham. Dette er af for bigtighed at vide at naar (6ud har tanet ben forfte gnift af tro $\mathfrak{t}$ funderen, da er han ombendt; thit Yigelom ent gnift har iddent bele natur, faaledes har den foage tro dgfaa troent brefentige egenffaber. $\mathfrak{D g}$ troen, enten den er foag elfer fterf, Gar del i fude nande og fatighed.

Effer at habe newnt fill. 2, 13 ("(Gnd er dent fom birfer $\mathfrak{i}$ eder baabe at bille og $\boldsymbol{u}$ rette efter fit velbebag"), figer Яontordieformelen
 fromme fififue jom fornemner $i$ fit Gierte en liden gnift af og loengiel efter (subs nambe og den ebige fatighed; thit be bed deraf at fand hat optenot dente begundelfe til fand gudejuggt i beres bjecte og bil
 ver i den fande tro indtil enton."

##  mentuflets medvirfent.


Dent belfige ferift bebioner at menneffet er af naturent amberig万ob (Ef. 2, 1.5; Rol. 2, 13); og med dette ene ord frafjendee det al eme til pan nogen maade elfer til nogen tio at burfe med til fin onventefie. Exn fom er bob, formaar iffe at gipre fig felb levende og da ombendelfen retop ex, en levendegiørelfe, en opftandefe fra ben aande ige bob, fan memeffet intet bidrage dertil. - Da den gyerre Sefus engang bionede at bet er Yettere at en famel gant giement et naalerie end at en rig fommer ind $i$ © 6 ub rige, og difiplene derpan fpurte: "Sbo fan ba blive jalige?" $\mathfrak{D a}$ forebe §erten: "For men= neffer er bette umuligt; men for ©fub er alle ting mulige" (Mat. 19, 24). Ex det nu iffige bette umuligt for et memeffe at freffe fig feto, faa er det ogiaa muligt for det at ombende fig jelo, the unen ombendelfe er ber ingen falighed. Šobedfedet er wel ₹er. 31, 18: "Dnabend ou mig, fan bliber jeg ombendt, thi bu er Seerren mint (6ud." Ger figes det at ombendelfen er Gube gienting, og at men= neffet ene og alene bliver ombendt derbed at (Gut ombender det. ©it lignende fted er ₹̌er. 17, 14: "\&og mig, ફerre, faa briber jeg logt!

forififet ond bette, at han font har beghnot en goo gjerning $i$ eser, vil fuldiøre ben indtil ©efu rutifi bag."

Sher figee iffe blot at (3nt hat begund ambenderfens gode gier= ning, og iffe blot at gon alene fuldobringer ben; men ogfaa at hom furbjorer den inotil šepu Srifti bag, at han uemitg ogian ophorder den ombentete $i$ ombendelien.
$\mathfrak{D g}_{\mathrm{g}}$ ontwendelfens gienning tilffrives iffe bare ben eut perion $\mathfrak{t}$
 6, 44: "Sitgen fan fonme til mig, ndenat Faberen, jom har ubjenbt mig, fant braget $\mathfrak{h a n}$." Somnen, Mat. 23, 37: "צ̌eruialent, §eruja= lem . . . hoor ofte billo jeg foriantet bine born, ligervis fon ent
 dermed ens: Эeg har billet ombente eder?); men ferlig Dos; den



Frembele har bi hort at onvendelfer er en banding, ber fore=
 biljen onventst til (shio.

Ingaaende forftanden figer fififten, 1 sor. 2, 14: "Det naturlige menteffe fatter iffe be ting fon gorer ©ibs and til; thi be er ham en barffab, og bou fan iffe fienoe bem." Det naturlige mennefes forftand er helt formarfet, wab be ambelige ting angan, fac ben itfe fatter bent, ja ben holder bem endog for banffab. Sigeja libt altiaa jom morfet fon gixue noget til at det bliber lyit, fan ben for= morfede foritand gixue noget til, at ben biver opryit $\mathfrak{i}$ ambeltige ting. Forlt bed en overorbentlig, gubbonmelig virfing fommer ben ub af
 er bugtig til at tanfe noget gobt. Saar bet nut er fig, Goorleves er bet da muligt at bi fulto fume medoinfe noget til ombendefin? Sefigutue figer: "Da mitmentet vigielig, lyon shos jager an= gaar, intet foritaar, men er ioef marfe, fom friftem visner, hoor= ledes bil det da medorife og biclpe anget til fin onvendelie?"

Sm bor forvendte vilije figer ffriften, Rom. 8, 7: "§ipocts jant er fiendifab noo (6uts." Wred figoct foritaces bet naturlige mentefe. filg fom det fonmer fra mobers $\mathfrak{l i d}$, og fififten figer ome faabant
 fom endut er ent Subs fiente, endogs gide beghnoelfen til at bende
 ter (efter fintwefa"det) iffe alene er forberbede, men ogjaa bed finn= den er ganfe ag albeles ubrydode, babe i memeffer og dicoble;
altjan janledes, at ber hos den intet andet er and en forbarbet for=
 fife tonfer og tragter efter andet end fim alene bet fom ftrider imod
 bil og noretter noget goont, folgelig er bet iffe memeffet af bets naturltge fræfter. Derfor figer Befjendeljent: "Sigeledes tror, larer og befiender bi at menmeffete aigjenfødte bilie iffe alene er bort= bendt fra Gub, men ogjaa er bleven Gubs fiende, jan den fim lear
 1 Moi. 8 21. "Memeffets hertes tante er ond fra banz ungoont a!!" (אonfordieformelen, ふort Beg. II, 3).

Frembeles har bi hort at de to bejentlige ftyffer efler montenter $\mathfrak{i}$ ombendelfen er anger og tro. Sben virfer unt īnlge ffriften ant

 ledes er det andet moment, troen, ifølge ffriften en virfutug af Gnd alene. ©f. 1, 19: "Dg buiffen luan magt overvattes ftorlyed


 fulbfommer. Set ex bet janme jom bi befjender i dent 3die artifel: "Jeg tror at jeg iffe of egen formuft effer fraft fan tro paa sefus Srijtus, min berre, elfer fomme til hom, men bet er ben Şelfigamnos gienting." Det ftaar fanledes faft at (and alene maa birfe ontien= Deljen og at menneffet aldeles intet fan bidrage til fin ombendelie.

Serimod har ben indoending beret gioct at ©fit jo befater ment= uteffet at ombende fig, og fout ©fid befole menneffet dette, joa man Det bel ogja fifme giøre bet. Ment Deraf at memefet befales at giøre noget, folger ingeutunde at bet fan giøre det. Dent 1wntwendte befales jo ogjaa at bolde lowent, at hat ffal elffe (ffid over affe tints og fin hofte jom fig felb, og bog fim ban det iffe. Saar for ef empel apoitelen $\mathfrak{B e t e r}$ figer til ben lyalte: "Stan op og $\mathfrak{g a a}$ ( $\mathfrak{i l p}$. gi. 3, 6), faa forlongte ban jo noget fom lin iffe funde. §borfor figer ba $\mathfrak{B e t e r}$ Det til ham? Forbi han i jamme pieblif ogfaa gab ham fraften til at jtan op. Derfor figer $\mathfrak{D r}$. ©eter: "ßelagianerne og mutiloagz papifterne er fomme paa be tanfier, naar Ght figer: 'Smbender eder til mig, at menteffet jelo fon ontbende fig. Sun bil jeg paa jamme bis fige eder: Serren befaler den Døde yngling at hat ffal fana op: altfan har han faa mange frefter at han lan opitan. Wet folger iffe deraf." Der er to ting bi her jerlig bor merfe os med opfororin=
gerne til ontbendelje: delp at bisfe fal tiene til at innderent fal je goor nøobendig ombendelfen ex, om han fat blive jalig, og at det gubommelige ord har den fraft at det buthger med fig og birfer i finderen det fom det befaler, Yigefom seju ftemme, da han falde Zazants uo af gravent. Saatedes forbolder bet fig ogian nu naar prebifanten figer: "Sinvender eder!" da figer han intet andet end
 port: " $\mathfrak{D i t}$ Dobe, jtaa op!" Menneflet fan derfor iffe, naar bet iffe Gliber ombendt bagefter fige til (and at bet iffe har fummet. Wet
 han forfardedes, men itøote naaden fra fig.
 forbret fine filforere tif at ombende jitg, men ber faar jo ogian ont mange af bent, at de ombendte fig; artjaa maa de dog habe funnet.
 fraften dertil fom fra, hwem birfede at de funde? §erren birfede baade at bille og fimme, idet bat ombendte dem. §erom figer suent= iteot: "Dm menneffet figee at det ontbender fig ligejom man figer om ffibet at det bender om naar ftymmatoent elfer binden fretter det i be= boegelje, og font man figer om Memmons billeditøtte at den talte naar Den blew berørt af ben (opgaaende) fols ftraater," og $\mathfrak{H}$ uguitin figer: "Bi maa betcentie at den famme fom figer: 'Sfaffer eber et nut bjecte og en $\mathfrak{n g}$ aand,' han figer ogfaa: 'Yog vil give eder et nyt fjerte, og en ny aand bil jeg gibe eder.' Seborledes jiger han ba: 'Seg bil gibe eder Det,' Goorom han bog figer: 'Sfaffer eber bet'? Scoorfor befater Gan, naar han jelb wil give det? Seborfor giber han det, naar men= neffet jelw ffal ffaffe det? Jorbi han felb giber hoad han befaler, os Gjowlper ben fom Yan befaler, at han fal gixue bet."

Den bellige frift, fom jaa flart bevioner at det taturlige men= neffe er aandelig obd, bebioner ogjaa ligeja flart at thenneffetz om= bendelje er ent (endz naadegjerning alent og iffe noget boortil men= neffet felw medvirfer det allerringefte. (6atd er den fon birfer baade at bille og at ubrette efter hans belbehag. Derfor figer Befiendelfen (§onfordief. (3x. Forfl. II, 11): "Seertil fommer at i ben hellige ffrift ombenoeljen, troen paa ふriftus, gjenfobelfen, fornvelfen og alt Goad der harer til famme birfelige begyndelfe, og fuldendelfe, fffe tillcegges den naturlige frie biljes memneffelige frafter, horfen Gelt eller halit elfer for nogen, endog dent ringeite eller nuindite del, men "in jolidum," ס. e., ganfie og aloeles, tilftibes: den gubסom= melige virtuing og den Selligaand, fon ogiaa sfpologien figer."

Deme Yere, fom altio har baret en antonaten for memnefene, bax bebirfet at der antio har beeret og endma er den fom heeber fig op imod benne lare ved at tilffrive det naturlige menneffe visfe frofter, hoomed det enten helt elfer delvis fan bebirfe fin omben= Delfe. Deres bildfarelfer har varet, delj af en grovere, delz af ent finere art. ßelagianeme larte at ber iffe gabes nogen arbejnid, hoorfor menutfet af egnt frefter baode funde gixue begundeljent, forticettelfen og fuld endelfen i ombendelfen, og at bet bed fin egen ftyrle og formuft fimbe fomme til Sriftus og tro pan ham. Semi= pelagianeme larte og laxer at mennefet ombendes naar (shtis naade lifelper det dermed. (and maa yde menteffet biftand for at Det fan blive ombendt. Dimbendelfen farl ifolge heraf bwe lyalot memeffets, balot ©fubs gierning. Dette frtider jo mod de fteder $\mathfrak{i}$ ffriften, lyoor bet figes at bet naturlige menneffe "er døб $\mathfrak{i}$ over=
 tffe blot ginds biftomb for at blibe aandeligt levende eller onnembt, men (Stb maa fuldbringe berfet albeles alene. Rigefanliot fom Zazants blot bed srijti biftand bleb opbaft af bøde, ligejaaliot fan ogja en aandelig døo blot bed Gfubs biftand blive opbaft eller om= bendt. Som תrifus Dengang, faalede maa ogiaa her Gub giøue alt, baade begnndeljen og forticetteljen. Saa har, bi be grovere og fincere fonergifter fonn larer at menneffet bifnof iffe fon giøre begundeljen til ombendeljen eller bed fine egne frafter fan fort= fatte og fuldende ben, melt at memnefet ombender fig til (sud eller bejtemner fig for tetid bed de af Ghto ffienfede nandefreefter. Dette fan jo horej rimelig ub og futes at give ofub al aren for meme= ffets ombendelfe. Men herned Yeres jo en nuenteffets medoirfen, toet ©subj naade fun buter faa meget at menteffet fan ombende fig, men iffe felve ontbendeljen, effer at menneffet birfelig omben= Des. Man foreitilfer fit ontwendeljen faaledez: Menneffet bliber ved den forberedende naade ligefon fitllet paa en ffilfebei, lyor beiene til himlen og helvede ffilles ad. Wen nur fommer bet ant paa ment= neffet, hyad bei det bil gaa. Sette ex oberlabt til memueffets frie balg. Baar det Den rette vei, faa bliver bet ombendt; gaar bet den falffe bei, bliber det iffe mbendt, men gaar fortabt. Sifglge denne lare fafl menneffet for ombendeljen or ffeet, balige den rette bei, og at Det forit da bliver ombembt naar bet har giort bet rette balg. Men bermed tilferibes bog bet naturlige menneffe aande= ligt lib og aandelig fraft og ba funde det iffe beret bøo $\mathfrak{i}$ fynder og en Gubs fiende, fom ffriften faa ofte figer. Derfor forfaftes
deime Yere paa be fteder af vor befiendelje, hoor det befjendes at menteffet far fin onvendelie iffe $\mathfrak{g a r}$ "den "mindjte gnift" af andelige
 Forll. II, 3. 31, 47).
 ube af famo til at gixre noget godt, og fon derfor tefe medvirfe til effer i onvendeljen, guerfen i dent begundelje, fortjertelie elfer
 ontuendeljens Geghndelie, men ogjaa i dens forticettelie endma (anndelig) Dod." Det er forit i jelve ontventelien at menteffet hiliber Yebende, og faa fnart det er Gleben dette, da er bet onweubt og fan fra ba af burfe med be ambelige frefter jom det er gibet, fon §uenftes figer: "Mentrefets medbirfen folger forit paa om= bendelfens aft. Qt medvirfe er det ombende iffe bet nombende menteffes fag."

Wel er det faa, at derfom en teffe gaar til firte elfer oberfobedet iffe bil gøre ©nise ord, Da er det jo umufig at han Gliver ontvendt. Men deraf folger iffe at ont en lefer i bibelen og gaar til firfe, at han bidrager noget til fin ontbendelje. Det er iffe ntenueffet jom ¡øger ondet, men ordet fom jøger menteffet. Deir mombendte gant iffe til firfe for at Gribe ontbenot, men af aubre grimbe. 乌erom

 giœuebe at hore (futs ord" (3fp.gi. 13, 7). Ext er at begime at hare (finde ord efler at laje bet, noget anvet er det at begjere at tro. Seint fant $i$ bor magt og fan ffe enten af nysgierrighed elfer af belbefga til veltalentied elfer af jpottefoge eller af andre grume. Dette berimod er en gierning af Den ફelfigand, fom birfer i os at bille og at ubrette. Fill. 2, 13.

Mens den Gellige frift lerer at onvendeljen birfes af ©nto alene woen nogen neenteffets medbirfen, ntaa bi bog iffe opfatte ombendelfen jaaledeß fom ont ©ud toinger nogen dertil, fon om, naar $\mathfrak{l a n}$ falber memufet, men bet moditaar og iffe bil folge faldet, ©Hid da faal grife Det med en uimoditanelig magt og føre Det ind i fit namberige. Rei, Gub tuinger ingen til onvendefie. Manden er iffe nimoditanelig. Wed faldelfen og bragelien giør ©at af fabonne fom mosftaar og er nbillige, billige. 乌an birfer i bent og fortipetter dermed indtil han har overbumbet dem; font ogiaa
 Yedes forderbet, at ben mu fig felb intet andet formaar end at
moditan (Guds name (凡om. 7). Thi fiødets jans er fiendifab nud (Gud. Aft derimod memeffets foritand, Gjecte og wilje iffe moditan, men følger ben ફexligand elfer ordet og induilger deri, faabaut ebne og faa meget fraft har memeffets frie vilije iffe, men bet ar ent fficut og gave af ©

 'Rriftus figer iffe: Hben Faderen faar ledet og ført hom, for at iffe den foritanelfe fal were mulig, at i demue iag bor naturlige wilie fon god gaar foran, men fan figer: draget. Went boen ftat bel brage ben fom allerede forken er billig? Dig Dog er bet fand at ingen fommer til Retifus noo og uben fin bilie, men fun den fom har viljen; berfor bfiver mennefiet paa underlitg biz for at fan biljen, draget bed ordet af den fom foritan ag formar at birfe indo bortes i menteffenes hierter, ifffe fautedes at nemtefifne mod, uden og fortoden fin bilie ffal tro (hbilfet er wnultgt), men faaleoses at han af dem, fon af naturen er nbillige og gienftribige, gipr billige memeffer." Fontorbief. gr. Fortl. II, 30 heder det: "§ yoorbel Gud mut iffe tvinger memmeffet til at ombende fig (thit be font altio moditaar ben Selfigand og uafladelig modiatter fig enbog den er= fiende fandhed, fom Stefanz figer om de forlicroede ioder, घtp.
 menneffe fom han vil ombende, og brager bet faa at ber af en for= martet foritand bliber en oplyit forftand og af en gienitribig bilic
 51, 12).

Derfor fammenliguter beffendelfen bet tuturlige memulfe, yomo aandelige ting angan, nten en fien og en ftof, ja, ben figet endog at ent fen og fot ftaar iffe imod den fom bruger dent, ments nelt= teffet med fin vilje faar (5ud imot indtil det bliver onvendo. Der= for er det $i$ dette ftuffe berre eno en finn og fot. Sontorbief. gr. Forfl. II, 29 og II 9 . $\mathfrak{B i}$ fon berfor med rette fige at bet er et ftort naments under, naar et i finden opo memeffe bliber ontuendt. Det er et enonu fincre umber, menneffelig talt, end opbaffelfen af enfens fon af Main elfer Razarts; thi bisje labbe bel ingen frafter till at opitan fra de droe, men de moditod iffe, faaledes jom det na= turlige memeffe giør oberfor ©̧us nadevirfitinger, indtil bet bli= ber ombendt.
$\mathfrak{B i}$ ftan her owerfor en for undorfeelig hemmelighed; thi faa= fuart bor formuft forer at det ene og alene er ©it fom birfer i
menmeffet，at bille ag at wrette，at gan atene er ben fom gieutpoer $\mathfrak{o g}$ ombender metmeffet，og gixr af uvillige villtige，wil den ftrafe brage ben futning at findsen til at iffe alfe menneffer Gliver onto bendt man ligge lyos ghw．Man figer med Raybiuifterne at det fant altiaa iffe bare（Guds alvorlige bille at ombende og frelfe alle， forbi han fra ebighed ffulde have forlaftet og beitemt en del til ebig fortaferfe．Rei，ger gicelder bet at tage formufter fangen under תrifti lydighed．Ser gielder bet at fige＂§al，herte；din tiener そører！＂（3ude ord figer flart og tydelig at det er（fuid alene fom birfer at bi bil og ubretter efter Gans belbeljag，at bet er han alene jom ombender menteffet，men at be fom iffe bliber omwenote er
 er et ©゙ubs naadeberf alene，medenz memtefets fortabelfe er Dets egen fento． $\mathfrak{D g}$ fordi Gubs ord flart og tydelig Ireter begge bele， fan $\mathfrak{H o l d e r}$ bi os bertil felb om di iffe med fornuften fan fan disue tiug til at rime fanmen．Sammen mes bor befiendelie bolder bi os i enfoldighed til be ord how profeten＂Din forbervelfe er af dig fefo，o §̉̉rael，men yos mig er din hiolp．＂：ßrof．©S．Yofnion figer：＂ßib befinder os her paa ontandet af et myiterium 的or fagen iffe fon giememtrengee af bor indffrenfede forftand．＂ $\mathfrak{B i}$ itaar Ger onerfor ent hemmelighed jom（fnto ifin bizom iffe gar aubent baret og fom intet mennefe ffal foge at ubforffe．乌̆er man bi．fige
 ffab！foor atanfagelige er fant bomme og lans veie ufporlige！ Tht how Gar fiendt serrens find，aller hod bur lans raadgiver？ Efler hoo gab ham fxit，jaa bet ffulde betales ham tgjen？すhi af ham og bed fam og tif ham er alle ting；ham bere cre $\mathfrak{i}$ ebighed！＂
 Deme troenk gabe af ©sud iffe gives til affe，ba han bog farber alle til jig vg ifolge fin uenderige godlyed raber alworlig：＇תonmer til bryiflip！alt er rede！＇Det ar en tilluffet（sud alene befjenwt hemmelighed，jom iffe bed nogen menteffelig formuft fon ubforffes， men med arefrogt maa betragtes og tifbedes，jom ffrebet er Rom． 11,33 ．．．Snislectio fáal anfegtede fanvittigheder iffe ftøde fig over deme den gubommelige viljeß ffiulte maade，men fe－pan Den $i$ תrituts aabenbarede（5ubs vilje，fom falder alle figbere til fig．＂（Ev．ßittt．1885，¡．767．）

##  Droct $\mathrm{ug}_{\mathrm{g}}$ bablens pitfamerte．

Som bi har bart，er ombendeljen en छftbs 1ntorgjenting，nten for at bebirfe den gion han britg af bisfe af hant jelb forordnede midler，fom bi falder naademidleme．Disje er ordet og daabent jaframente，idet bi iffe her tager bet andet faframente med，ba man iffe egentlig fan fige at bet binfer troen，ment at bet jurfer og for＝ ager den．Sut ©fub britger ordet fom et miobel til at bitie omven＝ belfen fremgaar af folgende fteder $\mathfrak{i}$ den hellige fifift：＂Iroen fommer berved，at mant lower，men at man horer fer ved（suds ond（Rom．10，17）．Er troen altfan ent birting af orbet，ba er ombendeljen det ogjaa；thi den bejtaar jo egentlig i troents med＝ delelfe．$\Im \Im a f o b s$ breb 1,18 figes der at（fud har fobt 03 ，nemligy de friftue，bed jandheds ord，og er bi gientode ved ordet，ba er vi ogiaa ombendte bed det janme ord，da digje to handinger efter dereß b๙jen er enshetndende，bejtaar i troent meddelelje．＂ßrifti ebangeltum er en（3ubz fraft til jaliggiprelje＂（Ront．1，16）．Bor Gefjendelfe jiger berfor：＂（̧fud bil bed bette midocl og ellers iffe， nentlig ved fit hellige ord，naar man gren det forfynde eller lajer Det，ved jaframenteme，naar man butger den efter hants ord，falde memueftene til ebig falighed，orage bent til fig，ombende，gjentøde
 ＂Snmbendeljen birfer（Gul den Selligant iffe itoen midler，nten butger dertil ©̧uס弓 ond弓 proodifen og hørelfe，fom ffrebet jtaar，
 Ron．10，17：＂Iroen fommer bed（3ubs orde harelfe．＂Dg det er ©atbs bilje at nat fal hore hate ord og fffe tilitoppe fine orent． SBed dette ord er den Scelligannd nouverende og oplader bierternt faa at de jom Sydia i $\mathfrak{A p}$ ．gi 16， 14 merter derpaa og faaleøeふ bliver ont＝ bendte alente bed den Selligantos name og fiaft，fom ene og atene birfer menneffets ombendelfe＂（今ort $\mathfrak{B e g r}$ ．，II，4）．Mt det er bed ordet og iffe bed noget andet midoel ©ut bil ombende memeffer og $\mathfrak{g i p r e}$ dem falige，fer bi af arbrabant joar til dent rige nand．פa dente bad om at ¿azarus matte jendes til hans fem broder for at bione for bem，toet han mente at derjom nogen af de bobe gif til dem，ba ombende de fig，fif han det foar：＂De bar Mojes of profeterne，lad dem gøre dem．Şører de iffe Mofes og projeterne ba fullle be helle fiffe tro ont nogen opitaar fra de døbe．＂Derfor figer beffende＂fen：＂Serfor ffal og maa bi ftaa fajt paa at ©htiffe
bil hande med og memeffer nom gientent fit ord og faframente＂ （Schmarfi，Mrt．III，8，6）．

Det er berfor en bilbfarelfe at mene at ©fud uben bisie be＝ ftente mibler vil $\mathfrak{l o n}$ ne til mennefene og ombende dem，fom ogfan Ronforsief．Rort Begr．bioner：＂ßigejaa fortajter og forbømmer bi
 （Guds ouss horelfe og uben be bellige faftamenters bug brager menneifene til fig，oplyjer，retfardiggior og leelfiggint dent＂， （II，10）．Naar bet har baret jagt at baabens fatramente，jon ogjaa faldes gienføoelfens bad，er et（6udz nambemiddel til ombendelfe， ba er bette at forftan faaledes at daaben virfer $\mathfrak{i}$ be jmaa børn gien＝ fooelje，troens meddelelfe og faaledes overførex dent fra fyndejtan＝ ben til naabejtanden．AYngaaende fortgoldet mellen ordet og baabent bar $\mathfrak{L u t h}$ er fagt at ber ingen forffiel er umbtagen den at $\mathfrak{i}$ ordet til＝ bydeß naaden til alle，if faframentet til den enfelte．

Guס弓 ord delea，fom Geljendt，i Yov og evangeltum og ba der til $\mathfrak{e n}$ fand ombendelje gører to wajentlige ftyffer，nemlig anger og tro，faa bruger ©fil lovent til at wirfe det førite，anger，og ebange＝ liet til at birfe bet andet，twoent．Sil angerent hover fremfor alt fyodens erfiendelje，og for at bringe fynderen til erfijendelfe af
 Kjendte $\mathfrak{i z f e}$ funden itbent bed lobent，＂og Fom，3，20：＂ßed Ioben fommer fondenz erfjendelfe．＂Roben er fon et ipeil，hoori funderen ffal lare at je fin burfelige tilitand der bifer ham al hanz nøgenhed ffant．Dent anbenbarer subs brede ober innoen og oberbebijer fun＝ berent ont at han fortjenter ebtg ftraf og fordontatelje．Derbed for＝ ferbeß funderen，vilde gjerne finde ent uסvei，men jer ingen；derved begutor han at tmurre mod ©ud，fom 凡ont．4， 15 figer：＂尺obent bitfer wrede．＂©e Schnalf．Nut．3，2rt．II．Soben bijer memne＝ flet dets finder；men ved lowen fonnter intet ntentefe tilbage til ©fio．Sintet memteffe bliwer bed loven omvenot til Serren．Dette jer bi af Mombersempel．Moam fiendte til Yoben，fom fagde：＂§aa boilten bag bu ceder af bet ffal bu bizelig da＂．Dg hoad gioude Yan？San fogte at fomme Lengere bort fra（sub，han fiulte fig． $\mathfrak{D m}$ end $\mathfrak{h a n}$ fan fin nøgenteds fam og elendiglijed og vel øuffede at fomme 10 af ben，faa ban bog fiffe goorledes han fitloe befries og freljes．Det bar forjt efterat（stud felo font til ham og ved fin for＝ jattelfe om foindens fed brog ham tilbage til fig，at dex oppattes lomgjel efter © Sud og hanb ho弓 ham．Derfor figer de Schmalf．Mrt． III，3：＂Soor looen 1 topber dette fit embede alene， 1 toen at ebange＝

Yiet fonmer til, ber er bpo og helbede, og memuefet maa fortutie, Yigefon Saul og §ubas, fon St. §aulus figer: 'ㅇoben breber for= mebelit fanden' ( $\Re$ om. $7,9 \mathfrak{f}$.). Derimod giver ebangeliet paa jin fibe trafit og forladelje." ©emugeliet er Serfor egentlig bet eneite mitbel til en jand ombendelje. Som allerebe jagt, beitant to oms vendeljen $\mathfrak{i}$ menneffets tilbagebendent til ©fub og bet bevictes ved ebangeliet. Sara loven facet ntobe fiit gienning paa jowderen, faa
 wei oiner, fo mad ebangeliet til forat opreife og traite. Ebangeliet alene fan oberipre fonderen i naadeftanden, ibet bet fifonfer troent, der tilegner fig ©udj nambe i ßutitus og jniderneß forladelje. De gubommelige midler til menneffets onvendelfe bar berfor intsen foragte og derved lindre (fud fra at pue fiut nabes birfinitg paa Giertet. Den fom foragter midlerne og iffe gil bruge bem, Goorved (6nto bil omvende menteffet, fan io albrig bente at bitibe ombendt.

 bendelfe tar aldrig opiattes, forat iffe bes vor langfombed hient iogelfent tis ffal hengar og forivinoe. Thit ben (sub, ber har for= iceitet den bobfrerdige forladeje, lyar iffe forjaettet den jom iffe idag bil onvente fig, at ham fan embin leve i morgen." Derfor, mu er naadents tid, $\mathfrak{m u}$ er ©nid at finde, nu heeber bet idag. "Derfont


Zad os alfe flittig bruge namemiblerne, at den barmijertige (fud for Sefu jfyld maa give og opholde as alle $i$ den fande tro, indtil $\mathfrak{b a n t}$ fører os ind $i$ fit herlighede rige.

## Report of Board of Trustees.

The Board of Trustees has held two meetings during the past fiscal year. On July 30, 1930 (during the Pastoral Conference) a meeting was held at which G. A. Gullixson was elected President and J. E. Thoen was elected Secretary of the Board.

At this meeting the president and secretary were elected a committee in charge of the Knute Norstad farm, Manitowoc county, Wisconsin. The farm has been worked by the men of Grace Lutheran Church, with the understanding that the Synod should receive one-half of the proceeds and Grace Lutheran Congregation one-half.

The total income from the farm amounted to $\$ 546.08$. The "Synod's" share, $\$ 273.04$, was applied as follows: For repair on buildings, well, Fire Insurance, etc., \$152.46. The remainder, $\$ 120.58$, was sent to the Synod's treasury.

In the fall of 1930, a fire which escaped the control of the section hands, on the right-of-way of the "Soo" Railway line passing near the farm, burned over a tract of about five acres of timber land on the farm. Claims were made for damage to the railway company and the sum of $\$ 150.00$ received by your committee, was sent to the treasurer of the Synod. The fences were also damaged and not a little timber was felled by the fire.

The nembers of the Grace Congregation offered to clear up the timberland and restore the fences on condition that they might use the salvaged timber for lumber to be used in the construction of a chapel on the church lot, granted the congregation by the Synod last year. This proposition was accepted by your committee and the land has been practically cleared and all fences rebuilt. The excellent work of the men of Grace Church is to be highly commended.

Second Meeting. The second meeting of the Board of Trustees was held at Bethany College, December 3, 1930, upon the call of the President and Secretary of the Board. All members were present.

The meeting was held to consider alleged irregularities in the matter of the last will and testament of Mrs. Loonise Hansen of Arlington, Washington, now deceased. It was reported that her will had been changed under undue influence. After a thorough discussion of the situation, and in pursuance with legal advice, the board decided to support and take part in the legal procedure, instituted by a Mr. Nerheim, a nephew of Mrs. Hansen, to protest a later will of Mrs. Hansen then under probate, and to employ Mr. K. T. Dahlen as our attorney, together with the counsel of Mr. Nerheim in Washington.

Mr. E. N. Edwards and Rev. G. A. Gullixson were elected a committee to take charge of the matter.

The case has now been tried and the decision of the court was adverse to our claims.

Our attorney, Mr. K. T. Dahlen, requested that one of our ministers accompany him to the coast to act as advisor in the matter.

Dr. S. C. Ylvisaker was authorized to go to assist our attorney in every way possible. This he did.
G. A. Gullixson, President.

## Bethany College.

## Annual Report, Board of Regents and President of the College.

In His unspeakable grace God has permitted Bethany to complete another year of its activity. Although this year can record no outstanding accomplishments, it is well that our synod consider that one single school year means a year of blessing to those who attend, a year of opportunity to them and to our Synod, a year even of harvest where the church is given to see the fruit of its labors. The number of students does not seem so great; but who can measure the influence of the Christian instruction which has been imparted to these during this one school year alone? And who can trace the influence which is brought through them to parents, friends, and congregations wherever their future activity may lie?

## Statistics for the Year 1930-31.

Students of theology at Concordia, St. Loulis, 6; at Thiensville, Wis., 1.

Students from our Synod at Bethany: Boys, 19, Girls, 15 ; at New Ulm, Minn.: Boys, 2; at Concordia, St. Paul: Boys 1; at Concordia, Milwaukee: Boys 1. Total: Boys 30, Girls 15. Total 45.

Statistics for the student body at Bethany: From our synod, 34; of Norwegian parentage, though not from our synod, 4; from the sister synods of Missouri and Wisconsin, 24. Total, 62.

High School, 45; College, 15; Music, 3 ; Commercial, 4.
The following have served as members of the faculty at Betlany this past year: The men teachers, Buszin, Harstad, Natvig, Onstad, and Ylvisaker. The lady teachers, Hagen, Jacobson, Lillegaid, Seidel.

God has permitted the work to go on evenly without serious disturbances. On the whole it may be said that the spirit of work and play has been wholesome, indicative of the Christian teaching and principles on which the school is founded. Those who
have been in closer touch with Bethany and its activity are gradually learning to be grateful to God who has provided in Bethany a refuge for the youth of our synod, a school where teachers and students bow in humble submission to the sacred Word of God.

By way of encouragement and as signs of a certain progress it may be recorded that during the course of this last year the laboratories have been equipped with much needed materialthis through the magnanimous co-operation of friends of Bethany in Mankato and the Minnesota District of the National Lutheran Educational Association; that substantial additions and improvements have been made in the library; that the main office and several rooms in the dormitory have been decorated; that a vatult door has been put in place so that the Synod now has a fire-proof vault ready for service; and that the local congregation has succeeded in greatly improving the chapel by the rebuilding of the platform the purchase of an altar and hangings to the rear of the altar, and the installation of new chairs. These improvements have been made without expense to the Synod or the school as such. At a recent meeting of the Alumni Association it was resolved to make campus improvements the distinct project of this association. It should also be recorded here that the High School department has been recognized as meeting the requirements of the University of Minnesota, and that the work of the college classes has reached a high standard. A resolution of the Board of Regents has been put into effect by which the catalog now appears as a quarterly bulletin, and by means of this the attention of many, not only in our own Synod but also in our sister Synods, is being called to the work of our school. We are hopeful, too, that the visits of the choir to the various sections of our Synod and beyond will help to win the good will of an ever increasing number.

A complete financial statement of the operations and indebtedness of Bethany will be brought by the business manager, Mr. Onstad. The report is not as depressing as some may have feared. The income at school has increased, due to the larger number of students in attendance. Contributions from the congregations toward current expenses have increased materially. More has been received this year than ever before in the form of
foodstuffs for the kitchen department. To this should be added the donations of new equipment and furnishings mentioned above. To offset this, however, we must remind our Synod and its members of the debt which rests upon our college. Good progress was made in the liquidation of the original debt, which had been brought down below the $\$ 60,000$ mark. A committee was organized which was operating throughout the Synod gathering further donations and pledges toward the payment of this debt. Over $\$ 20,000$ has been sulbscribed and is being paid in installments over a period of five years. In the meantime a large percentage of our people lave during this past year been obliged to feel the effects of the so-called depression, and we were of the opinion that the collection for the debt fund should not be pressed too much this year. We would do well if the current expenses were met, and the Synod has made an earnest attempt to cover the amount needed there-with what success can only be made known after the Synod Sunday offering has been counted. In addition to the actual debt incurred by the purchase of the school, deficits for the years 1928-29 and 1929-30 must be listed, amounting to $\$ 9,312.54$. The failure of the Synod to collect the necessary amount to subsidize the college during these years has hampered us seriously; for it became necessary to borrow this amount at the local bank, and pay interest on it, thus increasing the burden considerably.

The Board of Regends recommends to the Synod that permanent calls be extended to Professors Buszin and Natvig. Students who plan on entering the service of the church as pastors have petitioned for the introduction of a theological course at Bethany. The Board wishes to refer this question to the Synod. Certain improvements are highly desirable in the boiler room, particularly the installation of stokers; but the expense involved is such that the Board must ask the authorization of the Synod in the matter. We also ask that the Synod consider the question of a buisiness manager at Bethany.

Besides the regular elections to membership on the Board, we would call the attention of the Synod to the fact that Rev. Thoen has resigned from the Board, this resignation being occasioned by his acceptance of the call to the editorship of Tidende and Sentinel. Rev. S. Sande was elected temporarily to fill the va-
cancy. Dr. Ylvisaker also resigned but was prevailed upon to continue as secretary of the Board until this present meeting of the Synod.

At the request of the Board this report was made a combined report of the president of the college and the Board of Regents, since the president of the college is at the same time the secretary of the Board.

And now may God, our dear Father, continue to hold His hand of blessing over our institution here and our whole Synod for the sake of Him who at that first Bethany blessed all who love to hear His Word.

Respectfully submitted,
S. C. Ylvisaker,

Secretary, Board of Regents, and President, Bethany Latheran College.

## Treasurer's Report.

To Norwegian Synod of the American Lutheran Church, in convention assembled, June 18-24, 1931.

Genilemen:
The folowing report of the Treasirer of Bethany Lutheran College covers the operation for the fiscal year, September 1, 1930, to August 31, 1931, the income and expenditures for the three months, June, July, and August, having been carefully estimated and budgetted, and the variations from the figures as here submitted and the final closing of the books on August 31, 1931, should be very small, and can be absorbed in next year's report.

The statement of liabilities is taken from the books of the college treasurer and has been checked with the Synod's treasurer's books, and the variation noted.

The statement of assets is taken from the college treasurer's trial balance as of May 29th, and may show some variation at the close of the fiscal year, August 31, 1931.

A comparison of the operation account for the fiscal year, September 1, 1930, to August 31, 1931, shows that the expenditures of the college for rumning accounts, except the teachers' salaries, show a steady, although small, decrease from year to year, the most noticeable being in the item of heating, which was $\$ 2,972.98$ for the year 1928-29, as compared with $\$ 2,262.03$ for the year 1930-31.

In contrast to this, there has been a gradual increase in the teachers' salaries account. For the year ending August 31, 1928, the salary account was $\$ 8,755.50$, for the year ending 1929 , $\$ 10,339.74$, for the year 1930 was $\$ 10,068$, and for this year, ending August 31, 1931, will be $\$ 11,877.10$. This increase hàs come about by action of the Board of Regents in the course of establishing the Junior College Department complete, and providing teachers so as to conform to the requirements for accreditation.

A comparison of the operating income shows a steady, though
small, increase from year to year, corresponding to the gradual increase in enrollment. This is shown by the statements from year to year, approximately $\$ 14,000.00$ for year ending August 31, 1928, as compared with $\$ 18,401.13$ for the year ending Augu1st 31, 1931.

Other non-operating expenditures have naturally been incurred this last year, the most important items being equipment for laboratories and library, and the interest paid on loans made to cover the deficits of former years. The laboratory equipment was entirely met by the contributions from the business men of Mankato and a contribution of $\$ 500.00$ from the N. E. L. A.

Another non-operating expenditure is that of interest on the deficits in the Synod's teachers' salaries fund from year to year. Instead of this item being carried by the synodical treasury as decided by the Synod at its meeting in 1928, it has been paid by the college treasurer from current operating income, and thus the load on the college has been increased because of the failure of the Synod's officials for taking this amount over at the proper time

The treasurer takes this opportunity of calling the attention of the Synod to the gradual rise in the amount of outstanding accounts, i. e., amounts due the school for tuition, room, board, etc. This item as of June 1st, 1931, presents the quite respectable amount of $\$ 3,930.91$, more than half of which is for the present school year. Under present economic conditions it will take considerable time to collect this amount, and there may be such acconuts included that can not be collected. The treasurer submits this matter to the Synod for such action as may tend to check any further accumulation in this account.

Attached hereto are the financial statements included as a part of this report.

1930-1931
INCOME OPERATION.

Board


| Trial Bal. | Addition to Total to |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| May 29 | Aug. 31 | Aug. 31 |
| $\$ 8,325.68$ | $\$$ | 75.00 |
| $\$ 8,400.68$ |  |  |
| $1,029.29$ | 65.00 | $1,094.29$ |
| $3,274.99$ | $\ldots 2$ | $3,274.99$ |
| $2,895.56$ | 28.00 | $2,923.56$ |
| 554.25 | $\ldots$. | 554.25 |
| 168.00 | $\ldots$. | 168.00 |
| 300.00 | $\ldots .$. | 300.00 |


| Laundry | 106.78 | 10.00 | 116.78 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Library and Nurse | 222.00 |  | 222.00 |
| Music | 878.50 |  | 878.50 |
| Piano Rent | 181.78 |  | 171.78 |
| Typewriter Rent | 108.00 |  | 108.00 |
| Swimming | 124.00 |  | 124.00 |
| Miscellaneous | 15.30 |  | 15.30 |
| Diploma Fee | 27.00 | 12.00 | 39.00 |
| Total Operating | \$18,211.13 | 190.00 | ,401.13 |

Non-Operating Income.

| Man. Bus. Men | 457.00 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Synod Gen. Fund for Interest. | 1,140.00 |  | \$1,140.00 |  |
| Norstad Estate | 1,000.00 |  |  |  |
| Synod Teachers' Fund. | 3.443.11 |  |  |  |
| Choir | 1,165.15 |  |  |  |
| Donations Direct for Improvements: |  |  |  |  |
| Mrs. Sequeland | 34.10 |  |  |  |
| Ladies, Our Savior's, Madison office . | 60.00 |  |  |  |
| John Leifsen for Storm. Windows | 40.00 |  |  |  |
| P. T. Buszin, for Music. | 10.00 |  |  |  |
| Chas. Huhnerkock, Coupons, for Interest on Bonds | 15.00 |  |  |  |
| Total Non-Operating |  | 7,364.36 | $\ldots$ |  |
| Total Income all Sources. |  | 25,575.49 | \$1,330.00 | \$26,905.49 |

## EXPENSES.

| Operating. |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Book Store: | Trial Bal. May, '29. | Add. to Ang. '31 | Total to Aug. '31 |
| Purchases | . ${ }^{\text {1,194.08 }}$ |  | \$ 1,194.08 |
| Freight. | 13.90 |  | 13.90 |
| Dormitory: |  |  |  |
| Repairs | 99.57 |  | 99.57 |
| Supplies | 380.46 | 20.00 | 400.46 |
| Library : |  |  |  |
| Books and Magazines *. | 149.63 |  | 149.63 |
| Miscellaneous | 15.60 |  | 15.60 |
| Salaries | 52.50 | 35.00 | 87.50 |
| Boarding: |  |  |  |
| Sutpplies | 4,871.50 | 225.00 | 5,096.50 |
| Equipment | 60.24 |  | 60.24 |
| Miscellaneots | 59.24 |  | 59.24 |
| Freight and Express. | 11.28 |  | 11.38 |
| Salaries | 1,014.07 | 145.00 | 1,159.07 |
| Gas | 308.52 | 50.00 | 358.52 |
| Laundry Operation | 118.24 | 8.00 | 126.24 |
| Advertising | 412.26 | 20.00 | 43226 |
| Heat | 2,262.03 |  | 2,262.03 |
| Insurance | 41:25 | 28.00 | 69.25 |



The Synod at the annual meeting decided that the deficit in the teachers' salaries, being considered as the difference between the income from tuition and the total teachers' salaries ini the college (excluding Music Department), should be made up by the Teachers' Salary Fund (Lærerløns Kassen). On this basis the deficit would be as follows:
Total Teacher Salaries, Sept. 1, 1930, to August 31, 1931 ..... \$10,685.43
Total Income from Tuition Charges ..... 3,274.99
Deficit ..... \$ 7,410.44
DETAILED STATEMENT OF LIABILITIES.
As of June 1, 1931.
Bonds outstanding (paid bonds deducted) ..... $\$ 39,100.00$
Note Payable, Regular, (Property Account).. ..... \$5,626.00
Itemized as follows:
Fred Brandt, Madison, Wis. .....  $1,000.00$
Rev. G. A. Gullixson ..... 860.00
Rev. N. Madson. ..... 500.00
T. K. Joitel, Stoughton, Wis. ..... 1,000.00
H. O. Kringlebotten ..... 1,448.00
Ole Lutness ..... 500.00
Mrs. J. B. Unseth ..... 250.00
Rev. J. A. Moldstad, Balance ..... 68.00
Notes Payable, Special, (Gentleman's Agree-ment)12,395.15
Itemized as follows:
Randi Kittilsby ..... \$ 300.00
Enma Tweeten ..... 2,000.00
Ole L. Tynning ..... 7,500.00
Alex. Stephens ..... 400.00
S. B. Stephens ..... 300.00
Mrs. Mabel Aasheim ..... 320.15
Rev. J. A. Moldstad. ..... 1,000.00
Rev. G. A. Gullixson, Balance. ..... 575.00
Total Notes Payable, Property Account ..... $18,021.15$
Total Liabilities on property account, College Treasurer's Books ..... \$57,121.15
Notes Payable, Operation ..... 10,950.00
Itemized as follows:
American State Bank, due August 15...... $\$ 7,000.00$
American State Bank, due ..... 2,500.00
1st National, St. Peter. ..... 450.00
Rev. J. A. Moldstad, Chicago Note ..... 1,000.00
Accounts Payable as of June 1st ..... 2,271.78
Total Liabilities, on Operation ..... 13,221.78
Total Liabilities, all Accounts. ..... $\$ 70,342.93$

Synod treasurer's account shows $\$ 100$ more, because of in renewal of a note, it was increased $\$ 100.00$ which was not reported to the college treasurer on June 1st, but which he has just now reported. Therefore, the account as it now stands on college treasurer's books, plus this item, will be $\$ 70,442.93$.

From this amount should be deducted the amount of cash in the property account now held by Synod's treasurer, which balance was as of May 1st, 1931, $\$ 2,570.00$. Deducting this amount from the property liability account leaves net liabilities, $\$ 54,551.15$ and net liabilities, all accounts, $\$ 67,872.93$.

## STATEMENT OF ASSETS, JUNE 1, 1931.

| Cash in Bank | 132.86 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Accounts Receivable; College | 3,930.91 |
| Accounts Receivable, Book Store | 416.31 |
| Note Receivable | 69.79 |
| Book Store, Inventory | 322.70 |
| Land . . . | 9,125.75 |
| Buildings | 275,853.48 |
| Furniture and Equipment | 10,476.84 |
| A. J. Torgerson, Treasurer, Balance | 2,570.00 |
| Library . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . | 5,643.00 |
| Unexpired Insurance on Buildings | 430.00 |
| Mankato Businessmen's. Fund | 331.70 |
| Alterations and Permaneint Improvetne | 514.11 |


| Total Assets | \$309,817.45 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Total Liabilities, as per statement. | 70,442.93 |
| Net Assets over Liabilities | \$239,374.52 |

Note: The above comparison of assets and liabilities includes estimated deficit in operation for this year, which may be reduced by contribution at this Synod meeting, and does not include other book accounts that usually are included in the annual financial statement at the close of the fiscal year.

Respectfully submitted.
E. J. Onstad, Treasurer, Bethany Lutheran College.
June 19, 1931.

## Indberetning fra den ftaaende finansfomite.

 og den har faabiot muligt baret reprojenteret bed mpoerne af

 at gione alt hoad der jtant $i$ denz magt for at ber fom indofome
 Ions $=$ og junodefasjen til at beeffe de robente nogifter. Selb on bi iffe faar jan rigelige bidrag til be andre foejer jon bi ffulde øufic fan bog arbeibet forticettes. Men fan bi iffe mobe be for= plistelfer fom lyvert aar ftiflez til bizje govedfasjer, man bi ind= fille arbeiot. ©ntiver maa funte indie at bi iffe $\mathfrak{i}$ bet nendelige fan fortjoette med at fitifte nt giald.
 tuent not til at bejtride ubgifterne. Ent lident anderbalance gar font regel baret baeffet af fynodefajen. Mpobendigheden af at bibrage til inoremisfionen har baret frembolot for bort foll faa lange at
 er bet anderledes. De farite aar bi breb vor egen fole bleb renter par laan og umberbalance $\mathfrak{i}$ briftsontfoftningerne ved ffolen ubredet of de almindelige Gibrag til folen. Samtibig blew det rapporteret til bore aarembder at der ingen underbalance var i bote hovedfa? jer. $\Im 1928$ antog jutoden folgende belutuing:

All subsidies with the maintenance of Bethany Lutheran College shall hereafter be paid out of the Synodical treasury (synodekassen), and subsidies required for professors' salaries, from "Iærerlønskassen." Members of the congregations of the Synod are urged to contribute liberally to these treasuries to meet possible deficits in current expenses of Bethany Lutheran College, so that it may not be necessary to draw upon the general fund for Bethany Lutheran College for such expenses.

Som folge af demt befutning er at ber $i$ be folgende to aar at fommet en famlet underbalance i biaje to fasjer til et beld ai over $\$ 9312.54$. Dette $\mathfrak{h a r}$ iffe baret holdt frem tilftreffeligt flart for bort folf, jaa at be bat forftant boor faare bi har trangt til Ftorre biorag tif bieju fasper.

Winatsfomitecn ar oberbevit om at bort foft mangler hoerfen
 op for den lyod der bitteligy er trang til. Somitect Gat berfor giemten antet fort torrefpondante med bore preiter for at oplyje dem ont jtiflingen og paaftynde dent til alvorligt arbeide for at imb= ¡ante de nobleusige belpb. Dette arbeide har viejelig bauret fugt; bet vilde bogs bare formeget at bente at bi paa et aor fatbe fan en jandan orden $i$ indomlingen $i$ affe menighener at der iffe frent deles ffulde blive mberbalance $\mathfrak{i}$ vore hobedfasijer. Der er jantedes
 af bette vil forbanbentlig Glibe baffet bed offeret miner dette mone.

Efter finnoens beffutuity mote reprejentanter fra jonodens

 ment. Folgende Guoget for de tre Gobedfasjer bled antaget: Zil
 000. Forat jfaffe bizje Gelp6 maa der gde马 giemuemiutlig $\$ 4$ af
 at bare mere ent bi fan bente at fan ibl. Set er bog miture end
 bent on bibrag fra be culfelte preitefald bajeret paa bisije overifag. Fepultatet ai dente indiamfing er jom †反ßger:

Zi fald lyar jaffet det belph jom de bied bedt om, elfer meere; Ftue fald gat faffet meilem $80 \mathrm{og} 90 \%$; tre fard har faffet mellem $70 \mathrm{og} 80 \%$; jets fald hat: ffaftet melifem 60 og $70 \%$; tre fald har
 et fald Gar faffet mindre end $30 \%$.

Wed at ftubere fasjererens rapport over bibrag fua de forifiel= Sige fars bil man let fumte je at Yougt itare bidrag bil fonme fra mange feder naar nere arbeibe gixtes for at oplyje medlemmerne on lyon bi birfelig trantger til be forifjellige gixtentaal. Tet vil ware til for hialp i bette opighnigsarbeise at lade demue rapport fra fasjerent tryffe i fynobalferetningen. Wor fomite inditiffer ber: for at beme rapport tryffes taar. Det bil gijelpe til at gibe beret=
 i feemtiden.

Ter er indofunct til bisie fasier fan perjoner fom iffe til= harer nogen ab bore menigheder, $\$ 539.56$. Der er desuben iub= formmet $\mathfrak{i}$ form af gaver "in natura" til colleget til en berbi af
\$345.03. $\mathfrak{D i z f e}$ gaver "in natura" er en for hicelp til beftribelfen af bore nogifter, og det er at hatabe at ret numge af bore menigheder fan fan ent god oroning med indiantinty af jaabame gaver, fan at der fan fomme ind meget mere mefte ant.

Komiteen fan iffe indje at bet bil bere mulig at formindife vort bubget for bet fommende ans. Fenter paa giceld mana betales
 jom den feal giøne ordentligt arbetoc. Bed at faa flere eleucr bil indtagterne pges, medens nogifterne for Larerifialp forbliver be famme. Med tresibe flere efeber bette aar vilbe bi hate ambganet den modergalance vi nu gar. Err iffe tiden fommen, da vi fan vente et ftare elebantal? Deriom der blev arbeibet med iver over fele famfundet for at fan me eleber, bil bet bizielity roffes at fan folen paa en fandan befiz at den iffe vil blive os til for for byrde.
 orbnet indjamlingen $\mathfrak{i}$ affe bore menigheder, jaa at itnore bionaty fan fonme itto. Derjont bi arbeider med fid $\mathfrak{i}$ tro pao Sectens forjeetteljer, bil han nof lade vor gjecning lyffes.

Der bor forges for at ferffilte !aat optages til at breffe unter= Gałancen i de lobende ubgifter fra tidigere aar, jau at Dette tages Ho af folens regnifaber.

תomiteen bil endelig iuditille at æibende og Sentinels rebut= tør โøm

Cgr. Notericm, fefretrer for finangfontecn.

# Indberetning fra indremisfionsfomiteen. 

"Ggpiten ex for, wen arbeiderue fant."<br>"Sirifi fiarlighed thitger mig."

Det er iffe ndeluffende et ghedens Guditab jom indremisjions fomiteen har at fremlagge for ben cerberbige fonobe iame. Det er iffe meo begeiftring bi man berette at bi fffe hax jentot tod eneite mi) arbeider i bet for øone and; ja, bi far endog maattet oberlabe, og bet tildelz af mantgel paa mibler, en ab wore nye marfer til vore Grobre $\mathfrak{i}$ Misfourijunodent. Med bedrovelfe nada bi berette at bi iffe for feet os iftand til at opta arbeibe paa mogen mity marf, tiftrode for at ell $5-6$ arbeibsongtige og arbeibslyitue unge momb
 lig brir ber flere arbeidere fardige out at aar eller fan.
§oad fan um grumben efler grmment til deme tilftanio it bort intorentigiontarbeioe bare? Bi bar netop hart at bet iffe er ntangel paa arbeibere. Rei, firfens herre har hort fine bonte bpmex ont at ban bilbe nobribe arbeidere $\mathfrak{i}$ fin hoit. Irrbeidere ftan fardige. Eller er ber maffe fare for at ber blix for mange arbetbere, og at bi derfor bor futte at bede on nue? Rei! \{hi hatant herre for= jufter os om at haten er for, og fonmer til at forbli for, mens arbeibente er forbobsuig faa, og fommer til at bli faa. Er bet
 Sertil maa bi foare Gade ja og nei, beljt net. Bijtrof ftan fan= wiot bi bed intet orbuet fald iflanot $0 \mathfrak{g}$ ledigt. Sig med jelbhjulpue fald har ebers fomite ingen mbndighed hoad faldejager antyaar. Meat bermed er iffe jagt at ber ingen marfer er. Det fom bred jagt gientem eber马 fontite for et par aar foon, gicelder frembeles: "ßi funde med tro arbeidere og de upboubige midrer, under $\preceq e r=$ rens welfignelfe, opta misfionsarbeibe i næften builfenjombelft af wore forme byer." $\mathfrak{D g}$ bi funde med rette tilfoie $\mathfrak{i}$ ncerfagt lybifent= jombeljt ftad effer landotituift, boor det rene, fulde ebangelium ont
 Srift tid finder wi den fargelige tifitand fom vor frelfer feilorer i Det foreganende bers, og fom gab anleonting fil vor teffes orb: "Ment ba ban fan folfet, buffebes lan iuberlig ober oem; thi de bar formagtede og adjuredte jon faar ber iffe hat hyrde" (Mat.
 probitifer ebongeliet for at fanduingen＂out of bate？

乌uad er bet ba jom mangler？乌bad er bet jon maa bere ffylden for at bi，tiltrods for at bi har arbeidere，belnoruftede ar＝ Getioce，og $\mathfrak{m a r f e r}$－lobende natfer－fa lovende font seerents for＝ gjacttelicr，fon jo＂i תriftus sejus er alle ja og amen＂，Dog med
 ord og oplafter eders pine－maa ftaa ntigitet，og berfor gaa til＝ fpiltoc．

Men grunden da？Dat benter at bi fáal joare，fon der regel joare，＂ßi mangler midler．＂Sed，vi bil iffe joare faaedes，ifiput det ex jatot at bi mang．er nibler．Men felveite roden gaar bybere， meget bybere． $\mathfrak{B i}$ mangler，tor bi fige det，ja，maa bi iffe fige det， og med jorg befjente at det er altfor fand： $\mathfrak{B i}$ mangle tiaerligheb， ficerlighed til gatent herre，vor eiegove freljer，og ficerlighed til be bed ham durefipote jicele．San bi med fandged fige med Wouluz： ＂Suifti fiarlighed toinger mig＂？Err bi buændende i aanden？
 paa bort hjerter alter？
$\Im a$, men man di iffe bere list rimelige her？Bed iffe fomiteen at tiserne er tryffenbe，meget tryffende，jaa at intange bar ganct， og flere ftant farbige til at gaa fra bus og giem？$\widetilde{s}^{0}$ ，Det er bi iffe ubibende ont，og det giør os af gjectet ondt．Men er ber iffe grumb ti：at frygte for at bet iffe biot er de hambe tider jorn er ffyld i bette，ment ogja titbels haato bjerter，font fanfe er ben egent＝ fige grund til de faarbe tider－hienter der foger forit fit eget，og Da，beriom der er tio og mibler igien，det fom Gprer תriftus til．

Men lobedhenfigten med denne indberetning er iffe at fifinde， men at opnuuntre．〇og bet er §erten马 egen mande at gipre det paa． $\mathfrak{D a}$ du tombget mig，giorde $\mathfrak{D u}$ mig for，figer falmiften． $\mathfrak{D g}$ er iffe bet enthber friften马 erfaring？ $\mathfrak{D a}$ jeg blev til intet，forft ba Gleo bin tande ftor for mig．Da jeg bleb tiffamme，forft ba bleb Sxifuts mint entefe ros．
$\mathfrak{B i}$ bed meget bel，©fud ffe low，at ber er frembeles iffe faa ibland os der effer ©ito og lanz tirfe；iffe faa ber ofter af deres Getrobde gode til yans mandige namis are og onveforbte jiales frelfe；iffie faa der erfijuter og effer fandlicien，og er overbevijt om at Detes ficere famfund har en guogiven opgave．Men er bet tilfacto med os alle？氏r jeg en af dem？Matte bi yomoge os
mber (andos belbige bant for at ban matte ophate os i jur tis! §oud arbeibet forejten angaar bar bi iffe meget at bevette. $\mathfrak{B i}$ bar bolst fem regelmuesige mpoct, og et "entergency" mode fiden fibite fonodembe. Seme eders fomite har artid banfelige ting fore, opgaber ber frober bisbom og ficerfighed herabenfor, og fomi= teen beder derfor om farodens forbomer.

Si beber pgiaa om rand og fritif, thi bet er eders arbeide $i$ Serren. Wi har lagt bind paa at bare fan foarionmelig fom mulig og forforlig-og ber low beret betybelig bejparelje-eflers babde fosjercrens rapport bift ent farte mberbalance. Wen ben ende.ige Genfigt bermed-og Det bar bi aldorig tabe affunc-er iffe at bi fal gipre faa libet jon bel muligt, men at bi fal bli itandiat til at gi og gipre far meget mere par atbre og mbe marfer.

Dreme ab troenz ghowe, og fiexlighedens itb, og banbete fiterne, ber vinfer os mode, maa bi, bil bi, ftebje fremad og opos. "Maar
 fin tio faafrent bi iffe trettes" (Gal. 6, 9).

Faa intremigionsfomitema begne, Э゙uftin N. Betcrieu.

## Report of the Mission Committee for the Pacific Coast of the Norwegian Synod.

The Mission Committee had several meetings during the year. Pursuant to decisions made at these meetings, different fields have been investigated, and some work begun and carried on. For several reasons-and not the least of these the tense situation in our Parkland congregation, brought about throngh agitation on the part of several prominent members of the congregation against the institution's principles and practices of the Synodwork has been seriously hampered.

The Board feels that the work must be carried forward, praying and hoping that in the near future conditions in Parkland will change for the better so that the pastor will have more time and the unhampered support of the whole congregation.

Services have been held in several places. First: At Louis Lake, sitnated across the Bay thirty miles from Parkland. Here services have been held regularly once a month with an attenclance from fifteen to twenty at each service. Collections have defrayed the expenses. A confirmation class has been started. The main obstacle in the way of success is the long distance from Parkland. Second: At Orillia, near Seattle. A Sunday school has been in progress during the year with an enrollment of about thirty-five pupils, and a fair average attendance. This Sunday school is conducted in the former Synod church, now abandoned by the Norwegian Lutheran Church in America, but evidently still in its possession. Third: Services were regularly held during the year at the Danish OId People's Home near Seattle. Here Robert Johnson resided during the last year of his life. He passed away in April. Since his death no services have been held there. Four: Services and work has been regularly done at the County Hospital. Services are held in four large wards every Tuesday. One lady seventy years old was recently baptized, four old ladies instructed for communion. Fifty services were conducted, and numerous bedside devotions were conducted.

While it is a very fruitful field, none of them are able to give any financial assistance. The Committee asks and recommends that the subsidy of twenty-five dollars a month to Parkland Congregation continue as before.
M. F. Mommsen, President.
E. B. Ellingson, Secretary.

## Report of Christian Day School Board.

The Committee on Christian Day Schools rejoices in that God our Father for Jesus sake has this year also kept His guarding hand over our dear day schools. Last fall your committee considered the requests for help from five of our 12 schools. The Synod treasurer's report will show what sums have been granted We do, however, wish to acknowledge the many contributions to the School Fund. While the money received this fiscal year is about 15 per cent less than that received last year, and while lowered subsidies have worked not a little hardship to individual schools, we cannot but marvel at the grace which we behold in the maintenance of our "menighedskoler."

Above all, we wish to make mention of the prayers of faithful shepherds, of the noble consecration of our teachers, and of the faithfulness of God-fearing parents, as being, under God, worthy examples to follow when we pray that we may all help in the most difficult work of preserving our schools.

We cannot refrain from expressing our happiness in seeing. the children of the faculty and of other families in Mankato make use of the Wisconsin Synod school. This example of those in the city "built on a hill" is worth much.

May the Lord of the Church not only keep the schools we already have, but also piant new schools. May our right use of the Gospel prepare the ground in all our congregations.

The Saturday afternoon session of our Synod meeting will again be set aside for mutual exhortation to further our schoot cause, and Rev. H. Ingebritson, a faithful friend of day schools, will be the essayist.
O. A. Smedal, Secretary.
A. M. Harstad.
P. Ylvisaker.

## Indberetning fra fomiteen for negermisfionen.

Synobarfonferenifen fonte for negernisfinten ar belt ito fos miteer, den liele fontite fom mpoer to gange ont aaret (hofit og baar), og $\mathfrak{l o f a l f o m i t e e n ~} \mathfrak{i}$ St. Routiz, fonn moder lyoer mamed.

Den torfe fonodes fonte Yor bibantet to regulare moder og
〔ijing 5oule, st. Routis.

Baftor ©. F. Wrewes, fom i mange aar yar baret efsefutivjefre= ter for hegermigitoten, bobe ibanr; og paitor $\mathcal{B}$. $\mathfrak{A}$. Bieler, St. Rouis, et mongeanigt meblem af fonteen, ev netop balgt jont yans eftermatio. Forlaobentlig antager han foldet.
 Glit entor fog, og frugterne er fore. Suteresjen for bemte mispion er for i vore foteritnober og botier aar efter aar. Mridler font= mer ind og forualtes med forite forjigtighed og troffab.

Bi $i$ bell norjfe futwe bar iffe giort fort for demte bor mis fion, but fader bar afobde formand S. St. Breus. Is be forfte aat af ben gienteifte finode bar ber iffeliben huteresie for neger= misitionen; bi fatte jom bort mand at janle $\$ 1,000.00$ aarlig jom wort bibug. Der fon moffa bra bidrag; men wi naacde albrits manket.
$\mathfrak{F}$ de jentere aar far wi havt bomberne ja futbe af andre gixte= mant at ber iffe har botet gjort meget for negermisfionen. Sfixu fon ber ind $\$ 470.93$. Der fubl bispelig beret familet mere; og funodenz fontite habde alting forbis for en aggresfib fampague; men turde iffe iberfiotte den for iffe at fonme iveten for bore tre


Begermisfioneu butbe bisjelig betragtes fom wor vigtigite bed. ningemisions: Bi Gør opnuntre bueramore til forre interesje og flere Gidrag til ben $\mathfrak{Z a b}$ as giøre $\mathfrak{b o r}$ bel, jom medtemmer af punodalfonferenjen.

Merbobigit, $\mathfrak{\Im}$, M. Moldjtad, fumite.

## Report of Church Extension Committee.

Since the last Synod meeting the Church Extension Committee has held two meetings, and in addition has taken care of various matters by correspondence. Three loans have been granted, as follows:
To Norseland Christian Day School................................. . $\$ 150.00$
To Holy Cross Church, Madison, Wis............................. . . 300.00
To Concordia Church, Eau Claire, Wis............................ 425.00
The Committee resolved to have a report concerning the Church Extension Fund printed in the Synodical Report for 1931. Following is the report up to May 1, 1931:

## LOANS-CHURCH EXTENSION FUND.

| Name. | Amount of Loan. | Amount Paid | Balance Due | Date |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Synod Congregation, Forest City, Iowa............ $\$$ | 1500.00 | \$1,356.00 | 14400 | 7-11-31 |
| Bethany Congregation, Story |  |  |  |  |
| City, Iowa | 300.00 | 160.00 | 140.00 | 8-19-31 |
| Scarville Congregation | 600.00 |  | 60000 | 12-1-31 |
| Our Savior's Congregation, Hayfield, Minn. | 500.00 |  | 500.00 | 4-18-27 |
| First Evanger Congregation, Fertile, Minn. | 1,000.00 | 888.45 | 111.55 | 11-21-'27 |
| Our Savior's Congregation, Princeton, Minn. | 500.00 | 63.46 | 436.54 | 8-30-28 |
| First Shell Rock Congregation, Northwood, Iowa... | 2,000 00 | 185.68 | 1,814.32 | 10- |
| Tjernagel, et al., Story City, Iowa. | 500.00 |  | 500.00 | 7-14-31 |
| Holy Cross Congregation, Madison, Wis. | 2,000.00 |  | 2,000.00 | 7-30-'31 |
| Mayville Congregation, No. Dakota | 2,000.00 | 1,500.00 | 500.00 | 12-3-31 |
| Emmaus Congregation, Minneapolis, Minn. | 1,200.00 |  | 1200.00 | 2-29-33 |
| Somber Congregation | 1,000 00 | 160.00 | 840.00 | 12-24-'33 |
| Our Savior's. Congregation, Belview, Minn. | 1,000.00 |  | 1,000.00 | 6-4-'34 |
| Concordia Congregation, Ean Claire, Wis. | 1,000.00 |  | 1,000.00 | 10- |
| Rev. O. M. Gullerud, Norseland Day School ......... | 150.00 |  | 150.00 | -26 |
| Holy Cross Congregation, Madison, Wis. | 300.00 |  | 300.00 | 12-15 |
| Concordia Congregation, Eatı Claire, Wis. | 425.00 |  | 425.00 | 8-5 |
|  | 5,975 00 | \$4,313.59 | 1,661.41 |  |

## Report from Dr. Martin Luther College, New Ulm, Minnesota.

The 1930-31 school year began September 3, 1930, and closed June 12, 1931.

The enrollment of the past year was somewhat less than it has been for a number of years. Two hundred students were enrolled. Of these 113 were boys and 87 girls. The Normal students numbered 70, while the high school had 130.

Three Norwegian students were at Dr. Martin Luther College this year. One belonged to the twelfth grade and two to the ninth grade. There were none preparing for the teaching profession. Two pursued a classical course; the other enrolled for a general education course.

On March 26th occurred the death of Professor M. J. Wagner. In him the church and the school has lost a tireless and faithful worker, and in his death we have suffered a loss that is keenly felt by all who came in personal contact with him.

Professor E. H. Sauer has been appointed to fill the vacancy caused by Professor Wagner's death, namely that of inspector of the boys' dormitory.

Respectfully, Oscar Levorson.

## Report on Koren's Books.

(Koren's Samlede Skrifter)
To the Norwegian Synod of the Anerican Evangelical Lutheran Church, in Convention assembled, June 18-24, 1931.

## Gentlemen:

Under date of April 5th, 1929, the undersigned was advised by Rev. H. M. Tjernagel that the remainder of Koren's Samlede Skrifter had been purchased and had been ordered sent to Bethany Lutheran College for storage and saie, and it was arranged to handle them in connection with the book store operated by the college. The account, however, has been kept entirely distinct and separate from the book store accounts and a separate account under the name of "Koren's Books, E. J. Onstad," was opened at the American State Bank of Mankato, Minn. Rev. Tjernagel agreed that the Synod should be advised of the present status of this matter, as it was undertaken for and in behalf of the Synod and its congregations; that a report would be in order at this Synod meeting.

Approximately 500 complete sets of four volumes were checked as the books arrived, besides a number of single volumes and quite a lot of miscellaneous books. Quite a number of volumes are stitched but have no covers, but so far there has been no need of completing the binding as the demand has not been sufficient to exhaust the supply of bound volumes.

Following is the statement of the account:


The statement submitted by Rev. Tjernagel shows additional receipts remitted to him direct amounting to $\$ 29.45$, which, together with the $\$ 220.00$ remitted by the undersigued as per above statement, has been applied on the purchase price, $\$ 249.45$, leaving an unpaid balance of the original purchase price of 55 c , which is more than covered by the cash balance of $\$ 1.87$ and outstanding accounts, \$7.33.

Respectfully subnitted.
Dated June 20, 1931.
E. J. Onstad.

I, Wilford Huso, have audited and checked E. J. O.'s books and found them to be correct.

June 20, 1931.
Wilford Huso.

## Report of Offering, Sunday, June 21, 1931.

To the Norvergian Synod of the Anerican Evangelical Lutheran Church in Convention assembled, June 18-24, 1931.

## Gentlemen:

We, the undersigned committee, appointed by the President of the Synod to take charge of the offering on Sunday, June 21, 1931, hereby report that we have tabulated the amounts by the charges of the various pastors as nearly as possible without specifying the particular congregation. The result is as follows:
Charge. Amount
Rev. A. Harstad ..... \$ 172.75
" N. A. Madson ..... 91.32
" H. A. Preus ..... 30.50
" G. P. Nesseth ..... 21.80
" J. A. Moldstad ..... 63.10
, E. Ylvisaker ..... 19.25
" G. A. Gullixson ..... 68.95
" S. E. Lee ..... 10.63
" C. A. Moldstad ..... 36.50
" S. Saude ..... 47.50
" A. J. Torgerson ..... 47.35

- Chr. Anderson ..... 107.25
" J. R. Runholt ..... 27.45
" E. W. Brewer ..... 27.45
" A. Strand ..... 17.15
" C. J. Quill ..... 122.35
" H. Ingebritson ..... 4.50
" L. S. Guttebo ..... 62.40
" E. Hansen ..... 1300
" G. O. Lillegard ..... 103.77
" J. A. Petersen ..... 65.80
" J. B. Unseth ..... 99.25
" S. C. Ylvisaker ..... 55.65
- C. N. Peterson ..... 8.00
" Paul Ylvisaker ..... 6.00
" M. O. Dale ..... 83.08" H. M. Tjernagel:
Saude Congregation ..... 106.25
Jerico Congregation ..... 207.60
O. M. Gullerud ..... 25.75
G. Guldberg ..... 31.75
Marian Jorgenson, Wisdom, Mont. ..... 10.00
Miscellaneous envelopes without names of pastor ..... 3.80
Loose change ..... 93.47

Mr. Odegard of Madison's charge was obliged to leave before the count was completed, hence he has not signed this report.

Respectfully submitted.
A. J. Torgerson.

Odegard.
June 22, 1931.
E. J. Onstad.

## Treasurer's Report, 1931.

## HOME MISSION.

|  | Dr. | Cr . |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Balance May 1, 1930. |  | \$ 545.32 |
| Contributions |  | 7,417.09 |
| Interest |  | 40.00 |
| Our Savior's, Albert Lea, Miun. | \$ 233.40 |  |
| Sutton's Bay, Mich. ............. | 360.00 |  |
| Simcoe, N., D. .... | 100.00 |  |
| Our Savior's, Amherst Junction, Wis. | 525.00 |  |
| Holton, Mich. ...................... | 224.90 |  |
| St. Luke's Chicago | 516.50 |  |
| Emmaus, Minneapolis, Minn. | 1,095.20 |  |
| Church of Holy Cross, Madison, Wis. | 1,652.66 |  |
| Concordia, Eau Claire, Wis. | 432.42 |  |
| First Evanger, Fertile, Minn. | 330.00 |  |
| Rev. J. R. Runholt | 816.00 |  |
| " A. H. Strand | 600.00 |  |
| " M. F. Mommsen | 300.00 |  |
| " H. A. Theiste | 633.25 |  |
| ", Elmer Brewer | 100.20 |  |
| " John Hendricks | 50.00 |  |
| " M. O. Dale | 250.00 |  |
| * Cyrus Kirkpatrick | 73.88 |  |
| Expenses | 90.47 |  |
| Deficit May 4, 1931 |  | 381.47 |
|  | \$8,383.88 | \$8,383.88 |
| SYNOD FUND. |  |  |
| Interest | . \$2,988.27 |  |
| Stationery, Postage, etc. | 53.64 |  |
| R. R. Sec. | 10.00 |  |
| Labor and Supplies, Financial Records. | 45.85 |  |
| Lutheran Synod Book Co. | 3.50 |  |
| Telephone | 1.30 |  |
| Moving Expenses, Dr. S. C. Ylvisaker. | 225.00 |  |
| Moving Expenses, Rev. J. E. Thoen.. | 100.00 |  |
| Printing | 13.32 |  |
| Tidende and Sentinel | 714.59 |  |
| Expenses | 531.62 |  |
| Mrs. Louise Hanson Estate | 404.45 |  |
| Jorgen Thorson Estate |  | 60064 |
| Balance May 1, 1930.. |  | 2,624 89 |
| Loan |  | 600.00 |
| Interest |  | 19.41 |
| Contributions |  | 2,877.58 |
| Balance May 4, 1931 | 1,630.98 |  |
|  | \$6,722.52 | \$6,722.52 |

## TEACHERS' SALARY.




|  | Dr. |  | Cr . |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Balance May 1, 1930Contributions. |  |  | \$ | 3.00 |
|  |  |  |  | 70.00 |
| E. Seuel, Treasurer | \$ | 73.00 |  |  |
|  | \$ | 73.00 | \$ | 73.00 |
| INDIA MISSION. |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Dr. |  | Cr. |
| Balance May 1, 1930 |  |  | \$ | 2.00 |
| Contributions. |  |  |  | 7000 |
| E Seuel, Treasurer | \$ | 14.00 |  |  |
|  | \$ | 14.00 | \$ | 1400 |

## INDIGENT PASTORS.

| Balance May 1, 1930 |  | \$ 255.00 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Balance May 1, 1931 | . 2255.00 |  |
|  | \$ 255.00 | \$ 255.00 |

## MR. AND MRS. JACOB LUNDE STUDENT FUND.



HANNA OTTESEN STUDENT LOAN FUND.


## HANS BLEKEN.



HOME FINDING INSTITUTIONS.

|  |  | Dr. |  | 29.68 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Contributions |  |  | \$ |  |
| Wisconsin Society, Wauwatosa, Wis. | \$ | 19.68 |  |  |
| Home Finding Society, Fort Dodge, |  | 10.00 |  |  |
|  | \$ | 29.68 |  | 29.68 |

## DEAF MUTE INSTITUTE.

|  |  | Dr. |  | Cr. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Contributions |  |  | \$ | 4550 |
| Deaf Mute Institute, Detroit, Mich. | \$ | 4550 | 45 |  |
|  | \$ | 45.50 | \$ | 45.50 |

## REV. G. GULBERG.



## TIDENDE AND SENTINEL.

Dr.
Cr.

| Balance May 1, 1930 |  | \$ 32.71 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rev. H. A. Preus, Manager. |  | 1,729.47 |
| Synod Fund |  | 714.59 |
| Printing and Expenses | .\$1,978.02 |  |
| Editor | 500.10 |  |
| Deficit |  | 1.35 |
|  | \$2,478.12 | \$2,478.12 |

Minneapolis, Minn., June $14,1931$.
We, the undersigned auditors, have checked the books and cash of the Norwegian Synod of the American Evangelical Lut theran Church, A. J. Torgerson, Treastirer, from May 1, 1930, to May $4,-1931$, and have found them to be correct.
M. R. Handberg.
G. Hendricks.

## Zlrbeidsfomiteer ved modet.

 reprejentant $\mathfrak{\Omega}$. $\mathfrak{z}$. Masjen fra $\mathfrak{B r i n t}$ eton, Mimatiota.
 Samian og reprefentant E. M. ©bmarỉ fra Madion, Miscontin.

Wrogramfonite: ふaitoreme $\mathfrak{N}$. $\mathfrak{F}$. $\mathfrak{Z o r g e r i m n , ~ \subseteq . ~ S a n i e ~ o g ~}$ (C. M. Molditab.





 worjon, 丞. (G). Slopter, Mir. (Beorge.

 Perneje.
 saritas, §. N. Molditas; reprajentanterne futon Dljon, Wartin D. Tueden.

 jon, Samb Sande.


 Sete Elingion, Wan Zorgerjon.


 $\mathfrak{o g}$ delegat $\mathfrak{y c n i y} \mathfrak{K}$. Waniou.

Wreftefufereuicrutz protofulfer: Wajturerne ©. R. Weterjout,
 itab.

Zil ligelig beling melfen preiterne af reifenbgifter: タaitor M. D: Dale.

Mejolutivner: Waitor $\mathfrak{\Im}$. Broffan.
Chnplait: Fsaftor ©f. W. Gulfition.


## komiteen for den indre misfion.

 til junoden. We pager jout har beret nownt waretages bedit af den itatende fomite. Si bil bog gentede fanobens opmerfiontige pata frogenoe tre panfter:

1. Tiltrobs for on at fremgatgen $\mathfrak{i}$ bet yore iffe bat bift fig jaa jor, er bet opmutrende at merfe ben wer jom nobijes intion fanfminet for Gubs ords jute lare i menighener, foler og bjem, og for deat friftelige tugt huad baabe leere og liv angaat. Served bil famfindet bed anbs name fiybe en fiffer og fifon befit og ongtiggjores til at belitgneljesrigt virfe i Gubs firfe.
2. Soften berre bax gibet os arbeibere tir fin byt. Wet er at Gabe at indremtsfonsfajien fuat bil were $i$ en fandan tilitand at bet vil bere mulig at jende bent tio pan miajionsmarfen.
3. Soad bibrag tir beme grat ai bort fantinto arbeibe ant gant foa er det en opmutring at fe ben trofajthed jom nuange af vore nentighober ubbifer, og bi taffer (sub becfor. Bi beder Gub at han vil opholoe og fremme bland 0 b ben rette ficerighed til ebangeliat, loboraf ogiaa ben fiarlighedens frugt ubflyder at de uøducubige bibrag goes.
4. Sy aritad, ịefretcer.

शf formandens indberetning fon bleo benvif til obemtebnte fontite:

1. "Fremgang $i$ bet tore paa entel fteder er gob, paa andre fteder ar ber tilbagegaty, ittedens de flefte fteder bifer itilitanio yoad beff i medremental angoar.

Mei heninn tix ben indre befft har bi ©ubs lofter at holde os til. Saalonge bort arbetoc beituar i at fortinde Gubs ord purt og rent og forbalte foframenteme efter §errens inditiftelje, og alt gixaes efter ben orben dy paa deat mande batt jelo bar beftemt, bat bi honz lofter. SMevegne boor dette fer bil levende ftene fxie til


Det er et opnumitrende tegn paa indre befit og junt liv at firfetugt mere og mere pues. şbue fonder $i$ lere og liv faar goo $i$ joang i en menighed give atarag til at ©hes navit beipottes iblanot be $\mathfrak{H d e n f o r i t a n e n d e ~ i f t e d e n t o r ~ a t ~ b r i n g e ~ b e m ~ t i l ~ a t ~ e r e ~ v o e ~}$ fader jont er $\mathfrak{i}$ Gimlene."

 fynoden."
๔. צ. ฏ.

## Committee on Christian Day School.

1. The Synod thanks God for grace bestowed upon the work of our Christian Day Schools, that He has sustained them against the attacks of the evil one, and permitted the work to be carried on without interruption.
2. The Synod also thanks God for the progress which has been made during the past year. A few families within the Nicolet Congregation have purchased a building for their school and have taken steps to establish it more firmly.

Action taken by the members of the Bethany Congregation, Mankato, for the instruction of their children in the Wisconsin Synod School is also praiseworthy.

The committee would urge that other congregations of the Synod, which are able to make similar arrangements, follow the example of the Bethany congregation.
3. We would urge pastors and congregations to do all they possibly can to induce talented and Christian-minded young peopls to prepare themselves for work in our Parochial schools at institutions within the Synodical Conference, where they may receive the necessary training for this work. We would urge particularly that young men be encouraged to prepare themselves for this work, since we feel that we need especially male teachers in our schools.
4. May God give us the implicit faith of Abraham, that we also in this work cling unwaveringly to the promises of His divine Word, being spurred on in the knowledge that He will not fail us when He says: "Train up a child in the way he should go: and when he is old, he will not depart from it" (Prov. 22:6). May this work of promise encourage us to greater efforts, in spite of opposition, to build more schools upon the only foundation, and may pastors, teachers, and lay-people consecrate themselves anew to the cause of training our youth not only for time but for eternity.
5. The Synod would also recommend to the congregations that they continue to give the collections taken at our Christmas programs to the Christian Day School treasury. And let us not with this forget our schools and their work, but remember them in our prayers and with our gifts throughout the year.

Prof. W. E. Buszin, President.<br>Rev. J. R. Runiolit, Secretary.<br>Leroy Hoff.<br>J. Espeland.

## Komiteen for hedninge og negermisfionen．

1．Snnoden befutter at fasifereren bar enfogie moder nabu af negermisfionen，og én fasfe under nabn af hedntingenisfonziasfen．

2．Synoben befutter at alle penge til diaje fasjer，fom henbift efler beftemt af giverne elfer misjinn马foniteent，jenðe马 foartalsuis til be refpeftibe utisfioners fasjerere．

3．Regernisfionen（ $\mathfrak{Z l h e}$ ©olored $\mathfrak{M i z f i d n}$ ）er fwnodens celofte Gednitgemizion og bor vel anjees fom den bigtigite og normeite． Den har beftanet t mere end femti aar og bar baaret rige frugter． §ficer i de jenere an har arbeibet gaaet hurtig frem．SMerebe for mange aar jibeu fatte fynoden fig det maal at fanle mindit et tujen bolare arrlig til dente misfion．Sidfte aar fom der ind \＄470．93． Synoden opmuntrer fine medlemmer til at ifutiomme deme mizs fion $\mathfrak{i}$ fine bonner og med fine rigelige bidrag．
 briber misition ibland bette land sidianere．Synoden Henleder finte meslemuters opnterfomhed paa bizje misjioner og opnututret til at ftotte jamme．

5．Det er med bedrovelfe bi hører hoilfe fmaa bidrag itarets lob er boet til heoninge＝，fitua＝og indiantermizitonen．§nteresjen for Gebningemiefionten $\mathfrak{i}$ fremmede lande fantes at bare meget liden
 lydighed mod srifti mizfionsbefaling．

6．§ §ndien har Miajourifinoden i lang tio haft ent blom＝ itrende misfion．（5t ab bore medlemmer far mu flere aar bitfet i Denne mizjibn．Synoden anbefaler ogjaa bente mizfion og op＝ muntrer til forbon og bibrag．

7．Raber os ogjaa bede for be ftaffels finefere frelfe．Maatte $\mathfrak{g}$ erren oplyje findene og oplade bjecterne for at nabneftriden（＂the term queftion＂）i fitamisfionen inart maa bilcegges．

8． $\mathfrak{B e f l u t t e t , ~ a t ~ f o n o d e n 马 ~ f o r m a n d ~ h e n f t i l u e r ~ t i l ~ M i s j o u r i = ~}$ fonodens misfionsbeftrelfe at jembe to ab fine medlemmer til bor paftoraffonferens $\mathfrak{i}$ fommer for at forbandle med os om＂the term queftion＂．

Thbert Strand，formand．
s． $\mathfrak{N}$ ．Molditad，jefretcer．
$\mathfrak{A n t o n}$ Difon．
Martind $\mathfrak{x}$ eden．

## Committee on Higher Education.

1. The Synod thanks God for the blessings He has conferred upon us through our Bethany College, and the institutions of our sister Synods whose doors have been open for our young people.
2. To the friends of Bethany in Mankato and to the Minnesota District of the National Lutheran Educational Association, who so splendidly have supported Bethany with their gifts, the Synod expresses its sincere thanks.
3. The Synod recommends that the Board of Regents extend calls to Dr. S. C. Ylvisaker, Rev. Walter Buszin, and Prof. A. J. Natvig as permanent teachers at Bethany Lutheran College.
4. The Synod heartily approves of the work which has been carried out by the Bethany choir under the able leadership of Prof. Walter E. Buszin.
5. The Synod authorizes the Board of Regents, together with the Finance Committee, to install stokers in the boiler room, in case they shall find that it is consistent with true economy.
6. While the Synod appreciates the interest shown our school by the young men who have petitioned for the introduction of a theological course at Bethany, it does not find that it is possible to do anything along this line at the present time. Let it be the prayer of every Synod member that God may so bless our church body that it may prosper and grow to such an extent that it will become expedient to begin seminary work.

Nels Spangelo, Chairnan.
O. M. Gullerud, Secretary.

In regard to the matter of Paragraph 6, the Synod resolved that a committee of three be appointed by the President to prepare the matter and present same to the Pastoral Conference for consideration.

## Committee on Church Extension.

1. The Committee thanks God for the contributions which the Church Extension Fund has received in the past year from the congregations as well as from individuals, and pray that donations to this important fund may continue. We also wish to remind the various congregations of the Synod to follow, if possible, the established rule of having a special offering for this cause on the 9th Sunday after Trinity.
2. The Committee recommends that the report of the standing committee be printed in the "Synodal-Beretning" for 1931.
3. We recommend that the standing committee see to it that proper papers or notes are secured for all outstanding loans.

Ben Torgerson, President. Nels Ellingson.
Stephen Sande.
E. Ylvisarer, Secretary.

## Committee on Publications.

The committee recommends that Synod adopt the following resolutions:

1. Synod thanks Rev. J. Hendricks for his efficient work on the 1931 Folkekalender.
2. Synod urges that every pastor and all members of Synod show their loyalty to our Church by ordering all book supplies from our own Book Company, even though it may mean some delay or small additional expense.
3. The Synod urges its pastors and congregations to continue working to put our church papers into every home of our Synod.
4. Synod authorizes its Standing Publications Committee to mestigate the offer of a printing plant at Hartland, Minn., and to purchase it for the Synod's future use if the committee finds it advisable and can make the necessary financial arrangements.
5. Synod urges its members to remember in their prayers the work of our committee on publications, and asks the blessing of the Lord on the work, so that we may be enabled to make full use of the mission opportunities open to us through our publications.

J. A. Peterson, Chairman.<br>Geo. O. Lillegard, Secretary.<br>H. Larsen.<br>Adolph Pederson.

Committee.

## Komiteindstillinger.

## Committee on Money Matters.

1. The Synod commends the standing committee on money matters particularly for its work of publishing the needs of the Teachers' and Synod Funds, and this committee is urged to continue this educational work.
2. The Synod urges the Board of Regents and faculty of Bethany to do everything in their power to reduce the operating expense without curtailing the efficiency of the school.
3. The Synod appeals to all its pastors and the representatives of the convention to use every opportunity to inform their respective congregations of the needs of our treasuries and to use every effort to establish an effective system for collections.
4. As a larger attendance of students at Bethany will not only be a blessing to greater numbers but will bring greater income without much added expense, we urge our members to try earnestly to secure new students for the school.
5. The Synod urgently asks the pastors and representatives to secure loans at the lowest rate obtainable to cover deficits of former years.
6. The Synod recommends the continuance of the meetings of the Committee of Committees and that there also all efforts be made to reduce the budget.
7. The Synod acknowledges with appreciation a larger amount of gifts in natura and urges a more systematic collection of these gifts for this and succeeding years.
8. The Synod recommends that the Synod treasurer for the time being makes use of the vault at Bethany College and of his local bank.
9. We are grateful to God for blessing our offering on Synod Sunday and we ask our finance committee to arrange with our congregations for a similar offering next year.
10. The Synod thanks individuals and organizations who also this year have done so much to improve and beatutify our building and grounds.
11. The Synod acknowledges with sincere appreciation the energetic efforts of Prof. E. J. Onstad on behalf of Bethany College.

> Paul Ylvisaker, Secretary.

Paragraph 11 was adopted by a unanimous rising vote of thanks.

Af formandens indberetning, som blev henvist til ovennævnte komite:

Ptunkt 8. "Dette aars driftsomkostning, sammenlignet med indtægt viser en ikke ubetydelig underbalance. Forholdsregler bør tages og iagttages saa at gjæeld ikke lægges til gjæld. Uden saadanne forholdsregler vil det gaa samfundet saavelsom individer ilde."

Punkt 9. "Samfundet bør vide og betanke at det ikke har brandfrit skab for sin kasserers regnskabsbøger, samt for værdpapirer og kontanter som, for længere eller kortere tid, maa bero paa hans kontor."
C. J. Q.

## Committee on Miscellaneous Matters.

The Committee on Miscellaneous matters suggests that in the case of Rev. Guldberg $\$ 100$ or $\$ 200$, as needed, be taken from the Indigent Pastors' fund and used to assist him in his present financial difficulty.

Heikry H. Hanson, Secretary. Rev. A. Strand. Rev. H. Ingebrittson.

## Prestekonferensernes protokoller.

Komiteen organiserede sig ved at vælge past. C. N. Peterson til formand og past. Einar Anderson til sekretær.

Komiteen har læst protokollerne for følgende konferenser: Den Almindelige Prestekonferens, Søndre Minnesota og Iowa,
samt Nordvestlige Minnesota Specialkonferens. Ingen protokol blev bragt fra Chicago-Madison Konferensen.

Komiteen finder at meget arbeide har været udført, men funder intet særskilt at indberette til den ærværdige Synode.

Einar Andirrson, sekr.

## Committee on Foreign Missions.

The Committee would refer the Synod to the report brought last year for the explanation of our continued apparent inactivity in foreign mission work. The discussions on the so-called Term Question in China have continued in the Committee of Four (Dr. Fuerbringer, Rev. K. Kretzschmar, Rev. Boerger, Dr. Ylvissaker), but with no real success. We expect that the question will be brought to the renewed attention of the Missouri Synod at its next triennial convention to be held at Milwaukee in 1932, and we can only hope and pray that a God-pleasing solution of our difficulty may then be found. Our committee has in the meantime authorized the temporary use of money on hand in the foreign mission treasury toward the printing of certain material which was of importance in the present discussion.

> H. A. Preus.
> Joh. Peterson.
> Adex. Stephens.
> S. C. Ylvisaier.

## Den Norske Synodes Embedsmænd.

Formand, H. M. Tjernagel; viceformand, O. M. Gullerud; sekretær, C. J. Quill ; suppleant, C. A. Moldstad; kasserer, A. J. Torgerson; suppleant, Einar Tyssen; revisorer, M. R. Handberg, C. A. Moldstad.

Board of Trustees for Synoden: G. A. Gullixson (3 aar, valgt 1929 ) ; P. B. Tjernagel, Story City, Iowa, J. E. Thoen, (3 aar, valgt 1930) ; E. N. Edwards, 224 East Main St., Madison, Wis., (2 aar, valgt 1930) ; T. S. Brustad, Scarville, Iowa, G. E. Bruns-vold, Somber, Iowa, (3 aar, valgt 1931).

Board of Regents for Bethany Lutheran College: Dr. S. C. Ylvisaker, K. T. Dahlen, 2419 Taylor St. N. E., Minneapolis, Minn., (4 aar, valgt 1929) ; Past. G. A. Gullixson, J. A. Moldstad, (3 aar, valgt 1929) ; J. A. Johnson, St. Peter, Minn., (4 aar, valgt 1930) ; G. G. Vaala, Saude, Iowa, Past. A. J. Torgerson, (4 aar, valgt 1931) ; Past. S. Sande, (3 aar, valgt 1931) ; Past. Chr. Anderson, (2 aar, valgt 1931).

President for Bethany Lutheran College: Dr. S. C. Ylvisaker.
Redaktør for "Luthersk Tidende" og "Lutheran Sentinel": Pastor J. E. Thoen.

Forretningsfører for "Tidende' og "Sentinel": Pastor H. A. Preus; assistant, Pastor S. E. Lee.

Jernbanesekretarer: Pastorene Chr. Anderson, G. A. Gullixson.

Stanende Komiteer.
Finanskomite: Pastor Chr. Anderson, M. Teigen, Princeton, Minn., (2 aar, valgt 1930) ; Pastor Jos. B. Unseth, Gustav Annexstad, St. Peter, Minn., (2 aar, valgt 1931).

Forlagskomite: Pastor H. A. Preus, O. B. Harstad, (2 aar, valgt 1930); Pastor C. A. Moldstad, Pastor John Hendricks, (2 aar, valgt 1931).

Komite for Indremissionen: Pastor L. S. Guttebø, Pastor E. Hansen, Nels Spangelo, Albert Lea, Minn., (2 aar, valgt 1930); Pastor J. A. Petersen, John J. Jordah1, Manchester, Minn., Pastor C. A. Moldstad, (2 aar, valgt 1931).

Sublkomite for Vesthysten: Pastor M. F. Mommsen, E. B. Ellingson, Parkland, Wash., E. H. Rygg, Parkland, Wash., (valgt 1931).

Komite for Hedningemissionen: Pastor H. A. Preus, John Peđerson, 2901 Milwaukee St., Madison, Wis., (2 aar, valgt 1930 ) : Dr. S. C. Ylvisaker, Alex. Stephens, Deerfield, Wis., R. 1, (2 adr, valgt 1931).

Komite for Church Extension: Pastor O. M. Gullerud, P. G. Kloster, Forest City, Iowa, (2 aar, valgt 1930) ; Pastor A. M. Harstad, Clirist Mellem, Glenville, Minn., (2 aar, valgt 1931).

Komite for Barmhljertighedsarbeide: Pastor E. Ylvisaker, N. J. Loberg, Nelsonville, Wis., (2 aar, valgt 1930) ; Pastor M. O. Dale, Melvin Madson, Manitowoc, Wis., (2 aar, valgt 1931).

Komite for Menighedsskoler: Pastor Paul Ylvisaker, John Førde, Emmons, Minn., ( 2 aar, valgt 1931) ; Pastor H. Ingebritson, O. A. Smedal, Albert Lea, Minn., (2 aar, valgt 1931).

Synodical Conference Hymn Book Committee: Rev. Chr. Anderson, Rev. N. A. Madson; subcommittee member, Prof. W. E. Buszin.

Reprasentant paa Synodalkonferensens komite for Negermissionen: Pastor J. A. Moldstad.

Delegater til Synodalkonferensen: H. A. Prens, Alvin Drotning, Cottage Grove, Wis., R. No. 1. Suppleanter: Pastorerne J. A. Moldstad, A. M. Harstad, G. A. Gullixson, Geo. O. Lillegard

## Greetings.

St. Louis, Missouri, June 16, 1931.
Norwegian Ev. Luth. Synod, Assembled in Convention at Bethany College, Mankato, Minn.

## Dear Brethren:

Grace be unto you and peace from God our Father and ourLord and Savior Jesus Christ! We, your brethren of the Western District of the Missouri Synod in convention assembled at Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, Missouri, send our greetings. May our gracious God and Savior bless you from on high and send to you a full measure of His Holy Ghost for your guidance in your deliberations, that all you do and resolve may redound to the glory of His Holy name and the welfare of our dear Lutheran Church.

With fraternal greetings,
The Western Districí Missouri Synod.
Per E. J. H. Duever.

Rev．H．M．Tjernagel， Bethany Lutheran College， Mankato，Minn．

## Dear Friend and Brother：

Please convey to the brethren meeting in convention of the Norwegian Synod my heartiest greetings and best wishes for a successful meeting．The work of your Synod is being followed with the most lively interest by thousands of our own people and we rejoice with you in your progress in numbers，but especi－ ally in your staunch adherence to orthodox Lutheranism．

Very fraternally yours， Theodore Graebner．

## Gjentilfener．

Baftor M．Fr．Wieje，Gambridge，Wis．
Sicure fader i Srifo！
Synoden Gar modtaget Deres benlige bǐjen．Det glooder oß neget at $\mathfrak{D e}$ fanlede，arindrex os og bor gierning under banffelige forbolde． $\mathfrak{D g}$ vi nedbeder ober $\mathfrak{D e m}$ bor himmelfe faders belfigntlfe til Deres tros bejtyrfelfe og bebarelfe paa det ftyffe libsuet jon endmt ftarar Den titbage at vandre paa．

Maatte $\mathfrak{D e}$ og bi alle engang opnaa maalet for bor tro，bore ficeles ebige frelfe！

Baa funodens begue， ふ． $\mathfrak{B l c} \mathfrak{f} \mathfrak{f} \mathfrak{n}, \mathfrak{r c f}$ ．font．

Pajtor 果， $\mathfrak{A}$ Widvet，Prairte Farn，Wis．
ふicere faber \＆Frifto！
Sbnoben hax med hjertelig taf og glade modtaget Dere马 venlige bizjen．Bor（6ud og fader，fra hoem＂al god gave og al fuldfonment gabe＂fommer，ffixnfe Dem frembeles alle be gaber og goder fom tiener til $\mathfrak{D e v e} \mathfrak{j}$ belfignelfe，ithrelfe og bebarelfe．Gan gibe Dem en god livsaften og foumbe os alle tiffut at famies it hans ebige faderfjem liftoppe！

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Waa fonodens begne, }
\end{aligned}
$$


תiare fader $\mathfrak{i} \mathfrak{\Re r i f t o}$ !
 Tem pan ignodemodet bed Wetfoni $\mathfrak{Z u t h e r a n}$ Corlege, i Manfato. Wi jender Dem vor biectelige gjentiffen og beder vor feetfez fader i finmelen frembeles at ffante $\mathfrak{D e m}$ alt goot til Deres gleode og velfignelje yer og giziet.

Sana innodens begue, き. Wlaffan, re! font.

®icere broder ; Serten!
Dem Rorife Ennoie forjamiet til fit aarige mode bed Bethany Sutheran Sollege, Mantato, Winm, taffer $\mathfrak{D e n r}$ for $\mathfrak{D e r e}$ bentige Gilijen og gode ønffer. Dent vil par jomme tio ubtale fin bjertefige Deltagelje med $\mathfrak{D e m} \mathfrak{t}$ anfenning $\mathfrak{D e r e}$ erflcering om at $\mathfrak{D e}$ thanget

 Yougt virfe $\mathfrak{i}$ fin \{tridentwe firfe bemtere. San give Dem frentele nambe til at holde uroffelig faịt paa de dyrebate fantifeder fou $\mathfrak{D c}$ $\mathfrak{i}$ fan mange aar har forfindt for Deres mentigheder, of iffoute Dem brade i det timelige og aandelige alt bet fom Gan ifin fiont light og bisbom finder tjenfigt for $\mathfrak{D}$ eres fande vei for tib on cuighed.

耳ata madens begnte


## In Memoriam.

MEMORIAL SERVICE IN HONOR OF DR. FRANZ PIEPER,
At the Convention of the Norbegian Synod, Saturday Morning, June 20, 1931.

Dr. Preper, A Great Christian Gentlenan.<br>Speech of Rev. John A. Moldstad.

In the early morning hours of Wednesday, June 3, 1931, there was transported into the realms of eternal glory the soul of a great Christian gentleman. Doctor Franz Pieper was received into the Father's house, where the many mansions be.

He was great in faith, great in love to God and men, great in God-given endowment, and great in the faithfulness of his stewardship, in glorifying God and heiping humanity. All that he was he was by that grace of God of which he was the divinely called champion and herald. He was a precious gift of God to His Church on earth.

My first meeting with Dr. Pieper dates back to the Jubilee Synod at Decorah in June, 1903. A few weeks later I became one of his students at Concordia Seminary and had the pleasure of participating in the festival service and social at which two seminaries conferred upon him the title Doctor of Divinity. And verily he was a doctor, a great and inspiring teacher of divine truth.

In the classroom, as elsewhere, he was the quiet, dignified gentleman, with a kindly smile playing on his lips and a humorous twinkle in his eye. There was gentleness and kindness even to those who did not deserve it-it was the charity which saw beyond the present. But, there was the fire of lightning in his eye and thunder in his voice when combating the false doctrines that maliciously encroach upon the grace of God and justification by faith alone.

It was his custom to dictate his lectures, in language that was clear and exact, in sentences well rounded but brief, making you feel that every word counted and that there was nothing superfluous. Afterwards he would discuss the subject, ask and answer questions, comment and explain. Some of the courses were given in Latin, and he seemed to relish the resulting discussion. The Bible texts we were expected to learn in the original language. His learning and ability, his manner and dignity, his kindliness and helpfulness inspired his students with such profound respect, love and good will that there was always order, quiet, and attention; and rarely was anyone absent.

It was my good fortune also to enjoy the hospitality of his home and to meet him there as the genial host. In those days of more than a quarter of a century ago Dr.Pieper was still a young man; and a very busy man he was; for he was not only president of Concordia Seminary, but also of the entire Missouri Synod. There was as yet but little division of labor, and his correspondence was enormous, and still, unless I am greatly mistaken, he
had no secretary but wrote his own letters with pen and ink. In spite of all this, he would come down and join us in the parlor and take part in whatever was done and said, as though he were a gentleman of leisure. He would quite regularly draw me away into some corner and would inquire with the greatest interest about things past, present, and future in the Norwegian Synod. He was exceedingly well informed on the affairs of our Synod.

During the past twenty-five years I have repeatedly been a guest at Dr. Pieper's home, the last time being on the occasion of the fiftieth anniversary of his ordination to the ministry. His interest in our success seemed to grow with the years; and the very fact that our Synod has become so small and so insignificant in the eyes of the world seemed to make it more dear to his heart. It was as the love of a father toward his child.

He watched with interest, with prayer, and with advice during the stormy days of tribulation in our Synod from 1912 to 1917. He with other brethren from the Synodical Conference came to be with our little minority at Hotel Aberdeen, St. Paul, during the closing days of the old Synod. Again and again he advised and urged: "Testify!" "Nothing else can be done, it is too late; but testify." "My sole interest is that you bear witness. Your testimony may not bear fruit for a hundred years, but it surely will bear fruit." "Obey the Holy Spirit, which is leading you. Testify now, while the Holy Spirit is upon you; for, if you do not, the Holy Spirit may leave you, and then you will not have the courage to testify." When he bade us farewell, he said: "I am satisfied; you have testified. The Lord bless you and keep you!"'

And now our Heavenly Father has taken him home. The crown of eternal life and the rest that remaineth to the people of God are his.

Throughout his long and busy life the Lord in His mercy preserved him and gave him the victory in every temptation and kept him faithful and steadfast unto death. He was a noble servant, a brave soldier of Jesus Christ. He contended earnestly for the faith which was once delivered unto the saints; and his shieId was without stain.

We thank God today for the gift of this great Christian gentleman, for his work, his testimony, and his example; for what he was to the Missouri Synod, to us, and to the whole church.

We pray God to bless his memory and his example for the Missouri Synod, for our Synod, for all of us. May we, too, follow in the footsteps of Christ Jesus, our Lord, and be kept faithful unto the glory of God and the salvation of many souls. Amen.

## Dr. Pieper, the Herald of Justification by Faith. Speech of Prof. Walter E. Bussin.

The cardinal doctrine of the Lutheran Church is that doctrine of Scripture which tells us that man is saved solely through the vicarious satisfaction of Jesus Christ. This salvation is offered us as a free gift by our gracious God and cannot be bought or merited even in part by sinful man. Take this doctrine away from the Christian religion and you have a religion that is vain and void.

One can hardly think of Dr. Franz Pieper without thinking of the chief doctrine of the Christian religion. It was my privilege to have my full course in dogmatics and also my course in pastoral theology with Dr. Pieper. When treating the various doctrines of the Christian religion, Dr. Pieper would always come back to the grace of God offered in the vicarious atonement of Jesus Christ. This doctrine was always treated as the core and center of all true Christian teachings. To man was never attributed any ability whatsoever to save himself. In practically every lecture did we hear: "Therefore we conclude that a man is justified by faith, without the deeds of the law." (Rom. 3:28). Especially when referring to the doctrinal errors of Lutheran Synods not affiliated with the Synodical Conference, Dr. Pieper would invariably quote the words: "There is no difference; for all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God, being justified freely by His grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus" (Rom. 3:22-24). In his lectures on pastoral theology this teaching was again always set forth as the foundation upon which all dealings of the pastor were to be based, and we were exhorted time and time again never to preach a sermon without preaching justification through Christ, bearing in mind that any sermon might be the last sermon heard by some mortal before. entering eternity. What was taught in the classroom was also
proclaimed by Dr. Pieper in his sermons and in his addresses before synodical conventions and conferences of various kinds.

It is claimed by unbelievers that preaching the vicarious atonement of Jesus Christ has no practical value; that it is ineffective, is dead doctrine. Dr. Pieper was a living proof to the contrary. Dr. Pieper was both a real character and a real personality. One always felt this when in his presence. The classes at the seminary were rather large at our time, each numbering a hundred or more students. It was never necessary for Dr. Pieper to call the class to attention; when he entered the classroom a sudden hush would come over us all. It was not necessary for him to remonstrate with many words; a glance usually sufficed. He never spoke about himself or about his accomplishments; it was always "Soli Deo Gloria" (To God alone be the glory). His own deep personal humility frequently put us students to shame, and his firm trust in the grace and mercy of God always encouraged us to emulate his splendid example. He was beloved by all; he was firm in character, strong in faith, humble in spirit, and submissive in the hands of God.

Dr. Pieper was not a self-made man; he was a man made by the Word of God. The Word of God regulated his whole conduct and life; in his thinking and speaking the Word of God served as the determining factor. I shall never forget his words when he said: "The pastor should be a walking Word of God." Dr. Pieper was a walking Word of God; he was a child of God inı the real sense of the word.

God has now taken Dr. Pieper from us. His works will, according to the promises of God, follow him. May he, even now, continue to serve as our teacher, as our example, and as our friend.

## Impressions of a Member of the Last Class of the Sainted Dr, Pieper.

> Speech of George Gullixson, Jr.

As a representative of the last class which the sainted Dr. Pieper taught, I have been asked to say a few words in regard to his last days and the impressions he left on those last disciples who were privileged to sit at his feet.

As for the man himself, it might be said he remained the same humble, devoted Christian as those who have worked under him for the past fifty-three years had known him. It was not our privilege in these latter years to have all our dogmatical training from him, but this privilege was reserved only for the graduates, a privilege which was looked forward to by all. In the same clear and lucid style which was peculiar to him, his work in conducting our classes went on regularly. We had covered the Scriptural doctrines concerning the Law and the Gospel, the necessity, the clarity, the Scripturalness of both, and their distinct purpose in the plan of God's salvation. The same smile hovered about his lips in the defense of Scripture against errorists that had played there for so long, and in his apologies the same wholesome humor bubbled forth as before, aroused, not by malice toward those in error, but by the particularly humorous situations which so, often arise as a consequence of departing from the pure water which flows from the fount of God's Word.

His lectures continued on through the means of grace, the Lord's Supper, and Baptism, and then, after one of the lectures, he announced that there would be none the following morning. Little did we realize that that was to be the last lecture which we were to hear from him. He was removed to the hospital over the week-end, to be operated on the following morning, and from the results of that operation we were to learn that that terrible disease, cancer, had been doing its damaging work. He rallied from the operation, however, and according to reports it was expected that he would be with us for some time. He resumed his work with his periodicals, having been granted the privilege of working as he felt able, and his farewell message to the world appeared in the last issue of the Concordia Theological MTonthly. A copy of this message, as it was reported, is to be mailed to every Lutheran pastor in America. For two weeks previous to his death he was confined to his bed, unable even to sign the diplomas for our class, the last of so many. His sincere desire to dismiss us was not granted him. Instead, we went to say farewell to him. On the morning of our Baccalaureate Day it pleased God to take him from us. Perhaps the most profound impression which he left on those who knew him was his own personal, childlike confidence in the will and plan of God through the vicarious atone-
ment of His Son Jesus Christ. Untarnished and unstained, unspoiled by the honor which the church had given him, gutided only by the Word of God, he was to be taken from us, surely a worthy bearer of the banner which had been handed down to him by that man of God, Dr. Walther. What the life of such a one would mean to us is inestimable, but, although he has been taken from us bodily, let us earnestly pray that by the grace of God his example will remain a guiding influence in the furtherance of God's Kingdom and more particularly in our own lives.

## - Mrs. Hans Gulbrandson and Family.

## Dear Friends:

The Norwegian Synod in annual convention assembled at Bethany Lutheran College, Mankato, Minn., has learned with profound sorrow of the recent departure of your husband and father.

We learned to know him as one of the staunchest supporters and friends of our church and what it stands for-unwavering faithfulness to the revealed Word of God.

By the departure from this life of Hans Gulbrandson, many of us who met him and learned to know him feel his demise as a great personal loss. Ever ready to help wherever he saw the need of assistance, his heart and purse were alike open to aid us in generous measures. We also found his counsels and advice worth consideration.

May God in His mercy comfort and solace you all in your great bereavement! May He call forth men and women with the same sincere purpose to follow in the steps of the Savior!

On behalf of the Norwegian Synod.
H. M. Tjernager, President.
C. J. Quili, Secretary.

## Discussion of the Christian Day School.

Brief report of the discussion of the Christian Day School at the Saturday afternoon session of the Synod meeting following Rev. H. Ingebritson's paper on the subject:

Rev.J. E. Thoen stressed the necessity of teaching the secular branches in connection with the teaching of religion.

Rev. H. M. Tjernagel emphasized the point that the Christian Day School is the best means by which one may acquire correct knowledge in secular branches. Only the Christian school is able to teach geography, history, biology, etc., correctly.

Rev. $N, A$. Madson: The state has the power of the sword, and can teach the children to do right only in order that they may escape the sword, or the punishment of the state. In the state schools the concept of life is wrong. The church has the power of the Gospel in its hands, and can teach the children to do right out of love to Christ. The child should have its whole training in the "light of the Gospel."

Rev. J. A. Petersen: The Christian Day School is not only a matter of life, but also a matter of death. Without it, there is danger of eternal death. If we obey God's command to train up a child in the way he should go, then we have the promise that when he is old he wrill not depart from it. Though one may stray away for a time, yet in old age, he may return to the right way.

Rev. O, M. Gullerud: God tells us to seek first His Kingdom and righteousness. The reason for the creation of all things and giving of children is that we may prepare for the heavenly Kingdom. In the secular school, training only for this world can be given.

Rev. P. Ylvisaker: Rev. Ylvisaker referred to Dr. F. Pieper as a man made by God's Word and said that in the Day School we have such as $F$. Pieper in m:niature.

# The Lutheran Synod Book Company. YEARLY STATEMENT AT THE CLOSE OF MAY, 1931. 

ASSETS.
Inventory for 1931 ..... \$1,523.18
Bills Receivable ..... 307.78
Balance in Mer. \& Mfrs. State Bank, (Ins1.) ..... 246.64
Gross Profit ..... 502.16
Funds in First National Bank (West Broadway) ..... 132.00
Funds on hand ..... 46
LIABILITIES.
Loans Partly Secured by Notes ..... \$1,200.00
Bills Payable for Printing. ..... 437.00
Bills Payable for Books ..... 411.81
For Mailing, Office Supplies, and Services ..... 631.09
Net Surplus ..... 32.41
The undersigned auditors have audited the books of the Lutheran Synod Book Co. and have found them to be correct.

## Diverfe．

## （3ntostienefterne．

 angelfe og norfe，føndag forntidoag．Den engelffe guistjentefe holote马 i firfeialen．ßafor Erlitg Ylbianter，Madifon，Wi弓．，pre＝ Sifont； $\mathfrak{D r}$ ．S．飞．Ylbizafer，liturgift；profesjor Ws．飞．Bufzin， organift．Den norffe gudstjenefte holdtes i gimnaftiflofalet．Saftor ミ．S．©uttebø，Cottage ©robe，Miz．，prodifant；paftor §． $\mathfrak{B}$ ． Unjeth，ふaterbille，Jowa，liturgift；Mije Dlga Rillegaro，organijt． Bed begge guostientiter optoges et tafioffer，＂（Sonvention offertig＂． Der indfom $\mathfrak{i}$ offer $\$ 1,785.12$ ．Senere indfom abffilfig mere．
（Bubstjenejte med altergang mandag aften．Waftor $\mathfrak{E}$ ．§anien


## Sepfontrate．

Mpoets regulare femioner bolstes fra 1.9 till 12 og fra 2.30 til 5 ．


 wed mødet弓＂（Ghaplain＂，©S．M．©uMtuion，med et fort foredrag over nogle bere，goce norgen，af 1 ßetri $\mathfrak{F r e b}$ ，fapitel 2.

Faitor $\mathfrak{\mathcal { S }} \mathfrak{R}$ ．Rumbolt beiprget afteumbagterne．Foruden ved paftor Funtholt bleb aftenandagten ledet bed paitorent $\mathfrak{s}$ ．N．Mold $=$ Ttad og © $\mathfrak{E}$ ．Lec．

## Resolutions．

Resolved，that the Board of Regents take the matter of per－ manent calls to be authorized by the Synod under advisement， and prepare same for next Synod convention．

Resolved，that the president＇s call of the meeting of Com－ mittee of Committees for Monday，July 27， 1 p．m．，be accepted．

Resolved，that the invitation from the Concordia Evangelical Lutheran Church of Eatu Claire，Wis．，Rev．E．Wulfsberg An－ derson，pastor，to hold the Synod＇s next annual convention in the Eatl Claire Congregation be accepted with thanks．

Resolved, that the president appoint one man in charge of publicity for the Eau Claire Synod convention, who shall cooperate with the local committee in giving our Synod meeting publicity in the local papers.

Resolved, that the Synod suggest to the Publication Board to consider the matter of having Rev. Lillegard's paper printed in pamphlet form.

Resolved, that Dr. Ylvisaker write an account as to the improvements made the past year at Bethany College for publication in our church papers.

Resolved, that the president appoint Dr. S. C. Ylvisaker to bring greetings to the meeting of the Minnesota District of the Missouri Synod, assembled in Concordia College, St. Paul. Also that he be requested to bring official greetings of our Synod to any other Synodical Conference Synod meeting he might attend.

Resolved, that the Synod express its appreciation to Rev. H. M. Tjernagel, Mr. George Natvig, and Prof. E. J. Onstad for securing the balance of the editions of Koren's Works for the Synod and for distributing this wonderful Christian literature among our people.

Resolved, that the Synod recommend that the secretary be instructed to address a letter to every congregation that is not represented, and has not been excused, and remind it of its duty to be represented at the annual Synod meeting.

Resolved, that Rev. J. E. Thoen and Rev. A. M. Harstad be requested to represent the Synod at the funeral of Hans Gulbrandson.

Resolved, that Rev. O. M. Gullerud represent the Synod at Knute 'Tyssen's funeral.

## Dpbiggedic og unberyotoniug.

 $\mathfrak{H} 4$.

Collegeforet, "Bethany af ©apella Choir," dirigeret af profes,
 fota, צowa, Wisconfin og צilinoiz, og om aftenen fanme bag gab fit ypperlige progran til Sbnodemodets opgnggelfe og tubertold= ning.

Goad foret har butbet ved fin vatue，velubtorte jang for bort Bethany og bort faminno er gloweligt og opnuntrende．

Smbong eftemibong holot Sinobent crjoral 1 nion fin foncert i colfegets fore forjanlitggial，jon blev folot til trengjel af be ntange fom fom fra fiernt og hær for at overvare fejtlighederne bed Shnodentøoet føndag．Brof．Bujain dirigerte，jant gaw en op＝ buggelig og larerig tale ont lutherfe firfemufit．Sgat flargiorbe hoorfor ben Yutherfe firfenujif med rette fon figes at boere uober＝ truffen．Derncit holot paftor §ohn Salbner fra Misfourtinnodens Dobltum nitifion i Minneapoliz en opboggelig tale om det arbeide joun der ubjores．

## Slutuing．

Effer nogle bemerfingger af formandent，hotalte innodempoet beb reibuing en hjectelig taf til ftedeta preit，mentghed og andre
 afer i en fort joartale forfiferet forjamlingen at bet havoe beret Dent en glade at tiene og hygge jnitodemodet．
 men nr .387 i ＂2utheran Symuary＂（v．1－3）blev jutget．Det fidite fapitel af forite Betri breb lofte3，Goorpaa bleb grumbet en gribende flutuingstale．

Fornaning zordene，＂ßerer cobrue，baager！＂fremifoldte马 med farlig eftertryt，deres betubniug og albor betomet $\mathfrak{i}$ betragtutug af erfefiendent jtadige og inedige ampb．
$\mathfrak{F n}$ derligt onffe Gleb notalt om Serrens belignelfe over fanz fundet，dent foler og witfombed；om naade til at fortjoette hans gierning og fremme lyats cere，berefter bon on fuifelig enighed， bebarelfe i oubs fandhed og befandighed i troen，boorpaa פerrent bon og afinngeljen ab bet fibjte bers of jalnten $n t .387$.

Saa bar det fiontende ordentlige innodemobe vel og belfiffet rumbet tilende．

ふ．©．〇uill，fetretœr．

## Resolutions.

Resolution of Synod granting authority to its Board of Trustees to sell the following described lot in the village of Deerfield, Dane county, Wisconsin:
"The Norwegian Synod of the American Evangelical Lutheran Church in convention assembled at Mankato, Minnesota, June 24th, 1931, hereby instructs, authorizes and empowers its Board of Trustees to sell, barter and convey, by warranty deed, Lot No. Four (4) in Block No. One (1), in High School Park Addition to the village of Deerfield, Dane county, Wisconsin."

## Committee on Miscellaneous Matters.

The committee on Miscellaneous Matters suggests that in the case of Rev. Gulberg $\$ 100$ or $\$ 200$, as needed, be taken from the Indigent Pastors' Fund and used to assist him in his present financial difficulty.

Henry H. Hanson, Secretary.

|  |  | 莀鬲 |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & .5 \\ & 0.5 \\ & 0.0 \\ & n_{i}^{2}, ~ \end{aligned}$ |  | 淢 |  |  |  |  | 挐 |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 曾 } \\ & =0 \\ & =0 \\ & =0 \end{aligned}$ |  | 䔍 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Anderson，Kev．Chr．．． | \＄352．531 | \＄158．71 | \＄ 244.90 | \＄ $47.60 \mid$ | \＄ 48.89 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 37 |  |  |  |  |  | \＄890．93 |
| Anderson，Rev．E．W．． | 51.85 | 2 ＋45 | 22.50 | 10.20 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 109.00 |
| Blækkan，Rev．I．．．．．． | 15.80 |  |  |  |  | 10.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 25.80 |
| Brewer，Rev．E．W．M． | 142.05 |  |  | 26.50 | 34.29 | 5.00 | 7.50 |  |  |  | 10.00 | 10.44 |  |  |  |  |  | 235.78 |
| Dale，Rev．M．O． | 166.30 | 77.10 | 86.40 |  | 22.09 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 20.12 | 372.01 |
| Guldberg，Rev．G． | 65.88 | 6.94 | 5.65 | 10.70 | 6.13 | 23.17 |  |  |  |  |  | 12．39 |  |  |  |  |  | 130.83 |
| Gullerud，Rev．O．M．．． | 220.15 | 74.90 | 53.85 | 87.10 | 43.69 |  | 26.00 |  |  |  |  | 15.00 | 25.00 |  |  |  |  | 545.69 |
| Gullixson，Rev．G．A．．． | 100.00 |  | 305.00 | 5.00 |  | 425.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 835.00 |
| Gutteb $\phi$ ，Rev．J．S． | 359.14 | 257.14 | 351.90 | 25.00 | 37.10 | 165.00 | 15.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 20.00 |  |  |  | 1，230．28 |
| Hanson，Rev．Emil | 186.08 | 86.55 | 103.80 | 7.50 | 26.40 | 56.00 ． |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 466.33 |
| Harstad，Rev．A．M． | 510.14 | 243.52 | 450.80 | 342.19 |  | 544．001． |  |  |  |  |  | 25.65 | 342.18 |  |  |  |  | 2，458．48 |
| Hendricks，Rev．J．．．．． | 36.10 | 13.00 | 7.50 | 3.00 | 1.00 | 100.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 160.60 |
| Ingebritson，Rev．H．．．． | 217.92 | 93.00 | 82.00 | 73.57 | 24.72 |  | 35.10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 10.00 | 3.00 | 11.88 ！ | 551.19 |
| Immanuel Cong． | 152.02 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 152.02 |
| Lee，Rev．S，E．． | 35.45 | 16.94 | 10.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.39 |
| Lillegard，Rev．G．O．．． | 207.80 | 143.50 | 213.70 |  | 10.00 | 78.00 | 10.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 663.00 |
| Madson，Rev．N．A． | 330.39 | 168.76 | 173.61 | 80.55 | 6.50 | 146.00 | $21.00 \mid$ |  |  |  |  | 82.65 |  |  |  |  |  | 1，009．46 |
| Miscellaneous | 362.61 | 138.25 | 38.70 | 137.50 | 88.00 | 431.50 | 59.00 |  |  | 7.00 | 9.00 |  | 4.00 |  | 9.68 |  | 20.50 | 1，305．74 |
| Moldstad，Rev．C．A． | 179.00 | 142.00 | 210.00 | 4.00 |  | 227.001 | 1.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 763.00 |
| Moldstad，Rev．J．A．．．． | 365.12 | 200.30 | 244.50 | 10.00 | 35.00 | 145.001 | 50.001 | 10.00 | 10.00 |  |  |  | 10.00 |  |  |  |  | 1，079．92 |
| Mommser，Rev．M．F．． | 177.76 | 80.00 | 92.00 | 88.50 | 31.39 | 35.001 | 10.00 |  | 15.00 | 10.00 |  |  | 5.00 |  |  |  | 8.00 | 552.65 |
| Nesseth，Rev．G．P．． | 56.30 ， | 5.00 |  | 5.85 |  | 5.001 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 10.00 |  |  | 82.15 |
| Peterson，Rev．C．${ }^{\text {N }}$ | 43.70 | 614.29 | 16.35 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 674.34 |
| Peterson，Rev．J． | 227.59 | 123.55 | 147.95 |  | 36.72 | 160.00 | $2.00 \mid$ |  |  |  |  | 16.95 |  |  |  | 11.81 |  | 726.57 |
| Preus，Rev．H．A． | 217.46 | $85.00 \mid$ | 105.00 | 5.00 |  | 5.00 | 107.45 |  | 39.50 | 5.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 569.41 |
| Quill，Rev．C．T．． | 275.27 | 66.40 | 150.45 | 82.08 | 51.00 | 333.00 | 4.501 |  | 2.50 |  |  | 9.25 |  |  |  |  |  | 974.45 |
| Rtanholt，Rev．J．R | 111.22 | 26.35 | 20.00 |  | 33.19 | 10.501. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5.00 | 5.00 | 211.26 |
| Sande，Rev．S．． | 220.84 | 70.15 | 84.10 | 27.50 |  | 17．607． |  |  |  |  | 5.50 | 35.001 |  |  |  |  | 7.81 | 468.56 |
| Strand，Rev．A．H． | 103.22 | 68.001 | 7.00 |  | 29.00 | 15．00｜． |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 222.22 |
| Strand，Rev．J．J．．．．． | 61.00 |  |  |  | 19.78 ． |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 80.78 |
| Theiste，Rev．FI．A．．．． | 102．31 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.76 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 104.07 |
| Tjernagel，Rev．II．M．． | 573.501 | 230.10 | 235.15 | 89.951 | 24．001． |  | 86.24 |  |  |  | 16.00 |  |  | 51.81 |  |  |  | 1，306．75 |
| Torgerson，Rev．A．J．．． | 417.171 | 99.001 | 116.05 | ， 10.25 | 61.44 | 50.00 | 26.14 |  |  |  |  | 26.301 |  |  |  |  | 6.001 | 812.35 |
| Unseth．Rev．J．B． | 280.17 | 141.501 | 191.50 | 31.05 | 37.981 | $14+.001$ | 10.001 | 2.00 | 3.00 | 13.00 | 5.00 | 48.901 | 10.00 |  |  |  | 5.001 | 923.1 C |
| Ylvisaker，Rev．E． | 37.721 |  |  | 13.64 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 51.36 |
| Ylvisaker，Rev．P．．．．．． | 229.22 | 5.001 |  | 1．06．20 | 25.001 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5.20 |  |  |  | 1.74 |  | 372.36 |
| Ylvisaker，Rev．S．C．．． | 226.191 | 18．75｜ | 187．71 | ｜．．．．．．．．｜ | 32.501 | 170.00 ！． |  |  |  |  |  | ．．．1 |  |  |  |  | ．$\cdot$－ | 635．15 |

[^7]PAROCHIAL REPORT FOR 1930.


[^8]PAROCHIAL REPORT FOR 1930.


* At Immanuel School. $\ddagger$ Including 1930 Convention Offering.
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# "A" <br> BETHANY LUTHERAN COLLEGE <br> Mankato, Minnesota <br> Balance Sheet, August 31, 1931 

ASSETS
Current
Cash on Hand and in Bank ..... \$ 45.22
Accounts Receivable-College ..... 2,853.17
Accounts Receivable-Synod Tuition ..... 11,136.02
Accounts Receivable-A. J. Torgerson, Treas. ..... 2,449.25
Accounts Receivable-Book Store ..... 405.13
Notes Receivable ..... 69.79
Book Store Inventory ..... 450.24
Total Current Assets ..... \$ 17,408.82
Fixed
Land ..... 9,167.62
Buildings ..... 275,853.48
Furniture and Equipment ..... 10,476.84
Library ..... 5,643.00
Total Fixed Assets
Total Fixed Assets ..... \$301,140.94 ..... \$301,140.94
Unexpired Insurance ..... 330.38
LIABILITIES
Current
Accounts Payable ..... 704.84
Notes Payable-Banks ..... 9,950.00
Notes Payable-Others ..... 5,726.00
Total Current Liabilities
$\qquad$NET WORTH
Excess of Assets Over Liabilities.254,004.15$\overline{\$ 318,880.14}$

We, the undersigned, auditors duly appointed to audit the accounts, books, etc., of Bethany Lutheran College, hereby certify the above financial statement is a correct copy of financial statement which is a part of the audit, as of August 31, 1931, original of which has been filed with Rev. J. A. Moldstad, President, Board of Regents of Bethany Lutheran College, 1701 N. Tripp Ave., Chicago, Ill.

Dated, October 19th, 1931.
C. A. MOLDSTAD.
M. R. HANDBERG.

## I vor Boghandel faaes

Ev. Luth, Folkekalender for 1919, 1921, 1922, 1923, 1924, 1925, 1926, 1927, 1928, 1929, 1930 of 1931, @.................................... 10c
Synodalberetningen for 1918, 1919, 1920, 1921, 1922. 1923, 1924, 1926, 1927, 1928, 1929, 1930, (a) netto ..................................... 25c

The Austin Agreement, netto . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 5 bc
Hvad gjeelder det?................................ 10 c

Redegiørelse . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 5 sc
Hvorfor den Norske Synode ikke kan vare med
paa foreningen med "Opjst" som basis, netto $\quad 10 \mathrm{c}$
Hvad var den gamle Norske Synodes stilling i
laere og praksis? netto..................... $5 c$
Samme paa engelsk, netto ...................... 5c
Udkast til menighedskonstitutionen, netto...... 5 sc
Samme paa engelsk, netto ....................... 5 se
The Norwegian Synod and the Christian Day
School, netto .............................. 5 .
Konkordiebogen . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . $\$ 2.00$
Dr. Koren's Samlede Skrifter i IV bind, netto. . $\$ 2.25$
Walthers Postille . . . ............................. . $\$ 1.75$
Walther's Law and Gospel...................... $\$ 2.50$
History of the Norwegian Lutherans up to 1872. by Dr, Rohne, 270 pages, netto.............. $\$ 1.25$
Eusebius's Kirkehistorie ........................ . $\$ 1.50$
Paul Gerhard ..................................... 40 c
Evangelisk Luthersk Tidende for hvert aar.... \$1.00
Lutheran Sentinel, for each year . . . . . . . . . . . . . $\$ 1.00$
For begge blade for et aar . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . $\$ 1.50$
Hvilkensomhelst bog $i$ handelen kan faaes $i$ Synodens boghandel.
The Lutheran Synod Book Co.
1101 14th Ave. S. E. Minneapolis, Minn.


[^0]:    * Our italics.

[^1]:    * Our italics.

[^2]:    * Our italics.

[^3]:    * Our italics.

[^4]:    * Our italics.

[^5]:    * Our italics.

[^6]:    * Our italics.

[^7]:    ＊China Mission，

[^8]:    * Belonging to Synod. $\dagger$ Including convention and conference.

