

The **LUTHERAN** **CLARION**



Lutheran Concerns Association
149 Glenview Drive, New Kensington, PA 15068-4921

July 2018
Volume 10, Issue 6

Commentary on and Analysis of the CTCR Report: 'Women and Military Service: a Lutheran Perspective'

The full text of the CTCR report cited in this article is at <https://blogs.lcms.org/2018/ctcr-report-women-and-military-service-a-lutheran-perspective/>. This and the other internet documents cited below can also be found at <http://www.lutheranclarion.org> > Newsletter > Document Library.

A history of delay and avoidance

Few CTCR (Commission on Theology and Church Relations) documents have been longer in the waiting and more predictable in the outcome. In 2001, following portentous signals in military policy involving the use of women in military combat that had already attracted attention within a few denominations, a congregation in Spring Valley, MN, submitted an overture for the Synod in convention. It did not reach the floor. Later in 2001, urged by the chairman of the Board of Directors of the Synod, the president requested the CTCR to "study the issue on the basis of Scripture and the Lutheran Confessional writings." Instead, the CTCR eventually solicited two retired military chaplains to write 600-word "pro-con" articles for *The Lutheran Witness* on the use of women in military combat. Finally published in May 2003, (<https://blogs.lcms.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/12/LWmay03.pdf>) nearly two years after the convention, the articles resolved nothing. Ironically, one of the authors had already published a substantive "con" position (<http://www.scholia.net/files/other/09%20Women%20in%20Combat.PDF>) paper on the subject that could well have informed a report from the Commission. The issue was anything but dead, however. Cultural pressures and changes in military policy moved on toward eventual regularization of women in all combatant categories and prospective draft registration.

Subsequent overtures to the Synod in 2004, 2007 and 2010 on the use of women in military combat met their demise in convention committees. In 2004, the matter was referred to the Armed Services Commission of the Synod (no known action). In 2007, a committee declared the issue resolved by the May 2003 pro/con articles in *The Lutheran*

Continued on page 2.

Teaching for Apostasy: How Educational Methods and Philosophies Work Against the Church

Dr. Thomas Korcok gave the presentation below at the 2018 Lutheran Concerns Association conference in Fort Wayne, IN, in January 2018. Since that time it has been slightly revised.

Currently in colleges of education across America, almost all future teachers learn from a standard canon of educational thinkers whose work forms the basis for the goals, methods, and structure of the modern American classroom. When students are introduced to these educationists, there is rarely, if ever, any consideration given to what they taught, believed, or confessed in their personal lives. Furthermore, their theories are presented as though they were all based purely on unbiased scientific research. Such an approach should be of concern for the Christian because it is radically different from how the church has traditionally measured teachers.

In the history of Western education until the 20th century, (which has always been inseparably linked with Christian education), theology has been the measuring stick for all areas of knowledge, including education. A teacher's confession of faith was always considered to be the first criterion in judging whether or not his or her teaching was acceptable. In the 16th century, the influential Lutheran educator, Valentin Trozendorf, insisted that "Those who belong to our school, let the same also be members of our Church and those who agree with our faith, which is most sure and true; because of perhaps one godless person out of the whole body, some evil happens." In this day and age, we are to believe that the contrary teaching is true: that what a researcher teaches, believes, and confesses has little or nothing to do with the methods he advocates. According to this principle, education can be structured purely according to a researcher's scientific theories and principles with little regard to what the researcher teaches, believes, and confesses.

This approach is a legacy of the 19th and 20th centuries, which presented the image of the dispassionate scientist in a white lab coat as the ideal model: one who carried out research without any consideration of personal biases or theological opinions. The assumption is that research

Continued on page 4.

In this Issue of the *Lutheran Clarion*

CTCR Report: Women & Military Service	1
How Educational Methods Work Against the Church	1
2019 LCA Conference	2

Witness. In 2010, a committee sidelined relevant overtures as having been handled by the CTCR (no specifics provided). Finally, in 2013, a strongly worded overture against the use of women in combat, Overture 2-10¹, was drastically revised in committee and reached the floor as Resolution 2-12A². It passed, and the matter was once again referred to the CTCR. But it was too late. The Department of Defense had already opened all combat positions to women. And so, during the 12 plus years of delay, not only were policy makers deprived of a clear prophetic voice, but helpful guidance for the Synod's clergy and laity regarding this important issue was also delayed.

O, you subverters of all decency, who use men, as if they were women, and lead women out to war, as if they were men. This is the work of the devil, ...

(John Chrysostom (c. 347-407). Homily 5 on Titus; emphasis added.)

CTCR overture before the report

There would be still further delay. Rather than dealing with the matter expeditiously by engaging exegetical, practical, and historical faculty from the seminaries, the CTCR gave the drafting task initially to a busy active-duty military chaplain. Despite a second attempt, time ran out. Having not carried out their charge, the Commission crafted an overture (5-32)³ for the 2016 Synod convention. (The U.S. Senate had already gone on record supporting registration of women for the military draft.) Was their overture in the spirit of "something better than nothing"? Was it a "finger in the wind" to test opinion before committing anything to paper? Regardless, other overtures, e.g., 5-31⁴, that provided clear scriptural opposition to the employment of women in military combat never reached the floor.

Overture 5-32 was essentially reworked into Resolution 5-11A⁵ (To Protect Christian Consciences and Address Conscription of Women). On the floor, parliamentary efficiency trumped thoroughness. With no prospect of a negative vote, discussion was dispensed with, depriving delegates of opportunity to hear or consider specific concerns or recommendations from fellow delegates, including this writer, in lines at the microphones. Res. 5-11A did offer scriptural support for excluding women from participation in military combat but then left the matter to individual conscience. The resolution passed, and the CTCR now had a sense of direction for their report. In essence, their resolution had tied their hands. Yet another year and a half passed before the report was finally released in March 2018. Meanwhile, how many of our Lutheran daughters and wives have enlisted for military careers in these, now, 17 years? Actions—or non-action in this case—have consequences. For the long delay and failure to prioritize action on an important matter, one can only express sincere regret and apology (omitted in the report).

Effect of the cart before the horse

The title of 2016 Res. 5-11A revealed the CTCR's focus and position: Conscience and (possible) conscription, not the use of women in military combat, were the matters the Commission preferred to address. The practical effect of this resolution was to release the CTCR from its charge to produce a substantive statement on the real issue based on Scripture and the Confessions, church history, and historical practice. They could now do little more than flesh out their resolution—essentially what *Women and Military Service: a Lutheran Perspective* does. The report provides additional cultural, pragmatic, and scriptural background material, but finally also arrives at the *individual* "conscience" position and concludes with procedural advice for conscientious objecting either to military service in principle or specifically to participation in military combat. In essence, we report, you decide.

A relevant comparison

One might consider the CTCR's equivocal position on a woman's engaging in military combat in the context of the Synod's strong position against abortion (cf. *Abortion in Perspective*, CTCR, 1984). For neither practice does Scripture offer a verbatim "thou shalt not" directive. Both require drawing conclusions based on God's Word. Regarding abortion, we have the Fifth Commandment, along with passages from Scripture, such as Psalm 139:13, Jeremiah 1:5, and Galatians 1:15 that refer to a child in the womb as already known by God; therefore, he or she is a living nameable person. Therefore, absent a specific command against aborting a child in the womb, one concludes that doing so is an offense against the Fifth Commandment. Also, since abortion has been practiced from early times, surely by the Greeks and Romans, there is citable evidence of opposition to abortion by the Early Church Fathers.

Unlike abortion, a woman's serving in military combat has been all but unheard of throughout history, accounting for the absence of controversy on the subject either in bib-

2019 LCA Conference January 14, 2019!

The LCA Conference will be held on Monday, January 14, 2019, at Don Hall's Guesthouse in Fort Wayne, IN. We already have an excellent lineup of speakers:

- **Rev. Dr. Michael Kumm**, Chairman, LCMS Board of Directors—Report by Chairman of Board of Directors.
- **Rev. Dr. Roger Paavola**, District President Mid-South District—Licensed Lay Deacons.
- **Rev. Joel Baseley**, Pastor, Immanuel Lutheran, Dearborn, MI—Walther's Preaching.
- **Rev. Steven Briel**, Chairman, Board of National Missions—Preaching.
- **Rev. Dr. Gary Zieroth**, Professor of Pastoral Ministry and Missions; Dean of Students; Director of Vicarage and Internship—Vocation of Man in the Church and Home.

Please plan to attend! More details will follow in future issues of the *Clarion*.



lical times or in the Early Church. *Why oppose a practice that doesn't exist?* At least one exception (that tests the rule?) can be cited. In referring to examples of heathen

Is there evidence in [Luther's] works that he would have condoned a woman's taking life-and-death orders from a man other than her husband or a woman's leading men on the field of battle?

behavior (specific context unknown), John Chrysostom (c. 347-407) writes: "...Woman was not made for this, O man, to be prostituted as common. O, you subverters of all decency, who use men, as if they were women, and lead women out to war, as if they were men. This is the work of the devil, to subvert

and confound all things, to overlap the boundaries that have been appointed from the beginning, and remove those which God has set to nature. ..." (Homily 5 on Titus; emphasis added). Note that Chrysostom likens the use of women in war to homosexual acts. Both violate boundaries ordered by God. This relevant censure by a Church Father is not found in the CTCR report.

Male ≠ female

Women and Military Service does allot significant space to male-female distinctions within the Order of Creation. Male and female in the Image of God is an *ordered* relationship, incarnating the ordered relationship within the Trinity. To be meaningful, however, the order must be reified in specific, lived relationships and distinctions between male and female, even if the image has been sullied by sin. In the Old Testament, as the report notes, one manifestation is *the complete absence of women in battle (armies of both Israel and its enemies)*. The report labels scriptural accounts of this unvarying male-only soldier practice as merely "descriptive," i.e., not prescriptive. Can it not be both? Romans 15:4 and 1 Corinthians 10:11 remind us that the Old Testament was written for our instruction: *Women, and surely the women of God's people, do not engage in military combat*. Consider also the New Testament image of Christ the Bridegroom and His Bride, the Church, an image that derives meaning from the understanding that Christ (male/bridegroom) is the protector, the One who goes to battle for His Church (female/bride), the protected one. The CTCR report also omits this paradigmatic image.

Just another vocation?

From a more recent historical perspective, Martin Luther's writings on vocation and the two kingdoms are hardly applicable (p. 6). Would Luther have encouraged wives and daughters to engage in military pursuits, either voluntarily or under compulsion from the state? Is there evidence in his works that he would have condoned a woman's taking life-and-death orders from a man other than her husband or a woman's leading men on the field of battle? *But then, Luther had no reason to oppose a practice*

that did not exist. A woman's pursuing a military career, even to the extent of engaging in military combat, has come into view only recently—in a sexually confused culture centuries after Luther wrote on vocation.

Confusion is rife

While the CTCR report recognizes the role of natural law and reason in opposing the use of women in military combat (pp. 12-13), what is natural law but the law of God written on our hearts? We ignore it to our peril. For atheists and agnostics, it may be all that informs conscience. But satanic forces against natural law, Scripture, and human reason have gained momentum, even dominance. By the turn of the millennium, Western culture had succumbed all but completely to *militant feminism* as the new social orthodoxy, uncritically adopting much of its agenda and language. Without naming it, the report refers to this culture-transforming movement only in passing in the context of "movements for equal rights (including calls for equal opportunities for women in all fields)" (p.2). The report's neutral and positive descriptions of changing roles of women in recent decades (pp. 2, 7) are balanced by some observations on the negative effects (p. 13-14). However, *feminism is part of a much larger agenda: the obliteration of sexual differences as they relate to all social, family, and vocational roles—in essence, obliteration of male and female in the Image of God*. While the report rejects the latter in principle, the agenda has been largely accomplished, some of it by legislation; and, surely, *military combat necessarily erases any distinction between male and female—in intent, in appearance (apparel) and in action*.

In 2015, the Supreme Court, citing the changing times, decided that complementary sexual identity is no longer a criterion for marriage. All that is required is mutual love between two (or more?) people. Regarding the "times have changed" claim (cf. p. 7), we Christians ignore the implications to our peril. They include recent demands to acknowledge a panoply of individual choices of gender identity and sexual preferences too numerous to catalog. Colleges and universities have issued lists of "appropriate" pronouns for these self-defined varieties of sex and gender, even requiring their use. Our culture is adrift in a sea of sexual confusion. Our military services are engaged in an unprecedented social experiment, attempting to blend people with all manner of gender "identities" and sexual proclivities into an effective fighting force, a reason for even *men* seriously to consider conscientious objection to military service. In this sea of sexual confusion, *the social acceptance of a woman's engaging in military combat is but one instance of the disorder*. Ominously, the picture on the cover of the CTCR report contributes to the confu-

...may the CTCR's "pro-choice" report motivate Christian women, pastors, and parents to seek authoritative, scriptural, and definitive moral-theological counsel also from other sources.

sion. It depicts only an armed, uniformed woman (?) engaged in (training for?) military combat. Given the equivocating tone of the report, a picture of a wife and children welcoming home a husband and father from a tour of military duty might have at least provided apposite balance.

Let us hope and pray that congregations submit overtures for a stronger statement against the use of women in military combat to the Synod at its 2019 convention. Meanwhile, may the CTCR's "pro-choice" report motivate Christian women, pastors, and parents to seek authoritative, scriptural, and definitive moral-theological counsel also from other sources.

David O. Berger

Prof. Em., Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, MO

Overtures (in Workbooks) and Resolutions (in Proceedings) cited in the article may be accessed at <https://www.lcms.org/convention/archives>.

- 1 2013 Workbook, Overture 2-10, pp. 147-148
- 2 2013 Proceedings, Resolution 2-12A, p. 114
- 3 2016 Workbook, Overture 5-32, p. 356
- 4 2016 Workbook, Overture 5-31, pp. 355-356
- 5 2016 Proceedings, Resolution 5-11A, pp. 159-160

The Lutheran Clarion—Ten Years!

We are into our 10th year of the *Clarion*. We continue to strive to present and uphold the truth of God's Holy Word.

If you would like to help with the cost of publishing a solid, confessional Lutheran periodical, there's an enclosed envelope so you can mail your check to Lutheran Concerns Association, 149 Glenview Drive, New Kensington, PA 15068-4921. Do it now. **Thank you!!**



Teaching for Apostasy...

Continued from page 1.

(including educational research) is a matter of scientific discovery alone, of studying everything in an "atheological" way, as though a scientist's personal confession has no bearing on what he or she observes or teaches. But is it truly possible for a scientist to operate in this way? I would argue that it is not. A researcher's personal beliefs, to one degree or another, will affect his research and will color his observations and shape his conclusions. For example, if a scientist rejects the concept of the flood as described in Genesis 6-9, then he or she will never research the effects of that flood on nature or the development of civilization.²

If this is true for the so called "natural sciences," it is certainly also true for psychology and sociology, which, in the past century, have come to dominate educational studies. Research in these sciences, which deal with human behavior, will always be influenced by what the investigator believes, teaches, and confesses. Very often arguments for using the most "modern" methods of education begin with something like, "Research has shown..." These words often tend to silence debate and

are regarded as normative by the educational community, implying that there can be no room for theological criticism. Such normative "research-based" education has dominated teacher formation for close to a century. Over that time, there have been countless studies about a particular pedagogical method over and against another pedagogical method. With each new study comes the promise that the newest method will increase student learning

or improve student engagement. One would assume that, with all this research (and the billions of dollars that have funded it), education would have made enormous progress and students would be better educated than ever before. Surely, after a century of researching the optimal educational environments and ideal teaching methods, the educational establishment should be able to point to some measurable improvement. Students today, who have been the beneficiaries of such prodigious research, should be better read, more thoughtful in their discourse, wiser in their deliberations and more intent on pursuing the virtuous life. However, in considering the vulgarity of the mass entertainment media and popular culture, as well as the level of civic and political discourse exhibited in recent elections, one would be hard pressed to make the case that funding all this educational research has been money well spent.

So why has this approach failed? Perhaps it is because we have never asked the fundamental question, "What does the researcher teach, believe, and confess?" In response to the argument "Research has shown..." I would argue that often the research reveals more about the researcher than the subject that has been researched. Indeed a researcher's personal beliefs about such things as the nature of man, the nature of God, the reality of sin, how we know truth, and so on, influence how he approaches education. For example, if I reject that children are born as sinful people, then I will look for some other explanation to justify their bad behavior. I will probably be inclined to remove the blame and guilt from the child and place it on the family, society, or religion. Or, if I believe that God is not the author of truth and wisdom, then I will look elsewhere for the source. I might well be inclined to believe that children construct their own truth, and so my research will revolve around proving that belief.

The point is this: what an educational philosopher believes and confesses dictates not only the type of research questions he asks, but also the explanations that he proposes. As fundamental as this is, the beliefs of the educational thinkers are rarely, if ever, considered in educational circles. When future teachers study the work of educationists, they learn about the various theories and how to apply the methods that grow out of their theories

In response to the argument "Research has shown..." ... often the research reveals more about the researcher than the subject that has been researched.

to lesson plans and classroom environments. But they don't learn about the origin of the theories. They will not be taught what the educationists believed and how their convictions shaped these theories and methods. While

From the days of Augustine of Hippo (354-430 AD) to the early 19th century, education had been understood as the church's mission.

this may not be considered a big deal for government-run schools, for the church it should be of utmost concern.

Beliefs and practices are inextricably linked. The church and her schools cannot uncritically employ foreign educational models, theories of learning, and teaching practices without, at the same time, importing the belief systems upon which those models, theories, and practices are constructed. I do not wish to imply that everything that these educationists observed or advocated was wrong or should be rejected. Often one finds similar methods suggested by Christian pedagogues. However, without knowing the corresponding theological biases of these educational philosophers and theorists, Lutheran teachers cannot properly assess what is usable and what is detrimental to their task as Lutheran teachers.

In the American educational community as a whole, it is widely accepted that Christian theology should have little to say about educational methods. In some cases, Christian educators may include Christian content, but the basic pedagogical theories and methods are generally taken from what is current practice in government-run education. It is also widely accepted that teachers should look first to child and adolescent psychology as the driving force of all pedagogy. These principles are relatively new to the field of education and were imposed in the late 19th and early 20th century by those who wished to prevent the church from exercising her historic mission of teaching children. The result has been a complete paradigm shift. The church, which previously had over 1500 years of educational experience and had produced some of the most enduring and insightful educational thinkers of all time, now has no influence on pedagogy, while the very young (and relatively

The famous educational reformer, Johann Pestalozzi (1746-1827), argued that children should not look to the church for correct doctrine, but to themselves. He said, "Believe in yourself, O Man—believe in the inner meaning of your being."

inexperienced) field of social sciences is given full authority to take its place as the driving force behind current teaching methods. How did this paradigm shift become so imbedded in our educational consciousness?

From the days of Augustine of Hippo (354-430 AD) to

the early 19th century, education had been understood as the church's mission. It was seen as a natural connection because education was about understanding truth. For the church, truth was transcendent; that is, it came not from within the individual, but from the One who claimed to be "truth made flesh." Thus Augustine famously said, "Let every good and true Christian understand that wherever truth may be found, it belongs to his Master; and while he recognizes and acknowledges the truth, even in their religious literature, let him reject the figments of superstition, and let him grieve over and avoid men who, when they knew God, glorified him not as God, neither were thankful; but became vain in their imaginations, and their foolish heart was darkened."³ For almost 1500 years, the church had entrusted the task of teaching to sound Christian pedagogues who recognized Christ as the author of all truth. In the 1500s the Reformers recognized that, in order to grasp Evangelical theology, a child's mind must be trained in a complementary way. While the changes made to education were dramatic and set the stage for modern public education, an indisputable union was maintained between the church and school. In speaking of university reform already in his day, Luther affirmed this principle:

"I would advise no one to send his child where the Holy Scriptures are not supreme. Every institution that does not unceasingly pursue the study of God's word becomes corrupt.... I greatly fear that the universities, unless they teach the Holy Scriptures diligently and impress them on the young students, are wide gates to hell."⁴

The Enlightenment all but sundered the bond between the church and education. By the 19th century, there were educators who believed that this bond was detrimental to a proper education. The famous educational reformer, Johann Pestalozzi (1746-1827), argued that children should not look to the church for correct doctrine, but to themselves. He said, "Believe in yourself, O Man—believe in the inner meaning of your being. Then will you believe in God and immortality."⁵ According to Pestalozzi, traditional catechetical teaching done by the pastor hindered healthy spiritual development. He argued, "Surely the best catechism is the one the children understand without their pastor."⁶

Friedrich Fröbel (1782-1852) took this one step further. He believed that Christian doctrine corrupted children, and so it was necessary for them to be removed from the influence of the church and their parents at an early age before they became "infected" with an unhealthy understanding of God. Until the time of Fröbel, children generally enrolled in school at age seven. Fröbel wanted to start them earlier so that they could be properly trained by "approved" teachers in a new "world religion" that would enable them to rise above confessional bounda-

Want to Read the *Clarion* Online?

If you would rather receive a digital version of the *Clarion* in your electronic mailbox, please send your email address to Ginny Valleau at gzolson2000@yahoo.com. We will remove your name from the hard copy mail list and add it to the email list.



ries and see that all religions were the same. Fröbel stated, "Education guides man to understand himself, to be at peace with Nature and to be united with God." The name he gave to this new early childhood program of indoctrination was called "Kindergarten." The concept was rejected by his countrymen in Germany, but some years later it would be warmly received in America. Having been freed from the guiding principles of Christian doctrine, education could now be molded according to any number of theological and world views.

What [Herbert] Spencer [1820-1903] effectively did was to substitute psychology for theology as the standard by which all educational practice was to be measured.

The dominant worldview among 20th-century educationists was evolution – not just the evolution of species as taught by Charles Darwin, but also social evolution in which man and society progressed toward a perfect world. While today we most often associate evolution with Charles Darwin, in the late 19th century, the writings of Herbert Spencer (1820-1903) were perhaps more influential. Before Darwin wrote *The Origin of Species*, Spencer wrote about evolution and coined the familiar phrase "survival of the fittest." According to Spencer, social perfection was not just possible; it was inevitable. To prove it, he combined evolutionary concepts with the new "scientific" field of psychology to demonstrate that mankind was progressing or evolving toward a superior culture and that this evolutionary progress could be observed and directed through scientific experimentation. Spencer developed a child-centered model of education that was guided by the "new" science of psychology along with his evolutionary views in order to create a new pedagogy. What Spencer effectively did was to substitute psychology for theology as the standard by which all educational practice was to be measured. By this new measurement, the education of the past, which had been concerned chiefly with teaching truth and wisdom and which Spencer viewed as irrelevant in view of the great strides man had made in "modern" times, was deemed wicked because it was "most often conducted by forcing irrelevant information into the minds of reluctant children by methods that were patently barbarous."⁸ Spencer believed that

"...in education the process of self-development should be encouraged to the uttermost. Children should be led to make their own investigations, and to draw their own inferences. They should be told as little as possible and induced to discover as much as possible."⁹

Reflecting on his vision of social evolution, he wrote, "Humanity has progressed solely by self-instruction; and that to achieve the best results, each mind must progress somewhat after the same fashion, is continually proved by the marked success of self-made men."¹⁰

Spencer's, Pestalozzi's, and Fröbel's ideas would inspire many of the 20th-century educationists. The church's long history of educational thought and methods that had been honed for over a millennium and a half was discarded. Psychology was now king; and evolutionary theory, with its hope of perfection through continual improvement, was presented as the new savior of mankind.

The rejection of revelation as a basis for truth, the psychologizing of education, and the belief in social evolution has had a decisive influence on the educational thinkers who hold sway in today's colleges of education, including those at virtually every Lutheran college.

Today every Lutheran teacher candidate is taught about Jean Piaget and Erik Erikson, John Dewey and Lev Vygotsky, Maria Montessori and Rudolf Steiner as though they were objective social scientists. A careful reading of these educationists reveals the opposite: they approached their task with strong convictions about theology, science, psychology, and evolution. They were "true believers" with regard to their personal convictions, and their goal was to use education to promote their beliefs. The secular educational community has been an active accomplice in this. The result is that we now have several generations of Americans who have had minds that have been shaped to be receptive to the theology of their pedagogical masters. Universalism, Marxism, Mysticism, and Gnosticism all find fertile ground in the minds of Americans

because their minds have been thoroughly tilted by the philosophies and methods of Universalist, Marxist, Mystic, and Gnostic educational methods and philosophies. Educational philosophy is never without theology; it is only a question of which theology it is designed to promote.

This principle was understood by the early Missouri Lutheran fathers. In early pedagogical writings, there were frequent warnings to avoid educational thinkers who contradicted sound orthodox theology. For example, in the early years of *Evangelisch-Lutherisches Schulblatt*, the forerunner of *Lutheran Education Journal/Lutheran Education*, almost every single edition had devoted space to a critique of a prominent 19th-century

German pedagogy. The theological shortcomings of educational philosophers such as Johann Pestalozzi, Johann Herbart, Friedrich Fröbel, Wilhelm Humbolt were all highlighted by the editors of the journal so that orthodox Lutheran teachers would understand the dangers that these thinkers posed to orthodox Lutheran education. This all

As the old voices of Lutheran education died away the new normal in Lutheran teacher education was often to adopt the very practices and philosophies that our spiritual forefathers warned against. We began looking to the government for guidance on how to train our teachers, and we looked to anti-Christian educationists for direction on methods and curricula.

began to change in the early 20th century. The critiques and warnings against the philosophies of anti-Lutheran and anti-Christian educators were slowly replaced with a more accepting attitude toward the new American pedagogues in the 20th century. Educational thinkers such as John Dewey and Horace Mann were entertained by Missouri Lutheran educators with scarcely a negative comment about their theology and the implications that their methods might have for Lutheran education.

This change in attitude occurred for several reasons. In part it happened because the educational views of the early Missouri Lutherans had not evolved and adapted to their new surroundings. These Lutherans continued to define themselves against the German educational system that they had left behind 50 or 60 years ago. Another reason it changed was that they were reacting to the persecutions of the ethnic German Lutherans during and immediately after World War One. Across America there was a wave of anti-German sentiment, and the Lutherans were prime targets. Laws were being passed by states like Nebraska that were designed to shut down German Lutheran schools. As a result, Missouri Lutheran educators were reluctant to criticize American educators for fear of being branded un-American. They looked for ways to adopt secular methods and philosophies of education in order to make themselves look acceptable to state educational authorities. Finally, attitudes changed simply because of the spirit of the age. The 20th century was the age of progress, science, and new ways of understanding man. Psychology and sociology claimed new insights as to who people were, how they learned, and how education could employ these new insights for the good of man. It is hard to imagine that Lutheran educators could have resisted this pull and held that the old Lutheran ways were correct and the new ways were wrong.

As the old voices of Lutheran education died away, the new normal in Lutheran teacher education was often to adopt the very practices and philosophies that our spiritual forefathers warned against. We began looking to the government for guidance on how to train our teachers, and we looked to anti-Christian educationists for direction on methods and curricula. Thus, in our LCMS Teachers Colleges (which have become Colleges of Education within universities), future Lutheran school teachers are now taught almost exactly the same as their secular counterparts, with the exception that they must take several required theology courses. They are taught the methods of Lev Vygotsky without hearing about his Marxism, Dewey without hearing about his Secular Humanism, Piaget without hearing about his Mysticism, and Montessori without hearing about her Gnosticism.

Like the dictum, *lex orandi lex credendi* (the law of prayer is the law of belief), the way we teach is the way we believe. One cannot separate educational philosophies and methods from theology. Methods of teaching always grow out of theology, and theology will shape methods. In this world where society, in general, and secular education, in particular, are openly opposed to the teaching of the Christian faith, we, as Lutheran educators must

rediscover our own ways, our own methods, and our own pedagogies, so that our own children may be taught according to the truth.

Dr. Thomas Korcok

Associate Professor of Theology
Concordia University, Chicago

Dr. Korcok is director of the Center for the Advancement of Lutheran Liberal Arts (CALLA). Based at Concordia University Chicago, it works to develop and implement standards of educational excellence that are rooted in biblical theological truth and that reflect an ongoing commitment to a classical understanding of Liberal Education. More information can be found at www.cuchicago.edu/CALLA.

- 1 Goldberg School Rules.
- 2 The work of scientist philosophers like that of Richard Dawkins and Steven Hawking should be sufficient to put an end to that argument, for in no way are they theologically neutral. Their theories are directly shaped by their confession that there is no god and that we are the masters of our own destiny.
- 3 *De Doctrina* 18.28
- 4 "To the Christian Nobility" *Luther's Works*, American Edition, vol. 44, p. 207.
- 5 Pestalozzi, *The Education of Man*, 90.
- 6 *Ibid.*
- 7 Fröbel, *Education of Man*, 57.
- 8 Egan, Kieran, *Getting it Wrong From the Beginning: Our Progressivist Inheritance from Herbert Spencer, John Dewey, and Jean Piaget*. Yale University Press: New Haven and London (2002) p. 14.
- 9 Herbert Spencer, *Essays on Education and Kindred Subjects* [1861] Editor: Charles W. Eliot <http://oll.libertyfund.org/titles/spencer-essays-on-education-and-kindred-subjects-1861-1911>.
- 10 *Ibid.*

New Student Aid Endowment Fund! Concordia Theological Foundation, Inc.

In early 2018, in honor of Mrs. Ginny Valleau's contributions to the publication of the *Lutheran Clarion*, a **Concordia Theological Seminary Student Aid Endowment Fund** was established at **Concordia Theological Foundation, Inc.**, which is recognized by the Internal Revenue Service as a tax-exempt 501(c)(3) religious charitable organization. Contributions are tax deductible as permitted by federal and state law. The fund now has contributions totaling \$4,500.



The Board of Directors of the Lutheran Concerns Association invites *Lutheran Clarion* readers and friends to contribute to the Fund which can be done by sending your check marked Valleau Endowment Fund to:

Concordia Theological Foundation, Inc.
6041 Stellhorn Road, Box 15810, Fort Wayne, IN 46815
or to

Lutheran Concerns Association
149 Glenview Drive, New Kensington, PA 15068-4921

Donors will receive receipts for their gifts.

The Lutheran Clarion

The official publication of the Lutheran Concerns Association, a non-profit 501(c)(3) organization.
Circulation: 6,000



Published regularly to support issues and causes in The Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod which build faithfulness to true Confessional Lutheranism and to be a clear voice of Christian concern against actions and causes which conflict with faithfulness to the One True Faith. LCA consents to readers reproducing articles provided the entire article, plus footnotes, is included in the reproduction and full attribution given.

The address for all matters pertaining to the LCA is:
149 Glenview Drive
New Kensington, PA 15068-4921

Editorial Board: Mr. Walter Dissen (Chairman)
Rev. Jerome Panzigrau
Dr. John F. Lang

Mrs. Ginny Valleau: Layout, Printing & Mailing

Faithful Lutherans who are members of LCMS congregations are invited to submit articles of approximately 500 words for consideration. Inquiries are welcome. Manuscripts will be edited. Views and judgments expressed in articles are the author's own and do not necessarily represent those of LCA. Please email articles to Mr. Walter Dissen (wdissen@aol.com; 757-436-2049).

The Board of Directors for the LCA:

Mr. Walter Dissen (Chairman)
Mr. Mark Franke (Vice-Chairman)
Rev. Jerome Panzigrau (Secretary-Treasurer)

Rev. Joseph M. Fisher Rev. Andrew Preus
Rev. Dr. Kristian Kincaid Dr. John Rahe
Dr. John F. Lang Mr. Leon L. Rausch
Rev. Dr. Martin Noland Mr. Winfried K. Strieter

<http://www.lutheranclarion.org>

Lutheran Concerns Association
July 2018



Lutheran Concerns Association
149 Glenview Drive
New Kensington, PA 15068-4921