Dale Copy

Spring 1967
Vol. 1, No. 2

ISSUES...

IN CHRISTIAN EDUCATION

Accent: HISTORY

What is a "Christian view" of history?

Whence parochial schools?

Why a fifth year of college?

Can history be education?

Published Once Each Semester by the Faculty of Concordia Teachers College
Seward, Nebraska

ISSUES . . .

In Christian Education

PUBLISHED ONCE EACH SEMESTER
THREE TIMES A YEAR
By the Faculty of
Concordia Teachers College
Seward, Nebraska
A teacher preparation college of
The Lutheran Church — Mo. Synod

EDITOR: M. J. Stelmachowicz, Ph. D.

EDITORIAL COMMITTEE
AND ASSOCIATE EDITORS

Associate Editor:
Carl T. Brandhorst, Ph. D.

Special Features Editor:
Arnold C. Erxleben, D. Ed.

Circulation and Promotion:
Robert Garmatz, M. Ed.

Book Review Editor:
Darrel Meinke, D. Ed.

Editorials: Walter Rosin, Th. D.

Ex Officio: President W. Th. Janzow, D. D.

Subscription office: C. T. C.,
Seward, Nebraska 68434
Robert Garmatz

Subscription: $2.00 per year

About Our Authors and Their Articles

Martin B. Kirch, D. Ed. *(Concordia's Non-Degree Advanced Study Program),* is the director of the graduate program, summer school, and postbaccalaureate studies at Concordia, Seward, Nebraska. His article describes nondegree programs of study leading to specialization in youth work, parish music, and as director of Christian education.

Frederick C. Luebke, Ph. D. *(German Immigrants and Parochial Schools),* is associate professor of history at Concordia Teachers College, Seward, Nebraska. Dr. Luebke analyzes the sociohistorical setting in which many Lutheran parochial schools emerged and calls for the schools to "return to the historic universality of Martin Luther."

Wilbert H. Rosin, Ph. D. *(The Christian View of History),* is associate professor of history and chairman of the social studies department at Concordia Teachers College, River Forest, Illinois. His article analyzes the problem faced by the Christian historian who strives to be objective with his academic discipline and yet interpret from the Christian perspective.

Walter D. Uhlig, M. A., S. T. M. *(History as Education),* is associate professor of religion and church history at Concordia Teachers College, Seward, Nebraska. His essay contemplates history as our teacher rather than as that which is to be taught.

IN This Issue of ISSUES:

ARTICLES

	PAGE
The Christian View of History *The Problem of Objective Interpretation of History* by Wilbert H. Rosin	6
German Immigrants and Parochial Schools *A Sociohistorical Look at Institutional Beginnings* by Frederick C. Luebke	11
History: Reality and Education *An Essay on the Value of the Study of History* by Walter D. Uhlig	20
Concordia's Nondegree Advanced Study Programs *Postbaccalaureate Programs for Teachers* by Martin B. Kirch	18
BOOK REVIEWS	
History by John Higham with Leonard Krieger and Felix Gilbert Reviewed by Prof. Robert D. Fiala	24
The Nature and Study of History by Henry Steele Commager Reviewed by Dr. Rudolph W. Heinze	24
Christianity and History by H. Butterfield Reviewed by Dr. Carl Volz	25
Towards a Theological Understanding of History by Eric C. Rust Reviewed by Dr. Erich H. Heintzen	26
History Sacred and Profane by Alan Richardson Reviewed by Dr. Walter L. Rosin	27
EDITORIALS	
Ebenezer: A Time in History to Say Yes	3
History, Lutherans, Civil Rights	4
Shooting for the Moon	4

EDITOR'S NOTES

We wish to thank the many readers who took the time to write congratulatory expressions to ISSUES after its first appearance last autumn. The editorial staff and the entire faculty at Seward deeply appreciate your interest, your encouragement, and your kind appraisals of these initial efforts. Present editorial policy, however, does not provide for publishing letters to the editor.

ISSUES is primarily the voice of the faculty of Concordia Teachers College, Seward, Nebraska. Guest articles, reviews, and editorials written by other Christian scholars and educators will also continue to be a regular feature of our publication.

ISSUES plans to speak on the general subject of Christian education but to view it not as an isolated topic but always in relation to the total phenomenon of the educational process. This issue, for example, focuses on *history* and Christian education.

The year 1967 should serve in many ways to make Christian educators more conscious of history. Proper celebration of the 450th anniversary of the Reformation ought to contribute much to our appreciation of our religious heritage.

For Missouri Synod Lutherans 1967 has special historical meaning as the Ebenezer year. We look back at our personal history as human beings and contemplate God's mercies to each of us in our own life. But we soon see that our life and its many blessings is bound up with the life of the church. It is most difficult if not impossible to give thanks to God for the one without the other. May the historical record that the saints of God write in 1967 with His blessing serve to inspire our children even as the witness to His mercies by previous generations of His church inspires us today.

M. J. STELMACHOWICZ

EDITORIALS

Ebenezer: A Time in History to Say Yes

THE YEAR OF OUR LORD 1967 holds high promise of being an exciting year in the history of The Lutheran Church — Missouri Synod and especially in the lives of 3,000,000 Christians bound together in a spiritual fraternity of 6,000 congregations. 1967 is to be known as the EBENEZER Year, proclaimed so by its president, Dr. Oliver R. Harms. His proclamation reads:

> In the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.
>
> Confident of the love of God and in response to His mercy, The Lutheran Church — Missouri Synod resolved at its 1965 convention to bring a special thankoffering of at least $40,000,000 in praise of Him who always helps us, in order to buy and build properties in all parts of the world by which God may achieve His purposes through us.
>
> Therefore, as the President of the Synod, I proclaim the year of our Lord 1967 THE EBENEZER YEAR
>
> By the mercies of God, I beseech you to
>
> praise our Lord by bringing Him a special thankoffering on your birthday during this year
>
> measure your gift in relation to the years of grace you have enjoyed from your Father's bountiful goodness
>
> share with your fellow Christians your joy in being alive in the risen Christ
>
> plead with God to give us all thankful hearts and enable us to bring a true thankoffering
>
> a thankoffering which may shock us and will honor God.
>
> OLIVER R. HARMS, President
> The Lutheran Church — Missouri Synod

The plan for the EBENEZER Thankoffering is a simple one:

that I mail an EBENEZER Thankoffering on my birthday in 1967;

that I measure my gift in relation to the years of grace I have enjoyed from the Father's bountiful goodness;

that I, for this one year, give my family, relatives, and friends an EBENEZER Birthday Gift of money in place of the usual birthday gifts, which they may add to their personal EBENEZER Thankoffering.

If God says "good morning" to me on April 11 during the EBENEZER Year, I shall have the opportunity to respond to His mercies in my life and mail a personal thankoffering which becomes a tangible expression of my confession: "The Lord has always helped me." If God permits me this moment of grace, I shall multiply 51 times "x" dollars in praise of Him who has given me the gift of life and the greater gift of eternal life through Jesus Christ my Lord. It has been suggested that *children under* 12 years of age prayerfully consider giving at least one dollar for each year of their lives.

About 75,000 laymen and women are providing leadership for the Thankoffering. Their role as leaders is not that of being ecclesiastical arm-twisters but persons of faith who constitute a circle of love around those they serve through their prayers and personal witness to the evidences of God's mercy in their lives. If we are to bring a thankoffering acceptable to God and not a collection of abominations, our greatest need will be to ask God to make this possible. He alone can bestow a thankful heart. He alone can give us the means so that we can bring Him a thankoffering. He alone can open our mouths to the witness of His mercy in our lives.

The EBENEZER Thankoffering comes at a significant moment of our synodical history. About half of our membership has never been *asked* to do what it is being asked to do in 1967, simply because this is our first special Synodical Thankoffering in 15 years and many of our people were not asked 15 years ago because they weren't there to be asked! It's a first chance for many! And you may be one of the many!

Another significant element is the burden of our affluence. The teen-agers alone in our Synod will have access to about $130,000,000 for spending in 1967. Some of the creaking and groaning heard about our inability to bring a thankoffering which may shock us and will honor God must turn God's stomach sour. One of the biggest challenges God places before us in this special tribute to His mercies is the challenge to "come clean" with the God who has made us clean by faith in Christ Jesus. There is no doubt that God has given us the money. We should be bold enough to ask Him for the faith to honor Him for doing so. We need to beg Him for the willingness to bring Him that which is already His in such an overflowing measure that we do not insult Him with any weird protestations of a poverty which is not our lot in life.

What is EBENEZER?

EBENEZER provides a time for each one of us to say yes to God with joyous obedience and heartfelt gratitude.

EBENEZER is an opportunity for our church body to enter doors opened by God right now!

EBENEZER is a moment in time in which I can assess my life as a precious gift of God.

EBENEZER challenges me to be honest with God and with my brethren, and to tell them in my words and in my deeds: "The Lord has always helped me."

M. L. KOEHNEKE
Executive Director
Ebenezer Thankoffering

EDITORIALS

Shooting for the Moon

JOHN GARDNER, SECRETARY OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, asks, "Are we nourishing the kinds of talent that will create a great civilization, or are we not?" We, in the preaching and teaching ministries of the kingdom of God, might well ask the question, "Are we nourishing the kinds of talent that will create a great kingdom, or are we not?" It is well known that we shall have only the talent we nourish, the kind we want and expect. It is particularly true that high expectations produce high performance. A prince is expected to be kingly, so he is. The office has often made the man. The implication for Christian education is as inescapable as it is for public education. We must nurture the new man in those who have received the "power to become the sons of God" (John 1:12). Hence we are not only "making them wise unto salvation" but are also training them in holy living. Christian education nurtures Christian growth. Christian teachers nurture Christian students properly when they set high expectation levels for the new man, for growth in grace, and when they diligently water a growing faith.

Are we nurturing the new man or are we content with uncovering the old man, giving him a couple of sound licks, and proceeding as though we have assisted the Holy Ghost? To the extent that we take seriously our citizenship in God's kingdom, we become committed to seeking His righteousness, letting Him be glorified through us, showing forth the praises of Him who has called us into the light, and living like people in the light, people that can see. When we do not set high expectations for new-man growth, we still get what we expect. When we expect strong, active citizens in God's kingdom, we get them. The Holy Ghost has not lost power, but we may not have set the expectations high enough for this power to reveal itself.

Setting high expectation levels requires that we be instant, in season and out, for Christ. Satisfying Christ is more essential even than satisfying regional accrediting associations. Many another church "problem" may well stem from low expectation levels. We once spoke of shooting for the moon to illustrate a wild dream. We now hit the moon regularly (more or less). Let us not forget to set high goals, commensurate with the high calling of our Christian students. Let's shoot for heavenly goals. Children of God deserve godly goals. Christian education needs to remember its source and the use of Christian nourishment "that the man of God may be perfect [how's that for an expectation level?], thoroughly furnished unto all good works." (2 Tim. 3:17)

GILBERT DAENZER

History, Lutherans, Civil Rights

ONE OF THE MOST COMMON OBSERVATIONS about history is that it is constantly being rewritten. This is as it should be, for each generation views its past from a new vantage point. Its perspective is altered by its own unique experience. Inevitably, then, each generation asks new questions of the past, and historians provide new answers.

In the era of the Great Depression, Americans were preoccupied with economic problems. Historians shared this concern, and during those years they produced many volumes tinged with an economic determinism.

In more recent times, American society has focused its attention, willingly or not, on the nagging problems of civil rights. This experience, in turn, has stimulated historians to examine America's past for other chapters and episodes in which the civil rights of American citizens have been persistently violated. Thus the Alien and Sedition Acts of 1800 have been the subject of several excellent recent books. The painful years of reconstruction after the Civil War have likewise been reexamined with the result that many traditional interpretations have been significantly revised.

But there has been another chapter in American history in which the civil rights of American citizens were flagrantly violated, one that probably has not yet received the attention it deserves. This was an episode which involved the rights of German-American Lutherans, especially those of the Missouri Synod. The minds of many of the elder statesmen within our church remain seared, after 50 years, with the memory of the injustices and humiliation they suffered at the hands of superpatriotic Americans during the troubled years of World War I.

Today we hear voices of those who condemn certain clergymen of the Lutheran Church for participating in the civil rights movement. These pastors are faulted, it seems, for seeking effectual means to end the centuries of injustice and humiliation which Negroes have suffered in American society.

How curious it is that our past is forgotten so quickly! If some of these critics would restudy the social history of our church, it is possible that they would mute their cries as they recall the days of our own oppression.

FREDERICK C. LUEBKE

Invest in
LUTHERAN
CHURCH BONDS

Earn to 6 3/4 %
on your savings

Yates, Woods & Co.

Paul Brown Building
St. Louis, Mo. 63101
Call Collect MAin 1-5448
Area Code 314

Member: New York Stock Exchange; American Stock Exchange; Midwest Stock Exchange; Pacific Coast Stock Exchange; Chicago Board of Trade; Chicago Mercantile Exchange.

Specialists in Underwriting and Distributing
CHURCH, SCHOOL and HOSPITAL BONDS

Charles E. Groerich, Manager
Lutheran Division
Bond Department

Write for information on:
CHURCH, SCHOOL & HOSPITAL BONDS
Yates, Woods & Co.
Paul Brown Bldg., Dept. 4423
St. Louis, Mo. 63101
MAin 1-5448
Attn: CHARLES E. GROERICH
Please send me information on Institutional Bonds
NAME
ADDRESS
CITY STATE

THE CHRISTIAN VIEW OF HISTORY

"We are living in an age of interpretation in which any number of responsible historians arrive at different views of the same movement or period . . ."

by WILBERT H. ROSIN

EDWARD HALLETT CARR in *What Is History?* suggests that writing history is like fishing. The results depend partly on chance, partly on what part of the lake the historian chooses to fish, his selection of tackle, as well as the kind of fish he wants to catch. Even the time of day has some effect, we might add. If then, as every historian is profoundly aware, we are living in an age of interpretation in which any number of responsible historians arrive at different views of the same movement or period, then certainly a Christian understanding deserves consideration along with all the rest. Limitations of space compel us to confine ourselves here to but a few summary statements which ought to be pursued in greater depth.

Before examining the unique contribution of Christianity to the understanding of the past, keep in mind that historical presuppositions are not merely a modern phenomenon. Our Western civilization is uniquely historical-minded, and this interest in history has evolved from both of the two major sources of our culture – the classical, with Herodotus the father of history, and the Christian, with Augustine the father of philosophy of history. The Greek emphasis on nemesis and the recurrence of spirals – much as the ebb and flow of the tide – appears impractical and unrealistic to the Western mind. Yet Bruno Snell of Hamburg University, a specialist on Greek historiography, says the Greeks had a philosophy of history, and it was indeed cyclical. Witness Thucydides writing so that when these things come to happen again, men will know how to act. The Greek concept of history accounts for the difficulty that beginning Greek students often face in translating *opiso*, which sometimes means "behind" and other times means "in the future." The Greeks thought of time as coming from behind and overtaking them. As it moved beyond them, it became the "past" before their eyes.

But a theology of history was possible only with the coming of the prophets and evangelists, for the difference between philosophy and theology is that theology in the traditional sense of the term presupposes and depends on revelation. The early Christian theologians, as contrasted with the Greeks, were slow to recognize their unique position, and St. Augustine was the first to articulate this difference clearly. Even so a consciousness of distance from the past, as contrasted with the classical sense of contemporaneity, emerges most clearly in the era of the Renaissance and Reformation. The reason for the wholesome growth of historical consciousness in the Reformation lands and the later unfortunate emergence of secularized historicism in the same areas – with its turn in the direction of development, individualism, and subsequent relativism – is that the Reformation in putting the accent on the Word alone reemphasized the basic historical elements in Christianity.

The Historical Character of Christianity

Christianity becomes uniquely historical in that God enters time and space in the Incarnation, as Oscar Cullmann so interestingly elaborates in *Christ and Time*. The promise of the Messiah was made in time as a covenant or redemptive plan *(oikonomia)* to be fulfilled in time (Eph. 3:9). Thus each moment from the time of the promise until the time of the fulfillment in the covenant is significant, for it brings mankind in time and history closer to the moment of deliverance. When the opportune and favorable moment of time came *(kairos)*, God sent His Son. Paul lends even greater meaning to the kairos when he speaks of the fullness of time *(pleroma tou chronou)* as though time itself was growing great and, when it was full, delivered. Significantly, this happened once and for all *(ephapax)*, making it the most unique event of all time. By implication, if one event can be unique, then all other historical events must in some way also be unique, since they are related from various points to a unique event. The Christian concept of the last times *(eschata)* becomes meaningful for history.

Christianity is uniquely historical not only because God entered into time and once and for all provided an irrevocable qualitative change by effecting man's salvation. Christian theology is uniquely historical in teaching that there will not be an indefinite and unending progression of history, as some would have it. In modern secular culture a true feeling for history is sometimes lost in fatalism or a sense of drift rather than in a sense of time and movement, and that is precisely because it is cut off from these religious premises. This malaise needs the Christian cure.

What do history and theology have in common? The primary area of theology's concern for history is and must be Christian anthropology, that is, the doctrine of man. Here history certainly reinforces the Christian understanding of man's great potential for creativeness on the one hand and for sinfulness and destructiveness on the other. What man really is, in the sense of the real meaning of his historical existence and of the meaning of the life of the individual, can be gained only from revelation. Luther comments that despite the majesty of man's reason, he does not know of it a priori but only a posteriori. Reason of itself does not know the efficient cause for certain, nor likewise the final cause, and cannot know that the efficient cause is God the Creator. Man's worth as an individual becomes apparent only through revelation and the Christian tradition, thus accounting for the contrast between the price placed on human life in the Western nations as compared with China or the Soviet Union.

Christian anthropology holds to the moral responsibility of man just as the secular world does. But Christian theology embodies no practical method or scheme for one human being to judge the total moral character of another. Law and order must be maintained, the transgressor of the law must be punished; yet to pass upon the moral character of a ruler in an absolute manner involves a judgment of motives, admittedly a difficult if not impossible task from the human standpoint, and is beyond the ability and prerogatives of man from the theological point of view. Yet he must make a responsible judgment in specific instances over against society, condemning and restraining evil, at the same time exercising charity because even the accuser may have unknowingly been a causal agent for the immoral act. Only God can make the final judgment. If the moral condemnation of individuals is risky, it is less possible to reject entire nations. Apart from theological concerns, it becomes almost impossible to fix responsibility for major wars.

The Pattern and Meaning of History

Equally frustrating is the attempt to find a pattern or meaning in history. Every hypothesis, including those of Pitirim Sorokin and Arnold Toynbee, however fascinating, eventually emerges frustratingly inadequate. These may be momentary glimpses into the divine plan, but any hint of truth seen *sub specie aeternitatis* must come from beyond the stream. Divine revelation does not have as its purpose to describe in any specific manner the course which particular nations will follow. The historian can perhaps trace the history of a nation with some objectivity as he looks back, but as a historian he can never pretend to describe in what specific manner and to what extent divine will has become operative.

For example, to assume a Christian interpretation of the defeat of the Spanish Armada creates problems of its own. Obviously, there can be at least two Christian interpretations, one Protestant and one Roman Catholic. The defender of either would be hard pressed to justify his position on the basis of divine revelation, much less by means of respectable historical method.

The Christian tradition of the West has had a marked influence on historical method. One of the dominant themes in Western thought is progress. Forell's study entitled *Faith Active in Love* points out that Christian social ethics are directed toward improvement of society as collective man in society. At the same time the Christian concept of progress differs from and is more realistic than the secular notion of absolute improvement of the human race. Christianity recognizes the inability of any individual or the human race to achieve perfection. All human efforts to eliminate evil can deal merely with the problem of the time. Technical advance and social progress do not alter human nature. Well-minded Christians frequently forget this, and there is always the temptation to fall back on the Gospel as the means of controlling the social order. True, through the individual believer Christian love affects and improves the social order, but the Gospel cannot become a new law to direct and regulate society.

Free Will vs. Determinism in History

As for the problem of free will versus determinism, Christianity holds that man is responsible and accountable for his actions. While the Western world subscribes to this also, it is obvious that man is not really free to work out his own destiny. Many of his actions and opinions are shaped for him by his environment. Nevertheless, Western society maintains that the individual is responsible for his actions to the extent that he has the ability and the opportunity to manipulate or modify his environment. There is this difference, however, that whereas the courts may exonerate the person who seems to be a victim of his environment, according to Christian theology he may at times still be held morally responsible. It is not in contradiction to the Christian principle of moral responsibility for the courts to recognize deterministic factors. This and the Anglo-Saxon practices of considering the defendant innocent until proved guilty are consistent with, if not the result of, the Christian law of love. In actual fact, the problem of God's omnipotence, transcendence, and immanence as contrasted with the possibility of man's freedom and responsibility remains a paradox and an unknown in the Christian view.

The above discussion would seem to rule out any concept of divine guidance or direction and therefore

seems to contradict Christian revelation according to which "all things work together for good to those that love God." However, it does not, since this involves an area where faith must enter. The concept of a God, particularly the Christian God, by definition includes superhuman power if not omnipotence. It is an inherent and fundamental aspect of the concept that God's power is not always evident nor can it be proved in any objective manner. Nor does Christian revelation state that this power is always employed in an active way. Evil is explained as taking place by God's permission rather than direction, an idea usually forgotten by the critics of Christianity. It results largely from man's abuse of the free will which God has given him. In another sense the ills of the world are the result of God's judgment operating through the inexorable laws built into the world, to which each individual is likewise subject. But these laws also include the possibility of forgiveness for the repentant, so that his relationship to the Divine Being can be restored. The Christian view of history is moral rather than moralizing. God is envisioned as the efficient cause of moral goodness through Christians who have been redeemed and rejuvenated but who nevertheless lapse into their former pattern.

Divine influence on the affairs of men ought not be unduly difficult for the Christian to embrace within his faith if he but remembers the impact which outsized mortals have had upon their age — Franklin D. Roosevelt, Abraham Lincoln, Napoleon Bonaparte, Otto von Bismarck, and Winston Churchill, to name but a few. To recognize the power of individuals in shaping history one need not subscribe to the Carlyle great-man theory that an age is dominated, almost hypnotized, by individual leaders. On the other hand, one cannot deny their influence. It is but a short step further for the Christian to conclude that God, if He exists at all, can in some way, even unknown and unrecognized by man, give direction to events in time. Most, if not all, historians believe in causation, that preceding events determine the present, and that writing history means more than a mere recording of events in a time sequence. The Christian also recognizes causal factors and includes among them divine as well as human influences. The Christian historian, as a Christian rather than as a historian, acknowledges a force outside the natural cause sequence and can point to innumerable Scripture references to support his position.

Keep in mind that the Christian view is not that God will direct affairs in such a manner so that this results in the physical well-being of the Christian. In fact, the doctrine of providence does not emphasize historical causation but rather that, come what may, God's grace will sustain the Christian and will assure his salvation. The providence of God is not demonstrable by any objective historical method. Yet faith refuses to deny the sovereignty of God. The Christian does not claim to have greater historical insight than the non-Christian. But in the course of time, as a Christian rather than as a historian, he catches glimpses or fleeting insights which seem to corroborate his Christian view of life, which seem to make sense of what he hears and sees, and which seem to wrap up everything into a manageable package. Each individual Christian's view differs from the next. The listener may not understand harmony and may not be able to analyze the individual chords of a Beethoven symphony. Nevertheless he can appreciate it, and it makes sense to him as he listens to it. Similarly, the Christian cannot identify God in specific historic acts, at least not by any kind of empirical evidence. He perhaps cannot convince his fellowman, much less the "objective" historian. Yet he sees God in the total pattern of history.

Ultimately, then, the Christian holds that God is supreme and in control. He cannot go much beyond that. For we are virtually at the limits of concrete expression. If nothing whatsoever in time appeared to corroborate Christian understandings, Christ Himself would be a mere myth, for all practical purposes merely a sophisticated Santa Claus. In searching for evidences of God in history, man expects to find obvious and unquestionable manifestations, not realizing that while God is active in time, the evidences are less apt to be in the thunder than in the still small voice. This is especially true because it is not the divine purpose to save any one nation or culture, contrary to what some might like to think. Toynbee in his *Study of History* comes very close to identifying the institution of the Christian church with the kingdom of God and of crediting it with far more than objective history will permit. "The kingdom of God comes not by observation." Incidentally, the Christian concept of God's providence is furthermore in sharp contrast to the Old Persian view in which there are separate origins for the good and evil forces, Mazda and Ahriman. Consequently the good force, Mazda, does not rule over the entire world, because it created only a part of it. Once again the Christian view is more lofty and dignified.

Relative to the Christian concept of divine providence is the necessary assumption that the presuppositions of the Christian and the methods of secular history differ basically and that they can never be completely merged in some new synthetic Christian historical method. The historical method cannot be employed to verify and validate the Christian view of history in a scientific manner. Neither should theology be employed in writing objective history. Man, being finite and limited in the use of his reason, may at times think that Christianity and history are contradictory, whereas it would be far more appropriate to think of each being valid in its own approach and complementary to the other, though in a somewhat imperfect manner, as they attempt to describe man in time.

The Problems of Language and Philosophy

Language is one of the stumbling blocks in clarifying the issues concerning theology and history. It is

patently less difficult for the secular mind to speak of man as the highest of animals than it is to think of him as a child of God who because of his fall into sin at times approximates animal behavior. It is easier to speak of eternal values above history because it is more in the pattern of classical philosophy than it is to refer to the Last Judgment. While it is necessary to speak in language that carries meaning and can be understood, Christian theologians have a tendency to employ clichés which do not clarify the issues unless their predispositions are explained. Furthermore, these predispositions frequently represent an accretion of theological ideas through time rather than the simple concepts of Christian revelation, contrary to what they may think. But eliminating the language barriers will not eliminate the point of clash. That, quite plainly, is the point of faith. The recent revival of interest in philosophy, and more particularly the challenge of existentialism, has lent respectability to Christian theology by demonstrating through logical and philosophical argumentation that there is a place for faith. Although much of what the existentialists have written does not undergird Christian theology and very often is actually anti-Christian, it has indirectly contributed to raise the level of respect for Christian theology by using terminology suggestive of and tangential to Christian thought. Of course, faith for the Christian means more than mere credulity. It means faith in the promises of God.

If it could be demonstrated beyond a doubt to the satisfaction of all and on the basis of human reason that there is a God, there would be no need for faith, no need to ask whether Christian theology is applicable to history or any of the other liberal arts and sciences but only to spell out the details. Christianity demands faith. Yet the Christian is sometimes asked to demonstrate absolutely the validty of Christian faith and Christian theology for history. Quite understandably he asks, "Why?" Reasonable validity and dependability is all that can be expected in any discipline or area of learning, even the natural sciences. One may be a respectable scientist while resorting to two or more theories to explain the nature of light. One may be a respectable secular historian even though his interpretation of a historical movement differs from the traditionally accepted one, if he can furnish reasonable validity — not proof — for his views. Why must the Christian thesis be proved beyond a shadow of doubt? Hardin Craig in his *New Lamps for Old* decries the application of the positivistic methodology of the natural sciences to the humanities. This "apathetic fallacy," as Toynbee calls it, is equally unfortunate in the realm of historical or religious knowledge. The Christian historian can be on a par with all other historians. He need not be a little less scholarly or less scientific than those who reject or ignore Christian theology. As a historian the Christian uses the historian's methods and tools. As a historian he does not attempt to find God in his interpretations. But as a Christian he may embrace theological postulates which lend color and meaning to his own private understanding of history. He cannot prove nor dare he attempt to prove a Christian interpretation of a given historical era or event. Nevertheless, the Christian teacher of history may speak in general terms, as we have above, of the meaning of Christianity for history.

This can be far more than a subtle and unconscious infusion of Christian morals. In addition to those general understandings mentioned in the previous discussion, he can impart an awareness that, because of the fall into sin, man has an unfortunate tendency to nullify or weaken his position as creature. This Christian insight alone has far-reaching implications. It explains the failures and shortcomings of the League of Nations, the United Nations, summit meetings, and disarmament sessions. While cushioning the shock of these failures, Christian revelation also offers hope by pointing to the source through which Christian men can become the salt of the earth, the only power through which man's self-seeking and self-advancement can be effectively tempered and modified for wholesome and peaceful endeavor. Christianity is meanwhile realistic in not expecting "the perfect stature of Christ" for society in time. It does not deny progress, though it maintains that progress will be followed by regression, which can best be counteracted by turning to the power which can uplift and restore mankind. Though "the powers that be are ordained of God," they are not sinless and, like all mankind, are in need of spiritual help. The Christian doctrine of man and Christian eschatology furnish the necessary balance between fanaticism and despair in humanitarian programs and schemes for political progress.

Luther's View of History

Martin Luther, who himself was no doubt one of the outsized men of history, provided hints which lend perspective to the Christian view of history. Luther believed that one could see God at work in history, much as one can see God in the rosebush in nature. But who that God is one can see only in His self-disclosure in Christ. What the heart of God is like and what His intentions toward us are we can know only in Christ. In fact, God works *a contrario* in history, not in a straight line, and hence we can always expect the unexpected. As He handled Christ, so He handles men and nations. Heinrich Bornkamm in his book *Luther's World of Thought* (p. 210) summarizes Luther's insights. "God's guns are always loaded. He battered the Jews to pieces with the Romans, the Romans with the Vandals and the Goths, the Chaldeans with the Persians, the Greeks with the Turks. . . . Perhaps the Turkish bullet is destined for us, for our coldness and indifference to God's Word cannot go unpunished. . . . However, even if the Turks should destroy Germany, this will not be history's final chapter provided the world continues. The Turks will also meet their battering ram." Or, as Luther says in his commentary on Ps. 2, our job is to have a large open

eye so that we can with one glance take in all the kings with all their wisdom and power. Otherwise we will be like those who thrust themselves against God, do not see the Lord whom they defy, and do not realize their infirmity. An awareness of the transcendent God is the finest antidote to false pride and optimism, since every Christian knows that there will always be those who will rise up to overthrow the cause of the Lord and will prevent Christians from developing false security and pride in their achievements. On the other hand a large eye will temper and relieve false pessimism, because the Christian knows that ultimately the Lord determines the limits of man's destructiveness.

This requires faith, a faith that, for the sake of Christ, God's promises have meaning for the Christian, as Luther says in his commentary on the Magnificat: "Such a faith has life and being; it pervades and changes the whole man; it constrains you to fear if you are mighty, and to take comfort if you are of low degree. And the mightier you are, the more must you fear; the lowlier you are, the more must you take comfort. God is able to keep what He has promised, even though no one may understand it before it come to pass; for His Word and work do not demand the proof of reason, but a free and pure faith." Bornkamm aptly summarizes Luther's view thus: "Faith must be able to wait patiently, perhaps must often wait so long that it never gets to behold the change in events as it expected to see them. But if faith persists and abides, God will open its eyes to behold His method of help" (p. 213). "For Luther Christ's cross was a pledge of God's wonderful, hidden rule in history; and in it he found, as every Christian finds, the help not indeed to understand history but to bear it and to be victorious over it." (P. 217)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The following bibliography is reflected in the above essay and will be helpful for understanding some of the major ideas which could be referred to only in summary fashion.

Bornkamm, Heinrich. *Luther's World of Thought,* trans. Martin H. Bertram. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1958.

Bultmann, Rudolf. *History and Eschatology.* The Gifford Lectures, 1955. Edinburgh, 1955.

Butterfield, Herbert. *Man on His Past.* Cambridge: University Press, 1955.

———. *History and Human Relations.* London: Collins, 1951.

———. *Christianity and History.* New York: Scribner's, 1950.

Butterfield, Victor L. *Liberal Learning and Religion in the American College.* Bulletin XIII, National Council on Religion in Higher Education, November 1950.

Carr, Edward H. *What Is History?* New York: Knopf, 1962.

Case, Shirley Jackson. *The Christian Philosophy of History.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1943.

Cullmann, Oscar. *Christ and Time,* trans. from the German by Floyd V. Filson. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1950.

Daniélou, Jean. *Essai sur le mystere de l'histoire.* Paris: Editions du Seuil Paris. German translation: *Vom Geheimnis der Geschichte.* Stuttgart: Schwabenverlag, 1955. English translation: *The Lord of History.* London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1958.

D'Arcy, Martin Cyril. *The Meaning and Matter of History.* New York: Farrar, Straus, and Cudahy, 1959.

Ditmanson, Harold H., Howard V. Hong, and Warren A. Quanbeck. *Christian Faith and the Liberal Arts.* Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1960.

Fairchild, Hoxie N., ed. *Religious Perspectives in College Teaching.* New York: Ronald Press, 1952.

Ferré, Nels F. S. *Christian Faith and Higher Education.* New York: Harper, 1954.

Florovsky, Georges. "The Predicament of the Christian Historian," *Religion and Culture. Essays in Honor of Paul Tillich,* ed. Walter Leibrecht. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1959.

Forell, George W. *Faith Active in Love.* Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1954.

Haecker, Theodor. *Der Christ und die Geschichte.* München: Kösel Verlag, 1949.

Jaspers, Karl. *Reason and Anti-Reason in Our Time,* trans. Stanley Godman. London: SCM Press, 1952.

Jeffreys, Montague Vaughan Castelman. *Education, Christian or Pagan.* London: University of London Press, 1946.

Krüger, Gerhard. "Die Geschichte im Denken der Gegenwart," *Grosze Geschichtsdenker,* ed. Rudolf Stadelman. Tübingen und Stuttgart: Rainer Wunderlich Verlag Hermann Leins, 1949.

Latourette, Kenneth Scott. "The Christian Understanding of History," *American Historical Review,* LIV (January 1949), 259—76.

Löwith, Karl. *Meaning in History.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1949.

Matthews, Shailer. *The Spiritual Interpretation of History.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1916.

McIntyre, John. *The Christian Doctrine of History.* Edinburgh, 1957.

Meyerhoff, Hans, ed. *The Philosophy of History in Our Time.* New York: Doubleday, 1959.

Niebuhr, Reinhold. *Faith and History.* New York: Scribner's, 1951.

———. *The Irony of American History.* New York: Scribner's, 1952.

———. *The Self and the Dramas of History.* New York: Scribner's, 1955.

Piper, Otto. *God in History.* New York: The Macmillan Company, 1939.

Richardson, Cyril C. "Church History Past and Present," *Union Seminary Quarterly Review,* November 1949.

Rupp, E. Gordon. *Principalities and Powers, Studies in the Christian Conflict in History.* London: Epworth Press, 1952.

Rust, E. C. *The Christian Understanding of History.* London, 1947.

Shinn, Roger L. *Christianity and the Problem of History.* New York: Scribner's, 1953.

Sloyan, Gerard S., S. T. L. *The Recognition of Certain Christian Concepts in the Social Studies in Catholic Elementary Education.* Washington: Catholic University of America Press, 1948.

Spitz, Lewis, Jr., ed. and trans. *Career of the Reformer,* Vol. 34, Luther's Works. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1960. Pp. 135—44, 271—78.

———. "History in a Metaphysical Key," *Lutheran Scholar,* October 1958, January 1959.

———. "Jerusalem and Athens; A Tale of Two Cities," *Lutheran Scholar,* January 1957.

———. "Johann Lorenz Mosheim's Philosophy of History," *Concordia Theological Monthly,* May 1949.

Stern, Fritz. *The Varieties of History.* New York: Meridian Books, 1956.

Tillich, Paul. *Dynamics of Faith.* New York: Harper, 1957.

———. *The Interpretation of History,* trans. N. A. Rasetzke and Elsa L. Talmey. New York and London: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1936.

Van der Ziel, Aldert. *The Natural Sciences and the Christian Message.* Minneapolis: T. S. Denison, 1960. Especially pp. 13 to 40, 233—52.

Ward, Paul L. "The Christian and History Teaching," *Religion in Life,* Autumn 1957.

GERMAN IMMIGRANTS AND PAROCHIAL SCHOOLS

— a look at institutional beginnings

"People will not look forward to posterity who never look backward to their ancestors" — EDMUND BURKE

by FREDERICK C. LUEBKE

DURING THE PAST YEAR the parochial schools of America have received an unusual amount of attention in the public press. The results of two extensive studies of education in Catholic schools have appeared.[1] Less publicized, save within Lutheran circles, has been the pioneer study of the effectiveness of Lutheran elementary and secondary schools conducted by Ronald Johnstone.[2] It is not at all unusual that American Lutherans and Catholics (as well as Jews) should subject their educational systems to careful study. These churches, whose American origins lay in their appeal to ethnic groups, seem to have lost the last remnants of immigrant psychology during the past two decades. It is appropriate, therefore, that the effectiveness of their institutions, rooted in the immigrant condition, be carefully assessed. Catholics and Lutherans should, indeed they must, determine if their schools are viable institutions capable of serving efficiently the church's needs or if they are essentially anachronistic agencies which have outlived their raison d'être. As the standards of educational excellence rise, as the costs of maintaining even minimal standards sweep upward, the church would be remiss in its duty if it failed to perform this evaluative task.

Lutheran and Catholic schools are not without their critics, both within and without the fold of the church. Some insist that while parochial schools served a necessary cultural and sociological function during the immigrant phase of the church's history, the circumstances which brought them into existence have long since disappeared; parochial schools, therefore, are neither necessary nor desirable today, according to this view. Moreover, these critics assert, a sociological point of view suggests that the religious instruction characteristic of parochial schools was always secondary to the perpetuation of an immigrant culture, despite vehement rhetoric to the contrary. Hence, they conclude, the church would be well advised to redirect the human and financial resources consumed by parochial schools into channels consonant with the needs of contemporary society.

Such a view of parochial school education, whatever its merits, invites a sociohistorical analysis of the immigrant church and its educational institutions. This is virgin territory for the modern researcher.[3] Much of the literature on the history of Lutheran education in America has tended to be filiopietistic. Its orientation has been essentially theological. Moreover, sociological insights and research have illuminated few of the more sophisticated studies, including unpublished theses and dissertations. While it is hardly within the compass of this essay to provide for that lack, a tentative and exploratory framework is offered here for a study of the history of Lutheran schools as immigrant institutions.

Rather than focusing on the parochial school and its relationship to its parent church, to the host society, to public education, or to government, a sociological view calls for attention to be directed to the individual immigrant and to the ways in which he and his fellows responded to the stresses and strains of acculturation in an alien environment. The Lutheran school, in this view, becomes one of a variety of responses, institutional and otherwise, which immigrant groups made as they experienced the process of assimilation.

Adjustment Problems of the Immigrant

When the typical non-English-speaking immigrant arrived in America, he knew that he would have problems of adjustment to life in a new land. He expected language difficulties, climatic differences, unfamiliar units of measurement or of money, or strange political practices. Rational men could foresee these. But there was nothing in the typical immigrant's experience that could prepare him for the myriad frustrations, disillusionments, and negative encounters with American people and American customs, the sum total of which we today call cultural shock.

[1] Andrew M. Greeley and Peter H. Rossi, *The Education of American Catholics* (Chicago: Aldine Publishing Co., 1966) and Reginal A. Neuwien (ed.), *Catholic Schools in Action* (Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 1966).

[2] Ronald L. Johnstone, *The Effectiveness of Lutheran Elementary and Secondary Schools as Agencies of Christian Education* (St. Louis: Concordia Seminary, 1966).

[3] The foundation for such inquiry was laid by H. Richard Niebuhr in his *The Social Sources of Denominationalism,* first published in 1929. It has been reprinted by The Shoe String Press and in paperback by Meridian Books.

To his dismay and confusion, the immigrant found that the marks of his self-respect in Europe, the signs which granted him status in his old-world community, were of no account in America. His clothes, his mannerisms, and his speech often became objects of derision and contempt. Old standards of conduct seemed to malfunction in the new environment. The immigrant was uprooted, socially and psychologically, and for this he was unprepared.[4]

As the typical immigrant came into contact with American culture, he experienced some measure of competition or conflict. He discovered that, if he wished to achieve the goals which he hoped to attain by emigrating, he had to accommodate his behavior to the dominant American pattern. Thus he quickly abandoned European dress; his mannerisms were modified to the point at which they no longer evoked ridicule; and he learned whatever English was necessary to get along. In short, circumstances forced the immigrant to adapt his external behavior patterns to whatever extent his community demanded. Many immigrants quickly learned to participate freely and fully on many levels in American society, especially in economic matters. They often became American citizens, voted regularly, and sometimes even held political offices.

But in his heart the acculturating immigrant often remained a German, an Italian, or a Swede. His accommodation usually did not involve his family relationships, his circle of close friends, or his church. An immigrant from Germany often continued to speak German in his home and among his friends. He continued to read German-language publications, to worship his German God in a German church, and to send his children to a German school. He had his reservations about American ways but usually was discreet enough to voice them only among his close friends. His self-image was that of a German in America, a hyphenate. He thought of himself as an American, just as good but not the same as the other hyphenate who lived down the street, the Anglo-American, who by chance had inherited the dominant culture of American society.

In a general way, this level of acculturation is descriptive of what Milton Gordon, the eminent sociologist, has called *behavioral assimilation.*[5] It may be distinguished from a second, more thoroughgoing phase, which he has labeled *structural assimilation.* At this level, immigrant groups achieved large-scale admission into the cliques, clubs, and institutions of American society. With it came close, personal relationships with members of "the Establishment." In other words, the immigrant gained entrance into the *structure* of social and institutional life of the host society.

[4] Perhaps the best introduction to the cultural shock experienced by the immigrant is Oscar Handlin's *The Uprooted* (Boston: Little, Brown, 1951).

[5] An excellent introduction to Milton Gordon's theories of assimilation is his "Assimilation in America: Theory and Reality," *Daedalus,* XC (Spring 1962), 263—85. His ideas are fully developed in his *Assimilation in American Life* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1964).

The response of the individual immigrant to the stress of cultural disorganization and subsequent acculturation was dependent on a wide range of variables. One of the most important of these was place of residence. If one accepts the proposition that the rate of assimilation was directly related to the number and quality of interpersonal relationships with members of the host society, then rural residence usually meant a slow and gradual acculturation compared to what an immigrant normally would experience in the urban ghettos. Immigrant institutions operative in the rural and small-town environment were fairly successful in easing the process whereby the newcomer was assimilated, mostly, perhaps, by slowing it down. Immigrants of the same ethnic origin tended to cluster together in rural areas, small-town merchants frequently hired bilingual clerks, and professional people who could speak a foreign language advertised the fact. Sometimes even political campaigns for such posts as county clerk were based on a promise to select a German-speaking deputy for the convenience of new citizens.

Another factor which had a bearing on an immigrant's rate of assimilation was his economic status. Prosperity was normally accompanied by a more rapid rate. As the immigrant moved up the ladder of success, he tended to shift his loyalties from his ethnic group to his new economic class. Not only was his life filled with more interpersonal contacts with native Americans, but his ethnic bonds were often impediments to economic success.

Moreover, each immigrant, as he faced the problems of adjustment to life in America, was influenced by his own particular character traits and psychological needs. For one, the consolations of orthodox religion were paramount; for another, economic security was the primary consideration. Basically there were two types of immigrants: those whose psychological orientation was American and those whose cultural bonds continued to be with the land that gave them birth. The attitude of the former type was characterized by a resolve to break with the past and to make a satisfactory adjustment to the new environment. Whatever it was that prompted the original decision to emigrate — economic hardship, political upheaval, personal disgrace, or flight from justice — this type of immigrant had a minimal attachment to his ethnic group and sought interpersonal contacts with Americans in order to discover the new norms and standards to which he was expected to conform. He learned English rapidly, discarded membership in immigrant social, religious, and economic institutions as quickly as possible, and was assimilated into the structure of the host society to whatever degree it would permit. His self-image was that of an American.

In the mind of the European-oriented immigrant the fond memories of home reigned unchallenged. He regretted that conditions had forced the decision to emigrate. He considered European values to be superior values; he was anxious to re-create institutions based on them in the American enviornment. The mother tongue was nurtured. Identification with the ethnic group was strong. For such a person emigration exacted a toll measured in sentimental loss that was difficult to replace.

Ideally, the former type represented rapid assimilation, economic success, urban and small-town residence, urban-type occupations, associational activity in American institutions, preference for public school education for his children, affiliation with Anglo-American Protestant denominations, and, in the political arena, higher rates of naturalization, voting, and political activity. The latter type, by contrast, represented slower assimilation, rural isolation, the preservation of old-world heritages through support for immigrant institutions, including foreign-language newspapers, churches, and schools. This type was characterized by a wariness of native American institutions and activities, and, in politics, by lower rates of naturalization, voting, and political activity, and the playing of ethnic politics.

Second-Generation Immigrants

The conflict between the native and the immigrant cultures was particularly intense for the second-generation immigrant. Nurtured in the warmth of ethnic family life, the children of the immigrants learned to speak German or Polish or Italian before they learned English. They shared the ethnic life of their parents. Yet it was impossible for them to share it completely because their experience was also American. While their love and loyalty for their parents was genuine, many of them were also painfully aware of the fact that their ethnic status was a source of deprivation and humiliation for them.

Thus, the second generation immigrants were caught between two worlds of culture. They responded in a variety of ways.[6] One type, the "in-grouper," tended to identify with the parental group and embrace the ethnic cultural heritage. Since this response involved a denial of his American heritage, the "in-grouper" often compensated for consequent feelings of insecurity with a militantly defensive posture. Indeed, sometimes he became a caricature of the ethnic culture with which he identified. Defenders of a cultural complex that had only limited reality for them, such men often became pitifully conservative, sometimes more extreme in their views than their fathers had been.

Another second-generational response was that of the "rebel." Resentful of the disabilities imposed upon him by his immigrant heritage, he sought to divest himself as thoroughly as possible of all immigrant symbols. It was relatively easy for the German, for example, to anglicize his name, or to shuck Lutheran church membership for Methodist or Epicopalian.

A third response made by the children of immigrants to cultural clash was that of apathy. Sensitive to the counterpulls of the two cultures, this type often sought to evade the problem by avoiding situations in which ethnic origins could have a part. Such a German-American, for example, would turn his back on association with German churches, schools, *Turnvereine,* or any other immigrant-oriented organization. At the same time, however, he was afraid to participate in native-American institutional life out of fear that his ethnic background would somehow become a source of embarrassment or humiliation for him.

[6] The typology which follows is taken from Irvin L. Child's *Italian or American? The Second Generation Conflict* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1943).

Shortly after arriving in America, the individual immigrant began to discover that there were others whose assimilational experience and problems matched his own. Inevitably they were drawn together. They could communicate with each other; they spoke the same language, literally and figuratively. In Europe language had rarely functioned as a checkpoint for the comparisons and contrasts which a person uses to locate himself in society. Prior to his arrival in America, a German immigrant ordinarily thought of himself as a *Bayer,* a *Pommer,* or a *Sachse,* and not as a German. But when thrust into the alien American environment, he discovered that the old distinctions had lost much of their meaning. In America nationality stood out as the unique attribute; language became the outstanding distinguishing feature. Moreover, as the immigrant group became increasingly aware of itself as a cultural minority, it also discovered that ethnic group action could be surprisingly effective on the American scene.

Immigrant Organization, Institutions, Movements

As a consequence, each immigrant group of size went about building a society of its own within American society. In this effort, immigrants were motivated not only by their own psychological inability to participate extensively in the associational affairs of the host society, but also by reason of the exclusionist policies of native Americans. As Hesse-Darmstadters or as Westphalians they could not accomplish much, but as Germans their numbers often were adequate for much ethnic enterprise to be successful.

The strength of the ethnic enclaves erected within American society was directly related to the number and effectiveness of the institutions, both formal and informal, that the immigrants created. In the urban areas immigrant groups established a variety of social, cultural, religious, economic, and political organizations. In the rural areas, however, the churches were by far the most important immigrant institutions. The church was best equipped to serve as a nucleus around which the newcomers could organize their lives in America. It had the best potential for maintaining the unity of the group and for symbolizing the sentiments and values that had suffered erosion through the transfer to the new world. As the immigrant struggled to preserve something of the old familiar ways, he frequently rediscovered religion. Under these circumstances the

church tended to assume an importance that it had not had for him in Europe.[7]

This is not to say, of course, that all immigrants were religious. The resentment of some to the church and all that it stood for was of long standing. For others, hostility dated from the time that they realized the full implications of separation of church and state in America and that church membership implied financial support. Forced by circumstances to be frugal, many immigrants found giving to the church a painful experience. It was easier to denounce the pastor as a grasping, domineering rascal who lived off the labor of others. Certainly the rapid assimilators were prone to keep the immigrant church at arm's length. For them the Anglo-American denominations had a strong attraction. Moreover, many members of the second generation did not feel the same psychological need for the church that their parents had.

By contrast, the slow assimilators among the immigrants realized full well that if their cherished European values were to endure in America, the preservation of the mother tongue was indispensable. Speaking the mother tongue in the home was hardly enough to counter the effects of the many interpersonal contacts their children were experiencing with the American-born, especially in the schools. As a rule American public schools took no account of the cultural background of the children. Their special needs and capacities were ordinarily ignored. Old world customs, dances, music, and folklore were denigrated, often unwittingly, by teachers who were anxious to instill a love of America in their charges. The children, eager to please, readily joined in the rituals of the American secular religion. The songs were sung, the recitations learned, the symbols revered, and the secular saints venerated. In the process, the great gulf fixed between the parents and their children was widened. To the church-minded immigrant there was no better solution to these problems than the parish school.

Among German immigrants, parish schools were most common in the Lutheran and Catholic churches. There is some evidence that other German-American denominations maintained them at various times, but their number was insignificant. Among the Evangelicals, for example, attempts to maintain parochial schools usually did not meet with success because the ecumenicity or unionism of their theology militated against the cultural isolation which the parish school symbolized.

For the German Mennonites cultural and religious separatism almost became a fetish. In many instances, however, they did not establish parish schools in the 19th century. The reason was not that they considered them unimportant but rather that the exclusive quality of their settlements made them unnecessary. As all other denominations were choked out, all of the constituents of given school districts became Mennonites. By hiring teachers of their own faith, they were able to accomplish their ends without the expense of a duplicate system.

Roman Catholic Parochial Schools

The relationship of the Catholic parochial school to immigrant groups is somewhat different from that of Protestant churches with European roots. This flows from the fact that one ethnic group was usually not sufficiently numerous to dominate the character of a Roman Catholic congregation. While strong ethnic congregations did exist, particularly in Eastern cities, more often than not the typical Catholic parish was a polyglot institution that included Irish, Bohemians, Poles, native Americans, as well as Germans. In multinational parishes there was no choice but to use the English language. Hence in such cases Catholic schools had minimal influence in slowing down the assimilational process. In the more purely ethnic congregations, of course, the mother tongue was used in the school. Gradually, however, there was an enlargement of English-language instruction so that by 1900 German was commonly used only in religion classes. Its continuation in the curriculum was as a subject, not as a medium of instruction.

Of course, not all German Catholics were content to have their children instructed in English in their parochial schools. Germans were largely responsible for a considerable furor over organization in the Roman Church during the 1880s. Irish prelates had come to dominate the hierarchy of Catholicism in America. Since they did not have to struggle with a language problem, the Irish bishops were accused by the Germans of having scant sympathy for their problems of adjustment to American life. The Germans agitated for the establishment of parishes and dioceses along ethnic lines. They insisted that the traditional use of geographic lines by the church was not applicable to America with its heterogeneous population. Archbishop Ireland of St. Paul, Minn., led the opposition against this pro-German movement, somewhat inappropriately known as Cahenslyism, after Peter Paul Cahensly, a prominent German Catholic lay leader.[8]

Moreover, Catholics were by no means in perfect agreement regarding parochial school education in America. It was not until the Third Plenary Council of the American Catholic hierarchy, held in Baltimore in 1884, that the church established the policy of urging each parish to establish its own school and to make it obligatory for Catholic parents to send their children to parochial schools. Thus the number of Catholic schools in Nebraska, for example, was very small prior to the Baltimore decision. In 1885 there were only 22 Catholic parish schools in the state, with a total enrollment of less than 2,000. Thereafter, however, their growth was more rapid, with nearly 60 in operation by the end of the century.

Lutheran Parochial Schools

The function of the parochial school as a conservator of an ethnic cultural heritage was much more apparent among Lutherans. Their congregations were most common in the small towns and countryside, where social isolation was most complete. Coming from lower classes in European society, these Lutherans were frequently lacking both in education and in the riches of this world. Moreover, the Germans among them, particularly after the unification of Germany in 1871, tended to be cultural nationalists. Often they were militant defenders of a cultural heritage which assumed greater importance for them in an alien environment than it had in the homeland.

There were, of course, many rapid assimilators among the Germans, as among other immigrant groups. Yet it is not likely that many of them felt comfortable in rural and small-town Lutheran parishes, particularly those of the Midwest. Their psychological orientation led them to evade the constrictions of ghetto existence and to fade into the native-American social complex as rapidly as possible. Probably the majority of those German immigrants who became active members of Lutheran parishes tended to be slow assimilators. Their external behavior patterns were adapted to the standards set by the host society, yet many years were to pass before they were to experience any significant measure of assimilation into the structure of American society.[9] Similarly, among members of the second generation the "in-groupers" remained strong in Lutheran circles and tended to assume the leadership positions while the "rebels" and the apathetic tended to drift away. These, then, were the people who turned to the parochial schools as the device to preserve the cultural and religious values and attitudes that were being weakened in America.

While the attitudes toward parish schools varied among the several Lutheran bodies, those synods whose constituencies were constantly replenished by the flow of German immigrants considered them to be an essential part of the parish program. In contrast to the typical Catholic priest, the Lutheran pastor of the Missouri Synod, on his arrival in a new German settlement, almost always established some kind of a school with himself as teacher. Many of these institutions, of course, would not qualify as schools by modern standards. Terms were often short, and frequently sessions were held only three or four days a week. Sometimes the curricula were woefully inadequate and consisted of little more than religious instruction. Other parish schools included in the statistics seem to have been merely part-time agencies intended to supplement public school instruction. Nevertheless, in many German Lutheran communities the first church building erected doubled as a school. Usually located in the country or in small towns, these schools rarely had more than two teachers, including the pastor. In 1881, when the Nebraska District of The Lutheran Church – Missouri Synod was established, 26 parish schools were in operation, with 965 children in attendance. Four years later Missouri Synod schools in Nebraska had more than doubled to 57, with 2,084 pupils. By 1900 they had increased to 125 schools with an enrollment of 4,200. The majority of these institutions were comparable in size and quality to the typical Nebraska public school in rural areas. In 79 instances, according to the statistics of 1900, the pastor served as teacher, usually the only teacher. Virtually the only cases of congregations not having schools occurred when the pastor served two or more parishes. In those instances, a school was almost always maintained in the community where the pastor resided.[10]

The German Language Factor

In evaluating the impact of parochial education on the process of assimilation it is easy to overestimate the importance of the German language in the churches and schools. Unquestionably an appreciation for the German cultural heritage was fostered by these institutions, and there is no doubt that German Lutheran communities tended to be isolationist by choice. Yet the fact remains that the churches and schools were primarily religious institutions rather than cultural, at least in the minds of the clergy. Many of the laymen, no doubt, conceived of them in the same terms as *Sängerbünde*, *Turnvereine*, or such organizations as the *Deutsch-Amerikanischer National-bund*. Yet, from the first, prominent leaders warned against making the churches and the schools instruments for the perpetuation of German language and culture. Articles in church periodicals stressed the need for instruction in English; model curricula directed that instruction in English should be steadily increased through the elementary grades.[11] Nevertheless, as long as new German immigrants continued to swell the ranks, the churches and schools had to continue the extensive use of German if they were to be effective ameliorative institutions.

There is evidence, however, to indicate that English instruction was not uncommon in many Lutheran schools during the last quarter of the 19th century, even in

[7] Niebuhr, pp. 222f. and *passim*.

[8] The best treatment of this controversy is by Colman Barry, *The Catholic Church and German Americans* (Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Co., 1953).

[9] O. H. Pannkoke cites the example of an old friend who, even though he was the president of a large mortgage house in Chicago, confessed that he was never at ease with non-Missouri Lutherans. See *A Great Church Finds Itself: The Lutheran Church Between the Wars* (Quitman, Ga.: published by the author, 1966), pp. 14 and 28.

[10] The Lutheran Church — Missouri Synod, Nebraska District, *Erster Synodal Bericht* . . . 1882, pp. 54f.; *Statistisches Jahrbuch* . . . 1900, pp. 75—80 and 113.

[11] E.g., see J. C. W. Lindemann, "Die Wichtigkeit der englischen Sprache als Unterrichtsgegenstand in unseren Gemeindeschulen," *Evangelisch-Lutherisches Schulblatt*, I (March 1866), 205—11; "Lehrplan für die Gemeindeschulen der evang.-lutherischen Missouri-synode zu Milwaukee, Wis." *ibid.*, XXV (April 1890), 97—128.

the strongest German colonies.[12] As in the Catholic schools, instruction in religion was in the German language while the other subjects were frequently taught in English. However, German grammar, literature, and handwriting normally continued to be a part of the curriculum. This is the exact pattern that was announced when the Seward *Schullehrer-Seminar* was established in 1894.[13] When that institution was dedicated, English as well as German sermons graced the day. Moreover, English seems to have been the customary language used by the boys in the dormitory.

It appears that in practice the typical German subsociety defined distinct social spheres for the use of each language. In the home and with other primary group relationships involving first-generation immigrants the familiar dialect, *Plattdeutsch,* was used. Since the younger generation felt a stronger need for English as the *modus operandi* to effect accord with the host society, they preferred to use English. Meanwhile, High German was largely restricted to literary and sacerdotal uses. It was the language of books, periodicals, and newspapers; it was the language of sermons, hymns, and prayers.[14] Thus at mealtime a German father could lead his family in a High German table prayer; if one of his children misbehaved, verbal chastisement in *Plattdeutsch* could be expected to follow; more likely than not, the youngster would subsequently nurse his wounded ego in English conversation with his playmates.

Although there is much evidence to indicate that by 1900 the great majority of the members of the Missouri Synod were quite capable of using the English language, it does not follow that they had achieved any significant measure of structural assimilation. They had accommodated their behavior patterns to meet American standards, yet their subsociety could continue for generations. From a sociological point of view, the German churches and schools then became most important, not as preservers of language and culture, but as preservers of endogamy, that is, marriage within the group. While there had always been marriage unions which crossed group lines, especially among the rapid assimilators, partners were normally sought within the ethnoreligious community, a practice which was strongly encouraged by the church and by social pressure. So long as the family units used the church as their social nucleus, it mattered little what language was spoken. Though the use of the German language could disappear, Lutherans of German origins generally did not gain entrée into established American society until extensive marriage with non-Germans occurred. In the meantime, as this transitional phase of the church's history has been running its course, the parish school has often served as a buffer against the disappointments of nonacceptance. It has served as a basis for group identity. Among many Lutherans of an "in-group" orientation, it has filled a compensatory psychological need.

The Theological Factor

It would be a mistake, however, to explain the Lutheran school exclusively in terms of social interaction by immigrant peoples with native or established American society. Social determinism is as simplistic as any other monistic interpretation. If the immigrant condition were the sole factor, German Methodists, German Evangelicals, and the German Lutheran synods associated with the Pennsylvania Ministerium should have had school systems comparable to those of the Missouri, Wisconsin, and Iowa synods. Yet they did not. The reason seems to lie in their theology.

Traditionally, the history of Lutheran elementary schools has been told in terms of its relationship to Lutheran theology, that is, that the schools served as the great conservators of *reine Lehre.* Although its telling has been frequently marred by filiopietism, its essential validity remains. Preoccupation with *reine Lehre,* or scholastic confessionalism, as it has been called by F. Dean Lueking, implied that the Missouri Synod was the repository of the full truth of Christian revelation. It was intimately connected to the cultural factor because of the widespread fear that, if the pure doctrine were cast into English, it was likely to be lost, since it was so seldom preached in that language. Inevitably, scholastic confessionalism meant a "self-conscious separation from the surrounding life of the Christian church."[15] No doubt these theological concerns worked together with the conservative social forces associated with the immigrant condition to create and sustain the extensive system of Lutheran schools in the Missouri Synod.[16] Each reinforced the other, giving the schools uncommon strength as they weathered the troubled years following World War I.

It may be argued, of course, that the frequent assertions by Missouri Synod clergymen that their schools were religiously motivated, that they were *not* agents for the perpetuation of German language and culture, betray an anxious fear that the laity did not share their views, that in the lay mind cultural motives were paramount. There is much evidence to support this view. Yet the schools could not have been founded, nor would they have survived the transitional period, without the active and energetic support of the pastors. For all its vaunted congregationalism, the Missouri Synod has nevertheless been dominated by its clergy. Moreover,

[12] E.g., see Wilfried W. Wegener, "A Historical Study of the Parochial Schools of Trinity, Immanuel, St. Peter's, and St. Mark's Lutheran Churches of the Missouri Synod in Thayer County, Nebraska" (unpublished bachelor's thesis, Concordia Teachers' College, Seward, Nebr., 1941), pp. 5, 50, and 80.

[13] *Blue Valley Blade* (Seward, Nebr.), Nov. 21, 1894.

[14] As late as 1911 it was reported that only three percent of the congregations in the Synodical Conference were using English in their worship services. See Carl S. Meyer (ed.), *Moving Frontiers* (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1964), p. 361.

[15] F. Dean Lueking, *Mission in the Making* (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1964). See also Pannkoke, Ch. 1.

[16] See Frederick C. Luebke, "The Immigrant Condition as a Factor Contributing to the Conservatism of The Lutheran Church — Missouri Synod," *Concordia Historical Institute Quarterly,* XXXVIII (April 1965), 19—28.

it is not likely that the enthusiasts for German culture among the laity considered *reine Lehre* unimportant or something that had to be swallowed in order to retain the parochial schools as agents for the perpetuation of a cultural pattern. Other less expensive and equally efficient means were available to achieve that goal.

Sociological Factors

Yet this social interaction of theology and culture does not tell the whole story. Many questions remain unanswered. If theological orientation is central, why did the Iowa Synod, which was so similar to Missouri in terms of its origins, immigrant constituency, and devotion to *reine Lehre,* lose its schools? What accounts for the survival of parochial school education in the Wisconsin Synod, the origins of which were less like Missouri's than Iowa's?[17] Why were the schools of the Norwegian and Danish Lutherans so much more culturally oriented than the German schools?[18] Why have the Scandinavians generally been less concerned about *reine Lehre* than German Lutherans? The sociology of immigration and theological stance are only the most obvious conditioners of these phenomena. Explanations may also be sought in the cultural differences between Germans and Scandinavians, in the relative size of the various synods, in the impact of association in such organizations as the Synodical Conference or the General Synod, in the success of teacher training institutions in the several synods, and certainly in the quality of synodical leadership. Differences among the synods on such seemingly unrelated issues as prohibition and woman suffrage seem to have had a direct bearing on the success or failure of Lutheran parochial school education.[19] Of course, it is not within the scope of this essay to explore these matters. Yet the history of Lutheran education in America will remain only partially understood until they are adequately investigated.

In a broad sociological view, the institutions erected by immigrant peoples had, as their basic function, the amelioration of the assimilational process. They were designed to cushion the newcomer against the shocks he endured as he adjusted to the standards of a new and strange society. When these various social, economic, cultural, and religious institutions were no longer necessary, they either atrophied or were transformed into the fabric of the larger society. Thus the culturally oriented schools of the Scandinavian Lutherans withered on the vine, while most of the Missouri and Wisconsin Synod schools managed to survive. The casualty rates were nonetheless high, especially during the traumatic years during and following World War I. Yet those schools which endured rapidly divested themselves of those Germanic traits that remained.

By the end of the Great Depression the social transformation was reasonably complete. Schools continued to be closed during those years, but more often they were victims of economic constrictions and, later, during the early '40s, of a severe shortage of teachers. Nevertheless, the losses were offset by the founding of many new schools.[20] These, of course, were totally without a history of service to immigrant peoples. Like the older schools that had survived, they were completely oriented to the American way of life. Yet most Lutheran congregations, especially those in rural and small-town America, continued to be ethnically homogeneous groups. Though they had adapted thoroughly to American standards, most Missouri Synod congregations remained endogamous.

It was not until the time of World War II with its attendant social ferment that extensive intermarriage with non-Lutherans and non-Germans began to occur. With the urbanization of American society and its remarkable mobility, with its ever-rising standard of living, and with the attraction modern Lutheranism has for middle-class suburbia, exogamy has become standard.[21]

This trend has been accompanied, inevitably, by a breakdown in the traditional social and theological isolation which has been the hallmark of a great many Missouri Synod parishes. Lutherans no longer hover on the fringes of "the Establishment." In many communities, Lutheran church membership has ceased to be a stumbling block to admittance into the clubs, cliques, and leadership of established society. In brief, full structural assimilation has finally been achieved. Concomitantly, religious separatism, together with its historic symbol and chief prop, the parochial school, has been increasingly viewed as an encumbrance rather than as an aid to the social needs of the laity. In other words, the traditional "scholastic confessionalism," which in past times complemented the social and psychological needs of the Lutheran constituency, is now often seen as an anachronistic theological orientation, inadequate and irrelevant to contemporary society. Thus the new ecumenical spirit evident in the Missouri Synod (so applauded by some and deplored by others) is a "home grown" variety, independent of, but complementary to,

[17] For a good introduction to attitudes toward parish schools in the Iowa Synod at the end of the century see Johannes Deindoerfer, *Geschichte der Evangel.-Luth. Synode von Iowa und anderen Staaten* (Chicago: Wartburg Publishing House, 1897).

[18] See Paul Nyholm, *The Americanization of the Danish Lutheran Churches in America* (Copenhagen: Institute for Danish Church History, 1963).

[19] These issues were connected, for example, in the election of 1890 in Wisconsin, Illinois, and Nebraska, where the status of parochial schools was a key issue. Generally, the prohibition-minded Republican party was hostile to parochial schools. As a consequence, German Lutherans and German Catholics voted heavily Democratic, while the more pietistic Norwegian Lutherans supported the Republican and Populist tickets.

[20] It would be revealing to discover how many or what proportion of the Lutheran schools in existence in 1910 were still operating in 1940 and to contrast this figure with the number or proportion of schools in existence today which have been founded since 1940. Unfortunately the published statistics do not lend themselves to this kind of analysis.

[21] Even among the pastors and teachers of the Missouri Synod a non-German name no longer raises an eyebrow. *The Lutheran Annual* for 1966 lists 23 pastors and male teachers with names beginning with "Mc," while only 7 continue to carry the "von" which has traditionally marked the members of the German upper classes.

the new ecumenicity and the renewed search for relevance which has characterized American Christianity since the postwar religious boom has run its course.

Significance for Lutheran Schools Today

And what is the significance of all this for Lutheran schools today? The Missouri Synod stands at a crossroads just as its fathers and grandfathers did. In their time, Lutheran parochial schools were forced to become thoroughly American institutions. Atrophy, the consequence of irrelevance, was the alternative. Since the religious function ordinarily prevailed during the immigrant era, most German Lutheran schools successfully weathered the storms of transition to full structural assimilation. Indeed, the Lutheran school system survived to experience a period of remarkable growth which seems to have tapered off only in the last few years.

In our day Lutheran parochial schools no longer serve the social needs of an assimilating people as they once did. In the past they were perfect complements of religious isolationism. So long as the Missouri Synod felt that it was being denied full acceptance by American society, it operated much like the churches of "the disinherited." In short, it functioned as a sect.[22] But its sectarianism had been forced upon it by social realities attending the process of assimilation.

Nevertheless, this sectarianism was, in fact, a denial of the Lutheran genius of universality which the Missouri Synod insists it never lost. In order to illuminate the relationship of parish schools to these matters, it may be fruitful to consider the Seventh-day Adventist and Mennonite churches. These denominations rightly conceive of themselves as sects. They are religious separatists who do not see their communions as potentially all-encompassing or universal. Their raison d'être is secession from the established churches. Hence they effectively employ parochial schools to promote particularity.

Lutherans, by contrast, are not religious secessionists. Their church is a catholic church. The social forces which produced particularity during the immigrant and transitional phases have all but disappeared. Hence it is now possible for the Missouri Synod to return to the historic universality of Martin Luther.[23] All of the church's agencies, including parish schools, must work toward that end. If they do not, if they persist in the promotion of sectarianism, they will become increasingly irrelevant and incapable of carrying out the mission of the church.

Just as the Lutheran schools of our fathers faced atrophy if they persisted in perpetuating a cultural pattern longer than necessary, so our schools, as agents of the church's mission, face a crisis if they perpetuate religious sectarianism beyond social utility. Lutheran schools have the potential of turning the church in upon itself.

This is not to predict, of course, that the Lutheran school system of today confronts a problem of survival like the one it faced as the immigrant phase of the church's history drew to a close. It is a system of 1,364 elementary schools which enrolls 160,822 children, employing 2,445 teachers, many of whom were prepared for their careers of service in three thriving colleges which are themselves part of the church's educational complex. This system is not likely to disappear overnight. The question is not one of life or death but rather one of how well Lutheran educators will perform their duties as members of the body of Christ.

[22] In employing this terminology, I am drawing upon the usage developed by H. Richard Niebuhr in his *The Social Sources of Denominationalism.* He writes: "Churches are inclusive institutions, frequently national in scope, and emphasize the universalism of the gospel; while sects are exclusive in character, appeal to the individualistic element in Christianity and emphasize its ethical demands" (p. 17). See also his Ch. VIII, "The Churches of the Immigrants."

[23] This is not to suggest that Luther or Lutherans have considered or should consider doctrine to be unimportant. Rather it implies that the church must be universal or inclusive in its appeal and in the relevancy of its message, unhindered by unchristian polemics directed at fellow Christians. Concern for the health, growth, and welfare of the body of Christ must take precedence over the interests of the institution known as the Missouri Synod.

CONCORDIA'S NONDEGREE ADVANCED STUDY PROGRAMS

by MARTIN B. KIRCH

When the Graduate Commission was established at Concordia Teachers College, Seward, it took the position that not all advanced study beyond the baccalaureate degree should culminate in a master's degree. It became quite apparent that Concordia would need to offer programs which would prepare people for positions in the church as directors of Christian education, youth, and music. It was also recognized that some would not want to pursue the rigidly prescribed master's-degree curriculum but would rather choose a more personalized program to suit individual interests and special parish need.

A number of such special programs of study beyond the bachelor's degree are offered for Lutheran teachers who desire to improve their knowledge and skills in educational and parish leadership, or their own professional classroom competence. These programs do not lead to an advanced degree but prepare master teachers, directors of Christian education, youth leaders, music directors, or combinations of these.

These programs are built on the premise that each candidate should be a teacher first, should be eligible to be certified to teach, and then can develop a field of specialization. Courses in these programs are offered during both the regular terms and summers. A student may elect to enter the program at the beginning of the junior year or after completing the bachelor degree.

For students enrolling in the fifth year of a 5-year nondegree program after completing a bachelor degree in teacher education, admission is similar to admission to graduate study. The student must have a 2.00 (C) grade-point average and must maintain this average for successful completion of the program. Part of the work will consist of graduate work.

A. THE 5-YEAR CLASSROOM TEACHER PROGRAM

The 5-year master classroom teacher program is designed for teachers who do not wish to pursue the rigidly defined requirements of a master's degree but whose objective is to improve their personal competence through further academic study to meet their own needs or interests as Lutheran teachers. The program seeks to encourage the growth of those abilities, attitudes, understandings, and commitments that are part of the professional competencies of the effective Lutheran teacher.

Course requirements of the fifth year are flexible. The student with his advisor will plan a proposed program to fit needs and intended emphasis and submit this to the Director of Graduate Studies for approval.

REQUIREMENTS

a. Professional education (Required, 3; electives, 6)	9 sem. hours
b. Religion (Required, 3; electives, 6)	9 sem. hours
c. Subject field (all planned electives)	9 sem. hours
d. General electives	3 sem. hours
Total	30 sem. hours

(158 sem. hours minimum: 128 sem. hours predegree and 30 sem. hours beyond bachelor's degree)

B. DIRECTOR OF CHRISTIAN EDUCATION AND YOUTH WORK

The director of Christian or parish education shares in the duties and responsibilities of the office of the ministry and serves as leader, guide, consultant, and teacher for the various established agencies of the parish. This program is basically an extension of the prebaccalaureate teacher education program of Concordia.

A student planning to prepare himself to be a director of Christian education should choose this specialization as early as possible and no later than the end of the sophomore year of college. The student in this program will take the 4-year bachelor of science in education program now offered at Concordia but will make certain adjustments and selections to prepare himself for the duties of the director of Christian education.

The student shall elect either a major or a minor in religion. His other academic emphasis (major or minor) shall be in one of the academic core subjects — English, social science, science, or mathematics. A student choosing the program is urged to select his undergraduate elective hours carefully. Courses in speech, music, drama, counseling, guidance, and physical education can provide skills and experiences that will be especially helpful to the director of Christian education and youth work.

The program requires two semesters of work beyond the bachelor of science in education degree. The additional time gives the student opportunity to obtain the type of background that can provide him with the qualifications necessary for effectiveness in the office. For example, in addition to 8 weeks of student teaching that provides considerable acquaintance with the parish and is therefore useful to a director of Christian education, the student spends an additional 8 weeks in an intensive, guided internship. This experience supplements the first and emphasizes the work and viewpoint of the director of Christian education.

REQUIREMENTS

a. Must qualify for Lutheran teacher diploma.
b. Religion major or minor (undergraduate or graduate).
c. Minor or major in either English, mathematics, science or social science (undergraduate or graduate).
d. Parish internship of 8 weeks for 6 sem. hours credit.
e. Electives in speech, music, drama, counseling, guidance, and physical education are suggested.
f. Total of 30 sem. hours minimum. (158: 128 predegree and 30 sem. hours beyond bachelor's degree)

C. DIRECTOR OF PARISH MUSIC

This program is designed to improve the preparation of teachers who choose music as their special field of service to the church or parish.

A student planning to prepare himself to be a director of parish music should choose this specialization as early as possible and no later than the beginning of his junior year in college. The student in this program will take the 4-year bachelor of science curriculum now offered at Concordia but will choose electives to prepare himself both for teaching and for director of parish music responsibilities.

The student shall elect a major in music and a minor in one of the academic core subjects (English, social science, mathematics, or science). A student in this program will be able to distribute his elective hours for breadth in areas that will be especially useful to him personally as a teacher and as a director of parish music.

The program requires two semesters of work beyond the bachelor of science in education degree. The additional time gives the student the opportunity for intensive study in music to increase his effectiveness as a director. The two additional semesters also provide time for course work in other areas.

REQUIREMENTS

a. Must qualify for Lutheran teacher diploma.
b. Major in music (undergraduate or graduate).
c. Minor in English, mathematics, science, or social science.
d. Electives for supporting or interest areas.
e. Total of 30 sem. hours minimum. (158: 128 and 30)

For more information regarding Concordia's summer school, fifth-year, or graduate program write to the Director of Graduate Studies, Concordia Teachers College, 800 N. Columbia, Seward, Nebr. 68434.

History: REALITY AND EDUCATION

"The living past must be considered as living and as a part of the living present. It is then that history can be and will be education."

by WALTER D. UHLIG

THE SEAT OF CLIO in academe is secure. There is little likelihood that the historical muse will lose her revered position in the halls of learning. Herodotus is not likely to be disowned as unworthy of the attention of space-age scholars.

It is not that there is a lack of individuals who would like to eliminate the study of history from the academic life. There is no dearth of students who would gladly be spared a concern with ancient dates and "the useless facts of history." Nothing would please some more than to leave the trivia of the past to be studied by anachronistic scholars. As the present rushes forward with the breathtaking conquests of science, some would like to make living today the chief object of concern for contemporary man in the area of scholastic activity also.

Historians are unanimous that such an attitude is regrettable. They are not, however, united in their opinions as to the causes thereof and the steps that should be taken to improve it. We would submit the suggestion that while there is much study of the facts of history, there is all too little study of history. Too often a lack of awareness of the nature of history, even on the part of knowledgeable historians, has led to concentration on the facts of history and not on history itself. The result has been in many cases a dislike for the study of history and a feeling that the subject is irrelevant. History has continued as an academic subject that is frequently not educational. If history is to be educational and not merely academic, it must be recognized that history is life.

History is life. It is life as it is portrayed by living characters. The actors in the drama of life are always living, breathing individuals whose existence, no matter when or where they live, was or is just as real, just as important to themselves, as is our own existence to each of us. They are flesh and blood: strong, lusty, courageous warriors or delicate, attractive ladies or misty, pensive poets or penetrating, analytical scholars. Whoever the persons are, they are not nonentities active in an imaginary, unreal novel of bygone days, but a cast that is alive in a story that is real as the participants live the drama of life with its varied situations.

As in a drama the characters of the play of life are active under a God who observes and guides the players. At times the divine Director actively leads the cast, while at other times He allows the players a freedom that has unfortunate results; but in any event the God of history is always in the wings as the play progresses.

Although all history is life, it is not all identical. The drama of life is different for every person. Most obvious are the variations of time and place. The life of Julius Caesar in the first century before Christ was different from that of a medieval prince in France. It was different also from that of Brutus and even of Caesar's brother, although they lived at substantially the same time and place.

More significant are the variations in the social conditions in which individuals function. Moses' colleagues at the palace of Pharaoh lived a different life from his Jewish compatriots. An inhabitant of a metropolitan slum faces an existence radically unlike that of the city alderman.

Not only is variety caused by external factors of a social or economic nature, but more subtle and intangible influences shape specific thought patterns so that variety is multiplied and each individual is unique. Heredity and environment determine personality, and this in turn is partially responsible for the uniqueness of the existence of every individual.

Despite the fact that there is such a great variety among people in their individual entities as well as in their lives in the environmental situations, consequent actions, and varied experiences, history, which is composed of the sum total of these lives, is life and is reality. History is varied, but it *is*, whenever and however it occurs. History or life is not a play. Amos would object very strongly to the suggestion that it was merely make-believe when he thundered against the capital of Syria: "For three transgressions of Damascus, and for four, I will not turn away the punishment thereof, because they have threshed Gilead with threshing instruments of iron." It was also reality for Cleopatra as she met in rendezvous with Mark Anthony in Alexandria, a reality that culminated in her death from the venom of the fiery asp sometime later.

History as Reality

History is reality to the participants as they endure the bitter darts of fortune or the sweet smiles of joy and success in their varied experiences. It is reality in diversity because it contains basic ingredients found in the lives of all people. The universal themes of life are the core of every existence. The Preacher stressed the universals of human life in the third chapter of Ecclesiastes: "To everything there is a season, and a time to every purpose under the heaven: a time to be born and a time to die, a time to plant, and a time to pluck up that which is planted." Work and play, sickness and health, poverty or wealth are but a few of the experiences that come to all people.

Besides the universals of experiences, the needs and desires of mankind are reality, for they are the warp of existence. Hunger and thirst, love and hate, selfishness and altruism, generosity and greed are samples of sentiments and passions that drive or guide men in existences that are varied and ways that are frequently strange.

Not to be forgotten among the universals of life that make up reality are the spiritual elements. The all-pervasive influence of sin is a constant in the nature and affairs of mankind. Though many a person may endeavor to ignore his soul, it is a facet of reality that exists for every person. Above and beyond all exists the ultimate reality, God, in relation to which alone there can be reality at all.

It may be readily admitted that history is reality for contemporaries. It is difficult to deny the significance of conditions and events for their participants, but reality carries in it the implication of universality, and universality is temporal as well as spatial. Not only does it impinge upon the existence of all people living at the same time, but it is a factor in the lives of all individuals whenever they live. The mere fact that events occurred in the past does not mean that they can be ignored as unreal because they are mere "history." Also to the present the past is reality, and to the future the present will be reality, for active participation in the drama of life does not cease with death. The shades of many persons of the past are still unobstrusively stalking about as the present is occurring.

To stress universality in absolute terms as the essence of history would be naive, but it is hardly inappropriate to indicate that historical reality is not limited by time. The evidence that the past is still living today is so obvious that it is frequently forgotten. Luther's hammer blows on the Castle Church in Wittenberg affected many more than Lutherans and Catholics of the 16th century or subsequent Lutherans. Joseph Lister died in 1912, but he is still standing right beside every mother as she applies an antiseptic medication to the cut finger of her child, even though she may be using a medicine that was unknown to Lister and differs greatly from the undiluted carbolic acid he used in his first experiments in antisepsis. Physically, Adolph Hitler may be dead, but he certainly is real for the millions of persons whose lives have been changed by his influence as well as for those yet unborn whose lives would have been greatly different if he had not lived. The list of names of persons and events that are real to the present generation because of their abiding influence could be pages long. It could be supplemented by a list of contemporary individuals and events that are real and will be a part of reality for ages to come as their influence, in the fields of science and industry especially, affects the lives of future generations.

The past is reality for the present because of similarity as well as causality. Basically, the characters of history in various ages are similar in nature as humans. More important is the similarity in the basic relationships that have existed in the past, exist in the present, and will exist in the future. Home and family are not ephemeral. The Assyrians had homes, the Russians have families, and it can be presumed that when future generations look at the past they will see in the family structure elements of similarity though not identity. What the patterns of authority will be in the future is uncertain, but although basic laws may be altered radically over the centuries, there will be some kind of law and government. Nations and people will still face the problems of group control.

The future will be similar to the present and the past in regard to the conditions and actions of society in addition to its institutions. Utopias of all sorts, planned societies from Plato's republic to Comte de Saint-Simon's industrial state, have aimed at the elimination of poverty, but it is more than likely that the words of Christ will always be true: "The poor ye have always with you." Concerned leaders of the future will doubtless direct their attention to social conditions like poverty, sickness, crime, and prejudice, just a few of the problems that are part of the reality of history. Furthermore, the actions of society in response to its problems will continue in the future in line with the past. Pacifism in its recent manifestations may be more extensive than it was in the past, but neither idealist nor realist goals have been successful in eliminating war in the past or present and will probably not be able in the future to make this world a place where the lion and the lamb lie down together in peace. As long as self-interest is a powerful drive in man, there will be individuals who pervert this potent force for good to their own advantage and who seek to attain their own goals by force of arms. The present will be reality with the past as the same problems are faced in ways that are at times similar and at times contrasting.

The relationships that pervade history, the connections that exist between the past and the present, demand that the history of man be treated as reality. The

living past must be considered as living and as part of the living present. It is then that history can be and will be education. Only then can history be more than a study of facts, events, and conditions that happened once upon a time. Only then will history teach.

History as Education

Many an hour has been spent by scholars in airing ideas as to how useful knowledge must be in order to be education. The golden mean of truth probably lies somewhere between the proponents of the dollar sign as an indicator of value and those who hold that knowledge is justified if merely possessing it contributes to the intellectual satisfaction of an individaul. The major complaint of undergraduate students of history is that ancient facts are worthless, but history can and should and will be profitable if it is considered to be reality.

Mirrors are useful. They help us see ourselves. Their value is not merely in seeing ourselves but in enabling us, as we see ourselves in relation to others, to judge how well we compare with them and then to act in accordance with that judgment. To many people the sight of dirt on one's face is a stimulus to cleaning it. The dirty boy is told by his mother to look at his dirty face. He may see dirt on his face and still not be inclined to rub hard with the washcloth and soap because he is not aware that cleanliness is one of the canons of polite society. The mechanic may agree that cleanliness is next to godliness but still not wash himself at the sight of grease on his face because he has a special standard that says grease is necessary and permissible at work but not at the dining table.

The mirror is educational because it shows a person the condition of his face and induces him to act according to standards and conditions as related to him. In a similar fashion, history makes it possible for individuals to make judgments as they see the past in relation to themselves. It is only in the decisions and actions of individuals and groups when attitudes are tailored, philosophies developed, and actions taken as a result of cues given by history that history is educational.

History is education as it reminds the individual how similar individuals in similar situations in the past faced their problems and solved them. A part of the reason why Napoleon became a 19th-century Caesar was his realization that the early Romans were not basically different from the people of 19th-century Europe but had the same needs and were influenced by the same basic desires as they faced the same basic problems of life. The records of Caesar's exploits indicated to Napoleon how Caesar had coped successfully with his problems and conditions, so Napoleon consciously sought to manipulate his situation in a similar manner. Napoleon recognized parallels not only with first-century Rome but also with Alexander and the fourth century before Christ, with Gustavus Adolphus and the 17th century and with other persons and times, from all of whom he learned.

Implicit in history is a reminder that the present can be expected to reach similar decisions as the past in so far as conditions are similar. Lyndon Johnson is evidence that this is so, for he may not have heard of *panem et circenses,* but his Great Society indicates that he is aware of the problems that faced ancient Rome and of the Roman resort to bread and circuses to calm their hungry, idle compatriots. Similarly, what many a contemporary citizen fears is that the subsequent era of Roman history may be repeated with similar unfortunate results. He is conscious of the repetitive nature of history and is aware that it does not always repeat itself as a result of careful planning but that at times the current of history becomes so strong that the ship of state may be swept into rapids and eddies which bruise and weaken the hull so it eventually sinks.

The study of history leaves no room for fatalism. If it teaches anything, it teaches causality. For every event there is a cause that is usually complex and extensive. Under the permissive guidance of the Divine Cause, man has in the past determined his own destiny, has been "the master of his fate and the captain of his soul." History tells the present individual that he must play a part in the determination of his existence as an individual and in society. As it succeeds in making him conscious that he must do this and aids him with insights gleaned from the past in doing this, it is real education. Attitudes must be fostered, goals set, and actions carried out if man is to do what his observation of the past tells him is desirable, if he is not to be swept into a position that may be undesirable, possibly even catastrophic, for him.

The message of history is clear in many areas of life. For intellectual life the voice of the past is loud as it directs attention to the golden ages of the mind and to eras that were comparatively barren intellectually, reminding and also helping the present to grow in its thought life. The most general concern of history has been the political. Here also history points to pitfalls and triumphs as it speaks to individuals, communities, and civilizations with suggestions and warning. In the tapestry of history are the figures of society that direct, more implicitly than obviously, the attention of man to praiseworthy aspects of earlier social institutions and to the undesirable conditions and arrangements under which man has functioned. The spiritual, the religious, the moral message of the past is always in the background, unfortunately often unnoticed. It is a constant reminder that life is also spiritual and that moral and religious factors dare not be overlooked by man today in shaping his thinking and doing, for this, too, is part of reality.

When history taught Napoleon how to plan and act so that the empire could come into existence, it was obviously education. When Thomas Jefferson gleaned from the past ideas for the formation of a new republic, he was obviously in the process of learning. But history

is education not only when it leads men to great feats in the public arena and affects the lives of the masses and multitudes. History is also education when it influences an individual and gives him some insight that helps him to alter and hopefully improve his own existence. It is education when the Confessions of St. Augustine touch the heart of a solitary reader and make the flicker of devotion burn a bit more brightly in his soul or when Cicero's *De senectute* gives a bit of helpful insight to a person as he faces the problem of increasing age. And who is to say that some light verse of Ogden Nash may not strike a responsive chord in a reader, so that he and his outlook are a bit different as a result of his encounter with an appealing thought in a lighthearted frame? As each of these readers is changed in a little way, he is being educated.

An awareness that history is real not only makes it profitable education as it is an influence in shaping the thoughts and actions of people, but it also makes it interesting education. A major cause for much of the dullness of historical teaching is the failure of the instructor to recognize the reality of history. All too frequently he himself has sat at the feet of instructors for whom the characters of history were vague figures in an ancient drama of make-believe. It may also be that the plethora of facts has stifled his imagination and in his mind reduced individuals to names and events to moves in an ancient game. On the other hand, the teacher of literature who has walked in the steps of the Bard of Avon or listened to the bells of Tintern Abbey may be better able to evoke the interest of his students in Shakespeare or Wordsworth. His visits to the places where these men were active may make them and their works live for him and consequently for his students. An approach to the characters of history in terms of flesh-and-blood reality will make their personalities fascinating, their activities interesting, and their foibles and idiosyncrasies delightful to teachers and students alike.

Distinct obligations fall to the scholar who thinks of history in terms of reality and who is interested in it specifically in the context of formal education. A thorough knowledge of the multitudinous factors that constitute the fabric of history is a prerequisite if history is real and is to be studied as reality. In the eyes of many, the historian is preoccupied with minutiae of little consequence, but it is these that make up the whole. Ignorance of them leads to distortions that fail to do justice to the persons who participated in the events and that vitiate efforts to learn from them. More serious is misrepresentation because of a failure to treat history with candor and honesty. Bias, whether it be intentional or the unconscious prejudice with which all mortals are afflicted to a greater or lesser extent, must be studiously avoided by the historian in his effort to let history be the best education that it can be.

Inherent in history as life that has been lived in an infinite number of places, by a host of fascinating persons, in a bewildering variety of conditions, are materials for the education and enrichment of later generations. With a recognition that all of it was real and is still a part of historical reality, it can still contribute greatly to the improvement of man and society.

LUTHERAN TOURS 1967

Complete Service for Individual or Group Tours Anywhere in the World

If you or your group are planning a special tour, we can smooth the way for you. Our complete travel service includes arrangements for all air, sea, and land transportation, hotels, sightseeing, travel documents . . . whatever your need may be . . . for foreign and domestic travel. Write or phone about your special tour or join us on one of the following tours:

TOUR **No. 3** — **HAWAIIAN HOLIDAY — 2 Departures**
June 22 to July 3 / July 24 to August 4
On return you have your choice of AIR or SHIP . . . visit Oahu and 3 outer Islands — Maui, Hawaii, and Kauai.

TOUR **No. 5** — **LAND-OF-REFORMATION TOUR**
July 17 to August 7
450th Anniversary Tour of the Land of Luther. East Germany: Wittenberg, Erfurt, Eisenach, Leipzig, Wartburg. West Germany: Frankfurt, Worms, Augsburg, Munich, Berlin. Then Switzerland: Lucerne, Interlachen, Montreau, and Geneva.

TOUR **No. 6** — **SCANDINAVIAN HOLIDAY**
July 17 to August 7
East and West Berlin — Finland, Sweden, Norway's beautiful fjords, Denmark, and Holland.

Mr. Jack Fleischli, Lutheran Travel Bureau, Dept. CE
8145 Delmar Avenue, St. Louis, Missouri 63130

Please forward information on the following:
Tour No. 3 ______
Tour No. 5 ______
Tour No. 6 ______
General Tour Information ______

Name ______
Street ______
City ______ State ______ ZIP ______

In the Next Issue of

ISSUES:

"The Place of Christian Education in the Congregation"

Toward an understanding of the unified function of the mission of of the body of Christ.

Please Detach

Please enter my subscription to ISSUES for
______ 1 year @ $2.00
______ 2 years @ $4.00
Check or money order enclosed ______

Please bill me ______
Please print or type:
Name ______
Address ______
______ ZIP Code ______
by ______

All subscriptions and inquiries should be sent to:
Mr. Robert Garmatz — ISSUES
Concordia Teachers College
800 North Columbia Avenue
Seward, Nebraska 68434

BOOK REVIEWS

The books chosen to be reviewed in ISSUES *will, in most cases, complement the central theme of each number. They will not always be the most current or the most popular, but will be, in the opinion of the editor and the reviewers, good books that can contribute to a better grasp of the topic under consideration. Unless otherwise identified, reviewers are members of the faculty of Concordia, Seward, Nebr.*

DARRELL MEINKE

History. By John Higham, with Leonard Krieger and Felix Gilbert. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1965.

The writing of history – both religious and secular – is one of the older avocations of mankind. Though a classical historian such as Thucydides sought to record the great events of his day for posterity and systematically checked his sources for accuracy, the technique often was not adopted by later writers. The writing of history became essentially a partisan political, social, economic, or religious activity. The "amateur" historian, often a politician or a patrician, performed an essential role in society, however, and frequently was a prime force in shaping and reshaping modern Western thought. History was a story of progress or a story of economic change, a study of liberty or a study of exploitation. Not until the 19th century and the systematization of research in all fields – not only history – did there develop the professional historian, an individual who was rigorously trained both in method and theory. History as an academic discipline emerged even later in the United States than in Europe; the German seminar techniques introduced in the last quarter of the century formed the basis for professional training.

The story which Dr. Higham relates, the various stages in American historiography from the decline of the patrician historian to the present, is not new. His emphasis on the social and institutional situation of the historical profession is, however, a valuable and significant contribution. Against such a background one can better appreciate Higham's brilliant summation of historical theory in the United States from the latter 19th century to the present day. Higham correctly suggests that to include every field of history would have fragmented the report, and limits the study almost exclusively to American and Western continental history. Sections three and four deal with American scholarship in American and European history. Dr. Krieger emphasizes American national character and interests in his important survey of American understanding of European history. Dr. Gilbert, in the concluding essay, widens the scope considerably in a comparison of American historical writing with that of European historical thought and activity. By utilizing the common culture of Europe and America, Gilbert demonstrates certain differences in the development and status of the European and American professional historian.

The scientific history of the Rankean school initially was most influential in the training of professional historians in the United States. Scientific history, however, soon came under attack from several sides. Nonprofessional historians protested the loss of the literary qualities which the greater of the early historians had possessed. Even sharper attacks came from social scientists. Since history had no special language, no uniform criteria for evaluation, and no consistent theoretical system, some writers questioned its separate existence. James Harvey Robinson attempted, in *The New History* (1912), not only to make history pragmatically useful by stressing the recent past but also to broaden its scope beyond the study of institutions and political developments. Robinson thus considered it essential to utilize the tools of other social sciences.

One might observe a similar difficulty in historiography after the Second World War. Contemporary historians, as shown in Bulletin 64 of the Social Science Research Council, readily – even eagerly – utilize the techniques of the social science disciplines. Though they often have spoken against quantification, many historians are moving toward the behavioral and social science analysis.

Higham suggests, however, that there is another trend discernible in postwar historiography. Despite the necessary emphasis today on science and technology, there is also a renewed interest in humanistic disciplines; historians, with their stress on understanding literature, philosophy, and the entire scope of human activity, are becoming even more closely associated with the humanities. Higham intimates, with an eye toward C. P. Snow, that "perhaps better than any other discipline in the American university, history can resist the partition of knowledge into two cultures" (p. 144). Such, of course, ought to be the goal of any analysis of the past or the present.

History, a part of the Princeton Study Series on humanistic scholarships in America, is a welcome addition to the recent surveys of American historiography. The authors' succinct summaries both of the general trends in American historiography and the theories of specific writers are quite good; more important to the educator, perhaps, is the humanistic emphasis of the endeavor. Many should familiarize themselves not only with this excellent and well-documented study but also with the other volumes in this same series.

ROBERT D. FIALA

The Nature and the Study of History. By Henry Steele Commager, with a concluding chapter suggesting methods for elementary and secondary teachers by Raymond H. Muessig and Vincent R. Rogers. Columbus: Charles E. Merrill Books, Inc., 1965.

The lack of communication between professional educators and specialists in the various social science disciplines has long been a matter of deep concern in education. Since historians, anthropologists, geographers, sociologists, economists, and political scientists usually lack specialized training in educational methodology and since the educator finds it difficult to keep abreast of the latest developments in the various disciplines, there has been a deplorable gap between research in the social sciences and its application to instruction on the secondary and elementary levels.

The Charles E. Merrill Social Science Seminar Series has been designed with this problem in mind. Each of the six volumes presently available has been written with the assumption that the program of social studies in the elementary and secondary schools should reflect the latest developments in the disciplines; that social scientists are not necessarily equipped to relate these developments to educational methodology; and that the professional educator must "decide what can be taught at various grade levels and how the subject matter might be conveyed, buttressed, and assessed by suitable methods, materials, and resources."

With these assumptions in mind, the volumes have been divided into two sections. In the first section, written by a specialist in the discipline, the author was "asked to describe the nature of his field, to trace its history, to look at its method and procedures, and to select what appeared to be fundamental ideas." The second section, written by professional educators, seeks to apply the material to teaching procedures on the elementary and secondary levels.

The volume on history, written by Henry S. Commager, Raymond H. Muessig, and Vincent R. Rogers, is an excellent example of how this procedure can be used effectively. Professor Commager's discussion of the nature and problems of history is a concise and balanced account of the subject. The author correctly considers history closer to the humanities than the sciences, and ably documents the difficulties facing the historian attempting to write objective history. His definition of history as both what happened in the past and the record of the past is broad enough to be acceptable and is probably a reasonable compromise solution to a thorny problem. His consideration of the problem of moral judgments in history is possibly the most impressive part of the book. Professor Commager reminds his readers that the historian has an obligation to try to understand the men of an age in the light of that age rather than from the point of view of the 20th century. He reminds us that the historian's task is to understand rather than to judge. Although he lists the arguments for making moral judgments as well as those against, one cannot help but conclude with the author that although the historian has an obligation to reach scholarly conclusions, "it is not the historian's business either to condemn or to forgive."

Despite the well-written first section, this would be nothing more than one more good book about history on an already flooded market without the concluding chapter by Professors Muessig and Rogers. It is their application of the material in the first section to teaching on the elementary and secondary levels which gives the work its major value and makes it a "must" for secondary and elementary teachers of history.

The authors select five of Professor Commager's ideas and suggest methodology for communicating these ideas in teaching. The methodology suggested is creative and varied. It will assist the reader to become a better teacher of history and make the discipline more attractive to students. The book is worth reading for this chapter alone, and one wonders how much differently the entering college freshman might feel towards the discipline if this type of methodology were consistently utilized. The values that can be derived from the book are concisely summarized by the authors in the concluding chapter. Since the book has clearly achieved those objectives, it is fitting to conclude with their words.

"If this book has served its purpose, the reader will have become more aware of the value, significance, and dynamism of history as an academic discipline. He will see (and, if he is a teacher, he will help his students see) the relentlessness of change. He will better understand the complexity of the task of the historian as he goes about the job of ordering the past, as well as developing the invaluable habit of seeing the past through the eyes of those who lived it. Perhaps the perceptive reader will also come away from his experience with this book with a more realistic understanding of the 'uses of the past.' He will have learned something of history's promise and something of its limitations, as well as an appreciation of the incalculable debt modern man owes to those who preceded him."

RUDOLPH W. HEINZE
Concordia, River Forest, Ill.

Christianity and History. By H. Butterfield. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1950.

H. Butterfield, professor of modern history at the University of Cambridge, first produced this work in 1949. Since that time it has been reprinted at least twice. In this engaging description of the nature of history the author has included much that is not specifically Christian but nevertheless comes under general historical methodology.

The author makes a plea for the study of man as an end in himself rather than as a part of the development of nature. Man should be seen as superimposed on nature. The natural scientists, however, cannot be trusted or given responsibility for the writing of human history, as though man were organized in the same fashion as an anthill. Although he doesn't use the term, he indicates a strong belief in man's status as reflecting God's image.

One of the strongest themes which dominate the work is Butterfield's assessment of human nature in history. It is not merely a plea for evaluating individuals in light of motivations, goals, and personalities. The author suggests that a true evaluation of history demands a realistic attitude toward man himself, and this requires acknowledgment of man's basically egocentric nature. Should the thin safeguards which control human behavior be removed, man reverts to a type of barbarian. The barbarisms displayed during the two world wars are cited as evidence, together with the fact of "the bomb" as man's ultimate scientific achievement. It is at this point, the author suggests, that Christianity addresses itself to man's most basic need. It alone attacks the seat of evil, the crust of self-righteousness in mankind. The author simply affirms the value of Christianity without theologizing a Gospel. His main point is, "It is essential not to have faith in human nature. Such faith is a recent and disastrous heresy" (p. 47). He does not deny great heights of self-denial and martyrdom in mankind, but in general he is pessimistic in his anthropology. We cannot help but agree in the main with this thesis, but it is difficult to reconcile this pessimism with his lofty view of man in the first chapter.

Butterfield approaches his distinctly religious view of history when he suggests the operation of a moral factor in history, that is, certain judgment by God upon offenders of the moral order. The most obvious case appears to be that of Germany, which vaunted itself against God by flying in the face of all established morality. It is this section of the book which raises the most serious questions. One wonders whether such an ethical view of history can actually be supported. Butterfield is probably closer to the truth when he acknowledges that "at bottom it is an inadequacy in human nature itself which comes under judgment" (p. 55). In the course of time it is sinful human nature which turns a good thing to an abuse. The old whipping boy of the Roman Empire can no longer be trotted out by Christian moralists as a case in point when we realize that the West had been Christian for a good 150 years before it "fell." The author's insistence on the intervention of God in history cannot but find a sympathetic response in Christian theology, especially as he points to the Old Testament as an example of God in history, but I feel that anything like an ethical view of history requires some unchristian presuppositions. The church has never taught that God rewards either men or nations according to their deeds.

Butterfield's section on Messianism in history is excellent. He points to the Old Testament prototype among the Jews in captivity, and he brings it up to date with modern notions of Messianism, e. g., "making the world safe for democracy," or "the Marxist solving the class struggle."

In describing the role of Providence in the historical process, the author utilizes the analogy of a symphony orchestra which is playing a composition for the first time. Since each one of us can only know and play his small part, say the second clarinet, we can never really hear the full harmony which the conductor can hear. No single person in the orchestra has any idea when or how the music will end, nor can a musician know the full implications of the next note he is to play. To carry the analogy further, the music itself has not been written to the very end, but the composer is still writing it even as it is being played. Thus, if someone plays a wrong note, the com-

poser can so arrange the music that it still results in meaningful harmony. This analogy assumes that history is going somewhere, that it is progressing, and so Butterfield asserts. History ultimately is under the direction of a superintending intellect. Providence, however, governs according to its own time. A Hitler, Napoleon, or Bismarck who seek to impose their own ideals and schedules upon history are bound to fail. Here the author has given us a helpful description which harmonizes the poles of flexibility and rigidity in understanding history.

Christianity as a historical religion presupposes a certain philosophy of history. It assumes a personal God. The Incarnation and Creation have sanctified matter. The basis for Christian history lies in the Gospel narratives, which, Butterfield admits, present facts which are already wrapped up in their own interpretations. However, he returns to his earlier warnings against a sterile technical approach to facts without regard to their underlying unity. He pleads for openness and toleration on the interpretation of the facts, but the underlying event of a historical Jesus can never be mythologized — that is, not without doing violence to historical methodology itself.

In his final chapter the author warns against an ecclesiastical interpretation of history which attempts to justify the church to the world. He points out that the church and churchmen have often "played the wrong notes" while the rest of mankind seemed to express Christian virtues. Often in the past the church has condemned a new ideology, only to embrace it as "Christian" later on. The church opposed the French Revolution but today lauds democracy as being rooted in the Bible. The impulse to social change has often arisen from heretical groups which were also anticlerical, only to see their programs eventually sanctified by the ecclesiastical establishment. Butterfield sees this not so much as an indictment of the church as evidence of sinful human nature at work within it.

The section on religion and war deserves wide reading. When warfare is waged on the basis of ideology, there can be no end to it until the foe is completely vanquished. There can be no compromise or negotiation, since this would vitiate the ideology. Better than inject ideology into warfare, statesmen would do well to outline their objectives in concrete terms. Thus an end can be made of the conflict, compromise and negotiation can honorably be carried on, and every combatant knows exactly where he stands.

Butterfield concludes his work with these lines: "We can do worse than remember a principle which both gives us a firm Rock and leaves us the maximum elasticity for our minds. The principle is, 'Hold to Christ, and for the rest be totally uncommitted.'"

The book is highly stimulating. One of its strengths is also a weakness, and that is its compactness. Two things impress this reviewer as being unique about the work: the author's attitude toward human nature as being basically sinful and egotistic, and the optimistic view of God's intervention in the historical process so that harmony eventually results. Thus history is the story of man's sin and God's grace.

Carl Volz
Concordia Seminary
St. Louis, Mo.

Towards a Theological Understanding of History. By Eric C. Rust. New York: Oxford University Press, 1963.

Eric C. Rust is a familiar and notable contributor to the growing literature in the meaning of history. The present volume covers much the same ground of his earlier *The Christian Understanding of History* (1946); however, the material has been reworked and amplified. The author's approach to the problem of meaning in history is that of the dialectical theology associated with Karl Barth, Emil Brunner, Reinhold Niebuhr, Paul Tillich, and others. But he is critical of some of the extreme forms of their thinking. Thus "the danger in the movement of Bultmann and his followers is that they divorce the meaning from the historical actuality . . . until for some extremists it would not appear to matter whether the resurrection was an actual event in world history so long as the Church itself could affirm its faith in the risen Lord" (p. 67). The author does not share Barth's low view of general revelation (p. 78) or Tillich's description of the demonic in impersonal and metaphysical terms (p. 126). Nevertheless, his stance throughout remains that of modern existential theology, which controls his methodology and interpretation.

First, the author deals critically with naturalistic, humanistic, and idealistic approaches to reality. He concludes: "If man is to find his historical hope and meaning within himself and in the process of history, he is doomed to despair . . . his hope lies beyond his sinful heart and fallen historical existence. All true historical meaning has transcendent roots and its final realization can come only through divine intervention of God." (P. 47)

And God has intervened. To fallen man He has disclosed Himself through His Word. "'Word of God' means more than verbal communication; it covers acts as well," and thus stands for "the revelation of God in historical events" (p. 65). The prophet and his testimony become part of the mighty acts which God works in history to redeem and to save. The Incarnation is the "act of acts." To this belongs the Gospel or kerygma of the early church (pp. 66–67). This stream of events within general history constitutes "salvation history." (P. 64)

These are actual historical events but "to the eye of faith, God has disclosed in them an inner meaning, which the non-Christian historian cannot discover. For the Christian, they become 'salvation history,' pregnant with divine meaning and distinct from other historical events because they bear and actualize the meaning of all historical existence" (p. 15). Thus salvation history "provides the clue to secular history." (P. 122)

Faith is man's response to God's revelation. Faith is a "personal commitment and decision when the living God discloses himself to us in Christ" (p. 70). Elsewhere the author explains that "even our faith is a gift of God." (P. 227)

Discussing Biblical symbolism and imagery, the author discards the term "myth"; he prefers "historical imagery," implying that "images and symbols are now grounded in historical revelation expressed in patterns which are the creation of the divinely inspired imagination of the Biblical writers." (P. 96)

In Part II the author proposes to draw out the significance of the symbols and historical images of Biblical revelation as they apply to a theology of history and "to interpret the Biblical images in terms appropriate to our times, and to this degree we shall have to demythologize them" (pp. 106 to 107). He then considers the fundamental categories and the "historical imagery" in which they are expressed. We can note but few. For example, the sovereignty of God, the origin of man, and the Fall are portrayed in the image of creation and the garden story. The Fall may have occurred at some rudimentary stage in an evolutionary process, but the author does not wish to press this "too far" (p. 121). As a result of man's fall, secular history is seen as the story of sin and the demonic (pp. 122 ff.). "Man's freedom is no longer freedom to respond to God. He has chosen to be a sinner, and henceforth he can choose only what kind of sinner he is going to be." (P. 120)

The tension between man's rebellion and demonic perversions of divine omnipotence is explained by God's providence and judgment in history. "As God gives them over to the sin in their hearts they become subject to a de-

monic bondage which brings about their own dissolution." But divine patience and forebearance are "evident in ways in which the exercise of judgment is delayed." (Pp. 161–162)

In the mighty act in Christ the "full meaning of history has entered history and has been actualized in his life, death, and resurrection." Christ's sacrifice is "objective and cosmic, availing once for all for all men at all times" (p. 196). But the author seems to weaken the objective character of this statement when he says that Jesus' act "potentially" avails for all and that "faith-union with him makes it actual." (Pp. 196–197)

The Resurrection (which is historical actuality and not to be explained away by "subjective experience" or "psychic phenomena") is the key to the final meaning of history (pp. 200 to 201). All history is to be seen in the eschatological framework of salvation history. So also the nature and the role of the church and its relation to the Kingdom.

Finally, the "symbols" of the final consummation are briefly examined. These are the Parousia, Last Judgment, and General Resurrection. Here only symbols can be used, and they preserve the inner meaning of the events they describe. (Pp. 257 ff.)

This book is stimulating. It is a masterful presentation of the subject from the stance of dialectical, existential theology. The author challenges the reader on almost every page. He has drawn from many sources and presents some fine Christian insights. The book also demonstrates some pitfalls of the dialectical approach: namely the tendency to make the objective character of God's acts somehow contingent on man's response; again, the tendency, in effect, to accommodate Biblical revelation to current theological thought. Should not rather the Biblical revelation inform theological thought? To turn things around is to risk ending up with more of a philosophical than a theological understanding of history, the very thing which the author himself doubtless intended to avoid.

Erich H. Heintzen
Concordia Seminary
Springfield, Ill.

History Sacred and Profane. By Alan Richardson. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1964.

For anyone wrestling with the problem of the relation between the revelation of God and the history of man this book is a must. It provides an excellent critique and alternate approach to this issue which some have attempted to solve through divorcing sacred and profane history by the alternatives of either forcing secular history into the mold of the Biblical narrative or by positing a view of the Biblical account as a super history which is beyond the examination of the historian.

This series of Bampton Lectures prepared by Richardson and presented at Oxford University in 1962 demonstrates that history is anything but dead. It is the most vital issue in this age or any other and is a constantly moving and developing discipline.

Richardson traces its development through its various stages. After beginning with a discussion of 18th-century rationalism with its "Reasonableness of Christianity," a movement which continued on into the next century, as well as with its "Life of Jesus" investigations, the author goes on to discuss the changes which are now taking place in historiography. From a position of relative uselessness in relation to philosophy, which already had all the answers to the questions of life, history has come to be recognized as a discipline which occupies the center of the stage in relation to other areas of study. In the course of this development, views of history have also changed considerably.

In contrast to positivist thinking, which felt that the purpose of history was to determine the "facts," historians have come to recognize that the "facts" are often determined by the "climate of opinion" of the investigator who poses the questions. "There are no uninterpreted facts which form the raw material for the scientific historian; the assumption that there are such facts prevents historians from asking the right questions. . . . What the historian can never detach himself from is the 'climate of opinion' of his own day; it is because of this that he notices certain 'facts' and ignores others" (p. 193). "Eminent leaders of continental theological thought during the first half of our century have attempted to disengage the Christian revelation from that sphere of history with which 'secular' historians are concerned, and . . . to find a home for it in a realm either of sacred history (*Heilsgeschichte*) or existential experience, to which historians, *qua* historians, had no access. . . . The reason they felt obliged to adopt this desperate strategy of withdrawal was that they had come to accept the positivist theory as the indisputably scientific account of it. Now that the positivist view itself has distintegrated before the march of events and today no longer represents what most historians think about history, it is time to reopen the question and to ask whether there are any good *historical* reasons for supposing that a divine revelation such as the Bible attests cannot have been vouchsafed in the midst of ordinary, everyday 'secular' history, the history which working historians handle" (p. 185). It is to this question that the remaining lectures address themselves.

Dealing with the resurrection of Christ, Richardson says there are two conditions to be fulfilled in order to demonstrate that the actual resurrection is the most coherent explanation of the evidence, "credible attestation on the part of witnesses to happenings which could not be more rationally accounted for by some alternative hypothesis; and secondly, the event attested would have to accord with the historian's own deepest understanding and experience of life." Examining the evidence, he finds the first of these conditions to be fulfilled. There is nothing to explain more clearly the faith of the first Christian community in the risen Christ than the actual happening. Those who reject it do so because it does not accord with their previous experience, and they are therefore not approaching the material with an open mind (p. 201). It does not accord with their climate of opinion. He sees this as the weakness of the existentialist school of theology as well as that of unbelievers. "For the problem becomes all the more insoluble in view of the assertion of the Bultmann school that neither Jesus nor his disciples had believed during his earthly life that he was the Messiah or the Son of Man. If there was no prior faith in Jesus' divinity to create the belief in the resurrection, and if there was no historical resurrection to create the faith of the Church, we are left with faith — an undeniable reality, Bornkamm's 'last fact' accessible to historians — hanging in the air, to be explained by existential analysis rather than historically" (p. 209). For the historian there are no "last facts."

The above is only a small indication of the incisive thinking of Richardson which is found throughout the lectures. A thorough reading of this book will do much to shed light on the problems of revelation and interpretation which confront the church today.

Walter L. Rosin

monographs on current developments in biblical theology

#1 Edgar Krentz

Biblical Studies Today

A guide to current issues and trends

Dr. Krentz opens the door to what's going on in the modern Biblical scholar's laboratory. He describes current issues and problems for the reader who seeks to keep abreast of new methods and concerns in Biblical scholarship. That Biblical studies are different now from the 1920s is underscored and demonstrated.
The author represents but does not caricature positions of radically different schools of thought. For the pastor anxious to sharpen his insights with the latest information, "Biblical Studies Today" offers these topics: 1 — The Historical Method. 2 — Source and Form Criticism. 3 — The New Quest for the Historical Jesus. 4 — The Bible in the World of Its Day: "Religionsgeschichte" and Biblical Records. 5 — Historical and Hermeneutical Issues in Current Biblical Studies.

Order No. 12U2261. Paperbound. $1.75

#2 Frederick W. Danker

Creeds in the Bible

Dr. Danker in this clear presentation of Christological confession offers a deeper understanding of Biblical expressions of faith and our own historic Lutheran creeds. This brief book gives a vibrant theology of the Bible and a view of the best progress in scholarship in this area.
The author sees the Bible as a book of confessions and proceeds under these topics: 1 — Confessions of Faith, Old and New Testaments and in the Early Church. 2 — One God. 3 — Jesus Is the Christ. 4 — Jesus Is the Son of God. 5 — Jesus Is Lord. 6 — Jesus Died and Rose. 7 — Jesus Is Savior.

Order No. 12U2262. Paperbound. $1.50

CONCORDIA PUBLISHING HOUSE • ST. LOUIS, MISSOURI 63118 • *"A growing ministry in print"*