

Calvin University

Calvin Digital Commons

The Calvin Forum

University Publications

5-1-1935

The Calvin Forum

Calvin College and Seminary

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.calvin.edu/calvin_forum

Recommended Citation

Calvin College and Seminary, "The Calvin Forum" (1935). *The Calvin Forum*. 1.
https://digitalcommons.calvin.edu/calvin_forum/1

This Book is brought to you for free and open access by the University Publications at Calvin Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in The Calvin Forum by an authorized administrator of Calvin Digital Commons. For more information, please contact dbm9@calvin.edu.

THE CALVIN FORUM

A MONTHLY

Facing New Issues

A Statement

Russian Communism

An Indictment

The Theology of Crisis

An Enigma

To Fight or Not to Fight

Pro and Con

The Living Voice in Education

A Plea

Missions

Christian or Humanistic?

Significant Books

Their Gist and Drift

Initial Issue

May, 1935

Two Dollars a Year

The CALVIN FORUM

Published by:

PROF. LOUIS BERKHOF, B.D., PROF. CLARENCE BOUMA, A.M., Th.D., PROF. ALBERT E. BROENE, A.B., PROF. JOHANNES BROENE, A.M., PROF. HARRY G. DEKKER, M.S., LAMBERT J. FLOKSTRA, Ph.B., PROF. PETER HOEKSTRA, Ph.D., PROF. WILLIAM HARRY JELLEMA, Ph.D., PROF. DIEDRICH H. KROMMINGA, A.B., Th.B., PROF. H. HENRY MEETER, Th.D., EDWIN Y. MONSMA, M.S., PROF. JAMES NIEUWDORP, B.S., WILLIAM T. RADIUS, A.M., PROF. ALBERTUS ROOKS, A.M., PROF. HENRY J. RYSKAMP, Ph.D., PROF. HENRY SCHULTZE, A.B., B.D., PROF. RALPH STOB, Ph.D., PROF. SEYMOUR SWETS, A.M., JOHANNA TIMMER, A.M., PROF. HENRY J. VAN ANDEL, A.M., PROF. J. G. VANDEN BOSCH, A.M., PROF. JOHN P. VAN HAITSMA, Ph.D., PROF. HENRY VAN ZYL, Ph.D., PROF. SAMUEL VOLBEDA, Th.D., HARRY J. WASSINK, A.B., B.S., PROF. MARTIN J. WYNGAARDEN, B.D., Ph.D.

The Editorial Committee:

DR. CLARENCE BOUMA (Managing Editor), DR. HENRY J. RYSKAMP, PROF. HENRY SCHULTZE, DR. RALPH STOB, and PROF. HENRY J. VAN ANDEL.

CONTENTS—Vol. I. No. 1, MAY, 1935

EDITORIAL CONTRIBUTIONS:

Facing New Issues: A Statement.....	3
Editorial Paragraphs	5
A Vicious Circle.....	6
The New Frontier Days.....	7

CONTRIBUTED ARTICLES:

Russian Communism — An Indictment. By Peter Hoekstra, Ph.D.....	8
The Enigma of the Theology of Crisis. By Diedrich H. Kromminga, Th.B.....	10
The Government Calls Me to Fight — Must I Obey? Two Views. By Jacob Harry Bruincoog, Th.D., and Peter G. Berkhout, M.D.....	13
Instruction by the Living Voice: A Plea. By Henry Van Zyl, Ph.D.....	17

BOOKS, PRINCIPLES, AND IDEAS:

Evolution Atheistic	20
Recent Gospel Research.....	21
Erasmus as Inclusive Religious Liberal.....	21
A Pastor on "Nervous Breakdown".....	22
Shall Christian Missions Continue Christian?.....	22
America's Outstanding Literary Writers.....	23
The Old Brand with a New Wrapper.....	23
Books in Brief.....	23

Who is Who in This Issue

BERKHOUT, PETER G., is a practicing physician at Paterson, N. J.
 BOUMA, CLARENCE, is Professor of Ethics and Apologetics at Calvin Seminary and Managing Editor of THE CALVIN FORUM.
 BROENE, JOHANNES, is Professor of Education at Calvin College.
 BRUINOOG, JACOB HARRY, is pastor of the East Muskegon Christian Reformed Church.
 HOEKSTRA, PETER, is Professor of History and Political Science at Calvin College.
 KROMMINGA, DIEDRICH H., is Professor of Church History at Calvin Seminary.
 KRUTHOF, BASTIAN, is Instructor in English at Eastern Academy, Paterson, N. J.
 "LOIS" shares the manse with the pastor of the Drenthe Christian Reformed Church.
 MERIZON, BETH, contributed "Footsteps" to the third volume of a yearly book of verse known by the title, "America Singing" (Edited by Loring Eugene Williams).
 REITSEMA, MILDRED, whose occupation at a Grand Rapids business office does not keep her from dreaming dreams and writing verse.
 RYSKAMP, HENRY J., is Professor of Economics and Sociology at Calvin College.
 SCHULTZE, HENRY, is Professor of the New Testament at Calvin Seminary.
 TEN HOOR, FREDERICK, a son of the late Professor F. M. Ten Hoor, whose library he recently catalogued.
 VAN ANDEL, H. J., is Professor of the Holland Language and Literature at Calvin College.
 VAN HAITSMA, J. P., is Professor of Organic Science at Calvin College.
 VAN ZYL, HENRY, is Professor of Educational Methods at Calvin College.

THE CALVIN FORUM is published monthly. Subscription Price: Two Dollars per year. Address all editorial as well as business correspondence to: THE CALVIN FORUM, Calvin College and Seminary, Grand Rapids, Michigan.

The CALVIN FORUM


Volume I

GRAND RAPIDS, MAY, 1935

Number 1

FACING NEW ISSUES

A STATEMENT



THE intelligent Christian is facing a serious and challenging situation today. He is living in an age of intellectual ferment and spiritual perplexity. He is called to grapple with new and difficult problems, problems which in many cases go to the roots of his religious convictions. Everywhere there is apparent a tension between the traditional formulation of our spiritual convictions and the issues which modern life and thought force upon us.

Many of these issues are distinctly ethical, and all of them are in their ultimate bearing and implications religious, theological, and philosophical. There is, for instance, the issue of communism and socialism, of social justice and capitalism, of war and peace, of nationalism and internationalism, of sex and divorce, of marriage and the companionate, of parenthood and birth control, of eugenics and euthanasia, of business ethics and speculation, of crime and punishment. There are the problems of the task of the church in modern life, of Christianity in its relation to the state, of toleration and free speech. There is the perennial problem as to the proper relation of natural science and philosophy to religion and theology. We are face to face with Behaviorism and Psycho-analysis, pragmatistic pedagogy and naturalistic education, with Humanism and Agnosticism, with Pantheism and a revived Atheism, with modernism and a religious sectarianism, with oriental cults and syncretistic religions. And more significant than all these are the questions as to the implications of a sound philosophy and a Christian-theistic view of reality and human life.

* * * * *

The need of a new magazine for the discussion of issues such as these is apparent. The lack of such a medium for the interchange of ideas has long been felt in our group. The pulpit, the church press, professorial chairs, libraries, lectures, and discussion groups — all these are making their contribution in some form or other to the solution of these problems, but among these a magazine is indispensable and can rightfully claim a place all its own.

Such a magazine THE CALVIN FORUM aims to be. It is to be devoted to the helpful discussion of subjects in the realms of Religion and Theology, History and Philosophy, Natural Science and Medicine, Sociology and Economics, Political Science and International Law, Psychology and Education, Literature and Art. Averse to anything musty or academic, it aims to be both popular and scholarly. It would seek to deal with these issues in such an untechnical way as to make an appeal to all intelligent and thoughtful Christians.

What will be the editorial standpoint and policy of this new magazine?

It aims to be progressive and open-minded, and to combine this mental attitude with a whole-souled loyalty to the Word of God and the distinctive world and life view which constitutes the spiritual heritage of our group.

Our policy will be one of progressiveness and open-minded investigation. We desire to move forward. We would help others in seeing the new issues and grappling with them. With full appreciation of our historical traditions, we would recognize that God calls us to live in the twentieth century. We would seriously cope with the problems of this day and age.

Only a soundly progressive attitude will meet the need of the hour. There can be no wholesome progression without a sound conservation and appreciation of the past. We need an ever deeper grounding in history. But mere traditionalism will solve none of the serious problems which we face. New occasions teach new duties. New wine must be put into new wineskins.

We are fully aware that much which passes for open-mindedness in our day is a mere euphemism for lack of positive conviction. The open-mindedness that we would cultivate upon the pages of this magazine is not of this brand. It is rather the attitude of mind which believes that, before anyone is entitled to pass a final judgment on any view or person or movement, he should be acquainted with the facts. It means belief in induction as well as deduction. This attitude of mind is the sworn enemy of all slipshod judgments, whether these be advanced in the interest of a hidebound conservatism or of a supposed progressivism.

This will in some cases call for the presentation of two or more divergent points of view in the discussion of a new problem. If the new issues before us are to be brought a bit nearer their solution, it will be desirable from time to time to have an intelligent presentation of more than one side of the question.

* * * * *

But the most determinative element in the standpoint and policy of our magazine will be found in the distinctive point of view from which its editors propose to survey all problems and evaluate all facts. Those sponsoring this magazine are deeply convinced that there is no hope for the solution of these new and urgent problems except on the basis of the distinctively Christian outlook upon life.

Here also lies the ultimate and only justification for a magazine of this kind. If our desire was merely for an up-to-date and informing discussion of the problems of the day, we might well turn to existing magazines. But this periodical is born not only from the conviction that we must face new problems and face them in a progressive and open-minded way, but no less from the conviction that the only hope of any fundamental solution for them must be found in the principles which constitute the spiritual heritage of our group. You may designate these principles by the name Calvinism, as some do; you may speak of them as constituting our Christian world and life view, as others are inclined to do; you may prefer to speak of Reformed Theology and its implications; or, again, you may feel satisfied with the designation of orthodox Christianity, — all these are names (significant names, each one of them) for that great spiritual reality with which all our hopes for the solution of modern problems are wrapped up.

* * * * *

We approach this task with no delusions as to the magnitude of our possible achievements. We nowise claim to have a set of ready-made solutions for all the pressing problems which stare us in the face. We would only make a humble beginning to tackle them. This surely is the least that can be done. And this must be done. Necessity is laid upon us.

We invite the widest possible co-operation on the part of all who may have any contribution to make toward the realization of the ideal sketched above. We are only taking the initiative in a work in which we feel certain a large number of thoughtful Christian men and women — whatever their ecclesiastical affiliation — will wish to have a share.

* * * * *

In humble reliance upon God Almighty we would enter upon the difficult task outlined above.

THE EDITORS AND PUBLISHERS.

EDITORIALS

Allow Us to Introduce Ourselves

FOR some time the need for a magazine such as THE CALVIN FORUM aims to be has been widely felt and repeatedly expressed. We herewith make our bow to the Christian public. As stated more fully above, we aim to cope with the deeper problems of our day in the light of the Word of God. We would aid in making articulate the spiritual, intellectual, and cultural life of our Christian groups in such a way as to produce and nurture a virile American type of Calvinistic culture. We would unfold in thought and in practical living the spiritual values inherent in a full-orbed, supernatural, biblical, God-centered interpretation of the Christian faith. Recognizing the centrality of religion and theology in such discussions, we have, however, no desire to restrict our outlook to this field. THE CALVIN FORUM would take the whole sweep of human thought and culture into its purview. We believe that all things are ours, and that we are Christ's, and that Christ is God's. Calvinism is a matter of an all-inclusive world and life view. No one will think it strange that this venture is undertaken by a group whose members are devoting their life to research and teaching at two institutions both of which bear the name of John Calvin. In this connection we would guard against a possible misapprehension or two. Though the constituency of the present CALVIN FORUM publishing group coincides, with the membership of the Calvin College and Seminary faculties, and our mailing address for obvious reasons is that of the Grand Rapids school, THE CALVIN FORUM is in no sense an undertaking of these institutions. There exists no relationship of responsibility, either financially or morally, between the Board of Trustees or the faculties of Calvin College and Calvin Seminary on the one hand, and the new magazine on the other. Participation in THE CALVIN FORUM group is a matter of voluntary and individual agreement on the part of its members. The Editorial Committee, elected by the publishing group, will be more directly responsible for the actual editing of the magazine, but the publishing group (whose names appear elsewhere in this issue) controls the magazine, determines its policies, and constitutes a body of regular contributors to its columns as well. Moreover, we solicit the contribution of helpful discussions on the problems we face from the hand of anyone interested in the realization of the objectives set forth above. The cause sponsored by THE CALVIN FORUM transcends not only social and professional, but also ecclesiastical and even national lines of cleavage.

C. B.

We Welcome Controversy!

ONE of the outstanding current magazines prints conspicuously across its front cover these words: A Magazine of Controversy. Many persons are morally afraid of controversy, but the intelligent person cannot live without it. Only through the clash of opinions and views can progress be made in such a world as ours. THE CALVIN FORUM welcomes controversy. We believe in the interchange of views and

opinions on the part of those who stand with us on the basis of the world and life view characterized above. Under proper editorial direction such debate is bound to lead to a clarification of the issues involved in the mind of the intelligent Christian to whom our magazine makes its appeal. Progress in the appropriation of our spiritual heritage is achieved not only by the constructive exposition of its principles but also by the helpful discussion of its implications on the part of those who may differ though having the same general aim. We also need controversy with a view to the error of our day. The assumption that all well-intentioned people are essentially agreed we know to be a fallacy. In every field, but especially in the domain of religious thought, we face an almost endless variety of distortion of the truth. This circumstance has led many people to adopt Pilate's cynical attitude voiced in his: What is truth! It has led others to resort to a hushing up policy vindicated by a specious appeal to the need for the cultivation of love and kindness. We do love truth and peace, and fully aware of the difficulty involved in doing justice to both, we at the same time have no desire to sacrifice the one to the other and thus lose both. We believe in peace, but are not enamored of the peace that marks the cemetery. It is a blight upon much of present-day American church life — conservative and liberal alike — that its press studiously avoids the expression of differences of opinion. We believe in controversy. There will, however, be no room on the pages of THE CALVIN FORUM for a certain type of controversy — at times altogether too prevalent. Articles which are controversial in the sense that the element of personal animosity creeps in will be rigidly excluded. The truth which we love and seek is too noble a magnitude to be dragged in the dust of unholy passion. Neither will there be room for interminable debate, in which the public is forgotten by the debaters and the desire for the last word is unmistakable. THE CALVIN FORUM would accord a large measure of freedom of expression to those that write upon its pages, but at no time do we propose to do so at the expense of a definite and outspoken editorial guidance.

C. B.

The Older and the Younger Generation

THE problem of the future of the spiritual identity of our group life may be put from the angle of the proper understanding between the older and the younger generation. In conservative circles the tendency is ever in the direction of stressing the superior wisdom of the older heads; insisting upon authority and tradition; and deprecating the new ideas of youth. In liberal groups the tendency is usually in quite the opposite direction. Just after the close of the war we were told repeatedly that the younger generation was going to build a new world order upon the ruins of the follies committed by the older generation. What we need is a recognition of the relative good both in the conservative and in the progressive attitude toward life. These only indicate two poles, between which our thinking and living must oscillate to be true and

effective. Conservatism by itself leads to stagnation and petrification; progressivism cut loose from history is like chasing the rainbow. The older generation should strive to remain young, open-minded, and fresh in its approach to problems. The younger generation must learn to appreciate the tried treasures of the past and to respect the wisdom of those who have traveled the road before they did. In Reformed church bodies there often is found a fine sense of the spiritual continuity of the generations. Their church audiences consist of young and old both. The religious motive being uppermost and the covenant conception prominent, the child is trained from its very infancy in the things of God in home, church, and school. This is a very wholesome situation, in which the older and the younger generations retain a desirable spiritual contact. However, also in these cases there sometimes arises serious misunderstanding and, at times, even tragic estrangement. There is need of a more earnest attempt on the part of the two groups to understand one another. Intelligent parents, whose children are often privileged to enjoy a much better education than they, feel especially the great need of growing intellectually and culturally with their sons and daughters. This will be of the greatest value to stimulate and encourage youth in loyalty to the faith of their fathers. All the agencies of church, home, and school should be mobilized for the accomplishment of this spiritual task. If THE CALVIN FORUM may be of some service, however small, to both the older and the younger generation in bringing them a bit more closely together in mutual understanding and in the pursuit of the aim of an intelligent and God-glorifying life in the complex world of today, we shall count ourselves happy indeed.

C. B.

The German Church Crisis and Karl Barth

THE issue that is being fought out in the German Church is one which deeply concerns every Christian group in the world. The glorification of the Aryan race in its national Germanic form is the first and last article in the Nazi creed. Theology and preaching are being refashioned in the image of this racial ideal. Distinctive elements of the Christian faith are being sacrificed to this Moloch of German nationalism. The extreme left wing of this movement openly repudiates our Lord Jesus Christ on the score of his having been a Jew. Instead of the one true God the Teutonic deities of pre-Christian Germany are reinstated and worshipped. Professor Hauer, a leader in this anti-Christian movement, recently said: "We believe that God has expressed himself especially through our great German leaders. Christianity is not the religion of the German people. On the contrary, we regard Christianity as a danger to the unity of the German people." This is paganism unabashed. Though this is apparently one of the most extreme utterances of its kind, it must be remembered that the German-Christian groups likewise stand for the supremacy of the racial, nationalistic ideal over the Christian and biblical. Even Brunner's championship of the "creation ordinances" seems to be a theological accommodation to this same spirit. Hitler and his reichsbishop are determined either to cajole or to cow the churches into submis-

sion to their program. Ministers who will not fall in line with the goose step have been thrown into jail, and thousands of them have been placed under temporary or permanent house arrest, which is sufficient to bar them from their pulpits when desired. We who believe in the spiritual freedom of the church and in a gospel that transcends all racial differences and discrimination, rejoice at the determined protest and the passive resistance of loyal ministers of the gospel — loyal as they are to their *real* Herr, the only dictator of his Church: the Lord Jesus Christ. The heroic stand of Karl Barth, who for his convictions on this score has cheerfully sacrificed an honored and influential professorial position at the University of Bonn, is deserving of high admiration. His break with Brunner and Gogarten, who have compromised with this essential paganism, is refreshing. Barth's pamphlet (the first of a series), entitled "Theological Existence Today" (published in English translation by Hodder and Stoughton, London, 1934), in which he voices a masterful plea for the spiritual freedom of the gospel, the church, and theological science, bids fair to become a document of historic significance. We will do well to keep our eye on the German church crisis. The issue of Church and State is far from dead, even in our own land.

C. B.

A Vicious Circle

A REVIEW of the period since the close of the world war reveals a chain of events that confirms the suspicion that we have been moving in a vicious circle.

The signing of the treaty of Versailles meant the setting up of new countries, the summary breaking down of old economic boundaries and relations. The tenseness of the situation arising from this break-up of the old order led each country to defend its spoils or to protect itself against further losses. The idea of protection extended itself particularly to economic activity, and one country after another resorted to the use of protective measures against the imports of other countries in order to build up and to diversify its industries. Although this may perhaps have benefitted some countries for the moment, it was disastrous to others that were economically dependent. In the long run it could not but be injurious to all because the economic life of the nations before the war had been dependent upon international trade.

When some countries discovered that this policy was slowly strangling them they resorted to depreciation or devaluation of their currencies, a practice which gave them an advantage in foreign trade because it lowered their prices. It did so temporarily only, however, because as soon as other countries discovered the effect of this policy they followed suit. Thus nation after nation left the gold standard. When some nations devalued more than others their economic foes retaliated by quota imports and by prohibitions. The use of one economic weapon after another led to each nation's attempting more desperately than ever before to entrench itself within its own borders, and led thus inevitably to economic and political nationalism. With nationalism becoming more and more a matter of desperation on the part of the nations other weapons were silently but grimly added to the

economic, and nations were once more in the position they had been led to believe they had forever abandoned in 1919.

When events or practices are so closely interrelated that one involves the other, can one very well defend one, for example, prohibitive tariffs, without defending the others? Can one condemn one, for example, devaluation, without condemning the others that led up to it in the chain of events?

Is there no way of breaking in upon such a vicious circle? We know that it is selfishness that leads to this kind of frustration. Perhaps a self-interest enlightened enough to see the consequences of a short-sighted policy may lead nations to concerted action to break the chain and to regard each other's interests. It is indeed too much to expect to see them act on the basis of duty toward others.

Our knowledge of human nature does not permit us to expect much more from individuals in the conduct of their affairs. Our difficulties are largely due to the fact that both as nations and as individuals we have been insisting upon our rights, — only to see them vanish in thin air. We face the challenge, however, not only of the hour but the ever real challenge for the Christian, to think not in terms of our "rights," but in terms of our "duties." What might not such a shift of emphasis, if courageously made by all Christians, accomplish!

H. J. R.

The New Frontier Days

THERE are thirty million new Americans without a background, if we may believe such a good sociologist as Louis Adamic. They do not understand America, their new fatherland. They do not know the homeland of their parents. They are suspended in mid-air. And, therefore, they lack personality, courage, the joy of life, and broad human interests. Their life will not be a success because they have the fear complex. What is worse, they constitute a danger for American civilization, for they are pulling down the level of general knowledge and morality. Adamic suggests that the government step in, and enhance the vision of all these immigrant sons and daughters by providing them with books giving them information about the achievements of their forefathers in the realms of education and art, and that public school teachers instruct them in the songs and the history of their ancestors.

We believe that Adamic's suggestion is a valuable one, but we want to point out one sad oversight on his part. He forgot all about the central category of life, religion, and how the religion of the fathers is bound up with the culture of the fathers. The church may do all it can to inculcate the principles of Catholicism, Lutheranism, Calvinism, Methodism, or any other European beliefs, but its labors will be in vain, if the schools do not provide the soil and the climate in which these religions grew. What faith will our young religious people then adopt? It will be either the short creed of Premillennialism, or the still shorter one of Religious Aestheticism. The intelligentsia will fall prey to the latter, the fashionable philosophy of our downtown churches, sweetened by music and ritual. The

less educated will flock to the camp of the Fundamentalists. But the historical creeds will vanish. It is, of course, possible that in the general downfall of the old religions a new hope will arise. But, if in the catastrophe Calvinism is also to go on the rocks, evangelical Christianity will have lost its leader.

Are we prepared for the new frontier days? Do we realize that our children are already losing their hold on our religion because their background is becoming vague and colorless? Do we understand that our offspring may shake off our heritage because they are ignorant of the struggle of our fathers first with Catholicism, and later with Liberalism? Do we grasp that the pioneer spirit may lead us into a bog of despair unless we benefit by the past?

H. V. A.

I THIRST!

Since first 'mid Eden's beauteous bowers
Man spurned the living streams of God,
His thorn-torn, sin-scarred feet have trod
Death's drought-cursed waste through countless hours.
Through endless years his yearning cry
Mounts upward toward the burning sky:

I thirst!

Though deep he sinks his sand-choked shafts
Into earth's droughty desert land,
His cisterns, hewn by human hand,
Can hold no sweet, thirst-quenching draughts.
And ever louder through the sky
Resounds man's helpless, hopeless cry:

I thirst!

But hark! On Calvary's cursèd tree,
While death's deep darkness hides the sky,
Escapes from pallid, pain-parched lips
Once more that piteous, plaintive cry,
The burden of humanity:

I thirst!

As sweet Shiloah's crystal flow
Gushed from the riven temple rock,
Refreshing those who dwelt below,
So from the Saviour's spear-pierced side
Flows forth a healing, quickening tide,
Which stills that wail of bitter woe:

I thirst!

"Ho! everyone who thirsteth, ye
For whom I thirsted bitterly,
Pass ye your broken cisterns by,
Whose deadly dross can satisfy
No stricken soul. Come! freely take
My living draughts, your thirst to slake.
Then nevermore shall earth and sky
Re-echo with your anguished cry:

I thirst!

"LOIS."

Drenthe, Michigan.

Russian Communism---An Indictment

By Peter Hoekstra, Ph.D.

IT HAS become rather common usage today, when reference is made to conditions in Russia, to employ the terms Bolshevism, Sovietism, Socialism, and Communism as though they all mean one and the same thing and can be used interchangeably. This usage is not a correct one. Perhaps a brief examination of these terms may be of value.

Bolsheviki, from which Bolshevism is derived, is a Russian word meaning majority, and is always used in contrast with Mensheviki or minority. These terms arose in 1903, when at a meeting of the Russian Social Democratic party those who accepted the views of Lenin were in the majority, and were called the Bolsheviki. It was this Bolshevik wing of the party which managed to secure control in Russia in 1917. At that time, however, they represented only a small minority of the Socialistic groups of Russia and had in reality become the Mensheviki. Partly because they felt the inconsistency of using the old term, partly because their beliefs had meanwhile undergone a change, they soon began to call themselves Communists. This term is no doubt a more correct designation of the doctrine for which they stand. The group in power today never speak of themselves as Bolsheviks. The term has gone out of use.

Sovietism is simply a term used to describe the peculiar form of government which the Communists have established. It is only one aspect of Communism, not the whole of it. A study of Sovietism as such does not enable one to understand what Communism stands for, no more than the study of a particular church polity would enable one to understand the beliefs and practices of that church.

Nor are the terms Socialism and Communism by any means identical. To be sure the Communists are Socialists, but there are many Socialists who are not Communists. Today there are almost as many brands of Socialists as there are of Heinz' well-known pure food products. The Communists pride themselves on being the only true followers of Karl Marx. About a year ago Stalin again emphasized this fact. In reporting on the progress of Communism, he stated "our successes are due to the fact that we worked and fought under the banner of Marx, Engels, and Lenin"; and he exhorted his followers "to remain loyal to the end" to this banner. Communists are consistent Marxian Socialists. But the need for distinction becomes the more apparent when it be remembered that not even all Marxians are Communists. Many who, like Spargo and Hillquist in this country, claim to be Marxians, are bitterly opposed to Communism. How then do Communists differ from other Marxian Socialists?

This question cannot be answered fully without considerable technical discussion. In brief, it may be said that all Marxian Socialists have a common set of purposes and that they share a general body of beliefs and doctrines. They differ among themselves in the means by which their purposes are to be achieved, and in the tactics and strategy which should be employed. Communists, like other Marxians, believe in the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat. They differ from other Marxians in believing that this de-

sired end can be achieved only by employing violent revolutionary methods. Their Socialist opponents also accuse them of teaching that the end justifies the means.

An Atheistic System

Communism is often described simply as an economic system and is then usually contrasted with capitalism. This is Communism in the narrower sense of the word. But Communism is more than an economic system. Unlike capitalism it is a complete system of thought. It has a philosophy of its own and this philosophy is out-and-out materialistic and anti-Christian. It seeks to apply this philosophy not only to man's economic life but to the whole life of man, to all human institutions and to human nature itself.

Communism is characterized by a hatred not only of Christianity but of every other form of religion. From the first there has been in Russia a systematic, cold-blooded and relentless oppression of religion. It betrays a woeful ignorance of the facts to represent this attitude simply as a natural resentment to the Orthodox Church of Russia, because of its close association with the Tsar. Communism regards all religion as an anti-social force, a capitalistic device, an enemy of the Revolution, which must be rooted out. Religion, as Marx has said, is "the opiate of the people," and Lenin has caused these words to be painted in huge letters on the walls of the Kremlin palace in Moscow. One of Lenin's followers has stated: "No compromise is ever possible between our program and religion." And another has said, "We are compelled to fight every religious life and world view."

Until 1929 religious propaganda was still to an extent permitted. Since then it has been forbidden, and only anti-religious, atheistic propaganda is allowed. Officially the state is atheistic. It is a definite part of the program under the second five-year plan to root out all religion. Anti-religious propaganda is carried on through the press, the school, the radio, the theatre — in fact by every possible means. Even playing cards are used for this purpose and the Soviet postage stamp today is a flaming insult directed at the God of heaven and earth.

There are those who say that Communism itself is a new religion. Thus when the archbishop of Canterbury in the English House of Lords asked his government to take action against the religious persecution in Russia he received the official reply that his Majesty's Government "could not even ask the Soviet government to change its attitude toward religion, because that attitude was its own religion." This reference to Communism as a religion is rather frequent. The writings of Marx are spoken of as its Old Testament, those of Lenin, as its New Testament. Marx, Lenin, and Stalin are its Trinity. Communism is said to have its faith and its doctrine. These are, however, mere ways of speaking. All such comparisons are superficial. There is under Communism no possibility of a belief in the supernatural, no room for mysticism, prayer, adoration. Its theology, if it may be said to have one, is wholly negative. Surely no one has more

vehemently condemned the belief in the supernatural than Lenin. And has he not taught his followers that the idea of God and faith in the divinity "has always placed the oppressed class at the mercy of the oppressors"? His followers today bitterly resent this reference to Communism as a religion.

Education minus God

One of the foremost means used to impose atheistic ideas upon the masses has been the school. Communism, according to Paul Monroe (*The Culture Program of Soviet Russia*) has a well thought out educational theory, which is a part of its general theory of life. The educational theory and practice of capitalistic countries must be discarded. For under capitalism, says Lenin, "the school was wholly an instrument of class domination in the hands of the bourgeoisie," it was "thoroughly permeated with the spirit of caste," and its aim was "to give capitalists obliging serfs." Moreover, it "infected" the child with religious ideas.

All religious instruction in the schools is therefore sternly forbidden. Instead there is much stress on the Darwinian theory of evolution and on the natural sciences. Education is thorough indoctrination in the Communistic view of life. It must teach the child to understand the nature of the class struggle, to work toward the establishment of a class-less society, and to make him a fit soldier of the Revolution. Education and politics are more closely intertwined in Russia than in any other country. In a sense, the whole of life and all social and institutional activity in the Soviet state is made educative. The school prepares for life, but life in turn must be in harmony with the doctrine of the school.

The success of this educational program is due in considerable measure to the Communist conception of the family and of the status of the child. The family is no longer regarded as an economic unit. Much less is it a spiritual force in the life of the child. Marriage is little better than mating, little more than a means of fulfilling the biological function. Divorce may be had for the asking. The very word "adultery" is said to have disappeared from the legal code. Family pride and parental authority are outworn ideas. Virtually the child is considered as belonging to the state until the age of eighteen. "Thus the school," says Monroe, "does replace the family in the earlier years." In order to enable the mother to do her part in the industrial reconstruction of Russia, the children are taken over by the state while they are still infants. They are cared for in nurseries owned and controlled by the state. Hindus tells us that in 1932 over 10,000,000 children below school age were cared for in such institutions.

The New Morality

Communism has now been in effect over seventeen years. A whole generation of Russian youth has been trained in its doctrines. The effect has been, if we may believe Hindus, that the "new man," the man thoroughly steeped in Communistic ideas, "has lost all faith in God and all fear of God. The very idea of God has no place in his consciousness."

Having cast overboard his belief in God, why should the new man feel bound by old standards of

morality? Why should he be bothered with a sense of sin? He still speaks of "sin," but he gives the word a new meaning, he uses it either smilingly or sneeringly as the occasion demands. Has he not been taught by Marx that there is only one sin — the private possession of property? This is the root of all evil and misery among mankind. Not he is a sinner who transgresses the law of God, but he who still possesses private property, he who refuses to accept the doctrines of Communism.

The "new morality" brings with it also a new conception of crime and justice. Soviet juries act on the assumption that it is the environment (the capitalistic environment, of course) which is the cause of crime. The individual is not to blame and should not be held responsible. Rather, it is society which is to blame, and this being the case society is under obligation to the criminal. The individual criminal must therefore be "sentenced" — never for more than ten years — to a "house of redemption." The word prison is no longer used. This institution, too, as every other, must serve an educative purpose. The death penalty is applied only to the enemies of Communism, to the so-called political offenders.

Dictatorship — No Democracy

This leads me to say a word about the Soviet state. I am not interested in the details of governmental machinery, but in the spirit in which the government is administered. Lenin at one time asserted that "the Soviet state is a million times more democratic than the most democratic bourgeois republic." But what does he mean by democracy? Russia has a dictatorship of the proletariat but what does this imply? Does it mean a worker's democracy? Perhaps. Marxian Socialists do a good bit of quarreling among themselves as to what this dictatorship implies and as to how it may be squared with the idea of democracy. In 1934 Stalin, quoting with approval from one of Lenin's speeches, says, "We want to abolish classes, and in that respect we are in favor of equality. But the claim that we want to make all men equal to each other is an empty phrase and a stupid invention of the intellectuals." What, then, is equality?

This much is certain that Russia does not have and has not had since 1917 anything in the nature of political equality in our western sense of the word. One may be a worker, a member of the proletariat, but this in itself carries with it no political rights and does not enable one to share in the government. Political power is concentrated in the hands of the Communist party. This is the only political party in Russia today — every other political group is outlawed. Now by Stalin's own admission this party numbers no more than two million adherents, so that the dictatorship of the proletariat means dictatorship by a small minority — actually less than one-eightieth of the population. And this dictatorship has been more harsh and ruthless than the autocracy of the Tsar. All liberty in Russia is dead. I am aware that Communist doctrine considers this dictatorship but a transitory stage and calls for the entire abolition of the state as soon as a completely classless society has been set up. But when is this to be? Will this promise be redeemed? Already suggestions are said to be arising from within the party to the effect that this boss control should be continued in perpetuity — always, of course, in the interest of the masses!

In the narrower sense Communism means the abolition of private property and of the profit system and the ownership and control by the proletarian state of all the means of producing and distributing wealth. It means the socialization of land and industry, of trade, transportation and banking, of homes and restaurants, of food and clothing — and so on. This economic policy is the crux of the whole Communistic experiment. Though it may be conceded — and this concession involves no recognition of the justness of the plan — that this economic experiment has in some respects been a real benefit to Russia, it has also brought in its wake untold heart-ache, human suffering and misery.

Dynamite

Whether an economic system such as Russia now has, if stripped of all association with the Communistic philosophy on which it rests, and if voluntarily accepted by mutual consent and put in practice in a Christian environment, can ever be justified on psychological, economic, moral or Christian grounds, this broad question I must leave for wiser heads to decide.

In Russia this process of socialization has never been voluntarily accepted by the masses. Today they acquiesce, largely because opposition means banishment to Siberia or death. The system has been imposed on the masses from above, by forceful and often utterly unscrupulous means. In fastening this system of socialization on Russia Communism has shown a total

disregard of fundamental human values and of human life. This use of force is of the very essence of Communism.

Curiously enough Marx predicted that Russia would be one of the last countries in which the proletarian revolution would make its appearance. This prediction has not come true. Yet it is true that it is not purely a Russian phenomenon. There is very little in connection with the whole movement which is typically Russian. Its philosophy is not of Russian origin, and Communism, whether introduced in backward China and Persia or in England and the United States, will remain true to its philosophy. Karl Huszar has conclusively shown (*De Dictatuur van het Proletariaat in Hongarije*, tr. by H. Schaapveld) that during the few months when Communism fastened its grip on Hungary, it proceeded along exactly the same lines as in Russia.

Surely Communism cannot be the remedy for the evils of the capitalistic system. The remedy is worse than the disease. It is not like an oil that will cause the social and economic machinery to run more smoothly. Nor is it like a mild castor-oil purge. Communism is a menace to Christianity, a danger to human liberty and to the continuance of Christian civilization. It is a disruptive and explosive force that will tear up the world by its very roots.

Communism is dynamite!

The Enigma of the Theology of Crisis

By Diedrich H. Kromminga, Th.B.

TO THE Reformed theologian, Barthianism presents no greater enigma than its twofold evaluation of the Bible. Karl Barth gave the riddle concise formulation in his counsel that we should calmly "think together" the divine infallibility and the human fallibility of Holy Writ. Its fallibility is conceived of as lying on a plane where any human investigator can approach and scrutinize it, while its infallibility is discernible only to the eye of faith. The counsel is without doubt intended as pointing a way out of the struggle with modern and modernistic assaults upon the Bible, and would have us transcend that conflict.

Barth, Kuyper, and Bavinck

It should be recognized that this double evaluation of the Bible is proposed for the sake of the maintenance of the reality and objectivity of the revelation and grace of God. If we have acknowledged the character of the Bible as the religious literature of an ancient people, which is as such comparable with other ancient religious literatures, we have not yet taken cognizance of the real and distinctive significance of the Bible, which lies in its presentation to our view of men and women whose earthly career is interrupted by a voice from above, who are arrested by the Word of God. They report what they hear, and that record, that testimony, is what calls for our attention; in it, we in our turn are to hear the Word of God.

Moreover, the question whether any person will or will not hear God's Word in the Bible is not left to human decision, though involving human decision. It takes an eye healed by the grace of the Holy Spirit

from the disease of sin, to see the divine Son of God incarnate in the New Testament representation of Jesus. It is only the free and sovereign Word of God that brings it about that a man hears and understands it and takes it to heart. The natural incapacity of the sinner for assimilating God's revelation in His Word and the absolute necessity of the renewal of his heart by grace are insisted upon to a degree that is offensive to the modern mind. And the Barthians choose to be offensive here, for they are convinced that here the modern mind has gone radically astray.

The framework in which they have chosen to work these ideas out is that of a doctrine of the Word of God, since this concept is best suited to bring out the discontinuity of God and man and the communication which God's Word establishes in this discontinuity. That Word is beyond and above the Bible, which bears witness to it; is centrally given in the incarnation and earthly ministry of the eternal Son of God; and is heard in and through the preaching of the Gospel only as God wills and in virtue of His own activity in the hearer. In fact, the Trinity itself is active and manifest in God's speaking, the Father being particularly prominent in the subject, the Son in the action, and the Holy Spirit in the hearing of the divine address to man. And in the Word Incarnate His being and work coincide and His work and message are one: incarnation and crucifixion can not be separated from the Son of God nor from each other, but for us He is the Word as incarnate and crucified.

Furthermore, God's transcendence is emphasized as essential to Him. The great chasm between God and

man which man can not bridge has, indeed, been created by man's sins, but prior to the antithesis between the holy God and sinful man is the contrast between the Creator and the creature, and the revelation in Christ, while bridging that chasm, does not destroy this contrast. Therefore the Word of God does not diminish His inscrutableness, but sets it forth, brings it out into full daylight, makes us realize that He is unfathomable mystery. The very name which God gives Himself in the Bible, Jehovah, the Lord, indicates that His revelation is the disclosure of His Lordship, His sovereignty, as the One Whom we can only trust and obey. And our salvation for time and eternity lies precisely in our recognition in trust and obedience of the lordship of God.

In all this there is no essential divergence from Reformed theology discernible. In fact, the Crisis theologians aim to call modern Protestantism back to the theology of the Reformation, and Barth and Brunner, while frequently quoting and highly esteeming Luther, nevertheless want to be known as being of the Reformed persuasion. It is, therefore, not surprising, that in these central and cardinal matters they are in essential agreement with such Reformed writers as Abraham Kuyper and Herman Bavinck. Kuyper's emphasis on the fact that only the regenerate heart is in "rapport" with the Scriptures is only another way of expressing the same truth. They do not follow this way mainly for the reason that their own terminology is better adapted to the avoidance of the impression as though the grace of God created something new in the heart of man which becomes man's possession instead of remaining from moment to moment in the hand of God, even His very deed.

Scripture both Fallible and Infallible?

It is this setting which makes the doctrine of the twofold view of the Bible appear so strange. It does not mean, that to the Barthians the two views are of equal importance. Their interest centers in the Bible as the infallible Word of God. It is this as the prophetic and apostolic testimony of the incarnate Word. This view of the scriptural message as having the Christ for its sum and content and heart is, of course, soundly Biblical. That it is emphatically brought to the fore, is good. The higher critical debate is, alas, altogether too much concerned with minor details; withdraws the attention from the central fact; and tends to leave us with a Jesus stripped of both, His divine glory and His ability to save, and with a Bible robbed of its unity and its life. And among those who still acknowledge its divine infallibility there is also much use made of the Bible that is not free from a tendency to extract from the Word of God information that does not have its center and goal in the Christ.

As the testimony to the Incarnate Word, the Bible is for the Barthians the norm of Christian doctrine. This reformatory principle has their cordial assent. Whatever mistakes the Church and its teachers may have made in the practical application of this principle by way of questionable exegesis does not in the least invalidate the principle. Exegetical methods may change, our understanding of the Bible may progress, historical-creedal differences may continue to vary our results, but no teaching can be recognized as Christian that is not derived from and substantiated with the Bible. When we hear the Barthians on this head, we

get the impression that they are in full accord with the very highest estimate of the divine inspiration of the Bible.

Nor are they at peace with the subjective view, which finds the Word of God in the Bible and allows the Bible to be the Word of God for the individual to just the extent in which some particular passages may grip or appeal to the person. Of course, no one has ever been gripped by every verse or statement of the Bible, and no one has ever discovered the precise relation of every detail of Scripture to Christ or its particular function in mediating the knowledge of Christ to us. But, however defective our actual understanding of the Bible may be, the Word of God pervades its most peripheral and minute ramifications, and the Church faces the task of elaborating all of its content into doctrine, and the individual believer faces the task of understanding the Word of God in every detail and verse of Scripture.

But this high estimate of the Bible accords ill with certain other utterances. We are surprised to hear from the same men such statements as that the Bible is humanly fallible, that its books are the product of errant and erring men, and that there is room for criticism of the Bible, perhaps for criticism of a very radical type. It is true that Brunner, who allows of very radical criticism, would not permit an unrestricted criticism; that he demands that criticism shall not destroy the credibility of the Bible as a whole, nor the essentials of the New Testament representation of Jesus; and that he recognizes the difficulty of indicating the precise limits within which criticism ought to stay. But the astounding fact remains, that, according to the Theology of Crisis, one and the same book must function as the indispensable norm for all Christian doctrine and must be conceived of in the realm of historical inquiry as no more trustworthy than any other average historical record. It would seem, that this double demand can not be met unless we are able to split ourselves into dual personalities, of which the one is by the grace and power of God believing, while the other is just naturally human. Without question every believer can discover the rudiments within himself of this kind of thing, but that is far from legitimizing the duality and giving both halves equally the right of way, as the Theology of Crisis seems to propose.

Where Barth and Brunner Diverge

In point of fact, the Crisis theologians never were in perfect agreement as to their attitude to Holy Writ. The impression that they were of the same mind on this matter was largely due to the fact, that the two best known spokesmen of the group, Karl Barth and Emil Brunner, both rejected in express terms the doctrine of the verbal inspiration of the Bible. One regrets that they failed to make clear just what that term meant in their thought. Certain utterances remind one of the Swiss nationality of both these men and suggest reactions to the highly mechanical views of inspiration advocated by some Reformed leaders in those regions in days long past. It is perfectly intelligible that these men do not wish to defend a theory of heavenly dictation and of the inspiration of the vowel points of the Hebrew manuscripts of the Old Testament. The audience which they address would make any one careful to avoid being identified with such views. But verbal inspiration is not of necessity iden-

tical with such methods, and the rejection of verbal inspiration is much more inclusive than a protest and repudiation of these mistaken subsidiary notions.

Just how much more it includes depends upon the mind of the repudiator. In the case of Brunner it includes decidedly more than in the case of Barth. The latter's view of Holy Scripture is open to criticism mainly on the two points of his conception of the Canon as only provisionally closed, and his exegetical method of lengthening or shortening the lines of thought in the text for the purpose of bringing home to the present reader or hearer its plainly intended message. This method is, no doubt, legitimate, but his own exegesis raises the question whether now and then it does not become in his hands a means of adjusting the plain sense of Scripture to his subjective idea as to what the superior revelation demands, as in the case of his representation of Paul's doctrine of predestination. And the demand that extra-canonical testimony must be testimony to essentially the same revelation as that recorded in the Bible, makes the assumption of the possibility that such testimony exists rather harmless, even though one would prefer to see Barth demand exact historical rather than merely essential identity of the revelation.

In the case of Brunner, the situation is far worse. He does not hesitate to assail the integrity of the Bible. The story of an original pair of ancestors for our race is said by him to be merely the visual representation of the universality of sin in both its fatality and responsibility, and if the qualifying adverb, "merely," is meant to have full weight, this plainly amounts to a denial of the historicity of Genesis 1—3. Still clearer is his rejection of the Virgin Birth as a legendary accretion which has arisen from the impression made by the inconceivable glory of Christ's deity, and which can be of service only as an inexact popular vehicle for the truth of that deity. Such attacks on the integrity of Scripture, if allowed, would alter its content, leave it an open question just what parts of the Bible are God's Word and normative, and reduce to nonsense the demand that we seek to discover the message from God for us in every part and detail of the Bible.

The Theological Break and . . . Hitler

A somewhat detailed criticism of the double view of the Bible would expand this article beyond its proper limits. A very good commentary on its weakness is furnished by the fact that the group that used to represent the Theology of Crisis has broken up over questions involved in this view. As soon as the advocates began to distribute their emphasis differently over its two discrete elements, this result became possible. The successes of the German Christians in the totalitarian state of Hitler forced the issue.

Gogarten had long ago stressed the normative value of the so-called "ordinances of creation," viz., marriage, the family, etc., without giving due consideration to the question whether their true nature can be known except in the light of Holy Scripture. Instead of minding Barth's criticism, he proceeded to demand from Barth an anthropological substructure for his dogmatics. This demand stimulated Barth to a very emphatic repudiation of any and all philosophic grounding of Christian theology. But Gogarten advanced to the subscription of the German Christian thesis, that for the Christian Church of the present in

that country the "nomos" of the German people or nation as manifest in its history must be held to be expressive of the will of God.

Then Brunner precipitated the final rupture by suggesting that the difference between the majority of the group and Barth was due mainly to misunderstanding. Barth thereupon formulated the difference sharply. It concerns the question, whether Christian faith can recognize in history or the world any second authoritative source of knowledge in addition to and by the side of the Bible. This question Gogarten and Brunner answer affirmatively, while Barth and Thurneysen give an emphatic negative answer. To the mind of Barth, the admission of such a second source amounts to the surrender of the Christian position and principle and the entrance upon the road of modernistic Neoprotestantism.

It would seem that this latest position of Karl Barth, for which he suffers the active opposition of the German government, ought to entail a revocation of the advice, calmly to think together the divine infallibility and the human fallibility of the Bible. For when you declare its human fallibility, you submit it to an extraneous standard. But when it comes to historical facts, as far as the Bible expresses itself in regard to them, they are not what we think or what extra-biblical witnesses may tell us about them first of all, but they are first of all just that what the Bible declares them to be.

OF ANOTHER RACE

Autumn is a Latin lady
Throaty-voiced and dusky-eyed
Moving regally in garments
Deeply dyed.

Spring is lithe and fair and elfin,
Spring is fluty-voiced and sly
With sudden birds of banter
In her eye.
She skins from bough to bracken
With a tripping, airy tread,
Hurling emeralds — Hiding dreams
In her head.

BETH MERIZON.

SONNET

They mourned his going as a tribe of old
Might mourn the going of a mighty chief.
He had implanted in their hearts belief,
Imparted wisdom that is more than gold.
They came with reverence to say farewell.
Those who had known him long and nearest wept
Stirring a vague unease in those who slept
Through words that he had labored so to tell.
They were not all disconsolate indeed,
They had his words. But for their children's sake,
Because his presence was denied, the ache
Throbbled in their hearts like an unanswered need.

We blinded mortals. Fools, when will we waken!
To know our treasure it must first be taken!

MILDRED REITSEMA.

The Government Calls Me to Fight---Must I Obey?

TWO VIEWS

(In harmony with the proposed policy of THE CALVIN FORUM to present from time to time divergent views championed in Christian circles, we herewith offer our readers an interesting debate on a live issue of the day. We welcome the expression of views on this matter from our readers and shall publish the most helpful of them — or pertinent excerpts from them — in a later issue. Editorial comment follows on a later occasion. — *The Editors.*)

I. The View of Obedience Without Reservations

By Jacob Harry Bruinooge, Th.D.

AS CHRISTIANS we can whole-heartedly subscribe to the statement that when a man follows a calling which panders to the vices of his fellowmen or is in any way demoralizing to their character, he is engaged in a sinful occupation. According to the teachings of the Bible, a military life or a soldier's profession is not to be branded as sinful. The Biblical examples of the centurion and Cornelius show us very plainly that no Christian needs to be afraid that when he feels called to serve his country as a soldier he thereby ceases to be loyal to his Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ. The temptations of the military calling are indeed great; the work which a soldier is called upon to do is apt to have a hardening influence upon his life; yet by the grace of God a Christian soldier is enabled to contend against an adverse environment and to make it subserve his life's purpose to honor his Creator and Redeemer. We can assert without fear of being contradicted, except perhaps by the militant pacifists of our day, that as in Christ's time so even now the ranks of the army are filled by men who are as sincere in their profession of the Christian religion and as loyal to Christ as the Christian lawyer, doctor, educator, or minister can be.

It is not necessary for any man to have served in the army to realize that the soldier's business is to obey the commands of his superiors. The severity of military discipline has been most pointedly delineated in the following characteristic lines: "Their's not to reason why, Their's but to do and die." Many parents have been known to send their unruly sons and daughters to those institutions of learning in our country whose organization along military lines makes it possible for them to inculcate into their pupils the time-honored virtue of absolute obedience. The results in most cases were very gratifying. It is to the rigors of military discipline with its authority on the one hand and its absolute obedience on the other, that the Roman centurion appeals when he asks Jesus to heal his servant by means of the spoken word. "Speak the word only," he says, "and my servant shall be healed. For I am a man under authority, having soldiers under me: and I say to this man, Go, and he goeth; and to another, Come, and he cometh; and to my servant, Do this, and he doeth it." The entire structure of the Roman empire was held together by means of the omnipotent mandates of the Roman authorities and the absolute obedience of the legions of the Roman army. Evidently Jesus did not see anything wrong in the relationship between the emperor and his subjects, the centurion and the soldiers. He knew that the twin-pillars of authority and submission were absolutely necessary to support the structure of the Roman empire and for that matter of any particular nation. Without these pillars a well-organized national life

would be an unheard of thing. Is Jesus Himself not the King of kings whom we ought to obey in all things?

Absolute Obedience or — Anarchy

Though we may be agreed that the Christian need not have any scruples about serving his country in the army, the further question presents itself whether the Christian, wearing the uniform of his country, is in duty bound to fulfil the mandates of his government without fail at all times? We feel that we must give an affirmative answer to this question. Refusal to obey the government at all times would mean the break-down of all army discipline. Ultimately it would spell anarchy and ruin for any country. Moreover, disobedience on the part of a Christian soldier to the powers that be would in reality be disobedience to God. It has been truly said, "He who serves God in humility will serve his king in fidelity." By disobeying his superiors the Christian soldier would be encouraging the lawlessness that abounds everywhere. Dr. Kaye makes the statement that an educator in the field of social science made the remark a short time ago that if lawlessness continues to prevail in both high and low circles of society, "our government will not last fifty years." Surely, no thoughtful follower of Christ would care to subscribe to the belief which is cherished in some circles that a Christian soldier should obey his government only when he sees fit to do so. The acceptance of such an attitude by our Christian men who are serving their country in the army would render them guilty of the sin of aggravating the lawless conditions that prevail.

If, for the sake of maintaining law and order, it is the duty of the Christian who is a member of the standing army of any country, to obey his government's orders at all times, the same thing may be said of any Christian whose services are demanded by the government in case the powers that be deem it necessary to carry on more extensive military operations than is usually the case. We, Christians of Reformed persuasion, believe that Jesus and His disciples taught as a general principle "that civil governors are to be obeyed, that the powers that be are ordained of God." We know that this Biblical truth is very unpopular today. God is not in the thoughts of men. The teachings of the Bible are regarded as having historical value only. That they are divinely authoritative in character and that they have normative value for all of life are truths which are emphatically denied today. As a result the Scriptural teaching that government is of divine appointment is ridiculed and the popular notion that government rests upon a mere utilitarian basis put into its place. The consequences of the acceptance of such views are fatal to a stable, well-organized

social life. If we are to obey the government only when it suits our convenience or when its mandates are in conformity with our personal notions as to what is useful and right, we undermine the foundations of our social life. The individualistic spirit of our times which disdains and defies all rightful authority is a disintegrating force in our social life to which we, as Christians, may not add the weight of our influence through our rebellious acts. Let us acknowledge that subjection to the magistrates is a civil as well as a religious duty. It is part of our obedience to the Author of all government among men. Of course, we realize that there are times when it becomes our duty to disobey the government. If Caesar should command us to abandon the faith of our fathers, or to blaspheme the name of God, or to live an immoral life, then "disobedience would become a duty and might rise into heroism." Chancellor Hitler, for instance, has attempted on more than one occasion to step out of his province into the sphere of religion to dictate to the Christians of Germany how they are to serve their God. We know that his plan to build up a totalitarian State has suffered a tremendous setback by the refusal of God-fearing men and women to give heed to his dictates. We honor these Christians for the courageous stand they have taken in this matter. But it surely is a recognized principle among us that in the exercise of their rightful authority the magistrates must be obeyed.

As to Taxes and Pacifistic Pledges

Christians also believe that it is their duty to pay the taxes which existing governments levy upon them. "Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's and unto God the things that are God's," Jesus said to the Jews on a certain occasion. Inasmuch as the Jews were subjects of Caesar, Jesus regarded it to be their duty to give him the tribute-money which he demanded of them to meet the expenses of his government and to support the many legions of Roman soldiers which were policing the world at that time. Undoubtedly not all of this money was used for good purposes. We have the assurance that the Jews questioned the right of the Romans to rob them of their independence as a nation and to keep them in subjection to themselves. We may even ask ourselves the question today whether it was right for Caesar to send legion after legion into various parts of the world to subject the nations to himself. We know, however, that Jesus did not enter into a discussion with the Jews about the mutual rights of the conqueror and the conquered. He simply told them that it was incumbent upon them to pay their taxes to the Roman government.

The Christian citizen does not always approve of every item of governmental expenditure. This, however, does not give him the right to refuse to meet his obligations to the government, if he is in a position to do so. We fail to understand why subjects should be held responsible "for the use made of the money which is exacted from them by just authority." It is also a fact that many Christians honestly believe that the majority of wars which have been fought in the past were morally unjustifiable. However, we have never heard of any Christian who refused to pay the taxes which the government levied upon them to pay the costs of such wars. Neither have we ever heard of any Chris-

tians who refused to help their country in times of war to manufacture those products which are necessary to carry on successful military campaigns. When a war breaks out the farmer and the city-dweller alike generally do all within their power to help meet the needs of food, clothing, transportation and even ammunition without which no government could wage war for any length of time. Just now, when Pacifism has become an "Ism," we read of pledges made by thousands of University students throughout the world that they will never support their country again in any war it may conduct; we hear of workers in the various industries who say that they will never again lift a hand in the manufacture of war materials of any kind. We are wondering just how true these well-meaning citizens will be to the pledges they have made in the event of the outbreak of another war. Besides, since no man can live entirely to himself in any society, it is difficult for us to see how anyone can avoid becoming involved in one way or another in any war in which the government may have become entangled. If the Christian is willing to help bear the costs of any and all wars, to put his shoulder to the various tasks which the government assigns to all non-combatants in the event of war, yes, even to share in the prosperity that warfare brings with it for a short time, consistency would seem to demand that he should also consent to serve in the ranks of the army when the government needs him, no matter what his opinion may be about the particular issues at stake.

The Macintosh Case

Dr. Charles S. Gardner of Louisville, Kentucky, made the following statement in a lecture which the writer was privileged to attend: "The State must deal with the un-social and the anti-social. Offenses are committed and the offenders must be punished. Law must rest upon the basis of force. Only thus is social order possible. To discontinue the use of force would be to leave all socially-minded citizens a prey to the selfish impulses of the anti-social; and that would mean a sudden drop into a state of savagery such as has never existed in human history." With this statement we are fully in accord. As long as the State "performs its duty of conserving fundamental human interests" the Christian who is socially-minded will for Christ's sake be loyal to the State. But we are all beginning to realize that there is no unanimity of opinion among Christians as to what these human interests really are. In our own country, for instance, there are many people today who believe that the Federal government should extend its control over the major part of life; others maintain that they are willing to shed their blood in defense of the doctrine of State rights. Some cling tenaciously to the idea that a capitalistic form of society is the ideal one; others seem to think that it is time that society be reorganized along socialistic lines. It seems to us that to refuse to defend the status quo until by orderly processes a change can be brought about in the social fabric is to invite chaos. If we fail to support the government in the exercise of its rightful authority, we, as Christians, stand convicted on the charge of disloyalty to the State which seeks to protect the interests of all. The assertion is quite frequently made that all wars are fought in the interests of the wealthy members of society. The underlying assumption of such a statement seems to

be that the interests of the rich always clash with those of the common people. In a complex society such as ours, this is not always the case.

Some Christians subscribe to the position taken by Dr. Macintosh a few years ago, who stated that he would bear arms for his government, if he were convinced that the war in which his country had become involved was a justifiable one. However, the difficulty of this position becomes apparent when we consider that under present-day conditions it is well-nigh impossible to determine whether a certain war is justifiable or not. In the phraseology of President Wilson the World War was "a war to make the world safe for democracy." In the words of others the World War was a "war to end all wars." These and similar statements served the purpose of rallying thousands of our youth round the Stars and Stripes. In the light of post-war developments, men have almost completely reversed their judgments with respect to the purpose of this terrible war. We firmly believe that in the absence of all facts, which usually are not available to the public, it is almost impossible for the

average citizen to come to a valid conclusion with respect to the lawfulness of any particular war. If we regard any war that is being contemplated as morally unjustifiable it undoubtedly becomes our duty to register our opinion with the proper government authorities and to seek to deter the government from following what we regard to be a sinful and suicidal course. But let us see to it that our conscience is properly illumined lest we set up our personal judgments as statutes of God. We agree with Dr. Pieters "that the right of judgments on such subjects has been committed of God to the government, just as the right of judgment on the case of an accused individual is committed to the court." Let us therefore accept the decisions of the powers that be and obey them in all matters that rightfully fall within their domain. If the authorities err in their judgments the responsibility is theirs, not ours. Let us pray that our Father in heaven, who is a God of peace, may cause wars to cease unto the uttermost ends of the earth. Let us encourage our own government to dwell in peace with all the nations of the world.

II. As the Conscientious Objector Sees It

By Peter G. Berkhout, M.D.

SINCE the position of those who answer this question in the affirmative will be defended by someone else, we do not have to say anything about it. But, in order not to be misunderstood, we must state that we are not defending the position of the peace-at-any-price man. We are proud of being a pacifist, but not a pacifist of the Tolstoy type, who believes in no resistance whatsoever; not even in an economic boycott against an unruly nation. We have an open mind for that point of view but cannot accept it now.

The Traditional View

We are perfectly well aware of the orthodox or traditional Calvinistic point of view on this subject. The traditional Calvinist will tell you that you must obey under all circumstances. However, Calvinists have been willing to change their views. They did so in regard to woman suffrage and free-trade. Perhaps the day will come when they will also change their views concerning the participation of Christians in modern wars. The orthodox Calvinistic view at present is that the only time when we may disobey the government is when it interferes with our religion in the narrower sense. And as far as war is concerned, if we consider it unjustifiable we have a right to protest to the government, but go to war we must. The government is responsible for our actions. We are sufficiently heterodox not to agree with that point of view. I cannot imagine that God will be satisfied with the statement that even though we knew a certain war was murderous, we helped the forces of evil along simply because a corrupt government told us to do so. We prefer to take the other horn of the dilemma in which the Christian may find himself: if we are not absolutely sure that a certain war is justifiable we should have nothing to do with the murderous business.

Christians will refer to Scripture to corroborate their point of view that we must fight whenever the government tells us to do so. But we should be very careful. Even the devil can cite Scripture for his purpose.

There is much in Scripture that has merely historical and pedagogical but not normative value. As far as the Old Testament is concerned we should notice that the *lex talionis*, the law of retaliation, of an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth, prevalent in those days, is incorporated in the laws of Moses. Jesus himself renounced this law. And I am sure that if the writers of the New Testament were living today they would not so readily write that we must be subject to the higher powers in regard to the imperialistic wars of today. We should not forget that we are living in a different age. In the days of the apostles mercenary and not conscript soldiers fought the battles for the government. In our day of universal military service I cannot imagine Jesus or Paul ramming a bayonet through the body of a Christian of one of the nations. The very idea is too sacrilegious to entertain.

Let us then not forget that there is progress in divine revelation, and that God acts pedagogically in Scripture. What was permissible in the Old Testament times and is condoned in the New Testament is not necessarily right today. Nor should we shut our eyes to what God teaches us through His general revelation in the history of mankind and the experiences of the human race.

What is a Justifiable War?

The question will now be asked what wars there are in which we think the Christian should participate. Perhaps you expect me to say that the Christian may and must obey when the government calls him to fight in a defensive war. We do not like that elusive term "war of defense," because it has meant the unnecessary death and maiming of millions of people. In every war the government tells its nationals that they are waging a defensive war. If you mean by a defensive war one that results from actual invasion of one's country, then we might agree.

About the only war in which we believe is what Grotius called the punitive war, which is really a war

against war. Grotius held the view that the greatest crime that a nation can commit is to go to war, and, according to him, the whole world should punish such a criminal nation. He did not believe that in such a war any nation should remain neutral. About a century later a French international jurist, Vattel (1714-1767), in his *Droit des gens*, developed the view that in case of war between two nations or groups of nations the rest of the world should remain neutral. The late Dr. C. Van Vollenhoven points out in his *Three Stages in the Evolution of the Law of Nations* that till 1914 the view of Vattel prevailed, and that this had much to do in bringing about the World-War. But since 1914 the principles of Grotius have been more applied by the nations of the world. Think of the economic and military sanctions of the League of Nations and the Kellogg-Briand peace pact. The main thrust of the Kellogg-Briand pact is that it outlaws war. Up to that time it had been a legal means to settle a dispute between nations, just as the duel used to be a legal means to settle a dispute between individuals. And since our country has signed the Kellogg-Briand pact it is questionable whether it can force its citizens to fight, at least in certain wars.

We might differ from Grotius in this respect that we do not like the idea of a punitive war. To us it seems that an economic boycott would be sufficient to bring a nation to terms in short order. But if not, and the military force is necessary to restrain such a nation, then we consider it the duty of a Christian to obey the government's call to arms.

How Will We Know?

The problem now presents itself how an ordinary citizen can determine whether a war is justifiable or not. It seems to us that if the nations of the world do not abandon the unnecessary and imperialistic wars of their own accord, then it behooves the orthodox Christians to organize into a great international organization headed by a permanent committee of its great international leaders. And if we should be confronted again with a situation as in 1914 such a committee could call upon the members of such an organization to refuse to mobilize or to fight. Notice must be served on the governments of the world what the purpose of such an organization is. In 1914 such a committee and such an organization, perhaps in coöperation with Catholic and other organizations, could have prevented the war. What a boon it would have been to Christianity and to missions.

What we have just described would undoubtedly be the best and proper method. But since we do not have such an organization each one must use his own reason. We purposely omit the term conscience because it is too elusive and changeable a concept. If rightly understood we would not object to it.

In the fall of 1914 Christian De Wet, the Boer general, among others, was called upon by his government to take German South-West Africa into possession. Instead of that he and general C. F. Beyers published a manifesto which concludes with the significant words:

"Your attack on a people that does you no harm, however successful, brings down God's curse upon you.

"We finally appeal to all burghers to exert their utmost strength to prevent the conquest of German South-West Africa and to refuse at the same time to be used by the government to fight us with arms."

The late Dr. C. Van Vollenhoven, famous international jurist, head of the juridical faculty of the renowned University of Leyden, lauds highly the attitude of De Wet and states that his example should have been followed by millions at the outbreak of the last war. De Wet did not act according to traditional Calvinism, and he knew that he was committing so-called high treason against the government. He also knew that England would crush him. He had imposed upon him a fine of \$1,000 and six years imprisonment. But he had the courage of his convictions.

We are not trying to preach rebellion and sedition. We should love our country that has provided us with so many wonderful things. For that reason we should make our personal influence felt now whenever we can so that the government may understand that we orthodox Christians will never participate in an imperialistic war.

THEOLOGY

I went in quest of Truth . . .
Fain would I know — yes, truly know,
Would understand Reality.

I studied Science
And knew much,
But knew not It:
Reality:
The heart of things.
I wooed Philosophy, and revelled
In categories and in Absolutes,
But found not
Truth
Nor . . . peace.

And then one day (or was it night?)
I heard a Voice:
O finite, sin-scarred man,
Thou knowest naught except thou knowest Me;
And, knowing Me, thou hast the key to All.

And then I found
Both Truth and Peace.

APORETIKOS.

IN A LIBRARY

I look about and question book by book,
For there is something I must understand,
And get no answer . . . What he undertook
Is not a thing to pass from hand to hand.

Silence is here, and silent are the dead.
And books are graven stones approached in vain.
I turn away, to ponder what he said;
"Living is nothing death cannot explain!"

FREDERICK TEN HOOR.

Instruction by the Living Voice: A Plea

By Henry Van Zyl, Ph.D.

THE telling method is discredited by many teachers of the young. Mr. Squires in his book, *The Pedagogy of Jesus in the Twilight of Today*, reports how one member of a committee connected with a national organization of religious educators proposed to add a phrase containing the word "instruction," and how another member — the head of one of the largest schools of religious education in America — attacked this proposal because it suggested that "we have something to tell the child" and that "people would conclude that the committee had the old-fashioned notion that 'telling' has a place in education."

In educational literature one finds occasionally a similar dislike for the telling method, and the young teachers are reading the authoritative injunction, "You cannot tell the children experiences; they must experience experiences." As a result we notice that from time to time graduates of teachers' colleges or schools of education when in actual service lay down the dictum, "Don't prepare lessons anymore for children; they must tell you and out of this information you build the program for the day."

No one, of course, will deny the great educational values bound up with the telling by the children, for out of their ideas we learn to know them, and to live and to play with them. The underlying principle of the custom to speak lightly and with pity about "instruction" by the living voice of the teacher is definitely related to the prevailing tendency that the child must find out for himself. The teacher is only a guide.

Why Discredited? — Some Principles

This loss of balance, characterized by a disregard for the telling method and an excessive regard for self-discovery by the child, is in a large measure, it would seem, due to an over-emphasis or abuse of certain principles of education. These principles, undoubtedly excellent in themselves, are given too prominent a place in the totality scheme of directing learning, a practice causing a lack of equilibrium which in every field of human endeavor, but especially in the realm of education, so readily violates more basic principles of the nature of reality, of the child, and of education.

Take, for instance, the unbounded enthusiasm some educators have for the child's embryonic purposes, his creativeness, his innate desires, needs, and interests — all of which native capital must be harnessed by the pupil for the all-absorbing purpose of "finding out for himself," the teacher not telling, or imparting, or explaining, or demonstrating, or communicating, or presenting or adding knowledge, but remaining in the background with the experimenting child occupying the center of the stage. (Monroe and Streitz, *Directing Learning in the Elementary School*, p. 7.)

Or consider the much-abused doctrine of self-activity, a more recent label for a much older doctrine: "Learn to do by doing." In too many schoolrooms this self-activity is identified with outward responses and reactions, and now and then teachers congratulate themselves that their rooms in the building are real "activity" rooms, altogether ignoring the fact that some of the finest and highest forms of education for

character are silent and unnoticeable inward responses and reactions, and forgetting that the good Book says, "And he that ruleth his spirit (is better) than he that taketh a city." Restraint within may be a most ennobling activity for genuine personality growth, fighting temptations and climbing to more glorious heights of a sanctified life. Are there no longer quiet waters that are deep?

A third principle of education, much in vogue at present, is: "Experience only educates." However much truth there is and will remain in these three doctrines, the first question one may rightly ask in each case is, "Is the thing thought through?" With this last doctrine, for instance, does everything not depend on what one means by "experience"? Clearly, if we cannot agree on the meaning of "experience," it is impossible to agree on what the values of life are, and it is equally impossible to agree on goals and on methods of reaching these goals.

Supernatural Truth vs. Human Experience

Let my reader ponder the import of the following quotation composed by Dr. Dewey and Dr. Childs in *The Educational Frontier* (by Kilpatrick and others), a book of rather recent origin.

"We affirm that genuine values and tenable ends and ideals are to be derived from what is found within the movement of experience. Hence we deny the views which assert that philosophy can derive them out of itself by excogitation, or that they can be derived from authority, human or supernatural, or from any transcendent source." (p. 294.)

From it we realize at once that natural theology, built up by Plato from mental abstraction, and that revealed theology of Holy Writ giving us in an authoritative manner the vast realm of spiritual values, are to be rigidly excluded from the child's program of experience getting. Taking "experience" in the narrow, limited, and exclusive sense, the slogan, "Experience only educates," becomes unmistakably humanistic, because values are derived from the stream of human experience; it exalts scientific method because the orbit of experiences is experimental in sweep from beginning to end; it subordinates thought to action, and not intending to go beyond experience in this narrow sense it ushers into the schoolrooms of the land an instrumentalism and experimentalism that raises "no questions concerning the transcendent; that is, concerning the general meaning and issues of existence, the nature of reality, the explanation of the cosmos, or the place of man in the universe, and makes no suggestion whatever that education may in any way be concerned with any of these things." (Horne, *The Democratic Philosophy of Education*, p. 3.) Are we then going to exclude all supersensuous experience?

Dr. Horne in the book just quoted quite pertinently signalled the dangers involved in the unfortunate one-sided use of these three principles of education by saying,

"It is time to point out that children are not merely little animals, and that while they can learn as animals learn, animals can not learn as children learn. . . . The reason for this difference lies in the superior brain capacity of the child, especially in his imaginative and conceptualizing ability. . . . It is this transcendent

reach of the human intelligence to which no behavioristic law of learning can do justice. . . . Every exclusive 'experience' or 'activity' curriculum today misses this point. . . . Only low grade intelligences require only an activity basis of learning." (*Ibid.*, pp. 18, 19.)

This narrow concept of "experience" of Dewey and Childs "lacks the view that man's science is a re-thinking of Divine thoughts and that man's power over nature is a form of coöperation between the Giver and the user." (*Ibid.*, p. 307.)

Activity Extolled Above Thought

Other principles of education such as "the schoolroom should be dynamic, not static," and "we want expression, not inhibition," are, like the three principles discussed so far, misapplied because born of a similar confusion and misunderstanding. The basic question in re dynamic and static is not whether in a schoolroom we want the one and discard the other, but rather which sort of dynamics are desirable and which category of static aspects we need for a balanced view of life. If all things are forever in a flux we should banish the static. If, however, some things are immutably fixed while others are in a process of change we want both. Meanwhile, it is clear that one who holds to the narrow view of "experience getting," who is always and only amid stream of human experience, who is a proponent of the experimental, who refuses to reach beyond experience, and who defends the doctrines of self-activity and of "experience only educates" in the naturalistic sense, must be an advocate of the dynamic theory and refuse to consider anything on sea or land static. The first three principles so understood must readily lead one to the fourth doctrine, that real and genuine education can be found only in a dynamic schoolroom.

That school teachers with the one-sided emphasis on these four doctrines rather uncritically accept a fifth principle, viz., that we want expression and not inhibition, should surprise no one, once the insistence on activity, experience, and dynamic rules supreme, and the whole field of rearing the child is given over to experimentation.

This dislike for instruction, systematic or otherwise, results inevitably in new practices in education that are similarly characterized by one-sidedness as the five principles mentioned above are. The tree bears fruit after its kind. And at present we hear of and see the multifarious new approaches in teaching, specifically such as building your program of activities around pupils' desires, extensive use of laboratory methods in chemistry and other physical sciences, projects, activity units, dramatization, cut-work, mounting of pictures, illustrations, movies, slides, less informational teaching, much experimentation, a child-centered school, student self-government, a disregard for ear-knowledge, too much respect for a certain brand of scientific method identified with test tube, microscope, telescope, statistical formulations, and tests (both mental and achievement), and in general a groping about in schools for methods in many cases quite truthfully labeled as fads and frills.

Throughout one notices in all these new techniques an overwhelming emphasis on the doing, the experiment, the physical, and to sum it up in one conclusion: an all-absorbing struggle to appeal more and more exclusively to the eye, as though eye-knowledge all along the line is superior to ear-knowledge. Instruction by

the living voice of the teacher is roundly condemned by one author as a violation of the principle of self-activity.

Why this Emphasis? — Pragmatistic Philosophy

An analysis of why, on the one hand, instruction by the living voice is so much curtailed, and why, on the other hand, so much is made of education by experience, activity, and experiment, will soon reveal two kinds of reasons: surface reasons, due to a wrong concept of educational method in the past; and deeper reasons, bound up with a philosophy of life so strongly entrenched in our social structure of the present.

No doubt the telling method was used too exclusively in the past with its high regard for the world of ideas and its disregard openly expressed or tacitly implied for the world of material things. A reaction has brought about a discrediting of the telling method and an over-emphasis on the procedure of experimenting with things. Again, too much reliance on the winged words of Bacon, "Knowledge is power," readily led teachers into a more mechanical use of the telling or lecture method, with too great confidence that once the facts were poured into the mental hopper, some mysterious mental process of discipline would apply and integrate and sanctify the thoughts so presented. But, meanwhile, experimental approaches registered another argument in their favor. And, thirdly, in the past the prevailing stress on subject matter made teachers less critical of the great importance of the relationships of the thought presented by the living voice of the teacher and the mind and its functions of the learner, with the result that little attention was paid to the problem of how to provide definite learning exercises for economy and for effective habits of study. Method was treated as of little consequence or totally ignored. This separation of subject-matter and method could not possibly help the mind of the pupil, and when more direct, visible, physical, and material approaches to probe the world of cosmic reality and the material universe made their first appearance, enthusiasm for them grew by leaps and bounds, and education by ear and particularly the telling method fell into disrepute.

And yet there were also reasons for discrediting instruction *viva voce* deeper than bad or poor technique in the use of the telling method. A new attitude in the student's approach in finding the nature of reality, in discovering truth, and in determining the relation of the one and the many had come upon the scene. The realism of Plato, the idealism of Hegel, and the faith of the orthodox Christian were all alike painstakingly avoided. The gospel of experimentalism, of instrumentalism, of experience, and of trial and error method was slowly but surely occupying the chief place in the age old struggle for a world and life view. Pragmatism, the daughter of "Positivism" and "Agnosticism," was born. A new philosophy has come. "Action" is prior to thought. Hence, "experience" is enthroned, and "the movement of experience" is the laboratory "whence cometh our help." The individual decides all questions for himself on the basis of his experience.

And this new philosophy not only has a new basis of attack and a new approach to truth; it also comes forth with new conclusions and standards. A thing is no longer hurtful because it is wrong; we do not steal

because it is forbidden; a deed is no longer beneficial because it is good; and the righteous shall swear no longer to his own hurt for righteousness' sake. All this is changed about. A thing from now on, so the new philosophy proclaims, is wrong when your experience says it is hurtful; we do not consider stealing wrong unless our experience — the new alpha and omega — has come to the same conclusion; a deed is good because it is beneficial; and we swear only when it is beneficial for our own sake. The ultimate criteria are experience and experiment. And many future American citizens are made to believe in high schools and even in junior high schools that they as pupils who, mere children as they are, should listen to the wisdom, authority, and mature views of their teachers, are now sufficiently harnessed by themselves for the task of doing "research work." Find out for yourselves! Instruction by the living voice of a well-informed teacher is belittled, or discredited, or entirely ostracized.

Needless to say that this new philosophy of pragmatism leads unavoidably to a new scale of values derived not from excogitation of the mind, nor from a supernatural source, but purely from your own experiences of an out and out naturalistic type; a new ethics, and a new psychology of stimulus and response, of annoyers and satisfiers, of pleasure and pain, and of conditioned, unconditioned, and re-conditioned reflexes; which new and undefiled psychology must *nolens volens* be admitted to the modern schoolroom where, once you worship the new ideals of "activity" and "experience," a pragmatic pedagogy reigns supreme. No wonder that the telling method and instruction by the living voice of the teacher in such rooms of learning are held in light esteem. And if gold rusts, what shall iron do? Does it surprise you any longer that one member of that committee mentioned at the very beginning of this discussion took the firm stand that telling has no place in education, and that much teaching in the present age assumes that eye-knowledge is far superior?

Eye-Gate and Ear-Gate Compared

On the basis of the assumption that values of life are also, and even primarily, to be derived from a supernatural source and from contemplation and abstraction through thinking, I shall proceed to advance some reasons why instruction by the teacher has still a rightful place, and should even have a prominent place, in any schoolroom. Believing that the standards of truth, goodness, and beauty are once for all static and set for us; that truth has a valid existence apart from our discovery of it; that truth in its very nature is fixed and eternal, because it existed long before our experiences, activities, and expressional abilities came into being; and that the Bible, as understood by orthodox Christianity, and not pragmatism determines the eternal verities, the unchangeable realities, and the abiding values regardless of mere man; I shall attempt to set forth why teachers of the young should once again restore instruction *viva voce* to its position of honor. A consistent Bible Christian, who loves historic Christianity as of Reformation days, can not do otherwise; nor for that matter can an honest follower of Plato or of Hegel, without violating the philosophy of either, discredit this old-fashioned method and assign it to the scrap-pile.

It is true that the eye is superior to the ear in physical and technical matters. "It deals with the greatest number of objects, gives us the most varied information respecting them, and thus furnishes the mind with the greatest number of its ideas concerning the material universe." (Kay, *Memory,—What It Is and How to Improve It*, p. 185.) But the ear is far superior to the eye in what is beyond the material universe, in all social, moral, and spiritual affairs, in the realm labeled by the Apostle Paul "things not seen," in the vast region of the intangibles of life, and in all aspects of life dealing with ultimate reality and the more worthwhile aspects of our existence. This difference would somewhat explain that the ear is the nearest gateway to the soul. Is this the reason that truth revealed by an authoritative Creator cannot be accepted by sense-bound man, unless it be done by faith which "cometh by hearing"?

"The great superiority of the ear to the eye, from the psycho-genetic point of view, is but slightly prominent upon superficial observation of the child that does not yet speak; but we need only compare a child born blind with one born deaf, after both have enjoyed the most careful training and the best instruction to be convinced that, after the first year, the excitements of the auditory nerve contribute far more to the psychical development than do those of the optic nerve." (Preyer, *The Senses and the Will*, pp. 182-183.)

According to Kay, concentration and attention are stronger and more sustained in hearing so that the mind is more impressed by hearing than by seeing. "The ear is the organ by which man listens to the voice of his fellow-man, and the wail of anguish, the cry of pity, the word of exhortation, find an entrance here to his inmost soul, moving him, it may be, to deeds of the greatest self-denial or of the utmost heroism." (*Op. cit.*, p. 181.)

The Living Voice and Spiritual Things

It is this superior power of the living voice that explains why we would infinitely prefer hearing the chorus and soloists rendering *The Messiah* to merely reading it. It is this superior power exciting and satisfying within us the higher emotions and the longings for things unseen. It is this superior power that explains why people still throng the courts of Jehovah to hear the Gospel preached and to listen to the voice of Him "who spake and it was done, and who commanded and it stood fast." It is this superior power that draws believers together for worship and prayer and praise. And because the ear is the nearest gateway to the soul people will never cease saying at the proper occasion,

"Sing them over again to me
Wonderful words of life,"

or

"Tell me the old, old story
Of Jesus and His love."

And children will always listen to the "Once upon a time . . ."

This brings us to a second reason why telling is a highly unique and desirable form of communication. There are ever so many values both spiritual and moral which can not be seen whole without God's special revelation. And it is here in the transmission of the wonders of old from father to son that the human voices looms large. Hence homes in which the family altar is still held sacred, where an evening is still spent

in conversation instead of card playing on a mere repetition level, and where the spoken word of the parents is still law in a wholesome sense for the guidance of the children are still among the strongest bulwarks of this civilization. There, information given by the living voice is not in disrepute; catechism preaching is not criticized; catechism teaching is heartily appreciated; and pragmatism is avoided, for the simple reason that there is a transcendent world with a non-spatial and a non-temporal order, concerning the contents of which a child is to be told by the authoritative voice of father, or mother, or teacher — all of whom are more informed, more capable, and hence more reliable in character training than mere pragmatic pedagogy.

Again, it may truthfully be argued that the very nature of the normal child is eager for information, (Squires, *The Pedagogy of Jesus in the Twilight of Today*, p. 271) that a well-told story gives him the most real and vivid experiences due to the wonderful gift of God to man, viz., his imagination, now mightily stirred up by the living voice.

And, finally, to mention but one more argument in favor of this more preferable mode of instruction, is it not true that personality by means of the voice has a much stronger influence on pupils than the self-discovery plan of experience getting?

Dr. Weimer makes the pertinent observation somewhere in his book, *The Way to the Heart of the Pupil*, that "Man produces every effect upon his fellow-men that he does produce, through his personality." And Dr. Horne in *The Democratic Philosophy of Education*, a book in which he comments on the philosophy of pragmatism so ably outlined and defended by Dr. Dewey, has come to a final summary,

evaluation, and rebuke when he writes, "The failure to appreciate the significance of personality is one of the striking features of this philosophy" (p. 531).

No one, I think, would doubt that personality was in the past, is now, and forever ought to be a mighty molding force of character. And personality reveals itself best normally through the living voice.

A Word of Caution

The plea presented here in no wise wants to belittle the principles of education discussed earlier. It finds no fault with "activity" or "experience" as such. It means to be a warning against a certain one-sidedness born of a dangerous philosophy and resulting in a new psychology, a new moral science, and a new pedagogy. It longs to restore instruction by the living voice to its place of honor. It wants to encourage those teachers who, instinctively or otherwise, still are old-fashioned enough in the wholesome sense to tell their wards about the visible and invisible, the tangible and intangible, and the absolute and relative. That this telling method is no easy task is quite evident in a world where especially the children of today, both on the adult and the child level, are in very large numbers all from Missouri — they want to be shown.

And while assigning on the basis of a better philosophy and the revealed will of God "a less presumptuous place to eye knowledge," (Van der Kooy, *The Distinctive Features of the Christian School*, p. 57) let us not forget one of the injunctions — and we still believe in them — given long ago:

"Give heed how you hear."

But that's another story.

BOOKS, PRINCIPLES, and IDEAS

EVOLUTION ATHEISTIC

EVOLUTION OR CREATION? by Ambrose Fleming, Kt., M.A., D.Sc., F.R.S., Marshall, Morgan and Scott, London, \$1.35.

THE distinguished author of this book is an emeritus professor of electrical engineering in the University of London, president of the Victoria Institute, and Philosophical Society of Great Britain, and president of the Television Society. Unquestionably he is qualified to weigh factual evidence and the validity of conclusions drawn from it. Moreover, he realizes the significance of his problem. In the evolution theory there is no room for Christianity. Both cannot be true.

By evolution the author does not mean every progressive change in the universe, but the belief that there is an *automatic cause or agency* of improvement independent of the purposive thought of a Mind or of the Will of an Intelligent Being. The evolution theory has grown out of the desire to eliminate Individuality and Will from the idea of final cause. It is atheistic.

The author's philosophy is *theistic* idealism. The various forms of matter are essentially divine thoughts which are revealed to us as objects, but matter has no existence apart from mind. All phenomena of nature are transformations of energy. They manifest an ever active Supreme Will. Creation is a revelation of the Infinite Mind and Supreme Will to subordinate minds. It is the opposite of evolution.

Next, the author explains and criticizes the theory of organic evolution proposed by Darwin. The general thesis that the difficulties of Darwinism are increasing is supported by quotations from eminent biologists.

With reference to inorganic evolution the author exposes the

physical impossibility of the nebular hypothesis. Kelvin's law of the dissipation of energy and the disintegration of radioactive atoms are contrary to the theory of evolution. Moreover, the mathematical relations evident in the laws of the inorganic clearly indicate the operations of a Mind.

Evolution cannot satisfactorily explain the origin of life, mind, and man. For the origin of life evolutionists depend upon a faith in spontaneous generation, a pure speculation contradicted by every scientific observation. They make the absurd assumption that mind and purposiveness somehow emerged from dead matter. To bridge the gap between distinctively human qualities and those of the animal evolutionists can present only a few, doubtfully interpreted fossil bones. Relying on their own interpretations of these bones they make bold speculative leaps in order to reach the altruistic, ethical, and spiritual powers of man. Yet evolution implies universal continuity.

Religion is not a product of evolution. Religious beliefs did not arise from dreams and animism. Monotheism was primary and polytheism was a later corruption of it. Natural Selection does not truthfully explain the moral imperative as a development of the herd instinct. The evidences of design, adaptation, and beauty in nature declare a personal Creator. The Bible with its universal appeal, its organic unity, its authority, and its veracity and mercy, is not an evolutionary product. Its historical events have been proven by archaeological researches and many of its prophecies have been fulfilled. Its origin is Divine.

In spite of its Arminian taint and of a few erroneous statements, this book is invaluable for anyone who has lost the true sense of direction in the mazes of the evolution theory.

J. P. VAN HAITSMAN.

RECENT GOSPEL RESEARCH

FORM CRITICISM: A NEW METHOD OF NEW TESTAMENT RESEARCH. Including: *The Study of the Synoptic Gospels*, by Rudolf Bultmann; and, *Primitive Christianity in the Light of Gospel Research*, by Karl Kundsinn. Translated by Frederick C. Grant, 161 pp., Willett, Clark & Co., Chicago, 1934.

THERE are at the present time two related lines along which research in the field of the New Testament is being pursued. The one may be called the religious-historical line. It represents an attempt to show that the Christian Evangel passed from a Palestinian Jewish particularism to a Hellenistic universalism. Contributions from various contemporary religious thought and practices, with which Christianity made contact, are traced with a thoroughness that is almost convincing. Insufficient allowance seems to be made for the fact that the very genius of Christianity is universal. Christ saw that clearly and revealed it unto his disciples as they were able to bear it.

The second line is literary-historical: it is called *Formgeschichte* (Form Criticism) and is ably and briefly illustrated in the volume before us.

Form Criticism, anticipated by J. Weiss and Wellhausen and practiced diligently since the World War, is a method of attempting to secure the words and the teachings of Jesus unamplified and unedited by any early Christian teacher. It is declared that fancy has elaborated the material as it came from Jesus; that the evangelists have changed the discourses from direct to indirect, and vice versa; and that the materials were subjected to considerable manipulation in the interest of schematization. None of these assertions need to be denied by the most conservative scholar in the interest of the divine authority of the Scriptures as it is before us. There is incontrovertible evidence of redactional modifications in our records of the Gospel. This was done under the guidance of the Spirit and rendered the records more serviceable for the purpose for which they were written.

The success at which a scholar will arrive at the original words and thought of Jesus will depend upon the reliability of the methods which he adopts and the fairness with which he employs them. The methods of the *Formgeschichte* are held to be determined by folk psychology. The early Christians modified their religious treasures, as all people do, to serve their own religious ends, namely, to glorify their accepted Messiah; to create liturgical forms; to strengthen themselves over against heresies; to fit a changed viewpoint due to historical development. In short, the final motive for such modifications is "cultic." And it is with amazing cleverness that such modifications are traced, after the Form Criticism fashion, in the various Gospel records of the same event or teaching.

The conclusions of this form of criticism are by no means unanimous, as might well be expected. To be sure, it has undone some of the things that past critics have done. The eschatological view of Christ and his teachings with its "interim ethic," so fervently and effectively sponsored by A. Schweitzer, is admittedly no longer tenable. The ethical approach of Wellhausen and his satellites has suffered the same fate. *Formgeschichte* has established the fact that both the ethical and the eschatological teachings ascribed to Jesus by the Evangelist are *de facto* his.

Modern New Testament scholarship has been particularly busy with the question of the origin and development of the idea of the Messiah as applied to Jesus and with the question of Christ's own consciousness on this matter. The Form Criticism has come no nearer to a solution to this problem. Bultmann himself tends to doubt whether Jesus ever claimed the Messiahship for himself. On this particular point "The Self-Disclosure of Jesus" by Dr. Vos has not yet found its peer.

The results of *Formgeschichte* as a whole will have to be approached hesitantly. It seems to me that we must assume that the evangelists were conscious of reflecting accurately the spirit and the teachings of Jesus or they deliberately modified the tra-

dition as it came to them, directly or indirectly, to suit their own purposes. The ethical character of these men and the character of the productions of their pen would seem to justify the rejection of the latter alternative. If the former position be adopted, we will have to select between the evangelists' reports of and reflections upon the teachings and life of Jesus and the reflections of the *Formgeschichte* upon the records of these men which they themselves question.

Furthermore, the *Formgeschichte* has, outside of the Gospel records themselves, no objective standard with which to judge the Jesus back of the New Testament writings. Subjectivism must and does play an important rôle in its investigations. Its idea of the method of development from the original words of Jesus to the record as we have it is imposed upon the half century following the death of Christ. It is, therefore, not surprising at all that a man like Bultmann without any ado dismisses any Gospel statement that conflicts with his idea of Jesus, as he does in his *Jesus and His Word*.

Although the implication, that we have not an accurate and objective picture of Christ's teachings in the Gospel records, is repugnant to those who hold fast to the doctrine of Scriptural inspiration, yet I am happy that this critical school is functioning, if critical schools there must be. It has done much to tone down the extravagances of the critics of former years and to discredit their work, and it itself tends toward a scepticism that leaves the impression that "for all we have done, we have received nothing." The Bible simply slips away from those who refuse to accept it as it offers itself.

H. S.

ERASMUS AS INCLUSIVE RELIGIOUS LIBERAL

ERASMUS OF ROTTERDAM, by Stefan Zweig. *The Viking Press, New York, 1934.*

EVER since Froude made Erasmus a hero of the Reformation the reputation of the great Dutch scholar has improved, and many a book in Holland and America has been written to sing his praises. Some one tried somewhat to put the damper on this glorification of a man who was rather brilliant than great, but Erasmus, the father of Biblical Humanism, is too much in vogue at present to make any one believe that he was not in the possession of a big heart.

The latest effort to picture him as a grand leader is that of the prolific German author Stefan Zweig. Erasmus is now made to stand for a unified church, for a universal culture, and for a cosmopolitan mentality. His giant adversary, Luther, is playing the opposite rôle. He is made to represent the national spirit in religion, civilization, and politics. Erasmus is the progressive leader. Luther is the general of the reactionary forces. Erasmus was fighting for something worth-while. Luther was defending primitivism.

In other words, this work tries to be a justification of the modern spirit of pacifism, internationalism, universalism, and idealism, and wants to label all opponents of these fads as militant, localistic, emotional, and realistic. It is one of the most clever attempts to propagate progressive views without making the critical reader feel uncomfortable.

Yet, it should not be understood that this work is not scientific or artistic. It is one of the best interpretative histories of Erasmus, for this humanistic scholar is indeed the forerunner of our present pious liberalism. If you like the emphasis on toleration and half-hearted Christianity, you will admire Erasmus. Neither does the author idolize his hero. Erasmus remains human, and is even reproached for not wanting the masses to be enlightened. In this respect Erasmus was a true follower of the Italian Renaissance, which wanted culture only for the *élite*. Nor is Luther depicted as a sheer reactionary. Luther was fully in line with the new nationalism of his day, but Erasmus was the man of wide horizons. Luther was in his place in the sixteenth century, but Erasmus is the man of the future. Luther's work had only value for the past. Erasmus' labors were for all times. A scholarly and artistic work, but with a subtle bias for the religion and philosophy of the hour.

H. J. V. A.

A PASTOR ON "NERVOUS BREAKDOWN"

PSYCHOLOGY AND LIFE. By Leslie D. Weatherhead. Abingdon Press, New York, 1935. 19+280 pp.

Psychology and Life — an intriguing title, certainly. To be sure, new it is not. A generation ago Muensterberg published a book under identically the same title. That, of course, is saying nothing against the book under review. Each generation, I take it, will want to write its own "psychology and life." And that in spite of the formidable opposition of none other than Titchener of Cornell, who his life long was opposed to every attempt to bring psychology down to earth. Indeed, I would think that in his latter days a book on "psychology and life" might have perilously raised this cocky John Bull's blood-pressure. Titchener insisted that psychology must be cultivated as a pure science, a purely academic discipline. He fought every attempt to apply psychology to the problems of daily living. Either he did not or would not realize that no science can be pursued in a vacuum. That never has worked. Long before astronomy was astronomy men utilized it, vainly it is true, to predict a man's future, and, more successfully to sail the seven seas. Slim though our knowledge of psychology may be, you can not keep men from applying, often misapplying, it.

If anybody, then, certainly, Muensterberg in his generation was competent to write on psychology and life. What about the author of this later book? My impression is that he is modest enough to deny equal competence with Muensterberg on the score of psychology. However, in a foreword Sir Henry Brackenbury, a distinguished English physician, informs us that "its author's wide reading, accurate learning, and experienced judgment are evident on every page." In a second foreword McDougall's successor at Oxford, Dr. Wm. Brown, asserts that Mr. Weatherhead "is a sound psychologist, with a wide experience of the practical application of the science." He has also seen something of life. He saw service during the late war, has had teaching experience, is today minister of the largest Wesleyan church in Leeds, and, judging by his picture, is in the prime of life.

Mr. Weatherhead has something more than a smattering of Freudian terms. Neither is the book a mere compilation, but very plainly is the product of his experience. It is an honest book. As the Dutch (I can not join any movement to eliminate the convenient term "Dutch") would say, the flag covers the cargo. While the ship sails under no false colors, it is the reviewer's opinion that the cargo hardly fulfills the expectation aroused by the flag. The life with which the book deals is largely the life of the mentally disturbed, and the psychology is the psychology of abnormal people. The best evidence for this is the table of contents. After an opening chapter or two on the nature of psychology and its relation to healing, there are chapters on the unconscious, repression and self-control, the inferiority complex, the mind of a child, depression and irritability, and a chapter on fear, anxiety, phobia, and worry.

It is obvious, therefore, that the life with which Weatherhead's book deals is narrowly conceived. Indeed, he is quite frank about this, admitting in the preface that he has just two objects in view, namely, "to save people from so-called nervous breakdown," and, "to show those who are at sixes and sevens within themselves . . . that there is a path through the wilderness."

A reading of the book accounts for the author's popularity as a preacher. He has talent. There are any number of quotable sentences. His illustrations are fine, unhackneyed, coming out of his own life. The book holds the attention from start to finish. The writer manifestly has wide human sympathies and is possessed by a fine idealism. He gives in this book quite the most acceptable exposition of what are essentially Freudian principles that I happen to recall. His account of the difference between repression and suppression is excellent, and he emphatically denounces, as one might expect of a preacher, the monstrous doctrine that we must "never repress." There is, too,

an illuminating discussion of the significance for healing of consciousness of the forgiveness of sins.

All in all, though I differ with the author emphatically on various matters, I can recommend this book to discriminating readers not as an introduction to psychology and life, but as an introduction to the modern psychology of abnormal people.

J. BROENE.

SHALL CHRISTIAN MISSIONS CONTINUE CHRISTIAN?

CHRISTIAN MISSIONS AND A NEW WORLD CULTURE. By Archibald G. Baker. Chicago, 1934, Willett, Clark & Co.

THE FINALITY OF JESUS CHRIST. By Robert E. Speer. New York, 1933, Revell.

THINKING MISSIONS WITH CHRIST. By Samuel Zwemer. Grand Rapids, 1934, Zondervan. Paper, \$1; Cloth, \$1.50.

MODERNISM AND THE BOARD OF FOREIGN MISSIONS OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN THE U. S. A. By J. Gresham Machen. No Price. Distributed by the Author.

THE publication of *Re-Thinking Missions* in 1932 has called forth a number of books discussing the real basis and motive of mission endeavor. Of the four titles here given, the first takes the out-and-out humanistic, anti-supernatural view of missions. Baker is Associate Professor of Missions in the University of Chicago. The real value of this book is found in the fact that it shows just exactly whither the more mildly modernistic view of missions actually leads. Baker is impatient with the inconsistency of many modernistic writers, and when he criticizes them on this score he is right. The issue in missions today is the clash between the naturalistic and the supernaturalistic, the biblical, view of Jesus. Baker has chosen unequivocally for the former. Human culture with a human Jesus as a mere center of reference is all he has to bring to the nations of the world. How Paul would turn in his grave if he knew that this book was written by a professor of "Christian" Missions! Dr. Speer's book takes just the opposite view. To him the divine Christ, the God-given Savior of mankind, is central and final. This is a book for every missionary, pastor, and student of missions to read. It contains a wealth of material of value for the biblical and supernatural conception of Christian missions. The work consists of scholarly lectures (the book has 386 pages) delivered at Princeton Seminary and Southern Baptist Seminary. But it is not a book for scholars only. Every intelligent Christian will be benefitted by its study. It is a powerful counter argument to the thrust of *Re-Thinking Missions* and of Baker's humanistic book. One could wish that at times the author might have been a little more critical, but as far as the real thrust and defense of the book is concerned, it is "wholly on the side of the angels." Zwemer's 140-page book is in the same strain, but more popular. This little book is a fine plea for keeping the divine Christ and his atonement at the heart and center of the missionary enterprise. Even the humblest Christian can be well-informed on the fundamental thing that matters in missions today if he will read this book. And it will strengthen his faith. Dr. Machen's 110-page booklet is a significant indictment of the Board of Foreign Missions of his own denomination on the score of its conniving attitude toward unmistakably modernistic influences and practices. The argument is dignified and well-documented. The Pearl Buck case and the organization of the Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions have opened the eyes of many to a menace that should have been signalized long before. One may think of the now well-known "trial" of Dr. Machen what he will, but there can be no doubt that this exposé, now more than two years old, was sorely needed. It is not only sad, it is passing strange that men like Dr. Speer can write such splendid books on the finality of Christ and then in the actual missionary policies and practices play directly into the hands of the half-way and all-the-way modernists. Dr. Machen has done not only his own church a great service by writing this pamphlet.

C. B.

AMERICA'S OUTSTANDING LITERARY WRITERS

AMERICAN LITERATURE, AN INTRODUCTION, by Carl Van Doren. 92 pp. U. S. Library Association, Los Angeles, California. 1933.

MANY of us Americans are less familiar with the field of American literature than with that of English literature. The reason may be a very common one. We usually look for whatever looms on the horizon and forget the treasures on which we carelessly walk. But it may also be true that the things which lie farthest away after all lie closest to us. The ingenious spirit of English literature is the greater power that draws. Even an hundred percent American must feel that in the scant years of our country's existence neither a Milton nor a Shakespeare nor a Shelley has risen to pull down the stars and reveal uncommon mysteries to common man.

It is, however, absurd to close our eyes to the greatness of American literature. Carl Van Doren has helped in no small way to keep our vision clear. He himself has looked toward England and seen giants moving about there. His admiration is embodied in his admirable work on Swift. But Van Doren has also seen giants moving on our own soil. His book on the American novel is a scholarly presentation of the men and women who in fiction have caught the spirit of a young country.

In his little work, *American Literature, An Introduction*, Van Doren gives a brief but careful review of the outstanding American writers. He does not tell us all he knows, as certain words on the bright orange jacket seem to imply. But in what he does tell us there is a strong hint that he knows all of American literature from the time of the explorers, the first wide-eyed chroniclers, and the time of Jonathan Edwards, another wide-eyed chronicler of more countries than one, to the time of Cabell and Lewis and Edwin Arlington Robinson.

Van Doren is intimate with the writers he treats. From the warp of their lives and the woof of their writings he weaves a beautiful, small tapestry of American literature for those who would be introduced to the writings that have sprung from their native soil.

The author intends his work to be only an introduction. At the end he gives a bibliography of original works that should be read. There is more than a gesture in this. There is the emphatic assertion that books of criticism and discussion are always of less importance than the pristine sources on which these are based.

B. KRUTHOF.

THE OLD BRAND WITH A NEW WRAPPER

REALISTIC THEOLOGY. By Walter Marshall Horton. New York, 1934, Harper.

THIS purports to be a plea for a new theology, or, at least, a new departure in theology. The author, himself a liberal, appears to be very critical of the current liberal theology. In fact, the opening chapter is headed: The Decline of Liberalism and the Rise of Realism. This title raises great expectations, but it is not long before the reader is disillusioned. It is true that the author has undergone the influence of Barth. It is also of some value to note that at various points in his presentation of the doctrines of the liberal system of theology he introduces a more "realistic" note. The protest — though muffled at times — against the superficial optimism of the liberal theology is to be appreciated. But when the whole story is told, it turns out that Horton champions essentially the very liberalism he purports to flay. The hand extended in the opening pages may be Esau's, but the voice throughout the volume is Jacob's. It is not surprising that some of his liberal *confrères* have taken him mildly to task for this. However, we can appreciate this book for a number of admissions it makes, some explicitly and others by implication. Horton is right: we need a theology that has turned its back upon the current liberalism. And again he is right when he pleads for a "realistic" approach to theology. It is only regrettable that the book under discussion fails to offer either in any real deep sense of the word.

C. B.

Books in Brief

A CHRISTIAN MANIFESTO. By Edwin Lewis. New York, 1934, Abingdon Press.

This is a refreshing book. Whoever may feel inclined toward modernism ought to read it, and many more. Professor Lewis, who teaches Systematic Theology and the Philosophy of Religion at Drew Seminary, has written and taught along the current liberal lines of thought for some years. Then he underwent a change and wrote this book. Sneeringly, some of his liberal friends have said that he had "gone Fundamentalist," or become a "Barthian." The book is an intelligent and well-reasoned plea for that supernatural, biblical conception of Christianity which alone deserves the name. Like the reviewer, our readers may find some things in this book with which they cannot agree, but these can be overlooked in the appreciation of the real thrust and sweep of the book. This book must be read by every intelligent Christian who wants to know the issue *par excellence* before the church today. It is a fundamental apologetic for the Christian faith with all the trappings of a scientific work left out.

C. B.

THE THEOCENTRIC THEOLOGY IMPLICIT IN THE NAME OF THE TRINITY. By William Childs Robinson, Th.D., D.D.. (May be had from the author.)

An enthusiastic Reformed theologian here champions the theocentric nature of theology, offering in this 30-page booklet a discussion of various aspects of the system of Christian truth around theocentricity as the organizing principle. The pamphlet is a reprint of an article which appeared in *The Evangelical Quarterly* of July, 1934, and is issued as a number of the Bulletin of Columbia Theological Seminary (Decatur, Ga.), the institution in which Dr. Robinson holds the chair of Ecclesiastical Theology. The author presents his argument with copious references to current theological literature. The brochure is eminently worth reading and study.

C. B.

THE CERTAINTIES OF THE GOSPEL. By William Childs Robinson, A.M., Th.D., D.D. Grand Rapids, 1935, Zondervan, \$1.00.

Robinson's pamphlet (see above) is only for those familiar with theological terminology, but this book of his is for everyone interested in devotional reading. The chapters of this book were delivered as lectures to a young people's conference down in Mississippi. They should be widely read. Here is a fine combination of edifying devotional literature with a real and soundly Reformed doctrinal basis and background.

C. B.

DEEP SNOW. AN INDIAN STORY. By C. Kuipers. Grand Rapids, 1934, Zondervan. Paper, 75c; Cloth, \$1.00.

CHANT OF THE NIGHT. AN INDIAN MISSION STORY. By C. Kuipers. Grand Rapids, 1934, Zondervan. Paper, \$1; Cloth, \$1.25.

Two stories of life in Zuni Village of the Indian Southwest country. Very much worth reading, especially for those who are interested in the mission work carried on among these pueblo Indians. They bring the Zuni tribe and their oft-discouraged missionaries closer to the heart of Christian people. These stories should be placed in every church library. The author, at present a student at the University of New Mexico in Albuquerque, knows his Zunis and loves their souls.

C. B.

FACTS AND MYSTERIES OF THE CHRISTIAN FAITH. By Albertus Pieters, D.D. Grand Rapids, Eerdmans. Second Edition. Paper, 75c; Cloth, \$1.25.

This book of Dr. Pieters is deserving of wide circulation. The main positions of the Christian faith are stated here in a rare combination of the doctrinal, the apologetic, and the devotional angles. This book, written in popular style, will strengthen the Christian's faith and ground it more intelligently.

C. B.

To the Public: An Announcement

THIS first number of THE CALVIN FORUM is in the nature of a sample issue, which we are giving wide distribution. Though the magazine is to be a monthly, the second issue will not appear for a month or two. In the next sixty days we are putting on an intensive subscription campaign.

All writing for THE CALVIN FORUM is done without remuneration. Those sponsoring this publication have enough idealism for the cause to give of their time and energy gratuitously. It will be up to our reading public to enable us to meet the bills of the printer and of Uncle Sam.

The subscription price is Two Dollars (\$2.00) per year. The magazine offers twelve issues.

We are planning articles in forthcoming issues on vital and live subjects, such as the following:

- The Ethics of Economic Regimentation.
- Calvinistic and Pragmatistic Fundamentals of Education.
- The Christian Faith and Recent Philosophical Movements.
- Fascism, Nazism, Communism, and Democracy.
- Youth and the Discipline of Life's Urges.
- Recent Interest in Eschatology.
- Organized Christian Youth Movements.
- Calvinism and Socialism.
- Sterilization as an Ethico-Medical Problem.
- Crop Limitation, the AAA, and the Christian Farmer.
- The History of Reformed Theology in America.
- The American Indian and Recent Federal Policies.
- Do the Humanists Believe in God?
- The Why of Missions.
- Calvinism and Political Action.
- Abraham Kuyper: His Life and Thought.
- Collectivism and Scriptural Principles.
- The Socialization of Medicine.
- Recent Archaeological Finds and the Truth of the Bible.
- The Freedom of the Church in the Modern State.

Arrangements are in the making by which a group of permanent staff correspondents in various parts of the world will write letters reflecting upon happenings and movements in their country of interest to our readers.

Reviews of significant books will appear in each issue. There will also be literary articles and bits of verse.

We are also planning to offer from the hand of competent persons various surveys of current thought and activity in such spheres as: philosophy; theology; preaching; economics; internationalism; governmental affairs; literature; music; Dutch culture; the organic and inorganic sciences; educational theory and practice; etc., etc.

We invite your reaction to this issue. Both criticism and appreciation will be welcome. Any suggestions for the discussion of problems confronting our readers will also be appreciated.

If you believe in this magazine, recommend it to your friends. We shall appreciate the names and addresses of your friends who might like a copy of this first issue, which will be sent to them free of charge — as long as they last.

Send your subscription today. Two dollars plus your name and address in an envelop takes care of your end. We will take care of the rest.

Address all correspondence, business as well as editorial, to:

THE CALVIN FORUM

Calvin College and Seminary

Grand Rapids, Mich