

Calvin University

Calvin Digital Commons

The Calvin Forum

University Publications

1937

The Calvin Forum

Calvin College and Seminary

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

Recommended Citation

Calvin College and Seminary, "The Calvin Forum" (1937). *The Calvin Forum*. 21.
https://digitalcommons.calvin.edu/calvin_forum/21

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

THE CALVIN FORUM

A MONTHLY

Sit-Down Strikes
An Editorial

The Supreme Court Issue
Throw Out the Umpire!

The Reformation and Education
Hostile or Friendly?

What Is Christian Education?
No "Projected Christianity"!

Centrism and Calvinism
There is a Difference

The C. I. O. and the C. L. A.
Radical vs. Christian Labor

Pre and Non-pre Theology
The Issue in a Nutshell

Preventing Sectarianism
Some Constructive Suggestions

The CALVIN FORUM

PUBLISHED BY THE CALVIN FORUM BOARD OF PUBLICATION:

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

THE EDITORIAL COMMITTEE:

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

CONTENTS—Vol. II. No. 9, APRIL, 1937

EDITORIALS

Sitting Down on Law and Order.....	195
Prayer at Labor Union Meetings.....	195
Germany and Russia Have Not Repented.....	196
Bringing God's Word Into Contempt.....	196
Ananias Was a Poor Communist.....	197
The President Overreaches Himself.....	197

ARTICLES

The Protestant Reformation and Education. By Johannes Broene, A.M.....	198
Projected Christianity vs. Christian Education. By J. C. Lobbes, Ph.B.....	201
Is "Centrism" Calvinism? By Henry J. Van Anandel, A.M.....	203
The C. I. O. and the C. L. A. By John Van Vels.....	205
Premillennialism and Dispensationalism. By R. I. Campbell.....	206
The Church and the Sects. A Preventative Attitude. By John Bovenkerk.....	209
Out of the Editor's Mail Bag.....	216

BOOK REVIEWS

What Is Sound Money?.....	211
A Valuable Study.....	212
Ministerial Success.....	212
Jesus—A Classicist's View.....	213
Peace, Satan, and the Millennium.....	213
Jesus and Education.....	213
Dr. Buswell's Theology.....	214
The Doctrine of Inspiration.....	215
Inspiration—Another View.....	215

VERSE

If I Follow Him.....	200
Objects Divine Dissolved.....	204
We, Not Angels.....	204
Cathedrals.....	208
The Glory.....	215

THE CALVIN FORUM is published monthly. Subscription Price: Two Dollars per year. Address all editorial as well as business correspondence to: THE CALVIN FORUM, Franklin Street and Benjamin Avenue, S. E., Grand Rapids, Michigan.

Entered as second-class matter October 3, 1935, at the Post Office at Grand Rapids, Michigan, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

The CALVIN FORUM

VOLUME II

GRAND RAPIDS, MICH., APRIL, 1937

NUMBER 9

EDITORIALS

Sitting Down on Law and Order

NO ONE who has any sense of social justice will fail to sympathize with the laboringman in his struggle for a living wage. The depression has served both as cause and as excuse for a wage scale in industry that was utterly inadequate—the more so seeing the worker's income can only be gaged when actual working days are taken into consideration no less than the prevailing wage scale. Moreover, the collapse of a good part of President Roosevelt's New Deal legislation through Supreme Court rulings has been responsible for a reactionary attitude on the part of many manufacturers. It was to be foreseen that with the return of economic prosperity would also come the opportunity of the working classes to demand a more adequate wage. To speak of the stupidity of the laboringman for stopping the machinery of industrial recovery when it has just barely been set in motion after a long period of depression only betrays a lack of understanding of the actual operation of the forces that make for industrial adjustment. But, however much the intelligent student of industry and labor—and especially the Christian—will sympathize with the struggle of the laboringman for regaining a decent wage in proportion to the prosperity of the industry in which he is engaged, there can be no doubt about the pronouncement of condemnation upon the weapon to which he has recently resorted to fight his battle. The sit-down strike is not a strike. It is a sit-down on law and order. To forcibly seize and hold the property of a corporation, thus depriving that corporation of the use of its machinery of production, is a form of vandalism that disgraces the American labor movement. To say, as some do, that no injustice is done because no sabotage is involved, is tantamount to saying that I may steal and use my neighbor's automobile provided I do not damage it and declare my intention of returning it after some time. The sit-down strike is a resort to violence with very serious implications. Most serious among these is the spirit of defiance against the agencies of law and order which it inevitably engenders. Flushed with victory in the General Motors strike the C. I. O. crowd is now showing a rebellion in the Chrysler strike which is ominous and fraught with grave possibilities. When court orders are defied, the rights of property are trampled upon, and the mob spirit begins to assert itself as it is doing at present in Detroit, the

labor struggle is no longer a struggle between two groups in industry—it becomes a struggle between law, order, and decency on the one hand, and lawlessness, vandalism, and violence on the other.

C. B.

Prayer at Labor Union Meetings

PROFESSOR Reinhold Niebuhr has recently made a trip down South in the interest of improving conditions among the share croppers in that part of the country. Upon his return to New York he had a number of interesting things to report. One of these was that for the first time in his life he had attended a labor union meeting which was opened with prayer. If this radical reformer will come to Western Michigan some time, we could usher him into many a meeting of laboringmen whose every session is opened and closed by calling upon Almighty God and seeking His blessing. It is a sad comment upon the labor movement that God has been left out of it. God must get back into the consciousness of employer and employee before there will be a satisfactory solution of our labor problems. Laboringmen have in many cases spurned religion and turned their backs upon the ordinances of God, thinking that religion is their greatest enemy. And capitalists have in many cases used the sanctions and halos of religion and church worship to justify and please themselves in their God-dishonoring practices of social injustice. If the latter have appealed to Almighty God as being on their side in maintaining the *status quo*, however marked by greed and selfishness, the former have often turned away in disgust and bitterness from the church and the Bible and have taken the blasphemous utterances emanating from Moscow upon their lips. Instead, both should learn to pray in earnest. Whoever prays—truly prays—prays to the God of the Scriptures, cannot help becoming convinced of the need of both mercy and justice. The employer and employee are both insisting upon their rights, whereas there can be no sound ethical basis for asserting rights in human society without the prior recognition of duties, reciprocal duties. The man who prays to God will see his social duties before he sees his social rights. Here capital and labor are equally at fault. Both have need of true repentance. Not the blasphemous assertion of our rights, nor the heartless appeal to economic power, but the humble recognition of reciprocal duties before God is needed in him that

gives and in him that receives employment. This is recognized by the Christian and should be part of his applied, practical Christianity. The Christian Labor Association recognizes this as basic in the solution of the labor problem. There is prayer for employer and employee in its meetings. And at the same time these prayers are not opiates to lull people asleep. Those who live by the Word of God are very, very humble in the presence of God, but they are no less fearless in the presence of men when these trample upon their own duties and spurn their fellowman's rights.

C. B.

Germany and Russia Have Not Repented

FOR some time it has been quite apparent to the Christian world that the challenge which both Germany and Russia throw at the feet of Christianity is a religious before it is an economic challenge. Those who tell us that Nazism and Communism are two sworn enemies of Christianity are right. It is Communism OR Christ. And, again, Christ OR the well-nigh deified dictator Hitler. Those who think that the issue is merely an economic or political one need only to study the spirit and philosophy of these two dictator nations more thoroughly to be convinced of the error of their diagnosis. The Russians were not giving a mistaken impression of their real objectives to the world when they formulated these objectives in terms of religion. Nor were those Germans who must be judged to be most deeply imbued with the spirit and philosophy of the Third Reich committing an error when they, with their traditional thoroughness and *Gründlichkeit*, propounded a new religion as being basic to the Nazi state and its philosophy. Not communism but atheism is the deep root out of which the revolutionary Russia of the last two decades has sprung. Not fascism but an intensely German racial and nationalistic paganism is at the bottom of the aspirations of the Third Reich. On this account no one will take the promises of a new attitude toward Christianity, which of late have issued from both these countries, very seriously. The so-called religious liberty which the new constitution is said to assure all Russians is but a sop to Cerberus. Already Russian leaders have assured the world that there will be no change in the official government attitude toward religion, which is still considered an opiate for the people. And as for the coming church election of Germany, this promises to be a farce like all the other elections that have in recent years been held in what was once the most educated and enlightened nation on earth. Unless we are sorely mistaken, these elections, scheduled to be held in April, will only serve in an adroit way to weaken the influence of those courageous church leaders who have stood the brunt of the attack of the Hitler regime, which is determined—come what may—to make the church and its agencies the tool of the almighty state and its racial, nationalistic, anti-Semitic, pagan ideals. Germany and Russia have not repented.

C. B.

Bringing God's Word Into Contempt

ONE of the remarkable by-products of recent "prophetic study" is the interpretation and application of proper names in the Scriptures. Whoever follows the "students of prophecy" in our day must have been impressed by the well-nigh inexhaustible ingenuity of some of these men when it comes to the occult meaning of seemingly enigmatic proper names found on the pages of Scripture. The latest illustration on this score comes from the Royal Poinciana Community Chapel, where William Edward Biederwolf is minister. The sermon preached on February 21, 1937, copies of which apparently are distributed freely throughout the land, is entitled: "Awake, O America! or, The Peril of Communism." So far so good. No one will accuse the present editor of underestimating the godless and dangerous character of Russian, atheistic communism. On this score we can hence shake hands with Dr. Biederwolf. But now notice the use—or, rather misuse—made of Scripture to drive the message home. When an orthodox, Bible-believing man chooses a text for a sermon, he means to use that text not as a mere human motto (as the Modernist is wont to do) but he presents that passage as a word of God which he as a preacher interprets. The text chosen is Ezekiel 38:2, "I am against thee, O Gog, Prince of Rosh." Note what this passage of God's Word is made to mean by the venerable preacher of Royal Poinciana Community Chapel. After page upon page of exposé and denunciation of the godlessness and anti-Christian character of the present Russian regime, he goes on to say: "Do you wonder that God said, 'Behold, I am against thee, O Gog, Prince of Rosh, Meshech, and Tubal?'" And then the preacher continues: "If by 'Rosh' is not meant Russia, and by 'Meshech', Moscow, and by 'Tubal', Tobolsk, I do not know to what land or cities they could refer." Hence this passage from Ezekiel is a solemn declaration that the Lord is against the Moscow, the Tobolsk, and the Russia of our day! One may be pardoned for asking a few questions. If the Lord by the mouth of Ezekiel, who prophesied surely not later than the days of the captivity, referred to Moscow when speaking of Meshech, how is this to be harmonized with the fact that there was no Moscow in existence at that time, this city dating from the 12th century A. D.? Or, again, what meaning can there be in the claim that the Tubal which in Ezekiel 38:2 was said to be the object of divine displeasure is the same as the Russian city Tobolsk when one remembers that Tobolsk did not come into existence until two thousand years later? But suppose that the impossible had happened, and it were true that these two names in Ezekiel did refer precisely to Moscow and Tobolsk, and Rosh to Russia, by what feat of exegesis does the minister of Poinciana Community Chapel make this displeasure of God to apply to these cities and this country in the year 1936, and not, say, in the pre-Revolution, tsarist days? Was God not against Moscow and Tobolsk and Russia in 1915, when the tsarist regime was still in control? Whence the designation of time after 1917 and not before? It is "exegetical" feats like these that bring the Word of God into contempt.

C. B.

Ananias Was a Poor Communist

THE "prophetic" Bible students are not the only ones adept at making the Scriptures say what they never intended. Some of the liberals have developed an equal proficiency in this direction. "I Was a Monk and a Communist" is the title of an anonymous article in a recent issue (Feb. 24) of the well-known liberal weekly *The Christian Century*. After definitely implying that the first Christian Church in Jerusalem was a communistic society, the author has this to say about Ananias and his wife, "By the time of the first Christians Ananias and his wife kept some of the purchase money back, as the Acts of the Apostles reports. When they were discovered by Peter both of them fell down and expired." The Bible adds: 'Great awe came over all who heard it.' Unfortunately, the incident apparently failed to produce the same effect when members of the property-holding churches read about it several centuries later." Here the author clearly implies that the sin of Ananias and his wife was their failure to be good communists in withholding some money from the community for their private use. If this anonymous "Ex-Monk" (of whom it may possibly be presumed that at some time or other he knew his Bible) will turn once more to the story in Acts, he will find that the reason for the judgment upon Ananias and his wife lay not in their withholding a certain amount of money, but in their mendacious testimony concerning this act. "Why hath Satan filled thy heart to lie to the Holy Spirit . . ." "Thou hast not lied unto men, but unto God" (Acts 5:3, 4). And the implication that the community of goods in the early Jerusalem church was a compulsory and not a purely voluntary one is clearly refuted by Peter's remonstrance in the fourth verse: "While it remained, did it not remain thine own? and after it was sold, was it not in thy power?" Ananias was a pioneer in the founding of Ananias clubs, not of communistic societies. Meanwhile the distortion of Scripture passages to suit their meaning will undoubtedly go on both at the hands of "prophetic Bible students" and of "liberal" propagandists.

C. B.

The President Overreaches Himself

THE President's proposed reorganization of the federal Supreme Court overshadows every issue before the country today. It does so in point of fact, and it ought to do so by reason of its transcendent importance. The motive and aim of this far-reaching proposal for judiciary reform find expression in the following sentence spoken by the President himself on January the sixth. Said he: "Means must be found to adapt our legal forms and our judicial interpretation to the actual present national needs of the largest progressive democracy of the modern world." Stripped of all incidentals, the President proposes that the Congress shall give him power to appoint within a month after the passage of this legislation a number of new members to the bench of the Supreme Court sufficiently large to guarantee favorable action on New Deal legislation. The President's claim clearly is that there

is much urgent legislation looking toward social welfare which is unduly and unwarrantably vetoed by the Court once it has passed Congress. Now one does not need to be a proponent of the whole New Deal to feel that there is a real point to the President's claim on this score. Although in the main proponents of the New Deal may be in favor, and opponents of the chief executive, the issue which the President has herewith placed before the country far transcends party limits and party loyalties. Already this is apparent in the impressive number of Democratic leaders in Congress who feel constrained to raise their voice in opposition to the new proposals. It seems to us that the President is making a serious error in representing the Supreme Court as a sort of superlegislature thwarting the will of the people as presumably expressed in the New Deal legislation (whatever its content) passed by Congress. The Supreme Court holds a unique place in our federal government. It has the specific task of passing upon the constitutionality of measures passed by the legislative branch of our government. As such it is an important and valuable link in the system of checks and balances essential to the safeguarding of the liberty of minorities in a democracy. Now it is of the very essence of our American democratic form of government that this supreme judiciary shall be independent of any and all legislative and executive influence in arriving at its decisions. On this score, it seems to us, the President's proposal for the reorganization of the Court stands condemned. It is not that the Supreme Court has not been "packed" before. Nor that the number of judges is sacrosanct. It is that the chief executive proposes to Congress to give him power to create a Supreme Court that shall pass favorably upon legislation which he and the Congress desire but which the Court has so far shown no great inclination to declare constitutional. This is a blow at one of the basic elements in our democratic form of government. It is not the President's good intentions that are in question: an essential element of our traditional liberties is at stake. No one thinks of the present occupant of the White House as desirous of powers comparable to those wielded by European dictators, but it is the position of a potential dictator which the proposed plan virtually creates which alarms many thoughtful people and which undoubtedly is responsible for the stiff opposition which it is receiving from both Democratic and Republican quarters. When the President in his tremendously effective fireside chat told the country that what we need is a pulling together of the judicial with the legislative and executive horses of our federal team, he was representing the people as the driver that has a right to give orders of team work, so-called, to these three horses. The fact of the matter is that, as the plan stands, the real driver of the team will be no one but the chief executive himself. To the cracking of the whip over the head of the Congress is now to be added the cracking of the whip over the head of the Supreme Court, and there is no doubt who holds both whip and reins. If the present occupant of the White House were not so capable a man as he is, and the emergency in the midst of which we find ourselves were not so serious, the American people and the Congress would long ago have protested against the methods of the present driver of our

federal team. It is time we look to our liberties and the foundations of our democratic form of government. Or, to change the figure, if we would avoid dictatorship, we need an umpire. Our federal Supreme Court is the great umpire in our national government. Players and spectators in a game of ball may heartily dissent from the decisions of the umpire, they may even razz him, but no man in his senses thinks of

throwing out the umpire when we don't like his decisions and substituting one who gives decisions to our liking. However fine a game of ball the President may have played so far, the laurels with which he has been decked to date hardly justify us in making him pitcher, batter, and umpire all in one in the games that are to follow.

C. B.

THE PROTESTANT REFORMATION AND EDUCATION

Johannes Broene, A.M.

Professor of Education and Psychology, Calvin College

WHAT was the effect of the Reformation on education? The Protestant answer generally has been ready enough, namely, we owe to the Reformation both the common elementary school, and the beginnings of true modern learning. During the Middle Ages, we are told, the Church left the common people in an easily led ignorance. It was Luther and the Reformers who laid the foundation for the education of the masses.

But Is This True?

Is this true? Roman Catholics have always denied it. Not only men of the stripe of, let us say, Thalheimer, who in his, *Die wahren Verdienste Luthers um die Volksschule* (p. 6, and see also p. 20), says categorically: "It is a widespread historic lie that Luther was the founder of the common school." No, but a scholar like Janssen in his, *Geschichte des deutschen Volkes seit dem Ausgang des Mittelalters*, is extremely severe in his denunciation of the disastrous effect of the Reformation on schools and learning in general.

However, even Janssen, scholar though he is, might be suspected of Roman Catholic bias. For such suspicion there is no warrant in the case of another authority whose judgment is, if somewhat less severe, no less emphatic. I refer to Friedrich Paulsen. Paulsen in his *Geschichte des gelehrten Unterrichts* (Vol. I, sec. ed., p. xxv), says of himself: "I am no Catholic, neither purpose to become one. By birth and education I am a Protestant, and by conviction stand on its side." While it is true that in his thinking he did not remain a sound Lutheran, his development away from Lutheranism certainly was not in the direction of Romanism. If he is critical of Protestantism as regards its influence on education this, surely, cannot be ascribed to Roman Catholic prejudice; and critical he is, only less severely so than the Catholics themselves. Many a paragraph between the pages 179 and 465 of volume one of his *Geschichte* draws a gloomy picture. I need not use space to substantiate this assertion. Any one who is sufficiently interested can easily verify it for himself, Paulsen's work being accessible enough. It comes down to this: Paulsen contends that so far from stimulating education the Reformation threat-

ened to destroy all schools, all universities, all learning.

Neither, we were told, does this hold for the Reformation in Germany only. Cyril Norwood, headmaster of the famous Harrow School, one of the most renowned of England's educational foundations, in his, *The English Tradition of Education* (p. 13), says: "It was the Reformation which in this country dealt the hardest blow to education. It broke up the unity of the nation. The Catholics were outlawed and persecuted, and the Protestants broke into sects. Many schools were plundered and destroyed, and a spirit of self-seeking, of private profit to be made at the expense of the public benefit, was let loose."

Lastly, to quote a Protestant of Protestants, by birth and training a partisan of the Reformation, H. H. Kuyper, in his, *De Opleiding tot den Dienst des Woords bij de Gereformeerden*, says (p. 88): "The consequence of the coming of the Reformation was that schools and universities were depopulated."

The Facts in the Case

Well, what can a Protestant say to all this? Deny it? Not, of course, if it squares with the facts. And the fact, however unpalatable, is that Janssen, Paulsen, etc., are essentially correct. It would be folly to deny that the coming of the Reformation brought disaster to learning and the schools. Indeed, this can be proved out of the mouths of the Reformers themselves, notably Luther. The very first sentence of Luther's epoch-making letter, *An die Ratsherren aller Städte deutschen Landes* (1524) reads: "First of all, we see how the schools are deteriorating throughout Germany, the universities are becoming weak." In the same year, the year 1524, he laments in his *Tischreden* the decline of his Alma Mater. In his famous sermon, *Das men solle Kinder zur Schule halten* (1530), he deplores the decay of the universities of Leipsic, Erfurt, "and others more." It would be easy to multiply passages from Luther alone, and to add many more from Melancthon, Camerarius, Eobanus Hessus, Justus Jonas, and others. Especially significant is a passage from Justus Jonas, who, in 1538, wrote that prior to the Reformation Germany had a large number of thriving universities, of which many since the coming of the Reformation had prac-

tically died out. (See Georg Mertz, *Das Schulwesen der deutschen Reformation im 16ten Jahrhundert*, p. 3.)

Unfortunately, Luther, in impassioned moments when he squirmed in his chair as he thought of the stranglehold the Church had on the seats of learning, said things that can easily be construed as a direct attack on learning itself. Janssen, and one can hardly blame him, does not fail to make the most of such lurid passages. In this matter, as in so many others, Luther often was his own worst enemy. In his championship of the Gospel against the Roman Church, he said things that are most damaging to what after all was his fundamental position. In reality Luther was not opposed to learning, but only to schools dominated by the Roman Church. He contended for schools founded not on Aristotle but on the Word.

Then, too, whatever may be true of the responsible leaders of the Reformation, this movement like every reformatory movement, had its "lunatic fringe." The men who constituted this fringe, men like Karlstadt, were definitely and uncompromisingly hostile to all learning. It is well known that Karlstadt taught explicitly that schools were no longer necessary now that the Holy Spirit led believers into all truth.

Some Reformers Misunderstood

It is, however, unfair to hold the Reformation responsible for the utterances of men whose competence to speak the leaders of the movement themselves denied. Melancthon, with a ferocity that was not characteristic of him, declares that pastors who deflect the youth away from study should have their tongues cut out. To any fair-minded reader of Luther it should, it seems to me, become plain that his opposition, often as almost always with Luther in unmeasured terms, is directed not against schools and learning as such, but against the learning taught in the schools of the day. Now, surely, from the standpoint of Luther and his fellows, there can be in this nothing surprising. Even Erasmus, who never shared Luther's bitter hostility against the Church, urges parents not to send their children to the monastic schools (the most numerous of all existing schools), because of the corruption that prevailed in them. Surely, it is a strange irony that men like Luther whose very last service was to education, and Melancthon than whom none other has so just a claim to the title, "preceptor Germaniæ," should be pictured as the enemies of all learning.

If, after all that has been said, anybody doubts the essential friendliness of the Reformers, greater and lesser, to learning, I refer him to the evidence he can find in detail in the 681 pages of the scholarly work of Mertz already cited.

War's Devastation and Education

Very well, but why, then, if Luther and the Reformers generally favored learning, why was there this admitted initial decline? There are a number of reasons, most of them obvious. There was, for example, in Protestant regions the decline, and in the case of England the virtual destruction of the monas-

teries, the traditional seats of learning. Their wealth was largely appropriated to other ends than education. There was further a lack not only of school buildings, but of Protestant schoolmasters and school textbooks. But the main factor in retarding the Protestant program of education so beautifully outlined by Luther was the religious wars, more especially the terrible Thirty Years' War. It is quite impossible for us to realize the havoc wrought. In an article contributed to the *New York Times* of October 15, 1933, our one-time ambassador to Germany, Mr. James W. Gerard, said:

"The Thirty Years' War, which ended in 1648, reduced the population of Germany from 24,000,000 to 4,000,000, polygamy was legalized, and human flesh was on sale in the markets of Heidelberg."

In reply to my letter asking for the authority for his statement, Mr. Gerard sent me a kind but not satisfactory reply. I surmise there is some overstatement. Eby and Arrowood in their, *Development of Modern Education* (p. 293), say:

"Large areas of fertile soil became wilderness. The entire country was more or less devastated, much of it was depopulated, while the inhabitants of Germany decreased one-half, [more conservative than Gerard's figure]. In many places the people were reduced to savagery. In villages there was often not a wagon nor a draft animal to be seen; many a peasant was forced to harness himself or his wife and dog to the plow . . . Religion, morals, and the arts of civilization were practically forgotten. The bestiality and licentiousness of the soldiers were incredible. Pastors and teachers had nothing to sustain them at their labors and largely ceased their ministrations. The people lapsed into barbarity, ignorance, superstition, and crime. Except in the largest centers of population every trace of schools passed away."

In all conscience this is terrible, is it not? Does one marvel that under such conditions education languished?

Protestantism Stimulates Education

As I see it, the significance of the Protestant Reformation for education must be sought not in the first place in what the leaders said, nor even in what they themselves accomplished, but in what is essential in Protestantism itself. A priori, apart from the facts, one would expect Protestantism, as opposed to Catholicism, to manifest a far more lively interest in the education of the masses. A Roman Catholic, a good Roman Catholic, needs to do very little thinking for himself. He accepts what the church teaches him by virtue of its divine authority. Not so the Protestant. If many a Protestant does, he is in so far not a good Protestant. It is of the very essence of Protestantism that the believer acknowledges as supreme not the Church but God's Word, and only that Word. What is final for him is not the decision of some consistory or session, some classis or presbytery, not even of some synod or general assembly, but the teaching of the Scriptures. And, mark you, on this point the Protestant believer must satisfy himself. Now, emphatically, if he is to do this it is not enough that he can read, he must be able to read intelligently these Scriptures, his only rule of faith

and practice. And that means education. It means an education such as Protestantism has never yet attained.

There is one more reason why, as contrasted with Catholics, Protestants, more especially those calling themselves Reformed, must be educated. In the Roman Church the layman takes no part either in the government of the church or in formulating its doctrine. All this is exclusively in the hands of the clergy. Not so with Protestants in general and the Reformed in particular. With the latter the consistory, the ruling body, consists entirely of laymen, with the sole exception of the minister or ministers, if any. Classes, particular synods, and synods consist of clergy and laymen in equal proportion. It is obvious that only laymen of some education and considerable intelligence can acceptably perform the functions of such offices.

Luther, Melancthon, Calvin

It has, therefore, always been characteristic of a self-conscious Protestantism to manifest a profound interest in education. We see this in Luther. In the letter and sermon already mentioned and his almost equally famous, *An den christlichen Adel deutscher Nation*, he touches on nearly every important phase of education. Indeed, in insisting on education for all, girls as well as boys, the most indigent as well as the rich, the lowliest as well as those of high estate, Luther was some three centuries in advance of his age.

We see it, too, in Melancthon. Not for nothing is he called "the teacher of Germany." We have today the correspondence between Melancthon and the authorities of no less than fifty-six cities concerning their educational problems. We are told that he trained every great rector (with the single exception of Johannes Sturm) of the next generation, among them the very greatest teachers of that generation — Neander, Trozendorf, Camerarius, Wolff, and Fabricius. Not only did Melancthon train the teachers, he wrote the text-books: a Latin grammar, a Greek grammar, text-books on ethics, rhetoric, and physics. He edited the classics as diligently as Erasmus before him. He was active, too, both in the founding of new and in the reformation of old universities.

Even in so brief an account as this the great services of Johann Bugenhagen should not be forgotten. In 1520, by a general "church order" he made generous provision for schools in the states of northern Germany. For example, his order for Hamburg of 1520 provided for a Latin school with a rector and seven teachers. Provision was made also for vernacular schools for boys and girls in each parish. Less than a decade later a church order for Brunswick made provision for two classical schools, and two elementary schools for boys and four for girls, so located that all children could attend. In how far these orders were complied with, I do not know, but the man's interest is patent.

We are, of course, familiar with the very great interest in education manifested from the start by Protestant church authorities in the Netherlands. This interest was preserved even during the period of hot-

test persecution. In the very year when the Thirty Years' War began, the famous synod of Dordt required every parish to provide elementary education for all.

As for Calvin, with the exception of his very great service to the University of Geneva, his direct influence was probably less marked than that of Luther or Melancthon. Indirectly, however, he did more for education than any other among the Reformers. I refer the reader who desires to inform himself on this point to the exceptionally fine article by Professor Foster on "Calvinists and Education" in Monroe's *Cyclopedia of Education*, a work of reference to be found on the shelves of every public library of any size.

The Genius of Protestantism

In conclusion, I think it not unfair to point to the contrast between the educational level of countries definitely Protestant and those in which the Roman Church is in authority. Less than a century ago Lord Macaulay, in the first volume of his *History of England*, wrote the following:

"Whoever, knowing what Italy and Scotland naturally are, and what, four hundred years ago, they actually were, shall now compare the country round Rome with the country round Edinburgh, will be able to form some judgment as to the tendency of Papal domination. The descent of Spain, once the first among monarchies, to the lowest depths of degradation, the elevation of Holland, in spite of many natural disadvantages, to a position such as no commonwealth so small has ever reached, teach the same lesson. Whoever passes in Germany from a Roman Catholic to a Protestant canton, in Ireland from a Roman Catholic to a Protestant county, finds that he has passed from a lower to a higher grade of civilization."

In fine, the immediate effect of the Protestant Reformation on education, for reasons I have outlined, was scarcely short of disastrous. I trust I have made plain, so plain that even he who runs may read, that the reason must not be sought in that great movement itself. I hope, too, that I have also made plain the fact that the very genius of Protestantism is such that under conditions at all favorable it should, and as a matter of fact, has, profoundly stimulated education.

IF I FOLLOW HIM

Thorns marked my Master's way, and if I follow
Him
Briers will strike at me, and tears my eyes may
dim,
But somewhere in the narrowed close
Will blossom a beautiful rose.
'Twill not be a thornless rose, but a very lovely
flower
With courage of lifted head, willing to scent its
hour;
And somehow I shall find it there
To offer the Christ with my prayer.

—JOAN GEISEL GARDNER.

PROJECTED CHRISTIANITY VS. CHRISTIAN EDUCATION

J. C. Lobbes, Ph.B.

Principal, Edgerton Christian School, Edgerton, Minnesota.

IN the February issue of THE CALVIN FORUM there appeared an article entitled: "Projecting Christianity into the Public School," in which the author presented what seemed to him to be an easy solution of the age-old problem of supplying religious education to the youth of the land. Ordinarily, such an article would be read and then dismissed as merely presenting a difference of opinion on a subject on which there is no general agreement. However, when someone announces himself as being a Calvinist, and then makes a series of assertions that not only contradict all principles of Calvinism, but by implication challenge the very existence of the Christian School, it is time for others who call themselves Calvinists, to speak up. For that reason this article may be considered to be a direct answer to the one named above.

Of course, I appreciate the warmth and enthusiasm with which the esteemed writer presents his arguments. Nevertheless, I propose to show with equal force and candor, three things: first, the error and contradiction in the author's arguments; secondly, that those who try to project Christianity into the Public School are not doing so at all; that instead they are merely trying to pin insignificant fragments of religious truth on the garment of a non-Christian (in many cases, anti-Christian) system of education; and thirdly, that there is a vast difference between Projected Christianity and true Christian Education.

In order to avoid misunderstanding, I wish to say that we are not challenging the right of existence of the public school; neither are we challenging the right of a Calvinist to teach in a public school, even though we do think him to be inconsistent, and last of all, our conclusions are not based on petty prejudices or unfair criticisms.

Error and Contradiction

In the opening paragraph, the author weakens his arguments appreciably by an error and a contradiction. He says, "I am firmly convinced that the public school teacher has an equal, if not a greater opportunity of projecting some of the fundamental principles of Christianity into the lives of his young students, as has the teacher in our Christian Schools." Now this is the exact opposite of the truth. To say that the teacher in a non-Christian (or anti-Christian) institution has an equal, if not greater, opportunity for Christian training than a Christian institution, such as a Christian High School, or Hope College or Calvin College, reveals either gross exaggeration, or a lamentable ignorance of the facts.

In the same paragraph the author makes a statement which, later on, he contradicts twice. First he hastens to assure us that a Calvinist need not discard his religious convictions if he accepts a position in a public school. Later on he says that the law does not allow any one to attempt to indoctrinate the child with any particular religious formula as worked out by any denominational unit. This is repeated on page 159, where he says that the law "only prevents us from in-

doctrinating students with our personal and particular interpretations of some of the fine points of religion."

It seems to me that we are doing the author no injustice when we say that in the first statement the term "religious convictions" refers to Calvinism both as a system of religious truth, and as a world and life view. The same is true of the term, "fundamental principles of Christianity," which the author uses several times. It also must refer to Calvinism. Again, we do the author no injustice when we say that in the second and third statements the expressions: "particular religious formula," "attempts to indoctrinate," "personal and particular interpretations," refer to the same thing as religious convictions. It is inconceivable, at least, that a person can be a Calvinist, and have convictions or principles that are not Calvinistic. How, then, I ask, can anyone first say that he need not discard his religious convictions and then say twice that the law does not allow him to teach them?

Personal Opinion and State Law

If we examine the second and third statements above, where the author tells us what the law forbids, we notice that he merely gives his personal opinion of what the law says, and not the law itself. Of course, the law varies in different states, but it is quite certain that no state law says what is stated above. It is true that public opinion does not always demand the strict enforcement of the letter of the law, but public opinion is not law. Most state laws strictly forbid the teaching of Christian principles, and even brand such truths as that of Creation as being sectarian.

A Futile Task

At this point someone may interrupt to say that I do not understand the writer: he does not want to propagate Calvinism, but merely wants to "put a few fundamental principles of Christianity into practical use." To this I answer, that for a Calvinist there are no fundamental principles of Christianity that are not included in Calvinism. But, still worse, it is both foolish and futile to attempt to inculcate fundamental Christian principles into the minds and hearts of those who are not even acquainted with the simplest historical truths of the Bible. Take, for instance, the concept of the Church. How can students of whom the author says, "only a small proportion have a certain knowledge of what Christianity means or a high respect for the institutions of Christianity," be able to discuss "the need of a true religious belief," or "the problems facing modern denominations in the Christian religion"? Isn't it still true that one cannot discuss that of which one knows nothing?

A Prerequisite

There are many serious-minded Christians who, while they reject the Christian School as the solution of the problem of Christian training for their children,

are constantly trying to project Christianity into the Public School system. All of them, however, forget this fundamental truth: if we are to project Christianity into the Public School, we must first purge it of all other false teachings. Let us assume, for the sake of argument, that Mr. Gernant tries to project Christianity into his teachings; who can prevent other members of the faculty from spraying these Christian teachings with the acid of evolution? And what will be the result of an education where one seeks to project Christianity, another evolution, a third modernism, and a fourth atheism? Nothing but confusion and bewilderment of the student body.

In this connection it must not escape our attention that Christianity does not tolerate competition. It does not present itself as *one* answer to the problems of life, with evolution or modernism or rationalism running a close second; on the contrary, Christianity presents itself as the *only* solution to the problems and perplexities of life with all other views branded as false and misleading. For that reason, the difference between Christianity and other views is not a difference of degree of truth, but one of truth and falsehood.

Sinai Without Calvary

It may have surprised some of the readers to notice the statement in the second paragraph of this article that those who try to project Christianity into the Public School are not doing so at all. Yet I believe this to be the truth. The great objection to all such teaching is, that this is *an attempt to teach Christianity outside of God's revelation*. For us, the Bible is the inspired Word of God. Even though human intermediaries were used to record it, we believe it to be God-breathed and the infallible guide of life. Likewise, the Bible has a central message: the Cross of Calvary, and it may be studied only in the light of this central message. When we study the Bible without any regard for its central message, we make it say what it does not say. For example, when Mr. Gernant teaches the Ten Commandments as he says he does, he is not projecting Christian principles into the public school, but merely reducing the Ten Commandments to a code of ethics, and placing Moses on one line with Confucius.

The purpose of the Ten Commandments is quite different than Mr. Gernant represents it to be. They are not merely a pattern for human law, nor a code of ethics, but they serve as a mirror to show us our sinfulness, and to lead us to Calvary. Anyone who does not link Sinai with Calvary, is not teaching Christianity.

What has been said of the Ten Commandments, may also be said of the other examples given. To teach the Church as an institution, without showing that it is the body of Christ, is not Christianity. To teach the organic sciences without standing firmly on the foundation of Creation as related in Genesis, is not teaching Christian principles, but at best offering teleological proof of God's existence.

The Difference

Since there are many who are under the impression that projected Christianity is the same as Christian Education, I wish to show very briefly that there is a

vast difference between them. Projected Christianity announces the principle that education should also include religion, Christian Education announces the principle that every study in the curriculum should be permeated with religion. It accepts that beautiful quotation taken from Dr. Kuyper's Stone lectures, and brings those principles into practice. Projected Christianity can do no more than place the salt of religion next to the mental food offered the students; it cannot authoritatively demand that they shall make use of it, but must be content with a "take it or leave it" attitude. Christian Education does not place the salt of religion *next* to the mental food and give the student the option of taking it or not; on the contrary, religion (i. e., Christianity) is mixed with the mental food before it is served, and compels the students to take that or nothing.

In order to bring out the difference between these two views still stronger, allow me to outline briefly what we mean by the Christian teaching of History.

(a) Definition: History is the unfolding of God's Plan of the Ages. Even as the central message of the Bible is the Cross of Calvary, so likewise, the center of all history is the Cross of Calvary.

(b) Causes of Events: Primary: God, who through His Providence, controls all events and movements in History; secondary: the characters and wills of leading people; the influence of great movements of public opinion, etc.

With these fundamental Christian principles to build on, we trace the great movements in history, seeking to appreciate the day in which we live by interpreting the past by the present; etc. Last of all, we introduce the study of Christian Ethics into our lesson, thus showing the particular and general truths that are involved in the historical events.

Historical Event: Downfall of Spain.

(a) Secondary causes: cruel treatment of its colonies; the religious persecutions; destruction of the Grand Armada, etc.

(b) Primary: God, who punished Spain for her sins as a nation. Job 12:23.

(c) Particular truth: Nations as well as individuals are punished for their sins. E. g., Israel, Judah, Syria.

(d) General truth: Our nation also has its own national sins for which God's punishment is sure to come; e. g., Sabbath desecration, divorce, lawlessness, no respect for parents, gambling mania, etc.

Conclusion

I would not like to give the impression that I want to abandon our public school system to the agnostics and atheists. Those students whose parents are completely oblivious to their most sacred responsibilities, are indeed to be pitied. They can truthfully say: "No man careth for my soul." Yet I cannot see that it is the task of the Christian teacher to engage in mission work in the public school, and, what is more, I am sure that it will produce no good. Furthermore, if a Calvinist is to be consistent, he should apply his energies in an altogether different direction. First of all, he should cooperate with the present Christian School movement; or, if the existing schools do not suit him, let him join with others to erect schools that do suit his ideals. Then the students could get *real* Christian

Education, and the Christian Teacher could teach his Christian principles without being restricted or hampered by state laws.

If, however, the Christian teacher wishes to remain in the public school system, let him go to the source of the evil. Let him cry out against the false philosophy of William James, and the anti-Christian principles of John Dewey that are permeating our public education. Let him point out the hand of the modernists

and atheists who are seeking, under various guises, to introduce their principles into the state courses of study. Naturally, such a procedure would meet with fierce opposition, especially from the side of those who refuse to see any defects in our system of public education, but it might lead a larger number of Calvinists to see, even as the newly-organized Presbyterian Church is seeing, that for orthodox Christianity the danger of perishing is real and imminent.

IS "CENTRISM" CALVINISM?

Henry J. Van Andel, A.M.

Professor of Dutch Language and Literature, Calvin College

THE other day Walter Lippmann wrote an article on "Centrism" in which he made a plea for all temperate and intelligent politicians to pull together for the common good of America. As examples of this "Centrism" he mentioned some prominent Republican, Democratic, and Socialistic leaders. As extremes he named Huey Long and William Randolph Hearst. This idea of "Centrism" is of the nature of Macauley's advice that the best statesmen are the progressive Tories and the conservative Whigs. It is a new version of the old truth that a country is safest in the hands of the middle-of-the-roaders.

In President Roosevelt's annual message we find a similar note when he lays down the three principles for a successful democracy: the curbing of abuses, the extension of help to those in need, and the better balancing of our interdependent economies. The president does not want to break up our political, social, and economic life—at least not according to these basic principles, but he wants to reform it in a progressive way by power to stop evil and power to do good, as he put it in his inaugural address.

Now article 36 of our Belgic Confession—the heritage of Calvin—in accordance with Romans 13, states explicitly, "For this purpose He has invested the magistracy with the sword for the punishment of evil-doers, and for the protection of them that do well." This sounds a good deal like Roosevelt's three principles which can easily be reduced to Calvin's two: the negative one of checking evil, and the positive one of protecting the good citizens. How? By extending relief, and by balancing the economic forces. Indeed, Roosevelt's program even resembles in many respects the program of the progressive Calvinist party in the Netherlands, on the economic side of which we reported in the recent December issue of THE CALVIN FORUM.

The question arises, can we call the leading ideas of such "centrists," or middle-of-the-roaders like Lippmann, Roosevelt, Hoover, and Norman Thomas Calvinistic, or not? In answering this question, we want to point out first of all, that Lippmann and David Lawrence carefully avoid the word Christian, and continually speak of progressive liberalism in contrast with the *laissez faire* of the old liberals of the Manchester school, who only believe in the negative task of the government. Further, we must not forget, that Roosevelt, tho swearing his oath on

Corinthians thirteen, and though finishing up his inaugural with a verse from the Song of Zacharias, also leaves the adjective Christian unused, and seems to prefer to speak of democracy and self-government.

The best explanation of this similarity between "Centrism" and Calvinism is probably that in our American moral fabric there are many remnants left of our ancestors, the Puritans. Granted that we may call our American civilization still a Christian civilization—which Christian character appears rather conspicuously if we compare it, say, with Chinese life—then we may, in such a broad sense, also call this middle-of-the-road economy "Christian." How far are "Christian" Europe and America not ahead of pagan Asia! We have still many things to be thankful for, and our political and economic life still show several historical traces of the influence of the Cross of Christ.

But, if we view this "Centrism" more closely we shall have to relegate it to the realm of so-called Christian humanistic philosophy. It is true that it contains many excellent elements and that, therefore, we may with a free conscience cast our vote, at least for the Republican or Democratic parties. But as Calvinists, we cannot be satisfied with any "Centrism" that is not consciously rooted and grafted into Christian principles, whatever historical connections it may have with the Puritans, or even with Calvin.

We are afraid, first of all, the final criterium of this "Centrism" is of a purely rationalistic character. Would not its advocates grant that it is based on human experience as gathered and classified by the modern universities, and on the old Greek assumption of a universal law which in some way or other we have to adhere to in order to arrive at an equilibrium of the individual and social forces? Do the propagandists of this liberalism ever speak of the eternal principles of God's Word? No, they try to make us believe that somehow or other the collection of facts will be objective and well-balanced, and that in some mysterious way through forensic processes the truth will appear.

A still weaker point in the progressive liberalism appears when they consider the causes and the remedies of economic and social evils. To some it occurs that there is only an inadequate distribution of the world's goods, to others that the profit motive is the root of all misery. Some contend that capitalism can be reformed. Others that it must go. Some want to

preserve private property and private initiative. Others want to replace it by collectivism. Which school is right, the mildly progressive or the more radical? Will these schools not remain divided, and will the socialists not get on top, if the progressive liberals do not succeed? From a rational point of view the arguments of the one group are just as sound as of the other. If you do not believe that the fundamental principle of the Mosaic law points to private property, and that the Scriptures reject a materialistic conception of life and revolutionary means, if necessary, to bring about a change, then how will you choose between the two schools? There is no choice, but to let the trend of the times decide. Fatalism is just as inevitable in the solution of progressive liberalism as in its gathering of the data and in its crystallization of the truth.

Finally, what right have the liberals to be so optimistic as to assume that the more abundant life will come about by technical means? History teaches very clearly that there are periods, sometimes even centuries, in which mankind seems to break loose from its moorings. In such times man seems to be unmanageable. Then the nations, in the words of John's Revelation, have drunk of the wine of the fornication of Babylon. And even in normal times, is it not true that man is never satisfied and incurably selfish? There have been periods in the history of Europe when mankind seemed to be more prosperous and content than at other times. But these were periods, as the Calvinist historian Groen van Prinsterer has pointed out, when there was more emphasis on virtue than on riches, and when the public conscience realized that virtue was bound up with the faith of the church. To the law and to the testimony, otherwise they will be driven to darkness, says the prophet. There is no room for optimism unless there are strong convictions among believers, and there are no strong convictions among Christians, unless the Holy Spirit works powerfully in their hearts.

If we look this progressive liberalism over once more, we find that its criterion is rationalistic, its solutions fatalistic, and its optimism superficial. We have to make the best of it, but it would be preferable that believing Christians of all types would organize socially, economically, and politically. Progressive liberalism is at its best Christian Humanism, the founder of which was the celebrated Erasmus. Many of its adherents may be Christians at heart, but in their life and world view they are really unchristian. Christian Humanism—the adjective devalues the noun, or, the noun the adjective. We can appreciate the good in the views of Lippmann and Roosevelt, and we can rejoice in the fact, that at least the government of our country did wake up to its tremendous economic task. (It is far better to have political leaders who are middle-of-the-roaders than to have extremists in Washington, and it is far better to have a president who believes in social justice than in *laissez faire*.) But economic Christianity means more than a balancing of economic forces. It is not only richer. But it is of a different spiritual quality. For at its root is faith in Scripture.

OBJECTS DIVINE DISSOLVED

Life is not enough for me.
I seek the brimming source,
The verdant plains of essence.
Unhappy creature, I, who
Never knew the love of finite things
Without imputing touch of infinite —
Making of the clay a god
Or goddess — only to find
After years of adoration
That the tinsel and the sheen had dulled,
The pristine beauty disappeared,
Objects divine dissolved in human tears.

And then
Mad laughter and the brittle cracking heart
Soon give way to silent prayers and beaten breast.
Conscience in ashes, from illusion loosed,
Swiftly exiles forms
Of beauty, love, and truth,
Returning to the spirit-worship
Of One beyond the sensuous reach
Of outstretched arms or tears;
Who lightly soothes the inwardness,
The empty, dreadful inwardness —

The space to which the Spirit comes.

—CORNELIUS VAN ZWOLL.

WE, NOT ANGELS

It is too late, you say, to save our love,
My words are water spilt in vain oblation;
One drop revives the parched but not the dead,
The time is past for reconciliation.

While I reply, Are you a Solomon,
And wiser still, that you should fix the seasons?
Have you seen death determined in the skies?

Not in the stars but nearer root the reasons.

Jonah beneath the withered branch declared
Destruction must descend for he had spoken.
Pride made the proclamation, not decree;
Through humbleness the city stood unbroken.

Behold, beloved, I have banished pride,
I come in sackcloth; ashes on my head.
Together let us roll away the stone.

Love is immortal, only we grow dead.

You thrust me from you still into a waste
Of wilderness you will not contemplate?
You have some comfort then; but I have none,
Knowing that we, not angels, lock the gate.

—MILDRED REITSEMA.

THE C. I. O. AND THE C. L. A.

John Van Vels

President Christian Labor Association, Grand Rapids, Michigan

THIS seems to be the age of initials: N. R. A., A. A. A., C. I. O., C. L. A. The two organizations designated by the initials in the heading of this article represent two distinctly different movements. Both are organized for the well-being of the working-man.

C. I. O. stands for Committee for Industrial Organization. This Committee is headed by John L. Lewis and seeks the organization of every worker in a given industry.

This way of organizing industry has severed the tie that bound John L. Lewis to the American Federation of Labor. The new movement has eliminated some of the outstanding evils of the A. F. L. It seems that the C. I. O. is not working for so-called Trade Unions or the closed shop. Trade unions can only be successful at the expense of other groups of workers. They can obtain their demands only by organizing a large percentage of their tradesmen. That is why there are only a few trade unions able to get a wage of one dollar or more per hour. Lewis organizes the entire industry and works for the well-being of all workers in that industry.

The closed shop idea is also abolished. Under the closed shop system there is no room for the unorganized, nor for workers differently organized. The C. I. O. is satisfied with the sole bargaining agency.

The question may be asked, If this union is so much better than the A. F. L., can a Christian belong to it? The answer to this question depends entirely upon the world and life view the Christian has. Is the Christian before everything else a Christian also in his practical life, then we answer: No! But if his life is divided into different compartments, so that not his religious convictions but utility and expediency guide his life, then I would say: Yes.

The other organization designated in the heading of this article is the Christian Labor Association.

The fundamental principle by which this organization is guided is the sovereignty of God. God is Ruler in every relationship of life and His precepts are our laws. Therefore we, of the C. L. A., too, believe in industrial organization. Not because it is so much easier to organize every worker, but because industry is an organism.

Industry can only be successful if all the vital parts — each member of that industry — cooperate. The Apostle Paul spoke of the organism of the human body, in which no member is complete in itself, but in which each and every member must function harmoniously and cooperate with the rest of the members, in order to attain the desired results.

This is the reason why the Christian Labor Association advocates industrial organization. Not because there is more money in it (that may not be the case for many!), but because of Christ's commandment that we should love our neighbor as ourself.

The C. L. A. also agrees with the C. I. O. that the closed shop idea is wrong. But we are not so sure that the C. I. O. will maintain this stand in the future.

The C. L. A. recognizes the right of every man to work. No union should deprive him of this right when his conscience forbids him to join such a union. Accordingly the C. L. A. advocates that every worker shall belong to the organization of his own choosing.

But although there are these similarities between the C. L. A. and the C. I. O. in certain of their objectives, there is a radical difference between the motive which prompts their respective action as well as between the ways and means pursued in reaching their objectives.

The motive that prompts the C. L. A. is one of Christian principle. That of the C. I. O. is expediency. The means employed by the C. L. A. are controlled and determined by God's law. With the C. I. O. the selection of these means is again a matter of expediency.

Let me mention a few of these ways and means.

When 51% of the workers in a given industry are organized under the C. I. O., it insists on being the sole bargaining agency for the entire industry, and in this way oppresses the minority. This is an injustice. No, the minority is not necessarily right. But neither is it necessarily wrong. Its voice should be heard. It is an unjust usurpation of power to claim to represent the minority without their consent.

The sitdown strike is a plain violation of the present law of private ownership. Such strikers are taking possession of property which is not theirs. Regardless of what we think of this law, as long as it is in force, it should be obeyed. This is one of the methods employed which demoralizes the people. By taking the law into their own hands they join the ranks of the "lawless one."

The C. L. A. recognizes God in prayer and in Christian fellowship when we come together in our meetings, whereas the meetings of the C. I. O. are often marked by swearing and vile language. One of our members, belonging to a church which is (to say the least) very lukewarm toward our organization, testified: I met with the Lewis group, but I thank God for our C. L. A.

If the Christian affiliates himself with this organization by an act of his own free will, he is also responsible for the methods and practices pursued. Strange tales are told in this connection. A member of the C. L. A. was recently accused by a Christian brother, a member of the C. I. O. This man held that we were morally obliged to join the C. I. O. seeing we enjoy the results of their activity. However, when one points out that such members are morally responsible for the evil practices and methods of the C. I. O., they make the reply that they do not attend the meetings or they blame the "radicals."

There is a great future for organized Christian action. "When the foundations are overthrown, what can the righteous do?" He can protest. He can proclaim the principles of God's Word. He can organize with the C. L. A.

PREMILLENNIALISM AND DISPENSATIONALISM

R. I. Campbell

Toronto, Ontario, Canada.

WHY do certain writers on all sides of the Premillennial question use the terms *Premillennialism* and *Dispensationalism* synonymously? Are these two systems identical? If not, are both capable of explicit formulation? How do they stand in relation to the historic Reformed Faith?

It would seem to be in the best interests of all parties that the respective positions of these two groups be formulated in terms that would admit of no ambiguity or misrepresentation.

It is unnecessary to enter into those matters which separate the Calvinist from the Arminian or even those which separate both from the Lutheran. Those do not enter into our present discussion. We shall, however, in order to be more explicit, confine ourselves to those doctrines and principles which are common to all the authoritative documents of the Evangelical sections of the Anglican, Holland Reformed, and Presbyterian Churches. Let us, for convenience, call this the *Reformed Faith*. Is Premillennialism consistent with the Reformed Faith?

The ultimate purpose of this discussion is to find an answer to this last question; the immediate purpose is to find the answer to the questions previously asked. In order to do this it will be necessary to define *Premillennialism* or to formulate its doctrinal position on those matters wherein it differs from the other parties which adopt the Reformed Faith. This, we take it, has never been done by any person or group authorized to speak for a majority of Premillennialists. Until this is done we can appraise its position in so far as it is possible to do so, only by the published writings of individuals. But, by such a study, it is impossible to differentiate between Premillennialism and Dispensationalism. Both are Premillennial and both profess loyalty to the Reformed Faith. There is no clearcut or generally recognized dividing line between these two.

But the amazing fact emerges that, with these two and the non-premillenarian, we have three parties each professing loyalty to the Reformed Faith and to the Scriptures and yet each adopting contradictory positions on essential Christian doctrine and on basic principles of moral conduct. How are we to meet this perplexing situation?

The following two outlines of the respective positions of Premillennialism and Dispensationalism, as compared with Non-premillennialism, (see Postscript), were begun several years ago and have been revised periodically after much correspondence and many conferences with representative theologians, editors, and authors of all parties and on both sides of the Atlantic. It is believed to be a fair and impartial statement of each position as gleaned from the best known and most scholarly authors who have written on these subjects in English during this and the last century.

We shall deal only with the teaching common to all the writers who support these respective positions. We do not sit in judgment on these teachings. Our purpose is to ascertain just what that teaching is. If

the supporters of each of these systems will agree that the enumeration we shall present is a fair statement of their own position on each specific point dealt with, a decided step forward will have been made.

It is necessary to emphasize the fact that we are not seeking to find, or to define, the position of any individual, periodical, congregation, denomination, or group. We are seeking answers to the questions: What is Premillennialism?, What is Dispensationalism?, and How do these differ from each other and from the Orthodox Reformed Faith, if they do indeed differ?

What Is Premillennialism?

Partial Outline of What is Assumed to be the Respective Positions of Premillennarians and Non-Premillennarians. In Seven Particulars.

1) OLD TESTAMENT PROPHECY

The Premillennial position is that Old Testament prophecy in its more hopeful and glorious earthly and temporal aspects converges on the Second Advent of Christ, and will not be fulfilled until or after that event. We must not expect fulfillment during this age.

The Non-premillennial position is that Old Testament unconditional Prophecy relating to future earthly or temporal events after the First Advent and Pentecost will be fulfilled during this present age or dispensation or at its catastrophic termination. The Second Advent introduces the eternal state.

2) THE JEWS

The Premillennial position is that the teaching of Scripture in relation to the Jews considered as a nation or as a racial unity is that they will not officially or generally recognize Christ as their promised Messiah until the Second Advent.

The Non-premillennial position is that when now apostate Judaism is converted to Christianity it can be in no other manner than by those methods and instrumentalities which have been at the disposal of the Church during the whole Christian era.

3) THE MESSIANIC KINGDOM

The Premillennial position generally is that Christ does not now sit upon the throne of David (Luke 1:32), and will not do so until the Second Advent.

The Non-premillennial position is that Christ is now exercising His Messianic or Davidic kingship. The Messianic kingdom was instituted after the First Advent and will reach its greatest earthly extent prior to the Second Advent.

4) THE BLESSED HOPE

The Premillennial position is that the hope of the believer as taught in the New Testament means that at least one thousand years prior to the final Resurrection or Judgment there will be a resurrection of the bodies of believers who will then reign with Christ during a future Millennial or

Kingdom age, prior to the end referred to in Matt. 24:35, II Peter 3:10-12.

The Non-premillennial position is that the hope of the believer has reference to the final coming of Christ in glory at the last day, and to the glorious immortality which thereafter awaits all believers.

5) THE OLD TESTAMENT

The Premillennial position in regard to the Old Testament means that some of the non-predictive parts of the Old Testament cannot apply in their fullest earthly application to this present age (e. g., Psalms 48, 76, 87, 122, 147). It is necessary to ascertain to which era some passages are applicable before we can apply them correctly.

The Non-premillennial position is that the passages referred to above are wholly applicable to the present dispensation, finding complete correspondence, fulfilment, or adaptation in the Gospel, the Christian Church and era, where not applicable to the eternal state.

6) THE NEW TESTAMENT

The Premillennial position as compared with the Non-premillennial necessitates entirely different interpretations of much of our Lord's teaching, particularly the parables. The *leaven* and the *mustard seed* in Matthew thirteen represent evil. *The Non-premillennial position* is that the leaven and mustard seed in Matt. 13 represent the Gospel or the manner in which it operates and grows in the world.

7) THE GOSPEL AND THE CHURCH

The Premillennial position is that the Gospel, including the means and agencies now at the disposal of the Church, was never intended to be the chief or final means of establishing the Messianic Kingdom on earth in its widest predicted earthly extent. (Earthly in the sense of the existing constitution and order of terrestrial life.) The millennial or golden period of human history will not come until the Second Advent of Christ the King, who will return in glory to set up or fully establish His earthly Kingdom, or to introduce a period during which the true Gospel will be known and accepted by all nations.

The Non-premillennial position is that the Gospel together with the means and agencies, divine and human, now and always at the disposal of the Church since Pentecost, is sufficient to bring about the establishment of the earthly Messianic Kingdom in its fullest predicted earthly manifestation. The Gospel is primarily a Gospel of redemption from sin and its consequences and is perfect and sufficient for its destined purpose. Christ's return in glory will abrogate the Gospel, and this present age or dispensation, and introduce the final eternal state.

What Is Dispensationalism?

We shall now consider Dispensationalism as it differs from Premillennialism or as it is an extreme form of Premillennialism. We shall introduce our tentative formulation of its distinctive position with some preliminary remarks.

From the current *Bulletin* (Jan.-March, 1937) of the Dallas Theological Seminary we learn that the constructive expository work being done at that Dispensational seminary is described as "expounding

the clear Biblical distinctions marking the characteristics of the dispensations of Law, Grace, and the Kingdom."

Here are three distinct dispensations enumerated:

- a) That of *Law* which operated from Moses to Christ.
- b) That of *Grace* which now operates.
- c) That of *The Kingdom* which is said to commence at the Second Coming of Christ.

We shall ignore for the present the earlier dispensations prior to the Mosaic era, and accept the terms *Law* and *Grace* as convenient, if not quite adequate, designations of the Mosaic and the Christian eras. The terms *Grace* and *Kingdom* as applied to the present and a future dispensation are not uniformly understood by all parties because of the fact that these two dispensations, if they can be clearly distinguished, exist concurrently in the Non-premillennial system.

Dispensationalists say that there will be another dispensation, another era of human history after the present Christian or Gospel era comes to an end. Non-premillennialists say that the present Gospel age is the last in human history. Some Premillennialists take the same position as the Dispensationalists on this point. Other Premillennialists accept a new era or dispensation without acknowledging any material change in the method of the divine administration. Dispensationalists assert that each dispensation is characterized by far-reaching differences in the method of administration. It will be necessary to ascertain what are these *clear Biblical distinctions*.

Seven Additional Particulars in Which the Dispensational Position is Assumed to Differ from that of the Non-Premillennialist.

8) THE MOSAIC ERA

The Dispensational position is that the Mosaic era, or Dispensation of *Law*, was one during which the predominant element was *Law* while the saving element was *obedience to that Law* instead of the *Faith* or *Grace* which characterized the preceding and succeeding dispensations. *The Non-premillennial position* is that *Grace* and *Faith* were explicitly present and as necessary for salvation during the Mosaic era as in any other era, after the Fall.

9) THE SINAI COVENANT

The Dispensational position is that the Sinai Covenant was designed or utilized as the way of spiritual salvation for Old Testament Israel.

The Non-premillennial position is that the earthly historic covenants were gracious covenants in which God dealt with man as redeemed or as professing loyalty and obedience to His righteous administration, for temporal and educative ends, for the temporal and eternal well-being of the chosen people, for the conviction or condemnation of unbelievers and for the instruction of all subsequent ages.

10) THE OLD TESTAMENT

The Dispensational position is that the greater part of the Old Testament, being based on, related to, and descriptive of, the Sinai Covenant, and the nation of Israel while under that Covenant, it is evident that an erroneous conception

of these "clear distinctions" which marked that dispensation will fundamentally alter the meaning and application of the Old Testament for us today. The greater part of Old Testament Scripture with its symbolism, promises, prophecy, and poetry is intended only or chiefly for the Jews and for the future kingdom. If used by the Christian Church during this present age these parts of Scripture must be used with great reserve and must be understood in connection with the "Dispensational" method of interpretation.

The Non-premillennial position is that the Dispensational system breaks up the continuity, organic unity, and harmony of the Scriptures, and virtually destroys their value for the Christian Church. The Old Testament is as fully applicable to existing conditions as they will be at any future age of time.

11) THE NEW TESTAMENT

The Dispensational position is that the introduction of a new earthly era or dispensation succeeding the present era in which the administration of Divine Government will be fundamentally different necessitates an entirely new method of approach to the study of the New Testament as well as to the Old.

The Non-premillennial position is that the whole New Testament is wholly applicable to the present age. (The Dispensational position eliminates the Sermon on the Mount, nullifies the Moral Law, and is distinctly Antinomian.)

12) THE MESSIANIC KINGDOM

The Dispensational position is that the Messianic Kingdom predicted in Old Testament Prophecy, heralded by John the Baptist and by our Lord, has not yet been inaugurated or established on earth. Because Christ was rejected by the Jews at His first Advent the establishment of the Kingdom was postponed and in its place the Christian Church was established as a temporary institution to occupy the period between the first and second Advents.

The Non-premillennial position is that this view of the Church and the Kingdom carries with it very serious and far-reaching implications in relation to the doctrines of the Incarnation and the Atonement.

13) THE TEN COMMANDMENTS

The Dispensational position is that believers in this age are not under obligation to obey an explicit and objective moral law, and particularly that Law which is summarized in the Ten Commandments and expounded by our Lord. That Law is not intended for the Christian Church or the world during this present age.

The Non-premillennial position is that the Ten Commandments are wholly obligatory for all men in every age of time.

14) THE SABBATH

The Dispensational position is that the Fourth Commandment of the Decalogue is not a part of God's Law for all mankind, but only for the Jews under the Mosaic economy and again during the so-called future "Kingdom-Age." Christ or the Christian Church instituted a new Day, "The Lord's Day", after the Resurrection which has no connection with the Fourth Commandment and

which the Christian Church has no authority to ask or expect unbelievers and the world to observe.

The Non-premillennial position is that the non-observance of this commandment, as of the other nine, is a transgression of the Moral Law and therefore sin.

POSTSCRIPT. An arbitrary starting point is necessary from which to begin a study of the Premillennial position. We select for this purpose the following conservative and scholarly Premillennial Authors, all of whom, we believe, were Presbyterians:

Samuel Henry Kellogg, D.D., LL.D., "Are Premillennialists Right?" (Fleming H. Revell, 1923 edition.)

Adolph Saphir, D.D., Chapters on the Kingdom in vol. "The Lord's Prayer." (Christian Alliance Publishing Co.)

Henry W. Frost, D.D., "The Second Coming of Christ." (Eerdmans.)

Professor John T. Duffield, Princeton, N. J., "In Defence of Premillennialism," dedicated to Westminster Seminary. (Arno C. Gaebelen, Inc., N. Y.)

The modern Dispensational position we assume to be most clearly expounded in the published works of the late Dr. C. I. Scofield, in the "Scofield Reference Bible," together with all the published writings of the present faculty of the Evangelical Theological College, Dallas, Texas (advertised as "A Standard Calvinistic Seminary").

All Non-premillennial authors from the Reformation to the middle of the nineteenth century, who professed loyalty to the Reformed Faith are, I believe, in substantial agreement on all these fourteen items. (The Antinomians are of course excepted.) For the purposes of the present discussion all Post-millennialists and A-millennialists are classed as *Non-premillennialists*.

CATHEDRALS

Cathedrals — stately sentinels —
Silent vigils keep

Over their communicants

Soundly wrapped in sleep.

Sleep? while echoing down the aisles

Methinks the organ tones

Murmur, "Whited sepulchres

Full of dead men's bones."

Cathedrals — 'neath their graceful spires

Men bemoan the loss

Of a figure crowned with thorns

Bleeding on a cross.

Day by day they eat His flesh,

Drink His blood and cry:

"Mother of the Holy One,

Save me or I die!"

Cathedrals — reverent devotees

Count their beads and nod

As they worship saint or host,

Everything — but God!

When men pause to gasp in awe

At heaps of gorgeous stones,

All I see is sepulchres

Full of dead men's bones.

— VERA SMITH TEEUWISSEN.

THE CHURCH AND THE SECTS

A PREVENTATIVE ATTITUDE

John Bovenkerk

Minister, First Reformed Church, Muskegon, Michigan.

DEPARTURE from what we have termed historical-Biblical orthodoxy leads to utter confusion. The continuity of the Christian Faith, embodied in the Scriptures, must be kept at all costs. The Holy Spirit, once for all time promised to the Church to lead her into all truth, has laid the tracks upon which the trains of His Church must run. Obviously, if disaster is to be avoided, it will be wise to stay on those tracks. The Church, as we have stated in our previous article, recognizes the presence and guidance of the Holy Spirit throughout the centuries and adheres to the continuity of Christian truth as formulated in the historic creeds. Those fundamentals of Christianity, like the organs of the human body, each and all in their rightful place, are indispensable.

The sects, however, think and act otherwise. They invent a way of their own; too often a lawless and bolshevistic way, novel and sensational, designed to captivate the masses of people who, insufficiently indoctrinated, live on the borderline of Christianity.

The One String Fiddler

I remember having heard once upon a time of a fiddler on the stage. This audacious performer astounded his audience by deliberately breaking three strings of his violin — snap, snap, snap! — and now, lo, on the one string left he plays some popular music with thrilling variations. Thrilling, indeed, for a vaudeville audience! But such performance can never satisfy either the real musician or the lovers of real music.

Many a sect-leader is just like that fiddler entertaining by playing on one string and posing like a genius. The fact remains that classic music cannot be played on one string and that no musician worthy of the name advocates that kind of performance. The average sect-leader proves himself to be what is frequently called “a one-track mind.” He has fallen in love with a certain doctrine of the Bible, which perhaps has not received the emphasis it deserved, and forthwith he makes it the great, predominant truth of his preaching and teaching. Pulling it out of its co-related position in the whole body of Christian truth, thus committing the unpardonable sin of forgetting or ignoring that it cannot properly function unless it remains in its organic relation to every other doctrine, he proceeds to make a demonstration of its tremendous importance by blowing it up.

How solemnly the Apostle Paul warns against this kind of thing in I Cor. 12, when he compares the Church with the human body and its various members: “And if they were all one member, where were the body? But now are they many members, yet but one body.” As to the body of Christian Truth, the sect-leader stands indicted of the crime of making the hand, or foot, or eye, or ear the whole body. This is both heretical and schismatic. It throws all existing law and order in the realm of doctrine out of gear and upsets divine, inherent unity, coördination,

and purpose. It is a mark of extreme independence, if not of obnoxious egotism. By a single sweeping gesture of the hand precious historic documents, treasured commentaries, valuable results of painstaking research, and even authenticated creeds are relegated to the waste basket. Unbalanced, lopsided, “peculiar” with a vengeance, the sect proclaims boldly an orthodoxy all its own. It reminds one of the funny, convex and concave mirrors that reflect the human form all out of proportion: a grotesque caricature of the real.

Preaching the Whole Counsel of God

And yet, in spite of the gross errors of the sect, it prides itself almost invariably upon preaching the full Gospel, at the same time accusing the established Church and its ministry in particular of not proclaiming the whole counsel of God. This sounds like a terrible accusation. Surely, the Christian minister has a holy obligation to preach the whole Gospel with all its implications for time and eternity and the full-orbed Christ in all His redemptive value to all conceivable relations of God to man and man to his environment. What conscientious minister does not feel this great responsibility? Who is sufficient unto these things? Does he do it? Has he ever done it? I fell in with a preacher one time who seriously proposed to accomplish this by selecting a text from each of the 66 books of the Bible and giving an exposition of it. That, he claimed, would be an excellent check-up on preaching the whole counsel of God. Naturally, I inquired as to whether or not he had studied Systematic Theology. No; he was not in favor of that kind of study, had never had a seminary course, preferred a chain-Bible to commentaries, and had gotten into the habit of independent study with the Scriptures before him, earnestly invoking the guidance of the Spirit. One wonders whether the Holy Spirit has just begun to illumine people today.

Paul testified to the Elders at Ephesus: “I have not shunned to declare unto you the whole counsel of God.” Did he mean to say that in his Ephesian pastorate he had expounded the main contents of each Bible book? Did he mean to impress the Elders with the idea that he had preached and taught all the wisdom of God in all its comprehensiveness? Certainly not. He assured them that he had not intentionally omitted or hid any of the fundamental truths. Paul was never afraid to preach the Gospel that “is not after man” (Gal. 1:11). That fine, heroic spirit should mark every minister of the Gospel.

The sect-leader is hereby courteously advised to take a good, stiff course in Systematic Theology and invest in a few sets of critical commentaries (hoping he can use them, for usually the gentlemen are averse to the study of Hebrew and Greek) in order that he himself (or is he a she?) may somewhat approach the preaching of a full Gospel or the procla-

mation of the whole counsel of God. And, incidentally, we might add, for good measure, that the same militant leaders, ever knocking the established churches, might make a serious attempt to indoctrinate the pick-up membership of their groups, lest these less-informed people receive revelations from the Spirit(?) again different from those of their shepherds.

The Task of Prevention

But what can the Church do to prevent sectarianism and the increase of the sects?

We have alluded to this in our former article by saying that the harmful bugs must be killed in embryo, not forgetting that sectarianism originates in the church. Schism and subsequent independent groups are but a result of false toleration.

1. Our first obligation is naturally the preservation of that body of Biblical Truth that we have referred to right along. Since the germs of heresy and sectarianism are present in every local church, it is imperative that great care must be taken in the preaching and teaching. The cardinal doctrines of Christianity must be explained in detail. Sound, comprehensive doctrinal preaching is needed today more than ever. But that kind of preaching will find a poor response unless the youth are adequately indoctrinated. It ought to be perfectly clear that catechetical instruction needs a tremendous re-emphasis. The Sunday School has its rightful place, but it is woefully insufficient and cannot take the place of the Pastor's classes. Youth Fellowship organizations, too, fill a place, but may not be tolerated usurping the teaching of the ordained minister. One of the most crying needs in the Church of today is a revival of indoctrination. That will prove a real safeguard against heresy and schism.

Credal Revision and Denominational Consciousness

2. We must cultivate a new interest in our confessional standards. That will be difficult in our day and age with its general aversion to creeds, unless we do our much-neglected duty of revising them, both by deletion and amplification, emphasizing the latter. This should by no means be interpreted as an attempt to soft-pedal any of the fundamental doctrines; to the contrary, the purpose should be to render in modern phraseology the same never-dying truths, but decidedly presenting them in their relation to the current philosophy and "isms" of the present day. We may as well confess that in this respect we have fallen behind. It's high time to catch up. This has been advocated by a number of eminent theologians, whose soundness in the faith cannot be questioned. In our Reformed Churches, such a revision, particularly of our Heidelberg Catechism and Belgic Confession should not be attempted independently but jointly, all the Reformed Churches in the world coöperating.

3. We must earnestly endeavor to rekindle the denominational consciousness. With due respect and appreciation of the good in other historic Churches, we nevertheless need to remind ourselves that we must make our own distinct contribution to

the Kingdom of God. This is infinitely better than to strive for an ecclesiastically united Protestantism. As there is a fine, wholesome nationalism, so there is a splendid and most purposeful denominationalism. As the people of America must learn to love and maintain all the good things that are characteristically American, so the people of our Reformed Faith must learn to cherish and practice all the good things that are distinctively Reformed: for the well-being of the Christian Church as a whole: for the highest good of mankind. Denominationalism is no more an evil *per se* than nationalism. Paul said to the Athenians that God "has made of one blood all the nations of men for to dwell on the face of the earth" (Acts 17:26). That same principle can be applied to the variety of churches, so long as they adhere to the fundamentals of Christianity.

4. Closely allied with this denominational consciousness is the concept of "The Church." It is very necessary to inculcate into the minds and hearts of the rising generation that the Church is a divine institution with officers called and ordained by God, with an authorized message and an authoritative commission, and with a God-given mandate to administer the sacraments and exercise discipline. As the concept of the State together with law and order is suffering tragically these days, being made light of by those who administer it as well as by its insidious enemies, so the Church-concept is cheapened and adulterated in our day, both because of a disgraceful lack of firmness within and a consequent lack of esteem from the world. This is not a plea for hierarchy (à la Roman Catholicism), but for a much-needed return to Biblical authority, to a "thus saith the Lord" followed by the Biblical use of what our Catechism calls "the keys of the kingdom of heaven."

Need for Spiritual Quickening

5. In addition to what has been said pertaining to doctrine—and that will ever remain basic in the Church's attitude to the sects—it is well to remind ourselves that we are greatly in need of a spiritual quickening in genuine and warm Christian fellowship. Often the sects accuse the Church of being cold and formal. Is there no truth in this? Again we are told that the Church caters too much to a social fellowship consisting of eating and drinking at the cost of true spiritual communion. Is there no truth in that? Where prayer meetings are in vogue, is it easy to keep up interest? Has the prevailing custom of using the bait of "refreshments will be served" not been overdone? Much of the present-day worldliness in the church might be prevented by a determined effort toward a healthy and happy spirituality that shall manifest itself in a fine and warm fellowship in the local church. What a happy time some of the sects have! How dull and dreary a time we have! What an enthusiasm and zeal, consecration and witness-bearing in the sectarian circles! What a lukewarmness, indifference and aloofness often in our churches! The extravagance of the Holy Rollers and noisy demonstration of certain Pentecostal groups deserve our condemnation, but we have too many "holy rollers" in our own churches who turn

over in their beds on Sunday morning too lazy to get up in time for the divine worship in God's house, and we have too many worshippers whose spiritual interest and participation is but slightly above zero. St. Paul's fervency in spirit is, alas, a rare thing in our historic churches these days.

To sum up. The Church's attitude to the sects should never be one of persecution—for martyrdom

is coveted by them and actually strengthens their cause—but of prevention. "An ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure." For the existence of every sect the Church must find the cause within itself, whether in doctrine or life, and forthwith highly resolve to seek the needed remedy and apply it with faith and prayer in the Name of the Head of the Church.

BOOK REVIEWS

WHAT IS SOUND MONEY?

MONEY CREATORS. WHO CREATES MONEY? WHO SHOULD CREATE IT? By Gertrude M. Coogan. *The Sound Money Press, Inc., 120 W. Adams St., Chicago, Illinois. pp. 344. \$2.00*

THIS book was sent by a subscriber to the undersigned for review. One's first reaction upon reading it is this that those people who feared and strongly condemned the government's action in going off the gold standard and thus "setting the stage for inflation" should read this book. Running through it as its most important theme is the strongest denunciation of those who used our monetary system before 1929 either to expand credit or to contract it, thus to bring on either inflation or deflation. In it one will find a scathing criticism of those who set up and used the gold standard to accomplish their ends, and who in accomplishing these caused variations in the value of money far beyond any the present government has thus far brought about, or, as the author insists, a government if freed from control by international bankers would ever bring about.

The reading of this book, if followed by or incidental to a more careful study of the whole monetary problem, should convince any reader not of the simplicity of the matter only, as the writer would have it, but of the great confusion that exists in the minds of people concerning money and of the amazing things that have been done in the name of sound money and banking in this country and others in the past.

The author knows monetary theory not only but monetary history so well that she is able to present criticism of our present monetary system that no one can fairly deny. She presents as facts bits of history that one does not find in usual accounts. If her testimony is correct then selfishness and chicanery not only corrupted the working of our monetary system, as one might expect, but built it on corrupt foundations as well.

The main theme of the book is this that the creation of money and the regulation of its supply has not been in the hands of the government, where by law it belongs, but in the hands of the bankers, particularly the international bankers. The international bankers receive the blame for our major depressions not only, but even for such major historical events as the civil war. Central banks and banking systems such as our first and second Bank of the United States, our National Banking System, and our Federal Reserve System are criticized as having done irreparable harm to the country rather than good; Alexander Hamilton, usually regarded as our greatest secretary of the treasury, is roundly scored as a selfish schemer; the issuing of the greenbacks is used as an example of desirable creation of money as contrasted with wrong methods used by the bankers; the insistence upon silver in the past and the purchases of silver in the present are defended as furnishing us with a metal which the international bankers could not control as well as gold.

The author knows the meaning of inflation, "an unjustified expansion of money," and records, what is generally unrecognized to be a fact, the unjustified expansion of money by the banks under our banking system while we were on the gold standard.

Our banking system, she points out, is a collapsible structure. Most of our money consists of credit money, deposits subject to check. This money is created by the banks in connection with the expansion of loans, and whenever the banks create it faster than consumers goods are produced, we have inflation. Her contention is this that, "If the money system of this country were honestly managed, those entrusted with the power to issue currency bearing the imprint of the nation, would issue it only as the people increased their stock of consumer goods available for distribution and consumption." Then we would not, as in the period after 1929, suddenly have a contraction of fifteen or more billions of credit money leaving people with insufficient money to carry on normal business and trade.

Where others criticize the government's going off the gold standard as immoral and its changing the gold content of the dollar as immoral, the author of this book defends this as being just what the Constitution requires, as being distinctly honest and moral as contrasted with the generally unrecognized but immoral conduct of the bankers in causing rapid fluctuations in the value of money in this country. The government's control of the money, she insists, will stabilize its value, not cause inflation, and will only hurt the international bankers and speculators. As a matter of fact she contends that no government ever brought on inflation; careful research, she avers, will reveal that the international bankers have always brought it on. She shows that we were at the mercy of the international bankers when other countries went off the gold standard and we did not. And she believes that we are even today in the toils of the international bankers in so far as a large part of our money may still be created by bankers and not by the government.

Here is a frank, one should say, impassioned demand for money to be issued by the government only, not on the basis of government bonds which mean interest payments but without interest obligations, in response to the needs of trade as determined by the production of consumers goods; such money not to be cancelled as credit money is and, therefore, not likely to bring on financial reactions. It is a demand that the government simply print money without first borrowing to get it, that the government use such money to pay its bills, particularly those arising out of war, and that the government inject just enough of such money into the economic system to keep the price level stable. This proposal is usually dismissed by critics as fantastic. Our experience during the last few years should prove, however, that the old monetary system permits economic behavior that would seem almost unbelievable if not only too true. And the author may, of course, be right that even so-called government inflation in the past was actually banker inflation; which does not absolve the government of all blame nor necessarily prove that everything the bankers have done in creating credit money is wrong.

Those inclined to favor the old gold standard or to regard it as inherently sacred will do well to read such a discussion as this book presents. The weakness of the book is its vehemence, its one-sidedness, its obvious selection of evidence to suit the case it presents. One would get the impression that the setting up of a monetary system is ever a rather simple matter, interfered

with only by the willfulness and chicanery of the few. The book does not deal with the real difficulties that would have been involved in the setting up of such a system a hundred years ago, in the absence of thorough accounting and statistical aids. Nor does it recognize sufficiently the evils of politically controlled monetary systems, — admitting the great dangers in banker-controlled credit money. It seems to the reviewer that it glosses over many of the practical difficulties that any system would have had to meet in the past and that it is glowingly propagandistic in the way in which it presents the system which the author believes should now be set up. Such characteristics leave the dispassionate reader wondering still, although he must admit that only a frank recital of the weaknesses and evils of our present system such as is given in this book may give us that degree of scientific caution that is necessary in condemning any change that has for its purpose the good of the country.

H. J. R.

A VALUABLE STUDY

DE STREKKING DER BERGREDE NAAR MATTHEUS. By H. N. Ridderbos. J. H. Kok, Kampen, Netherlands. 1936.

IT IS with a great deal of enthusiasm that I call the readers' attention to this work. It is of such outstanding value, in my estimation, that those who can read the Dutch are to be congratulated that they have access to its contents. It is to be hoped that some industrious translator and enterprising publisher may be able to give it to the English readers.

There are in this volume seven enlightening chapters. The first gives us a brief characterizing survey of the Gospel according to St. Matthew and the relationship of the Sermon on the Mount to the whole. The chapter ends with a presentation of the setting and the characteristics of the Sermon itself. This is followed by a discussion of the peculiarities of the style and the form of the passage — a matter not taken into sufficient account by many modern students and yet so indispensable for a proper interpretation.

After giving us a valuable, though brief, survey of the Sermon, the problem of the relationship of the teaching in the Sermon to the idea of the Kingdom finds interesting treatment. The radical-ethical, the eschatological, and the super-ethical theories are evaluated and related to the thrust of the sermon. It is well done. Then follows a discussion of The Sermon on the Mount and the *Ordo Salutis*. The question answered is, what is the place of salvation for the requirement of good works? How did the Jews conceive of this relationship? How did Jesus conceive of it?

The sixth chapter discusses the problem of contrasts which every student of the Sermon must face. Does Jesus contrast his teaching with Mosaic Law or with the traditional interpretation thereof? A splendid and satisfactory case is made out for the second position. The last chapter I found to be the most illuminating of them all. The problem presented deals with the matter of the validity and applicability of these precepts of Christ to the life in this world. Seven interesting views all the way from Börnhauser's theory of limited-validity-sphere to that of the crisis (judgment) function of the Sermon of Brunner are presented and criticized. The author though recognizing the illustrative and historically-limited character of the precepts of Jesus, argues for the general applicability of these commandments for all Christians to all spheres of life.

The work is obviously not primarily an exegetical study. It is in no sense a commentary. It is a valuable discussion of the most important problems that have attached themselves in the course of time to this particular section of the Bible. It deserves unqualified recommendation.

H. S.

MINISTERIAL SUCCESS

IF THE MINISTER IS TO SUCCEED. By U. S. Brown, D.D. Wm. B. Eerdmans Pub. Co., Grand Rapids, Mich., 1937. Price \$1.50.

NO minister entirely succeeds. Some ministers succeed in a measure; others do not succeed at all. But how may a minister succeed, be it only moderately? But what is ministerial success? What standard is to be used as the basis of appraisal? Now, the minister occupies an intermediary position: he is a link between God and the Church. Has ministerial success an exclusively ecclesiastical reference or has it a divine reference also? If it relates to both, which reference is primary and basic? With a view to the Church, ministerial success may be defined as the edification of the people of God through the faithful, diligent and pastoral preaching of the Word of God. The measure of genuine edification he affords is, on this score, the measure of the minister's success. A biblical statement of what constitutes true edification may be found in Eph. 4:12. A minister's success in ecclesiastical respect should not be computed in terms of qualifications he possesses and methods, formal and otherwise, which he employs, but should be construed as the objective in whose service his qualifications are pressed and to whose attainment methods are made subservient. And that distinctive objective is the building up of the body of Christ through the perfecting of the several saints that form its members, in the way of a divinely ordained ministry.

But it should not be forgotten that the Church is *the House of God*: it is His creation; it belongs to Him; He has dominion over it; it has its purpose in Him. Ministerial success, therefore, must have a divine reference no less than an ecclesiastical import. More than that, the divine reference is as superior to the ecclesiastical reference, as the Builder of the House is greater than the House itself. What can ministerial success be on this score other than fidelity to the divine commission on which the ministry is based? To succeed in the ministry is to please God in its exercise through the performance of His will, the gratification of His sovereign wishes. Obviously, ministerial success is *fundamentally* not the measure in which the preacher contrives to promote the progress of the Church, but the degree to which his ministrations are well-pleasing in the sight of God, according to His Word. It may well be that a minister succeeds eminently on the score of divine satisfaction, though the Church declines and becomes moribund; though his person is highly unpopular through his refusal to serve men rather than God; though his message is distinctly distasteful because it does not cater to man's proud reason. There is a brand of popularity that is an almost infallible token of ministerial failure on its *divine* score. And contrariwise a minister may very well be a sweet savor of Christ unto God in them that perish, if he is willing, nay determined, to forfeit the favor of men if the price they demand is disloyalty to Christ and the repudiation of His Word. Every minister of the Gospel should seek to gain the certificate of success phrased in the well-known words which Scripture puts upon the lips of the great Judge soon to appear: Well done, thou good and faithful servant. That will be their heavenly diploma.

But, to return to ministerial success on its *ecclesiastical* score, the Church of God has the Spirit of God, and through that Spirit the Word of God is a power of God unto salvation. The minister that really pleases God and is successful in the divine reference of the term, cannot, will not, fail altogether as regards the Church which he serves. The measure of his ecclesiastical success may not be as large as he could wish, but a measure of success there will be, and it will be true and real success. Let it be noted, that success is first of all a matter of quality. A minister's ecclesiastical success is very imperfectly registered in compliments paid him during his life and eulogy pronounced upon him at his funeral. The true minister's expectation is that not until the eternal day dawns on the Kingdom of God, will it appear what measure of genuine edification he has been privileged to contribute to the saints among whom his lot was cast.

If the minister is to succeed in reference to God and in reference to the Church of God, he must needs be the right man, travel the right road, employ the right means, and use the right methods. There are wrong men and wrong roads and wrong means and wrong methods. Character, spirit, attitude, temper, habits, conduct, etc., are by no means unrelated to ministerial success whether with respect to God or to the Church. The minister is not an impersonal preaching instrument. He is not a homiletical phonograph playing sermon records, or a pastoral robot. He is an organic and spiritual medium whereby God transmits holy truth to sinful men. He is, indeed, but an earthen vessel, but the vessel, though earthen, should not be cracked and disfigured and unsightly and contemptible. In his *Lectures on Preaching* Phillips Brooks has set forth this aspect of the ministerial vocation in admirable fashion.

It is here that Dr. Brown's book may serve a good purpose. In the present reviewer's opinion the volume does not relate the ways and means of ministerial success to the biblical notion of the minister's success sufficiently. Perhaps that deficiency explains why the approach to the subject canvassed is too prosaically professional and too flatly matter-of-fact. The point of view is too predominantly social and human; the emphasis placed is too one-sidedly on business efficiency. There are exceptions, it is true, but these exceptions throw this general weakness into so much the bolder relief. The spiritual implications of the ministry, as contradistinguished from its moral aspects, do not receive the emphasis and appreciation to which they are rightly entitled.

But the above stricture is not intended as a derogation from the fine qualities the book undoubtedly possesses and the useful purpose it may serve. Dr. Brown has packed his book full of fine counsel born of rich experience, a wide range of observation and the testimony of many well-known contemporary ministers. The author quotes prominent present-day preachers amply, and devotes a whole chapter to "Helpful Suggestions from Outstanding Church-leaders." Every minister should read the volume and ponder its advice, much of which is surely sage. Young ministers in particular may escape many painful and detrimental experiences, if they heed the wise warnings with which the book fairly bristles from beginning to end. The book is put up in a neat style and is deserving of a wide sale. For whoever may fail, the minister should by all means succeed. God's cause is at stake.

SAMUEL VOLBEDA.

JESUS — A CLASSICIST'S VIEW

WE WOULD KNOW JESUS. By John A. Scott, *The Abingdon Press, New York, 1936, pp. 176. Price \$1.50.*

THIS work might fall within the competence of the present reviewer because it is written by a classicist. Some of the most important contributions to theological studies have been made by classicists. The very beginnings of the new study of the language of the New Testament belong to James Hope Moulton. And in our own day Professor Henry A. Sanders of the University of Michigan has taken a high position among Biblical scholars by reason of his work on the Freer Manuscripts.

Professor Scott has been teaching Greek at Northwestern University since 1897. His specialty is Homer. His *Unity of Homer* (Sather Classical Lectures of 1921) confirmed his leadership in the study of that particular author. As Schleimann with the spade did much to convince a world of skeptical scholarship of the historical reality of the world of the Homeric poems, so Scott through literary studies has led the way to a greater sanity in Homeric criticism.

"The whole trend of scholarship is away from disintegrating and negative studies back to a renewed confidence in long-established traditions" (p. 61). That is everywhere Scott's thesis. Can it be that at long last we are to cease drifting on the sea of "problems"? At any rate, *We Would Know Jesus* assures us that we can know Him, and that, too, from the book which His followers have cherished these many centuries.

The title is somewhat misleading. The work is not primarily devotional. It is something of a handbook of biblical propaedeutics. These are four lectures given on the John C. Shaffer Foundation at Northwestern University for promotion of the appreciation of the life, character, teaching, and influence of Jesus. The first sets forth our knowledge of Jesus from non-biblical sources. The second tells about the creation and preservation of the Gospels. The third, "Luke the Greek Physician," ranks that writer with Thucydides in his unerring accuracy of detail and his passion for first-hand acquaintance with his material. Last, we reach that inevitable analogy, "Socrates and Jesus." "There is a certain similarity between Socrates and Christ" (p. 169). But Scott does not leave his reader with similarities. The dissimilarities are as clearly set forth as are the similarities. It is the fashion to place side by side utterances of Jesus and of Socrates, with the implication that they are both saying the same thing. There are several pages here of these striking parallels, as for example, "Socrates said that 'Whatever a man might gain at the cost of his moral nature is only loss.' Jesus said: 'For what shall it profit a man, if he shall gain the whole world, and lose his own soul?'" (p. 171). But (p. 173) "In these matters and thus far they agree, but Socrates has nothing to place beside any of the following, since they belong to another world." Then follow the great things of God out of the mouth of His own Son.

Altogether it is a refreshing work, and, incidentally, an impressive demonstration of the relevancy of classical studies to the study of the Holy Scriptures.

W. T. RADIUS.

PEACE, SATAN, AND THE MILLENNIUM

THE PROGRAM OF PEACE. By Joseph Taylor Briton. *Findlay, Ohio, 1935, Fundamental Truth Publishers. \$1.00.*

"PROGRAM of Peace" deals with the program of war, the superhuman cause of war, and the ultimately overruling program of peace of the Prince of Peace. The material is presented in an interesting fashion and is reinforced by a good deal of evidence. The book, therefore, makes interesting and profitable reading. Against the superficial pacifism so prevalent today, it offers the correct antidote.

The author first considers the "unconsidered factor" back of every war, namely, Satan, "the squatter and his cohorts." The blame for every war, rests, in the first place, on him. He influences man "of sinful tendencies" with his super-human powers. And thus develops the "mystery of lawlessness." Consideration is also given to the general apostasy in the professing Church. These factors have produced conditions of chaos prevalent today. Again—there is the attempt everywhere to put a Satan-inspired man on the "world throne." According to the author, however, the "rapture of the Church" must take place before Satan can and will culminate his plans. Hence the writer of the book spends a good deal of space on the program of peace, realized at the coming of the Lord, first in the millennium, and finally in universal peace and glory.

The book is a splendid analysis of war's causes, and it is to be hoped that many who are inclined toward pacifism will read it. Personally we regret that the author has placed such great emphasis on the millennium. Without it, the book would have been still stronger.

J. G. VAN DYKE.

JESUS AND EDUCATION

THE PHILOSOPHY OF CHRISTIAN EDUCATION. By H. H. Horne. *New York, 1937, Fleming H. Revell Co. \$1.50.*

A FEW years back I made my first acquaintance with Dr. Horne, professor of the History and the Philosophy of Education in New York University. I read his simplification and effective criticism of John Dewey's epoch making work on education. Dewey's *Democracy and Education* was badly in need of the former and certainly deserved the latter. I was

deeply impressed with the authority of Dr. Horne in the field of education, with the warmth of his Christian spirit and with the sanity of his judgments.

When I heard that he was to deliver a series of lectures on The James Sprunt Foundation in the Union Theological Seminary of Virginia, I hoped that they would be printed and that I would be privileged to read them. They are now before me. I have read them with a mingled feeling of disappointment and pleasure.

My disappointment is due to the fact that I had expected an educator to speak in this volume. But Dr. Horne, the educator, has retreated to the background, and Dr. Horne, the Bible student, stands out boldly. This volume strikes me as being not so much a course in the Philosophy of Christian Education, but rather as a popular presentation of such materials as you will find dealt with in works on the Biblical Theology of the N. T. The teachings of Jesus and of St. Paul constitute the bulk of this volume and are basic to all the rest. The last chapter, however, is an exception and deals very directly with the materials suggested by the title of the volume. Indeed, it is called, "The Absolute God — the Philosophy of Christian Education."

However, turning from what one would expect in this volume to what is actually given in it, the reviewer finds much that deserves the highest commendation. Dr. Horne is not a critical theologian. He is a Christian Bible student who takes the Christ for what He claims to be. In the introduction the author confesses that Christianity, Gentlemanliness, Scholarship, Manhood, and Cosmopolitanism are behind him as influences. The traces of these influences, and particularly the first one, are easily detected in this work. His appreciation for spiritual values seems to be unbounded. He possesses a keen grasp of the mind of Jesus and of St. Paul. He has arranged and presented their teachings interestingly, intelligibly, and orderly. He has sensed the superb pedagogy of Jesus. Indeed, the contents of this volume are basic to a Philosophy of Education such as can be properly called Christian.

The first chapter deals with the equipment that Jesus possessed as a pedagogue. The second instructs us on the matter of Paul's interpretation of Christ. In the third, which in some respects overlaps the first, we are introduced to the contents of Christ's teachings and in the next to his method of instruction. Chapter five pictures the character of Jesus as the individual goal of education, and this is followed by a discussion of the social emphasis in the teachings of Jesus. The final (seventh) chapter, swinging away from the Bible, discusses the Philosophy of Christian Education.

The views of Dr. Horne are in the main genuinely orthodox. Here and there one will find signs that warn him to read with caution, as all books should be read. There is the doctrine of the universal Fatherhood of God presented as taught by Jesus. This doctrine has been conclusively discredited as an item in Christ's teachings. There is the doctrine of the freedom of the human will, which is not satisfactorily related to divine predestination and election in this volume. Perhaps one will look in vain for a satisfactory solution to this problem, but surely it is not in the direction of weakening God's absolute sovereignty. So there are other matters that men of Reformed persuasion will look upon askance.

The volume, however, deserves to be recommended. Proponents of Christian Education will welcome it highly. Dr. Horne has no tolerance for a host of "isms" that have been offered as a panacea for the world's ills. He is an objective idealist in his philosophy. He is orthodox in his faith in the supernatural birth of Jesus and its allied doctrines. He is an ardent proponent of the position that the world's moral development will be impossible without Christian Education.

H. S.

DR. BUSWELL'S THEOLOGY

THE LAMB OF GOD, in Five Volumes. By J. Oliver Buswell, Jr., D.D., LL.D., Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids, Mich. Price of first four volumes, per volume 65c in paper, \$1.00 in cloth; and of the last volume 35c in paper.

PRESIDENT BUSWELL of Wheaton College, Wheaton, Illinois, published a series of works under the general title, *The Lamb of God*. The five volumes appeared under separate titles as follows: Behold Him! What is God? Sin and Atonement. The Christian Life. Unfulfilled Prophecy. These volumes are written in popular style, contain practical expositions of some of the great Christian verities, and are at the same time somewhat devotional in character. The author takes his stand unwaveringly on the Bible as the infallible Word of God, and writes in a very interesting way about revealed truth. His style is lucid, and the many little stories, incidents, and illustrations, with which his expositions are interspersed, serve to drive the point home.

The stand which the author takes deserves the hearty appreciation of all those who share his faith in Scripture as the inspired Word of God, especially in these days, in which many place the Bible as a collection of old Hebrew and Christian literature on a level with other literary productions. The author is not ashamed of his convictions and writes with the fervor of a true evangelist. His writings are characterized by a warmth and glow that are well calculated to counteract the chill winds of Rationalism. They also contain a great deal of useful instruction for the children of God. If there is anything which the people need to-day, and need very much, it is sound exposition of the truth. The complaint of the prophet is only too true to-day, that the people are perishing for want of knowledge. It is especially for that reason that we welcome these volumes. May they be helpful to many, as the author undoubtedly intended that they should be.

This does not mean, however, that we find ourselves in agreement with all that is written in these volumes. In some cases I do not quite understand the logic of the reasoning. But that is not the main difficulty. Dr. Buswell stood out in the recent conflict in the Presbyterian Church as a rather staunch adherent of the truth as it is embodied in the Westminster Confession. In view of that fact I do not understand some of the sentiments expressed in these volumes. The statements on page 52 of *What is God?*, that God of "his mere good pleasure and of his sovereign grace . . . has elected to save those who, he foreknew, would put their faith and trust in the crucified and risen Saviour"; and that "to illustrate God's foreknowledge and sovereign grace in election, Paul introduces the case of Pharaoh . . . a man who, in the foreknowledge of God, was going to rebel against God's grace", — certainly create the impression that the author believes in a predestination based on foreknowledge, which is contrary, not only to the Canons of Dort, I, 9, but also to the Westminster Confession, Chap. III, 2. On page 40 of the volume on *Sin and Atonement*, after saying of men in general: "In our natural state we are utterly condemned and unclean," he continues with the statement: "However, in the finished work of Christ on the cross, we (men in general, as I understand it), have a complete removal of hereditary sin." Again, on the following page he says, without any restriction: "The guilt of hereditary sin is removed by the blood of Christ. Complete pardon has been purchased and is freely offered to 'whoever will receive it'." Is not the author here teaching a species of universal atonement? How does his view differ from that of the Wesleyan or Evangelical Arminians, that in Christ all men are justified from original sin, and how does it fit in with the Calvinistic doctrine embodied in the Westminster Confession, Chap. VIII, 5, 6, 8?

On page 92 of the same volume the author asserts that hereditary sin never determines one's eternal destiny. Only the conscious rejection of Jesus Christ has such a determining influence. "There is just one question before every lost member of the human race. What will you do with Christ?" Since the

author shares the common Presbyterian conviction that all children are saved, he naturally feels no need of asking on what ground some of them are lost. But the question remains, What is the ground for the condemnation of the heathen, who die in their sins without ever having heard the offer of salvation?

In the last volume the writer defends the doctrine of Premillennialism, as over against Post- and A-millennialism. It deserves appreciation that he avoids the extremes of present-day Premillennialism, especially as wedded to Dispensationalism. His arguments are substantially the same as those found in other Premillennial writings on the points discussed by the author. He is unique, however, in finding support for his doctrine also in the Westminster Confession. To the present reviewer the arguments presented in this volume do not seem to be altogether convincing.

L. BERKHOF

THE DOCTRINE OF INSPIRATION

THE INSPIRATION OF THE SCRIPTURES. By *Lorraine Boettner*, *Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, Mich.*, pp. 88, Price \$1.00.

A FEW years ago Professor Lorraine Boettner published an important work on *The Doctrine of Predestination*. From this work we have learned to know him as a staunch defender of the Calvinism of the Synod of Dort, for it really contains an exposition of the so-called "Five Points of Calvinism." Knowing his stand, we felt perfectly confident that he would not disappoint us in the book now under consideration, and we are happy to say that it contains a defense of the plenary inspiration and the absolute trustworthiness of Scripture. We rejoice in this particularly in view of the many erroneous views on inspiration that are current in our day.

The author first points out that the writers of the books of the Bible themselves claim inspiration. He realizes that the doctrine of inspiration should be derived from Scripture, just as every other doctrine, and calls attention to the testimony of Jesus to the Old Testament, to the manner in which the Old Testament is quoted in the New, and to the claims of the New Testament writers. Speaking next of the process of inspiration, he rejects the mechanical theory, though admitting that in some instances inspiration amounted to little more than a process of dictation. He considers it necessary to conceive of the process of inspiration in such a way as to allow for the expression of the personality of the writers, for the use of sources, and for a measure of flexibility in the expression of their thoughts.

He further calls attention to the fact that the so-called errors of Scripture are a vanishing quantity. Many of them have been cleared up, and of those which have not yet been explained many are of little importance. The so-called "moral difficulties" of the Bible can hardly be adduced as arguments against its inspiration. And if there are conflicts between the Bible and present-day science, we should not at once proceed on the assumption that science is right and the Bible wrong. The Bible is perfectly trustworthy and is inspired in all its parts, though all parts are not of equal value.

We welcome this defense of Professor Boettner, and hope that it may find a wide circle of readers. It is a book especially adapted to the needs of the ordinary members of the Church. Written in popular style, it can be enjoyed by all.

L. BERKHOF.

INSPIRATION — ANOTHER VIEW

THE INSPIRATION OF THE BIBLE. By *R. H. Malden*, *Dean of Wells, Oxford University Press, Oxford and London*, pp. 72, price \$1.25.

THIS is a book of an entirely different type than the one of Professor Boettner. It contains the substance of a series of lectures, delivered by the author in Wells Cathedral during Lent 1935. Like the book of Boettner, it is also written in popular style, but the standpoint of the author is quite different. One

feels this at once on reading these words in the Preface: "It is to be feared that some Church-goers still take the unintelligent, unimaginative, unhistorical view of the Bible which its American adherents have labelled *fundamentalist*. The writer hopes that these lectures will do something 'to dispel such notions'."

He also claims to believe in the inspiration of Scripture, but his conception of inspiration differs very much from that of the Bible writers themselves. Says he: "When we call the Bible inspired we mean (or at least I mean) that it is of unique and permanent religious value. That is as far towards a definition of inspiration as I am prepared to go." He frankly accepts the results of higher criticism with respect to the development of the religion of Israel. Israel was unique in that it gave birth, after many centuries of struggles and bitter experiences, to a monotheism that abides.

We are not concerned very much in reading the Bible, says he, with the truth of the facts recorded. Much of what appears as history is really myth and legend. We are concerned primarily with the value of the ideas found in Scripture, especially with what the writer calls the philosophy of the prophets. While he is not sure that all 'Old Testament difficulties' are always quite as real as they are made out to be, he accepts the evolutionary view of creation, speaks of the story of the fall as "a meditation on the origin and nature of sin in a purely mythological setting," of that of the flood as "a combination of myth and legend," and of that of the tower of Babel as "a naive attempt to account for the existence of different languages," and treats the story of Jonah as a symbol.

All this is naturally offensive to those who accept the Bible as the Word of God. The author is another example of those who speak as if doubt respecting the historicity of many parts of the Word of God goes hand in hand with a greater appreciation of its spiritual value.

L. BERKHOF

THE GLORY

He came from the Glory,
The infinite One,
The cherished of heaven,
The Father's lone Son.
Essentially holy,
From law He was free;
Yet He came from the Glory
To keep it for me.

He came from the Glory
Though equal with God,
And humbled Himself
By a life on this sod;
Obedience led Him
To Calvary's tree,
And He came from the Glory
To die there for me.

He's gone to the Glory,
A place to prepare
For those He has chosen
To be with Him there.
And soon when earth's shadows
And sorrows are o'er,
I am going to the Glory
To dwell evermore!

— VERNA SMITH TEEUWISSEN.

OUT OF THE EDITOR'S MAIL BAG

Calvinism Taboo

My experience is that people have a tremendous prejudice and will not study Calvinism, for it is regarded as a foregone conclusion that it is taboo and out of date. But you may be sure I shall mention you.

52 Queen Street,
Edinburgh 2, Scotland.

T. T. EDWARDS, F. R. H. S.

Happy

Enclosed find my check for Two (2) Dollars, the annual subscription to THE CALVIN FORUM. I am very happy with the FORUM and would not like to miss it. Splendid editorials and fine articles, scholarly and thought-provoking.

1133 N. 13th Street,
Lafayette, Ind.

J. M. GHYSELS.

A Voice in "Afrikaans"

Dit spijt mij dat ek nou eers mij subskripsie vir die CALVIN FORUM stuur. Mij boekhandelaar het vir mij ingeteken op die CALVIN FORUM en vanjaar nooit my subskripsie aangestuur nie. Ek sluit 'n postwissel van 8 sh. 6 d. (2 dollars) vir U in daarvoor.

Ek vind die CALVIN FORUM baie interessant en leersaam. Dit verheug ons hier in Suid Afrika om ook so'n heldere klank van die Calviniste in Amerika te hoor.

Ek wil u redaksie 'n baie geseende Kersfees toewens en vir U blad 'n baie voorspoedige Nuwe Jaar.

Hofmeyerstraat,
Stellenbosch, S. Afrika.

Met agting, die Uwe,
P. W. VORSTER.

Wide Open

"If you, as a Christian," writes Mr. Gernant in the February issue, "if you were teaching for instance the beautiful poem by William Cullen Bryant entitled, 'To a Waterfowl,' would you not be stirred to the depths of your Christian soul when you read with the students that last stanza:

"He who from zone to zone,
Guides through the boundless sky thy certain flight
In the long way that I must tread alone,
Will lead my steps aright."

We agree that a Christian soul might well be stirred provided he considered these lines without reference to the poet himself and other expressions in which he discloses more fully his philosophy of life.

How, for instance, does the poet treat the issue of death in 'Thanatopsis':

"So live, that
.
."

Thou go not, like the quarry slave at night
Scourged to his dungeon, but, sustained and soothed,
By an unfaltering trust, approach thy grave
Like one who wraps the drapery of his couch
About him, and lies down to pleasant dreams."

That certainly is not the Christian's attitude towards the last enemy.

As a matter of fact, Eliot of Harvard (himself a Unitarian) has said that the poem "To a Waterfowl" is a perfect expression of Unitarianism.

Had the writer of "Projecting Christianity Into the Public Schools" borne this in mind, I'm sure he would have hesitated to use the poem as an expression of the Christian's faith in the Heavenly Father.

We condemn modernists' use of Christian terminology to gain a more ready acceptance of their views among people having an orthodox background. By the same token should we not refrain from making implications to further Christian teachings from literature which in spirit and content is anything but Christian?

To the author of "Projecting Christianity Into the Public Schools" imparting Christian teaching in a Public School is an easy task. If this teaching is merely a running commentary on any and all material presented it would indeed appear easy — easy and superficial.

To my mind, Christian education is something more fundamental. After all, Christian education implies a teaching *content* of which the Christian view of life is the natural product.

Sheboygan, Wis.

HENRY KUIPER.

Appreciating Our Heritage

Dear Dr. Bouma:

I have received the two back numbers of THE CALVIN FORUM which I have requested from you. I am very glad to have them, as it completes my file. I like your periodical very much. It deserves wide reading and careful pondering. The copies are very much worth filing away or being bound in a volume for the sake of reference. I cannot help feeling that we of the Reformed persuasion, founding our view of theology and all that is related to it upon principles that have proved so satisfactory to past generations and deep thinkers, should appreciate our heritage more and more. It is a pity that there always obtains a lukewarmness to these things which does but lead to further departure. Even "Calvinists" have been in danger and have fallen from their high privilege. Would that today all could "see" it and act accordingly.

East Williamson, N. Y.

G. H. HOSPERS.

A Discussion on Barthianism

It is an undeniable fact that Barthianism is the theological issue of the day. Barthianism is so challenging, that every theologian must take a stand with reference to it, whether for or against. Diametrically opposite views expressed about it puzzle us, and make the need for a more definite understanding and evaluation more keenly felt.

Without such an understanding and evaluation what can the average minister of the Word of God think, when he hears that the strict (Kuyperian) Reformed Church in Holland, through her Synodical meeting, condemned Barthianism and called on her theologians to fight Barthianism as a menace to historical Reformed faith and thought, and, on the other hand, in many continental Reformed Churches and theological circles Barthianism is hailed as preeminently the Reformed theology? It is all very puzzling, very disquieting.

So, in my opinion, those theologians of ours who are champions of the faith once delivered to the saints, and whom we, just for that very fact, do trust and who have more opportunity and time than those engaged in practical ministerial work to delve into the problem of Barthianism, would do well, if they would give us more guidance and enlightenment on this problem.

We would welcome such guidance and enlightenment particularly from three points of view:

1. How does Barthianism relate to what we call Calvinism and the Reformed system of doctrine as embodied in the historical creeds of the Reformation of the Reformed type?

2. How does Barthianism, divested from its post-war continental, especially German background, relate to American conditions and theological thinking? What are the particularly attractive and repulsive elements in it, looking at it from the American point of view?

3. What is there in Barthianism that can be carried up into the pulpit and utilized for the general edification of a given Reformed congregation?

We have received some partial and scattered information in regard to Barthianism. We even had some able books. But the trouble is that they hardly left the press when the appearance of some new release by that school of thought upset them and we were left where we were before. Barthianism is fluctuating. It is developing, or breaking up, or entangling itself in its own paradoxes — as one may say in accordance with his own sympathy or antipathy — right before our eyes, but it still holds the theological headlines and continues to divide theological opinion in any given church.

Therefore I venture to call upon the theologians of America to express their mind, in a pointed, concise way, concerning Barthianism in an open forum, which, I presume, will be gladly furnished by THE CALVIN FORUM.

331 Kirkland Place,
Perth Amboy, N. J.

CHARLES VINCZE, S.T.D.

[Gladly will THE CALVIN FORUM furnish space to American theologians "to express their minds, in a pointed, concise way, concerning Barthianism." Might it not be wise to focus the discussion on the subject: Barthianism or Calvinism? Or, to state the issue even more pointedly: Is Barthianism in harmony with the genius of Reformed Theology? Is it a wholesome, progressive form of Calvinism? Our pages are open to all who have a reasoned conviction — or, even, opinion — on this important subject. — EDITOR.]