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I.

There is urgent need for a re-appraisal of the Christian attitude toward war and peace, both by reason of the prevalence of perverted propaganda against all war, and by reason of the fact that a good deal of traditional training in the Christian duty of patriotism has not been properly dissociated from a glorification of war and militarism.

II.

Citing Scripture to justify or to condemn war is like handling a two-edged sword. All rashness and superficiality is out of place here. “Blessed be the Lord who teacheth my hands to war,” has served as an abominable lie in many Christian pulpits, and the teaching of our Lord on “Resist not evil” has been distorted so as to stand in diametric opposition to the Pauline teaching in Romans thirteen.

III.

Much confusion and misunderstanding among those who claim to solve this problem by an appeal to Christian principles is occasioned by the fact that proposed convictions touching war and peace are often not properly grounded in biblical truths concerning man’s ability and inability, the meaning and scope of redemption, and the purpose of God for His Church, the world, and human history.

IV.

Whether consciously or unconsciously, the answer to the war-peace question which each man claiming to be a Christian gives, is largely determined by his theology, his philosophy of history, his eschatology. It is an error to reduce this ethical question to an eschatological one (as some are doing), but it is no less an error to divorce it from one’s eschatology.

V.

The Modernist-Humanist view underlying the main thrust of the modern pacifistic movement is unbiblical and anti-Christian. Its main tenets are:

1. Man has at no time in history fallen and is not totally depraved, but is gradually rising by his own individual and collective effort to a higher level of religion and morality.

2. History is not the realization of God’s redemptive purpose in and through Christ, but the gradual rising of men to the consciousness of being sons of God in their own right.

3. The goal of history is not a God-appointed crisis culminating in the judgment of humanity by — and upon the basis of each one’s individual relation to — Christ, but it is a flying goal of an endless development of the inherent capacities of man’s nobler nature issuing ultimately in an ideal society on earth.

VI.

Inspired by these underlying assumptions, the Modernist-Humanist views world peace as one of the chief objectives of his moral endeavor. He repudiates the divine Christ and reduces Jesus to a mere moral teacher and an example of a peace-loving neighbor. Holding that a warless world is the great ideal of Christian social endeavor, he considers that goal attainable by man through his own efforts, identifying the Kingdom of God with this human utopia.

VII.

The biblical Christian can have no part or share in this humanistic, anti-Christian, essentially pagan attitude and outlook. His theology, anthroplogy, Christology, soteriology, and eschatology are so radically different from this humanistic view that he cannot draw his ethical inspiration for the solution of the war-peace problem from this source.

VIII.

The pulpit which preaches that Christianity is a matter of peace between the nations because Jesus Christ is “the Prince of Peace,” and that the real task of the Christian Church is to promote and establish such international peace, is missing the real point and heart of the gospel of the Prince of Peace. Not international relations were the chief concern of Jesus Christ (though his redemption will also touch these in its ultimate influence), but the spiritual peace of the sinner with God, against whom he has risen up in rebellion. Let the Christian Church beware lest it fall into this modernistic trap.
IX.

The apocalyptic-Chiliastic type of eschatology is right in rejecting this modernistic-humanistic construction of man, sin, redemption, and the goal of history, and in maintaining the standpoint of biblical supernaturalism, man's fall and depravity, Christ's redemption, and the goal of history as being one of supernatural cataclysm and final judgment. But it perverts biblical teaching on the following score:

1. It labors with a distorted view of the relation between creation and redemption, nature and grace, the natural and the redemptive order of human history, due, in part, to its failure to appreciate the significance of God's common grace for human society and for the development of human history.

2. By its undue and unbalanced emphasis upon the apocalyptic point of view it minimizes the Christian's positive duty to labor for Christ, his King, in every realm of human life.

3. Because of its restricted, other-worldly point of view it speaks disparagingly of the Christian's duty to influence human society, virtually negates the Christian moral ideal for this life and the present social order, and cancels all this by the seemingly pious claim that Christ will set all things right when he comes to judgment.

X.

Inspired by these assumptions the apocalyptic-Chiliastic type of Christian is led to assume one of two attitudes in the matter of war and peace. Some of them—though their number today is not very large—refuse to serve an earthly government in any capacity because "their citizenship is in heaven," and become pacifists—though from a radically different motive than the Modernist-Humanist. Others—and they form by far the majority in the group today—prompted by their repudiation of all that partakes of Modernism, Humanism, Socialism, turn strongly anti-pacifistic and apparently champion unconditional obedience to the government when the call to arms comes.

XI.

Repudiating both the Modernist-Humanist and the apocalyptic-Chiliastic eschatology, the biblical Christian maintains:

1. That God's great purpose has at no time been frustrated by sin, but that He is continually realizing it from the beginning to the end of human history.

2. That man through his fall is totally depraved, incapable of any saving good, and that he is redeemed only through the personal appropriation by faith of the atonement of the God-Man, Jesus Christ, the Savior.

3. That despite man's fall into sin and the present prevalence of sin and corruption in human social life, government, order, and decency are still found in human society by reason of God's common grace for all humanity.

4. That the Christian is redeemed not only for the ultimate heavenly glory of the future, but no less to live the Christ-life here and now in all his human relationships and in all the spheres of a God-created, though sin-marred, human society.

5. That in the pursuit of this difficult duty the Christian is at no time inspired by the spurious belief in the innate perfectability of human nature and the establishment of a Kingdom of God on earth by man's own efforts, but that (though fully appreciating the advantages of orderly and decent society made possible through the operation of God's common grace) he is inspired in all his endeavors by the principle of God's saving grace and looks forward to the consummation of human history in the divine judgment at the end of the age.

XII.

With the background of these Christian fundamentals and in the light of these biblical truths, the Christian views his duty in relation to war and peace. It appears that there are four distinct duties which the Christian must recognize in this connection. These are:

1. The duty to keep and promote peace with all men.

2. The duty to defend his own life and that of his loved-ones against acts of violence on the part of an aggressor.

3. The duty to obey his government.

4. The duty to obey God rather than man whenever he faces a serious clash between human orders and what he conceives to be a divine injunction.

XIII.

The duty to keep and promote peace is an elementary duty for all Christians. Contention, strife, warfare are subversive of the Christian virtues of brotherliness, love, and peace. This duty to hate no man but to keep and promote peace holds for the Christian in every relationship of his life: individual, domestic, ecclesiastical, economic, industrial, civic, political, and international.

XIV.

This duty of the Christian to keep peace with every man in every relationship of life in no way conflicts with the duty to oppose in spiritual conflict all those who oppose Christ. When the humanistic mod-
It is true that there exists a psychological and theological connection between the international pacifism of the Modernist-Humanist and his ecclesiastical "pacifism" on the score of the spiritual struggle for the "faith once delivered," but it is a fatal mistake to conclude from this connection that the Bible-believing Christian, believing as he does in a spiritual antithesis and the duty to spiritual warfare for "the faith," should be predisposed in favor of physical warfare and the spirit of nationalistic militarism. The weapons of our warfare are not carnal, but spiritual. The peace-at-any-price position is wrong (whether in the ecclesiastical or in the international sphere), but this can be no excuse for confusing the war-at-any-price attitude which Scripture in the spiritual sense imposes upon us and the easy-going militarism of the nations of the world which often parades under the garb of the "Christian" virtue of patriotism.

It is fallacious to hold that, seeing the Word of God teaches there will be no lasting peace until Jesus Christ returns, therefore Christians have no duty to promote peace between individuals and nations today. One might with equal propriety argue that, whereas there will be no sinless world until the Lord Jesus returns, therefore the Christian is not called to fight against sin and its manifestations in human society right here and right now.

It is fallacious reasoning to argue that, seeing the leadership in the current movement for world peace has been largely in the hands of Modernists, Humanists, Socialists, and Communists, therefore the Christian has no positive duty to throw his influence on the side of the promotion of world peace. Reasoning of this kind is about as ineffective as the argument of those who—a few decades ago—reasoned that, seeing social reform was being largely promoted by Socialists, and seeing Marxist Socialism and Christianity were incompatible, therefore the Christian could have nothing to do with attempts to promote the elimination of social evils. The real question is whether a Christian can be indifferent toward the existence of such social evils and, if not, what he, as a Christian, inspired by his own principles, is going to do about it.

The Christian Church should be on its guard lest, in the swirl of humanistic public opinion, and in its eagerness to promote peace, it adopts the ideals and motives of the humanistic pacifist. But the Christian Church should be no less on its guard against becoming the mouth-piece and tool of a militaristic propaganda which indiscriminately lands going to war merely because the government has declared one—whatever the cause or provocation.

To ridicule the efforts of the League of Nations and to discredit these efforts by pointing to past failures on this score is just as stupid and just as un-Christian as to ridicule and discredit the efforts of the person who strives to bring about peace between two hostile individuals or between two clashing industrial groups for the alleged reason that failures to establish such peace have been plentiful so far.

The only hope to curb the imperialism of any nation is to have it feel the resistance of the rest of the nations of the world whenever it resorts to an act of aggression upon the territory of any other nation. Such resistance should avoid clash of arms as long as possible, resorting to economic boycott and similar measures, but if such measures are not effective, the resort to arms by the resisting nations may be the only honorable course to pursue.

The stand of absolute non-resistance is stultifying and in conflict with sound Christian ethics. It is true that Scripture teaches that we must be willing at times to forego our rights and that situations may arise in which it is the noble thing to suffer rather than to insist upon our rights. But this can never justify the cancellation either of our individual Christian duty to ward off an assault upon our life or of our solemn social duty to protect our loved ones from such assault. And in the sphere of national and international relations it should be remembered that government is instituted precisely for this protective purpose, viz., to maintain justice and protect the weak from the strong.

To call all war sinful without any restriction whatever is ethically untenable. All violence against an individual is sinful, unless such violence is inseparable from the act of defending one's own life (or that of persons for whom we have responsibility) from the unprovoked attacks of an assailant. If I
take the life of my assailant in self-defense, I have taken his life but am not a murderer. However
difficult it may often be to determine who is the assailant in international relations, and however
much misuse may in the past have been made of this principle, the principle is not only sound in
international relationships but it must be said that no permanent international relationships will be
possible in a sinful world without its observance.

**XXIII.**

- Disarmament is a great and noble ideal to strive after and disarmament efforts should be supported by
  Christian public opinion, but to assume that in a sinful world such as we live in this ideal can fully
  be realized and that all we need to do is forthwith to scrap all armaments, is to talk nonsense.
  In a world where the germ of imperialism, fascism, and militarism (not to mention other
gers) is constantly infecting various nations, it is the solemn duty of a nation inspired by the high-
est desires for peace to provide a reasonable degree of preparedness. The genuinely Christian atti-
dute toward this phase of the problem apparently does not lie in complete disarmament, but in cul-
tivating a different war-psychology.

**XXIV.**

- Certain sincere promoters of peace greatly weaken their plea by failing to recognize the right and duty
  of genuinely defensive warfare. To hold that, seeing the emphasis has so long been in the opposite
direction, it is now proper to condemn all war without any exception and thus to justify the radical
pacifist either explicitly or by implication, is misleading, to say the least.

**XXV.**

- The duty to obey the government is one of the basic duties of all Christian social ethics. The solemn
  teaching on this score of Paul in Romans 13 is plain. A state in which the citizen obeys the govern-
  ment only when it suits his convenience is no state and that government is no government.

**XXVI.**

- The Christian’s duty to obey his government is, however, not absolute and unrestricted. The early apos-
tles refused to obey the government when it forbade them to preach Christ and we laud them for it.
Protestant believers refused to deny their faith under pressure from a Roman Catholic government,
joyfully going to the stake, and we call them heroes and martyrs of the faith today. When the call
to a higher loyalty is unmistakable, and the Christian by obeying the government is convinced he
would be a traitor to such a higher loyalty, it is not only his privilege but it is his duty to offer passive
resistance and take the consequences.

**XXVII.**

- To hold that such refusal to obey the government is justifiable for the Christian only when it involves a
  serious attack upon his religious freedom, would appear to be untenable. The government may com-
  pel him to participate in activities which are an outrage to what he conceives his Christian moral duty
to be in the sight of God. In that case, no less than when it concerns his religious rights and privi-
leges, the only honorable course open to him is to obey God rather than man.

**XXVIII.**

- It is fallacious to hold that the Christian citizen should heed the call of the government to arms regard-
less of the justifiability of the war, just as he would pay his taxes regardless of the question how
the government will expend this money, thus leaving the responsibility in both cases up to the gov-
ernment. There is no comparison between taking the life of fellowman and paying one’s taxes.
When we take the life of fellowman, we remain morally responsible beings and cannot allow our-
ourselves to be degraded to automatons who transfer the moral responsibility for their acts to an imper-
sional power called the state.

**XXIX.**

- Those pacifists would appear to be wrong who hold that if a Christian is not certain of the justice of the
war which his government wages, he should refuse to fight. This would be a sound position in case
the moral alternative which he faced were: to fight, or to do nothing. However, the actual alternative
which he faces is: to fight, or to disobey his government. He must have sufficient grounds to dis-
obey his government.

**XXX.**

- The fact of the complexity of the causes of modern wars can be no excuse for the Christian to be satis-
fied with blindly obeying the government's call to arms. It is his duty, both as a Christian and as a
citizen of a democracy, to become intelligently informed on the moral justifiability of a war in which
he is called to engage. Through his personal influence and through all legitimate means in a repre-
sentative form of government he should strengthen public opinion in the direction of the cultivation
of such high moral standards that war will not be declared for flimsy causes. But when war is de-
cclared and the call to arms comes to him, he must take a stand. If (and as long as) he cannot by
reason of the complexity of its causes determine whether such a war is justifiable, he ought to obey
his government. If, however, and as soon as, he has the conviction that the war is morally not justi-
fiable, it would appear that he has no right to take part and the only ethical course open to him is
to become a conscientious objector and refuse to take part in the mass murder of his fellowmen.

C. B.
Mark Twain and the Forgotten Boy
Bastian Kruithof, A.M.
(In memory of Mark Twain whose one-hundredth anniversary we commemorated in November.)

In the long years of history it must be that mankind was aware of the existence of boys. Since no human being springs full-fledged from the forehead of any earthly father, the young male must certainly have shared the paternal tent or hut or villa. Although history deals more with the lives of men, it will recognize boyhood as that stage which precedes manhood. Julius Caesar and Napoleon and Lincoln were once boys, but we know them only as men. In the life and times of the boy there is still a fertile field for the scientific historian. Biography too will admit that the mature male individual once upon a time wore dresses or rompers and then knee pants. (I am childless and do not know the exact order of these.) In praise of contemporary writers it can be said that biography today is more concerned with the first years of human life.

Literature taking its cue from history and from life has likewise honored a man's beginnings. However, for many centuries literature seems not to have known the real boy. Worse still, it appears that literature did not even care to know the real boy. It takes no Aristotelian logic to prove that he existed. But age after age writers were so taken up with the more mature product that they all but forgot the bud before it bloomed. Here then was the problem of the forgotten boy, a problem that was not taken seriously until the nineteenth century. Even though Socrates called in a boy to prove his theory of education, and Jesus blessed the little ones because of their simplicity, the real boy begins to appear only in the century preceding ours.

I do not think that the old world discovered him. That the civilization across the sea should have become aged without heeding greatly the fulness of early youth, is only another riddle. Where does one find the boy in Homer, Dante, Shakespeare, and Milton? Their lofty thought and expression has little room for him. Wordsworth has honored him philosophically by calling the child father to the man. But in general the boy does not leap from the pages of the poets. He fares somewhat better in the English novel. There are traces of him in Tristam Shandy, but he soon dissolves in the shadows of men of stature like the elder Shandy and the immortal Uncle Toby. Dickens gives us David Copperfield and Oliver Twist. But to me these creatures do not come alive fully as boys. Robert Louis Stevenson had a heart and a mind for children as is evident from his “A Child's Garden of Verse.” And yet Treasure Island and Kidnapped are stories for boys more than stories of them. On the continent the boy leads a shady existence in books that have become classic for their presentation of truth and beauty in the life of humanity.

The genuine boy was discovered by Americans. Whitman may be considered one of the discoverers although his barefoot boy has not shaken off the little man. Holmes gives us a better presentation. He knew boys and loved them because as a doctor he must have fed them syrup of pepsin and pulled slivers out of their unwashed feet. But the real boy was discovered and made known to the world by Mark Twain. Huckleberry Finn and Tom Sawyer are the first flesh and blood presentations of that great host of rascals put to bed by loving mothers and doting aunts and put to grief by the proverbial slipper. With Mark Twain the world becomes a stage not only for men and ghosts and the determinism of the gods but also for boys with patched and unpatched breeches, and tousled hair, and propensities for mixed comedy and tragedy. And the beauty of it is that these boys do not strut as so many grown-ups do, but act natural out of abundant boyish hearts. Unaware of the possible fact that “our birth is but a sleep and a forgetting” they have their back-yard visions and clandestine plottings, their perennial taste for sweets, their innocent love affairs with candy sticks for love missives, and are ready at all times to apply their pocket knives to all visible objects from mahogany tables to cork legs. “Here is God's plenty” in the field of youth.

The boy is wrapped around with that realism and romanticism of life, which contribute greatly to literature. To be sure he has his fun, lives joyfully, and redeems the present. But shadows touch even him. Huck Finn has no father and mother, and sleeps in a barrel. Tom Sawyer in better circumstances is parent-less and suffers, as only children can, from love-sickness and forced doses of medicine. Mark Twain's boys live in a world of wretchedness and hypocrisy. America's humorist is not always sparkingly humorous. The pessimism that runs deep under the stream of his controlled hilarity would make an interesting subject for a doctor's dissertation. Yet when all is said, Mark Twain gives us the real boy in his lights and shadows. In literature he should be looked upon as the standard for the picturing of that life which begins almost forty years before forty. Well-meaning writers, who give us little angels and missionaries instead of he-boys, should read Mark Twain. That experience should keep them and their cheap Sunday School stories from the ridiculous.

The tradition once established by Mark Twain has been kept alive by such writers as Booth Tarkington, Sherwood Anderson, and Rövaag. Penrod and Sam are cousins to Huckleberry Finn and Tom Sawyer. They are boys who never become men, and we are glad they do not. Tar is first and last a boy who has in him the makings of a man. And Peder Victorious with the spell of the Dakota prairies upon him sheds slowly his clinging boyhood. In this connection it is note-worthy that Anthony Adverse is a boy for a long, long time. The author has remembered that “the thoughts of youth are long, long thoughts.”

Here, then, we have the boy, not the American boy merely but the boy universal. He is primarily the literary artist's child. If he is not over-psychologized in laboratories by his worst enemies, he will live long to beautify and amplify the life of the world. Again I say, he is the artist's child.
Japan as an International Danger
By Albertus Pieters, D.D.
Professor of English Bible and Missions, Western Seminary, Holland, Mich. For Thirty Years Missionary to Japan for the Reformed Church in America.

Truly, one must go away from home to hear the news. I had no idea that I was a dangerous militarist until I read the article in The Calvin Forum of November, entitled: "The Gospel according to St. Mars." Indeed, I do not more than half believe it yet, for perusing that article led me to re-read my own in the September number, a proceeding I earnestly recommend to the reader. If he will do that, he will probably share my surprise that so moderate and cautious a discussion of the situation in the Far East should have provoked such a reply.

It is not my purpose to answer Mr. De Boer in detail. Some of his remarks seem to me irrelevant, and some almost hysterical, but of that let the reader judge. One can not argue with an exclamation point. Rather let me restate and defend the fundamental thesis objected to by him, namely that in certain eventualities, toward which the situation in the Far East is tending, it may be right and necessary for us to fight Japan. In doing so, I can not hope to win the approval and agreement of those who think that war is always and under all circumstances wrong for the Christian. That position seems to me so clearly and thoroughly unscriptural that I think a man must have quite parted company with the Bible as a divine revelation before he can take it. He must also, I think, be blind to the lessons of history and to present realities. Mr. De Boer does me no wrong when he represents me as believing that war is sometimes a benefactor of humanity. It was, in my judgment, a great day for humanity when Charles Martel stopped the Mohammedans in the Pyrenees. Likewise, there were great days for humanity when Cromwell defeated the Stuarts and thus made England safe for democracy, when William the Silent took up the sword against Philip of Spain, and when Gustavus Adolphus turned back the tide of battle against Protestantism in Germany. Has history really nothing to teach us? My reasoned convictions on the question whether war is sometimes right may be found in my pamphlet: "The Christian Attitude Toward War" (Win. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., Grand Rapids, Mich.).

Rights versus Dollars and Cents

I address my remarks, therefore, to the other group, to those readers who, with me, deplore the necessity for war, and joining heartily in all legitimate measures that make for peace, nevertheless believe that it is sometimes — like a surgical operation in a serious case — the wise and right thing to wage war.

The eventualities of which I spoke are two:

(1) The possibility that Japan may invade the commercial rights of Americans in China.

(2) The possibility that the temper and policy of Japan may make her an international danger so great that it will be necessary to restrain her by military measures.

These two possibilities are closely connected, and in any actual case would probably be found to coincide. In support of my belief that the first possibility exists, I pointed to an utterance of what is usually regarded as a semi-official agency of the Japanese government, to the effect that Japan would not permit anything that might help China to resist her advance; naming shipments of munitions, airplanes, supplying technical and financial assistance, etc., etc. Remember that this warning was given in time of peace!

So far, this is only a warning, and an unofficial one at that, therefore it is no occasion for war; but suppose that such words should be translated into action (which may some time be the case), what then? Suppose, to imagine a concrete case, that a shipment of air-planes from an American firm to China, in time of peace, were met and turned back by a Japanese war vessel. What then? "Why, then," some will answer, "certain American salesmen will lose a commission, and the firm they represent will lose a profit. That is all; and who would want the American people to go to war for that?" Is that really all? Would this be merely a matter of dollars and cents, or a matter of rights? Can you see no difference between these two things? If not, I shall find it difficult to reason with you; but for most people this difference is very real and very great.

Government Duty to Maintain Right

Nearly or quite a hundred years ago the Barbary States engaged in piracy in the Mediterranean, and captured several American ships. Safety for our commerce could have been purchased by the payment of a comparatively small annual tribute to them, but our government preferred to make the Mediterranean waters safe for our ships by war, saying: "Millions for defense, but not one cent for tribute." In this I think our nation followed the right course. What is a government for, and what claim has any government upon the loyalty and support of its people but because it undertakes the defense of their right?

Those who, upon Christian principles, urge the duty of non-resistance, commonly appeal to certain passages in the Bible, forgetting or ignoring the fact that the instructions there addressed to individual believers are precisely the opposite of the teaching in regard to governments. To the individual it is said: "Dearly beloved, avenge not yourselves." Of the government: "He is a minister of God, an avenger for wrath." It is the Christian individual ideal to "lead a quiet and peaceable life in all godliness and honesty," but in order that we may do so, we are to "pray for kings, and for all that are in authority," who themselves are not to lead quiet and peaceful lives when wrong is done, but to be active in opposing it. To the individual disciple it is said: "Why do ye not rather take wrong, why not rather be decieved?" but of the ruler: "He beareth not the
sword in vain." When Christ laid down the rules for his disciples, he said: "Resist not him that is evil, but whosoever smiteth thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also. And if any man would go to law with thee, and take away thy coat, let him have thy cloak also"; but when he speaks a parable in which he himself is represented by a king with rebellious subjects, that king says: "These mine enemies, that would not that I should reign over them, bring hither, and slay them before me." When he comes in glory, according to the 25th chapter of Matthew, those who have done him wrong, in the persons of his brethren, shall go into everlasting fire. To Pilate he says: "If my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight"; which may be fairly paraphrased: "If I had a political sovereignty, then I, too, would use fighting men." Upon a scriptural basis, therefore, these two things are distinctly contrasted, the one with the other. The individual may, and often should, yield his rights: the government must maintain the rights of the people, or be untrue to the very purpose for which it was established and ordained of God.

Traffic in Munitions

Recent revelations in regard to the traffic in munitions have shown that those interested therein often stir up trouble between nations that otherwise would remain at peace, in order to increase their profits. It is no wonder that such revelations have aroused great indignation, for there are no words in which the baseness of such conduct can be adequately expressed. Nevertheless, even here, let us not lose our balance. Not all traffic in the arms and implements of war is illegitimate. Take the case under discussion, that of China. It is not wrong for the government of China to buy arms and munitions of war. Both for the maintenance of internal order and for defense against foreign aggression, that is what the Chinese government ought to do. If after the war with Japan, forty years ago, China had adequately re-armed, by sea and land, the whole situation in the Far East would be very much better than it is. Since, therefore, it is right for the government of China to buy munitions of war, it is right for Americans to sell them to China. We can not allow that right to be abridged by any other nation for its own selfish purposes without forfeiting our self-respect.

This is quite a different matter from the control of such exports by our own government, whether in time of peace or of war, in the exercise of its lawful authority over its own people. Laws on that point may be made at the discretion of the government, with an eye to the general welfare, and to such laws all citizens should render obedience; but it is quite otherwise if another government, to which the merchant owes no allegiance, interferes with trade in this or that article of commerce. Then it becomes a matter, not of money, but of rights, and for the maintenance of rights it is proper and Christian to wage war.

Japan an International Danger

The second eventuality of which I spoke was that the temper and policy of the Japanese people might make them such an international danger as to require restraint by military measures. I compared Japan with ancient Rome in her unscrupulous extension of her territory by conquest, and I cited evidence that this policy is deeply rooted in the religious ideas of the people, producing a very dangerous military and religious fanaticism. Mr. De Boer seeks to undermine my argument by alleging that similar things were unfairly said before the war in regard to Germany. Probably he refers to the use then made of some of the teachings of Nietzsche and Von Bernhardi. Whether that was really unfair to Germany might be an interesting subject for debate, but let us suppose it was, then the only thing proved is that it is quite possible, by unfair quotations, to misjudge and misrepresent a people; which I cheerfully concede. That proves nothing with regard to my recent article on Japan. Whether I did in fact misrepresent Japan by my quotations, must be decided on its own merits. Mr. De Boer brings forward no proof that I did so. If any one with adequate knowledge of their temper and literature comes forward with such evidence, he is entitled to a hearing; but for any one who has no such knowledge to counter my argument by gratuitous insinuations as to my fairness, is a cheap and unworthy method of controversy.

How shall the average reader decide whether to attach any weight to such an article as mine? That will depend upon his respect for the good faith and knowledge of the writer. So far as my good faith is concerned, I must cast myself upon his mercy. Obviously, no protestations of mine will convince him if he doubts it; but I can at least ask this question: "Why should I unfairly defame the Japanese people?" I have nothing to gain by that. I assure my readers that I have no stock in any munitions factory! Individually, numerous Japanese are my very dear friends, and I have not the remotest desire to do that nation an injury; but I do desire that the American people should understand with whom they have to deal on the other side of the Pacific.

Japan's Record

As to knowledge, perhaps not all the readers of THE CALVIN FORUM are aware that I lived for more than thirty years in Japan, learned to speak and read the Japanese language, and devoted myself with earnestness for many years to a study of the Japanese people. In my judgment of them I may be wrong—let some one better informed instruct me—but what I wrote I did not write ignorantly or carelessly. I submitted hitherto unpublished quotations from current literature, showing that deep in the religious thought of Japan lie embedded principles that cannot but lead to military conquest. To this the recent history of the country corresponds. In the nineties they made war with China, professedly to maintain the independence of Korea; but presently they annexed that unhappy country by force. I got a pretty thorough education on the resulting conditions when, for more than six months, at the request of the Presbyterian Board, I was in Korea, in connection with a criminal trial in which many Korean Christians and some Presbyterian missionaries were falsely accused. When Japan, under cover of a revolution in Manchuria, extended her
control over that country, her action was investigated
and condemned by a committee of the League of
Nations; with the result that she withdrew from the
League. By that act she declared that she would
brook no restraint in the name of international
justice. Her attack upon Shanghai is fresh in the
minds of all, and her present proceedings in North
China are a portion of the daily news. Having signed
the Nine Power Treaty, in which all the signatories
promised to respect the territorial integrity of China,
she has flagrantly violated her word. She signed also
the Treaty of Paris, called the "Kellogg Pact," but
the ink was scarcely dry upon the document before
she callously disregarded it. She stands forth today
as a great military nation, urged on by a lust of con­
quest, animated by religious fanaticism, and unre­
strained by any regard for morality or international
justice.

The League of Nations and We

Does all this concern us? Yes, it concerns us very
deply, just as it concerns every decent man if crime
is rampant in his community. The days of national
isolation are gone. Travel is so swift, communica­
tions are so perfected, and the nations are so inter­
dependent, that the world is like one great commu­

Unluckily, all that the League has done has been
begun some time, and at whatever point of time it
begins, the inevitable result will be to stabilize the
condition then existing. The old wrongs can not be
all undone. Some of them can, and it is cheering to
see a beginning made in this direction. For our
government to leave Cuba free and to grant inde­
pendence to the Philippines is a fine thing. Like­
wise, it was a noble act of England to grant South
Africa self-government and virtual independence
after the Boer war. The freedom of Ireland has been
granted — or won, if you prefer that word — and the
freedom of India is well on the way. Under the old
system Egypt, Palestine, and Mesopotamia would by
this time have been annexed to the British Empire.
Thus some things can be corrected, and a start has
been made; but it is true that most of what has been
done will remain. We cannot altogether efface the
past, but we can set our faces to the future. I believe
that a better world will come, not by pacifism, nor by
the selfish policy of isolation and neutrality now pur­
sued by the United States, in which there is no ele­
ment of moral greatness, but only a deep concern
for Number One. It will come, as I see it, only by
such a deepening of the sense of justice that men will
stand together to obtain it, and by such a combina­
tion of well armed nations that the offender can be
brought to book.

Sanctions and War

Can it not be accomplished without war, by "eco­
nomic sanctions"? Perhaps much can be done by
the use of this new instrument. It is difficult to see
how Japan could resist such pressure as they are
now seeking to exert upon Italy. However, as Mus­
solini has said, such sanctions are a form of war,
and actual war is always in the background. If by
waging war he could stop these sanctions, he would,
and by the same token the allied nations must be
prepared, in case of need, to make their sanctions
good by the sword. So long as sin drives men and
nations to evil ways, we cannot get rid of war alto­
ger, and we ought not to get rid of it. The sword
is God's appointed means for the restraint of wicked­
ness, and it must not be basely cast away. In the
last analysis, there is no answer to force but force.
That is the "ultima ratio," whether of God or men.
God is slow to anger and of great mercy. He will
love and persuade men into holiness and righteous­
ness, if they will listen to him; but if not, "he will
whet his sword," and overwhelm them with destruc­
tion by his almighty power. God does not believe in
"non-violence," and neither should we, if we are his
children.
A Quest for Certainty amidst Modern Perplexity
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PROFESSOR JOHN DEWEY entitled the eleventh or last chapter of his The Quest for Certainty, "The Copernican Revolution" (p. 287). This chapter is one of the most lucid and most readable among Dewey's latest writings. As he summarizes his views on the relation of knowledge and action, one follows with great interest. It would have been less presumptuous perhaps had he been substituted for the, for even Kant claimed that he had effected a Copernican revolution in human thought. But Kant can lay no claim to such achievement, according to Dewey, for all he did was edit "a new version of old conceptions about mind and its activities in knowing" (p. 290). Kant's was no revolution at all but only a "shift from the logical to human authorship" (p. 288), for actually the world still turned on the constitution of the knowing mind, and hence, was only a return to an ultra-Ptolemaic system. Surely, a revolution in philosophy it is, to state, as does Dewey, that knowledge revolves about existence instead of all existence about eternal knowing, or that things are as they are because they have first been known.

Dewey's Copernican Revolution

Let us note briefly the nature of this revolution in philosophy which Dewey calls the "reconstruction of philosophy," but which some prefer to call the "destruction of philosophy."

In Dewey's philosophy there is no fixed center. "Neither self, nor the world soul, nor nature is the center" (p. 291). The center emerges in an effort to change the interacting parts of a moving whole. This revolution involves many vital changes, chief among which are: (1) Mind is part of the ongoing process and within the world; (2) a complete abandonment of what Dewey calls "the intellectualist fallacy"; (3) the relation between objects as known and objects as valued is that between the actual and the possible.

First, therefore, mind is within nature, a part of the ongoing process. Its only mark of distinction from other interacting parts of the moving whole is that wherever it is found there is movement from the doubtful, confused to the clear, the resolved, the settled. Knowing is an active participant in the drama of eternal change. Here we have a naturalistic monism with all the objectionable features of any monism, chief among which is that it fails to account for the manyness, the great diversity of phenomena. It seems a gross oversimplification, a rather forced identification to claim that mind's only distinctive feature is to give direction to an ongoing process. In the first place most of this process is beyond the control and direction of the human mind. But, what is more, how can we account for such a unique, apparently very superior phenomenon on a naturalistic basis? To resort to chance, to blind force, to necessity is hardly worthy of human intelligence. As I see it, the physical and the mental, mind and matter are distinct, not to be identified as one within the other, but both have their common origin and center in the one and eternal Logos. This interpretation escapes the Scylla and Charybdis of monism and pluralism.

Secondly, this philosophy can boast of the complete abandonment of the so-called "intellectualist fallacy," or the "ubiquity of knowledge as a measure of reality" (p. 291), or the glorification of the separation of a life of knowing and a life of doing. "Knowledge is instrumental" (p. 298), "does not encompass the world as a whole, is not co-extensive with experienced existence" (p. 296). In knowledge becomes means and effects become consequences. The business of knowledge is to secure control, even if it is only that control which might be called understanding. Here we really have, not a playing with terms, but a re-interpretation of knowledge. This is a positivistic position. There is existence which does not ask to be known. The gain made in knowing is not in the approximation to a universal solution but in improvement of methods and in enrichment of objects experienced. Furthermore, there is apparently no room for knowledge gained from observation, apart from experimentation. In the latter we order and control the conditions observed, while in purposeful observation with external control we also have a legitimate source of knowledge, as, for example, in astronomy. Here control can be predictive only, not manipulative. Dewey admits that our control may be very limited, and our knowledge may be merely what we call understanding with the prospect of acquiring more active control. Neither does this leave room for knowledge of an immediate nature. This world, it seems, is an ordered world, having its existence in eternal being. It is a knowable world because, having first been known, there is a correspondence of the knower and the known. The function of knowing is not merely to give us control, but to approximate solution to the questions whence, why, and whither as well. Nothing less will satisfy human intelligence. These questions will be asked. It is futile to ascribe the seeking of ultimate solutions to a psychopathic escape from the world of things. Be it granted that pietism and asceticism did delay scientific progress and that there was and still is a tendency in certain circles to depreciate the material world, the alternative is not the opposite extreme of regarding science as the only source of values, but in the interpretation of all reality, the natural and the spiritual, as deriving their significance from eternal being.

A New Philosophical Deal

Dewey turns prophet of a new era in human thought when he says, "I do not know when knowledge will become naturalized in the life of society. But when it is fully acclimatized, its instrumental, as distinct from its monopolistic, role in approach to things of nature and society will be taken for granted,
without need for such arguments as I have been engaging in" (p. 288). The new era is at hand. The new philosophy will prevail. The Copernican revolution will usher in a new deal in philosophy. And the leader is apparently sure of his position.

Finally, the relation between objects as known and objects as valued is that between the actual and the possible. A new idealism and a new religion (if it may be called religion) is advanced in this philosophy. The ideal is the possible in contrast with the actual, that which the actual may bring into existence. The real is a world of contingencies, the ideal what that world may become through operative thinking. The new idealism is one of action that is devoted to creation of the future. But where is more idealism, in the belief of what the world may become by human action or in the belief of what the world will become as guaranteed in the nature of things because of divine purpose operative in all things? On the basis of the former one may well despair; but according to the latter one can be confident that notwithstanding apparent reverses in human progress "all things work together for good" as the Infinite is realizing an objective in and through the finite.

A New Religion?

And the new religion? It is heartfelt piety evoked by nature, including man, as a source of ideals, possibilities, and essential abode of all attained excellencies, according to Dewey. There is nothing higher than nature; it is the source and end of all things. Here we have a refined, cultured paganism. We are back where man was when Christianity commenced to penetrate human civilization. Sophism and positivism once again assert themselves. What a contrast between the gospel of Christ, to whom Dewey refers in his Democracy and Education as an excellent authority, and the gospel of nature, in, of, and unto whom are all things in the experimental philosophy. Piety evoked by neutral nature and its possibilities! What a thought! One can't conceive of it. But, inasmuch as the argument of inconceivability has great limitations, one had better discard it. On the other hand, it is difficult to be unbiased in this case when one is so thoroughly convinced of the fallacy, what is more, of the bare character of such would-be piety.

Philosophy has a new calling in this revolution. Let philosophy forget about its attempt to integrate all of knowledge, for knowledge is essentially analytic and discriminating. There can be no complete synthesis of knowledge on an intellectual basis. Philosophy must abandon its search for the universal, the absolute, the immutable, for it is a vain pursuit, of no consequence.

We may be grateful to Dewey for his frankness, for he draws the issue clearly in philosophy and religion. All of historic philosophies and religions are wrong, experimental humanism is right. The latter offers the world the old pagan religion of nature in a new garb, and a philosophy positivistically confined to the facts and conclusions of science. There is no need of halting on two opinions. One may choose this day whether he will be right or wrong.

Horne says that Dewey's Quest for Certainty might more descriptively be called Trysting with Uncertainty, for the quest is futile and leads to no conquest. At least Dewey denies that we can have any certainty; and all attempt at attaining it is fruitless, for in our search we are not discovering antecedent, pre-existent being, but effecting means of control. Control is substituted for certainty, the scientific method for a more comprehensive knowledge of truth.

Kant's Quest for Certainty

Kant similarly denied human capacity to attain certainty, intellectually of things in themselves. Man can have moral certainty only of those things not present to the senses. He distinguished among opinion, believing, and knowing. In believing or faith we have moral (subjective) certainty, but no objective evidence. In knowledge we have both subjective certainty and objective evidence. Hence, in the intellectual sphere one can have knowledge, but not in the moral sphere. Here faith is the organ of understanding. In opinion we have neither subjective certainty nor objective evidence, and it is based upon information which we ourselves admit to be inadequate. Knowledge is confined to the perceptual.

Though we can appreciate the noble effort of the philosopher of Königsberg to remove faith, man's moral sense, from the field of combat in science, yet the dualism which Kant created can lead only to further confusion. Though in Kant's theory of knowledge the quest for certainty is no vain pursuit, there are conflicting certainties. The conquests of our intellectual endeavors are one thing, those of moral conscience another. It becomes faith versus knowledge. In modern psychology we are once again reminded of the wholeness, the integrated character of our mental life. The cognitive, affective, and conative experiences are those of an integrated individual. Psychology as a biological science does not commit itself as to the nature of the integrative process, but the very fact that integration takes place seems indicative of a unifying factor. That which becomes one must be one in essence to begin with. Modern psychology seems to point again in the direction of the ultimate reality of the self. If human personality is essentially a unity at the outset, possessing a variety of potentialities and pro-activities — which may be described in terms of nervous structure and chemical balance — we are back where Aristotle left us when he distinguished between pure and practical reason, but created no dualism as did Kant by having each originate in an independent source. It must be admitted that Kant was not "trysting with uncertainty" as is Dewey, but he did make some truth unapproachable intellectually. Positivistic intellectually, Kant was no positivist ethically.

Can We Have Certainty?

The question whether we can have certainty, whether we can be certain of anything, is of paramount importance in this present era of wide-spread perplexity. The perpetual "open mind" is frequently an "empty mind" and a so-called "unbiased" approach to the facts in cases synonymous with the
principle of negation. We can well afford to be sparing in the use of the words “open-minded” and “unbiased.” Yet there is much so-called conviction which is based on prejudice only, having never taken account of the facts except for apologetic purposes.

One wonders what the moral consequences will be of a philosophy divested of its reassuring conviction of the immutable character of ultimate truth and that this truth can be known, i.e., that our ideas, thoughts can at least progressively approach their correspondence to pre-existent reality. Such a philosophy, essentially naturalistic, deprives human personality of the beauty of holiness to which it is at least analogous. All the higher values of ethical significance degenerate into tools of adjustment merely which they admittedly are in part, and are no longer inherent values to be possessed. The glory which once was ours has departed. If it was merely illusionary, this may be welcomed, for even from a mental hygiene point of view it is desirable to face reality, but if this glory is real, man has lost a priceless heritage not to be regained by a piety toward physical nature.

One can begin with the conviction that truth exists and can be discovered by the searching mind of man, or he can proceed from the assumption that truth is produced by a process of verification of hypotheses. In the latter case a perfectly legitimate test of truth is regarded as truth itself. One can likewise look for knowledge as an intellectual approach to reality or he can regard knowledge as an outcome in testing tentative conclusions. Again in the latter a legitimate test of knowledge is identified with knowledge itself. Knowledge in this case becomes information to be used in further testing of hypotheses. In either case one accepts the pre-existent character of reality or the relative nature of things. Both aim to take facts into account and to proceed from the facts, but their interpretation of the facts will vary according to their perspective. On the basis of the latter certainty is not possible, for all truth is relative and all norms subject to change. According to the former the quest for certainty is one of man’s greatest endeavors both theoretically to satisfy man’s intellectual curiosity and practically that man may effect control, predictive as well as manipulative.

Santayana has pointedly written somewhere that the human mind was never master of so many facts and sure of so few principles. The researches in the field of science have disclosed to human observation the telescopic and microscopic and have brought within the reach of human control many forces of nature, ignorance of which led to many catastrophes among human beings. Have these scientific conquests deprived us of the more fundamental, the more permanent values of life? Is the perplexity in which the world finds itself today a forerunner of another episode in which modern civilization is leveled as that of the ancient civilization of Egypt, Greece, and Rome? Being sure of so few principles, lacking the beacon lights which mark the way, and what is more, deprived of a goal, a fixed objective in the progress of mankind, can be marked down as the weakest points in the experimentalists’ philosophy. What the world needs more than anything else today is the certainty, the conviction that truth is attainable and the faith that persistent search for it will lead to progressive conquest. Increased mastery of facts will then not deprive us of fundamental principles, norms of thought and action, but will clarify our thinking and stimulate more effective action in man’s endeavor to realize his fullest potentialities.

Truth Grounded in Eternal Reality

Neither in divorcing faith and knowledge, as did Kant, nor in confining knowing to effective control in the adjustment of man to his natural environment, as does Dewey, but in the recognition of both as mental functions by which the whole human personality lays hold upon truth as pre-existent in eternal reality lies the approach to the problems of our modern civilization. Our failure to distinguish between working hypotheses in the field of science and the nature of reality has obscured our view of the whole. Recognizing with Millikan that it behooves science to walk humbly with its God, we shall not narrowly restrict ourselves to the scientific method in the discovery of truth, but direct our search by faith to those values that transcend those of science and discover in the changing the changeless and amidst modern perplexity a growing certainty.

NAY! NAY! NAY! NO A.A.A.

By John Hanenburg

Farmer near De Motte, Indiana

Much has been said and written in defence of the government’s crop curtailment plan and all its benefits for the farmer and the public in general. But the question is still asked in many circles whether it is right for a Christian to give his moral support to such a movement, and whether it is fair to the consumer as well as to the farmer.

Thousands of farmers, especially in the West and Middle West, have benefitted and have been spared much anxiety and worry as to ways and means of meeting their obligations when their farms were made barren by uncontrollable droughts, the grasshopper menace, low prices, exorbitant freight rates (which naturally reduced the price on the little salable products they did have, because of the disadvantage of remoteness from the large trading centers), and—not to forget—the crippled buying power of his city friend.

Crop Curtailment, Waste, and Destruction

At this strategic time the government steps in and sells the farmer on the idea of destroying what he has on hand, and of raising less in the future, so that prices can be forced up by the law of supply and demand, thus making everybody happy. And besides that the government pays the farmer a certain amount per acre for not raising a certain commodity such as wheat, corn, cotton, or the like.

The method of estimation by which the amount per acre which the government will pay is deter-
mined is generally known, viz. the acreage of said
crop in 1932-33, the average yield per acre, measur-
ing the acreage and completing routine figures as
were necessary and under strict government super-
vision. Over 111,000 farmers were given quasi-
official positions for good political reasons.

And so the great campaign of waste and destruc-
tion was launched. Brood sows and young pigs were
slaughtered by the thousands in large electrécuting
chambers and used for various commercial purposes.
Thousands of acres of fertile soil were laid waste,
and $563,438,800 was doled out to farmers for cur-
tailment of five commodities.

In 1934 the Middle West was visited by indescrib-
able wind and sand storms, and drought, leaving the
farmers no forage for their live stock, thus furthering
the cause of the government's curtailment program.
We find in the state of South Dakota alone approxi-
mately 3,000 brood sows left in the spring of 1935,
while in 1932 there were 30,000.

Curtailment, Taxes, and High Prices

This past summer we saw the price of pork rise to
a new high of $12.00 per 100 live weight, not includ-
ing the processing tax of $2.25, which is three times
as high as a year ago. But only a small percentage
of farmers had hogs to sell at that price. The stock
of pork in cold storage is the smallest in 20 years
and men who otherwise found steady employment in
the large packing plants were added to the ranks of
the "men of leisure."

Now it is an undisputed fact that thousands of
farmers have profited by the government's crop cur-
tailment, and that these are great boosters of the
plan. In 1934 those farmers who signed a corn-
wheat curtailment contract had to let the ground lie
idle. But after the great drought they were allowed
to raise crops as could be used for rough feed and
were not in conflict with the government contract.
In 1935 there were 5,000,000 acres of soy beans raised,
and much of it on contract soil. Soy beans have
great commercial as well as feed value and when-
ever the demand for a product is great, the price is
naturally good. In the spring of 1935, soy beans
sold for $1.15 to $1.50 per bushel. Other farmers
used their so-called idle, but very good paying acres
in competition with the small farmer or gardener by
raising tomatoes, cabbage, etc., on a large scale.

And while we have allowed well drained and fer-
tile soil to lie waste or to be used for other purposes,
the government has transplanted many farmers from
the West to the barren regions of Alaska, and is
spending millions of dollars constructing dams and
improving waste and unfertile soil. While all these
inconsistencies are practiced here, foreign countries
have increased their wheat, corn, and cotton pro-
duction and are reaping the benefits.

Who pays or helps to pay this processing tax from
which the farmer is paid? The consumer, the ma-
Jority of those living in cities or industrial centers,
working for a minimum wage and then probably
only part time. They have to pay from 21 to 23 cents
for lard, and when he purchases a pound of bacon
(which he cannot afford to do often), the butcher
tells him smilingly, only "48 cents please." And so
we could enumerate the exorbitant prices of differ-
cent cuts of meat which include the processing tax.
Due to the inflated prices of pork and beef the con-
sumer is turning to substitutes, vegetable oils, com-
pounds, etc. The demand for these products has in-
creased as well as the price, raising the general cost
of living to such a new high that the worker finds it
very difficult to balance his budget.

Injustice to the Small Farmer

We have the small farmer, commonly known as
the truck gardener, whose name is legion. His farm
usually consists of a few acres, and because of that
he cannot enjoy the temporary benefits of govern-
ment relief or A. A. A. He is dependent upon the
direct sale of vegetables raised in large quantities on
the New Deal acres. Besides this, he too must pay
the unreasonable prices for what he consumes and
which he does not raise, thereby helping to pay that
which is given his competitor in the form of the
A. A. A. check. Little wonder some of them are try-
ing to increase their equipment and lease or buy a
large farm so they can stand in line with open hands.

And add to this the new so-called Potato Bill, H. R.
8819 to amend the A. A. A., by making all varieties of
potatoes a basic agricultural commodity and to raise
revenue by imposing a tax on the first sale of these
potatoes at the rate of 45 cents per bushel. This will
benefit about 30,000 large potato growers, but will
spell doom to between three and four million small
growers. Is it fair to subject all these small growers
to such a compulsory plan? This leads to no good
end, and if the farmer is not on his guard, he will rue
the day that he first signed an A. A. A. contract. The
farm has long been known as an independent and
unmolested enterprise, but farmers are fast selling
their agricultural birthright for a mess of pottage.

With all this unfairness echoing in our ears, can
we as Christians give our moral support to such a
plan? A program which creates hardships to the
commercial worker and which becomes unfair com-
petition to the small farmer? A system which de-
strues the fruit of hard and frugal labor, to be a
means to an end? Although the plan has its tem-
porary benefits, especially in the Middle West (which
is far enough removed from the large commercial
centers so as not to see the effects of their benefits),
nevertheless, we Christians have a responsibility and
should never endorse a system which creates hard-
ships upon our fellow man.

Secretary Wallace was quoted in one of the lead-
ing magazines as saying that he was thankful that we
would not have a surplus this year. Is that a reason
for gratitude, that we as a nation have no surplus?

It is encouraging to note that there are farmers
with large tracts of land who have refused to sign
the government's crop curtailment contract and who
wish to maintain their agricultural freedom.
The Message of the Reformation for Our Day

By Peter Holwerda
Minister Riverside Christian Reformed Church, Paterson, New Jersey

"THE REFORMATION" was that great liberating and restorative movement which came into being in the early part of the sixteenth century by way of the religious experience of Martin Luther. "It first came to expression in the religious world and from thence spread out into the broad field of morality and government." It aimed at the reformation of the Roman Catholic Church and failing in this went on to the reformation of society by direct appeal to the mind of the masses. Its fundamental implications were most clearly expounded and applied in the latter half of the same century by John Calvin. It was born in Germany in the early part of the sixteenth century by way of the "souls triumph."

This movement was born in an age in many respects similar to our own, though no one would claim they are identical. The yet greater freedom and more varied and widespread education of our times as well as the presence of two churches instead of one make our age less easy to classify, yet the dominant characteristics, leading forces, and basic issues are so strikingly similar that one cannot help but feel that a specific comparison of the two will enhance the "message."

The Reformation Period

"It was no dead age to which Luther spoke." "It was an age of great virility," inhabited by "men possessed of a great zest for life." "It seethed with unrest," was troubled by "multitudinous unsolved problems" and annoyed "by unfulfilled longings." "It was an age of fear." Briefly, society was in an agitated and discordant state.

The source and augmentation of this agitated state lay in the confluence of cross currents of life manifesting themselves in the deterioration of old institutions. The two great institutions to which men turn for peace and security failed them. There was no strong centralized state government to administer justice. The church was the strongest centralized power, but instead of ameliorating "it augmented fear and unrest by its actions as it enforced taxation upon its people." It perverted its authority by maintaining large tax-exempt estates at the expense of the peasantry which worked them and the small business man, both of whom were ground down by it. Hence by failure and perversion of authority fear was stimulated, unrest increased, problems were multiplied and longings were stirred.

The two great means given to promote peace and security were prostituted to the service of selfishness, by a few. Law is the supreme instrument of the state, Roman law had come to the foreground, but instead of promoting it was used to impede or frustrate justice entirely. Those set for its exposition, defense, and administration, increasingly pursued their profession for its financial returns. Crooked lawyers multiplied. The gospel, which is the strength of the church, was neglected as those set for its administration emphasized the external and pursued the material. This loss of the sense of duty and growing irresponsibility aided in destroying stability.

Forces at Work

At least two other major forces were at work to increase fear and unrest. The first was a revival of learning known as the Renaissance. This came by way of the schools where men began to "reappraise the spirit of classical antiquity as found in the great literary monuments." This appreciation slowly percolated down to the masses stirring and arousing the intellectual forces formerly under the influence of scholastic theology. It brought a different view of life. Its outlook was humanistic rather than theological. "It emphasized man as man and not as a candidate for heaven or hell; as a potential power rather than as an object of salvation or loss." It gloried in his achievements. "This life, and not the next, was stressed for its possibilities, beauty and satisfaction." Man, this world and the material things were preeminent. Such emphasis and intellectual awakening naturally made men dissatisfied with their conditions.

The second force at work was spiritual. "There was a popular religious awakening manifesting itself in a deepening sense of terror and concern for salvation." "Humanism despised theology which had been discredited by nominalism and supplanted by scepticism." But the religious needs and aspirations could not be denied.

Briefly, it was a man-centered, materially-minded, shortsighted age. This view and unrest forced men to the basic questions of where to find rest or security and how to live?

Our Modern Age

Like the Reformation period our age is one of great activity. Men have great zest for life. Contemplation is a lost art. The knowledge of God is extremely limited if not lost altogether among a great portion of the people. There is "much unrest, many unsolved problems and unfulfilled longings." Fear stalks through the land.

Forces similar to those in the foregoing age have been and still are at work presenting the same view of life. Government, it is true, is centralized and strong. But its effectual working has been hampered through the powerful influence of partisan politics and powerful lobbies, which through bribery and graft have corrupted both the legislative and judicial branches at large. This together with blindness to needs and ignorance of proper measures has meant inadequate protection and disturbance of the balances of justice for millions with consequent loss of peace and security. Its heavy taxation, the continued challenging of its basic foundations, and the questioning of its ability to secure the rights of individuals and groups, have all worked together to stimulate fear.

The chief instrument of government, law, has been grossly perverted as its exponents and administrators have sought to evade rather than uphold it. Crooked lawyers have multiplied and there are few spheres which it has not touched.
Closely allied to government in our age is the commercial world with its extensive ramifications because of its gigantic size, interstate character and constant need of legal guidance. Its collapse, due to unscrupulous speculation and disproportionate relation to the rest of the world, was the occasion for the present troubled state.

The Church and the School

The church has contributed likewise. Especially the Protestant church lacks power to enforce its authority. Like the Roman Catholic church of the preceding age it has neglected the Word of God and has been emphasizing man's potentialities and abilities in a yet grosser way than the Roman Catholic church of the day. Both tend to emphasize form. Especially Protestantism for a great part has failed to allow the note of Divine authority to ring out. The “light of classical antiquity,” of the “primeval ooze” and of “ingenuous man” has supplanted the “Light of the World.” Gradually the eternal foundations have been obscured and others substituted. The mind of man has been substituted for the mind of God, the Word of man for the word of God. Those set for the exposition and administration of the Gospel have perverted their authority and abused their office so far as they have neglected the ministry of the Word for its disciplining power. It has thus been instrumental in augmenting fear.

Closely allied to the church is the educational world as it is represented in our public school system from lower to higher education. Through it a new humanism has been disseminated with the age-old emphasis upon the materialistic sources for satisfaction and the importance of living in this world with no thought of the next. It found added reason and support for this, as it thought, in the evolutionistic development of life from lower to higher and in the scientific inventions which it hailed — and still hails — as the deliverer from all that is burdensome. The schools have had added support in this from the fruits of the printing press, the radio, and the motion picture. Its outworking has been hastened and made possible by the way which was useful in breaking down old restraints, and the post-war prosperity which offered opportunity for widespread expression. Its weakness has been brought home by the bursting of the economic bubble. Today there is confusion in the fundamental relations of life the world over as fear and unrest prevail.

Briefly, the basic questions of the Reformation period are becoming crystallized. Where can a man rest, he he sinner or business man? How shall he live? In this, also, age speaks to age.

The Specific Message

The answer in Reformation Day came through Martin Luther's spiritual experience and was most completely systematized and applied by John Calvin. Luther rejected the legal profession as answer to his need. Instead he went into the church to find rest for his disturbed soul. He had pursued the studies of ancient antiquity and of medieval theology. He fol-

owed rigidly the teachings of the church. In them his soul found not its answer. Only when he heard the authoritative voice of Scripture did he find peace. The others were instrumental to it. But both had to bow to the Word of God. Here he found the answer to — Where shall a man rest? Now he would be able to say: Here I stand; He found answer to — How shall a man live? in: “The just shall live by faith!” From these flowed again the answer to the disturbed relations of life. For Luther stood not only in the presence of the Judge, but also the Redeemer of life. The eternal foundations were again brought into view so that others might aid again in their presentation and application to all of life.

The age from Luther to Calvin then speaks. And its first note is one of hope. It is addressed to the individual and through him to society. It proclaims a way of escape from the state of fear and unrest. This is not to be found in the man-centered view of life, but in the God-centered view of it. God is supremely sovereign in all of life. He alone has sufficient authority to secure for man peace and security. He is its Creator and Lawgiver. He alone exercises and affords justice in a world of disorder. Hence every sphere of life needs to be placed in the light of his Presence. It needs to have over it the light of the past, present and future, both temporal and eternal. For in this light the Lawgiver shall judge all things.

Authority in State, Church, and School

Hence to government specifically comes the voice out of the past saying: a strongly centralized government is essential to the earthly peace and security of its citizens. Sufficient authority is necessary to this. In His holy ordinances God has provided for this as the Supreme Disposer of all goods, the Orderer of all society, the Rewarder of all good, and the Avenger of all wrong. Those holding office must know that God has spoken, that over the babel of vices, which seek to control them for special advantages at the expense of others, they may hear the authoritative voice of God speak to them with compelling power.

Its message is a warning against all tyrannous abuse of authority or prostitution of office. Along that road lies dissatisfaction, unrest, and finally revolt.

To the educational and formative institutions such as church, home, and school its message is: Preach, teach, and present the Gospel in all its fulness to your own fellowmen. They are essential that they may hear the authoritative voice of God speak to them with compelling power.
Christ Revealer and King

Preach the unseen God, who has revealed Himself in nature, and preach Him also centrally as He has revealed Himself in the Incarnate Word, Jesus Christ. The past declares not man, but the “God-man” is the center of the universe. Not man’s achievements as the source of deliverance, but his potentialities as the power by which we can escape, but the achievements of Jesus Christ and His power are the source of deliverance. For in Him is vested all power and authority in heaven and in earth. He speaks with finality to the soul through his life, teaching, death, resurrection, and session at the right hand of God, that He is the conqueror of all the forces that make for unrest, fear, and uncertainty. He is the great Mediator in matters of rights, duties, and relationships of life and the chief expounder of the Will of God. Upon His propitiation of the wrath of God alone can one abide. He cannot be pulled to the common level. He always must be above. Not through the church or state building upon men is the Kingdom of God to be brought in, but men building upon Him will be instrumental in bringing it in.

So long as He is not acknowledged as King of the Church, and recognized as such in the hearts of men, the process of deterioration must continue. To the extent that He is recognized will it be stopped. The message of the church of the Reformation to that of our day is: Present Christ as the Truth, the Way, and the Life. Man with God shall be supreme over the earth.

Though he is absent from us in body, He is present in Spirit. He is made known through the Word. This Word, says the Reformation, was known in the monastery and not entirely unknown outside it at the time of Luther’s experience. But it was neglected and forms took the place of the essence of religious life. Through the agency of Luther and the invention of the printing press it became increasingly the property of the masses. Thus the eternal foundations of all life were brought again into the foreground. Humanism brought forth the potentialities of men and this world, but the Word revealed the sources of both. This then became normative for faith and conduct. Man for his daily pilgrimage, for his earthly battle-ground as well as for his earthly workshop needs and can have a daily guide, a handbook which is basic to all his relationships.

The Word, Eternal Truth, Interpretation

You of the twentieth century have covered over this revealer of the eternal foundations though your printing presses have multiplied them. Let the light of that Word be uncovered from every pulpit in the land. Open it again in every home. Permit its eternal truth to shine out upon the educational channels of the day. Let its truths be expounded and applied through the great newspapers of the land. Let them magnify the true in morals and ideals. For only as there is corresponding enlightenment on eternal truth can the temporary truths of man be properly appraised and evaluated.

To this age of relativity in morals permit it to speak with the authority of the eternal and abiding character of morality as taught and exemplified by Jesus Christ. Here, too, are eternal foundations.

The interpretation of that Bible is, however, an individual as well as a group affair. The Reformation says again, society can only be safe as the individuals in society are safe. The safety of the individual is dependent upon his relation to God. Man is imperfect and sinful. To be delivered from this and their results he must come face to face with truth. Jesus Christ is the truth. He is revealed in the Word. He must interpret the Word so that Christ may speak directly to him. He needs to rest on God. For this he needs to know the Way to God. The Word of God shows the Way. He needs life. The Word of God shows the Way to Christ.

Society is made up of many individuals. Every individual has an own mind. Hence there are bound to be diversities of opinion. What message does it convey for this difficulty or diversity? The age tells us not by the mind of one alone is the fulness of truth brought, necessary to the redemption of all individual life or society, but through the corporate mind of the family of mankind. Luther’s and Calvin’s mind were prompted by that of Augustine and Aristotle as well as by the theology of their day. The essence of both was only reconciled and perfected by the revelation of God’s Word. The message of the age to our age which seeks to adjust the individual and group relations is: Every man must be accorded the right and each one should seize the opportunity to interpret the Word for himself. No group, be it church or state, has the right to take it away from him, though it may — nay even must — at times condemn the interpretation and thwart its outworking. Every individual who would interpret should be willing to test his opinions by the light of Christ which alone speaks with compelling force. It is the Voice of God. This voice may be heard in history and in the Word. It can only be understood by faith. It must be heard personally to give peace for time and eternity, and corporately for the redemption of society. This is the message of the Reformation to our day and age.
Pure Pacifism

By B. D. Dykstra
Minister of the Reformed Church in America, Orange City, Iowa

The issue is upon us again, in fact, it has always been with us, that tremendous question of war or peace. There are many who would gladly settle down at ease upon the comfortable dictum of an ancient philosopher in Holy Writ, that there is an appointed time for all manner of antithetical phenomena; and among these, for peace and war. Some would have us accept the alternating recurrence of these states of a nation and of the world as but the rhythmical tick-tack of all history. And it is surprising to what wide extent even thoughtful Christians incline to this attitude. Just now, it appears common and convenient to take such a view. Schoolmen do it; and churchmen; and whatever other men there be. Most, perhaps, all men are pacifists—except in war time. This after the model of the would-be saint in the quoted lines:

She never followed evil ways,
Except when she was sinning.

Still, in our time the feeling is abroad in the world and in the minds of men that there is something amiss with this whole business of war. Benjamin Franklin already wittily and pithily observed, that there never was a good war nor a bad peace. This question of war and peace is a great moral and practical issue. The Christian Church might well be notified of such a situation. She has too often been disposed to be haughtily or otherwise naively unconcerned on moral matters. At meetings of consistories, censura morum may still be a formal routine; classical agents of morals have been laughed out of the procedure. May I suggest at least three important problems in this field? Suppose we name slavery, liquor, and war. Lesser trios might be mentioned: dancing, card playing, and lottery. And then an unspeakable social evil might be named, legalized in heathen temples. Probably some would not coordinate slavery, liquor, and war. These three have all wrought much injustice and misery in human affairs and men's lives. There may be those who would not class them in the same category. They would preferably consider them seriatim, or one by one and each upon its own merit or demerit. They fear that certain logical conclusions reached with the one might prove too sweeping for the other.

Slavery, Liquor, and War

Today, all Christians denounce slavery; many condemn liquor; some are strongly opposed to war. We have this “all-many-some” ratio to deal with. We have had the abolitionist, the prohibitionist, and the pacifist. Historically, as great moral issues or matters of human conduct, they have emerged quite in that order. Abolitionism passed from a minority to unanimity; the prohibitionist rose from minority to majority until the recent moral decline reversed the relation; pacifists have till today at best attained only to minorities. In passing, we need but remind how a hundred years ago, abolitionists were a minority. They have proved to be a saving influence that has at last leavened the whole lump. It may well be suggested to all, who would take Christian ethics seriously and who have an open mind for possible progress therein, to review the story of the struggle against slavery. There are dark pages of modern martyrdom, when men like Garrison were in jeopardy of life and property. And then, if we would in the liquor or in the war problem behold another act in the moral drama of humanity, the lessons of these earlier scenes might prove instructive. Any reader taking exception to aught herein written must first definitely accept or reject the parallel we have proposed.

Pacifism and Cowardice

I would speak of Christian pacifism with the same right to the qualifying adjective as it may be used in talking of a Christian school. Some find fault with pacifism because of an inborn aversion to -isms. And yet, such have found in Calvinism a mighty fortress of God. There is pacifism pure and simple. This view of peace has obtained honorable status in history by the practical demonstration of Penn and his Quakers. It was once more beautifully exemplified at the close of the late great war, when the British government called upon the navy to clear the North Sea of remaining mines. The marines thought it a too hazardous venture. At this point, the English Quakers offered his Majesty to undertake the task. The war had been waged and the mines were laid against their will. But they were willing to assume great risk that the seas might once more be free and safe for the intercourse of peace. And yet, an able writer in a Reformed paper quite boldly accused the pacifist of cowardice. They possess no virility or moral stamina, he averred. We regret that men of culture should say such.

Wars Are Wrong Except . . .

Pure pacifism disapproves of all war, and especially of the hysterical and horrifying refined wars of today. The pacifist finds no more place or justification for war than for a duel or a common street fight. And in solemn compact nations have declared that wars lie without the pale and sanction of law. Theoretically and practically, peace and world peace appeal to good men. Ask a million mothers in America and in Japan. True, much prejudice in favor of war lurks in the minds of many men even today. It is quite the manner now to condemn war in general, and then to proceed with one or more glorious exceptions. Every people has some pet war. Ask the Dutch about the Eighty Years’ War with Spain; or an American whether the Revolutionary War should not have been. And then, of course, the Civil War was doubly justified by the preservation of the Union and the liberation of the slave. An Italian Reformed minister has written a noble defence for Mussolini’s war with Ethiopia. He calmly allows that it is for conquest; and then he argues that Italy needs territory and that England and other nations have indulged in such wars of conquest. To be sure, the brother adduced some facts to prove the case. He
stoutly concludes that we better keep hands off these Italians, since they are quite heathenish anyway. All we can do about it is to pray! That, generally speaking, is all that warring powers ask or allow preachers to do; just say prayers, bury the dead, and bless banners.

**Misquoting Scripture**

Abundant proofs for wars, past and future, are found in the Bible. This used to be a favorite way to defend slavery. Of late the method is revived to support the restored liquor traffic. We may yet need it for lotteries and prostitution, etc. Has not our Savior foretold about wars and rumors thereof? Yes, he also told of the betrayal by Judas. But are wars and Judas acquitted by such prophecies? The reader may find his own answers. I am not writing a catechism on these things. Let it be noted that most folks who readily quote Matt. 24:6, hardly proceed to the ninth verse where Christians are spoken of as hated by all nations. Had He there in mind such as might in the course of human events in a warring world oppose those wars? Again let the reader reply.

We may not in this day of growing moral influence forecast the outlook of a movement against war. To be sure, it has gotten under way and has acquired some momentum. Those who attack pacifism have not read the sad heroic story of it, and they have not armed themselves to wage peace. They know not of the 3,000 conscientious men at Leavenworth during the war, nor of the persecution of the Mennonites in South Dakota. Much fault has been found with temporary association of Christian pacifists with other groups who on other grounds opposed wars. The general rule has been ignored that we may cooperate in one point of agreement with those who may differ from us on nine other points. In matters of Christian education, for instance, Calvinists of Holland have voted with Catholics, and the followers of warring groups in Reformed churches have worked together in school affairs. Criticism of this nature launched against the pure pacifist savours of petty meanness and betrays impotence to cope with him in the Christian purity of his convictions.

**A Pacigerent Christianity**

I have ventured but a few random observations upon this movement for peace. Those who are more or less identified with it may well utter the serious Scotchmen's prayer when they petitioned: "Grant, Lord, that we be right for we are very much in earnest." There is a growing mind throughout the world against war. The strength of it may not be known until war might arise. Certain percentages of Christian leaders as registered for definite objection to arms would be sifted considerably when put to the test. May that test be very far hence! Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called the children of God. Even by them of old it was lamented: "I am peaceful, but when I speak, they are for war." Recently a very orthodox writer admonished pacifists to be not so outspoken, lest it might lead the government to still severer methods of warlike preparations! Such reasoning is like the popular logic that Prohibition brought back the saloon. Rea-

I SAW A MAN

I saw a man betray his Lord
For thirty silver pieces,
And seal it with a kiss—a traitor's kiss ....

Not Judas—no!
It was not he.
It was not he.
That man who so betrayed his Lord
Was I.
I was that man.

I saw a man deny his Lord
From nought but shame and fear,
And seal it with an oath—a lying oath ....

Not Peter—no!
It was not he.
It was not he.
That man who so denied his Lord
Was I.
I was that man.

I saw a man hung from a rope,
Dashed to the rocks,
A suicide with outgushed bowels ....

O God! O Holy God!
Who is that man?
What is his name?
Am I, am I that man?

I saw a man in bitter tears
Repenting his denial,
A penitent with outstretched arms ....

O God! O gracious God!
That man, that man am I.
By grace, by sovereign grace,
I am that man.

POENITENTIA.
As Our Readers See It

PROOF READER ERROR

Enclosed please find two dollars ($2.00) for my subscription to The Calvin Forum. I heartily endorse the project from every point of view. I believe the first issue of The Calvin Forum indicates that it is a magazine of a truly high caliber. It answers to a very definite need of the thinking public. Therefore I sincerely hope it may long endure and enjoy a very enviable reputation among periodicals of high standard.

Flint, Mich.
HENRY RADIUS.

P. S. In the November issue the article, “Christian and Pagan Ethics,” by Gordon H. Clark is very fine if it is only an error in printing (page 52, column 2, line 17) where it reads: “Furthermore, since in the Hebrew-Christian system God is absolutely independent...” This probably should have read: “independent.”

(This emphatically should have read: independent. Thanks to subscriber Radius for pointing out an error which escaped the critical eye of editor and printer both. We come ourselves with the thought that the error was of such a nature that nine of the ten readers read the word correctly—though erroneously!—Editor.)

Holy Ire and Mental Inspiration

To say that I am pleased with your splendid venture in launching The Calvin Forum is too mild. I am delighted! I have just had a grand time reading thru the last issue. I enjoy it and thank God for it. It stimulates sound thinking in religion. It stirs the brain and the blood. It contains seasoned food for whetted spiritual appetites, with some less digestible matter thrown in. On one page it aroused the holy ire, and follows with a dozen pages that inspire the mind and spirit to intelligent zeal.

I am intensely interested in the discussion on war and peace in your last issues. You are bringing the issue out into the open court in an admirable way, far superior to the manner in which The Christian Century handles this poignant problem. Would you welcome another contribution to this discussion that would be pointedly opposite to the position of Dr. Pieters and in general accord with the sentiments of Mr. De Boer and Dr. Mulder? I am ready to go to battle in the fight to “wage peace.”

You have begun a glorious adventure in the field of Christian journalism. May God prosper your noble cause as you implement the gospel of personal and social salvation through the medium of the printed page. You may count me as one of your earnest advocates.

First Presbyterian Church, 
Endicott, N. Y.

JOHN ARTHUR VISSER.

Those Poor Ethiopians

I have read so much of what we should do and should not in regards to war, by men who are supposed to know so much more about that which is good and bad, and say so little, that I’m going to tell you some things you don’t have to believe, and if you don’t want to you don’t have to print them either.

You will never prevent a war or establish a permanent world peace with all your discussions, Mr. Preachers, and you haven’t added one mark on God’s score board in your favor with all your efforts. If you don’t believe this, tally up the sinners you have saved from it. “Truly,” Jesus says, “the harvest is great, and the workers few.” What do you suppose he is going to say to them that have wasted his time? Time belongs to God and it isn’t money, — it’s grace. There is still another angle to this. Mainly — that if there was a war declared — Mr. Preacher would be exempt. But what about the poor fellow that has no voice? When they line him up against a wall for your revolutionary activities? Are you going to stand in front of him and catch the bullet that his own government will shoot at him? You say, that’s exaggerating! and too hard to be possible! Maybe so, but it wouldn’t be anything new!

No, the type of Preacher I’m referring to, he won’t have so much to say then as he has nowadays. Yes, I have seen Chaplains on the front line during the war; in fact, I saw a Chaplain conduct a funeral one night, the corpse was barely cold and in a place where death was so close that you feel its presence. The Preachers I’ve been referring to are not the kind that would be able to do these things. To do these things there is more required than to be able to pick God’s Bible apart. This seems all very cold logic but the truth is not always nice. And when the government declares war no matter where, your philosophy will only form a small minority no matter how strong you think it is. No one is convinced against his will and you won’t be able to convince these young men when the flags are flying, bands are playing. No, in a great many cases you won’t be able to hold your own children at home. In the meantime the poor Ethiopian! who started all these discussions — thinking that we knew, in a Christian country, who our neighbor is, — he, too, must show us a wonderful opinion of the American Christian. When a man attacks your wife, or your child, and a friend passes, but does not assist them, I suppose when you pass this friend on the street the next day then you call him “brother!” Who is neighbor to the Ethiopian? the priest, the Levite, or the Samaritan? But what’s the difference anyway? He’s only a heathen! Maybe Mussolini’s gospel is better than ours after all for the Ethiopians.

12551 Carrington Ave., 
Cleveland, Ohio.
WM. HEINS.

(We are quite ready to give space to letters from sincere contributors, whatever their point of view. It is not possible that in this war-peace discussion it is so easy to generate heat rather than produce light, a weakness, by the way, to which both sides of the argument seem readily to succumb. Meanwhile a little more “cold logic” and a little more honest effort to know the will of God as revealed in His Word, rather than gratuitous remarks about “picking God’s Bible apart,” will be very much in order. Both “pacifists” and “militarists” will do others as well as themselves the greatest service in this discussion if the interchange of views is kept on the level of honest, balanced, sincere argument. As for the merits of the issue, we refer the readers to the articles of Dr. Pieters and the Rev. Mr. Dykstra in this issue, as also to the current editorial.—Editor.)

In the light of our faith

By this time The Calvin Forum needs no introduction in our group, and yet I would like to urge all those in our midst who are trying to keep abreast of the leading movements today in religion, economics, politics, etc., to subscribe to this monthly journal, published by the members of the faculties of Calvin College and Seminary. Many a time when reading The Christian Century for the past few years, I have said to myself that it was a pity that we did not have a journal which discusses the very same problems in the light of our evangelical faith. The questions raised by the Barthian theology—a much more important theology than many realize; the problems confronting us because of the failure of our economic system to provide employment for all the people; the question as to whether we have the right as children of God to participate in a war of aggression, such a war as Israel was not allowed to fight after it was established In the promised land; the need of a more critical analysis of the loosely used term “birth control” — all of these problems and many others call for a journal in which there is a serious and many-sided discussion in the spirit of loyalty to the Word of God. Many of us are asking for more light on these subjects.
FINE START

Your periodical is making a fine start. I personally liked the first copy better than the second. The third issue was an improvement over the second. On the whole the monthly meets the need of a paper for the more schooled among us. If you continue your policy of freedom of discussion, you'll render a valuable service, especially to those of our young people who encounter the conflicting philosophies of our day.

Congratulations and success!

Hawthorne, N. J. C. JAARSMA.

A NOBLE VENTURE

I wish to thank you for sending me as an exchange with The Moslem World, THE CALVIN FORUM. I appreciate its visits very keenly and think that you have begun a noble venture. I hope that you will receive the co-operation of all those who hold to the faith of Calvin.

Princeton, N. J. S. M. ZWEMER.

CHRISTMAS GIFT

Enclosed you will find a money order for $4.00 which is the subscription price for two subscriptions to THE CALVIN FORUM.

The first subscription is my own that I have been receiving since September for which I had not as yet paid you. The other subscription I wish to make a Christmas gift to Mr. and Mrs. L. G. Oren, 5800 Wentworth Avenue, Oakland, Calif. I would like to have you send me your regular Christmas gift card on this second subscription along with their first issue (December) to 1628 Church Street, Oakland, California. The subsequent issues of course will be mailed to their address.

Let me add that it is my opinion that your magazine is the most thorough and full-orbed presentation of the cardinal truths of the Christian Faith. It is only in such dogmatic declarations of the Gospel truth that the true Church of Jesus Christ can truly say that it is "contending for the Faith once for all delivered unto the saints."

Wishing you the blessings and the guidance of our Covenant Lord; I am, Very cordially yours, SANKEY OREN.

P. S.—My first copy of THE CALVIN FORUM was read by at least five different people. The other copies are making the round and are being read by the lovers of true Calvinism.

CALVIN FORUM TRUE TO THE "REFORMERS"

Recent issues of the Presbyterian Record and the Evangelical Christian have brought your publication to my attention.

Believing that the hope of the world and of the Church is to be found in the Christ to whom the "Reformers" of the early Protestant Church witnessed, I am persuaded that a publication such as yours may be, has an important rôle to play in present-day theological thought.

I am therefore enclosing $2.00, for which please send, to the above address, your journal beginning with the initial issue.

Fort St. John, B. C., Canada. GORDON A. PEDDIE.

RECENT BOOKS

THE SOUL OF MARK TWAIN


THIS year marks the first century of Mark Twain's birth. It has been the occasion for the publication of several magazine articles and books on this popular American writer, all of which aim at giving not only an interpretation of his genius but also an explanation of what to many seem to be the conflicts of his life and work.

Opinion about Mark Twain has always been varied. The fondness of the reading public for his works is abundantly attested by his popularity and the handsome fortune these brought him. Because of his coarseness his earliest critics, however, were not favorably disposed toward him until at the turn of the century such conservatives as Barrett Wendell and others were honest enough to characterize him, in spite of much that they disapproved in him, as a writer of great literary ability. But this view was too favorable to suit Van Wyck Brooks, a leader in the group of "young intellectuals" as they liked to style themselves, or "literary mohawks" as Brander Matthews called them, who found the atmosphere of Puritan America too stifling for beauty to flourish. In his Ordeal of Mark Twain Mr. Brooks expressed the conviction that the satirist in Mark Twain had been frustrated by the Puritanic and materialistic forces predominant in American civilization, and this view has been echoed in one form or another in most of the text books on American literature since then. The courage and the knowledge needed to discredit this view and to offer an interpretation more nearly based on facts and more favorable to both Mark Twain and America were displayed by Bernard De Voto in his admirable book, Mark Twain's America. And now in this centennial year along comes Professor Wagenknecht of Yale with a new life of the humorist in which he avoids both the disparaging explanation so loudly voiced by the "young intellectuals" and the hostility of the earlier critics, and in which he tells us that pessimism had its roots in a nature that could not brook hypocrisy, injustice, and cruelty.

 Doubtlessly, this view is saner and nearer the truth than that of Brooks and his followers. Doubtlessly, too, Mark Twain deserves credit for having immortalized certain aspects of American life and human nature. But there is his bitter pessimism which caused him, in spite of his fondness of friends and children, to speak of the "damned human race," and there is also his humor. How must this pessimism be explained and how is it related to his humor? One might feel disposed to derive it from his having a keen eye for life's incongruities, but a melancholy as dark and pervasive as was Mark's goes far deeper. The seeing of incongruities may give rise to humor, satire, or tragedy, according as these are viewed intellectually, judicially, or emotionally, but hardly to deep-seated cynicism. Nor can a reference of this cynicism to financial losses, to the depressing effects of oriental travel, and to the death of wife and children suffice. These are but secondary factors which undoubtedly deepened but did not cause Mark's gloom.
Mark Twain's tragic pity for mankind was caused by his determinism, and this in turn was caused by his want of the proper knowledge of God. A keen eye for life's shams, oppressions, and sufferings he most assuredly had, but the best explanation he could offer was that man is an automaton in a mechanistic universe, as he does in What Is Man, and that life is meaningless, as he does in The Mysterious Stranger. A letter of his is extant in which he indignantly charges a librarian that, if his Tom Sawyer and Huckleberry Finn could not circulate, the Bible ought also to be subjected to a process of purging. Nothing could more sadly reveal his want of fine spiritual discernment than this. At another time he wrote that "Nature's attitude toward all life is profoundly vicious, treacherous, and malignant." And this attitude by his own confession "was beneath all his success as a humorist." It is no wonder, therefore, that to a reader with a delicate Christian conscience this attitude is implicitly or explicitly present in most of his works.

Did Mark Twain laugh because he was amused by the follies and foibles of men? Admittedly yes. Was the bitter note in some of his laughter due to his scorn for the pretensions and the cruelties of life? Undoubtedly so. Finally, was not his humor at times the obverse side of his inability to find meaning in life; in other words, did he not sometimes indulge in it in a sort of whistling to keep his courage up?

J. G. VANDEN BOSCH.

LECTURES ON PREACHING


BOOKS, real books with a vital message and written in a fascinating style, are always interesting. But they have never been more interesting than today. Men who are a bit abreast of the times eagerly scan the books that flow from the pens of the religious leaders of this country. There is a stir in the air. The old "isms" that men were so sure about a few years ago seem no longer adequate. Liberalism and modernism with their allied branches of thought are looked upon askance by the very men who formerly championed them. We are living in an age of disillusionment. Lewis, the Niehrurs, Miller, Pauck, Fosdick, and others see no hope in the type of Christianity that modern scholarship has developed. There's a note of pessimism as they realize the inadequacy of their former position. The rock upon which they have stood is crumbling and they have not yet found another rock to stand on.

Among these leaders stands a Bowies. He is primarily a preacher and not a scholar. He sees that the things that were once held as secure must go, but he remains optimistic because he has confidence in the ever renewing Gospel that can be adjusted to any and every condition of men. Preachers are incurably hopeful.

Bowies is rector of the Grace Church in New York City. He was invited to deliver the Lyman Beecher Lectures on preaching last Spring. He accepted the invitation. These lectures now appear before us in book form. It is a very readable book. The style is superb. His convictions are fearlessly expressed. The author has the unique gift of analyzing a situation in such a way as to make his analyses and conclusions usable.

The first lecture is devoted to a discussion of the relationship between a minister and his people. It is an excellent discussion as far as it goes. But it should go farther. A minister is not merely "an individual fortified by a great fellowship and overshadowed by God." He is much more than that. He is a divinely commissioned messenger with God's Gospel of redemption. His significance cannot be expressed in the psychological terms of man to man relationships. His primary significance lies in his God-man relationship. This matter doesn't come sufficiently to its own in the paragraph devoted to the preacher as a man overshadowed by God. Neither is the function of the minister adequately expressed when it is said that "he is to bring a divine awareness, he is to give instruction in religious truth, and he is to communicate a friendliness which encourages, comforts, and helps men to grow."

Dr. Bowie in the succeeding three lectures presents to us the conviction that something must be done. He doesn't feel uneasy about the letting go of the tenets of modern theology. In fact, he believes that we should move on. He is no objector to creeds, if we would have them, but they present the spirit of the men who formulated them. And such formulation was always expressed as an advancement but not as a final step. He is positive that we shouldn't go back to the convictions of men a century or two ago, but should go forward to make new adjustments. But may it not be wise for those of us who are on the wrong road to go back and start from the place where we went to the left? We may go forward best by going backward a couple of thousand years and stand on the ground of the Apostles.

I found the next two lectures most captivating. They constitute an analysis of human nature and its evaluation and of the world recalcitrant over against the Christian ideals. In them the author is justly critical of the various evaluations of men, of the movements that tend to cheapen personal values, and of the world so hesitant to respond to Christian ideals. But here again his treatment stops short of a frank acknowledgement that the world and man with it is in the grip of sin. The fact of sin explains the things that he criticizes and redemptive values only will bring about the cures that he would have effected.

The last chapter is the weakest. It is called, When the New Prophets Come. Bowies is not wistfully looking for some great religious leader to lead us out of the uncertainties of present-day religious thought, as Miller, Pauck, and Niehrur are. In fact, he believes that the men are here now, only to be called to the front when they appreciate the crisis. "The best men will not be drawn into the Church in days of safety. They will be drawn in when there is something noble and worth while to risk." This optimism is committed to the position that great men are largely the product of their age, especially if that age be a bad one.

H. S.

ART IN STORY AND PICTURES


HERE is a history of art that has stood the test of time. It was published more than thirty years ago and is still up to date. Reinach never suffered from the Italian fever, but gave due credit to the Northern Renaissance in France and the Netherlands, and to the influence of the Reformation on Dutch Art. And this is not the only token of Reinach's modernity. Before his death he added a new chapter on modern art, and "revised and corrected many statements in accordance with new discoveries." This volume is remarkable for its terseness, its exactness, its comparative completeness, its humorous and well-chosen illustrations, its handy size, and its fair price.

H. J. V. A.

CONTEMPORARY EDUCATIONAL TRENDS


Redirecting Education really consists of two volumes. For some years a course which was known as Contemporary Civilization was offered by various teachers at Columbia. The volume before me deals with the situation in the United States; Volume Two presents the material on Europe and Canada.

The most excellent feature of this book is that it is not narrowly and technically a treatise on education. The object of the authors is much wider than that. They have tried to analyze and so to understand our modern civilization and the place
that education should occupy in it. The volume is consequently of very great value for many besides technically trained educators. It should interest them, to be sure, but also all those who wish to know about the character of our present civilization, and its direction. In fact, it is a very excellent way for the average man to get acquainted with what is going on in our present world.

The redirection of education consists in an emphasis on the social aims. The title of the first section by Tugwell is "Social Objectives in Education." I know of no better comparatively brief account of the contrast between our present industrial civilization and that which obtained in the earlier part of our history. The contention of Tugwell is that the doctrine of lasseiz-faire permeated all of our earlier civilization, and that certain attitudes and estimates and characteristics have resulted. The distressing thing is that we have passed on to an industrial civilization in which those attitudes, estimates, characteristics no longer serve the true end. It was perfectly right to glorify independence, when one could be independent in an agrarian civilization. But now we must work for something else.

Tugwell's main thrust is that we must get rid of lasseiz-faire and substitute for it the social outlook. In the past one believed in individualism and independence, (which meant, let every one do as he saw fit without interference) but today, because every one is so closely bound up with all others, there must be a different emphasis. There must be control through taking into consideration the whole life of the people rather than the individual alone. The elective system in education was only one expression of this doctrine of lasseiz-faire.

We must strive for that which is the common good and not the individual good alone. That is the position of Tugwell. Does he then have a definite pattern for the socially desirable end? No. What has been in the past is no longer adequate today, but what the future should be, he refuses to state. In fact he takes strong issue with Counts, who thinks we should inculcate definite social objectives, and so indoctrinate the youth. Both Tugwell and Counts want a very definite emphasis on the social aspect. Counts has particular objectives, but Tugwell will not have this at all. Tugwell wants only experimentalism on the social level. That is why he maintains that though the trend is toward collectivism, the alternatives are not either Fascism or Communism.

The views of the other writers in the volume agree substantially with Tugwell. There are three excellent sections on the teaching of Economics, History, and Political Science. If one is perplexed about the New Deal let him read this volume. All the leaders in Washington seem to want what Tugwell wants, only they express themselves much less coherently and consistently. The criticism of the Supreme Court as being of the horse-and-buggy days is right there. Only in this volume it is spoken of as the "homestead" days.

A DUTCH REFORMED THEOLOGIAN


URING the lifetime of Maresius the Christian world was agitated by numerous movements that were of first-rate importance to the Reformed persuasion. The Thirty Years' War was devastating Germany, France saw the gradual diminution of Huguenot privilege, the Stuart rule in England was interrupted by the Cromwellian period, and the United Provinces were in almost continual conflict with Spain. Arminianism disturbed the Netherlands; Independency grew strong in England; Amyraldism spread among the French Protestants; the Jesuits were successful in France, Germany, commerce, and even amalgamation of all Protestant

if not all Christian Churches; and Cartesius was publishing his new and disturbing philosophical speculations. The Netherlands were not only centrally located, but were at the same time the leading Reformed commonwealth, and in the Netherlands Maresius was one of the foremost Reformed theological and ecclesiastical leaders.

He was a fighter. His natural gifts made it possible, and the task of defending and maintaining the Reformed position on so many fronts made it unavoidable that he should become such. Most deplorable and least excusable were his long polemics and disputes with Gisbertus Voetius, his great associate in the defense of Reformed orthodoxy. Maresius' ceaseless disputes with one prominent person after another have brought it about, that he is traditionally looked upon as one of the best examples among the Reformed of the least lovable trait in the old Protestant theologians.

This biography is corrective of that tradition. It is honest: it by no means obscures the faults and weaknesses and sins of Desmaets. It is fair: it takes proper account of the circumstances and of the methods of his opponents. It is appreciative: it saves from forgetfulness the manifold constructive services Desmaets rendered his students and the churches, the friendly relationships which he maintained through the long years of his professorship at the university of Groningen with most of his colleagues and with many other prominent men besides, the notable attachment and enthusiasm which he evidently knew to inspire in his students, and the not exactly rare instances in which he manifested appreciation and tolerance toward others with differing views. Maresius appears to have been a sturdy and able champion of the Reformed position in a combative, conceited, and quarrelsome age, the faults of which age he shared.

Our readers will be interested to know that Dr. Nauta has just been appointed Professor of Church History at the Free University to succeed Dr. H. H. Kuyper.

D. H. Kromminga.

A CROSS SECTION OF MEXICO


THIS is a moving tale of contemporaneous Mexico. The revolution, the persecution of the Roman Church by the government, Communism, the Evangelical Church—these are presented here as woven into a fascinating story. There is passion and movement on every page. The author is himself a Mexican. Evangelical Christianity is championed over against atheism, unbelief, and the Roman Catholic system. At times one wishes that the Evangelicalism woven into this story might be a little more evangelical. Two extracts that challenge: "We cannot better the social order unless we convert individuals—leaders and led; unless we ourselves are converted." "Lupita gave all her fortune for her cause in New York, and that cause was Communism. Shall we spend less for a greater cause, even the cause of our Lord?"

C. B.

HOME MISSIONS

TOWARD A CHRISTIAN AMERICA: THE CONTRIBUTION OF HOME MISSIONS. By Herman N. Morse. New York, Missionary Education Movement, 1935. $1.00.

THERE is a revived interest in Home Mission activity in a number of denominations. The depression has occasioned some stagnation in this field, but it has also led church leaders to think more seriously of the challenging task to bring the gospel to those who live without Christ at our very doors. It is well to read books like this one and Home Missions Today and Tomorrow, not because one agrees with all that is proposed but because these books are very informing on Home Mission conditions and problems which the Christian Church must face.

C. B.
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