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Religious Liberty Imperilled

ABOUT the first of May, 1936, Judge Mason in the State of Massachusetts sentences three children, ages six to nine, to the reformatory because they refused to salute the United States flag. Their father, a Russellite, had taught them that it was a heinous sin to show reverence to any national symbol. It was idolatry. Thus they had learned what was for them the will of God. And they must obey God rather than men. One may question the wisdom of the father, but he must admire the courageous conviction of the children.

We wonder, however, whether this decision of the judge is symptomatic of a growing intolerance toward religious freedom in this country. We have sat back in smug complacency when the press reports revealed the story of the subordination of religion to state's interests in various parts of the world. We have looked with disgust mingled with pity at that enlightened age when the Puritans could find no religious freedom and were forced to find a place of tolerance in the wilderness of the new world. But that was three centuries ago. But, after all, such persecution pales before what has happened in this enlightened age. Russia leads the ignoble parade of nations that desire to submerge religious interests to those of the state. Germany followed not so far behind. And — and will this country fall in line? I do not care to be a Calamity Jane, neither do I wish to follow the proverbial antics of the head-hiding ostrich.

Methinks I see a cloud in the bright skies of our religious freedom. It is a dark and ominous cloud that is gaining momentum. I can see the signs of the four A's in it. It is full of "isms." It is picking up our educational and our political institutions. Indeed, it seems to be sweeping everything and everybody along except the conscientious objectors. They are left strewed in its path. Among them are children from six to nine.

H. S.

Father Divine's Peace Mission

FATHER Divine is a negro, small of stature and quiet of mien. He was but an ordinary preacher in a small fishing village on Long Island, until he put into successful practice the adage that the way to a man's heart is through his stomach. That was fifteen years ago. Today he is located in New York City and many thousands — he claims 20,000,000 patrons — believe that he is God. He specializes in eating places and has more than a hundred of them scattered throughout America. They are called Heavens and are officially known as Kingdom Extensions. Meals can be had for the nominal fee of 15c and lodging for $1.50 per week. Whites as well as blacks are rallying to his leadership. "It is not merely an industry, but a phenomenal religious movement, based on the credo that Mr. Divine is the second Messiah, appearing in the flesh of a lowly race and that the Kingdom of Heaven is not at, but in hand."

We stand amazed at the astonishing success of a religious cult which so obviously represents the spirit of an exclusive diesesseitschristentum. It gives to its adherents real and tangible values here and now. And that is, after all, not so far removed from the spirit that permeates many of the more "respectable" religious cults round about us. Father Divine has by and in his religious cult exposed the real motive of many a religious devotee. He has proved the devil's charge that men serve God because it is profitable business. Many Christian leaders today prefer to ask their people to make an investment rather than to present a thankoffering. They urge their parishioners to be engaged in religious activities, such as prayer, scripture reading, church-attendance, and so on, because it pays to do so. It is a damning commercial view of religion. It stands foursquare over against the religion of Christ. He gives freely. One needs to buy nothing. The Christian is rich in Christ, for "all things are yours." There remains nothing for a Christian to do but to show genuine gratitude by a life dedicated to obedient service. But we will not rise to that spiritual elevation until we have learned to prefer Manna to chicken and God's mansions to Father Divine's heavens.

H. S.

The Old Modernistic Trick

Kagawa is a concrete instance of the ambiguity, the yes-and-no attitude of modernistic Christianity. He is a noble soul, as there are many noble souls both inside and outside of the Christian pale. He has been deeply influenced by the ethical spirit of Christianity. He proposes a solution for the economic ills of his land which may prove to be of surpassing value. But when the question is raised: Is Kagawa a biblical Christian? Is he a true follower (not of the imaginary modernistic Jesus but) of Jesus Christ, the Son of God, the Savior of man? Is
he an orthodox, i.e., straight-thinking Christian? —
There can be only one answer.

Dr. Willis G. Hoekje, a Reformed Church mission­
ary at Tokio, and an ardent admirer of Kagawa,
speaking of the latter's "great consuming passion," writes these significant sentences in The Intelli­
gence-Leader of December 18:

This consuming passion harmonizes his conservative theology with his sympathy for a radical social gospel. It has long been a matter of deep interest to me to note how an unrepudiated conservative theological training, first in Japan, and then by choice during the years in America, has produced the outstanding Christian social worker in Japan, who makes no apologies for linking his faith with deepest human physical and social need.

If the term "unrepudiated" in this statement is meant to convey that Kagawa has never avowedly and publicly repudiated his former orthodox training, it is no doubt correct. Whether he has not "de facto" so repudiated biblical, orthodox, historical Christianity, is possibly another question. One wonders whether the spiritual heirs of such a genuine social service type of Modernist as Rauschenbusch was have made an error in their spiritual identification of this dynamic Japanese. A fact it is that he is in America at present primarily on the invitation of the Rochester Divinity School to deliver the Rauschenbusch Foundation Lectures. And he himself has explained that this occasion affords him an opportunity to repay in some measure the debt he owes to his thinking to Walter Rauschenbusch. Possibly Charles S. Macfarland is not far beside the point when he calls Kagawa "this Japanese exponent of the social gospel."

That with all his revivalistic and mystical lan­
guage, much of it derived from orthodox Christianity, Kagawa has after all embraced "another gospel," judging by the standards of Paul, can hardly be open to serious doubt. According to his own state­
ment in Japan Christian Quarterly (as quoted on the Kagawa Calendar for 1936) "the Christian Bible is a story of human emancipation from the begin­
ing of the Old Testament till the end of the New." "The Bible is the living sociology of a people, written in the blood and tears of many centuries." "It is the record of the social evolution of a people to a high plane of power and culture."

Theologically speaking the root-error of Kagawa is that the absoluteness and uniqueness of Christ's incarnation, death, atonement, and resurrection are evaporated into a universal experience for everyone who follows him. We are to become Christ's; we are to be crucified, just as Christ was crucified; we are to rise from death to life. All this is just exactly what Idealism has made of the historic facts of the Christian Faith long ago. It is the mystical line of Paul's teaching (at least a semblance of it), but without the objective, historical, once-for-all redemption wrought through Christ and through Him alone.

In this light we can understand that such an avowed Modernist as W. E. Garrison could head his review of Kagawa's book, Meditations on the Cross.

—The Eternal Gethsemane. Garrison is right. He has caught the real thrust and spirit of the book, and his remark that "this would have been an appropriate title for the book" is apropos. His further comment is equally enlightening. He continues:

Kagawa does not shrink from using the terms of traditional theology with reference to atonement, even substitutionary atone­
ment, though for the most part his language is far from that of conventional orthodoxy and his thought constantly outruns the ancient dogmas. It is as though he found nothing that he cared to deny in even the most conservative statements about the "power of the blood," but was much more interested in going on from where the dogma leaves off or in using it as the foundation upon which to build his teaching of the necessity for a continu­ance of the practice of sacrifice.

It is the old modernistic trick of using all the old terms (if people want them!) but pouring an entirely new and alien content into them. This is the greatest menace that the Christian Church faces, and it is a great pity that Kagawa has fallen into this pit. The merit of his economic plan of co-operatives is not to be repudiated because of his modernistic theology. We hope to be able to offer our readers an article on Co-operatives in some future issue of The CALVIN FORUM.

C. B.

National Sovereignty and Wars of Invasion
An Anomaly of International Law
Gerald Monsman, J.D.

Attorney, Agency of the United States, General Claims Arbitration United States and Mexico, Dept. of State, Washington, D. C.

The parade of the captains of the munitions in­
dustry and their confederates, the war financiers, through the elegant Hearing Room in the Senate Office Building, has been completed. It has been an event of high educational value, which for a time gave promise of producing a landmark in American foreign policy in the form of a permanent and effective neutrality law. However, at this writing that result is not at all assured.

There has been another hearing by another Senate Committee. This time certain international jurists had their opportunity to promenade and testify. As a consequence the out-worn theories of those who in the past have not been able to keep a neutral nation neutral, threaten to scuttle the efforts of those who are seeking to improve upon the past. With that in mind, it may not be inopportune to re-examine the traditional attitude of international jurists toward the laws of war and peace, and more particularly to note what appears to be a glaring discrepancy in the traditional position.

To face this inconsistency frankly, may aid to indicate to us where lies our path of Christian duty, where ends the claim of Government upon our serv­ice, and where begins the terrain which the Church, in the name of a higher loyalty, should expect its members to enter only as non-combatants.
The Right of Invasion

Those men are most fortunate who build better than they know; who formulate principles pregnant, like our Master’s mustard seed, with a capacity for the commonweal of mankind far beyond their apparent significance. One suspects that when men like Bodin, Suárez and Grotius set their theories of sovereignty a-germinating, they did not half comprehend their full vitality. For it does not seem to have occurred to them that the logical development of their theories must needs have a revolutionizing effect on “The Rights of War and Peace,” which were being given more accurate formulation contemporaneously with the growth of the concept of sovereignty.

In the same age and often by the same minds the foundations were being laid for both international law and the concept of sovereignty. Yet in international law the age-old right of war and with it the right of invasion, was accepted without dispute. True, the tradition established by the Christian theologians of making a distinction between just and unjust wars was continued and systematized. But there seems to have been no realization that if the concept of sovereignty were taken seriously, it would eat the vitals even out of “just” wars, when by them is meant “just” invasions. Writers on international law, down to the present, in imitation of their forerunners, have done much the same. The reasoning seems to run: “Here is the right of invasion; it always has been a part of international relations, and, doubtless, always will be, till millennium dawn. Let us regulate it as best we can. That taken care of, let us admit the concept of sovereignty to its own proper place in the scheme of things.”

Yet, therein lies the anomaly, for by its very nature the concept of sovereignty is monopolistic. Once admitted, it will dominate the situation as completely as Japaka’s camel monopolized the tent when he carried it out of reach of all prior occupants. Sovereignty granted to a state automatically cancels all right of ever again invading the state in which that sovereignty resides, unless it be by consent of that sovereign state. Not to acknowledge this is, either, (1) not to take the concept of sovereignty seriously; or (2) to declare that international law is not law in time of war — which is as disastrous to international law as to say that one’s contract is good except when brought into court, or that a statute is binding except upon its violator.

The Territorial Sovereignty of the State

It is an underlying assumption of this discussion that, at least as far as international law is concerned, sovereignty is the primary attribute of statehood. For sovereignty is the element which distinguishes a state from all other human associations. It is, further, the pivotal contention of this discussion that this primary attribute, sovereignty, is a territorial sovereignty; that is, (1) it is strictly limited to being exercised within the given territorial boundaries of any one state, and (2) is not subject to violation from without. If these should be found to be valid positions, it must follow as night the day, that all practices inconsistent with this primal characteristic are foreign to the true nature of a state and, therefore, unwarranted by a consistent jurisprudence.

International jurists from Grotius, the systematizer of international law, and Vattel, that international lodestar of early American statesmen, to such more recent writers as Oppenheim, Westlake, Moore, Scott, Hyde and others, uniformly take the position: first, that sovereignty is an attribute of statehood; and, second, that this sovereignty operates only within fixed territorial boundaries. This territorial aspect of sovereignty has been stated even more emphatically, and certainly more authoritatively, by judicial decisions.

Invasion a Crime Against Humanity

It may further be observed that the “right” of invasion is not at all comparable in importance to a state’s inherent attribute of territorial sovereignty. For invasion is only one method of warfare; which in turn is only an alternative method of settling disputes by force; which in its turn is only the second best method of disposing of controversies, after the best method, peaceable settlement, has failed. The elimination of the “right” of invasion, therefore, would not alter a state’s relationship to other states; would not eliminate any of its inherent functions, as, for example, its duty of self-defense. It would only proscribe one of the methods of such self-defense. A state is as much a state without this “right,” as it is with this “right.” In other words, the prerogative to invade a foreign state is allegedly a right, not an attribute of statehood. Since this alleged right is in conflict with the primary attribute of statehood, viz., sovereignty, it would assuredly seem to be an anomaly to recognize it as a right in international jurisprudence.

Invasion and occupation of a neighbor’s territory are, nevertheless, realistic practices among nations, recognized and regulated by international law. Inasmuch as this discussion is concerned with a consistent system of international jurisprudence, it will be apropos at this point to enquire what serious studies by high-minded scholars have done about this anomaly of a real-politik which legalizes, at one and the same time, the owner’s control and the burglar’s theft.

It is a disconcerting discovery one makes when he turns to the writers. They generally accept the fact of the anomaly, without calling it such, and cheerfully go their way without so much as attempting to rationalize the situation. The standard works on the subject have two divisions: The Law of Peace, and The Law of War. Peace and War are treated as insulated compartments, as far as the character of the laws controlling each is concerned. But nations can pass from the one status to the other as if through vacant space. They are made to pass from under the reign of the Law of Peace to that of War with the alacrity with which Milton’s Satan committed between earth and heaven, and adjusted their morals to the occasion, as he did his. It is this dualism in the thinking of writers of the traditional school which is fatal to a consistent system of international law and is a standing invitation to future wars.
For legal scholars to regard the coming of war, with resultant invasions, as the signal for a legitimate shift in the rules of the game, seems worse than folly. Yet, it is largely because scholars have in the past not branded invasions as outlaw practices, that these practices have retained much of their glamor. True, writers have usually condemned unwarranted invasions. But none have hewn straight to the line that every exercise of authority beyond the home frontiers is a sin against the Law of Nations and a crime against humanity. If this had been done for some centuries, or only decades, many a war would have been less popular and many a knight-errant expeditionary force would have stayed at home. One wonders whether mankind has not paid grievously for the sins of inconsistency of that profession, whose chief asset is supposed to be logical acumen.

The International Scene Since the War

It is, therefore, submitted, that inasmuch as there have been significant changes in international relations since the World War, the time has now more than arrived for scholars to change their traditional classification of war, meaning invasion, as a legal method of settling controversies. A cursory listing of some of the most striking developments of the last two decades will aid to establish that the hour for this reclassification has struck.

(1) League of Nations. We now have international machinery of government.

(2) World Court. We have a Permanent Court of International Justice. One frequently meets with the archaic argument that war is inevitable and must be regarded as legal, because states “acknowledge no common arbiter or judge” and have no “common superior tribunal.” With the League machinery available and the World Court in existence, it would seem that this apology for war must be interred with the defenses of private duelling. If a nation refuses to resort to the new avenues for settling differences, it must stand equally guilty with the individual who refuses to use the courts for the litigation of his private grievances.

(3) The Treaty of Mutual Assistance, proposed at the third League Assembly; the famous Geneva Protocol drawn up by the Assembly of 1924; the Locarno Agreement; and the American Movement for the Outlawry of War were all efforts to arrive at some satisfactory formula for outlawing wars that pass as self-defense, but are not such. Statesmen have usually hesitated to accept a violation of the frontier as the criterion, but they have approximated it.

(4) The Paris Peace Pact renounced war “as an instrument of national policy” (Article I).

(5) The Convention on Rights and Duties of States adopted at the Seventh International Conference of American States held in 1933 under the auspices of the Pan-American Union, states that the “territory of a state is inviolable and may not be the object of military occupation nor of other measures of force imposed by another state directly or indirectly or for any motive whatever even temporarily.” (Article XI)

(6) Lastly, a most remarkable series of declarations have come from the White House during the present administration. Among the most progressive of President Roosevelt’s many enlightened actions are the issuance of these three documents: (a) His message to the sovereigns and presidents of the world, May 16, 1933; (b) His message to Congress informing it of his message to the sovereigns and presidents, May 16, 1933; and (c) His address before the Woodrow Wilson Foundation, December 28, 1933.

Shall We Fight Beyond Our Borders?

In the first message the President proposed that the nations “individually agree that they will send no armed force of whatsoever nature across their frontiers.” And in the second message Mr. Roosevelt said:

“It is high time for us and for every other nation to understand the simple fact that the invasion of any nation, or the destruction of a national sovereignty, can be prevented only by the complete elimination of the weapons that make such a course possible today.” (House Document No. 36, 73rd Congress, 1st Session.)

It is unusually significant that the President here links invasion with the destruction of national sovereignty. If the President means to intimate that the one implies the other, the whole argument of these pages is implicit in that last quoted statement.

The last of President Roosevelt’s significant trio is his address of December 28, 1933. The President said that “after a hard-headed practical survey” of what the world’s masses wanted, he had made the following proposals to the nations of the world:

(1) That all offensive weapons be abolished;

(2) That permanent, non-mobile border fortifications as protection against possible invasion be allowed;

(3) That a continuing international inspection be provided to guard against the return of offensive weapons;

(4) That violation of the frontier be considered aggression;

(5) That each nation pledge not to permit its armed forces to cross into another nation’s territory; and

(6) That these agreements be unanimous.

Here, then, is a group of concrete, hard-headed suggestions which cut the Gordian knot of vague, entangled, diplomatic wrangling. The President said leaders of some peoples had met these suggestions with “ridicule.” But these peoples have wondered, he continued, whether they “themselves could not some day prevent governments from making war.” And Mr. Roosevelt closed with this stirring sentence:

“It is but an extension of the challenge of Woodrow Wilson for us to propose in this newer generation that from now on war by governments shall be changed to peace by peoples.” (Executive Office Files, No. 197, Newspaper release of Dec. 28, 1933.)

Would it be out of keeping with the spirit of the President for the youth of the nation to respond: “Quite so, Mr. President! Your inspiring frankness has proposed to us a challenge, and we mean to answer it with equal candor. The next time we are called upon to fight beyond our borders, we shall resolutely refuse.”
A Criterion for Defensive Warfare

As stated in the introduction, we have not attempted to mirror international practices. That, to paraphrase Mr. Hale’s double, has been so often done, and on the whole so well done, that we would not take the time to repeat it. All that reasoning “in vacuo” about self-defense, sacred rights, injured honor, right of intervention, bringing a wayward nation to its senses, and so forth, to the tune of antiquated rules and a tercentenarian terminology, is as grotesque as an ox-cart on Fifth Avenue. The stark fact of machine guns, tanks and bombing planes, all in a halo of mustard gas, has made us ask what the student of international law can in such a situation contribute to world equilibrium.

In answer we have proposed: That the dualism of Peace Law and War Law is unwarranted; that territorial sovereignty is the primary attribute of international statehood; that invasions violate this attribute; that they should, therefore, be outlawed by legal philosophers, even if they had not actually been outlawed by international conventions; that recent international negotiations and treaties make the present an opportune time to stigmatize international trespass as crime against society, and deprive it of every shred of legality; that such opprobrium consistently applied will bear fruits in the growing courage of ethically-minded citizens to suffer the pain and penalties of the law, rather than place unholy feet on a neighbor’s soil; and, finally, that such faith and practice are the surest way of making the Christian mandate effectively operative in governmental conduct.

The prime practical advantage of, in addition to the juridical reason for, selecting the national boundary as the Rubicon beyond which an army may not be carried, is that it offers a fixed and definite criterion of conduct. In the whirl of heaving passions that comes with war, it is difficult to tell whether a conflict is defensive or offensive. Yet most conscientious have foresworn all but defensive wars. They only need a fixed criterion by which to judge the nature of the conflict. Now a boundary is fixed and ascertainable even in time of war. Not all the haze of propaganda can blur that test of offensive or defensive war from our vision. It, therefore, offers a rule of practice, a modus vivendi, for the ethically-minded who must challenge the war system.

No Pacifism and No Wars of Invasion!

The Fathers of the Church inaugurated the discussion of just and unjust wars. Since their time, the argument has run from just wars, through probably just wars, invincible ignorance, excusable ignorance, war as the execution of a wrongdoer, and wars as just on both sides, to the tough-mindedness of the past century which abandoned the idea of justice as applied to war altogether. Having arrived at that point the cycle was complete, and we were ready to begin once more not far from where the “musty tomes of the Fathers and canonists and scholastic moralists” had begun. Our post-war efforts at world organization have enthroned the conscience of mankind as the criterion of what is just in matters military.

That situation would seem to offer a promising opportunity for those who “for conscience sake” must challenge the war system, without embracing pacifism. Most Calvinists appear to fall into that category. To meet the unique requirements of their faith and historical antecedents a proposed position in these matters should be the logical outgrowth of fundamental legal concepts, should offer a fixed criterion in an actural crisis, and should be a sufficiently radical, “root-and-branch” type of position, to evoke the courageous loyalty of fearless men. It is submitted that the position outlined above has these merits and should, therefore, receive the serious consideration of individuals, and of ecclesiastical assemblies which seek to guide their constituencies by adopting official recommendations in the matter.

FOR THREE FRIENDS

I

More like the stars than anyone else I know
You have maintained remoteness here below,
Moving serene in altitudes as rare
As all the beauty you have gathered there.

II

I live in new dimensions
Since you endowed my days
With unexpected coffers
From lavish treasuries.

These iridescent riches,
Evasive to define
Supply me with a stimulus
Superior to wine.

III

Your intellect is emery
To the metal of this mind,
For contact there, however brief,
Leaves the edge refined —

Leaves a polished instrument,
Thick along the blade
Where intermittent pressure
Skillfully was laid.

I try to tell you how this is —
How burnished one can feel
When you have laid that lambent touch
Along the slender steel;

But you demur and shrink into
A shy humility,
Incompetent to estimate
Your private emery.

—B. M.
The Camel's Hump
A Phantasy, by Frank Vanden Berg

A NUMBER of months ago for no reason whatever I became interested in the subject of camels. So I did the logical thing, the thing that any schoolmaster would do under the circumstances. I went to the library and got me a book on camels.

That book was a decided revelation. I soon found that my ignorance about the genus Camelus was profound. I knew as much about camels as a camel of ordinary intelligence knows about the theory of relativity, if not less. Less, you say? Yes, less. When you know a thing that isn't true, you know less than you would know if you didn't know that thing.

I read the book. But I first studied the pictures. That, by the way, is a good modus operandi. If the pictures aren't good, you can rest assured that the reading matter isn't any better. If the pictures are good, you can skip the descriptions.

Well, the camel is a quadruped, has a small head, a long neck, carries burdens, is called the ship of the desert, etc., ad infinitum. But one of the peculiar ear-marks, or rather back-marks, of the camel is the permanent saddle-horn, or saddle-horns, as the case may be, on its back. There is a reason for the hump, as you will learn.

Let me digress here for a moment.

Have you ever wanted real, exact, genuine, first-hand information on any subject when you were willing to go to almost any length to get it? And did it ever happen that at just such a time you found someone who had the exact information you wanted? Yes? Then you know how I felt when on a midwestern train I met a swarthy son of the desert. And how he did talk! We whirled through many a town and city and hamlet as he talked. And how he did talk!

Now, don't worry. I am not going to give you a reproduction of his discourse. My friend's description and narrative would lose ninety-nine per cent of their vividness in the transmission. Second-hand stories have that quaint habit. But let me tell you what he told me about the camel's hump.

The hump is of muscular and cellular composition. When the animal is healthy and well-fed, the hump accumulates fat and swells in proportion. During a time of fatigue and scarcity of food the hump supplies the animal with sustenance from this extra supply of food. When this extra supply is exhausted, the hump falls over and hangs like an empty sack along the ridge of the animal's back. This hump is for the camel a reservoir of physical energy and serves a useful purpose but — and this is the point — it serves for only a limited time. The store of energy must be continually replenished.

A pause followed his vivid lecture. There was nothing to say for a while and we both said it.

Then he again turned to me.

"You have no camels in your country except perhaps in your zoos."

I admitted that we didn't have a legion of them in captivity.

"But," I continued, "let me tell you about certain people in various walks of life, in every city, village, town, and hamlet, and even on our farms, whom we shall liken to camels for a moment."

"Please do so," he replied.

He was evidently non-plussed.

So I explained to him in everyman's English. I talked to him about our professional men, our merchants, tradesmen, office people, and other folk.

"We have in every career men and women who once upon a time in the dim past absorbed more or less thoroughly a great quantity of knowledge. They received a certain undefinable but nevertheless, let us hope, real mental drill. In their younger days they matriculated at a normal, business, professional, or technical school. Some even got a preparatory training in a college. They pursued the study of mathematics, science, literature, psychology, pedagogy, engineering, medicine, or whatever captivated their interest. A few of these dear folks didn't get very far in their studies because they labored under the delusion that extra-curricular activity was a substitute for intra-curricular inactivity, but we're not talking about that group. Well, tempus fugit.
One rare day in June the diligent students were handed a square foot of sheepskin which certified to a number of things. Then they began to put their knowledge to some use. They were thoroughly prepared for the long trek. They were full of enthusiasm. They were up to date.

"But the years rolled on. They seem to have that custom. Gradually their enthusiasm died away. Ambition began to flag. Times changed. The world's knowledge increased by leaps and bounds. But these dear folks knew nothing about all this. They had quit studying. They no longer read. Now they're still doing the same old things in the same old way. They're in a rut. Their reservoir of knowledge is exhausted. Their professional hump is just about flat. They belong to the army of has-been's."

"I should say," injected my friend, "they belong to the regiment of never-was's."

After some little time he remarked, "Aren't those folks so exhausted that they cannot go on?"

"They're still going," I replied, "not so strong, but they're still going."

"How much longer can they last?"

"I don't know. We say of them that they've gone to seed."

Again he was puzzled.

"Isn't there any opportunity to get new knowledge and to learn about new methods so they can keep up with the times?"

"Oh, yes. We have summer schools, evening classes, correspondence institutes, extension courses, lectures, free public libraries, etc."

"Why don't they use these things?"

"Now you have asked a real question. Some don't think they need it. Some are too busy with other activities. Some are too lazy. Some don't know any better."

"Are they satisfied?"

"Some are and some aren't."

He had one more question.

"What are they going to do about it?"

My answer was simple.

"You had better ask them."

We reached the Grand Central Station. The man from Arabia put on his hat and took his grip from the rack overhead. The train came to a stop. We shook hands.

"My dear sir," I said, "will you give me a suggestion?"

He nodded.

"Three weeks from today I have to talk to a professional group. What shall I tell them?"

His answer came in a flash.

"Tell them about the camel's hump."

---
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FROM the Dallas Evangelical College, Dallas, Texas, comes this book on a familiar but always interesting subject. It was prepared as a thesis in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Theology. It is a pleasure to welcome, in the person of its author, a young champion into the arena of theological controversy. He comes to break a lance in defense of the premillennial system, and his trumpet challenges especially two men well known to readers of this magazine, Drs. William Masselink and Martin J. Wyngaarden. In such a tilt, the onlooker has much to gain. It is written, "He that pleaseth his cause first seemeth just; but his neighbor cometh and searcheth him out. (Prov. 18:17.)" Here Dr. Feinberg is the neighbor, who subjects the Reformed theology to a searching criticism on certain vital points. It will do us all good to take heed to what he has to say; that we may mend our ways, if found to be in error, or may the more firmly and intelligently hold our own position, if it will really bear examination on biblical grounds. It is on the Bible that he takes his stand, and it is refreshing to read a book that so completely, without reserve or apology, accepts it as the Word of God.

The title of the book, however, seems to us open to criticism. In it (and throughout his book), the author refers to the system he holds and defends as "Premillennialism"; but on numerous points many of those most eminent in that school of interpretation would repudiate his doctrines. What he says on the Church and the Sermon on the Mount would not meet the approval of the older Protestant millenarians like Joseph Mede or the millenarian members of the Westminster Assembly, or of the very eminent and learned commentator Henry Alford, whom he repeatedly quotes. His views on the "Tribulation" and the "Imminence" of the Second Advent are rejected by Dr. Henry W. Frost, in his recent work, The Second Coming of Christ; and his interpretation of the book of Revelation is vigorously controverted by Dr. H. Gratian Guinnness, in The Approaching End of the Age, chapter 3. All these are premillenarians, but not of Dr. Feinberg's school. On the other hand, most of the doctrines he opposes are not peculiar to a limited school of theologians, the "amillenarians," but have been the faith of the entire Christian church, Catholic and Protestant, from the beginning until now.

In the introduction, the Rev. Dr. L. S. Chafer, president of the Dallas Evangelical College, speaks very highly of the author and his work, which is natural and right in an introduction; but he says one thing that arouses our dissent. He says that Dr. Feinberg is "peculiarly qualified to discuss the problems presented in this book," and then informs us that this peculiar fitness rests upon the fact that he is a Hebrew, reared in a strictly orthodox Jewish home, and trained for rabbinical service. Now, is it not clear that the Jews are Jews in religion, and not Christians, primarily because they do not accept the New Testa-
ment interpretation of the Messianic prophecies? From the Christian standpoint it must therefore be held that the author of this book was from childhood trained in a false system of prophetic interpretation. That he has, with such a handicap, come to accept Christ, is wonderful. We welcome him into the Christian fellowship with open arms.

This work is divided into four parts, an introductory discussion, dealing chiefly with principles of interpretation; a second part, setting forth the dispensational system, a third part, stating the "amillennial" position, and a final section, refuting the ordinary Christian doctrines on the points involved.

The Early Church Chiliastic?

On p. 27, of the first part, we find a statement to the effect that "the entire early church for the first three centuries was premillennial, almost to a man." He quotes in support of this statement a passage from the writings of Dr. Adolph Harnack, (the reference is not given) but the said quotation, carefully read, does not say anything of the kind. It merely asserts that the chiliastic expectation was early, which no one will deny. It says nothing about the extent to which it prevailed. If Dr. Harnack's article on the millennium in the 14th edition of the "Encyclopaedia Britannica" be consulted, it will be found that he gives full recognition to opposing views present in the church of the first three centuries. It is not clear where Dr. Feinberg begins his "first three hundred years." If at 50 A.D., before the New Testament books began to be written, the period closes at 350 A.D., and it is preposterous to say that during all this time the early believers were chiliasts, "almost to a man." Justin Martyr, the first millenarian of whom we have writings, tells us plainly that, in his day, many orthodox Christians did not share that opinion. Within this period lived Origen, famous for his opposition to chili­asm; his successor Dionysius, equally active in opposition; Caius, who attributed the origin of chili­iasm to Cerinthus, the heretic; and Eusebius, the church historian, who swears at Papias for being a millenarian, and therefore "a man of small understanding!" The "Alogi," of the second century, also rejected it. How any one who has even a moderate acquaintance with the patristic literature can think that millenniumism was during the period named the general faith of the church, is difficult to understand.

Spiritualizing not Allegorizing

In discussing methods of interpretation, our author again arouses our dissent when he identifies the spiritualizing interpretation of Dr. Wyngaarden and Christ­ian theologians in general with the allegorizing of Origen and others in the early church. Nothing could be more inaccurate and unjust. No one now defends or employs the allegorizing method of exegesis. Calvin and the other great Bible students of the Reformation saw clearly that the method was wrong, and taught the now generally accepted "grammatico-historical" literal interpretation, so far as the scriptures in general are concerned. That they retained the spiritualizing method in expounding many of the prophecies was because they found themselves forced to do so in order to be faithful to the exegesis of the New Testament. Passages like Isaiah 7:14 (Matthew 1:22, 23), Hosea 11:1 (Matthew 2:15), Jeremiah 31:15 (Matthew 2:18), Exodus 3:6 (Matthew 22:32), Psalm 16:10 (Acts 2:25-32), Exodus 12:46 (John 19:36), Jeremia­h 31:31 sq. (Hebrews 8:6 sq.), and many others, are said in the New Testament to have been fulfilled, although the "grammatico-historical" literal interpretation of the texts as found in the Old Testament can not possibly discover such meanings in them. To the modernist this offers no difficulty. He sticks to his "grammatico-historical" exegetical apparatus, and says the New Testament writers were mistaken; but if we are to accept the latter as our guides in the interpretation of Scripture we must seek a principle that will unify and justify their exegesis. This is the principle that within the history and prophecy of the Old Testament there lies a spiritual significance, everything looking forward to the redemption of Christ, and that ultimately the spiritual meaning is the real thing, through which the prophecy will be fulfilled in essence, whether it is in form or not.

With page 52 our author finishes his criticism of the "spiritualizing" interpretation, and turns to a review of "The Kingdom in the Old Testament." He begins with Gen. 3:15, the "protevangelium," and—mirabile dictu!—he proceeds to spiritualize this text! Having just insisted strenuously that in any passage the literal sense, and that only (with proper allowance for figures of speech) must be accepted, he finds in this passage "two contending forces, headed by Satan on the one hand and Christ on the other"; but no such parties are named, and no "grammatico-historical" literal exegesis can discover them there. To find them here is spiritualization, pure and simple: very good spiritualization, too, in our opinion, but spiritualization nevertheless, and nothing else in the world. To learn what the literal exegesis without any spiritualizing finds in this passage, see the one volume commentary of A. S. Peake; who finds nothing here but a story of men and snakes. Thus does literalism lead straight to modernism.

Millennium and Kingdom Identical?

On pages 53-83 the author reviews the development of the idea of the Kingdom of God in the Old Testament, in terms which we also can, for the most part, accept. One is tempted to ask what all this has to do with the millennium; but we find enlightenment on p. 143, where we are told that "millennium and kingdom are exactly the same ideas." If that is true, these pages are pertinent—but it takes a lot of proving, and most of us are not convinced.

From page 84 to page 147, the dispensationalist doctrines are presented. All the familiar Scofield positions are here, well and clearly stated. Here and there scriptural proof is offered, but for the most part there is assertion only. This is more easily understood than justified, in a book of this kind. The writer seeks to defend all the doctrines of Darbyite dispensational the-
ogy, and can not possibly devote the necessary space to a careful exegesis of the biblical passages on which he relies to prove them. He must therefore content himself with saying that such and such scriptures must be understood in this or that manner; but this is precisely the question at issue. Is it exegetically defensible to separate the seventieth week of Daniel 9:24-27 from the previous sixty-nine weeks? Does the Sermon on the Mount bear the character he gives it? Can the great judgment scene in Matthew 25 be understood of nations in their national capacity? Is there the least proof of the postponement of the Great Day of Atonement? It appears much more abundantly in the prophetic revelation alongside of the law. Thus, while we may rightly call the period before Christ the dispensation of the law, and that after Christ the dispensation of grace, yet this must never be so held or taught as to exclude absolutely grace from the former or law from the latter.

Because the subject is so intricate, he is a theologian indeed who can formulate a doctrine of law and grace that shall do full justice to all the elements of the case, without omission or error. The brief discussion here given of thirteen pages does not fully satisfy. What Dr. Feinberg confutes is called by him the "amillennial" doctrine, but is really the standard Protestant doctrine. For our part, in reading what he says, we feel that much that he puts forth is acceptable, and that the difference between him and his opponents rests partly on difference in definition of terms; therefore is not so fundamental as he thinks. Yet there are some things he says to which we must register our dissent. On page 180 he insists that the moral requirements under law fall below those under grace. Yet the Lord Jesus Christ gives as the greatest commandment in the law, quoting from Deut. 6:5 and Leviticus 19:18, the duty to love God supremely and our neighbors as ourselves. What requirement under grace can possibly exceed this?

Law and Grace

We begin with his chapter on "Law and Grace," pp. 171-183. On the one hand we must do justice to John 1:17: "The law was given through Moses; grace and truth came through Jesus Christ." This indicates a definite point in history at which there was a change. So also in Galatians 4:1-5. Thus, in general, to speak of the dispensation of the law and the dispensation of grace as contrasted, is fully justified. On the other hand, to this historical change answers in a measure an experience of the individual life. The unconverted man is under the law, and thus under condemnation, although it is now nineteen hundred years since the dispensations changed. When he is redeemed by grace through faith he is in some sense and to some degree (as all evangelical Christians agree) free from the law, but exactly in what sense, and to what degree? In solving the problem of the law, one needs to determine his terms very carefully. In what passage does "the law" mean the Mosaic law, and where does it mean the general law written in the heart of man, or does it sometimes mean both? If it means the Mosaic law, does it mean the whole law, or only the Ten Commandments? One must give full weight to the numerous passages where the Decalogue is cited, or at least seems to be cited, as a rule of conduct still binding upon Christians; but one must not ignore the special attitude of the New Testament writers toward the Fourth Commandment. Observance of this commandment alone is never called a Christian duty, believers are not exhorted to obey it, praised for keeping it, or blamed for failing to obey it; and when the Council at Jerusalem writes to the Gentile Christians, enumerating things peculiar to Judaism which they ought to observe, nothing is said about the Sabbath.

In addition to the above, it must not be overlooked that there is much grace, even in the dispensation of the law. It is embedded in the law itself, in the provision for sin and trespass offerings, and in the Great Day of Atonement: it appears much more abundantly in the prophetic revelation alongside of the law. Thus, while we may rightly call the period before Christ the dispensation of the law, and that after Christ the dispensation of grace, yet this must never be so held or taught as to exclude absolutely grace from the former or law from the latter.

No Grace in the Millennium

The most surprising thing in this discussion—and perhaps the most surprising in the whole book—is found on p. 177.

"The Epistle to Titus affirms that 'the grace of God that bringeth salvation hath appeared to all men.' That grace, which came by Jesus Christ and now offers salvation to all, 'for there is no difference between the Jew and the Greek: for the same Lord over all is rich unto all that call upon Him'; that grace, I say, will terminate at the catching away of the Body of Christ to be ever with the Lord.

Again he says, on p. 190:

"Israel was governed (and will be in the millennium age) by a principle wholly foreign to that which is in force in the Christian age. Israel was under the Mosaic system, which required one to 'Do and live', and 'Do and be', as we saw in our discussion of the law and grace. It afforded no divine enablement, but could only pronounce finally: 'Cursed be he that confirmeth not all the words of this law to do them.' It was a system founded upon the covenant of works and was dependent upon the energy of the flesh for its accomplishment."
These two passages seem quite clearly to say that during the millennium there will be no grace of God, but only law. It must follow from this, we think, that no one can then be saved, for sin will still be in the human heart (as Dr. Feinberg fully allows) and the Pauline principle must still hold: “By the deeds of the law shall no flesh be justified.” Yet on pp. 202 and 217 we read of people being saved after the church age, in the same way as now, through faith in Christ. We can not reconcile these things. If the author really means to say that in the millennium there will be a restoration of law, and law only, without grace; then for sinful men this will not be a joyful, but a dark and hopeless time. Let us then give thanks that we do not live in it! The positions taken seem so inconsistent with each other and the former is so abhorrent to any evangelical faith that we suspect we have misunderstood the author in some way. We look eagerly for more light on this point.

Israel, the Church, the Kingdom

The heart of the whole problem is the relation of Israel and the Church, and here, also, what the author rejects is not the theology of a limited group, but the faith of the whole church from the beginning until the times of John N. Darby. He repeatedly seeks to show that his view is that of the early church, but even if this were true with regard to the millennium (which it is not), it is emphatically untrue with regard to this point. That Christ did not set up His kingdom at His first coming and that the church did not take the place of Israel, would have seemed to the church fathers amazing heresies. I am not aware that any one of them ever dreamed of such a thing.

The two chapters in which our author discusses “Israel and the Church” and “The Church and the Kingdom” are to us the least satisfactory in the book. He seems to us not to have apprehended the strength of the arguments for the ordinary Christian doctrine; at any rate, he gives no adequate consideration to the grounds upon which that doctrine rests; such as St. Paul’s teaching of the one olive tree, from which the unbelieving Jews were cut off, and into which the believing Gentiles were grafted in; with the analogous teaching of the “commonwealth of Israel,” to which the Gentile believers were at one time aliens, as “fellow citizens with the saints.” Nor does he notice the very clear teaching of II Corinthians 3 and Hebrews 8-10, that the “New Covenant” promised to “The House of Israel and the House of Judah” has been fulfilled in the church. All this may be wrong, but it should at least, in such a study as this, have been shown, by thorough exegetical examination of the passages concerned, to be wrong. It should not be simply ignored.

Two things account largely for the dispute on this point, of which the first is the different conceptions of the church entertained by the parties to the debate. From what Dr. Feinberg says in regard to the church, on pp. 187 and 188, taken partly from the teaching of Dr. Chafer, it is clear that he has in view only the “invisible church,” the body of those truly regenerate. Of course, no one believes that the church, in this sense, is the continuation of, or the successor to the national Old Testament Israel. But the church is also a visible community, with officers and ordinances, the members of which are bound together by their profession of faith in Christ. Some of these members are regenerate, others are not, but are as unfruitful branches in the vine. Yet they all together are in the church, as all the fish, both good and bad, are together in the net. It is the church in this sense that we believe to be the New Covenant Israel, the “commonwealth of Israel,” the olive tree, the vine planted by the great Husbandman; and when so considered it is the historic continuation of the People of God, the heir to all the promises, and the body to which the prophecies must be fulfilled. It is no adequate reply to this to point out differences between this church and Israel, To be sure, there are such differences, plenty of them. Nor is it any better reply to prove that Christ spoke of the church as yet future in Matthew 16:18. No one denies that it was, in one sense, future at that time. Can, then, a thing be new and yet the same time be identical with something that already existed? Certainly that may be so. Take as an illustration the foetus in the womb and the child after birth. The day of his birth is the beginning of a man’s life, as a man among men, but did he not exist in the womb? You can multiply differences between the man and the foetus, but are they not, after all, one continuing organism? So with Israel and the church.

The True Israel

The misconception that commonly obscures the unbroken historical continuity of these two is the idea that all Israel rejected the Messianic king, and that therefore the promised kingdom could not be set up. Many in Israel did, including the official heads of the nation, but not all Israel. There was a group — and not so small as often supposed — who accepted the King, even during His humiliation, and these were augmented by thousands who did so after His resurrection. They were a minority of the nation, to be sure, but that also was in accordance with prophecy; for “Isaiah crieth concerning Israel, If the number of the children of Israel be as the sand of the sea, it is the remnant that shall be saved” (Romans 9:27). These, then, who in faith accepted the King and the offered good, what became of them? Was the offer which they had accepted withdrawn, and did the King fail to set up His kingdom? Nay verily, for it is written: “The election obtained it, and the rest were hardened.” Obtained what? The thing offered and sought, the hope of Israel, “the hope of the promise made of God unto our fathers.” These Israelites, therefore, constituted the only group that had a right to be called Israel, for the rest had by their rebellion and rejection of the King lost that status. For some time — we do not know how long — the church was composed exclusively, or almost so, of these Israelites, and when the Gentiles came in it was they who assembled in the Council of Jerusalem to determine the conditions on which the latter could be admitted to citizenship. It is therefore not true, as often stated, that the covenanted promises were transferred from the Jews to the Gentiles. Those promises were simply continued to that portion of the nation that was willing to accept the fulfilment in the form offered. When the Gentile converts came in, that made no change in the situation, any more than it makes a change in the nature and constitution of the United States when immigrants are admitted to citizenship.
After the Spring
Bastian Kruithof

When Keesge reached his mother's side, she was lying very still. He felt a painful fear like a stab in the chest. But when he stooped to pick her up, a slight groan escaped her. She was alive. The words burst from him as his father and Jan came up panting. They asked no questions, but together they carried Elsa to her bed where they bathed her forehead and temples with cool water from the creek.

After a time Elsa stirred and stared wide-eyed about her. When the look of surprise had vanished, a faint smile crept over her mouth and cheeks. Like a child awakening to the mother's touch she lay gazing up at the concerned faces of the men. She noticed the changing expression there and was happy at their subdued happiness now that she was smiling. But there was anxiety in Wiebe's questioning.

She replied very calmly:

"'Twas the heat, I guess, Wiebe. I became giddy in the bean-field and thought it was best to get out of the sun." Consciousness was returning more clearly now. Her voice grew stronger as she continued. "I don't remember just how I came here. I think I fell on the doorstep, didn't I?"

"Yes, Elsa, and Keesge saw you in time. But now you mustn't talk too much. You need rest, and you're going to get it too. You've been working too hard for your own good." He added playfully: "And now that we've got you in bed, you're going to have a little vacation. Frozen feet, and spring rains, and summer heat have brought you to this, no doubt. So here you are for a good rest, Elsa."

"But the beans, Wiebe, the beans. I didn't pick enough of them for the evening meal. I . . . ."

But Wiebe interrupted her firmly. "Never mind the beans, Elsa. There are others here besides you who can pick them. And Jan here can cook as fine a pot of beans as many a woman. Isn't that right, Jan. You've done it before, haven't you?"

Jan was grinning sheepishly and tugging at the faded pockets of his overalls. Under normal conditions Jan never felt quite at ease with women, but with women ailing he felt more than ever out of place. However, he managed to reply to Wiebe's direct question.

"Guess it will be all right, Wiebe; guess it will. And maybe we'd better pick some more beans first, eh, Keesge?"

He was eager to find an excuse for getting out into the fields again where life did not hang unsteadily suspended as in the somber coolness of this room. Keesge followed him, but at the door he threw a warm smile back at his mother, the intangible expression of wordless love. Her eyes followed him past Wiebe out of the room. With the peaceful figure on the bed floating in his mind Keesge hurried into the heat of the afternoon to help Jan with the bean picking. He was thankful that it had gone well with his mother, and his gladness increased at the thought of his father's cheer when they might have been discouraged.

Elsa Gombert was failing. She had not been her strong, vivacious self since the last rigorous winter with its alternating blizzards and frost that had stunned the life of the young settlement. As the busy days leaped ahead toward summer, she felt her strength ebbing. After the thaw and the rains spring had crept like a soft green blush over the open fields and the wooded hills where naked trees had slumbered with the cold. For days the wild geese had flown overhead in arrow-headed flocks and had settled in the marshes to feed, only to resume their unwearied flight to distant marshes that called. But one warm May morning when robins were warbling in the clearings, and the tinted buds had given birth to fresh green shoots, there had come as a whisper to Elsa the realization that her life was not quickening with the new season as in years past. There had been a time when with the awakening of nature her life seemed to bloom afresh. But this time there was no stirring of the young settlement. As the busy heat and struck their shovels into hardened clods with the sweat of their faces. When three times a summer day had left them. The men no longer measured the rhythmic rows she suddenly experienced a giddy feeling. The stroke of the hoe crept into her temples. Round about her the bean-field was spinning dizzyingly. She closed her eyes and leaned heavily on her stiffened arms to keep from falling forward. When she felt strong enough to rise to her feet, she picked up the pan of beans and walked slowly toward the cabin. At the doorstep she hesitated. It was coming again. Her hands clutched wildly at the doorposts. Then she reeled and fell heavily forward to the floor.

Keesge, who had been watching his mother's uncommonly slow steps from where he was working at the edge of the woods, saw her fall. With a cry to his father and Jan he dropped two ears of corn and ran with the utmost speed to the cabin. Jip dashed ahead, barking furiously at the unexpected break in the day's even course.

August followed like a hot blast upon the heels of July. The men no longer measured the rhythmic stroke of the hoe that had sounded like the clash of metal on sand-stone. They were now retrieving what the burning days had left them. One day Elsa went to the bean-field where the picking was meager enough. Crouched down between the overhanging rows she suddenly experienced a giddy feeling. The heat seemed to be pressing into her temples. Round about her the bean-field was spinning dizzyingly. She closed her eyes and leaned heavily on her stiffened arms to keep from falling forward. When she felt strong enough to rise to her feet, she picked up the pan of beans and walked slowly toward the cabin. At the doorstep she hesitated. It was coming again. Her hands clutched wildly at the doorposts. Then she reeled and fell heavily forward to the floor.

Keesge, who had been watching his mother's uncommonly slow steps from where he was working at the edge of the woods, saw her fall. With a cry to his father and Jan he dropped two ears of corn and ran with the utmost speed to the cabin. Jip dashed ahead, barking furiously at the unexpected break in the day's even course.
For several days Elsa held her bed. Wiebe did not flinch from his determination that she should rest. But the fact that she ceased to protest after the first day was not entirely cheering. It had always been a wasted effort to dictate to Elsa about letting up on her duties. Now, however, there seemed to have come over her a certain weariness against which she had neither the power nor the inclination to assert herself. It pained her not a little that she was unable to hide it from the eyes of her husband. But neither of them spoke of it, largely for the sake of Keesge whose youthful hopes must be spared the bight of sorrow as long as possible.

When Elsa left her bed, she was resolved to do her work as usual without the least complaint. Though she felt that she would never again regain her former vigor, her hopes ran high that fresh air and sunshine would drive away the lassitude which had enchanched her since her fall. One morning for Keesge's sake and the joy of the household she sent Jan pellmell away from the first place where the pots were bubbling and lectured him on his neglected affairs in the fields. Keesge and his father could not refrain from laughing loudly at the sight of Jan standing in the open doorway, rubbing his nose awkwardly and pretending to be taken aback at Elsa's playful scolding. But in spite of her playfulness Elsa melted with pity.

"You may have your breakfast first though, Jan."

Her words only provoked more laughter. Jan heaved a sigh of relief as he drew up a chair. There was mirth in their hearts on this morning when Elsa had left her bed to rule once more at the hearth.

But Elsa did not work in the fields again. From morning till night she made a pretence of keeping busy with her household cares. There was the new plank floor to be scrubbed daily; there were the mending, and cooking, and scouring of pots and pans until they glistened. She kept to herself the times when she had to stop and rest for want of breath. Though she felt that she would never again regain her energy, her hope ran high that her heart throbbed in every limb. Then the dizzy spells would come over her, and she would clutch the table for support. But these things she did not mention to the men folk. Her only dread was that they might come upon her when these spells were at their worst.

Under the elm on the creek bank Keesge made a bench for his mother where she could sun herself and enjoy the air when the morning was clear. Only after a great deal of urging did she consent to sit there for a short hour on week days. But then she took her knitting with her, for it would be nothing short of sin on her part if the world should see her idle with so many duties unfulfilled.

September saw the settlers putting their last efforts into the meager harvest. The late rains had put an end to the ravages of the drought, but the crops had not revived sufficiently. The needy farmers looked forward to another winter of sharing with the needier. So it had been in the past; so it would continue to be until with the help of God they had tamed the wild enough to give them their daily bread with less of the wounds that came with failure.

But in the Gombert family little thought was given to the harvest this year. One day in October when the leaves were beginning to fall from the giant elm, Elsa took to her bed. For weeks she had striven against this with failing strength, but at last she surrendered with characteristic serenity. Though she knew it was useless she allowed the doctor to come for the first time. Now she rested daily and was content to see the men take over her duties with hands not fashioned for the more delicate cares.

One day Keesge heard a subdued conversation between his mother and father. For the moment he did not dare enter the room. Something within him quaked, and his throat felt as if it were ready to burst. His father was talking very softly.

"And if you should not rise from your bed again, Elsa?"

Elsa took to her bed. For weeks she had striven with failing strength, but at last she quaked, and his throat felt as if it were ready to burst. Her voice came protestingly.

"You may have your breakfast first though, Jan."

Keesge held his breath. His mother was replying in a weak but controlled voice.

"Then 'twill be all right too, Wiebe. Of course, I would like to stay with you and Keesge. It's hard for men to do without women in the house. But if it must be, well then it must be. There's little we can do about it, I'm thinking. I'm not afraid, Wiebe, because the Lord will take care of his own, that's sure."

"Yes, Elsa, it's good to be able to believe that. But we're ready to say that you mustn't leave us yet. Elsa. We'd be missing you in the home. There's those that can be missed and those that can't."

He paused for a moment, and went on: "But when we think of the many mansions, we'll not be missing each other for long."

"That's it, Wiebe. I can be thankful for that. And I can be thankful that I'll be the first to go. It's men who are needed in the settlement. When I look at your hands and mine, Wiebe, it seems as though mine were not made for such work as we've found here. But your hands have done a good work. And there's more than the work of a man's hands to be done. I'm satisfied, Wiebe, when I think that you've not been wanting there either."

"Sometimes I feel guilty for having brought you here, Elsa. It's not like the old home across the sea, and life in this country seems hard on the women folk."

Her voice came protestingly. "Don't say that, Wiebe. I wanted to come as much as you. Moreover, one can't be thinking of oneself alone. It was for Keesge's good too and for the others who've come. And now, Wiebe, I think I ought to sleep some. I'm so tired."

"Yes, Elsa, you ought to sleep some. 'Twill do you good, for you are tired."

Keesge heard his father coming from the room, but above the footfalls he still heard his mother's voice that had descended to a hushed whisper. In later years he was to hear again those subdued, trailing words thirsting for rest: "I'm so tired."

His eyes sought his father's, and in the swift glance later there lay a unspeakable anguish silentlysmarting under the crushing sense of a coming loss.

The days and nights passed like chill wreaths while Elsa Gombert lingered. November came creeping over the land like a silver dream tinged with ochre. In its frosted breath the pungent odor...
of burning leaves drifted lazily like incense. Tumbleweeds no longer went barreling over the bleak ground. Cornstalks that had ratted and waved shriveled pennons in the raw winds of October stood like stiff corpses in tattered clothing, reaping a last glory on the lifeless fields. The clearings stretched farther and farther where more timber had been cut. In the silent reaches of the woods the last leaves were falling like forked tongues of flame to warm the chilled earth.

Keesge tried to overcome the gloom that the season could not dispel. He swept and scrubbed the stalls daily and repaired the leaking roof of the barn. But try as he might, he could not keep his eyes from wandering back to the cabin where his mother lay. It seemed that the ebbing life within was the focal point of all his thoughts and actions. In these days his mother's life appeared to draw all things toward it. The settlement, the world, the retreating sun during the day, and at night the bright stars seemed to be moving with mute sereneness around the waning life that lay so very still under the thatched roof.

One morning as Keesge leaned against the new corn-crib which he and Jan had made, he saw his father step from the door of the cabin with raised arm. A cold fear ran through him as he started to run. His father with set face motioned him to follow. As they softly entered the room, Keesge heard but vaguely his father's words:

"I think 'tis the last, Keesge."

His mother was lying in a half-stupor; she had lain thus for days now. Her wasted form seemed far too small for the large bed. On the pillow her silvery hair lay loose and lifeless. She was breathing heavily; her open mouth hung slackly as if they were heavy with slumber.

"The hands are getting cold, father."

Keesge had scarcely uttered the words when it struck him with a pang that he had not said, "Her hands." This thing that was silently creeping into the room he could not associate with his mother. And yet, it was there, more forceful because of its secret workings. Slowly but steadily like the shadow of a passing cloud over a field of grain it swept over the frail body of his mother while they stood by helpless and staring.

Keesge quietly stole out of the cabin into the enfolding darkness. There were the same stars as before. They had not changed, though life on this little plot had altered decidedly. Still a feeling of peace had settled on him after the return from the cedar swamp. He found it impossible to fix his mind on that particular spot. Was not his mother alive, and was not life going on as before? He was standing under the elm from whose pleading branches a few curled leaves hung like dead sparrows in the moonlight. Tonight the great tree became the symbol of changing life and the varied seasons. For countless years — he did not know how many — it had stood there, silently striking its roots more firmly into the soil, drawing without show its nurture from the blurred ground to the naked arms with their fine weavings of branches and twigs that stood out like a network of veins against the blue haze of the November sky. He remembered by contrast how the succulent breath of spring had called forth the buds, it seemed in the short span of a night of tepid rain. During the summer the elm's great, green crown, that hid half the sky, shaded the restless lives of twittering sparrows and fighting jays that came and went like flashes of pale blue against the massed leaves. But each year persistent robins held their nest in the topmost branches and carolled peacefully above the din of hostile birds. He remembered how a few summers ago there had come to him the crazy suggestion that he was walking in the tree's top with the dark green leaves swaying under him in soft, sibilant waves. But now the elm had shed its leaves, and soon it would stand silhouetted darkly against grey lowering skies and fields of snow. Nevertheless, its huge bulk would go on living, sipping its nourishment from the soil below the frost-line. After the winter the renascence of life; and after the spring, fulfillment.

Then under the elm there stole over Keesge the renewed reality of love whose subtle weavings had patterned with color the grey of these last days. Elaine had come to him the morning after his mother's passing and had asked knowingly after his welfare. Her arms had gone unhesitatingly around
him, and their nearness had been a buoying force in his stunned condition. He looked across the creek and the clearing to where a light shone immovable like a star. In the years to come he would follow that beam, for it was not good that a man should be alone in the world. After the spring life would again breathe upon these acres; and in the cabins mothers would croon to the young lives that knew not the stroke of an axe from the fall of an acorn. He started at the thought. He must return at once to his father who was now alone with nothing but the memory of the woman who had toiled and loved for years at his side.

When Keesge stepped quietly into the cabin, his father was sitting at the table, his elbows planted firmly on the large family Bible. By the light of the candle his figure loomed massive against the shadowed parts of the room. To Keesge his father seemed like some hermit of whom he had read, filling the lonely vigils of the night with words of promise that never fail. As Keesge tiptoed softly across the room, he saw between his father's head and the upright arm the spaced columns of the Psalms. And on the wide page there were raised blisters where the print was moist with a lonely man's grief.

---

**T R E E S**

I love trees.
Their green and brown and red;
The netted outlines veined
In each fluttering light leaf-blade.
The trunk that stands so strong;
The branches that lean long
And bend
With fruit or bloom or blessed shade
Trees, God-made.

I love trees.
Their rustling and their sighing;
Their budding green of spring, gay autumn dying;
Tufts of snow, white on bare branches lying;
Stark silver-gray and brown toward blue and white:
Trees, God's Might.

Somewhere in a garden the tiny thing was set;
Small shoots reach up for early dews and wet;
The little plant as yet no tree is showing
But in my heart already praise is glowing
For all the future joys the tree is knowing.
And any tree in any stage of growth
Is but an emblem of a living truth.

And don't you love a single tree alone?
Great, strong and true. With courage it has grown.
A living tree set in a living field,
The plain all sunlight and the tree a shield.
Protecting watchman on the shimmering green
It offers peace and rest to workingmen.

I love trees.
Orchards of trees, with blossoms heralding
Their color trumpets of gay fruits that swing
From under branches like a magic thing.

A row of trees set by a temple wall
Is more than music or a worship call.
Tall trees in rows set by a garden plot
Have made impressions that were not forgot.
And trees around a home may reach to heaven
And call a blessing down that is God-given.
I love them flush or sere
Trees, God-dear.

Forests of trees. Dim aisles now penetrating;
Dark verdant growth of these
Lead onward still thru winding paths of peace.
Entreating, retreating,
Our feet the echoes beating.
Life snapping twigs, now grating
Now hushed. How still! Our very souls are waiting.
How strong!
How they reach upward as we move along.

How soft with moss and fern beneath our feet;
How still the air, with odors pungent, sweet.

Who does not love the trees? Their understanding
Patience, caprice, and joyousness unending;
Their strength, endurance and their quivering birth,
Their height to heaven with warm roots in earth.

The trees, the trees!
Dear home for birds and bees.
And every living thing in some strange way
Is blessed because of what trees give away.
Matted in jungles, in deserts green oases;
On the lone mountain-top, or swishing with the grasses.
Shielding a home or shading a well
There is a message from God in their swell.
Wherever trees stand on the earth's lined face
They are a token of God's common grace.

I love trees.
Their green and brown and shade;
Their singing and sighing;
Their wild-life crying;
Their poise and their praise;
Their growing living ways.

When I am standing close beside a tree,
I feel that God is very near to me.

—JOAN GIESEL GARDNER.
The follower of Christ is a community member. Toward his community he has certain responsibilities, and in modern states where the people rule, these responsibilities are very great.

As to the precise nature and extent of such responsibilities there is great confusion. But God rules over this area as over every other, and surely in His mind there is no confusion. His children should be able to learn that mind, and so join themselves to the calm omnipotent certainty of God's will, in their political activities as in other things.

God's Will in Scripture

And where can we learn the will of God? There is no lack of human wisdom confidently presenting itself to our attention. At the moment there are two prominent types of political thought. Germany and Italy illustrate one. Russia the other. In neither does the sincere Christian find any search after the will of God. And into our ears pours a continual stream of debate by men whose very confusion of mind shows that they have not so much as touched the hem of the divine garment in their political thinking.

But God has given us a book where His mind is revealed, and when great issues are clouded, and the path of righteousness uncertain, we generally find in that book, the chart that we need. Now the issues at stake in this matter certainly seem important, and no one will deny that we are confused and uncertain as to the path. Let us see, then, whether God has perhaps provided us with a chart for this voyage, too, in His divine book?

No prolonged search is needed to uncover some guiding principles. "Render to Caesar the things that are Caesar's." In the day of the Roman empire all that the government asked from a Christian was that he pay his taxes and obey the law. In the thirteenth chapter of Romans, Paul puts very great emphasis on this duty of the Christian toward the state. It is a divine mandate. But you and I live in a state where Caesar demands from each citizen that he participate in the conduct of the government. Christ being our Master, the one thing that we may not do is to withdraw from political life, and refuse to take the trouble to vote. Vote we must and with our best intelligence; with our Christian courage, too, at times. And we must study the problems of the state and throw our whole weight into every effort to advance toward justice and honesty and cleanliness, and resist as God gives us power, all the evil things that make a malodorous jungle out of so much of our modern industrial and political life.

God's Law and Social Justice

But we need more guidance than that. Our political-industrial machine has broken down. In a way that seems fantastic and impossible, the very abundance of good things that God has put into our hands, has pushed millions of families into poverty and distress. Certainly some false principles must have been followed, some disobedience to God's laws must have crept in. No one can suppose that this dreadful collapse with all its pitiful human wreckage, is His will. No, nothing but a violation of God's laws can possibly have led to the present situation.

What are the laws of God regarding men's relations to one another in their community life? What principles should guide us? The answer of the book is simple and emphatic. Men are to live together according to the dictates of righteousness, or as we are more accustomed to say: according to the principles of justice. It would not be easy to exaggerate the emphasis which the Bible gives to this. From Genesis to Revelation the same note is sounded. It is impressive to take a concordance and see the great number of times this subject recurs throughout the entire book. Apparently the whole will of God in regard to our community life can be put into that one word Justice.

"Righteousness exalteth a nation, but sin is a reproach to any people." Men and nations depart from the will of God to their hurt. Those of us who see in the Bible the Word of God and the whole divine will for our community life, in His law of Justice, will know that if we can find wherein justice has crept into our community life, there we will find the cause of our present troubles, economic and social and political.

The purpose of this article is to discuss two points where it seems to the writer and to those of similar political views, that injustice has crept into our community life. It has been built into the structure of our political state and become an integral part of our economic life. It is a disastrous thing to walk contrary to God's law, and we are paying the penalty for it now, as we will try to show.

The Gospel and Social Evils

However, we are anxious to protest most earnestly against that type of religious thought which is fond of asserting that none of us can be genuine Christians because we are members of a social order that at some points departs from the Law of God. From the days of the Apostles to our own, no follower of Christ has ever had a Christian social order to live in. If the Gospel of Christ has a message only for men who live in Utopia, then it has no message at all, for anyone. It is the special glory of the Gospel that it can bring men to God no matter how unfavorable their external environment. With Christ in their hearts, men can walk in the glory of the divine fellowship even in the bitter poverty of an Arabian desert, or in the stench of a Roman court.

But it remains true that any man who has Christ in his heart, and who walks in the glory of the divine fellowship, once there is committed to his hands a share in the affairs of state, will do his best to eliminate from his community the injustices which mar its social and civic life. He will try to make it a "nation whose God is the Lord." It follows from this, and it is an important corollary, that in pointing out the defects of our present social order, the Christian citizen is pointing no finger of criticism at any individual. George Wash-
The fact remains that the workman must receive all he earns. Every man who is a Christian will put his shoulder to the wheel, this particular form of evil that George Washington encountered. We occupy much the same position regarding injustice. The man who works should get all that he earns, not two-thirds of it. That is the law of God, and the Christian will work for it. When we disregard God's law, disaster overtakes us. It has overtaken us as a nation now. The Christian conscience will be carefully studying the situation and supporting every step toward a society organized according to the will of God, with every man receiving all that he earns. In such a society dividends and other levies on the workmen's wages because of outside ownership of his tools, will be eliminated.

Socialism?

The road to the goal of paying the workman all that he earns, will doubtless be a long one, but some progress toward that goal of obedience to God's law is a matter of very acute present necessity. Our depression is due in the last analysis to the fact that a group of workmen who have produced by their labor commodities to the amount of three hundred dollars, cannot buy that product for which they have been given in wages only two hundred dollars. It is useless to try to sell it to the farmers for the farmers are workmen, too, with something to sell to us. We used to suppose that we could sell it to the Japanese, but the Japanese have built their own factories now, and the sort of foreign trade which buys factory products at a high price, and gives in exchange raw materials at a low price, is rapidly diminishing and will soon be completely gone. It becomes increasingly evident that there is no one to buy the output of our factories except the people who work in them, and these workmen have only two-thirds of the money necessary to do it. When we disregard God's law, disaster overtakes us eventually. It has overtaken us as a nation now. The Christian conscience will be carefully studying the situation and supporting every step toward a society organized according to the will of God, with every man receiving all that he earns. In such a society dividends and other levies on the workmen's wages because of outside ownership of his tools, will be eliminated.

This sort of political thought is usually termed Socialism, the name indicating a purpose to socialize, i.e., bring under community ownership and control the means of production, the modern tools, factories, etc., that workmen have to use in doing their work.

The writer is usually termed a Socialist, and he rejoices in the name, but as a matter of fact he is not a very good Socialist, for Socialists as a group have a body of political doctrine so precise and detailed and dogmatic, that it takes one's breath away, and doubtless is as full of mistakes as an egg is of meat. Working toward a righteous industrial order will inevitably be a matter of many experiments and frequent mistakes, a long and tedious process. But righteousness exalteth a nation and sin is a reproach to any people. It is the law of God, and the Christian will work for it in every way that he can, and the day will come that sees the righteousness of God in our industrial order.

Private Property, But Not of Land

The other social injustice which we are beginning to recognize, has to do with the ownership of land. Nothing could be clearer than the teaching of the Bible regarding the righteousness of the institution of private property. From the command, “Thou shalt not steal,” down to the end of Revelation, nothing is seen that can be considered as calling this in question. But it is not generally realized that the Mosaic law excludes land from this category. Leviticus 25 is the original charter of the Liberal in politics. Land was held by
individuals, but it could not be permanently sold. At the end of each fifty years, it reverted to the house to which it was originally assigned, when Canaan was divided among the tribes. Evidently it was the intention that land only be thus exempted from complete private ownership, for with certain minor restrictions, city houses could be permanently sold. Says God speaking to the Israelites of those days, “the land shall not be sold in perpetuity, for the land is mine.”

It is not always easy to know just what place the Old Testament should have in the life and thought of a Christian. Certainly we are not under the Mosaic Law now, but we are given there an authentic picture of the mind and will of God and not least of all we are given His definition of righteousness and unrighteousness in human relationships. We shall be well-advised to listen to the law of Moses at this point, for it is exactly here that we have allowed very serious injustice to enter, and we have woven that injustice into the very fabric of our social order. It is fundamentally just that a man should own his house completely and permanently, for he made it. It is the work of his hands. But no man made the land. God made that. Just as the Law says: “the land is mine.”

$100.00 a Square Foot

We always get into trouble when we depart from the Law of God and this is no exception. For there is only a limited amount of land, and once it is surrendered into complete private ownership, its owners can levy on the rest of the community almost any tax they choose. Without the use of the land, men cannot live. Manhattan Island is perhaps our best example of this almost limitless power over the community. Why should the great-grandson of some colonial settler receive a rental of a hundred dollars a square foot for his small piece of land? He has not earned it, and judged by the justice of God it does not belong to him. We must remember that when some one is given money which does not belong to him, inevitably some other man has had taken away an equal sum which does not belong to him. As we said, landowners can extort from the rest of the community almost anything they want. In our large cities the average citizen pays one-third of his income for rent. Only a very slight fraction of that appalling tax on his resources represents the cost of the house he lives in. Most of it is a tax extorted from him because he must use a tiny bit of city land.

Now, as illogical and unjust as all this is, we are going to find it a very long and difficult task to eliminate it and put justice in its place. The private ownership of land is woven into every part of our community life. No Christian is open to criticism for owning land at this present moment. We live in a social order which is built on that foundation. No doubt if a man by inheritance or otherwise comes into the possession of a large income from rent, he should realize that fundamentally this money belongs to the community, and he should administer it as a trust for the community good. Most of us have no such problem.

But we are all citizens of a state where this injustice dwells, and it dwells there by our permission. We are responsible before God for this talent of membership in a democratic state. That talent is not to be wrapped up in a napkin, but used, for God will require it at our hand. We who serve the Almighty God who is Sovereign of the political state and of the industrial order, will seek His will in our political life and strive with every ability and every opportunity which He gives us, to weave Justice into the national fabric in the place of the injustice which characterizes it now.

à la Henry George

The line of thought of this second section, has been discussed with great ability by Henry George in a book which is the supreme classic of the Liberal in politics. It will clarify any man’s understanding of justice and injustice in our national life to read Progress and Poverty, written as it was by an earnest and sincere Christian, who devoted his whole life to advancing the cause of social justice which shone in his soul as a heavenly vision. It takes lots of patience to be a Liberal in politics, and not be disobedient to the heavenly vision of community righteousness. Opposition is continually springing up in quarters where it is least expected, and the cause of justice must expect to be defeated nine times out of ten, always. “But Thou art our Father though Abraham be ignorant of us, and Israel acknowledge us not, Thou O Jehovah art our Father, our Redeemer forevermore.”

A LETTER

Philadelphia, April 21, 1936.

Editor of The Calvin Forum:

Generally I don’t favor the practice of authors commenting publicly on the criticism of their books when that criticism happens to be unfavorable. Only in rare instances, where such criticism is palpably unfair and incorrect, do I believe that authors should be given the opportunity to defend themselves. Even such highly respected organs as the literary sections of The New York Times and The New York Herald Tribune open their columns from time to time for such defensive comment, and I trust that The Calvin Forum will want to be as fair and hospitable as they.

I feel that the full-page criticism of Dr. Pieters, of Hope College, of my book “The Shepherd King,” published in your April, 1936, issue, calls for certain statements. If this book on Abraham were to stand alone, as a casual literary production, I should perhaps remain silent. But the book is the first of a contemplated series dealing with outstanding characters in the history of Calvinism (chiefly to acquaint our young people with our life-and-world-view) — using the term “Calvinism” anachronistically, in line with Dr. Kuyper’s well known assertion in Stone Lectures that Calvinism issued from the tents of the Patriarchs.

I appreciate the great deal of labor Dr. Pieters has spent in the reviewing of my book; I regret keenly the unfortunate result of this labor. One wonders about the really enormous difference between the magnificent editorial written about the book in The Intelligencer-Leader by Dr. Pieters’ colleague at Hope College and Western Seminary, Dr. J. R. Mulder, and the present review. One also wonders about the fact that of all the
scores of reviews and comments that have reached the publish-
ers and author of the book, Dr. Pieters' is practically the only one that is definitely unfavorable. In fact, the large majority of comments (and many of them by highly responsible editors) are highly laudatory. In the very same mail in which Dr. Pie-
ners' review reached me eight other reviews were found. Just
by way of example, may I quote from among these eight the
comment offered by the American Lutheran Magazine:

"This striking historical romance deals with that outstanding
character of Old Testament times, 'Abraham, the friend of
God,'—that heroic figure who in wealth and power attained
the status of a king. The story remains true to the Scriptural
account but tells a fascinating tale against a striking historical
background and with great emotional appeal. The various in-
cidents in Abraham's life are graphically portrayed and the book
will be read with a breathless interest. Particularly striking is
the portrayal of the queenly Sarah. (This in contradistinction
with Dr. Pieters' observation re Sarah, who denounces my de-
scription of her.) The author tells his story with true rever-
cence and with an honest regard for historical data. The book
is recommended for gift purposes and also for church libraries."

Well, Mr. Editor, there you are. I feel I should be given the
opportunity to let your readers know that Dr. Pieters' opinion
is decidedly not the prevailing one.

As to my English, for which I am being given a verbal lash-
ing, I have purposely written the book in the vernacular of our
own time. Dr. Pieters has the right not to like that. But when
he says, "I do not remember ever having read a book of this
kind in which the language used was prevalingly so poor in its
literary quality," an only say that he again stands totally
alone in his judgment. The Religious Telescope comments on
the book's "lofty literary style." The Watchman-Crusader says,
"The settings are excellent and the descriptions of the scenery
vividly realistic." The Evangelical Quarterly: "Mr. Monsma
has good descriptive powers." Dr. Clarence Edward Macart-
ney: "A very readable book." Dr. Donald G. Barnhouse: "A
highly readable book." Dr. Edward Yates Hill: "Written with
classic simplicity and sustained power. It grips the attention
from beginning to end. Dr. Monsma cannot use his bril-
liant gifts to better service to young and aged alike than to
write more books like 'The Shepherd King.'"

My most serious comment concerns a number of faulty state-
ments by Dr. Pieters dealing with the historical and archelog-
ical facts. My book is the result of painstaking investigation,
both in loco and among ancient records and documents. I have
studied in the American School of Oriental Research in Jeru-
salem, in the National Egyptian Museum in Cairo, and in many
other places. I have consulted ancient Jewish, Arabic, Egy-
pian and Babylonian sources, to find a factual basis for my de-
scriptions. And then to find a reviewer lightly brushing all
that material away with a mere wave of the hand is almost
amusing — tragi-comical.

I cannot enter into the details. Just a few remarks: Abra-
ham's experiences in Egypt are based on records that are cen-
turies and millenniums old. It is not at all a proven fact that
Isaac was born in Beershebah instead of Hebron, as Dr. Pieters
avers. That Ur was situated on the eastern bank of the Eu-
phrates, as Dr. Pieters thinks, is disproved by the fact that
Teruh and Abraham lived opposite Ur, and that Abraham had
to cross the Eufrates ("Hebrew" — "river-crosser") to get to
Canaan. Dr. Pieters' idea about the actual location of Sodom
and Gomorrah is not bolstered by the best archaeologists, Dr.
Kyles opinion to the contrary notwithstanding. For Dr. Pieters'
information, the Syrian language was in use long before the
period of the Israelitish kings. It was widely used by the
people of the "Suri," or northern Mesopotamia, in Abraham's
time, and was the language of diplomacy between Babylonia
and Egypt. The priests of Egypt are not "perhaps" correctly
portrayed, but their portrayal is exact, historical, based on in-
controvertible archaeological facts. I cannot use more space to
dilate on all this.

I deeply regret that Dr. Pieters did not see fit to emphasize,
or even mention, the chief feature of the book, namely, the por-
trayal of Abraham as a man of faith — a man who withstanding
his human frailties and human passions, held fast to his
all-sovereign, all-powerful, all-merciful God, — a God-pos-
sessed man, quiet, majestic, towering far above the polytheistic,
superstitious, ignorant world of his time. The popular concep-
tion of Abraham as a gilded saint is unhistorical. Dr. Pieters
apparently has not been able to wrest himself loose from that
conception. Abraham was a sinner like the rest of us, but a
sinner in whose life the glory of the grace of God shone forth
with unusual brilliance.

I also deeply regret that this present attempt to help give
America a Christian belletristic literature, as Holland has it,
and as, to a certain extent, also Germany and England have it,
was met in our CALVIN FORUM (of all publications!) with a re-
ception that is hardly encouraging, to put it mildly. Allow me
to assure your readers, however, Mr. Editor, that I am not yet
"fooled." In fact, I think I shall continue my efforts, if
God in His mercy gives me time and strength.

And will you personally accept my very hearty thanks for
all the space you are giving for this rather lengthy rebuttal?

JOHN CLOVER MONSMA.

BOOK REVIEWS

DR. LIGHTFOOT ON THE GOSPELS
HISTORY AND INTERPRETATION IN THE GOSPELS. New York, Har-
per and Brothers, 1935. 236 pages.

THIS volume contains the Hampton Lectures of 1934. Its sig-
nificance lies in the fact that it represents a sort of an intro-
duction to and acceptance of a definite form of German
scholarship into the English world. In the field of theology,
the Germans have shown themselves willing to give themselves
over with a courageous and effective abandonment in the pursuit
of establishing a hypothesis. The English are far more con-
servative. Lightfoot states in his preface that he regrets the
suspicion and indeed hostility with which this study (form-
criticism) is regarded at present in his country and he thinks
that it is a mistaken attitude.

The first two lectures give us a valuable review of the his-
tory of the study of the Gospels from Ireneus up to the pre-
sent time. Considerable space is devoted to a thorough analysis
of Formgeschichte.

Dr. Lightfoot applies the form-criticism method only to the
Gospel according to Saint Mark. In lectures three and four a
scholarly attempt is made to discover what is history and what
is interpretation in the second Gospel. He concludes that from
the very beginning the Gospel writers and even the preachers
before them were interested not in presenting Jesus, but the
Christ, that is to say, an interpreted Jesus.

Lectures five and six discuss the passion narrative as found
in the Synoptics. Dibelius also subjected this section to special
treatment. This is probably due to the conviction that the pas-
sion story has taken shape as a connected whole earlier than
any other section of the Gospel and that there is a closer meas-
ure of agreement in the structure and order of this part of the
Synoptics than can be found elsewhere. It presents itself most
advantageously for this study since it is possible to trace varia-
tions in the form and interpretation due to the specific objec-
tives which the several authors may have had in mind. For the
same reason a special section is devoted to a treatment of
Christ's rejection in Patris (Lecture VII).

The last lecture consists of a conclusion in which the author
compares the Johannine and the Pauline conception of Christ's
incarnation. He calls attention to the fact that John in the
Fourth Gospel tends to exalt the Christ even while in the flesh, whereas Paul, particularly in the Koinōnía passage, stresses the depth of his humiliation. There is, of course, interpretation here. And scholars today do not want interpretation, even though they be Paul's and John's, but they want the facts.

"The book will give a shock to the old-fashioned churchman," says Dean Inge. But then they can find a shock absorber in the BASIC PRINCIPLES OF EDUCATION.

To thinkers in the field of education to reconsider on scientific than of the heavenly Christ is for the most part hidden from realization that Lightfoot has retained us little more than a paragraph:

"It seems, then, that the form of the earthly no less than of the heavenly Christ is for the most part hidden from us. For probably we are at present as: little prepared to assign the material for formulating a theory of education, defensible on grounds of scientific principle." He continues, "in the present volume I have attempted to do that."

This treatise is divided into nine chapters, respectively headed as follows: Chance and System; Terms and Sources; Man as a Product of Organic Evolution; The Adaptive Organism; Physiological Aspect of the Adaptive Organism; Psychological Aspect of the Adaptive Organism; Personality; The Fabric of Personality. Integration of Personality; Education as Adjustment; Educability. The chapter headings in themselves are indicative of the scientific character of their contents.

In chapter seven the author definitely leaves the restricted field of exact science when he gives an exposition of the nature of personality. He distinguishes between the self, "the entity in which adjustment adheres," and personality, "the form which adjustment takes." The child is "a self and organism, but, save in the eyes of the law, no person." Here the author has difficulty to find his unified whole and seems to indicate that this is achieved in adjustment, the result of which is a person. This chapter is a clear indication that we need more than a biological account of human personality if we desire to take all the facts into account.

The fabric of personality, according to chapter eight, consists of such structural learnings as obedience to rightful authority, regard for the rights and needs of others, read, write, and cipher, the elements of the arts and sciences, and the moral and volitional religious attitude which make up the fabric of civilization. These structural elements have evolved during the long process of social experimentation. Thus the cumulative social experience of the human race becomes the content of the curriculum. Surely, more basic criteria for curriculum construction than those of the present act or problem. Here we have a preservation which conserves the fundamental values of the past because they have proved their basic character, not in a recent decade or by one generation, but in the entire course of human experience. But goodness, truth, and beauty transcend the scientific merely because they antedate the scientific era, not because they are inherent in the nature of reality. The latter is metaphysical, which the author avoids as mystical. Right is right because it has been found to be so in human experience rather than that human experience has found it so because it is right. Morals are more than conventions and moves but not pre-established by intelligent purpose. Man's moral nature is not inherent in the entity of the self, for man has no potentialities, but becomes a part of the person by the process of adjustment. The author tries to give human values a more permanent basis than a naturalistic view of life can allow, but on a scientific principle merely, which proves inadequate for this purpose.

The integration of structural learnings in wholesome, mature personality is the aim of education. If perfection were the aim, education would be hopeless. Dominance of volitional and thought structure is the center of integration. Hence, we can speak of education as preparation as well as progressive adjustment. This chapter, Integration of Personality, is a clear illustration of how adherence to the scientific principle only limits one's views. If man is merely a child of nature, inevitable because of antecedent circumstance, his very being, even his qualitative transcendence, is limited to the course of his earthly existence. If, on the other hand, the individual is also a child of intelligent purpose transcending space and time as we know it, reflecting the nature of Infinite Personality, education becomes a process of adjustment not merely in the interest of maturity as measured by our relative standards, but a growing perfection in the image of the Infinite.

In the closing chapter the author attempts to refute the view that there are levels of educability founded on organic adaptivity. Handicapped organic adaptation may result in limited adjustment, but this handicap is inferred with difficulty. Special talent does not mean superiority in general. Intelligence is a learning product not a native capacity. It is obvious what this theory means for our intelligence tests.

Indeed a basic discussion of educational theory, but in the reviewer's estimation not basic enough. It can not be denied that we have the material for formulating a theory of education, but limiting it to the scientific principle our view becomes distorted. One may try to avoid the mystical because it leads to a speculative form of thinking divorcing one from the actual world of the concrete, but in doing so one must not confuse metaphysical thinking with mysticism. The intuitive is a form of experience which must be recognized though not in isolation from the empirical. A science of education can point the way to our goal, but the ultimate objective is determined philosophically. The results of the process we call education find their criteria in one's interpretation of the whole of reality.

There is a philosophical thread in this scientific treatise. The self and its nature cannot be said to be a scientific concept. Integration of learning products to constitute a personality implies a process difficult to assign to the scientific, at least in the sense of exact science. It all has reference to what some psychologists begin to recognize as an X-factor not subject to scientific analysis.

Dr. Morrison's book and such other recent books as Dr. Bagley's Education and Emergent Man constitute a formidable challenge to the new education to rethink its underlying philosophy. Morrison has given the educational world a clear statement of what a science of education should include. Upon conceiving a thoughtful study of this scholarly treatise, one anxiously awaits the promised subsequent volume setting forth "a defensible theory of the curriculum of general education and of the school system as a civil institution."

C. JAARMSMA.

SOUND RELIGIOUS PEDAGOGY


ARE you looking for a helpful, stimulating, and suggestive book in religious pedagogy? Have you been wanting a small manual that would be of real help in teaching a Sunday
School class, catechetical classes, or even your own children? And have you at times felt the dearth of that sort of literature written from the point of view of the principles of biblical, supernatural Christianity? If so, you will want what Dr. Van Zyl offers in these 118 pages.

This is not a book to read once and then to discard. It is the sort of book that will stand re-reading. Questions of attention and interest, of perception and apprehension, of the living voice in education and the personality of the teacher are discussed in a practical and straightforward manner. It is especially the fundamental thrust of this book that gives it abiding value and that challenges the teacher to assimilate it. Dr. Van Zyl deals with real fundamentals in discussing attitudes, aims, and objectives, and at the same time the whole discussion is concrete, practical, and close to life. Many manuals for Sunday School teaching are superficial and often heretical. This little work deals with rock-bottom truths and exhibits the implications of the eternal verities of our Faith in their bearing upon both method and content of religious teaching.

The book is accompanied by a 44-page "Student's Work Book" containing 25 lessons based upon the material in the book itself. In this form the material can be assimilated by taking a corresponding course with the author, if one desires. Any experienced teacher or minister could give the course to a class in teacher's training by following this same method. However, this is not the only way in which the book can be utilized. Also without the "Student's Work Book" the text is of great value when properly assimilated. I would like to take this occasion to recommend this little book to all preachers as well as teachers.

The bibliography offered in Chapter I is valuable. The author gives a helpful evaluation of some 60-old titles in Sunday School pedagogy, Bible Story books, books on story telling, and the like. In almost every case the religious standpoint of the author is also indicated. Here is a book of sound principles and practice both. There is a crying need for raising the level of Sunday School teaching in many churches. This book can be a splendid aid in that direction.

C. B. SANTAYANA'S PURITAN


PHILOSOPHERS do not customarily write novels, but Mr. Santayana, once a philosopher, has become a novelist. Neither his twenty odd years of teaching philosophy at Harvard, nor his numerous works on philosophy and religion (as well as some rather austere poetry), nor, least of all, his secluded life in Spain, nor his twenty odd years of teaching philosophy at Harvard, nor his numerous works on philosophy and religion (as well as some rather austere poetry); nor, least of all, his secluded life in Spain, for the disillusion which he suffered when he became old enough to know the world as it is instead of as it is coloured by youthful dreams. "He couldn't forgive the world its general stupidity and cruelty and disorder." Nor could he forgive his friends for being mercenary, or the woman he loved for being romantic. Least of all could he forgive the war. "He couldn't throw over a sense of proportion, the perpetual rebellion of his reason against so much folly, so much suffering, so much unmitigated wickedness at the source of this carnage."

In Oliver this disappointment was something far more profound than that disillusionment experienced by so many young people when they step from the idealistic theorizings of school to the practical reality of the work-a-day world. Oliver's trouble was at heart religious. We often call Calvinism a "world and life view". We forget that it is at once a theology of Puritanism, a blind alley, as it were. He had discarded the theology of Puritanism; he wished to discard its temperamental features, but not the Puritanism per se. How did the Puritans live? Was Oliver's life headed for inevitable tragedy.

But a man may lose the theology of Puritanism and retain its temperament. He may deny intellectually that there is a God, but be unable to root out of his soul that passion for truth and righteousness which was founded on God. How can such a man face the world of today, a world of hypocrisy, of superficiality, of materialism? Lacking the belief in God which sustains the true Calvinist, and yet unable to deny his very nature and accept the sentimental intellectual dodges of the average unbeliever, his life is headed for inevitable tragedy.

Such was the life of Oliver Alden. He was the "last Puritan" not because there are not still Puritans today — there always will be, Mr. Santayana assures us — but because he had reached the logical end of Puritanism, a blind alley, as it were. He had discarded the theology of Puritanism; he wished to discard its temperamental features, but not the Puritanism per se. How did the Puritans live? Was Oliver's life headed for inevitable tragedy.

Mr. Santayana has chosen to cast his novel not in the more usual form of dialogue and description interpreted by the observations of the author, but rather as a transcription of Oliver's "stream-of-consciousness." We are told not what the characters say so much as what they think; and even what they think not as they think it (since many of them are necessarily more or less inarticulate) but expressed in the beautiful philosophical style of Mr. Santayana himself. This gives the book at once an air of intimacy and of impersonality. Since all the characters speak as the author would, one is tempted to attribute everything they say to him; since it is impossible to disentangle what is his and what theirs, one can never be sure of laying a finger on the author. The subtle irony which is so frequent and so delightful an element in Mr. Santayana's style adds to the difficulty of pinning him down. In his prologue he specifically disclaims a preference for austerity; and yet it is impossible not to notice the similarity between Oliver's life and Mr. Santayana's own aloofness from the ordinary world. In any case, it is hard to believe that Oliver's indictment of our world does not awaken sympathetic echoes in his creator's heart:

"It is a drearful inheritance this of mine, that I need to be honest, that I need to be true, that I need to be just. That's not the fashion of today... We [i.e., the Puritans] will not accept anything cheaper or cruder than our own ideal. If one can't live so, we won't live at all... The mind of the world is content to potter about with surfaces and numbers and machinery; it has been caught in the wheels of its own inventions, and its lovely motor has run away with it. The optimists call it progress. But we won't keep repeating things that are false, and producing things that are useless, and promising myself things that are impossible. Either the truth or nothing." — MARIANNE VON RADIUS.

EVOLUTION AND THE SPECIES


THE first edition of this interesting and instructive booklet was published in 1926. Its popularity is indicated by the need of subsequent editions. The second edition was published
in 1927; a third in 1939; the volume under discussion is the fourth and revised edition published in 1931.

The subtitle of the book is somewhat misleading. The author does not mean to give the impression that he has written the first and last word on evolution. "The First Word of Evolution" is the decree of the Creator at the time the different 'kinds' or species were created. 'The Last Word on Evolution' is the statement of the laws of heredity brought to light by the recent discoveries of the Austrian monk, Gregor Mendel." In this explanation of the subtitle the author virtually summarizes the conclusions he reached after "examining and weighing of evidences" for and against evolution.

A glance at the Table of Contents will convince the casual observer that the author has quite thoroughly covered the field and has succeeded in putting a great deal of information into a small volume. In this conviction he will become strengthened when he reads the book. In the first chapter the author "clears the ground" by giving his definitions for the terms "evolution" and "species." This "clearing of the ground" is absolutely necessary since these two terms are used rather loosely at the present time, and are given a wide range of meanings. By evolution the author means "the non-miraculous origin and development of the present world of plants and animals out of a single-celled ancestor." He identifies the word "species" with the word "kind" of the first chapter of Genesis, stating: "These kinds or species may be fittingly described as 'species,'" and he offers his own interpretation of the term "species." Essentially, the author means "clearing the ground" by giving his definitions for the terms "evolution" and "species." This "clearing of the ground" is absolutely necessary since these two terms are used rather loosely at the present time, and are given a wide range of meanings.

One of the pleasing features of this book is the fact that the author has been remarkably successful in avoiding the weaknesses which are often found in books criticizing evolution. He has not, however, evades the discussion of his viewpoint with the evolutionary arguments on the basis of classification. He states: "We know that old shoes have never evolved, yet by the above mode of reasoning we could prove that old shoes have evolved, merely by collecting samples of every known kind, and, starting with the smallest and simplest doll's slippers, grade them up in a series through baby's shoes, little brother's shoes, big brother's shoes, mama's shoes, grandma's shoes, daddy's low shoes, daddy's high shoes, ending with daddy's high boots." Again, on page 47, the same kind of argument is used with reference to blood-tests. The author states: "According to the logic of the argument from blood-tests, the cotton-gin, the long range gun, the locomotive, and the automobile can be proved to have evolved from one another or from a common iron ancestor for they are all made up of iron of varying degrees of hardness. Chemical or other tests would reveal a similarity, and thus their evolution would be 'proved!'" The author here uses comparisons which are not only far-fetched but invalid.

In the second chapter the fallacies in the so-called proofs of evolution from classification, comparative anatomy, embryology, vestigial organs, geology, and geographical distribution of plants and animals are successfully pointed out. In chapter three the author tells of the failure of the evolutionary theories of Lamarck, Darwin, and de Vries and points out that no other theories have taken their place. The fourth chapter deals with Mendelism, or "the last word on evolution"; and the fifth with the lack of evidence for the evolution of the human being. The summaries of these chapters contain the author's conclusions. These are very significant and are well stated.

In the third and fourth editions the author has added two appendices on "especially vital matters": (1) the existence and nature of natural species, and (2) the nature and cause of "mutations." These appendices contain valuable information and viewpoints. I see no reason why they were not added as two additional chapters of the book proper since they deal directly with the subject: (1) the first word on evolution, and (2) the last word on evolution.

Edwin Y. Monsem.
books on the origin of religion written from the point of view of orthodox, Bible-believing scholarship have not been plentiful of late. Kellogg's The Genesis and Growth of Religion still retains its value but is not abreast of current thought. Dr. Zwemer, who is Professor of the History of Religion and Christian Missions at Princeton Seminary, has performed a distinct service in placing this book on the market. It is the outgrowth of a series of lectures delivered last year at Columbia Theological Seminary, Decatur, Georgia.

In the main there are two views of the origin of religion: that of evolution and that of supernatural revelation. The former has held the field in theological scholarship now for more than half a century. Not that there were none who held to the opposite view, but the great majority of scholars and those whose views were most widely accepted, held that monotheism is the outcome of a long process of gradual development whose earlier stages were said to be: pre-animism (mana), animism, polytheism, and henotheism. Every religion was viewed as a phase in this development, Christianity included.

Against this evolutionistic, anti-biblical view a strong reaction has of late set in. Not that the rank and file of present-day anthropologists and theologians have discarded the evolutionistic hypothesis, but a great many voices have been heard of late raising serious doubts on this score. And one outstanding scholar has appeared who is devoting his life to research in the field of theistic religions, and whose extensive studies (still carried forward) have so far confirmed the belief that all religions show traces of monotheism which must have been very early. Such research powerfully confirms the revelation view, which, on the basis of Scripture, holds to the degeneration among all nations not enjoying the light of special revelation of an original true knowledge of God which humanity in its infancy enjoyed. This scholar is Professor Wilhelm Schmidt of the Faculty of the University of Vienna, editor of the magazine "Anthropos," a Roman Catholic journal, at present writing an eighteen-chapter work on The Origin of the Idea of God, of which five volumes have so far appeared.

Dr. Zwemer dedicates his book to Father Schmidt and in a closing note condenses the same scholar's lecture delivered at Princeton Seminary last year, the full text of which may be found in the January 1936 issue of The Union Seminary Review, Richmond, Va. Some might argue that Dr. Zwemer leans too heavily on other writers and that the book is too profuse with its quotations. But it should be remembered that the real value of this work lies in the collection for the general intelligent public of the results of one hundred years of research on this score. The book is a valuable feature of the book is intended to do and Dr. Zwemer has done it admirably, weaving his own interpretation into the material throughout. He handles his French, Dutch, German, and English sources with equal ease and translates them freely for the benefit of his readers.

Dr. Zwemer, himself a life-long missionary and student of Islam, a writer of many books on that subject, and editor of The Moslem World, is a Bible-believing scholar, holding to the biblical, historical, supernatural interpretation of Christianity. Dealing successively with the origin of the idea of God, the origin of the world, of man, of prayer, of sacrifice, of fire-worship, of marriage and morality, and of immortality, he téléphone exposes the current evolutionistic interpretations and champions a "primitive revelation to all mankind," which "included a knowledge of God, the idea of prayer and propitiatory sacrifice, the sanctity of monogamous marriage, and the sense of moral responsibility," as well as "belief in another life in a world-to-come with rewards for the good and punishment for the evil" (pp. 221-222).

Possibly the chapter on the origin of fire-worship is the least effective in the book. It offers an interesting discussion but hardly serves the purpose to carry forward the thesis so ably championed and confirmed in the first five chapters. In fact, the closing sentences of this chapter seem forced and appear to move on the level of devotional homily rather than of scholarly reasoning. But this is a minor defect. The book would be just as valuable, and its main thesis would stand unimpaired even if this chapter — interesting in other ways — were omitted.

A few slight errors might be noted with a view to a possible second edition, which the book eminently deserves. Rom. 2:14 is quoted as reading: "these being not the law," instead of: "these, not having the law" (p. 198). And the following slips in spelling occur: "consanguinous" for "consanguineous" (p. 190), "H. H. Breasted" for "J. H. Breasted" (p. 247), and "Karamovo" for "Karamazov" (p. 209).

A valuable feature of the book is that in championing the orthodox, biblical standpoint it does not fall into the error of certain Darbysite, anabaptistic writers, whose conservatism is marred by a failure to recognize the significance of common as well as special grace for the solution of the problem of the origin and development of religion. Recently the strange idea has been propounded that Christianity is not a religion and should not be called a religion. This erroneous idea, which is not so innocent as may appear on the surface, finds no place on the pages of this book, whose author knows his Calvin and Warfield and Bavinck.

In this connection it is interesting to note, says he, "that although Calvin's doctrine of the knowledge of God and of Common Grace was wholly based on the Scriptures, this very doctrine is now largely confirmed by anthropology and the history of religion. He held that in every man there is still a seed of religious truth and an ineradicable consciousness of God. Light is still shining in the darkness and all men still retain a degree of love for the truth, for justice and a social order. This knowledge of God, said Calvin, is innate but quickened by the manifestation of God in nature. It fails in its proper effect because of sin, and could only be restored by special grace in a special object of revelation."

Every Christian interested in the history of religion and in a refutation of the evolutionistic claims on this score ought not only to read but to own this book.

C. B.

THE MISSIONARY EDUCATION OF YOUNG PEOPLE


Rev. John Irwin has made a real contribution in the field of Missionary Education. He suggests numerous problems which present challenges to Christian youth and form material for group study.

The various chapters discuss and suggest methods of approach to the study of Missions. This together with the bibliography and the addresses of agencies whose services are available should prove valuable.

For one who is convinced of the authority of Holy Writ also in the field of Missions, there is something thoroughly unsatisfactory in the author's modernistic position. The "old missionary urgency" has by no means passed away. Most missionaries today do not consider their task to be that of truth-sharing but that of Truth proclaiming. Basically missions must always be the preaching of Christ and his crucified. Only upon this basis can the various approaches to the Christian missionary task be justified.

H. A. Dijkstra.

A TEST FOR WISDOM

A child displays wild berries before our eyes. As beauty and achievement, and expects our commendation. Whoever then rejects this opportunity is not so very wise.

Frederick Ten Hoor.