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Hands off Christmas

FOR weeks prior to the twenty-fifth of December we are permitted to forget Christmas not even for a single day. On the twenty-sixth we emerge from what has been called the Christmas Spirit and proceed to forget all about it—as far as those to whom we are indebted for our Christmas indulgence will allow. However, the values of the day should be far more important and should last much longer than that. Our attitude in this matter has been persistently prospective and rarely retrospective. The latter usually gives us a far saner perspective of the entire matter. As we see it now it was the merchants that proved to be the real beneficiaries. It was a day in which humanitarian and social agencies took advantage of the spirit and practiced their theories. We may be happy to take note of the fact that business spurted and that the cup of the milk of human kindness seemed to overflow, but we should deem it tragic that we have forgotten what it really was all about. Via the press and the radio we were regaled with deeds of love and cheer. We listened to songs in which the melody rather than the sentiments proved to be effective. We busied ourselves about the temporal and material, and, of course, received values that failed to abide. We forget because we receive only passing things. One of our difficulties lies in the fact that the Church has been and is surrendering the day to commercial and humanitarian interests. Of all the great days of the year, she should zealously guard this one and claim it as her own and dedicate it exclusively to the Son of God. It is His day—His birthday. All other interests should be told to forget about it on the twenty-sixth.

H. S.

Authorities on God

ABOUT a year ago Leuba, the psychologist, interrogated via the questionnaire American scientists as to their belief in God. He found that 38% of the physicists believed in God, 27% of the biologists, 24% of the sociologists, and 10% of the psychologists. Now this survey would be as innocent as it is useless, if it weren’t for the fact that the atheists and the agnostics point to these statistics with unjustifiable pride and that many are regarding belief in God as an indication of mental mediocrity. What are these figures worth? They are worth a good deal in the evaluation of the mental bent of the scientist. They are worth nothing at all for the determination of the existence of God. There is a peculiar American naiveté, which manifests itself in the position that when a man is an authority in one field, he is so in all. We prize Jack Dempsey’s opinion about matters that have nothing to do with pugilism. We cherish the ideas of Henry Ford about problems which are very remote from automobiles. We might as well ask a preacher for an authoritative statement on matters of finance. The only authority on God is, after all, God. “No man knoweth the Son, but the Father; neither knoweth any man the Father save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal Him.” The scientist as a scientist has no authoritative statement to make about God. Such statements can be had only from the man through whom God speaks.

H. S.

A Comment on Leadership

OUR Roosevelts, our Borahs, our Hoovers, our Thomases, our Coughlins, our Townsends, with their frequently contradictory programs, compel us to reflect on the nature and quality of leadership. To what extent are not these leaders but the mouthpieces for the expression of the loud, discordant, strident tones that well up from the millions of our people, representing the desires, the fears, the hates of the several groups or classes in our population? Do the combined voices of the few leaders do much more than give utterance, give direction to these many pleas, griefs, charges? Is not theirs but another clamor, more clearly enunciated, more pointed perhaps, but clamor still?

Do not these leaders reveal the almost insurmountable obstacles to real leadership? They do reveal how easy it is to be led by the followers rather than to lead, merely to protect something already achieved rather than to advance, to “wrap up something in a napkin” rather than to put it to use, to rely on the sidewise glance rather than the forward look, to think of the present pattern of the institution rather than of the needs of the individual, to think in terms of oneself as leader rather than of the true needs of follower and reader alike, indeed, to advance oneself in spite of follower or of the need that evokes the leadership itself.

Times like the present bring out strongly the tendency of the leader to reveal his own limitations, to proclaim his own feelings, his own emotions. How difficult for the leader to be a real instrument and to regard himself only as such! To be a fit instrument he must see beyond himself, beyond his class. He must envisage the particular need or desire in its setting of
the general good. His must be the backward glance that surveys all of the past. His must be the forward look that makes the future real. Caught up in the meshes of particular events, himself an expression of "time," he must nevertheless have his eyes fixed on the eternal. He must give ear to Bismarck's advice: "A statesman can never alone by his own efforts accomplish anything; he can only wait and listen till he hears the footsteps of the Almighty echoing through the changing events, then spring forward and grasp the end of His mantle — that is all." If he is inclined to regard this as fatalism he must know that the footsteps of the Almighty are always there to be heard, that if his ears are attuned to their coming they will hear.

H. J. R.

The Impossible

MIDST the din of rising controversy voices shout into our ears the positive, presumably final statements, "This is impossible," "That will never work." In periods when changing conditions have subjected the existing social and political framework to almost unbearable strains, such pronouncements have issued from the mouths of the exponents of both the old and the new. When the old, meticulously regulated guild system was giving way to a new order, those who shared the well-established point of view predicted that new ways of meeting the needs of the hour would mean certain disaster. Those insisting upon change, upon industrial freedom, were just as positive that only the new way would mean successful adaptation of man's life to changing conditions. In the nineteenth century the latter, in turn, rose in righteous indignation when because of changed conditions new leaders announced the need of trades unions, labor legislation, and other social reforms to meet the need of the hour. Both the advocates of reform and those resisting reforms were sure that they were right. Both insisted on particular modes of procedure, the one group even insisting upon theirs as demanded by natural law. The coming year will furnish evidence of similar positiveness on several fronts in the American political campaign.

Now, if there is any one interesting truth that history establishes, it would seem to be this that what was thought to be impossible has frequently turned out to be quite possible. The fact is that the positive, extremely dogmatic statements made in the past were as a rule one-sided, contained in them much of the truth but not all. Moreover, these statements were made concerning human life, a fact not always kept in mind. Economic activity is primarily human activity; economic affairs, economic laws are not natural in the sense that chemical or physical phenomena are natural. It is of the distinctively human that what was intimated above is so true: what seems impossible may, however, be quite possible. It is almost a commonplace to repeat that human life presents us with a paradox, but perhaps not quite so trite to say that what is true of life itself is true of our economic affairs.

The Christian, certainly, should be the first to proclaim the paradox. Preeminently true of spiritual relations, this may be and is true in much larger measure than we are wont to think of all of human life. What we think cannot be, may be or will be. The need of the hour is careful weighing of every program, even if one-sided, supposedly all-inclusive or final, the testing of each in the light of actual present conditions and needs, the testing of each on the basis of what is just, not only in terms of existing economic and legal institutions, but also in terms of what is eternally right and just. Were we to do that and were we able to choose that which is most just, the paradoxical character of life would stand out indeed. Much that we would we cannot do, but much that we think we cannot we can indeed do.

H. J. R.

When Professors Speak

SINCE March, 1933, our nation has moved in many new directions. What was formerly considered folly has been done, to the delight of some and to the deep regret of others. One of these amazing departures is that the "professors" have had their inning. Men of high scholastic and academic rating have sat in the inner circles which govern the destiny of the people. One need only call to mind Tugwell, Moley, Fisher, among a long list of others who have advised the President on many important issues.

And what has been the reaction? That these professors have been mistaken on certain points and have ill-advised is not the only complaint. The criticism was not that a particular measure advocated by an individual professor was wrong. It was to be expected that some of their plans could not be carried out. But that a wholesale condemnation of the "brain-trust" should follow is quite unreasonable.

To be sure, the advice of professors has not generally been sought in the high places of government in our history. We have entrusted the government of our nation to those who had been successful generals in war, or had become prosperous in business. Government was in the hands of practical men. When then the professors take their place in the inner councils this constitutes a real departure.

But does that make it wrong? Is it not high time that a little more intelligence be applied to some of our problems than has been done in the past? What we need is not only good men in high places (let alone the politicians of inferior grade), but men of trained and well-stocked minds.

The wholesale condemnation of the professors and the "brain-trust" may not go unchallenged. This does not mean that the views of any one professor who has been or is in the inner circle need be accepted. But it does mean that in a democracy we cannot have a general indictment of all those who have had special training in the problems of government and finance.

Too often the cry is to get rid of them all and, of course, to turn things over to the practical men of affairs.

It is amusing and at the same time very discouraging to find that these general accusations are made. Don't men see that it is folly for us to spend millions on educational institutions and at the same time to ridicule and laugh out of court the very individuals whom we expect to train the youth of the nation?

The remedy is not to ignore the professors as impractical idealists. We need men of real intelligence in the government of our democracy. But what is still
more necessary is that the “brain-trust,” so-called, be composed of men who have a definitely Christian outlook, and that their programs be tested in the light of the high ethic of Jesus and Paul.

R. S.

Christian Political Action

One of the crying needs of today is organized Christian civic and political action. Especially those who name themselves after Calvin have ever championed the God-given task of applying the principles of the Word of God in their bearing upon government into practical action and concrete organization. This is a huge task, beset with numberless difficulties. But the immensity and the difficulties of this task should not make us shrink from it.

One of the reasons that even Calvinists have done so little in the sphere of political action in our land is found in the fact that we are better theorizers than organizers. Before any organization gets under way among Calvinists (is it only peculiar to those of Dutch extraction?), there invariably ensues a period of wrangling about the Constitution, about some abstract principle and its various applications and implications. If we were as good organizers as we are debaters, what wonderful organizations we would have!

It is hopeful to note that in different communities steps are taken from time to time to come to the organization of the Christian citizenry of such communities in order to mobilize for Christian civic and political action. For one thing, it must be clear to all who take this task seriously, that the most sensible way to begin is by organizing locally. We sometimes hear bloated arguments for a national Christian Political Party. Combining a little sanctified common sense with our Christian idealism, it soon becomes clear that the way to undertake this God-imposed duty of exerting a Christian influence upon government is by beginning right close to home.

It is gratifying to notice that efforts of this kind are being put forth in various communities. Wherever people are imbued with the Calvinistic conception of an all-inclusive Christian life to be dedicated to God, sooner or later the idea of Christian political organization and activity is translated into reality. The latest organization of this kind has just been called into existence in Passaic County, New Jersey, the county in which the cities of Paterson, Passaic, and Clifton are located. Its name is: The Independent Citizens’ Forum of Passaic County. Its officers are: J. Hamersma, President; C. Jaarsma, First Vice-President; N. Prins, Second Vice-President; T. De Rose, Secretary; C. S. Greydanus, Corresponding Secretary; H. Wiegers, Treasurer; Edward Meima, Sergeant-at-Arms. A Publicity Committee consisting of H. Brandes and C. Fortuin, is active in stirring up interest in the cause.

The Calvin Forum is deeply interested in such activities and our pages are open to the discussion of the larger issues arising from such political organization. The coming months will see in our pages a number of discussions bearing upon the political problems which we are facing in the arena of our national government. But also the questions as to the most effective organization of the Christian forces in our local communities will come into the purview of our discussions, we trust.

We must move forward, both in our discussions and in our organizations.

C. B.

Economic Aspects of the New Deal

Theodore J. Kreps, Ph.D.

IN SPEAKING of the economic aspects of the New Deal one can always arouse interest by expressing approval or disapproval, but detached analysis and scientific appraisal require first that the phenomena be identified and correctly classified, and second, that every effort be made to hew to the line of impartial evaluation, fall the chips where they may. This is, of course, a difficult procedure, not only because the trees are so near at hand as to obscure the contour of the forest, but primarily because that which one sees is in part determined by that which one is looking for. The New Deal like all other contrivances of human brain or brawn, is probably both good and bad. It may well have less menace and evil in it than those of conservative persuasion hope or at least profess to fear. It will undoubtedly not be as commendable in many respects as enthusiastic supporters of the administration would make us believe.

Economic Interest Generated

On one matter, however, there can be little disagreement. The New Deal has generated enormous interest in economic problems. The American people are aroused as never before on questions of economics and government. They are doing more gesticulating, more arguing, and more thinking than they have done for many years. Thomas Carlyle in his famous account of the French Revolution states that even the humblest Frenchman living through the stirring events of that time found a personal greatness in just being a contemporary. All Americans have at times recently shared this feeling. They, too, have been contemporaries of great and stirring events — events of which few, if any, know the meaning and none the outcome, least of all those who shout the loudest, whether alarmists or apologists. The drama has been confusing and bewildering, even though to all there has come at times a vivid, almost palpable feeling of not only being a first-hand spectator, but in fact an actual participant. In the depths of 1932 the American people wanted a leader and clamored for action. They not only got one leader but several: professors, politicians, ex-army men, career men, bankers, lawyers, gentlemen andburgers. In an ever-changing pageant, these have had their brief hour and passed behind the scene, — into editorial chairs, or back to classes and offices, — out of the public view.
None the less, despite considerable changing of the cast the action has gone forward with fairly consistent development. While the audience were at first docile and bewildered, they have of late been doing no small amount of questioning and occasional cat-calls have been heard. More than a year ago from under a brown derby came the side-whisper of "Boloney!" at the financial table. The critics both favorable and unfavorable have divided themselves into leagues. All along there have been serious debates about the constitutionality of parts of the drama, and last May a substantial part of it was voided in the famous Schechter decision. Various other integral portions will have to pass before the bar of the Supreme Court, as well as of public opinion. How much will remain when the voters go to the polls in 1936 is hard to conjecture.

The New Deal Alphabet

Be that as it may, when the curtain was raised on March 4, 1933, the people's clamor for action was abundantly answered. Tremendous things began to happen—all banks were closed and most of them re-opened, Congress was summoned in special session, extraordinary powers were conferred on the President. Functions of agencies at hand, such as the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, were extended and various new agencies launched. Even a bare list of the more important ones is staggering.

A.A.A. Agricultural Adjustment Administration
C.C.C. Civilian Conservation Corps; also Commodities Credit Corporation
C.W.A. Civil Works Administration
F.A.C.A. Federal Alcohol Control Administration
F.D.I.C. Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation
F.H.A. Federal Housing Administration
F.E.R.A. Federal Emergency Relief Administration
F.F.C.A. Federal Farm Credit Administration
F.H.L.B.B. Federal Home Loan Bank Board
F.S.C. Federal Securities Commission
H.O.L.C. Home Owner's Loan Corporation
N.E.C. National Executive Council
N.R.A. National Recovery Administration
N.S.B. National Security Board
N.Y.A. National Youth Administration
P.A.B. Petroleum Administration Board
P.W.A. Public Works Administration
R.E.A. Rural Electrification Administration
R.R.A. Rural Resettlement Administration
T.V.A. Tennessee Valley Authority
W.P.A. Works Progress Administration

In addition the administration sequestered all the gold, cut the content of the standard dollar, and cancelled the gold clause in all contracts and securities. It put the Government into the business of financing industry, farms and homes. In industry, in order to bring about the civilization of competition and of monopoly, something a generation of anti-trust legislation had failed to do, it conferred the right of self-government on industrial groups, who under Government control, had enlarged powers to fix prices, wages, profits and labor relations. In agriculture, besides taking over the financing of farmers, the Government has rented land to keep it out of production, paid owners not to plant crops, and taxed consumers for the benefit of producers. It has spent stupendous sums on public works, work relief projects, and related activities. When to these colossal undertakings are added such comparative incidents as the repeal of prohibition, the drastic control of the issuance and sale of securities, the recognition of Russia, the complete reorganization of banking supervision and the Federal Reserve System, the consolidated control of communications, and reciprocal tariff bargaining, the panorama—unfolded is indeed a drama of gigantic proportions with economic consequences of vast complication and magnitude.

An Economically Consistent Program

Accurately to assess the results and evaluate the merits of any one of these measures is a task well beyond the competence of any one person at the present time. Wholesale approval or condemnation of the program in all its details is, of course, out of the question except for political mountebanks in and out of office and economic charlatans writing what they are paid to write. But there are at least two or three questions or aspects which responsible thinkers in my judgment can well discuss with profit.

The first question is, is the New Deal an economically consistent program with mutually supporting parts or do these many measures constitute merely an opportunistic hodgepodge?

Despite many but in my estimation minor inconsistencies I believe that in its major outlines the economic program of the New Deal forms an integrated whole. Its objective seems to me, to quote Professor Norman J. Silberling, of the Silberling Research Corporation, to be that of "lessening inequalities of wealth, removing disparities between economic opportunities of various groups, easing the burden of private debt, and diminishing the amount of waste and loss occasioned by exploiters, promoters, and gamblers. Whatever misgivings one may have regarding the wisdom of this political trend and in particular the regulation of prices and price levels, it is most important to recognize the fact that the program is a coordinated unit and it is not going to be possible to do much to prevent the introduction of the essential parts of any measure which fits into this program. We as a nation do not have to repeat our mistakes forever for the benefit of promoters and exploiters."

The economics of the New Deal while best expressed in the writings of the eminent British economist, John Maynard Keynes, upon whom has fallen the mantle of that great group of economists from Ricardo to Alfred Marshall known as the classical school, is by no means new or untested, neither in the arena of serious economic discussion nor in the governmental practice of advanced civilizations in Europe. On the contrary it is an economics that, beginning by way of protest against the evils of early English industrialism, has grown by more than one hundred years of contribution to one of the most important, if not the most important, body of economic doctrine today. It has long since triumphed over the obsolete and untenable principles of Ricardo or Herbert Spencer.

Sismondi and the New Deal

While important portions of it go back to Adam Smith, the founder of economic science, one of the best early expositions is to be found in the writings of the Swiss economist, J. C. L. Simon de Sismondi. I refer in particular to his Nouveaux Principes d'Economie politique published in 1819. Permit me to quote certain typical passages:

"The accumulation of wealth in the abstract is not the aim of government, but the participation by all its citizens in the pleasures of life which wealth represents. Wealth only deserves the name when it is proportionately distributed," vol. 1, p. 9.

"Should the government ever propose to further the interests of one class at the expense of another that class should certainly be the workers," vol. 2, p. 250.
Again he answers the contentions of doctrinaire individualists by saying

"there would seem to be a natural identity of individual and general interests, for does it not rest upon the two ideas, (1) that 'each knows his own interest better than an ignorant or a careless government ever can' and (2) that 'the sum of the interests of each equals the interest of all?' Both axioms are true. Why then is the conclusion false? Because of the unequal distribution of property and the resulting unequal strength of the contracting parties. The interest of each to avoid the greatest evil rarely coincides with the general interest. The interest of the day laborer undoubtedly is that wages should be sufficient for his upkeep and upbringing of his children. It is also the interest of society and of the employer. But it is the interest of the unemployed to find bread at any price, and of the employer to stave off impending bankruptcy. Hence low wages, long hours, and other industrial evils."

He sums up his recommendations to government by stating

"Crises are due to the unequal distribution of revenues, i.e., underconsumption" ... "Since the causes of the evils existing at present in society are (1) the absence of property and (2) the uncertainty of the earnings of the working classes, all government action ought to be concentrated on these points," very prophetic.

It is particularly interesting to note that when Sismondi addressed himself to the problem of suggesting concrete measures he advocated first, granting to labor the right of combination, i.e., full trade-unionism; second, the abolition of child labor; third, reducing the number of hours worked; and fourth, establishing what he called a "professional guarantee" whereby the employer would be obliged to maintain the workman during periods of illness, unemployment, or old age.

Flesh and Blood—Steel and Iron

The last principle while eventually developing into the great ideal of social insurance, was in reality a plea that labor as a factor in production should be treated as considerately as machinery, plant, or other capital. Why shouldn't employers be compelled to keep the same accounts for human life and blood they use up as for the steel and iron they consume? Don't they keep repair accounts for machinery? Why shouldn't every state compel them to keep them for human beings? Don't they keep depreciation and obsolescence accounts so as to be able to replace the equipment junked by the onward march of technological progress? Why not similar accounts for skill used up or junked by the same force? Don't they put machines on a fixed income basis, paying the bondholders who contributed them to the enterprise whether the machine works or not? Why shouldn't labor likewise be on a salary basis? Certainly their need for steady incomes is fully as great and fully as important for the smooth functioning of the economic system. In short, why not treat flesh and blood as considerately as steel and iron? The additional emphasis which these questions acquire when the fact is considered that consumption depending primarily on labor income is the "neck of the bottle" in realizing the advantages of modern mass production is obvious.

Brief as the hints given above are, may they suffice as do the bold strokes of a Frans Hals to make clear the outlines of the structure of economic theory which the New Deal embodies. Further reflection can easily supply other needed details. The cardinal economic principle is that of remedying underconsumption, i.e., increasing and protecting through the multiplication of wealth by cooperative effort the incomes of those whose incomes were reduced to distressingly low levels by the speculative promoter madness of the "New Era," that is, increasing the incomes and wealth of farmers, laborers, small investors, home owners, bank depositors, consumers of utility services, etc.

What is Laissez-Faire?

The second question upon which I tentatively wish to assume a position is, does the New Deal involve in the main a departure from the principles of laissez-faire. It is my belief that it does not.

By laissez-faire I mean, of course, what the principle has always meant, to scholars, or as Professor O. H. Taylor puts it in The Economics of the Recovery Program, p. 175:

"If we translate laissez-faire as 'let alone' it never meant that the government should in all matters let business alone, or let the people as individuals or as groups and classes alone, in their business dealings and relations with one another. It meant, rather, that the government should compel all classes and individuals to let one another alone, or keep their hands off of wealth belonging to others, or refuse to let itself be used as the agent of any group seeking to gain at the expense of any other."

The implication here is clear. The principle of laissez-faire emphatically does not mean "no government in business." That slogan is a radical anarchistic doctrine. Non-interference with their business is something for which outlaws and racketeers yearly pay millions of dollars.

On the contrary, laissez-faire is the practise of the athletic field or the race track where to realize the noble ideals of fair play, equal opportunity and justice, referees continuously exercise control over competitive activities in order that a maximum of liberty may be enjoyed by the contestants. So that each may secure the maximum individual reward appropriate to individual ability and individual effort, lanes or areas are marked out within which competitors must stay. In order to ensure a better playing of the game all the rules, no matter how old, are regarded as being constantly on trial and changed when necessary by the rules committee which meets regularly for that precise purpose. Vociferous mouthpieces of prejudice arguing that the rules should be sacrosanct despite the human cost are looked upon either as insane or ridiculous. In short, as Adam Smith points out on nearly every page of his famous Wealth of Nations, it is precisely the function of government to govern, to prevent force and fraud, to keep the hands of stock brokers off of the investments of small investors, to protect the savings of depositors from the mistakes of bank officers, to help save the homes of small homeowners, to help laborers secure a fair price for their labor despite their helplessness, farmers a fair price for their product, etc.

Our Economic Overlords

One of the modern forms in which economic domination insidiously regiments the lives of millions is that of large aggregations of capital. An economic imperium in imperio is now matching strength with the people and their government, beginning to wage a contest that is highly reminiscent of the bitter conflicts between Church and State one hundred years ago. This economic power entrenched behind special privilege, monopoly, and control of the strategic industries is using the cloak of liberty to conceal exploitation. It argues for economic competition but in reality de-
sires free play for modern Tamarlanes or Napoleon to build economic empires. The former is much to be desired, the latter requires vigilant control.

To quote Professor Taylor again:

"Most actual business competition is a mixture in some proportion or other of true economic competition, that is, rivalry in efficiency of service to the public and competition for customers, with the voluntary patronage of the public with the Machiavellian rivalry for power to manipulate markets, deprive the public of alternatives or mislead it in its judgment of alternatives and obtain the rewards, not of superior efficiency but of superior strategic power and position. This second type of business rivalry frequently entails the use of pressure upon the government for removal of legal impediments that stand in the way of the designs of one business faction, or creation of new legal obstacles to block the designs of the opposing faction; but whether it entails this or not, in particular cases the end sought — the spoils of victory in a struggle for power — and the means employed — manipulation of opinion, maneuvers putting opponents and often sectors of the public in positions permitting only a choice of evil, surprise tactics and the like — in all cases make this kind activity describable only as the politics of business, not economic competition."

It is precisely this politics of business which we are now witnessing on a gigantic scale, and it is precisely these propagandists of economic domination that most roundly denounce the New Deal and all its works. That they do so in the name of laissez-faire is indicative in part of their own ignorance, but mostly of the amount of ignorance and credulity which they assume to exist in the public. It is much to be hoped that Lincoln's maxim about all the people not being capable of being fooled all the time proves correct.

**New Deal Not Revolutionary**

So far as the economic scientist and the intelligent business man are concerned, they see in the New Deal, in the words of Mr. E. A. Filene, the well-known Boston department store executive,

"merely the full blossom of a finer repugnance against the license of catch-as-catch-can business. Since Poet's factory act in 1802 Anglo-Saxon annals have been the record of a struggle between the ethical susceptibilities of the community and the brutal application of so-called natural economic laws. I warn the conservatives that many of the apparently revolutionary aspects of the New Deal are not revolutionary at all but merely a revival of old restraints . . . I think it only fair to the government to say that the limitations imposed are largely the result of abuses which have developed under laissez-faire. Although these limitations are profoundly irritating to the business man, particularly in view of the fact that they are new they do not vitally impair managerial liberty. The government has left business ample latitude for the exercise of discretion."

In short, the program of the New Deal is in practically complete harmony with the traditional American philosophy of laissez-faire as expounded by Washington, Jefferson and Lincoln. The program is, of course, not in harmony with the swashbuckling individualist—anarchistic caricature of the principle that became current in business thinking in the piratical '80's and '90's when the great natural resources of the United States were given over to exploitation by gigantic combinations and trusts. This period, which Professor Taylor has well called "The Tragic Era," was the ideological father of the apparently revolutionary era of the New Deal. Its ideals, and its ethical appeal to powerful monopolistic groups but they are neither in conformity with the ethics of the Constitutional Founders nor in harmony with the principle of laissez-faire. In fact they are diametrically opposed to both.

**Sound Democracy and the New Deal**

In so far as the New Deal calls us back to the fundamental democratic principles of Jefferson and Lincoln and repudiates the fascist doctrines of Chief Justice "Two-Gun" Fields, of the railway promoters of the 1890's, the trusts of the nineties, and the stock speculators and public utility empire builders of the New Era, it is calling the American people back to the true ideals of democracy. For one of the essentials of democracy consists in asking about the purpose of our common arrangements. Our revolutionary fathers in a day of legal formalism raised the challenge, What is our legal system for? Their answer was equality before the law. In the stormy eighteen-thirties our grandfathers applied the same question to the matter of education. What is an educational system for? Their answer was equality of opportunity to secure an education. Now many thinkers are applying the challenge of the democratic ideal to the economic and business system. What is an economic system for? Why these resources, this abundance? Why a productive organization? What other purpose save that it will afford a maximum of opportunity for the maximum number of persons to obtain food, clothing, shelter and that well-rounded development of individual personality in adjustment with the social background, and that knowledge, self-discovery of abilities, and utilization of special artistic and other skills which cumulatively make a great civilization? Such at any rate is the democratic answer and such is the direct concern of practically everyone of the many new alphabetical administrations created by the New Deal.

In conclusion I want to be especially emphatic about one thing: I have not tried to assess the economic merits of the program as a whole nor of any of its parts. It should be unnecessary for me to make clear that I also have nowhere expressed approval or disapproval of the program, either in whole or in part. I have merely contended, first that the New Deal embodies in the main a consistent, coördinated structure of economic principles, second that it is squarely based on the oldest of American traditions, namely laissez-faire and democracy in their real sense as conceived by Adam Smith, Jefferson, and Lincoln. Whether you approve or disapprove of the New Deal depends on whether you actually know and approve of these principles and ideals.

**Will It Work?**

Whether or not the New Deal will work is an altogether different question, and one upon which in many respects, notably the silver program, the Civil Works Administration, and other make work attempts, I have serious misgivings. Whether portions such as social security legislation, stock market control, devaluation of the dollar, etc., which have worked elsewhere will work in the United States where business enterprise and one of the great political parties is so largely a-social in its thinking is again subject to doubt. Whether democracy itself is able to survive is seriously questioned by not a few. At any rate we shall see. But to the scientist it is of first order of importance that he allocate the stirring events of the last three years to their proper genus and species of economic and political device and doctrine so that no valuable objective evidence concerning their worth and practicability shall pass unnoticed. And it is my contention that the New Deal represents an attempt to apply, and will furnish a test of the validity of the economics of the Sismondi-Hobson-Keynes school. It also provides crucial evidence on whether capitalism, laissez-faire, and democracy can co-exist and survive together.
Calvinism and Islam

Samuel M. Zwemer, D.D., F.R.G.S.
Professor of the History of Religion and Christian Missions, Princeton Seminary. Editor of The Moslem World. Formerly Missionary in Arabia and Egypt.

ONE of the most interesting developments in the religious thought of Europe is the revival of Calvinism and a renewed interest in its historic significance.

Pastor Daniel Couvé, the Secretary of the Evangelical Missionary Society in Paris, in a public address after the Jerusalem Council meeting, used the argument, "we believe in Missions and world evangelism not only because we are Frenchmen and because we are Christians, but more especially because we are Calvinists." "It is not a mere coincidence," writes a French historian, "that the French Reformer, Calvin, is considered the most faithful interpreter of the spirit of Paul's Gospel, and that St. Paul has always been held up as the very incarnation of the spirit of missions." Doumerc in his life of John Calvin explains, "Who first penetrated the virgin forests of the new world to carry the Gospel to the savages, was it not Brainerd and Elliott, both Calvinists? All the heroes of the 18th and 19th centuries of Protestant Missions were disciples of the same Calvin — Carey and Martyn in India, Moffat and Livingstone in Africa, Morrison in China, and Paton in the South Seas," (Doumerc, Jean Calvin, IV, p. 454). Calvinism then was not static but kinetic — not only a creed but a missionary program.

Froude on Mohammed and Calvin

Now it is remarkable that as far back as 1871 in an address on Calvinism delivered as Rector of St. Andrews, the historian James Anthony Froude, called attention to the strange parallel between the Reformation in Europe under Calvin and that in Arabia under Mohammed. Islam, indeed, as Bancroft remarks, is the Calvinism of the Orient. It, too, was a call to acknowledge the sovereignty of God's will. "There is no god but Allah." It, too, saw in nature and sought in Revelation the majesty of God's presence and power, the manifestation of his glory transcendent and omnipotent. "God," said Mohammed, "there is no god but He, the living, the self-subsistent, slumber seizeth Him not, nor sleep — His throne embraces the heavens and the earth and none can intercede with Him save by His permission. He alone is exalted and great." It is this vital, theistic principle that explains the victory of Islam over the weak, divided, and idolatrous Christendom of the Orient in the sixth century. "As the Greek theology," so Froude remarks, "was one of the most complicated accounts ever offered of the nature of God and his relation to man, so the message of Mahomet, when he first unfolded the green banner, was one of the most simple: There is no god but God; God is King, and you must and shall obey his will. This was Islam, as it was first offered at the sword's point to people who had lost the power of understanding any other argument; your images are wood and stone; your metaphysics are words without understanding; the world lies in wickedness and wretchedness because you have forgotten the statutes of your Master, and you shall go back to those; you shall fulfill the purpose for which you were set to live upon the earth, or you shall not live at all," (Froude, Calvinism, p. 30).

And then he goes on to say, by way of correction: "I am not upholding Mahomet as if he had been a perfect man, or the Koran as a second Bible. The Crescent was no Sun, nor even a complete moon, reigning full-orbed in the night heaven. The light there was in it was but reflected from the sacred books of the Jews and the Arab traditions. The morality of it was defective. The detailed conception of man's duties inferior, far inferior, to what St. Martin and St. Patrick, St. Columba and St. Augustine, were teaching or had taught in Western Europe. Mahometanism rapidly degenerated. The first caliphs stood far above Saladin. The descent from Saladin to a modern Moslem despot is like a fall over a precipice. But the light which there was in the Moslem creed was real. It taught the omnipotence and omnipresence of one eternal Spirit, the Maker and Ruler of all things, by whose everlasting purpose all things were, and whose will all things must obey," (Froude, Calvinism, pp. 37-38).

"Liever Turksch dan Paapsch"

The Reformers themselves felt that Islam with all its errors and its Arabian fanaticism was closer to the truth than the Medieval Papacy. The Dutch in their struggle with Spain chose for their motto, "Liever Turksch dan Paapsch"— Rather the Turk than the Pope! You may still read these words and the symbols that accompany them on the carved pillars of a church at Middelburg. Islam was long considered a Christian heresy, and so should be approached.

In one of his letters Erasmus actually proposed that "the best and most effectual way to overcome and win the Turks would be if they shall perceive that things which Christ taught and expressed in His life shine so much bright and clear, that people would also go with them who will to know them. Therefore the best thing we can do, is to attempt them with epistles and some little books; ..." Calvinism and Islam have indeed much in common. Both are opposed to compromise and all half-measures. Both were a trumpet-call in hard times for hard men, for "intellects that could pierce to the roots of things where truth and lies part company."

Intolerance is sometimes a virtue. The very essence and life of all great religious movements is the sense of authority; of an external, supernatural frame-work or pattern to which all must be made conformable.

The Will of God Supreme

Calvinism and Islam were neither of them systems of opinion but both were attempts to make the will of God as revealed (in the Bible or in the Koran) an
authoritative guide for social as well as personal affairs, for Church not only, but for State. They both believed in election and reprobation, dependent on God’s will, not on man.

Calvinism and Islam have at their very core the principle of a claim of finality and universality, and it is this principle that is the very basis of a missionary religion. Paul’s theology and soteriology made him a missionary — drove him across all racial barriers and compelled him to set forth Christianity as final and triumphant. The strongest plea for missions is the will of God for the whole world. We can only have a passion for the glory of God when we acknowledge His sovereignty in every realm of life.

Again, singleness of aim is a mark of leadership, and in this respect Calvin and Mohammed were born leaders. As Barth expresses it: “Calvin first had a theme and then thought of its variation; first knew what he willed and then willed what he knew.” The same might be said of Mohammed. The genius of spiritual conquest is the consciousness that God is commanding the battalions, that the issue is not uncertain, and that the goal is God’s eternal glory. More than a century ago, James Montgomery, a true Calvinist, closed his great missionary hymn, beginning, “O Spirit of the Living God,” with the stanza:

“God from eternity hath willed
All flesh shall His salvation see;
So be the Father’s love fulfilled
The Saviour’s sufferings crowned through thee.”

Our American statesman, John Hay, a century later, interpreted in true Calvinistic fashion the prayer, “Thy will be done,” in his great hymn, beginning: “Not in dumb resignation we lift our hands on high.”

With God’s sovereignty as basis, God’s glory as goal, and God’s will as motive, the missionary enterprise today can face the most difficult of all missionary tasks — the evangelization of the Moslem world. The survival of the unfittest by election and by grace. It is in this arena that “Greek meets Greek,” and then comes the “tug of war.”

**Calvinist Missionaries to Islam**

God in His sovereign Providence and by His Holy Spirit has led the Reformed and Presbyterian Churches geographically to the very heart of the Moslem world. For more than one hundred years they, and they alone, have challenged Islam in the very lands of its birth — in its cradle and strongholds. They, more than other branches of the Church, were pioneers in the world of Islam. Jessup, Van Dyck, Dennis in Syria, Shedd and his colleagues in Persia, Lansig, Hogg, Watson in Egypt, Forman, Wherry, Ewing in North India, Keith Falconer, John Young, Peter Zwemer, Henry Bilkert in Arabia — to mention only a few, who have passed on to their reward.

It is still true, (as Professor Lindsay stated at the meeting of the Reformed and Presbyterian Alliance in Glasgow) that “the Presbyterian churches do more than a fourth of the whole mission work abroad done by all the Protestant churches together.” The Calvinistic churches entered the world of Islam earlier and more vigorously than any other group of churches. The first missionary to the Turks was a Reformed preacher, Venceslaus Budovetz of Budapest. He was born in the year 1551, and belonged by his religion to the *Unitas Fratum*, which was a branch of the Hussite Church in Bohemia. He was very faithful and a zealous member of that Church. Having spent more than ten years in Western Europe either at Protestant universities, especially Reformed, or in travels, he became a very strong and convinced Calvinist, and became acquainted with some of the most renowned evangelical scholars and religious leaders of his time. (See *The Moslem World*, Vol. XVII, pp. 401 ff., where we have a sketch of his life and influence by Professor Josef Soucek of Prague.)

**Benza, Du Plessis, and Budovec**

Among these friends were Theodore Benza of Geneva, the French Reformed lawyer Philip Mornay du Plessis, the Basel Reformed theological Professor Cryneus and also one of the Lutheran theologians, David Chytraeus, who had part in composing the famous Lutheran book of symbols, *Formula Concordiae*.

Vaclav Budovec lived in Constantinople from 1577 to 1581. He sought opportunity to win back apostates and to preach to the Turks; but he was staggered by the power of Islam. “I have been not a little in temptation,” he wrote, “seeing how these ungodly Turks prosper and that the noblest parts of the earth where God himself walked in human body . . . have been conquered by them in an incredibly short time.”

In one of his letters sent to his son in later years, he mentions the fact that he actually did win one Turk for Christ. Budovec wrote a number of books in the Czech language, one of them being called “Anti-ala-Koran.” It is a defence of the Christian faith and a refutation of Islam. This book is very rare, but copies are found in the University and other (private) libraries in Prague. Here we have the first Christian apologetic written by the Reformation Church for Moslems.

Nor can we forget that the Reformed Churches of South-Eastern Europe were the bulwark against the invasion of Islam for centuries. Again we note that in Java and Sumatra the Reformed Churches of the Netherlands have had more converts from Islam than any other Mission in any part of the world. Over 62,000 living converts from Islam are connected with the various missions in Java alone. These missions cover territory which has a population (almost solidly Mohammedan) of nearly forty million souls.

**Our Responsibility**

As regards America, it is not without providential significance that when the world of Islam faces a crisis and affords the Church a new opportunity, Reformed and Presbyterian bodies together have the strongest and widest work in four of the great lands of the Moslem world: Egypt, Syria, Persia, and Arabia. “The union of the United Presbyterian, the Reformed, and the Presbyterian Church,” says Dr. Robert E. Speer, “would bring a new joy and faith to the Church which today has responsibility for the strongest mission work in the world for the evangelization of Mohammedans.”

God’s providence has indeed led the children of the Covenanters, of the Huguenots, of the Dutch into the very heart of the world of Islam. Its old historic cities are mission stations of our churches: Alexandria, Cairo, Khartoum, Beirut, Damascus, Aleppo, Bagdad, Busrah, Mosul, Teheran, and Tabriz. The Arabian mission of the Reformed Church and the South Arabia
Mission of the Scotch Church have marched around Islam's Jericho and their trumpet gives no uncertain sound. The walls of Arabian intolerance and fanaticism have already fallen before the medical missionary pioneers of these Churches. But there are whole provinces of Arabia still unoccupied and vast areas in Africa and Asia where the missionary has never entered. This is the missionary challenge to the Calvinists of today. A challenge to dauntless faith and indiscourageable hope and a love that will not let go. Think of Afghanistan, and western Arabia; of Russian Turkestan, parts of Siberia, Bokhara, and the Crimea! Of Tripoli in Africa, the French Sudan, which fields together have a population of nearly forty-five millions — all these are a call for those who have Paul's ambition and Calvin's courage to preach the Gospel, "not where Christ was already named, that I might not build upon another man's foundation; but, as it is written, 'They shall see to whom no tidings of him came, and they who have not heard shall understand.'" But we need men of blood and iron for this spiritual warfare. True disciples of John Calvin.

LEADERSHIP

Johannes Broene, A.M.
Professor of Education and Psychology, Calvin College.

WHY do men think of adventure only in terms of doing something, doing something physically, doing something spectacular, going up into the stratosphere, exploring the Gran Chaco, climbing Popocatepetl — that sort of thing? Was not the life of St. Francis one continuous adventure? Yet he was one of the gentlest of men, who preached to the birds instead of shouting at them. I dare say for many people the only adventure Lavoisier ever had came at the very end when he mounted the scaffold to die. I doubt he thought so. Surely, to discover the real nature of combustion is about as big an adventure as can come into one man's life. Who questions that exploring the River Doubt was one of the greatest adventures in Theodore Roosevelt's life, but to how many has it occurred that getting his first spectacles and seeing for the first time with his myopic eyes this wonderful world as we see it, must have been one of the most thrilling of all his many and varied experiences.

Adventure Without Sensation

Adventure is not necessarily doing things. It may be merely seeing them. Unquestionably one of the chiefest of adventures is for the first time to set oneself over against the universe and see oneself distinct from everything else in it, for the first time, as Fichte phrases it in philosophical jargon, having one's ego posit the non-ego. Or as Barrie expresses it poetically, he, that is Tommy, "stumbled and fell into the daylight."

Let no prosaic soul tell me that my boyhood reading of Robinson Crusoe was no adventure, that it was Robinson who had the adventure, that I only stared at the printed page. He is badly mistaken. Whatever may be true of him, I did not merely read of Robinson's adventures, I lived them. I trolled, I suffered, I planned, I feared, I hoped, I rejoiced with him. When he came upon that ominous footprint in the sand the hair on my head rose with his. Even now my heart beats a beat at the sight of the imprint of that naked foot. Oh, no, not only they who go to the ends of the earth to do things have adventures. Many of us who have led outwardly prosaic lives have had our share of thrills. I shall never forget reading a good many years ago Hibben's little Problems of Philosophy. It was my first book dealing with that subject. A whole new world opened before me. It was like Balboa standing on the heights of Darien and seeing the Pacific in all its majesty at his feet.

There are adventures of the mind as well as of the body. I had one only this past summer. I read Macaulay's History of England. I had previously read a chapter here and there, but not till thus recently did I read it through from beginning to end, volume by volume, ten in all, in the edition that stands on the mantle over our hearth.

Now, as a matter of fact, Macaulay's England is not a history of England at all, though he planned one beginning with the reign of James II. Unfortunately Macaulay died before quite finishing the reign of William III. Since William succeeded James on the throne, Macaulay's book covers only two reigns.

James the Stupid

Not possessing Macaulay's marvelous memory, a memory which William James would have characterized as "like wax to receive and like marble to retain," I realize I shall forget much, most even of what I have read, but I am certain also that so long as memory serves me at all, I shall never forget two things, namely: the colossal stupidity and stubbornness, the intolerance and at least occasional pusillanimity of James; and the amazing sagacity and penetration, the tolerance and never-failing heroism of William. It is this that makes Macaulay's England so enthralling. The book is a study in contrasts. I doubt that in all history we have two other monarchs reigning in immediate succession that represent such extremes of ability, character, and temperament as do these twain.

Indeed, there is something so vast about the witlessness and obstinacy of James that it gives the man a certain distinction. I once thought that of all the fools who have sat upon thrones Rehoboam was chief. That is why on an earlier occasion I applied to him the stinging words which our great American philosopher, Mr. Dooley, used to characterize a contemporary, namely, "if he had a little more sense he would be half-witted." I now realize that I should have saved the picturesque and utterly annihilating phrase for James. He has been denounced as mulish, but to say that is to slander mules. A mule, says a Dutch proverb, does not stumble twice over the same stone. If that be true, then mules profit by experience, something James, at least in his regal capacity, never seems to have done. To his dying day he kept on repeating the self-same stupidities with the self-same obstinacy. Lessons he did not lack, lessons bitter and hard, but profit by them he could or would not.
William — Sagacious, Tolerant, Heroic

What a contrast is William! He had a frail body. There was always something the matter with him. But that frail body housed a heroic soul. On the battlefield his subordinates always had difficulty in keeping him out of the thick of the fight, and William having a mind and will of his own, they by no means always succeeded. His associates always again were amazed with the man in defeat. Invariably he who in daily life was taciturn, sometimes even morose, in defeat became cheerful, his spirits rising in proportion to the magnitude of defeat. Neither was there in this man a vassal of the French king. There was always something the matter with him.

But that frail body housed a heroic soul. In daily life was taciturn, sometimes even morose, in defeat became cheerful, his spirits rising in proportion to the magnitude of defeat. Neither was there in this man a vassal of the French king. There was always something the matter with him.

His tolerance was rare. It was genuine tolerance, for he had convictions of his own. A Calvinist, he wanted others to have the same liberty of conscience he demanded for himself. One regrets to add that though William aroused opposition by insisting on freedom of worship for papists as well as for dissenters, the former rewarded him by plotting against his life.

But it was especially in the diplomat's closet that William's genius shone its brightest. Macaulay says flatly that William was the greatest diplomat of history. This was, of course, before Bismarck, but even Bismarck would have found in William a foe worthy of his steel.

Surely, William of Orange was Holland's greatest gift to England.

The Value of Leadership

While reading Macaulay I was impressed anew by the tremendous significance for a country of its leadership. When James fled the country England was in a sad state. The royal court consisted of sycophants, bootlickers all. The judges were corrupt. Of all English judges the worst in history was lord chief justice during James's reign. The man was everything a judge should not be — coarse, sensual, brutal, cruel, vindictive, grasping, cowardly, corrupt, unjust. It was Jeffreys, a devil for wickedness. The navy, then as now, England's chief arm of offense and defense, was honeycombed with graft. Abroad the name of England was held in derision, and, in very truth, James himself was little more than a vassal of the king of France.

When William died all this had changed. True, there were still bootlickers at court as there always have been and will be, but William knew every single one of them, and, what is more, knew them for what they were. The law courts had been reformed and once again enjoyed the confidence of the people. The navy had been reorganized. Abroad the name of England was held in both fear and esteem. So far from being a vassal of the French king there was no sovereign in all Europe for whom Louis cherished such a wholesome respect as he did for William.

Leadership — Hitler Style

Oh, for a William or two to-day! No, the world lacks not leaders, but whether are they leading? Italy has her Mussolini, Germany her Hitler, leaders both. But William they are not. William was content to deal as a constitutional monarch, but Il Duce and der Fuehrer are tyrants, and tyranny grows by what it feeds on. No free spirit can be other than stifled in the Italy and Germany of the present. Returning tourists tell us of improved material conditions, but since when can man live by bread alone? Ichabod, the glory of Germany has departed. In the land of Luther there is no freedom of conscience. Were it not for the fine and heartening heroism of the clergy, Catholic and Protestant alike, Germany now would once again be largely pagan. The glory of her universities has vanished. Where is your German professor's proud boast of Lehrfreiheit, the freedom to teach truth as he sees it? What American would care to study at a university whose professors may teach only what the nazis permit them to teach, and must teach what these same nazis order them to teach?

Even your German student, hitherto always a free spirit, now is told, not by university authorities but by the central government, just what clubs he may and may not have, what uniforms (student uniforms) he may and may not wear, and, to crown all, is clapped into jail if he ventures to raise his voice in song while the sacrosanct Fuehrer happens to be spouting into some microphone in Berlin.

Surely, unless the German people have degenerated into Nietzschean herd-animals, one of these days with their Schillers, and Fichtes and Schurzes at their head, they are going to rise in their might to smash der Fuehrer with his Goerings and Goebbels and Mullers and their whole blatant and blasphemous gang. May God in that day show them the mercy they denied to His ancient people and all those who were brave enough to antagonize tyranny.

Our Own Roosevelt

As for our own country we have in Roosevelt a born leader. Personally I am sympathetic to much in the man. Who is not captivated by his manifest kindliness? Who can help but admire his gallant spirit? Who that is not an arch-conservative does not glow with pleasure at the man's readiness to welcome new ideas and new approaches to old problems? Indeed, there is little that will please me more than that history eventually should give him a prominent place among the world's great leaders. I am aware, too, how exceedingly difficult it is to appraise one's contemporaries, especially one's countrymen, and deeply conscious, moreover, of my own incompetence to do just that. Nevertheless, rightly or wrongly, I am not yet convinced that Mr. Roosevelt is possessed of that transcendent capacity for leadership that characterized William.

However this may be, the great need of the world is leaders, leaders with indomitable courage, outstanding ability, a profound sense of justice and of righteousness, a selfless interest in forgotten men, and the fear of God Almighty engraved upon their hearts.
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THE CONTINENT OF HEART

I.
I who am called the slave Ezekiel
Have felt the weight of God's almighty hand.
The blazing words I speak are His command;
This is the vision that He bade me tell:
Man's pride has budded forth into a rod,
Has stretched a towering bean-stalk to the sky;
In arrogance man boasts with swollen cry
That he has searched out heaven and equals God;
Disdaining meekness as a weakling's part
And humbleness as something to despise,
He wraps his haughtiness in thin disguise
And calls it wisdom as it puffs his heart.
This lofty pride that towers to the sky
Shall be the Haman gallows where men die.

II.
These words of violence are not my own
In amber clouds of light God came to me.
O Son of Man, he said, behold and see,
Then cry aloud like cymbals striking stone.
This pinch of dust, this narrow chain of bone
Has made itself the measure of all things,
Has crowned itself as lord and king of kings
And tries with puny fist to shake My throne.
Man seeks to build his own defence from death
But every wall is frailer than his breath;
He is deluded by a foolish lie.
O Son of Man, why will this people die?
He speaks of peace, but peace shall never be
Until he turns with humble heart to me.

III.
I trembled at the words and was dismayed
I knew my own conceit and bent the knee;
Then I heard angels sing His majesty,
Their silver wings the harps on which they played.
O Son of Man, said God, the little brain
Has broken open music's hidden sphere,
Has harnessed space till heaven holds no fear
And all the sea's white horses rage in vain.
With such small victory man is content.
The continent of heart is deep and wide.
Who conquers this and learns to vanquish pride
Has won a triumph past all wonderment.
Humility is not a beggar's role.
The greatest man has meekness in his soul!
Rembrandt Van Rhijn
1606-1669
H. J. Van Andel A.M.
Professor of Dutch History, Literature and Art at Calvin College.

The most famous of our day, and more famous even than Raphæl, the perfect painter, and Michael Angelo, the mighty universal man, ever were. The most celebrated of all the world's geniuses. The artist with the greatest individuality. The painter of the profoundest mystery and the most dramatic tragedy. The visionary who did not know how to live and yet knew life perfectly. The creator of a new brush technique, color tache, i.e., the method by which the stroke makes line, and color, and light. The father of Impressionism, in which the twilight is not used as a transition, but as a magical source of light. And the father of plein-air, full sunlight, luminism, in which the objects float no longer in half tints, but in a flood of noonday splendor. These are some of the titles given this giant of the ages, this descendant of the mystery-loving Calvinists, and of the vitalistic Dutch of the seventeenth century, in whose honor Amsterdam had an exhibition during the summer of 1935, and Chicago exerts itself in our present winter season. It is time for the Reformed people of Holland genealogy to wake up to their cultural heritage, and to ask themselves what the Shakespeare of the pictorial art has to do with Calvinism, and why he is the man of the hour.

Rembrandt and the Depression

Why is Rembrandt in the limelight to-day? It is because we are in the sad thirties, in the days of depression. The two new modern schools of Impressionism and Expressionism are on the wane. After the war of 1870 had spent itself, and the nations had begun to wake up to a new task, art also clambered for originality. These were the days of l'art pour l'art, of art without ethics, of art without feeling and personality, of ruthless technique and scientific application, of naturalism poured out in laboratory experiments, of the exact analysis and reproduction of impressions, of psychological situations, of sociological and pathological problems. It is true that painters discovered new tones and new hues, and that writers learned to express themselves in new idioms and images, but it was painful to observe that art became cold and intellectual under the lash of the whip of the natural scientists.

Then followed the revolt against this one-sided word-artistry and pale color parade, under Cezanne and Vincent van Gogh who clambered for passion, creative force, short-lived sensations, expressive and factual distortions, loud colors, heavy lines, neglect of perspective and third dimensions, ridicule of commonplace and conventionalism, the glory of restlessness and dissonants, symbolism and overtones, jazz and close harmony, till the whole earth burst into a terrific war which almost murdered civilization.

And now we are depressed and, therefore, ready for a return to the old masters. Realism and idealism have had their days. It behooves us again to listen to the geniuses of the past, to be appreciative and eclectic, to study Rembrandt and Hals; Bach, Beethoven, and Brahms; Leonardo da Vinci and Michael Angelo, Velasquez and Raphæl. There is a new humanism in the air, a respect for human values, for righteousness and faith, for mystery and religion. Indeed, Rembrandt has found his admirers everywhere. It is in vogue now to have a smattering knowledge of his life and works.

Rembrandt and Calvinism

But what has Rembrandt to do with Calvinism? First of all, he was a product of the so-called golden age, in which the Calvinists of the Netherlands led the whole world in the scientific study of theology, in colonization and world trade, in the spiritual and natural sciences, in painting and music, in hydraulic engineering and horticulture. What would secular life have amounted to without the rise of the Church? China and Japan, Hindostan and Abyssinia give us the answer. But just as certain it is that the rise of the new cultural, ntic life would have been impossible without the Reformation, and especially without Calvinism. After all, the Italian Renaissance, though it broke the chains of the Church, did not break with the ascetic outlook of Plato and Augustine. There was no real progress in the sciences. The arts remained impersonal, stylistic, decorative, imitative, olympic, ultra-objective. It was the iconoclasm in the Netherlands in 1566, says Scheffer, that brought about the real break with antiquity and with the Middle Ages. After this there was room for something new, terrible though the momentary outburst may have been. Henceforth, there was going to be personal research and original thinking in and outside the universities, and in the arts there was to be personal inspiration, individual vision, creative imagination, and expression of sorrow and victory.

Indeed, the curse of modern art, be it impressionistic or expressionistic, is that there is too much group spirit. It is tremendously difficult even to distinguish the great leaders. But in seventeenth century Holland there were dozens of outstanding geniuses each with a distinct art, and towering above all the rest stood the ominous looking, but great-hearted Rembrandt. This is the application of Calvinism, and its belief in personal election, religious as well as cultural. Calvinism is the belief which exalts God to the highest, and humbles man to the lowest degree, but just for these reasons it believes not in drab institutionalism, but in personal faith, personal conversion, personal calling, and personal victory.

Not only is this personal or human element seen in Rembrandt in such a way that almost any child can recognize one of his wonderful works, but his genius reveals itself also in the different periods of his artistic life. We shall pass by the period of his apprenticeship, or if you will, his Italian or Baroque period, in which he perhaps imitated the style of Caravaggio, Raphæl, Titian, and Leonardo, for the works of this stage are lost, either because Rembrandt destroyed
them, or because they are such excellent copies of Italian masters that they cannot be recognized as Rembrandtesque.

Rembrandt's Development

His real first period might be called the Saskia period, though it started in Leyden four years before he moved to Amsterdam. He painted many portraits of self, of his parents, of relatives and friends, of Saskia, and of numerous others. Typical for this period is the half light on the face, the shadow on the eyes, and the grey green tone which is so prominent in Simeon in the Temple.

In his second period he became more daring in the narrowing of the light funnel, sometimes covering only an eighth of the canvas, and in the drawing of a chocolate brown or purplish black velvety magic circle of chiaroscuro which seems to be full of a golden dusk, if one has patience enough to wait for its appearance. To this period belongs his famous Sortie, generally called The Nightwatch, which ruined his reputation though it has been called the world's most famous picture. It seemed that he was goaded on by his genius and could not stop. When customers failed to turn up, he began to draw the common people, especially the older folk, many of them Jews and Jewesses. For many mystically-minded persons this period of despair and somber colors forms the acme of Rembrandt's career, and whatever art one may prefer, it must be acknowledged that sorrow and tragedy deepened his work and made him into a full-orbed artist. To this period belong the Christ at Emmaus, the Holy Family (Rembrandt drew his beloved Saskia several times after she departed), many landscapes, and the illustrious etchings of the Three Trees and of the Resurrection of Lazarus.

Rembrandt's third period is the one of the warm maroon chiaroscuro with the Raphaelite gold and the Breughelian red. In those years the painter enjoyed the friendship and love of a noble soul, Hendrikje Stoffels, whom he could not marry for a certain clause in Saskia's will. She was a young woman of no education, or social standing, but winsome and comely, and with a business instinct which did not save him from bankruptcy, but which put new courage in his heart and new prosperity in his home, when everything seemed to have gone wrong. In this period Rembrandt painted the glorious portrait of burgomaster Jan Six, his protector, and the world-wide known Dutch Masters.

Rembrandt Calvinistic

But his genius was not exhausted with the twilight. After the death of Hendrikje Rembrandt developed the new technique of plein-air or full sunlight, with which Vermeer has been credited, and which eighty-year-old Hals also seems to have followed. Rembrandt's chiaroscuro pieces are lighter than the one of the preceding period, e. g., Pilate washing his hands, and the Jewish Bride. But besides those he has also paintings which remind us strongly of Hals, though we know that Hals traveled to Amsterdam, and we do not know that Rembrandt traveled to Haarlem. I mean works like the Praying Woman in The Hague, the Old Lady in Brussels, and the Portrait of a Man which has become so famous in our States. Even in his preceding years there are several paintings which point in the same direction, so that it is very well possible that Rembrandt discovered the method for which Vermeer and De Hooch have become world famous during his second period of prosperity.

Rembrandt is credited with having laid the foundation for the two modern schools of Impressionism and Expressionism, though he is neither coolly intellectual in his chiaroscuro, nor fantastic or wild in his plein-air. The remarkable idea, however, that stands out in Rembrandt is not so much his modern color schemes, which Hals had made possible through his focusing, visual union, and sacrifice of circumferential detail, but much more the profoundly human element which made Rembrandt Rembrandt, and which distinguishes Nordic art from Italian art. Southern art, be it classical or Italian, is superhuman, detached, aristocratic, objective, platonie, olympic, in a certain sense we may even say, pagan. But the art of the North—Rembrandt above all—is human, vital, democratic, in touch with the home, personal, full of the sorrow and joy of life, because the Northern painters believed in sin and salvation. The art of Rembrandt is Calvinistic.

DIVINE PROGRAM

Thru the hush of the vibratile ether, Static crackled and screeched and lashed, Rococo with jazz intermingled, Near rended my soul with its blast. Perservering, my fingers kept turning, Till from the dilations of sound, A chord trebled gently around me, Empyrean strains had me bound. Thru the maze of insurgent enigmas, Bewildered, but still dialing on, Wretched from dire indecision, Youth grapples the great pro or con. Generator of unending rapture, Mighty God of the Holy Three, Give heed! Send the Spirit's dilation To bind them as Thou hast bound me.

HENRY R. IDSINGA.

TSCHAIKOWSKI

And when this Russ rips, with his fire and thunder, The surface of the vast, tone-pregnant sea, Breathing his haunting pathos-passions under, Those dynamos of rare sublimity, The ocean roars with weeping hallelujahs; And as my soul dives in this tonal deep, It shivers with a joy that makes it weep.

If Bach could hear these Bach-less beauty-billows, So liberated and un-corset-ed, Would he then long for his own fettered phrases (Less liberal though not less exquisite) Or would he too for hours and hours just sit Spell-bound, lest he should miss a note of it?

ALBERT PIERSMA.
As To Limitation of Crops

Paul De Koekkoek
Minister of a Rural Church, Otley, Iowa

This is not the place to discuss whether limitation of crops is a paying proposition for our farmers. That question has been debated elsewhere and that ad infinitum. Happily many farmers themselves have lifted this problem out of a mere material setting and have inquired concerning its moral aspects. They have not only asked whether curtailment of production is right or wrong, but they have also given the answer; they have practiced it in cooperation with the familiar government experiment largely identified with the Agricultural Adjustment Act. Many Christian farmers have answered the question in the affirmative. We are inclined to take the same position although with certain qualifications. Why?

A pertinent consideration here is, that it is man's task to cultivate the earth, to bring it unto productivity. He is told to be fruitful, to multiply and to fill the earth. This in order that he may dress the earth and keep it. Doing so he is stimulated by the immediate purpose to provide for his own house, and by the ultimate aim to glorify Him out of whom and through whom and unto whom are all things. In this task he enjoys the response of nature, whence it has been observed that he that will not work shall not eat, and that drowsiness shall clothe a man with rags. It is man's task to make the earth yield its fruit, and the Christian farmer takes it to hand in a most direct way, desiring to do so in cooperation with Him who made the earth and maintains it through His power from day to day.

Using His God-Given Discretion

In this task he must use his God-given discretion. He is created an intelligent being equipped to bring his judgment to bear upon the labors of his own hands. An exalted position is assigned to him according to Psalm 8. Of man it is said: "Thou crownest him with glory and honor. Thou makest him to have dominion over the works of Thy hands; Thou hast put all things under his feet." He is king under God and, in a way, His manager. Not in independentence from God but in intelligent cooperation with Him, discerning and doing the will of his Master with understanding.

In a two-fold way the farmer receives direction from his God. Directly, through Revelation, he is informed, for instance, that he should work six days and rest on the seventh. Indirectly, he observes God's laws in nature and adapts himself to them. Says Isaiah: "Doth he that ploweth to sow plow continually? doth he continually open and harrow his ground? When he hath leveled the face thereof, doth he not cast abroad the fitches, and scatter the cummin, and put in the wheat in rows, and the barley in the appointed place, and the spelt in the border thereof? For God doth instruct him aright, and doth teach him." And then Isaiah continues and pictures the farmer threshing his seeds and grains as it should be done, stating finally: "this also cometh from Jehovah, who is wonderful in counsel and excellent in wisdom." The God-given wisdom of the farmer is proof positive that God very efficiently attends to world affairs. In agreement with this the Christian farmer does not aspire to lay down the laws of nature, but he endeavors to discover them. Even a master mind like Burbank must be instructed by God; he must master the lessons the Creator has given him to learn. Isaiah pictures the man who succeeds to the extent that he knows what and where and when and how to sow and to reap. The farmer is introduced by him as the man of discretion.

The Right to Limit Crops?

It is a pertinent question, however, whether this discretion should also determine (insofar such is possible) how much he should produce, whether it also implies the right to limit his crops. I believe this discretion on the part of the farmer implies this very thing. There is room for balancing production to the point of limitation. Limitation of production is nothing new; it has been practiced in several spheres in a varying degree without serious objection. In industry working hours have been shortened to reduce production. The farmer himself has practiced limitation of production, even he who may have conscientious scruples against the present government measures. He cuts down the size of his garden as the membership of his family becomes less. He does not raise more horses than he considers profitable. He leaves "that sandy knoll" idle, since he knows that it does not pay to work it. He would gladly quit working at four or five in the afternoon like his city cousins if he only could do so. He even limits the size of his family, and legitimately so, when mother's health makes it imperative. He does not consider it his duty to produce as much as possible of all things all the time. He does not shrink from stopping production completely and from forsaking the farm altogether when he believes that he can "no longer make it."

What the farmer has done and may do is much similar to what the storekeeper does, nobody questioning its propriety. No one finds fault with the latter when he estimates the extent of his business and stocks up accordingly. But are not farmers' crops under Divine control? So are the customers that come to the storekeeper. Yet this does not forbid either one of the two to use their common sense in the direction of their business.

What farmers have always done individually may be practiced in unison. Concerted adjustment of production may be plain business foresight. Particularly when they find themselves in an emergency.

As an Emergency Measure

Emergency, necessity, is a possible justification for turning from the usual way of doing things. That is why Joseph was justified to buy all of Egypt of the Egyptians for Pharaoh, why David took the bread from the consecrated table, and why the owner rescued his ox from the pit on the Lord's day. Necessity may justify the husbandman to narrow the bounds of his productive fields.
What constitutes an emergency calling for united limitation of crops? It may be necessary because of an oversupply of perishable goods, as a result of which they would go to waste. If the farmer has reasonable assurance that he cannot sell the normal yield of many acres, he should reckon with that condition of the markets and cut down his acreage accordingly. Spoiling of goods and loss of capital invested is reason sufficient to take that course.

Oversupply and a Fair Price

A subsequent drop in prices, also of non-perishable products, may intensify the need of limitation of crops. It is not certain whether "cost of production plus a reasonable profit" is the best formula to cover the farmers' just due. It is possible that their cost of production must be cut down instead of prices raised. The proper proportion between the cost of other commodities and those produced by the farmer is essential. Nevertheless the farmer is entitled to a fair price for his products, that is, the price should be in harmony with what it costs him to produce. Not, of course, as if he has rights before his God, but in his relation to his fellowmen. Oversupply may so depress a market that men simply will not give him a fair price for his products. Yet that is the reward of his labor. He is worthy of his hire. This hire is his daily bread or that which is needed to clothe himself and his family. The only way to give it to him may be through removal of the over-supply by curtailment of production. He who would not grant the farmer that right holds, in effect, the food must be cheap to the point of ruining its very producer. Let such a one remember that since the cry of those who mowed the fields (farm laborers) have reached the ears of the Lord Sabaoth because of wages kept back by fraud, a similar cry must have entered Heaven from farmers from whom has been kept back, also often by outright fraud, a fair price for the things they produced in the sweat of their brow.

Sub-Cost Prices and Crop Curtailment

And it is not only a matter of his daily bread; it touches his future occupation also. If he does not receive a fair return for his labor, he cannot continue to produce. Underpayment of farmers must stop production. Such must affect society as a whole adversely. "The king himself is served by the field." Things out of balance there throw his entire domain out of commission.

That continued farming at sub-cost prices is a physical impossibility, recent experience has shown. Many farmers went on relief. Others felt free to take to violence to emphasize their desperate situation. The great majority, of peaceful disposition and still on the farm, had been pleading that something be done to improve conditions. Farmers felt like sheep without a shepherd. Effective organization and cooperation was lacking. The government stepped in and promised to help them. It was agreed to limit production as an emergency measure. Many honestly thought that oversupply glutted the markets. No one could prove it conclusively. All knew that something had to be done to save the farmers from ruin and the country from calamity. When the government pointed to limitation of production as the best and quickest way out, a large number of farmers agreed to cooperate, being convinced of the justice of the experiment as an emergency measure. Granting the emergency, no one should object to the measure taken. I for one do not so from principle.

Crop Limitation and Scripture

It has been suggested that limitation of crops can be justified from the divine command to Israel to rest its land every seventh year. This cannot be adequately done. The cases are not identical. Israel did not have its land in cultivation all the time, it is true, but this measure was not taken to limit production. Nor was it taken to raise prices. And in practice the sabbatical rest of the land must have increased production rather than decreased it.

Neither can a valid argument be drawn from the fact that Scripture does not cite instances of actual limitation of crops in Bible times. Conditions were altogether different then. Primitive methods of farming and transportation alone will account for history's silence on any general systematic limitation of crops. Ours is a problem of modern society and economics.

If we look for precedent at all, it should be under conditions largely similar to ours and among people of similar convictions. And that we have in the Netherlands. There crop control and limitation of production has been practiced under the direction of the great statesman Colyn, a man whose genuine Calvinism very few will seriously question. Plain necessity of the hour was to him enough to take emergency measures which, though admittedly abnormal, are not inherently wrong. It encouraged our people to do the same thing.

How About the A.A.A. Program?

Do these several considerations imply blanket approval of all such measures taken? Is all of the A. A. A. sound from a Christian point of view? Was there actually an oversupply calling for curtailment of production?

One may well hesitate to speak even with a modest amount of authority here. It is extremely difficult to get at the sober truth regarding the nation's provisions. Statistics often prove unreliable, and their interpretation often amounts to rank misrepresentation. For that reason it is hard for an "outsider" who holds that balancing of production is right, to judge whether in a certain particular instance limitation of production is justified.

Perhaps it is safe to commit oneself to the following. One may doubt that there was a considerable and quite general over-supply of foodstuffs these last few years. The ordinary curve of production suggests scarcity rather than abundance. History does not encourage one to expect general over-production. Neither does Revelation, as it relates blessing and abundance, and disfavor and scarcity. In a sinful world one may indeed look for scarcity of the necessary of life as a result of the righteous judgments of God. Prophecy suggests the same thing. Revelation 6 may not point to outright famine, but it certainly does not leave the impression that the nations
may look for material abundance toward the end of time. This does not make it impossible, however, that there has been a real over-supply these last years. But again, many in our country have been in want at the very time limitation of production has been practiced. And is it not commonly admitted that during this last year imports of foodstuffs, etc., have increased enormously? Last year's drought accounts for that? No doubt it does, but it suggests also that the carry-over of supplies from the year before the drought was not as large as was estimated in official circles.

The A.A.A. to be Appreciated

Yet there has been an over-supply of farm products in certain localities. Costly transportation often proved unable to cope with the situation. Moreover, many other factors entered in to bring things of the farm to a critical point. If there was no general oversupply of goods, there certainly was an almost general emergency in the farmers' domain largely due to low prices. This being the case we can find little fault with government-farmer endeavors to meet this crisis by an effort to bring prices to a more equitable level. From that point of view we can appreciate the A. A. A. as a real attempt to help the farmer in the hour of need. Things might have been done differently, but the A. A. A. has brought money into the farmers' pockets at a critical time and when it seemed that there was no other way to get it. Thus it must seem to the outsider. The final word as to his participation in the familiar experiment was and is to be said by the Christian farmer's own enlightened conscience,—whether he believes conditions of sufficiently critical nature to warrant an emergency program by the government.

Must we at this point take the government to task for its “ruthless program of destruction” in plowing under growing cotton and killing off herds of little pigs? Can one justify limitation of production to the point of destruction? Without a doubt willful, unnecessary destruction of what God has caused to grow is abnormal and unnatural. Insofar the government (and the farmer) have done so, they stand condemned.

Cotton, Little Pigs, and God

Yet this matter is not as simple as it may seem. The abuse heaped upon the head of Secretary Wallace may not have as much justification as some think. It certainly came with poor grace from those who piously lamented about the abuse of cotton plants and little pigs which “God had cause to grow,” but who otherwise show little regard for the Almighty, and who raised not even a whisper of protest when thousands of gallons of milk and cream were dumped by violent hands during farmers’ strikes.

But not only they have objected. Many others felt that cotton and little pigs should be permitted to mature. Yet, the pious and the wicked alike insist on getting the tenderest of meats at the butcher shops,—meats ordinarily cut from animals that did not mature. The orthodox, too, like a three pound “fry” better than a ten pound rooster. At the vegetable counter the youngest and tenderest is none too good even for a rugged Calvinist. The faithful of Bible times feasted, no, not on cows or bulls come to maturity, but on the calves and lambs of the flock. “But cattle and pigs have actually been made into tarkage!” True enough. It is also true that since time immemorial gardens along the sea coasts have been fertilized by fishes for which there evidently was no ready market. And no one complained. It is safe guessing that the Puritan fathers in New England have committed the same atrocity!

As to the plowing under of cotton, it suggests that we ask: Do all other plantings come to their own? How much grass, cut to wither on city lawns, might have been used for hay if permitted to mature? Fields of blooming clover—ideal forage—have been plowed under to fertilize the land for the next crop. Let us be sober. Things may answer another, though probably not their immediate purpose. Abnormal uses may find ample justification particularly in times of emergency. Certainly cotton on the backs of farmers means more than cotton plants in their fields, and the nurture of men means more than the life and proper development of pigs. Ruthless, needless, useless destruction of food and clothing is to be condemned, but beyond that it is rather hard to draw the line. Especially in times of emergency. Whether an emergency is real or apparent will have to be determined by the enlightened Christian himself.

The Danger of Government Regimentation

There is one outstanding danger in the recent government measures to help the farmer. It has so enlarged its field of operation that it will find it hard to return to its proper domain. The tendency of government assistance of the farmer is toward his complete regimentation. Witness thereto that in the near future no one may raise more than five bushels of potatoes without incurring government interference. Nothing voluntary about it either. While the farmers appreciate what the government has done for them, they should seek to help themselves as much as possible. Regimentation of industrial workers is bad enough. Farmers, too, have had a clear taste of it at the hands of capitalists. It should not be their lot at the hands of the government. But it is bound to come unless they organize so as to attend effectively to their own problems and to cooperate intelligently with other interests in social and economic life.

The Christian Attitude

Here the Christian farmer comes to the fore again. We have tried to show that limitation of crops depends largely upon his enlightened judgment. He is also the man to take other factors pertaining to agriculture into consideration. Proper attention given to them may clarify his own position and may contribute to the solution of the farm problem as a whole.

Whenever the Christian farmer feels the need of limiting production, for instance, he should not do so for the mere accumulation of wealth. Neither should he indulge in regular speculation in foodstuffs. He is entitled to a fair price for his products. To that end he may avail himself of government loans which he is entitled to a fair price for his products. To that end he may avail himself of government loans which permit him to keep his goods until it pays to move them. It is a well-advised way to keep his products out of the hands of the regular speculators, and
helps him to secure the proper reward for his labor. But he should never forget that "there is that scattereth and yet increaseth; and that there is that withholdeth more than is meet, but it tendeth to poverty." "He that withholdeth corn, the people shall curse him; but blessing shall be upon the head of him that selleth it."

Improved means of production, partial cause of "overproduction," should benefit Kingdom Kingdom. Sometimes the "tractor farmer" works longer hours than his neighbor less well equipped. Wealthy farmers sometimes strain themselves to increase production and profit, almost reducing themselves to beasts of burden. Thus many a farmer has actually "over-produced." An appreciable limitation of crops would make his production more nearly normal, and a good deal more favorable for a spiritual harvest.

Landholding, Balancing Production, and Cooperation

A proper system of landholding is also of significance here. It should not be necessary for a farmer to strain himself to wrest from the ground double returns; enough for himself and enough for his landlord. Land ownership should be by those who till the ground. The system in vogue among Israel cannot be copied among us, but it might be more closely followed than is done today. And if the land is rented at all, it should as much as possible be on shares, so that the renter pays in proportion to yield.

The "normal granary" as a means of balancing production fits in beautifully with this more ideal farm picture. Farming in a less feverish tempo, on land owned by him who works it, or rented on shares, would permit a bountiful harvest to be stored away for distant, probably less bountiful years. A liberal carry-over from year to year would tend to prevent hasty limitation of crops to meet exacting demands in times of temporary over-supply. Joseph's example of saving the surplus may indeed be followed among us to good advantage. We rejoice to hear that the present administration begins to regard the control and distribution of the fruits of the earth, as well as the discernment of His laws for the production of the same. Their constructive effort should shed Scripture light on this phase of human endeavor, and their sanctified common sense should be exercised to the benefit of their fellow men and to the honor of their God.

In Humble Dependence Upon God

Need it be said in an article of this kind that the Christian farmer should recognize God as the final and real Adjustor of crops? Condemned stands that independence which forgets that it is not man nor the clouds which can give rain, but that it is the Lord Himself who directs the crops that grow. His blessing is needed for any field of any size. Wrong is also that security which rests on fields that produced well and on barns filled with goods laid up for many years. Crop control should be an exercise of man's discretion in humble dependence upon God's plan and power; he should not rest in natural means but in the blessing of his God. And this can be done. By the Christian farmer. By the Calvinist, if you please.

The present situation challenges those farmers to organize. Therein lies the strongest guarantee of truth, righteousness, and balance. They are most able to pay due respect to the government and to other parties in social and economic life. They should unite as brethren to know the will of God concerning the control and distribution of the fruits of the earth, as well as they discerned His laws for the production of the same. Their constructive effort should shed Scripture light on this phase of human endeavor, and their sanctified common sense should be exercised to the benefit of their fellow men and to the honor of their God.

"GOD'S HUNCHBACK"

Carandasj

BUSINESS was wretchedly dull, but at last I sold a car, F.O.B. Detroit. With a little close figuring of expenses I could go after it myself; see Detroit — a change for once from our little Kansas village surroundings — and make a few dollars besides.

But these were not the main reasons. On my way back I could visit the old dominie in Michigan, stay over night, and try to make him tell me a few stories of some of those old sturdy Calvinists of half a century ago in the land of windmills and dikes. I loved the old saint; his dogmatism was happily blended with a mild, soothing mysticism.

Wasn't he glad to see me again after so many years of separation? And how I scrutinized him! I hadn't seen him since my emigration. Waves of sorrow had passed over that soul, but they had only increased his saintliness.

"Dominie," I said, after we had partaken of the frugal supper, and we were dreaming of the long ago, "Dominie, you have known Jan S.; I have heard of him; but I think legends have been woven around the head of this man, and man must have woven that aureole . . ."

He interrupted me, and that far-away look was discernible now, and I knew, if I didn't even stir, the true Jan would appear before me.

He had taken me along to his study, and then he said: "Dim that light, please! I'm not an actor, but when you call up vistas of the long ago, I need a suitable frame for the picture."
"One can't get rid of that sharp, bitter tang of reality, that darkness that sin has brought into this world. But in the Light there is beauty; and through man has preferred darkness to the Light, because his works were evil, and gazing into the dimness caused by the light piercing that darkness, I see the silhouettes of single trees against the brighter heavens; a single white petal falls to the Light, because his works were evil, yet that darkness, I see the silhouettes of single trees steps of Jehovah Elohim walking in the garden in the cool of the day. Jan was such a petal; and true it is, there was a halo around his head, but it wasn't man that placed it there; it was there because Jan could say with Paul: Not I, but Christ, lives in me. That is the secret of his halo; physically there was nothing that attracted. In that respect he was an unsusitily, twisted, gnarled block from the quarry of life, perverted by sin.

And then he continued. "I always thought of Enoch who walked with God, when I saw him; and often the foolish question arose in my heart: I wonder, whether Enoch was deformed, too, that the light of God might be shed from him, too!

"Once, Jan was working in the field; and how he made the weeds fly with his hoe! As he was a Calvinist to the core, he knew what it means to hoe to the glory of God! And then I passed along the road, and said: Jan! But not too loud, for I saw a look in his face, that revealed to me he was absorbed in one of his reveries, and I didn't want to arouse him too rudely! But Jan did not hear; and then I fairly shouted: Jan! And then something happened, that is almost too sacred for me to tell you; it's to me a nugget of gold, that to this moment I have carefully hidden in the casket of my heart; but Jan is gone; the Lord took him; and you will hide it as a wonderful secret, Willem.

Down he threw his hoe, took off his cap from his head, and looking up to the sky he shouted: 'Speak, Lord, for Thy servant heareth!' That dear old saint, in his childlike faith and fellowship; I've never seen the like of him ... They call them fanatics now, I suppose ..."

"But I have seen him, too, in action against man; what torch flames against black heavens—but that's another story ... ."

We Listen To Our Readers

A Bit of Afrikaans

"The CALVIN Forum is "n maandblad wat deur enige leiers van die Christelike Gereformeerde Kerk van Amerika onlangs gestig is. Die eerste nommer het deur ongeval ons nie bereik nie, maar nou het die Die Afrikaanse melkds" by onthou ons dan ook met belangstelling en 'n hoë mate van instemming gelees het. Die hoofredakteur is Dr. Clarence Bouma, 'n betreklik jeugdige professor aan Calvin Seminary, die teologiese kweekskool van genoemde Kerk te Grand Rapids. Hy word gestuur deur 'n aantal van sy kollega's op die personeel van die Seminary, en ook deur enige van die professore van Calvin College, die hoë skool van die Gereformeerde Kerk te Grand Rapids. Sover ons van die Chr. Geref. Kerk van Amerika deur middel van hulle offisiële blaaie, The Banner en De Wachter, en deur middel van die pers van hulle sinode kennis gemaak het, meen ons op hulle van toepassing te kan maak die woorde, wat Dr. J. C. Rullman, van die Gereformeerde Kerk van Nederland in sy pasuitgewe 'Beknopt Christelijk Encyclopedia' en in 'n uitgawe van Bavinck gebruik: 'Hij vereet en niet af door enghartigheid, maar waardeerde ook den tegenstander. Hoewel positief Gereformeerd en die anti-these aanvaardend, was hij meer 'n synthetische figuur in die Gereformeerde wereld, maar zocht hij ook contact met christenen van andere kerken (voor sommigen was hij dan ook te ruim). Kerkelijk was hij, maar altemin kerkelik. Man van brede blik, die oog had voor de Katholieke van Christendom en Kerk.'"

"In die gesindheid, meen ons, sal dan ook hierdie nuwe blad geredigeer word. In sy hoefartikel sê Dr. Bouma o.m. die volgende (ons vertaal): 'Kalvinisme is dikwels verkeerd deed te wees . . . Maar die eenvoudige waarheid is dat Kalvinisme ver van dood is en sterk lewend. Dit is nie dood nie om die eenvoudige rede dat dit nie kon sterwe nie. Kalvinisme toeg is ge- loos van doodi is en sterk lewende. Dit is godsdiens in hoogste graad. Dit is godsdienst to die hoogste ontwikkel, Christendom op sy beste. Tog kan dit nie ontken word nie dat aan Kalvinisme dikwels weinig waarde toegelyk is, nie alleen deur ongelowiges en athefe nie, maar ook deur sekere christelike groepe. Hiervoor is Kalviniste moontlik self verantwoordelik. Hulle het hulle geloofspoortuigings hemelhoog gegerys, en het intussen vergoet dat die op aarde geopenbarde wredeste moet word as 'n lewende krag.' Hy wys verder daarop dat die soevereiniteit en ewige besluit van God tot skoalaatse speulkaaie verlaag kan word, sonder enige leenekruis in denken en doen te hê. Die leer van die uitverkiesing word by vele 'n oorsaak van verskoning van hulle farisese onverskilligheid aangaande die doen van sendingswerk en die verlooving toewyding van die lewe in al sy omvang. Dit was egter nie Kalvinisme nie — wel 'n karakters vooraan! Tot sover Dr. Bouma."

"The CALVIN Forum verskyn maandeliks en kos twee dollars jaarliks. Dit sal moontlik wees om by die C.S.V.-boekwinkel, Bus 26, Stellenbosch, daarop in te teken."

Capetown, Editor "Die Kerkbode,"
Union of South Africa Issue of Nov. 13, 1935.

From a Dentist

"Your magazine is splendid and fulfills a definite need in the Christian world of to-day. May its success be assured."

400 Medical Arts Bldg. J. A. VANDEN BOSCH, D.D.S.
Grand Rapids, Mich.

From Down South

"The last CALVIN Forum is a splendid contribution to the literary of the hour. I enjoyed it very much. I hope that you will secure many more."

S. M. TENNEY, D.D.
Presh. and Ref. Churches, Historical Foundation
Montreat, N. C.
From the Far Northwest

The Forum supplies a long-felt need. It is interesting and instructive to cover to cover. May you richly experience the blessing of God in this your undertaking.

Pilat Chr. Ref. Church, Lynden, Wash.

D. HOLLEBECK.

From the Windy City

Just a few words to let you know how THE CALVIN FORUM is appreciated in our home. Each issue seems to be just as good, if not better than, the preceding one. We find it well worth-while to read each issue from cover to cover and then file it away for future reference. May you and your colleagues be encouraged to continue your splendid work.

I am enclosing two dollars for a subscription for Mr. X. He read one of my issues and was so pleased that he asked me to subscribe him for it. He would like to have the back issues if they are still available.

Chicago, Ill.

JOHN A. VAN BRUGGEN.

From Puget Sound

I’ve been receiving every issue of THE CALVIN FORUM so far, and am enjoying it immensely. Have also been recommending it to others here, while to read each issue from cover to cover and then file it away for future reference. May you and your colleagues be encouraged to continue your splendid work.

I am enclosing two dollars for a subscription for Mr. X. He read one of my issues and was so pleased that he asked me to subscribe him for it. He would like to have the back issues if they are still available.

Everett, Wash.

JOHN VANDEN HOEK.

From Rural Wisconsin

Enjoy the magazine very much. I for one would appreciate a little more comment on current events — along the line of Dr. Pieters’ first article. God bless and prosper THE CALVIN FORUM.

Birnamwood, Wis.

ELCO H. OOSTENDORP.

From a Leading Hungarian-American Calvinist

It was a pleasant surprise to me to receive a copy of THE CALVIN FORUM. As a spiritual offspring of the Reformed Church of Hungary, a church of living Calvinistic traditions, and as one of the original organizers of this church’s American counterpart, the Free Magyar Reformed Church in America, I delight in the fact that at last there is an American Protestant periodical which places the name of Calvin on its title page. Our church has been monthly again in another form. It is printed in the Magyar language. Considering all these facts I shall regard it a privilege to be numbered among your subscribers. Subscription price enclosed.

Free Magyar Reformed Church in America, Perth Amboy, N. J.

DR. CHARLES VINCZE.

A Voice from Brazil

I have just read the second issue of THE CALVIN FORUM, and I love it. I love it so much more to me, because there is a real danger for me to degenerate mentally. I think you know what I mean. There is so much work, everything takes time, and I know you are constantly doing better and poorer. The language used in the column of Carabneh, where the Rev. and Mrs. Wm. V. Muller are living their busy and consecrated life, are the Portuguese and the Dutch — English is the native language. Dr. Bower, I don’t read anything. To use an expression Dr. Beets once used: it is like a refreshing bath.

(Pennsylvania Journals and THE BARMER, I don’t read anything. To use an expression Dr. Beets once used: it is like a refreshing bath.

Ponta Grossa, Parana, Brazil.

MRS. WM. V. MULLER.

The World State

May I convey to you the deep interest and real admiration with which I watch the spiritual growth of your paper and the way you deal with our acute problems. One of my studies advanced quite far along the line of the main issue between Jesus and country, patria. I am convinced that our arch-enemy is neither militarism nor nationalism but the antiquated idea of country, inflamed by the Romanticism of the past century and untouchable in this age of modern developments. We should replace it with the glorification of our own national ideal: the World State, based on federal constitution, with world parliament and united federal government, no tariffs, no armies or navies, but local and world police, unified money-system, etc. — the Utopia of many great thinkers of the past four centuries, but for which time has not yet come. I read with much interest on this subject both different American and Hungarian audiences, and I have yet to meet antagonistic criticism of my plans based on this theory. Ex- cuse me for this unwarranted outburst, clamy. Innermost of thoughts. I just wanted to say that although I accept almost all of your thirty theses, still I greatly disagree with the principled of Dr. Pieters, even if I am fully convinced of the reality of Japanese endeavors to establish their hegemony over Asia and the subsequent world-empire over Eurasia.

Hungarian Department, ALEXANDER THOT.


Resources, Population, and War

I was my intention to write you right after you had published your essay on Profit and Poverty. "For the Love of Money is the Root of All Evil," but I felt that these theses first had to be digested before proper re-action could be given. There is so much in the theses, which need clarification in relation to the declaration of the law of the Kingdom in a balanced mind upon scales of eternal justice and still the question remains: can they be accepted without comment or without criticism? Be it far from me to harass you; I rather praise you for the excellent discussion you have given and think that many of us will find fault with the manner in which you have handled and analyzed this, for us, most difficult problem. Notwithstanding, however, I have taken into account your personal viewpoint as seen through professional eyes and the outcome could not be but the drawing of a picture outlined by looking through theologically colored glasses.

Our search for a solution of the problem of “War and Peace” may be done in a theological way, or we may climb the eschatological stairs to obtain an apocalyptic-chiliastic view. However, we gaze into the distance to behold the fata morgana of things to come, often that which we thought would result in a balanced mind upon scales of eternal justice and still the question remains: can they be accepted without comment or without criticism? Be it far from me to harass you; I rather praise you for the excellent discussion you have given and think that many of us will find fault with the manner in which you have handled and analyzed this, for us, most difficult problem. Notwithstanding, however, I have taken into account your personal viewpoint as seen through professional eyes and the outcome could not be but the drawing of a picture outlined by looking through theologically colored glasses.

Our search for a solution of the problem of “War and Peace” may be done in a theological way, or we may climb the eschatological stairs to obtain an apocalyptic-chiliastic view. However, we gaze into the distance to behold the fata morgana of things to come, often that which we thought would result in a balanced mind upon scales of eternal justice and still the question remains: can they be accepted without comment or without criticism? Be it far from me to harass you; I rather praise you for the excellent discussion you have given and think that many of us will find fault with the manner in which you have handled and analyzed this, for us, most difficult problem. Notwithstanding, however, I have taken into account your personal viewpoint as seen through professional eyes and the outcome could not be but the drawing of a picture outlined by looking through theologically colored glasses.

Our search for a solution of the problem of “War and Peace” may be done in a theological way, or we may climb the eschatological stairs to obtain an apocalyptic-chiliastic view. However, we gaze into the distance to behold the fata morgana of things to come, often that which we thought would result in a balanced mind upon scales of eternal justice and still the question remains: can they be accepted without comment or without criticism? Be it far from me to harass you; I rather praise you for the excellent discussion you have given and think that many of us will find fault with the manner in which you have handled and analyzed this, for us, most difficult problem. Notwithstanding, however, I have taken into account your personal viewpoint as seen through professional eyes and the outcome could not be but the drawing of a picture outlined by looking through theologically colored glasses.

Our search for a solution of the problem of “War and Peace” may be done in a theological way, or we may climb the eschatological stairs to obtain an apocalyptic-chiliastic view. However, we gaze into the distance to behold the fata morgana of things to come, often that which we thought would result in a balanced mind upon scales of eternal justice and still the question remains: can they be accepted without comment or without criticism? Be it far from me to harass you; I rather praise you for the excellent discussion you have given and think that many of us will find fault with the manner in which you have handled and analyzed this, for us, most difficult problem. Notwithstanding, however, I have taken into account your personal viewpoint as seen through professional eyes and the outcome could not be but the drawing of a picture outlined by looking through theologically colored glasses.

Our search for a solution of the problem of “War and Peace” may be done in a theological way, or we may climb the eschatological stairs to obtain an apocalyptic-chiliastic view. However, we gaze into the distance to behold the fata morgana of things to come, often that which we thought would result in a balanced mind upon scales of eternal justice and still the question remains: can they be accepted without comment or without criticism? Be it far from me to harass you; I rather praise you for the excellent discussion you have given and think that many of us will find fault with the manner in which you have handled and analyzed this, for us, most difficult problem. Notwithstanding, however, I have taken into account your personal viewpoint as seen through professional eyes and the outcome could not be but the drawing of a picture outlined by looking through theologically colored glasses.

Our search for a solution of the problem of “War and Peace” may be done in a theological way, or we may climb the eschatological stairs to obtain an apocalyptic-chiliastic view. However, we gaze into the distance to behold the fata morgana of things to come, often that which we thought would result in a balanced mind upon scales of eternal justice and still the question remains: can they be accepted without comment or without criticism? Be it far from me to harass you; I rather praise you for the excellent discussion you have given and think that many of us will find fault with the manner in which you have handled and analyzed this, for us, most difficult problem. Notwithstanding, however, I have taken into account your personal viewpoint as seen through professional eyes and the outcome could not be but the drawing of a picture outlined by looking through theologically colored glasses.
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acts these laws, or by what color they may be called. It seems
that Calvin also had this in mind when he wrote in the Insti-
tute the following: "The moral law, therefore, with which I
shall begin, being comprised in two leading articles, of which
one simply commands us to worship God with pure faith and
piety, and the other enjoins us to embrace man with sincere love,
this, I say, is the eternal rule of righteousness, prescribed to
men of all ages and nations (italics mine, H. W.) who wish to
conform their lives to the will of God." Add further Calvin
writes: "Ceremonies might be abrogated without any violation
or injury or piety, as the precepts of duties and love remain of
perpetual obligation, notwithstanding the abolition of all these
expedient for them, provided they be framed
one simply
conform their lives to the will of

Let us search ourselves to find out whether we are truly Cal-
vinists, also in the problem of "War and Peace."

Paterson, N. J. HARRY P. WINSEMius

Education for Peace

I read your "Thirty Theses" and find myself in entire agree-
ment with the position you take on the vital issue of peace and
war. Permit me to make one comment on thesis 23. The final
clause of that thesis I would change to read, "but in cultivating

A CHRISTIAN-THEISTIC METHODOLOGY

DE NOODZAKELIJKHEID EENER CHRISTELIJKE LOGICA. Dr.
D. H. Th. Vollenhoven, Hoogleraar aan de Vrije Universi-
R. 3.50.

IT IS generally agreed that a consistently Christian concep-
tion of reality is quite distinct from all other conceptions of
reality. It is not so generally accepted that this distinctly Christian
conception of reality implies a distinctly Christian conception of
scientific methodology. Many Christian scholars seem to take
for granted that if we are to reason intelligently with non-
Christians we must have a common or neutral methodology.

But are not one's conception of reality and one's conception of
methodology involved in one another? We cannot help but think
they are. One's conception of reality is one's conception of the
foundation of the laws of logic.

We may take, for example, the Christian conception of reality
and show that it has definite implications with respect to the
law of non-contradiction. The Christian conception of God im-
plies that "whatsoever comes to pass" in the created universe
has been interpreted by God's plan. God's logic precedes
history. God makes and sustains the facts and the laws of the
scientists. The particulars and universals of the created uni-
verse are adapted to one another by God. They have their co-
herence and admit of interpretation by men because back of
them is the absolute coherence of God.

Stated in terms of methodology this means that the law of
non-contradiction has absolute validity because it has universal
application. Truth is absolute. It is this conception of the
foundation of the law of non-contradiction that enables us to
ask questions about nature and history. It is this conception
also that enables us to expect answers when we ask questions
about nature and history. Without this conception of the foun-
dation of the law of non-contradiction the curse of Heraclitus
cannot be lifted; if "all things flow" logic flows too. Things
do not submit to logic if the logic of God does not underlie them.
God is the presupposition of intelligent human predication.

Reasoning from methodology to reality we come to the same
conclusion. This need scarcely be pointed out if we adopt a
Christian methodology. If Christian-theism is involved in your
method, you will, of course, discover Christian-theism if you
apply your method. If you have put a mouse in your hat, you
will, as a true magician, discover a mouse when you take off
your hat. Thus your insistence on a Christian-theistic method-
ology, it will be said by our opponents, only helps to deceive the
"faithful."

This would seem to be sad enough. We should not wish to
catch men by guile of this baser sort. But sad though it be to
fool others, it is still more sad to fool yourself as well. He who
adopts a "neutral" methodology does the latter. It is a foregone
conclusion that if we apply a neutral methodology we can find
no more than a finite God. History proves this as far as history
can prove anything. None of all the many schools of philosophy,
except the definitely Christian-theistic, have offered us anything
higher than a finite God; all of them have used the "neutral"
method.

It could not be otherwise. It is the logic of the matter. If
men are "neutral" in their methodology they say in effect, that
as far as the possibilities involved in their investigations are
concerned, God may or may not exist. The facts and the laws
of this universe may or may not be sustained by God. The law
of contradiction does not necessarily have its foundation in God.
Thus the law of non-contradiction may or may not have uni-
versal application. A may be A tomorrow or it may be not-A
tomorrow. Thus history precedes not only the logic of man
but also the logic of God; God Himself must search for truth.
Eve was "neutral" when she put Satan's interpretation of his-
tory on a par with God's interpretation of history. She thought
that the devil might possibly be right. That seemed to be an
innocent attitude. Apparently God did not think so; He
published her with death for her "neutralitiy" in methodology.
To doubt God is to deny Him. Does not this hold anywhere?
Neutrality toward God is in effect negation of God.

Those who seek to defend the Christian-theistic position in the
fields of science and philosophy ought to become aware of the
fact that "neutrality" is really negation. It is only a happy in-
consistency that will lead us to a theistic conclusion by way of
a "neutral" path and we should not expect men to follow our
inconsistencies. We may do much valuable detail work but we
cannot present the Christian-theistic position logically and fully
if we adopt a "neutral" methodology. If we do so we place our-
selves at the mercy of the enemy at the outset of the argument.

On the other hand, if we recognize the interdependence of
method and conclusion in scientific research we can fruitfully
reason with men. We can then place ourselves upon our op-
nonents' position for argument's sake. We can be "neutral" for
argument's sake. We can see what happens to experience if the
"neutral" method is adopted. We can then whirl about
with men in their exclusively immanentistic and relativistic
January, 1936  

The argument's sake when as men of water they build ladders of water and place them upon foundations of water against a support of water in order to get out of the water a pure temporality. If to save men we should really and not merely for argument's sake enter the cauldron of "neutrality" or bare possibility we should need saving ourselves.

Can there be any doubt as to the urgent necessity of a consistently Christian methodology today? Modern thought as a whole has adopted the position that truth is relative. If the pepperpot of Chance shakes long enough every conceivable kind of configuration of facts and laws may eventually appear; theism may be true today and non-theism may be true tomorrow. This is virtually the position of such men as James Jeans. Such a position is reached by the application of the "neutral" method in the field of science.

To meet such a negation of God as is hidden under cover of the much-praised "neutrality" of scientists we need a humble but bold affirmation that God is so necessary to us that He is necessary in the field of method as well as elsewhere.

Arminianism cannot furnish such an affirmation of God. It says that God is at some points dependent upon the decisions of men. It says that the historical has not been preinterpreted by God. It therewith denies the universal application of the law of non-contradiction. It has compromised with the Irrationalism of modern thought. If anything is clear from Edwin Lewis' book, A Christian Manifesto, that is clear. He tells us that "Augustine affirming man's moral incompetence and Pelagius affirming man's moral competency may both be right" (p. 107).

He speaks of the necessity of a "structural change" in God, because of certain events in history (p. 170).

Nor is the compromise with modern Irrationalism limited to those who have an Arminian heritage. We have it in Dr. Geo. W. Richards' book, Beyond Fundamentalism and Modernism. Dr. Richards tells us we need not concern ourselves with the world-picture given us in Scripture. For him there is no God-interpreted system of truth. So, too, Dr. Donald Mackenzie in his book, Christianity — The Paradox of God, toys with the idea of paradox as the really contradictory instead of the merely seeming contradictory. The influence of Karl Barth and Kierkegaard is apparent in all three of these men. Barth himself struggles in vain to combine the motif of absolute Irrationalism with the Christian motif of an absolutely rational, though to man incomprehensible, God. Karl Heim, in his recent Sprunt Lectures, makes a false antithesis between believing in Christianity as a system of truth and following the person of Christ.

The question is as to how we are to meet this avalanche of Irrationalism within as well as without the Church. We believe it can be done only if, in reliance on the grace of God, we present a consistently Christian position. If we attempt to work according to a "neutral" methodology we have lost our argument against Arminianism and thus have also lost our argument against all forms of modern Irrationalism.

We believe that this is in the main Dr. Vollenhoven's position. His book gives the necessary discussion of the history of logic in order to establish what I have had to state briefly and dogmatically. The question of a neutral methodology and a neutral starting-point ought to be discussed, it seems to me, among those who wish to be Reformed in their thinking. It does not seem to me that we are really Reformed as long as we try to be neutral. It is a question that every teacher in a Christian institution of learning must face.

C. VAN TIL.

BOOKISH BREVITIES


STIMULATING addresses by leaders of Calvinistic youth. Young people who enjoy convention addresses like these — as is apparent they did from the subsequent discussions recorded — are the hope of the future. Here is a facing of issues of today in sincere and living loyalty to the great verities of our Faith.


POETIC gems in which a vital Christian faith, in its deeper as well as its lighter veins, comes to delicate expression. Mostly from the hands of young people, these bits of verse are a fine tribute to the group that produced it. Some forty poems by a dozen different authors.


A MOVING account of the martyrdom of a youthful missionary and his devoted wife at the hands of revolutionary Chinese soldiers near the village of Miaoheo, in the province of Anhwei, December, 1934.


HERE are ten truly spiritual sermons. The style is simple and lucid. The reader is never in doubt as to the meaning and purpose of the author. The messages are scriptural, edifying, sound. The Word is honored; the gospel is preached; and in such a way that contact with actual life and experience is maintained throughout. The book is a recent selection of the Texas Religious Book of the Month Club. Dr. Erdmans of Princeton writes a brief foreword.


TWENTY-FIVE brief devotional essays, every one of them biblical in spirit and doctrinally sound. The teaching is very elementary and there is nothing outstanding in these messages, but every one of them is good spiritual food. When occasion presents itself the author, who is pastor of the First Presbyterian Church at Meridian, Mississippi, champions some of the distinctively Calvinistic positions.


A CLEAR, simply-phrased account of some of the outstanding elements of the Reformed Faith. This little book is not a doctrinal treatise in any sense of the word. It is rather a series of brief essays exhibiting the truth and value of some of the distinctive elements in the doctrine and polity of the Presbyterian Church. Some of the subjects touched upon are: Common Grace, Predestination, Baptism, Perfection.


A HODGE-PODGE of pious platitudes, Scripture quotations, some sane observations, and half-baked economic statements. Here we surely have Dr. Riley at his poorest. In his Foreword the author states that this series of sermons is a plain departure from the custom of the First Baptist pulpit, Minneapolis, Minn. We hope the departure will not be repeated. We prefer to hear Dr. Riley preach Christ and Him crucified.

C. B.
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