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June, the month of graduations and commencements, offers the opportunity and challenge to reflect upon the deeper trends of education in our country.

A few years ago the then Vice President of the United States, Mr. Thomas R. Marshall, made the challenging declaration that one of America's ills today is that there is too much so-called science in our educational system and too little Almighty God. This is hitting the bull's eye squarely. Our educational system is dominated today by an outlook upon reality and life which is that of a refined Naturalism, expressing itself in Behaviorism in psychology, Pragmatism in philosophy, Utilitarianism in morals, and Atheism or, at best, Humanism in religion. Consequently the moral debacle is apparent on every hand. Indeed, the foundations are being undermined.

This situation constitutes a serious challenge to us as Christians. There is no greater task before us than that of the re-affirmation of the eternal verities of the Christian religion in their application to man's perennial needs as well as to our distinctly new and modern problems. The only power that is adequate to this task is the Christian faith as it has proved its mettle in the great crises of the Christian Church. No denatured, humanistic, Christless Christianity, evacuated of its real content, stripped of its glory and robbed of its power, such as we witness today in theological and ecclesiastical Liberalism, is adequate to this great task. Modernistic Christianity, falsely so called, has ruled out the supernatural; has negated Christ as the only Savior; has proclaimed the inherent goodness of man; has nullified the power of the cross; and has cancelled the moral responsibility of man as a sinner before God.

We must get back to the reality of God in our lives. We can have less of the nebulous religiosity of Liberalism: what we need is more knowledge of fellowship with the living God of the Scriptures. His divine will must become supreme in the lives of men. His salvation in Christ, the God-man, must be the sheet anchor of our hope. And the power of His Holy Spirit must become the moving impulse in our lives.

To inculcate this truth, this life, this vital, Christ-centered experience, in the lives of the rising generation is the heart of the whole educational task before us as Christians. The home, the church, and the school are the three great agencies for the realization of this glorious task.

The Christian home must be made more than ever the primary agency for the training of the men and women of the future. The present disintegration of marriage and family life can be counteracted only when God and the ordinances of his blessed revelation are respected. The restoration and strengthening of the family altar is hence of primary value and import in the nurture of the rising generation.

The second great educational agency for the development of a strong and virile Christianity is the church. The teaching ministry of the church must become more than ever a living reality. The pulpit is not for mere emotional inspiration, much less for pleasing entertainment or cultural delectation, but for uplifting and powerful instruction in the truth of God. The youth of the church should be given particular attention. Inseparable from preaching the gospel and leading men to Christ is the great teaching function of the church. In our age, which increasingly tends to view religion as a matter of sentiment or of mere moral inspiration, the church must boldly and unequivocally proclaim the great saving truths of Christianity as the answer to the deeper questions of human existence. The truth of God alone can save. Did not the great commission of our Savior and Lord enjoin teaching upon his disciples?

But the most crucial part of our educational task in the modern world centers in the school, in our educational institutions—primary, secondary, and higher. Our grammar schools, high schools, colleges, and universities present the most serious problem and challenge in the pursuit of our Christian educational task today.

Originally God and His Christ held foremost place in the educational institutions of our land. During the previous century, however, the process of the secularization of American education was begun and this has since gone on apace. Our American colleges and universities are, in many cases, becoming nurseries for a positively anti-Christian propaganda. Many young men enter these institutions with the simple faith of their Christian homes, only to leave them in a few years as confirmed agnostics and outright skeptics. Atheism, though in disguised and cultured form, is gaining ground among our educated and would-be educated young people. The attitude which spurs all divine sanctions for the moral life is growing alarmingly. We are apparently training a generation of pagans in many of the schools and colleges that were originally dedicated to a positively Christian and biblical learning.
This is a grave situation. Writes a Christian missionary in a recent magazine article: "One of the greatest needs of the present hour is Christian schools in the strictest sense of the word!" Shall we offer our prayers and gifts for the establishment of Christian schools in China, Japan, and India, and meanwhile allow our own so-called Christian schools and colleges to be increasingly paganized?

We must get back to God and to His Christ in our system of education. The great verities of Christianity alone can save us. The religion of Scripture is the power of God unto salvation, but no less—nay, rather, for this very reason—is it the one ultimate answer to the intellectual and moral questions of the human mind. This conviction must be the basis, the core, and the motive power of all our education in grammar schools, high schools, colleges, and universities. Nothing less than a complete system of positive, distinctive, biblical, Christian education from kindergarten to university is adequate to the situation which we as Christians face today. C. B.

Home, Church, and School
Christian - All Three

Every Christian who takes his Christianity seriously will sooner or later come to the conviction that only a Christian school is the proper and adequate ally of the Christian home and the Christian church for the training of the rising generation in our day. As long as the general Christian tradition in morals and beliefs still prevailed in our country, this need was less apparent. But that day is past. Moreover, a public school system must, by force of necessity, be just as fair toward Jew and unbeliever as toward any orthodox Christian. This means, as Dr. Archibald Hodge saw clearly some decades ago (see quotation on another page of this issue), that he who believes least of the verities of the Christian faith will have the right of way in our public school system. It is, therefore, not surprising that our boasted "neutrality" in education has been the very door by which an outright pagan thought has gained entrance into our public school system. We may do all we can to seek to counteract this influence for the good of our land. I take this to be our duty as citizens. But for Christian people to believe that this is the solution of our educational problem is the height of naïveté, and error as well. Please for "the Christian home, the Christian church, and the little red school house," which one can sometimes hear from the lips of Christian leaders are deeply pathetic, to say the least. In view of the powerful influence which the school of necessity has in the modern system of education; in view of the fact that the spirit of the age is away from the fundamentals of the Christian faith; and in view of the fact that our American public school system, though allegedly neutral, is in reality becoming increasingly anti-Christian and naturalistic—no Christian who sees the issue of our day clearly can be satisfied with an education for his children in which the five-day-a-week, five-hour-a-day Christian school is not the ally of the Christian home and the Christian church. Consistency is, of all realms, the most indispensable in the realm of Christian nurture. Those groups of Christians who are founding positively Christian day schools, in which all the branches of study are taught in the light of the teachings of Scripture, are the true pioneers for Christian education in our day and age.

C. B.

From Puritanism to Pragmatism

At last year's tercentenary of the founding of Harvard University President Conant delivered an outstanding address on: "The University Tradition in America—Yesterday and Tomorrow." In the course of that address he made the following statement. "When the Puritans wrote Veritas upon the open books, they had in mind two paths by which truth could be obtained: one, Revelation as interpreted with the aid of human reason; the other, the advancement of knowledge and learning. Bacon expressed the spirit of the age which was to follow when he declared that a man cannot 'search too far or too well studied in the book of God's word, or in the book of God's work, but rather let men endeavor an endless progress or proficiency in both.' He must be an utter stranger to the spirit of our day who does not recognize that this ideal of the Puritans has completely vanished from our dominant educational institutions and from our current educational philosophy and practice. Revelation is ridiculed or ignored. "The book of God's word" is considered antiquated or, at best, it is treated as a beautiful literary product of the Hebrew mind. And the study of "the book of God's work" has gone on apace in our day, but with God faded completely out of the picture. Dewey and Kilpatrick are the patron saints of our public school system. Their atheism, though not of the soap-box variety, is no less real and only more subtle than the latter. Dr. John Wesselink, formerly President of Central College, and at the time President of the General Synod of the Reformed Church in America, spoke these words on the occasion of the 50th anniversary of the establishment of theological instruction in Holland, Michigan: "The tragic failure of a large part of our educational work in these days may be accounted for by the fact that it has proceeded upon the supposition that human nature is normal and by the further fact that the regulative principle by which human life is designed and controlled, namely its relation to God, is ignored. In the training of the intellect and in the inculcation of morals we have proceeded upon the naturalistic basis and then afterwards perhaps have tried to give some instruction in religion, which rests on an entirely different concepton. The whole process has resulted in confusion." (The Intelligencer-Leader, June 26, 1935, p. 5.) How profoundly true these words of Dr. Wesselink are, and how tragically pertinent they are to the whole educational system of our day—primary, secondary, and higher! C. B.

In Revolt Against Naturalistic Education

It is an encouraging sign that the eyes of many American people, who still have some religious interest in education, are gradually beginning to be opened to the gravity of this educational problem. It is true that many of these leaders do not, or, at
least, not as yet, recognize where the only solution
must be found. But it is gratifying at least in our
day to hear the protest of some outstanding educa-
tors, though their number is still few, against the
current drift in education. Read Dr. William
McDougall's fine contribution, "The Psychology They
Teach in New York," to the volume entitled Be-
hiaviorism (Cokesbury, Nashville, 1930), in which he
with subtle ridicule exposes the pragmatistic educa-
tional psychology of Thorndike at Columbia. Read
that powerful indictment of modern educational theory and practice from the pen of America's
youngest great university president, The Higher
Learning in America (Yale University Press, Fourth
Printing, 1937). Says President Hutchins (and he
heads, significantly, the second largest stronghold of
pragmatistic philosophy in the country) : "The study
of man and nature and of man and man has thus
sunk under waves of empiricism and vocationalism."
Will Durant, in his The Story of Philosophy (Simon
and Schuster, 1927, p. 102) uttered a similar com-
plaint a decade ago, when he said: "Our modern
danger is precisely opposite; inductive data fall up-
on us from all sides like the lava of Vesuvius; we
suffocate with uncoordinated facts; our minds are
overwhelmed with sciences breeding and multiply-
ing into specialistic chaos for want of synthetic
thought and a unifying philosophy." And last but
not least, the intelligent Christian student should not
overlook those remarkable editorials which that out-
standing theological liberal, Dr. C. C. Morrison, edi-
tor of The Christian Century, has recently seen fit to
write when his pump had been primed by President
Hutchins trenchant criticism. None of these utter-
ances can satisfy the biblical Christian, but everyone
of them is a remarkable indictment of the main
thrust of that modern system of education which has
gradually but very really displaced the Christian
tradition in our land. Dr. Hutchins hints at the real
solution when he brings a luminous reference to
theology's loss of its erstwhile central position in
the domain of learning into the picture. We will have
occasion to refer to some of these utterances again.

C. B.

The School at the
Crossroads

T HIS is the title of a significant book from the
hand of a public school teacher. We call atten-
tion to this work because it is another indication of
the growing discontent with current educational
theory and practice in our public schools. The book
is published by Funk and Wagnalls and is written by
Thurra Graymar, said to be "a tried and proved
teacher in the New York City schools." There is
possibly no better way to introduce this book to our
CALVIN FORUM public, nor a more appropriate way to
bring this little series of educational editorials to
their completion than to quote the review of this
dynamic book from the pen of Bernard Iddings Bell
in The Living Church, the weekly organ of the
American Episcopal Church. He writes: "This ex-
traordinary book deserves reading by every parent,
tax-payer, teacher. Incidentally it ought also to be
read by every parson who may be puzzled by the
curious menial attitudes and the erratic emotional-
ism of the children he meets in catechism, Sunday
school, and confessional. It is a fearless, humorous,
and heart-searching analysis of our public schools
of today. The author believes that these schools are
by way of becoming a positive menace to American
intelligence and moral stability. This, she shows
clearly enough, is not the fault of the teachers, but
rather of the absurdities of the educational theories,
based on a naive Rousseauism fostered by our Ameri-
can teachers' colleges and forced on the schools by
organized pressure. The book is a probing exposal
of what Dewey, Kilpatrick, and Co. have done with
the best intentions in the world but with small knowl-
dge of actual teaching problems and a false theory
of man, to the civilization of these United States. Mrs.
Graymar minces no words. She says, 'The very
savages in their nuts do better. They are apt to
know the things that are vital and the things that are
not.'

It must not be supposed that this book is merely
a prejudiced polemic, written by an amateur in edu-
cation. Mrs. Graymar is a tried and proved teacher
in the New York City schools. Her points are driven
home by illustrations from experience and observa-
tion and as apt as they are humorous. But the humor
only punctuates the underlying tragedy. The volume
is blessed by an appreciative introduction by William
McAndrew, formerly superintendent of schools in
Chicago and now one of the editors of School and
Society."

May books like these set the complacent supporter
of the public school system to thinking; may it en-
courage those who are building upon the foundation
of a Christian philosophy to continue in their great
work; and may it be a stimulus for the leaders among
Christian educators to develop a sound Christian
educational psychology and a sound Christian peda-
gogy.

C. B.

Pagan Versus
Christian Rearing

T HE difficulty between the Pope and Hitler seems
to center primarily about the right of the Church
to educate its own children. It is refreshing to note
with what feeling and force the modernists are pleading
for the right of the Church in Germany to rear
its youth as Christians. One would be considerably
more convinced about the sincerity of their pleadings,
if they would manifest the same warmth for Chris-
tian training in their own country. Why not argue
for the right and consequently the duty of Christians,
either as parents or as an ecclesiastical organization,
to train their children to become Christian in their
thinking and living? Neutrality in education can of necessity not be pro-Christian. It can't be for
Christ nor for the God of Christ. It is at best a form
of education in practical atheism. The difference
between secular or neutral education and Christian
education is as sharply, though perhaps not as ob-
viously marked in this country as in Germany.

H. S.
Vital Christianity
and Intolerance

A SHORT time ago Christianity represented by the Pope and paganism represented by Hitler made a concordat. The two were to live together amicably in the same country. As everyone might have expected, the terms of agreement were broken. A papal encyclical of a month ago charged the Nazi Government with bad faith. Hitler responded with a May Day counterblast in which he made it plain that he would destroy the future of any organization that opposed the nazification of its youth. This incident brings home in a striking fashion that Christianity can't join hands with an ungodly power. If it were to do so, it would violate its own character as the final and absolute religion. It can't be neutral in any given situation. If it be vital it will seek to color its environment and to persist in operating as a leaven. It is therefore necessarily intolerant over against reactionary forces. The moment any anti-Christian powers make a compromise with Christianity and no violation of the compromise follows, that Christianity is dead and the compromise itself manifestly unnecessary. The Nazis are militant in their reaction to the intolerance of the Christianity of the Pope. By that very token they testify that religion is still a real vital force. Has German Protestantism acquiesced in the situation and thereby confessed that it is dead? H. S.

PRAGMATISTIC AND CHRISTIAN EDUCATION

George J. Van Wesep, A.M.
Principal Oakdale Christian School, Grand Rapids, Michigan

A NUMBER of years ago there were two leading, opposing theories in education. Each theory had its own following and each large educational conference, especially of the National Educational Association, witnessed pitched battles between these two groups. One held that effort was the greatest force in education and the other maintained that interest occupied that position. After many futile attempts to settle the difference by argument, both sides decided to submit the question to an arbiter. They selected a rising professor of philosophy of the University of Chicago—Dr. John Dewey.

After an exhaustive study, Dr. Dewey presented his findings in a little book entitled, Interest and Effort in Education. Dr. Dewey maintained in this study that neither interest nor effort acted as a single force, but that the integration of the two really constituted the driving force in education, with interest slightly in the lead.

This study not only brought an end to a controversy of some years' duration, but it also placed among educational authorities a new name, a name now written across all the pages of American education not only, but one that is recognized in many other countries as well. Since the writing of Interest and Effort in Education, Dr. Dewey has been a prolific contributor to the literature of Education. His book, Democracy and Education, sets forth his educational philosophy clearly.

John Dewey Holds the Field

Today the schools of America, for the most part, have adopted the Deweyian philosophy. Japan has translated all of Dewey's writings and has reorganized its school system according to his philosophy. In Mesopotamia, in parts of China, and in South Africa likewise, Deweyism forms the basis of educational theory and method.

Is Deweysim, then, a new philosophy? It is not. It is an extension and perfection of the pragmatic philosophy of Auguste Comte, and his school; a school which maintained that the standards of certainty are furnished by the experimental sciences; that in order to avoid getting lost in empty verbalism, the human mind must limit its work to the experience derivable from tangible things, and must renounce all attempt at building knowledge upon an a priori foundation. Consistent with the tenets of this philosophy, Dewey himself identifies religion with superstition when he contends that religion had its origin in man's fear and is the result of his effort to safeguard himself against unknown forces and changes which are beyond his control. In his Quest for Certainty, Dewey states: "Being unable to cope with the world in which he lived, he sought some way to come to terms with the universe as a whole. Religion was in its origin an expression of his endeavor. As a drowning man is said to grasp at a straw, so man, who lacked the instruments and skills developed in later days, snatched at whatever, by any stretch of imagination, could be regarded as a source of help in time of trouble. In such an atmosphere primitive religion was born and fostered. Rather this atmosphere was the religious disposition." Religion, according to Dewey, is man-made, not God-inspired, and its fundamental tenets and doctrines are essentially as unfixed and shifting as are the platforms of American political parties. And because he believes that religion is man-made, Dewey naturally cannot accept its doctrines as the expressions of eternal verities—such concepts just do not exist in Dewey's philosophy.

The pragmatic philosophy, known also as experimentalism or instrumentalism, is permeating the educational literature of America today. It is insidious in character and has already so grasped the American educational mind that parts of its broader program are used quite unconsciously by many teachers who neglect to reflect upon the possible outcomes of such teaching, and whose only desire is to be progressive.
The “Progressives” in Education

Dr. Wm. C. Bagley likes to refer to two types of progressive education, one spelled with a small “p,” the other with a capital “P.” Progressive education spelled with a small “p” refers to the spirited, sincere, forward-looking, rooted-in-the-past type of education which makes use of all that science, religion, history, philosophy, psychology, etc., have to offer and that can be coordinated into an understandable, teachable, and truly educational curriculum. Progressive education spelled with a capital “P” on the other hand, represents the experimentalism and instrumentalism of the pragmatic philosophy of education which occupies itself with immediate problems and needs, denying both the possibility and the need of education for ultimate certainty.

The Educational Frontier, edited by Dr. W. H. Kilpatrick, sets forth this view. In the last chapter, Kilpatrick defines education as, “a process of social interactions carried on in behalf of consequences which are themselves social, that is, it involves interactions between persons and includes shared values.” This is the sentiment voiced throughout this book not only, but also in the whole program of those who are the exponents of this “Progressive,” also called the “New,” Education. It is not surprising to find, therefore, that Kilpatrick, when he speaks of indoctrination says, “The common thought about propaganda and indoctrination has come down to us from the past when men thought in terms of orthodoxies as fixed-in-advance and clean cut rivals. Propaganda thus came to be thought of as the effort to win grown ups from heterodoxy to orthodoxy, while indoctrination was the method of fixing orthodoxy once for all in the hearts and minds of the young.”

History has convinced the modern-minded that doctrines themselves have their life histories of birth, acceptance and decay. With this conception of continued change and becoming, propaganda and indoctrination do not fit. We must distinguish a proper education from anything that is in effect prejudice building or mere training; we cannot in general rest content with the unthinking acceptance of what is learned.” (We italicize.) It might seem that Kilpatrick refers only to political, social or economic doctrines, but this is not the case. In a chapel lecture on, “Is Religion Permanent,” Kilpatrick included all religious doctrines in the same category of, “prejudice building or mere training,—the unthinking acceptance of what is learned.”

In full accord with Kilpatrick are all the co-authors of The Educational Frontier, Boyd H. Bode, John Dewey, John L. Childs, R. B. Raup, H. Gordon Hullfish and V. T. Thayer and many others. In spite of the fact that the book was published in the dark days of the economic depression, it has enjoyed a remarkable sale. The mantle of Dewey, it seems today, will fall upon Dr. John L. Childs, a scholar whose voice in education already carries much weight. Dr. Kilpatrick, however, is still the spokesman of today.

That the “New” or “Progressive” education has captivated the minds of a large number of our American educators is borne out further by the facts not only that the press headlines of the N. E. A. conventions of 1934 and 1935 were captured by the exponents of this education, but also the speakers of this group drew the largest, the most enthusiastic, and the most vocal audiences.

The Activity Movement

The educational philosophy of Dewey has been extended and amplified by Dr. Kilpatrick in the Activity Movement in education. In this program Kilpatrick desires to teach the child to be more self-directing that he may learn, that is, become educated, through practicing intelligent self-direction on his stage of development. In order to accomplish this best the practices and conditions of the school must take on the quality of the best life outside of school, and the pupils must engage in desirable, purposeful activities whose ends are the pupils’ own and they must be recognized and pursued as such by the pupils.

The Activity Movement is based upon the assumption that a child is immoral and that he may attain morality if he is encouraged to seek it in his own way. There is, of course, no room for the Reformed and Biblical concept of total depravity. If only a child is permitted to work for himself at what he is interested in, and in a manner of his own choosing he will learn to think for himself and will grow properly—that is the contention of Dr. Kilpatrick. Two ideals are held before the teacher: He must teach the child to “sense situations” and to “act on thinking.” The assumption is that these can be taught best by the method of freedom and self-direction. The only experience that has educative value to a child is his own unanalyzed, and undirected activity.

The “heritage of the past” has no place in this program. Any analysis or criticism of the pupil’s mental work is discouraged. The child is himself and can express only himself as he does; any other expression would be a borrowed, and therefore, unreal, one. Values are values only as the pupil finds and uses them. There is no room in this movement for an “unalterable certainty” or a “commanding moral attitude.” Neither is there a “deeply rooted constancy.” It conceives of truth as relative and that it never means the same to any two persons. And indoctrination violates the fundamental principles of the freedom of the Activity movement.

Criticism of “Progressive” Education

We will let Dr. Bagley, the exponent of progressive education with a small “p” speak first. He says in an evaluation of the Activity program in Yearbook XXXIII of the National Society for the Study of Education: “The theory underlying the activity program is fundamentally fallacious in the conception of freedom it implies. The freedom of the child to choose what he or she will or will not learn is utterly insignificant in comparison with freedom from want, fear, fraud, and superstition . . . . . . the theory is totally blind to two fundamental facts. In the first place it fails to recognize that one of the factors differentiating mankind from the animal species is the ability to work systematically and persistently in the face of immediate desire or impulse or interest. In
the second place, the theory implicitly denies the plain biological significance of the period of immaturity—namely the inescapable need of the human offspring for control, guidance, instruction, and discipline as a basis for the responsibilities of adulthood.”

Instrumentalism is responsible for the narrow conception of interest and experience which is peculiar to “Progressive” education. “The Progressives condemn all deferred values as a means of motivation (indoctrination) in the educative process . . . instrumentalism has influenced Progressive Education away from definite and exacting standards. In its disbelief in any fixed reality, instrumentalism is opposed to fixed standards,” writes Dr. Michael Demicshecky, a strong critic of pragmatism, in his Introduction to the Philosophy of Education.

Our own respected Holland theologian and educator, Herman Bavinck, calls our attention to fundamentals which refute the basis on which “Progressive” education is built. The relativity of truth is, of course, refuted and denied by all those who accept the principles of the Scriptures. Bavinck repeatedly calls our attention to the fact that truth existed long before man’s discovery of it. Dr. C. Jaarsma summarizes Bavinck as follows, “Truth is pre-existent and is true prior to man’s discovery of it. Ideas are true when they correctly represent the facts. Truth is the correspondence of thinking and being and not dependent upon work ability as pragmatism asserts. Pragmatism mistakes a perfectly legitimate test of truth for truth itself.”

“Progressive” education, with its emphasis upon experimentalism, is really agnostic in principle. It has incorporated much of the materialism of Karl Marx and, with him, it strikes out at religion as the substance of what is being taught in many of our American schools today. Marx and, with him, it strikes out at religion as the

The Christian School

“To the law and to the testimony! If they speak not according to this word, surely there is no morning for them.”

In direct opposition to the pragmatic philosophy as it is developed by Dewey and others and also to the materialistic, evolutonistic and behavioralist philosophies that are exerting no small influence upon American educational theory and method, stands Christian education, founded four-square upon the Scriptures. Instead of “continued change and becoming,” the Christian school teaches constancy; instead of relative truth the Christian school teaches absolute truth; instead of the extremities of self-direction, the Christian school teaches, “Thus saith the Lord,” and instead of individual experimentation, the Christian school indoctrinates her pupils, teaching them systematically the eternal verities.

But the influence of the Christian School is so very restricted and her teachers and leaders are not vocal in the larger assemblies of education. Should not they consider and make applicable to themselves, the suggestion Mordecai made to Esther, “. . . . and who knoweth whether thou art not come to the kingdom for such a time as this,” and promote in ever widening circles, the Christian philosophy of education?

M A Y

April smiled and May came tripping.
On her silent shoes,
Slipping gaily through the meadow
Spilling fragrant hues;
Down the golden lane she wandered
To the orchard hedge,
Where she found an oriole mating
On a pear-tree ledge.
Bluebirds spilled the appleblossoms
On the soft green grass,
Youth had strayed in truant fashion
With a blushing lass;
And the sky was such as Maytime
Only flecks with white,
To portray a deeper azure
For the heart’s delight.

April smiles but May’s full laughter
Sings in every heart
When the alchemy of summer
Plays its sunny part.

—JOAN GEISEL GARDNER.
TENDENCIES AMONG YOUTH
Johanna Timmer, A.M.
Dean of Women, Calvin College, Grand Rapids, Michigan

LAST fall I had occasion to prepare a discussion on such tendencies as account, at least in part, for the laxity in conduct among the covenant youth. With apologies to those who have heard me talk on this subject, I submit to my readers the meager fruits of my observations. In sharing with you my reflections on this problem, I make no claim to sweeping clean the entire field, nor do I attempt to prescribe a newly-discovered solution to the problem. It is my purpose to make generous use of the method of inquiry, hoping that some reader will try with me to seek an answer to the questions put. Whether we can in a measure account for the current laxity in conduct depends, I believe, on how we make answer to the questions that follow.

The God Reference

Is there not a tendency among us to neglect referring the practical problems of life to God? Is the God-reference, although present in theory, not woefully lacking in practice? Are not the particularities of life often weighed out of relation to God? To what extent does the environment of Christian youth impress upon them that the doing of a thing or the not doing of a thing must be linked up with God? The very fact that even some college students do not seem to link up with God their idea of what is good, is a matter of deep concern. Christian youth should realize that it is impossible to weigh the good out of relation to God, for nothing is good that is not good to God. Are not covenant young people too often satisfied with a horizontal conception of goodness which is of the earth earthy? Youth must develop a vertical conception of goodness. By this I mean that they must develop a conception of goodness which meets the approval of our Father in heaven.

Just as our idea of the good reveals our attitude towards God, so our attitude towards anything reveals our attitude towards God. I wonder to what extent Christian youth realizes that their attitude towards parents and teachers, towards church and Christian education, towards books and radio programs, towards work and play, reveals their attitude towards God? God's commandments are involved in all our attitudes. Does the God-reference prevail in the attitudes of covenant youth? Are the daily problems of life referred to God in a vital way?

Reverence for God

Is there not among covenant youth also a tendency toward an increasing lack of reverence for God? In seeking an answer to this question we might consider two matters, namely, the prevailing use of profanity, and the weakening observance of the Lord's Day. Does it hurt us much to hear any one of the names of God used profanely in speech or in print? Does it, for example, grieve us to hear the blessed name of Jesus used profanely? The most precious of all names is the name Jesus.

It is a name that is full of fire purging the hearts of men unto salvation. But, alas! as much else that was hitherto sacred has been stripped of its sanctity in this age of raw realism with its increasing emphasis on nudism, so that blessed name of Jesus is being stripped of its sanctity and is used by unholy lips and unholy writers in order to add fuel to the fires of flippant exclamation. Some of the holy fire of that name is being stolen for purposes of profanity. Some use the names Jesus in its pure form unto profane ends; others disguise the name somewhat by using “Gee” instead.

Do we really take God seriously? Do we, for example, take God seriously in the matter of remembering the Sabbath day to keep it holy? The commandment to keep the Sabbath holy constitutes a part of the Mosaic law, to be sure, but it also antedates the Mosaic law. Yes, it even antedates the appearance of sin in this world. It was a part of the original pattern of God for this world. It was a part of the perfect pattern to which we as well as Israel of old must conform. In fact, because we live in the dispensation of grace with spiritual blessings superior to those of Israel of old, we should rise to higher heights of observing the spirit of the Sabbath than the Jews of old did. I am concerned about the spiritual life of the college girl who told me that she never reads anything on Sunday that definitely promotes her spiritual life. Knowing this about this college youth helps me to account for her attitude towards several things.

Our attitude towards the Sabbath reveals our attitude towards God. The attitude of Christian parents and of Christian leaders towards the Sabbath reveals to the covenant youth what is the attitude of these parents and leaders towards God. Does it ever occur to you that youth is likely to be baffled many a time by what they observe to be the inconsistencies of older Christians also with respect to the observance of the Sabbath?

Respect for Authority

I would next present the question whether there is not a tendency among age as well as youth to show lack of respect for authority. Do leaders exert the authority that is theirs? There is, I know, a danger of exerting right authority in the wrong way. When one does that, however, one's method is at fault, not the authority. One may usurp the authority that is
not his. This is bad. One may also fail to exert the authority that is his. This is also bad. Usurpation of authority is sin, but so is neglect of authority. In the economy of God nothing is purposeless. God does not give us authority which He does not expect us to use. We must dare to do what God wants us to do, but we must also do it in the way God wants us to do it.

If youth observes that age does not properly respect its authorities, how can age expect of youth that they respect the authorities placed over them? If father thinks nothing of disobeying the traffic laws when the officials are out of sight, why should sonny, when out of his father's sight, think anything of crossing the street that father forbade him to cross? Must we not account for the current lack of respect for authority in a way other than that of merely criticizing youth? What is age doing while it is condemning the negligence of youth?

**Loyalty and Courage**

How must we account for the prevailing tendency to deaden the spirit of loyalty and of courage? Where are those who will be loyal to the Christian home, the Christian church, and the Christian school at all cost save at the cost of a higher loyalty? Where is that sacrificial spirit of loyalty to these great institutions which constitute in a very special way the spiritual nurseries of the soul? Is youth willing to be loyal only when it costs nothing?

Closely linked up with the spirit of loyalty is the spirit of courage. The cry, "Be a good sport!" resounds so loudly among us that it drowns every possibility of hearing the song,

"Dare to be a Daniel
Dare to stand alone;
Dare to make your purpose firm,
Dare to make it known."

Young people are willing to sacrifice their conscience to be good sports, but they are not willing to sacrifice their opinions to be loyal. Where must we look for the cause of this situation? Must we not look for it in the shallowness of religious conviction? Deep religious conviction breeds loyalty and courage. A shallow spirituality weakens the spirit of loyalty and courage.

**Love and Law**

Is there not a growing tendency among Christians to separate love and law? The tendency is, indeed, to embrace the one and to despise the other. This is a fallacious procedure because law and love are inseparable in the economy of God. To separate these two is to separate what is knitted together in God's own nature. Law is an expression of God's being just as much as love is an expression of His being.

The fact that laws are often negative does not warrant their rejection. Why did God Himself express the moral law in a predominantly negative way? God would not have expressed His law negatively if it had not been intended to reveal and combat sin which seeks to negate God. No law would have to be expressed negatively if there were no sin. It is because "sin is transgression," that is, a walking across, that God said, "Thou shalt not..." When God gave His law to Moses He once for all said to humanity, "NO trespassing." The burden of this negation was the affirmation, "Love me." God projected His law into a world that was seeking to negate the will of God of which the law was an objectification. The world was negating the will of God in a very positive way. It did this by setting up idols, by desecrating the Sabbath, by profaning the name of God, by permitting adultery, by stealing, by dishonoring parents. The world was walking across the will of God in a positive way. Because the positive things the world did had to be shown to be negations of the will of God, God reveals Himself by stressing the negations. Thereby God teaches us that we must negate sin as sin seeks to negate God.

When, fifteen centuries after Moses, Jesus came to tell us that the law is love, did He erase the negations of the moral law? Indeed not! Jesus did not negate the negations, but He rather affirmed the affirmations that were implied in the negations. To negate the negations is to deny the affirmation; to affirm the affirmations is to accept the negations. "If ye love me, keep my commandments." Without love the law would be heartless, but without law love is spineless.

The tendency to despise law is unconsciously fed by those who give youth the impression that faithful observers of the law are legalists. A lover of the law is not a legalist and may never be called a legalist until he proves to despise the spirit of the law or until he plans on the observance of the law for salvation. Too many people who are uncomfortable in the presence of law distract attention from their own weakness by pigeon-holing every lover of the law as a legalist. If we cannot sing whole-heartedly, "Oh, how love I Thy law," our love of God is sheer hypocrisy. This truth is strangely left alone by those who use the term legalism in altogether a sweeping sense. May this one-sidedness not in part account for the tendency among youth to despise even a healthy respect for the law?

**Proper Redirection**

I might go on to unfold other tendencies among youth, such as the tendency to expose themselves more and more to cultural influences and less and less to religious influences, and the tendency to expose themselves less and less to the influence of parents and more and more to the influence of companions. We must, however, not lengthen this article by comment on these and other tendencies. I hope I have mentioned a sufficient number to make my readers appreciate that we ought to think through the implications of these tendencies as well as their causes, in order that we may face them in the light of God's Word. God's Word shows the way to a proper redirection of the tendencies of youth. Laxity in the conduct of youth must be counteracted by such powerful weapons as prayer, Scripture study, faith, and consistent Christian example.
CHRISTIAN SCHOOLS AND PUBLIC FUNDS

James A. Van Zwoll, A.B.
Graduate Student in Education, University of Michigan.

Among the recurrent questions that have never been definitely settled, the one concerning public funds for the partial support of non-public schools seems to be coming into the foreground once more.

Two views, in regard to this question, have been rather consistently held by their respective exponents. The one view is that of the public school man, who maintains that the principles of democracy forbid the allotment of public funds for the support of non-public institutions. Nevertheless, this comparatively broad-minded public school man recognizes the Christian school's right of existence, but only as a democratic movement of protest against, and in competition with, the state-supported school. Opposed to the public school man's view is that of nearly all non-public school men, who contend that in so far as school taxes are assessed in accordance with the number of school children within the district, apportionment of such taxes ought to be made to the non-public school for those children, of the respective districts, who attend these non-public schools.

Each of these views is, of course, entirely correct from the perspectives taken; therefore all attempts to arrive at harmonious agreements by these approaches cannot but fail.

Whenever this question of state aid or support is raised, many of us consider the desirability of decreasing the load of private support which is entailed in the proper maintenance of the schools that give expression to our particular principles. Unfortunately, if we consider at all the dangers to be feared from the displacement of private by public support of our schools, we tend conveniently to disregard the possible evils or to benumb our consciousness of the consequences involved in the acceptance of public subsidies for our schools.

Continued subsidy, in whatever field or under whatever conditions it may be found, invariably leads to control of the subsidized by the subsidizing agency. This statement is borne out by the results which have accompanied governmental grants to schools. The Smith-Hughes Act of 1917 provided federal aid by way of appropriations for the vocational departments of public schools. At first no actual control was exercised by the government, but gradually — as the years passed on — pressure was exerted upon the schools to follow specified programs if they wished to continue to receive government funds. This control has grown to such proportions that the President has found it necessary to appoint a committee whose main task is the investigation of the control exercised and discovery of a satisfactory means for the curtailment of the evils of that control. This is merely evidence of the certainty with which domination follows from the source of the bounty. The question arises whether it is not the prerogative of the government to specify the uses to which its appropriations are to be put. Most of us would not only grant that this is the government's right, but also that it is the duty of the government to so designate the purposes for which the money is to be used as to assure all tax payers that the government is their responsible agent. All subsidizing agents must have the same rights of control over the funds which they supply.

It is this factor of control accompanying the reception of federal aid that causes school men who are imbued with the principles of democracy to be wary of appropriations that, even if they are made in good faith, have such potentiality for a control that can only bring about a democracy-destroying centralization of the administration and organization within the school system.

If the freedom of the public school is threatened to this extent by the dangers of controls that inevitably follow money gifts, the Christian schools must recognize the greater degree of danger that such subsidy entails for them. The public school may become functionally dead but remain institutionally existent. The Christian school cannot exist unless it is functional, for it has lost its distinctive character of Christianity as soon as it fails to function. Freedom is therefore an essential factor to the continuance of the Christian school.

Resorting again to analogy, we find that centralized control of the public school withdraws from the people those activities — of policy making and of close contact with the spending of their taxes — which were the interest-stimulating factors in their relations to the public school within their respective communities. Likewise, as soon as the support of the Christian schools is in part contributed by the state, interest of the Christians who are supporting the school will wane, for they have no longer the financial interest which they formerly had in the school; then as soon as the policy making is naturally taken over by the state in return for its financial contributions, the interest of the Christian in the remaining institution cannot be greater than that which he has in the public school, for the Christian school will have become identical with the public school.

The danger of accepting subsidies for school support from the state lies therefore in the devitalizing effects, upon the Christian school, which are entailed by the control that incontrovertibly follows subsidy.

When, therefore, renewed publicity is given to the issue of state aid for non-public schools, let us carefully weigh value against value in the effort to uphold the expedient; for it is for us as Christians to determine whether the Christian school and its principles are worth so little to us as to warrant the incurrence of the dangers that have been described, or whether we are to place such value on our Christian institutions that we prefer to retain their independence by a cheerful acceptance of an increased burden—the burden of providing adequate support to the school which is at once a protest against the public schools and an expression of our Christian principles.
O, for a mighty revival of home religion and the family altar, where every father is a prophet and every mother a saint!

J. Wilbur Chapman.

The home and the school must be governed by the same conception of religion, by the same philosophy of the world and of life. In one word, the school must be Christian.

P. A. Hoekstra.

I am as sure as I am of the fact of Christ's reign that a comprehensive and centralized system of national education, separated from religion, as is now commonly proposed, will prove the most appalling enginery for the propagation of anti-Christian and atheistic unbelief, and of anti-social nihilistic ethics, individual, social, and political, which this sin-rent world has ever seen.

Archibald Alexander Hodge.

I still thank God heartily for my coming from the Christian school and for my early training there.

John C. Stam, martyred Chinese missionary.

I am incurably convinced that the object of opening the mind, as of opening the mouth, is to shut it again on something solid.

G. K. Chesterton.

Public education in America ... by omitting positive religious and moral training, by implication teaches that a person can be completely educated without religion; so that the inference must be that morality and religion are relatively unimportant. But in America those who do not approve of this type of education have the privilege of establishing their own schools and universities.

Cecil De Boer.

Well sharpened tools in the hands of a good workman are admirable equipment, but in the hands of a fool, a criminal or a crazy man, they endanger life and property ... Education that merely sharpens tools of the mind and equips with knowledge and skill adds to the success of evil lives, as it enables good men to serve more effectively.

E. H. Griggs.

The false philosophy of evolution ... is filling the minds of youth with its pernicious influence. Even in our public schools the children in their tender age are taught that their ancestors a little while ago were hanging on limbs by their tails. We see, therefore, that the public school system of America has become a most effective agency for the propagation of paganism. The results are being felt in the morals of our young people. It has displaced God in their thought, and with God thus displaced, they are brought under the sway of their natural sinful passions ... The secret of the decadence of morals in America is found in the fact that God has no place in the life and affections of the people.

P. B. Fitzwater.
The state is permitted to mold children from the age of six up through the time when they are going through colleges, where many of the professors are agnostics and atheists. But now the church is awakening to the fact that children should be reared in the Christian faith from the nursery upward. I believe that there is in this country today a great spiritual awakening and the church is beginning to see that it has turned over entirely too many of its functions to the state.

Former Vice-President Thomas R. Marshall.

God pity the child who has not learned the meaning of "No" before his third birthday! His life will not be safe, he will be dangerous to property, and he will jeopardize the rights of others.

Garry Cleveland Myers.

I believe that the Christian school deserves to have a good report from those who are without; I believe that even those of our fellow citizens who are not Christians may, if they really love human freedom and the noble traditions of our people, be induced to defend the Christian school against the assaults of its adversaries and to cherish it as a true bulwark of the State.

J. Gresham Machen.

It is capable of exact demonstration that if every party in the State has the right of excluding from the public schools whatever he does not believe to be true, then he that believes most must give way to him that believes least, and then he that believes least must give way to him that believes absolutely nothing, no matter in how small a minority the atheists or the agnostics may be. It is self-evident that on this scheme, if it is consistently and persistently carried out in all parts of the country, the United States' system of national popular education will be the most efficient and wide instrument for the propagation of atheism which the world has ever seen.

Archibald Alexander Hodge.

The wise man gets the idea into his head — the foolish man gets it in the neck.

William Jennings Bryan.

Never discourage people from thinking. If they are thinking wrong, do not try to stop their thinking, but teach them to think right.

Phillips Brooks.

Christian philosophers, theologians, and educators cannot serve both Augustine and Schleiermacher, Calvin and Hegel, Luther and Dewey.

Clarence Bouma.
SINCE the World War much has been written on the problem of the Christian attitude toward war. The Calvin Forum has had several articles on the subject, and also a leading editorial. By his admirable thirty theses on "War, Peace and the Christian" Professor Bouma has greatly clarified the issues involved in this extremely difficult but very vital question. In view of these numerous articles and the splendid editorial there would seem to be little excuse for another article on this controversial subject. By way of justification I plead the importance of the question. It is one of the gravest issues which Christians today face. For this reason every point of view should be presented. Some time ago my attention was drawn to the essay by the Reverend Mr. John Bovenkerk on "Philosophical and Biblical Reflections on World Peace." About the same time there came to my desk a dissertation on "The Christian Ethic in Relation to the Problem of War." The two essays, which reached quite different conclusions, were written by Christian ministers, both men of deep evangelical conviction. The dissertation presented a point of view which should, I believe, be presented to the readers of The Calvin Forum.

Is War Morally Desirable?

I wish first, however, to make a few remarks on the pamphlet of Mr. Bovenkerk, for the reason that it represents an extreme but not uncommon position, and also because it contains some fallacies which orthodox writers often fall into. Mr. Bovenkerk is not content with arguing the inevitability of war. In his examination from the viewpoint of reason he quotes approvingly from Aristotle and Ruskin to the effect that "War is not only a good thing, but from the moral standpoint, indispensable," an imperative necessity in the progress of the world. By reference to two writers of the past, one of the very distant past, neither of whom could know anything about the effects of modern war upon contemporary industrialized society, Mr. Bovenkerk refutes all the moral, spiritual, economic and political devastations of the World War, in the midst of which he stands. The terrifying losses in property and human lives, the sweep of Communism over Russia, of Fascism over Germany and Italy, the rise of unbridled nationalism everywhere, and the destructive depression through which the world has gone, all this means nothing to Mr. Bovenkerk. Where and what are the gains to offset these appalling losses?

Mr. Bovenkerk inveighs against "the movement for world peace" because, he asserts, it is fostered to a large extent by men and women who are either Modernists, Humanists, avowed Atheists or Communists. In view of this his high regard for the views of Aristotle is interesting and not a little amusing. The movement for world peace is bad because there are Modernists in it. By the same kind of cogent reasoning Aristotle, since he defended war, must be a highly spiritual man. And indeed, so he becomes in the hands of Mr. Bovenkerk. He very nearly succeeds in elevating Aristotle into the Kingdom of God (page 6), "He approaches the Biblical doctrine of Christ and Him crucified" (page 13). The rankest Modernist could hardly do better than that!

Aristotle and Mr. Bovenkerk defend war because they regard "it as an occasion for the display of the highest human virtues," such as "laying down one's life for a worthy cause" (page 6). But there is no necessary relation between war and worthy causes. One side almost certainly, and both parties often, may be fighting for ignoble causes. The motives of each war would have to be analyzed to determine whether it was fought for worthy causes or not. Moreover, the world does not lack for good causes for which to die, and in contrast with war, causes which do not involve the destruction of human life, property, and moral and spiritual values as war does.

Doubtful Arguments

Mr. Bovenkerk criticizes the peace movement because, as he asserts, it is based on the doctrine "that by human effort permanent world peace can be effected." Here again Mr. Bovenkerk goes too far and not far enough. Nothing can be accomplished in any sphere by purely human effort. But where does that leave us? Many of the Constitutional Fathers were far from evangelical Christians. The movement for the Union and the Constitution was purely a secular movement. Could not Christians therefore join in it? If Christians cannot participate in the movement for world peace because many of its leaders are purely secular in their outlook, Christians cannot engage in war, for many of the leaders in movements for war are likewise purely secular and unchristian in their outlook. Those who have participated in it know what a grimly unspiritual business war is.

In his discussion of the problem from the viewpoint of divine revelation Mr. Bovenkerk likewise advances some very doubtful arguments. He cites the commands of God to the Israelites to wage war against their neighbors. Too much can easily be made of this. It should not be forgotten that the Hebrews had been selected by God as the vehicle for his revelation. It was a question of maintaining righteousness and religious purity. These commands are certainly not applicable today. Would Mr. Bovenkerk have Christians today slaughter their pagan neighbors? Modern warfare certainly is not of Old Testament character. It is not a contest with the pagans all on one side and Christians and non-christians of one country join in companionship to destroy Christians and pagans of another country.

Even in the Old Testament there is evidence to indicate that God looked with disapproval upon what may be called "secular wars," in distinction from wars Israel was commanded to fight for the purity of its religion. David confessed to Solomon that the Lord had not permitted him to build God's house for the
reason that he had “shed blood abundantly” and had “made great wars.” But to Solomon, a man of peace, was this great privilege given. 1 Chronicles 22:7, 8. See also I Kings 3:11. Mr. Bovenkerk seems to have a blind spot for such passages of the Old Testament as those of Isaiah 2:4 and Psalm 46:9.

The chief weakness of Mr. Bovenkerk’s argument is his constant indulgence in the game of ducks and drakes. When it suits his theme or when it is necessary to his argument he secularizes the spiritual and secularizes the secular. “Christ is the greatest warrior that has ever been here upon earth” (page 17). Can any one imagine Jesus as a general of an army with a sword at his side and a host of decorations dangling from his breast? It is sacrilege to suggest it. Again, “The humanist Pacifist needs be born again” (page 26). Certainly. But so must the non-Christian militarist.

**Conscience and the State**

Mr. Bovenkerk is finally led by the tortuous path of his own reasoning to take a position which I would not have expected from an orthodox Christian, and, least of all, from a Calvinist. “The prerogative to declare war,” he states, “belongs to the state and the church has no business to militate against this inherent right. In fact, the church is not competent, because of the nature of the case, to pass upon the merits or demerits of such a declaration of war. The whole matter, like that of Supreme Court decisions, is outside of the domain of the church.” I am willing to admit that it is not the business of the church to pass upon the merits of a declaration of war, but the individual Christian, who is called upon by his state to destroy fellow human beings, cannot escape this question. In small matters certainly the Christian will have to give the government the benefit of the doubt. But can he in a matter so important as war? Mr. Bovenkerk in trying to avoid secular absolutism jumps right into the arms of it, for Mr. Bovenkerk does not hesitate to advise the Christian to surrender his conscience to the state.

Mr. Bovenkerk makes an application. “If some nation, say Japan with its religious and national psychology of war, commits an international crime of such proportions that she must be punished and it becomes necessary, because of the nature of the transgressions, that America must do the punishing, it is not for the church to object or obstruct the painful duty of the government, but to uphold the principle of divine justice and to encourage its members to sacrifice for a righteous cause” (page 23). Mr. Bovenkerk has in this case made the problem relatively simple for the Church and the American Christian, but the simpler it is for these, the more difficult it becomes for the Japanese Church and individual Christian. What must the Japanese Christian do? Must he strengthen his government in its unrighteousness? May he resist the American Christian in his act of upholding “the principle of divine justice?” What a muddle Mr. Bovenkerk gets us into!

**Another Point of View**

There is more in Mr. Bovenkerk’s method and argument that I would like to comment on, but space does not permit and it would serve no purpose. I admit that the problem is one of great complexity and perplexity, but I find no contribution to a solution in this pamphlet of Mr. Bovenkerk.

Let us now turn to a brief summary of the dissertation to which I referred at the beginning of this article. The writer of the dissertation presents a point of view and a line of reasoning which ought to be pondered.

A consideration of the ethical utterances of Jesus leads to the conclusion that their general spirit is unquestionably opposed to Christian participation in war. Jesus was not opposed to “the use of physical force per se, in defense of a righteous principle, there being nothing essentially moral or immoral in the use of force, either physical or moral.” Rather it is in the fact that the very heart of the ethic of Christianity is the doctrine of love, interpreted as positive goodwill toward individual man and toward society, and that this love is unconditionally opposed to hatred, interpreted as its exact negation, which is itself part and parcel of organized, mass warfare, that the real conflict exists.

“Modern war is essentially offensive in character. Its decisive weapons are made for attacks rather than for defense. And with attacks weighing over defense, no search can reveal a just cause proportionate to the destruction wrought in every order, physical, political, social, moral or spiritual by a war such as the last.”

**Moral Responsibility of the State**

The state has moral responsibilities. Among these moral responsibilities are the preservation of life, law and order, peace and justice. Only if war promotes these can the Christian support the state in war. The writer concludes that it is quite obvious that war preserves none of these, but rather destroys them all. Once a state gets into war it uses every method to win, whether foul or fair.

The state has a moral responsibility to protect the nation’s possessions. The greatest tragedy of war is the destruction of morality that is its concomitant. Religious restraints break down and immorality increases on every hand. If the writer wished to he could have pointed to Germany as an example of the terrible ravages that war makes on a great people’s spiritual possessions, even at long range.

A third moral responsibility of the state is to safeguard its land and people. The writer points to a large amount of expert testimony to the effect that there is no defense against the modern weapons of warfare. Since the thesis was written Colonel Lindbergh said in a speech at Berlin that the terrifying progress of military aviation had abolished the time factor in defense and left nations defenseless.

The writer concludes that since the state cannot fulfill her responsibilities through war, Christianity will find itself in a dangerous position if it does not unconditionally refuse to sanction and take part in it. He quotes from Huber (Staatenpolitik und Evangelium, p. 34): “If Christianity does not set itself against this exalting of the state above morality, the spirit of the world will soon break loose from its fastness of non-moral political power, and will gradually conquer every region which the Christian conscience has subduced to itself in the course of twenty centuries.”
The dissertation does not end in a negative note. It points to the duty of the Christian aggressively to engage in discovering and promoting Christian alternatives to war.

A Cruel Dilemma and Conflicting Policies

Having briefly outlined the argument of the thesis, I wish to make a few observations of my own. The democracies of the world stand before a cruel dilemma. They face the danger of attack from the communist and fascist countries, for by their very nature dictatorships must be on the march. Because of their recklessness and irresponsibility the dictators have the diplomatic lead constantly in their hands. What shall the democracies do? If they resort to arming they may become militarized in the process. If war comes, so great a regimentation of the nation will be required (and is planned) that the nation may glide into fascism. If the war should be a prolonged one the inevitable social and economic chaos following in its path would lead to communism.

And what about American responsibilities? Is it good policy, is it moral, in the face of the menace of the dictatorships’ threat for democracy to follow a policy of isolation? Should not the United States, without going to war, treat the two sets of countries differently in case war breaks out, and even before war breaks out? Should we permit countries threatening the peace and civilization of the world to obtain from our shores the material with which they are seeking to forge the world’s chains?

Our government is now following two conflicting policies. Secretary Hull, a truly great man and one of the greatest secretaries of state the United States has ever had, is seeking to reduce tariff barriers. This will reduce one of the greatest causes of international irritations and by its tendency to increase the standards of living everywhere, will relieve the internal pressure in the so-called “have-not” states. But Congress forces upon the administration a mandatory, non-discriminatory embargo under the guise of neutrality legislation. Naturally, countries fearing war and knowing that their trade with the United States, at least in armaments, and if not a sea power, in all classes of goods will be cut off, are going to direct their trade in peace time into such channels as will remain open to them in war. Our new neutrality legislation, therefore, has the effect of directing the world’s trade to flow in war channels even in time of peace. Mr. Hull’s policy thus becomes neutralized.

An American Foreign Policy

In conclusion I would like to make a few suggestions for an American foreign policy. The policy of which the New American Neutrality legislation is an expression is physically and psychologically impossible and morally questionable. My objection is to its non-discriminatory features. Under it the United States government has placed an embargo on implements of war and munitions to both the rebels and the constitutional, democratic governments of Spain with which we are on terms of friendship. Should Germany attack Czechoslovakia or the Netherlands the embargo would have to be applied equally to both belligerents. Thus democracy would be wounded in the house of its friends. I believe we ought to join in a system of collective security to the extent of backing up the collective decision against an aggressor by embargoes and boycotts and the extension of financial aid to an attacked state, but not to the extent of giving naval and military aid. Let that be on a regional basis. This may involve us in some danger of being brought into the war actively. I believe that danger is very slight, but if it exists we ought to run it. The United States government should next reconstruct its armaments on a purely, territorial defensive basis. By doing so it could probably cut down its national defense costs by one-half or two-thirds, and set an example of which the world is sadly in need.

I believe such a policy would satisfy all but the groups holding extreme views. It would give those with pacifist leanings the assurance that they would never be called upon to fight or support other than a purely defensive war. It would go a long way in satisfying others who feel that the United States can not be indifferent to an attack on the peace of the world, who wish the United States to support righteousness in the international community, and who do not wish to see their country aid, even indirectly, an aggressor state. To those who cannot accept outright pacifism, the proposal should also be acceptable.

HIDDEN JEWELS

Into our life thou pourest blessings, Father,
Often we do not know them when they come,
As when a precious gift in ugly wrappings
Upon a pile of waste is hapless flung,
And then, reclaimed, with closer scrutiny
We find a shining jewel there among.

So come the gifts of patience, grace, and vision,
Dressed in a drab of trouble's drab disguise,
And while our bodies fret beneath the trappings,
Our souls in understanding are made wise;
So from the grave of selfish pride's endeavor
A noble Christian character may rise.

We thank Thee, Father, for all blessings given
Of tribulation that experience sends,
As well as for the joys and open favors
Of which the countless number never ends;
Like incense unto Thee, O God of Heaven,
Our highest praise in gratitude ascends.

— Joan Geisel Gardner.
THE END OF THE WORLD
R. I. Campbell
Toronto, Ontario, Canada

THE New Testament speaks in very plain language regarding some great and transcendent events which are said to precede or accompany an explicit ending or termination such as seems to be implied in the words of our Lord, "Heaven and earth shall pass away." This study will be confined chiefly to the order of these events and to the time of this end or passing away in relation to: (1) earthly history as a whole, (2) this present age or dispensation, (3) the Second Advent, (4) the future eternity, (5) the beginning of eternal blessedness for the righteous, (6) Christ’s spiritual and physical presence on earth, and (7) the resurrection of the dead.

The method proposed is to approach the subject through the obviously literal passages of the New Testament—those which all orthodox Christians accept as literal and not figurative. Fortunately the greater part of Scripture falls apart readily into three classifications: (1) the obviously literal, (2) the obviously figurative, and (3) the doubtful class, which falls between the other two. It is of course possible that a figure may occur in the midst of an otherwise literal passage, but this need not affect our classification, because, where the framework or leading thought is literal, the whole would be classed as literal. Then, the figurative insert, if it be alleged to affect the meaning, would be considered by itself. The figures which occur in the quotations which follow do not, we believe, affect the meaning of any of the passages or their context. In all cases the plain obvious sense is taken as the meaning. The Second Advent of Christ, gloriously and corporeally, is everywhere assumed.

I

There will be a termination or catastrophic ending to this present material sphere and to human life and history as presently constituted. This present world will come to an end and be succeeded by the eternal state. This is evident from:


“They shall perish; but thou remainest; and they all shall wax old as doth a garment; And as a vesture shalt thou fold them up, and they shall be changed” (Heb. 1:11-12). Also Heb. 12:27-28.

“But the day of the Lord will come as a thief in the night; in the which the heavens shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat, the earth also and the works that are therein shall be burned up” (2 Peter 3:12).

“And the world passeth away, and the lust thereof” (1 John 2:17).

Scripture everywhere assumes: the transitory nature of this present world, a permanent spiritual realm above us, and the perpetuity of a future state which lies before us.

II

The “last days,” the “last age” or “ages,” the “end” or “ends” (chronological) of this “world” or “age” are assumed in Scripture to apply to this present Gospel age or its termination in the sense that there will not be another age, or dispensation, of earthly human history after the present one.

“The harvest is the end of the world; ... so shall it be in the end of the world. The Son of man shall send forth his angels, and they shall gather out of his kingdom all things that offend, and them which do iniquity; And shall cast them into a furnace of fire: Then shall the righteous shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father” (Matt. 13:38-43). Also Matt. 13:49-50.

“Now all these things happened unto them for ensamples; and they are written for our admonition, upon whom the ends of the world (R. V. ages) are come” (1 Cor. 10:11).

“... but now once in the end of the world (R. V. ages) hath he appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself ... and before the judgment;” (Heb. 9:26-28). Also Heb. 1:1-2.

“But the end of all things is at hand” (1 Peter 4:7).

“Little children, it is the last time (R. V. hour)” (1 John 2:18).

Many Old Testament references to a future age of history called the last or latter days (see Is. 2:2, Micah 4:1, etc.) appear to be before the minds of the New Testament writers as having arrived.

III

The physical resurrection of the dead or the rapture, the end of the existing order of earthly life, the end of the Gospel age, the Judgment Day, or the disposal of final rewards and punishments to all men, are here shown to be co-incident with each other and with the next or Second glorious Advent of Christ.

“For the Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father with His angels; and then He shall reward every man according to his works” (Matt. 16:27).

“The Son of man shall come in His glory, and all the holy angels with Him, ... And before Him shall be gathered all nations: and He shall separate them one from another. ... And these shall go away into everlasting punishment; but the righteous into life eternal” (Matt. 25:31-46).

“Marvel not at this: for the hour is coming, in which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice, And shall come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation” (John 5:28-29).

“And he shall send Jesus Christ, which before was preached unto you: Whom the heaven must receive until the times of restitution of all things” (Acts 3:20, 21).

“But every man in his own order: Christ the firstfruits; afterward they that are Christ’s at His coming. Then cometh the end” (1 Cor. 15:23, 24).

“For this we say unto you by the word of the Lord, that we which are alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord shall not prevent them which are asleep. For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God; and the dead in Christ shall rise first; Then we which are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air: and so shall we ever be with the Lord” (1 Thess. 4:15-17).

Scripture nowhere even hints at a period or age of earthly history coming after a judgment day, a future physical resurrection or a glorious Advent of Christ.

IV

The general Resurrection or the final victory over Satan and physical death considered as catastrophic events, and the entrance into the state of the final blessedness of the righteous, are here shown to be co-incident with each other and with the beginning of the eternal state.

... every one which seeth the Son, and believeth on him, may have everlasting life; and I will raise him up at the last day" (John 6:40). Also John 6:39, 44, 54.

"In my Father's house are many mansions: if it were not so I would have told you. I go to prepare a place for you. And if I go and prepare a place for you, I will come again, and receive you unto myself; that where I am, there ye may be also" (John 14:2, 3).

I Cor. 15:23-26, partly quoted in Section III, also I Cor. 15:42, 43, 51-55.

"In a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump: for the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed. For this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality. So when this corruptible shall have put on incorruption, and this mortal shall have put on immortality, then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, Death is swallowed up in victory" (I Cor. 15:52-54).

Nowhere in Scripture is there even a hint of two future physical resurrections. The resurrections in Revelation 20 are not physical. (See Sect. VII.)

V

The reward of the righteous will be in an eternal and perfectly blessed state free from contact with this earth and immediately following death, the Second Advent, or the physical Resurrection.

See John 14:2, 3, quoted above, Section IV.

"For we know that if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God, an house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens" (II Cor. 5:1); also Romans 8:18-21.

"For our conversation (R. V. citizenship) is in heaven; from whence also we look for the Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ; Who shall change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body ... For if he were on earth, he should not be a priest . . ." (Phil. 3:20-21).

"Then we which are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air; and so shall we ever be with the Lord" (I Thess. 4:17).

"For he looked for a city which hath foundations, whose builder and maker is God . . . But now they desire a better country, that is, an heavenly; wherefore God is not ashamed to be called their God; for He hath prepared for them a city" (Heb. 11:10-16). Also Heb. 13:14; I Peter 1:4-5.

VI

Christ will continue in His present twofold state of glorious physical exaltation in heaven and intimate spiritual presence with His Church on earth until the end of the world.

"For where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them" (Matt. 18:20). Also John 14:18, 19, 23; and 16:17.

"All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth . . . I am with you always, even unto the end of the world" (Matt. 28:18-20). Also Acts 3:20-21.

"Now of the things which we have spoken this is the sum: We have such an high priest, who is set on the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in the heavens; A minister of the sanctuary, and of the true tabernacle, which the Lord pitched, and not man. For if he were on earth, he should not be a priest . . . But now hath he obtained a more excellent ministry" (Heb. 8:1-6). Also Heb. 9:11-12; 9:24; 10:12-13.

The New Testament never hints at our Glorified Lord appearing on this earth, prior to the end of the world, in any other manner than that in which He has already appeared since His Ascension.

VII

It is believed that no obviously literal passages can be found in Scripture to minimize, much less to nullify, the results of the six preceding sections. An objection will however be raised as to their finality on the ground that, by the omission of much that may possibly be literal, some fact or factor essential to the theme may be overlooked. This necessitates an examination of any doubtful passages alleged to conflict with the otherwise obvious conclusions.

Probably the first and most important passage which will be advanced as proof of the inadequacy of our method will be taken from Revelation 20. Some will say that this chapter is wholly figurative. Let us assume that it is literal. This would not necessarily mean that the two resurrections are physical resurrections. This section and the following will serve to illustrate how similar difficulties may be met.

There will be but one future physical resurrection and that at the last day or end of the world.

"For in the resurrection they neither marry, nor are given in marriage, but are as the angels of God in heaven" (Matt. 22:29-31).

... the hour is coming, in the which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice, And shall come forth" (John 5:28-29).

... every one which seeth the Son, and believeth on him, may have everlasting life; and I will raise him up at the last day" (John 6:40).

See Romans 6:9-11; Eph. 2:5-6; Col. 2:12-13; Col. 3:1.

"Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the first resurrection: on such the second death hath no power" (Rev. 20:6).

In this last quotation resurrection and death are not necessarily physical. A spiritual resurrection seems to be in sharp antithesis to a spiritual and eternal death. Some think it applies to a future revival which in its effects would be equivalent to the resurrection and return to active life of the great saints and leaders of the past. There is just as little foundation in Scripture for two Judgments as for two physical resurrections. Scripture everywhere assumes but one Judgment and that at the Second Advent.

VIII

The alleged imminence of the Second Advent prevents many from accepting the finality of the results of our method of approach, but Dr. H. W. Frost (Second Coming of Christ, Ch. XI, etc.) and other well-known authors say that while the Advent is impending it is not imminent. Certain clearly predicted events must first transpire.

It is believed, however, that a still better answer is possible. It is this: The Second Advent is the next great supernatural and cataclysmic event which will confront the vision of each living person. The Advent is as imminent in relation to the physical senses of man as death is imminent and as the end of the world was imminent, "at hand," to Peter (I Pet. 4:7). The Bible speaks only to man in the flesh.

Let us, however, apply our present method of approach to this alleged difficulty. Let the objector search the Bible and furnish one or more plain pas-
sages in support of the three following propositions:

1) A Millennium is possible after a future physical resurrection or the Second Advent.

2) Christ will be present on earth, or visible to men in the flesh, in a manner different from that in which He has been present or visible since His Ascension.

3) An instrumentality, human or divine, other than those now available, will be utilized in introducing the Millennium, or in the redemption of men.

Let the objector first use obviously literal passages. If these fail, fall back on the doubtful and if these also fail, let him try the figurative. But he must not allow figurative passages to contradict the plain parts of Scripture.

If we surrender the principle that the primary or essential meaning of a chain of literal passages can be altered by figurative Scripture there is an end to all Scripture as the final court of appeal by which truth or conduct must be judged. We must have a Bible which we can bring to bear as a self-consistent unity on every problem of life and if we approach it as outlined in this discussion we shall find that the result will not only be the complete harmony of the whole and the explicit adaptation of every part to the age and conditions in which we live but substantial harmony with all the historic authoritative documents of our orthodox Reformed Faith.

The different interdenominational movements are usually made up of liberalist, modernist Protestants. They get hold of a few rabbis, who do not mind it at all if they can mount a Christian pulpit or step up on a Christian platform. They are told to mind their own business and attend to the activities of their own church. They are told to attend to the activities of their own church. They are told to attend to the activities of their own church.

...
LETTERS

SAFELY ANCHORED

Dear Editor:

I read your editorial “The Revolt Against Reason” in the May issue of The CALVIN FORUM with the result that I feel constrained to tell you what my reaction to Calvinism has been. I am convinced that it is the only system of religious dogma which could possibly satisfy me. Unfortunately I am not one of those happy individuals who is never assailed by doubts. It has required a rather comprehensive knowledge of the character and of the purposes of God to keep my “steadfast (and) unmoveable” in spite of grave doubts which have assailed me from time to time. I feel, with Dr. Machen, that real faith must of necessity be based upon knowledge. It has been my experience that faith strengthens and increases in proportion to knowledge acquired. The more I know concerning the attributes and the loving purposes of the Heavenly Father, the more I am willing to trust Him and to patiently wait upon Him knowing that He is able and willing to cause “all things” to work together for my good and for His glory.

The following statement taken from your editorial struck a responsive note in my heart: “Yet every true Calvinist utterly rejects the label of being an intellectualist. He regards the full Christian life as an abundant enthusiasm, resulting in action in all of life, as well as an intellectual comprehension of the truth.” This has been exactly my experience. It seems to me that Calvinism stimulates the mind because it emphasizes “the correct understanding of the will of God revealed.” A stimulated mind naturally results “in action in all of life.” I never cease to marvel at the active interest which I seem to have developed in a variety of subjects since I came in contact with Calvinistic teaching. Certainly I am not an intellectualist, but I do rejoice in the knowledge which I possess concerning God, the great Creator and Redeemer. Without that knowledge my faith would be a poor feeble thing, “tossed to and fro and carried about with every wind of doctrine”; with it, my soul is wholly satisfied and safely anchored.

Your publication is very much to my liking. I have been a subscriber since the first of the year.

Foley, Minn.

BERTHA DziUK.

NO MONOPOLY ON TRUTH

Dear Editor:

We find your magazine very interesting. If you think this description rather dubious, we are willing to concede the point, for so it was intended. For though one cannot always agree with the views expressed, the latter may serve sometimes to crystallize one’s own. Therefore of interest.

I am not so certain but this might embrace the articles slightly tilted toward the New Deal philosophy, as such. Would we some of that? No, thanks.

Such is the content, of course, is of constructive and lasting value. We would especially mention two contributions—one entitled “The Place of God in Our Lives,” by Mark Fakkema, November issue—to which we never read aught superior—the other, “The Difference of Institutions,” by Prof. Henry Van Zyl. These articles touch bottom.

We always appreciate highly, competent book reviews, and, hence, your efforts in this line.

Lastly, your magazine floats upon the assumption that no one man or group has a monopoly on truth. This we consider sound; stick to it.

With best of wishes,
Byron Center, Mich.

P. AUKEMA.

HUMAN MORALITY VS. JESUS CHRIST

Gentlemen:

Please send me a copy of a recent issue of The CALVIN FORUM containing an excellent article by a former public school teacher of our country expressing penitence and confession for having taught in the public schools civic righteousness and other human effect morality, and idealism, instead of acceptance of civil obedience to our Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ. I think it was your March, 1937, or maybe, February, issue.

Please allow me to express my heartfelt gratitude for the privilege.

Kershaw, S. C.

C. M. BROWN.

SOCIETY FOR CALVINISTIC PHILOSOPHY

Dear Dr. Bouma:

A few weeks ago I told you about our plans to organize a society for Calvinistic philosophy. A meeting to discuss the advisability of such a society was held in the Westminster Seminary, April 23rd. Dr. Van Til gave a paper on goals and ideals a Calvinistic philosophical society may hope to realize in this United States. After a little discussion, all present felt the desire to organize such a society. A committee of four was chosen to draw up a constitution, and to propose a plan of procedure. It was also decided to have the papers read at our society mimeographed and distributed among our members. Other names were also given to be put on the mailing list. The purpose is to be as influential as we possibly can be. The paper Dr. Van Til read was also requested to be given to the mimeographer, for many felt that they would derive a lot of good from its reading.

Our next meeting is scheduled for September 29, at Westminster Seminary. The Rev. Peter Holwerda promised to give a digest and an appreciation of contemporary Dutch Calvinistic philosophy.

In a short meeting that followed Dr. C. Van Til was chosen president pro tem., and yours truly secretary pro tem.

This society expects to be very inclusive as far as denominations are concerned, but feels the need of a solid foundation. The “baby” hasn’t received a name as yet. The important matter is that it is here, and I hope by God’s grace, to stay.

Englewood, N. J.

JACOB T. HOOGSTRA.

ANENT SOCIAL JUSTICE

Dear Editor:

Our conservative clergymen seem to be gravely concerned about the lot of our Christian laboringmen, especially since the Committee for Industrial Organization has made such an inroad in the field of organized Labor. Class distinction has become a fierce class warfare and fear is expressed that the Christian workingman will be drawn into the conflict. The advice is given “to band and stand together as members of a Christian Labor Association under the banner of Christ.”

Our greatest problem, as such, is to be able to cope with the pernicious sit-down strike. This practice is denounced quite severely by our clergy and is disapproved of by our Christian labor leaders. In fact both conservative and radical Calvinists have agreed that the sit-down is unlawful. As to the moral question we find that they differ. Although we abstain from judgment in this case, let us remember, that all what is legal is not, therefore, moral. On the other hand, we must acknowledge that a thing illegal or unlawful is not always immoral.
For if we judge the action, or rather non-action, of the sit-down strike as unlawful and as something to describe it, "the law of the jungle," let us at least by that same token admit, that that law is only one of the many causes of political and social unrest. When economic anarchism reigns, political anarchy may follow if political rulers refuse to set their house in order.

The question arises, by what means this economic anarchy can be brought to an end by any means, or to any extent. As one who is himself a conservative, the Christian worker extract himself out of this economic morass by "handing and standing together?" In other words, they should form a "Christian economic unit," either to co-operate with or to compete with or even to destroy or annihilate for the "socialists" would not be the proper term. That in some instances results have been obtained by this procedure we gladly admit, but we do not see how it could long endure. We feel that it will only be temporary as long as their claims and rights are not backed by political law. In matters of economics the weaker will be absorbed by the stronger. The economic struggle cannot be decided without law. The conservative brethren maintain, that Labor must form its own economic class, it has in fact subscribed to the class struggle although unintentionally. Behind this lies the economic philosophy of the French Revolution upon which we cannot digress. Our conservatives are still building upon it, and the only possible way to find this out is by experience.

The radical Calvinist approaches the problem from a different angle and arrives at different ideas as to a quite true political philosophy as to "promote our concord with each other and to establish general peace and tranquility." (Institutes, Book IV, chap. 23.) For the exact meaning of such law as "humanity may be maintained," (Ibid., par. 3.) Is it not true that our laws are framed in such a manner that war and strife (economic warfare and class-struggle) are to be encouraged? They may seem to be based upon unholy, nay, even un-Christian, ends to such an extent that our Christian worker must seek a haven of refuge? And is it not true that many of our conservative Calvinists exalt and glorify "impartial competition?" If our Christian press goes to the limit by telling their readers that conservative and radical Calvinists have a different and separate concept of "right." It means that our Christian workingman deems himself "spoiled" and seeks to escape from the economic morass. Moreover, the economic and political disturbances make no other than the foundation for the economic and political disturbances become dangerous. The economic disturbances grow heavier that it remained as a planet, which we today call "earth." The Christian press never subscribed to the idea that conservative brethren maintain, that Labor must form its own economic class, it has in fact subscribed to the class struggle although unintentionally. Behind this lies the economic philosophy of the French Revolution upon which we cannot digress. Our conservatives are still building upon it, and the only possible way to find this out is by experience.

We are all well aware that brute economic force within the boundaries of political law will ultimately have its repercussions outside the limits of the law. And again, might does not make right. Right may be sustained by political force. The trouble seems to be that conservative and radical Calvinists have a different and separate concept of "right." They are, as many other factors, subject to different and various interpretations. Undoubtedly, economic and social standing modify or even falsify to a great extent the real meaning of the two words. But if our Christian press goes to the limit by telling their readers that conservative and radical Calvinists have a different and separate concept of "right." It means that our Christian workingman deems himself "spoiled" and seeks to escape from the economic morass. Moreover, the economic and political disturbances become dangerous. The economic disturbances grow heavier that it remained as a planet, which we today call "earth." The Christian press never subscribed to the idea that conservative brethren maintain, that Labor must form its own economic class, it has in fact subscribed to the class struggle although unintentionally. Behind this lies the economic philosophy of the French Revolution upon which we cannot digress. Our conservatives are still building upon it, and the only possible way to find this out is by experience.

According to Calvin (Institutes, Book IV, chap. 20, par. 9), we may safely assume that political law is primarily to establish "general peace and tranquility." While we might disagree with him upon the importance to be given to this end, we at least recognize the necessity of it. He then goes on to state in his analysis: "Of the origin of the universe, and that it is basically wrong, because God created the universe. I hope you don't believe that theory that God created the universe. I hope you don't believe it, because it is nothing but foolishness. She laughed at me for "speaking my piece," and the class laughed with me. I, for one, and for all, knew that I was right. The marvelous fact of it all is that I was stopped from drinking in "evolution" in time. It was getting a firm foothold in my soul. How did it get that foothold? I do not know. That is what happened when I was in our public schools. I thought the teacher and the book could never be wrong. I was on the road to ruin. God stopped me just in time. Today, in spite of my training in the public school, I give every bit of support I can to the evolutionless school.

Grand Rapids, Mich.

NELSON VELTMAN.
BOOK REVIEWS

ON CHRISTIAN ORIGINS

Dr. Hopwood is a Scotchman of no mean ability. His work has received much favorable attention across the Atlantic. In this volume he grapples with a problem that has engaged the minds of N. T. scholars for many years. It is an attempt "to reconstruct the evolution of Christian doctrine along the approach of religious experience in the pre-Pauline Church." This is not the first attempt along these lines, but none, I believe, has been as thorough. Other approaches to the problem have been made, such as the eschatological one by Schweitzer, the historical by Baur, the literary by Bacon, the confessional and ecclesiastical by many conservative leaders, and others of minor import. None of these have proved entirely satisfying. Christianity began with the miracle. It refuses to yield to the probings of human mentalities.

The study of the religious experiences of the early Christians calls, among other things, for two qualifications. The subject must be a good historian and a good psychologist. The combination seems to be rare. Historians stress objective facts. Psychologists the subjective reactions. Hopwood stresses the latter and at times it seems at the cost of the former. He is in doubt about the character of the resurrection, but has no doubts about the disciples’ reaction to the idea or to the fact of resurrection. He fails to differentiate sharply the pentecostal phenomenon and ecclesiastical by many conservative leaders, and others of minor import. None of these have proved entirely satisfying. Christianity began with the miracle. It refuses to yield to the probings of human mentalities.

The first part of the book deals with preliminary investigations. The question of the literary sources and that of the psychological and religious background are discussed. The first is found to be adequate, and the second to consist chiefly of Jewish apocalyptic ideas. The second section is an interesting presentation of the experiential response of the first disciples to Jesus and His teachings. Part three introduces us to the emergence of the Church. Here we find an unsatisfying discussion of the pentecostal phenomenon. It is followed by an excellent presentation of the Church’s consciousness of itself, of salvation, and of Christ.

Some of the conclusions of Dr. Hopwood, when compared with those of the historical critical school, are refreshing to those who have looked with alarm at the vagaries of the latter. Here are some of them. The origin of the Church cannot be separated from Jesus. In Him lies the key to the specific movement known as Christianity. The Christian Church was in its origin neither a minor Jewish sect, nor did it represent a conglomeration of Hellenistic influences. There is no gap between Jesus and Paul. There were no Pauline innovations. His contributions were rooted in what preceded him.

Particularly interesting are the treatment of the transmutation of the Jewish Apocalyptic into the spiritual equivalent of Christianity, the many pointed references to recent developments in psychology, the emphasis on the unbroken continuity between the impact of the historical Jesus and the actual emergence of the Church, the conclusion that the cardinal elements in historical Christianity were already taught by Jesus or implied in His teachings, the description of the growth of the idea of salvation, and the many illustrations from later history alleged (by the author) to be analogous to the experiences of Christ’s first disciples.

Well, read it. It is thorough, refreshing, up-to-date, and undoubtedly the most informing of all the works that seek to explain Christianity from the viewpoint of religious experiences.

H. S.

ON PREACHING

The volume contains the George Shephard Lectures on Preaching which the author delivered at the Bangor Theological Seminary 1904-05. The lectures are five in number and deal with the following subjects: I. The Dimensions of the Work; II. The Three Men Involved; III. The Growing of Sermons; IV. Form and Manner; V. The Place of Dogma in Preaching. They are well-written, the language is simple, the presentation is clear, the thought is interesting, the theology is orthodox, the spirit is reverent, the purpose is inspirational. The last lecture in particular is deserving of attention. The lecturer is popularly written and afford the layman an excellent opportunity to acquaint himself with the work that goes into the preparation of his Sunday spiritual meals. It does not do the minister any harm that his audience has some understanding of his week-day sermonic labors, and it may do them good.

May this useful and delightful book be widely read and so serve the Christian pulpit and pew alike in a generous measure.

S. Volbeda.

CHRISTIAN MARRIAGE

Dr. Walter A. Maier has made himself so well known to the people of this country through his broadcasts during the Lutheran hour each Sunday, that he needs no introduction. "This volume is essentially a code of Christian marriage, drawn from the Scriptures, which would help to make marriage 'for better, not for worse.'" Thus the author prefaced a book that runs to thirty-seven chapters on almost every imaginable matrimonial topic. The volume presents sections on: The Code of Christian Marriage Ethics, dealing particularly with marriage blessings; Pathways to Purity, the scriptural matrix in which marriage should be formed; The Offensive against Christian Morality, a frank, scathing criticism of those who to-day are undermining the old marriage traditions; The Criteria of Happy Marriage, a section dealing with the practical questions every young couple must answer; Courtship, Engagement, and Marriage, very pointed remarks concerning these relationships, and inspiring appeals to the forming of Christian attitudes towards them; Twin Menaces to Wedded Happiness, the evils and dangers of birth control and divorce; and finally nine chapters on the Elements of Wedded Happiness.

The attack on other than Scriptural approaches to marriage and its many problems could hardly be more virile than that offered here. The book is intended particularly for mature young people and its messages are presented to them in much the same form that the author uses in his radio addresses. They are argumentative, sometimes vehement, frequently exhortatory, but the point is always explicit. There is a clear ring to the
note that the author strikes. One would fain repeat after him, "The future of our church and of our country depends, under God, upon stalwart, Christian homes, consecrated Christian families, the exaltation of the Christian doctrines concerning marriage, parenthood, and home."

The author is so outspoken that one may perhaps hazard the one remark that although he well represents the Lutheran tradition, even the Luther manner of fighting existing evils, his scathing, sweeping statements seem at times almost to carry him too far. If so, however, it is real enthusiasm in a righteous cause that is responsible. This reviewer's reaction may be due to the fact that reading five hundred pages written in this manner is difficult for him. He would prefer the more quiet, calm consideration of the subjects discussed, with more exhaustive treatment of some of their implications. But for the average reader the author's method may be desirable. Read as it should be, piece-meal, and for its positive, inspiring advice, by young people old enough to think for themselves, this book deserves the highest recommendation.

H. J. R.

A MATTER OF BALANCE?


TO those who have been intrigued by the theories and frank statements of such educators as Glenn Frank and Robert Maynard Hutchins, this little book by the dean of teachers' college at Columbia will prove interesting and stimulating reading. Dean Russell would undoubtedly subscribe to the statement that those who do not know the past do not understand the present. To understand the rapidly shifting present scene with its conflict between those who insist on personal liberty and those who would have a greater measure of equality, one should know that the present struggle is but a new phase of an ever-recurring conflict. Mr. Russell provides us with that perspective. He shows us that throughout history the equalitarians and the liberals have opposed each other. Over-emphasis of one of these approaches invariably calls forth an emphasis on the other.

The author is convinced that the gulf between those holding these opposing views may be lessened. That there is need of this is obvious, particularly when one faces the two possibilities of government which the present world offers us in dictatorship and democracy. The solution to our present problem which the author finds, as one might expect, in education, leaves the reader somewhat unsatisfied, but his discussion does meet one need, that of correcting our perspective and of proving to us that our present conflict is not so new after all. May the light of history help to illumine our darkened pathways!

H. J. R.

ON COOPERATIVES


THE technique of cooperation in industry, both producer's and consumer's cooperation, is so well established that its continuance as a method of organization for the production and sale of goods seems to be assured. Enlightening volumes such as that by Marquis Childs on Sweden the Middle Way have informed us what cooperation has meant to Europe. Fowler tells us the story of cooperation in this country. He takes his reader through a rapid survey of what has been happening from the beginning of the cooperative movement here until the present, through a recital of cooperative ventures and successes in practically every industry or type of service in which cooperation has been tried, through a discussion of the need of doing away with profits by means, of course, of cooperation.

This book is highly informing and should, therefore, open the eyes of both the proponents and opponents of cooperation to the possibility of this new method of distribution of goods and services. The very titles of the chapters as well as the method of presentation of the material is evidence of the fact, however, that this is an enthusiast who is writing. One is led to wonder, therefore, whether the difficulties that this advancing movement must necessarily meet, the limitations to its possible successes in this country, the great obstacles to its being the one way out of our economic difficulties, have been carefully considered. These are not dealt with at length in this volume.

H. J. R.

THE AMERICAN INDIAN


EVERY student of the American Indian, his history, his culture, his religion, will want to read this book. Its author was formerly professor of anthropology at the University of California. It contains a wealth of material on the American aborigines. The work is illustrated. It is the second edition of a work originally published in 1927 and sold for five dollars. The reduced price of this revised edition places it within the reach of anyone interested in the American Indian. As one reads this book, he is deeply impressed again with the fact that the Indian's culture and religion are intertwined at nearly every point.

C. B.

CHINESE CULTURE


WHOEVER is looking for a fresh and informative account of the various phases of Chinese life can do no better than to read this book. Its author is a Chinaman educated in the West. The book deals with such subjects as: Chinese Character, the Chinese Mind, Ideals of Life, Woman's Life, Social and Political Life, Literary Life, the Artistic Life, etc. The five chapters on Confucian Humanism, on Taoism, and Buddhism are most informing, compactly written, and marked by a certain unique touch which the reviewer ascribes to the Chinese background of the author. There is no propaganda in the book, except that it is marked by regard for the Chinese heritage. This is no book to read with a view to missionary propaganda, but it is a most illuminating account of the Chinese people and their culture.

C. B.

RABBINIC LORE


THIS book of 396 pages offers in English translation an immense amount of material from the post-biblical Jewish sacred literature. The bulk of the volume is taken from the Talmud. The reading of this book, which is being offered for less than a dollar as long as the supply lasts, will give one a good first-hand acquaintance with the content and spirit of rabbinic lore. It is regrettable that the volume has no alphabetical index. Explanatory notes of the translator are found throughout the text. This volume will give the reader a good idea of the typically Jewish (rabbinic) interpretation of many Scripture passages.

C. B.
AMERICAN INDIANS

When Columbus discovered America the Indian population in what is now the continental United States is estimated to have been about one million. Ever since that time, until about 1910, this number has constantly decreased. Causes: wars, slaughter, and the inroads of the white man's diseases. The original million has at one time been reduced to 250,000. In recent decades a great change has come about. The birth rate has increased and sanitation has reduced the number of fatalities. The Indian Office estimates the Indian population today at 334,000, of whom only about one-third are full bloods. Outstanding among tribes in increase in population are the Navajoes. This tribe has increased in the last sixty years from 8,000 to nearly 45,000.

CHILD LABOR AMENDMENT

New York State has rejected the proposed child labor amendment. Its most powerful opponent was the Roman Catholic hierarchy, which interpreted the amendment to allow for state domination of the education of all children up to 18. It is now proposed by prominent statesmen, like senators Borah and Vandenberg, to change various details in the amendment which have been the occasion for much of the opposition to its adoption. It is proposed that the age limit be reduced from 18 to 16, and that the labor which is prohibited be designated as "labor for hire," so as not to encroach upon the rights of parents. It is questionable whether such changes as these will satisfy the opponents.

JOHN DEWEY SOCIETY

A new organization has made its appearance in New York, known as The John Dewey Society for the Study of Education and Culture. In what spirit this society will carry on is apparent from its name and from the fact that William H. Kilpatrick (see above, editorials and article of Mr. Van Wesper) of Columbia is Chairman of the Executive Board. The purpose of the society is stated vaguely enough in the constitution (Art. II): "to foster scholarly and scientific investigations of problems pertaining to the place and function of education in social change, and to publish the results of such studies." In reality this society will undoubtedly stand for the same naturalistic, godless education to which John Dewey has devoted his life, and to the propaganda for the radical, socialistic views held by this same educator and social philosopher.

PRINCETON, WESTMINSTER, AND CALVIN

Princeton Theological Seminary has appointed Dr. Frederick Bronkema as instructor in Systematic Theology. Dr. Bronkema, who according to press reports has accepted this appointment, is a son of the Christian Reformed Church, a brother of Dr. Ralph Bronkema, pastor of the First Christian Reformed church at Orange City, Iowa. He is a graduate of Calvin College and of Calvin Seminary and has pursued post-graduate study in Theology at Harvard (Th.D.) and Yale (Ph.D.). Westminster Seminary has just bought college property somewhere in the state of Pennsylvania (the location will not be publicly announced until certain legal details are straightened out) and the Seminary hopes to move to this new location. Meanwhile the following faculty changes have been made. Dr. A. A. McRae, teaching until now in the Old Testament Department, has resigned because of the attitude of the majority of the faculty in the matter of Premillennialism and the Christian's freedom to use intoxicants. The Board of Trustees has elected the following three members of the present faculty to full professorships: Dr. Ned B. Stonehouse (New Testament), the Rev. Paul Woolley (Church History), and Mr. John Murray (Systematic Theology). The Board of Trustees of Calvin College and Seminary has, upon recommendation of the faculties of Calvin College and of Calvin Seminary adopted a revised Pre-Seminary curriculum in which the college course requirements of the languages are reduced and provision is made for required and elective courses in other fields, such as: Philosophy, Economics, History, etc. The Board also appointed Mr. Henry Stob to the chair of Philosophy in the College. Mr. Stob is a graduate of Calvin College and of Calvin Seminary. He spent last year at Hartford Seminary and is at present studying in Germany under the terms of an exchange fellowship. He will, in all probability, continue his studies abroad for another year before he returns to the United States.

PUBLIC AID TO NON-PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Various state legislatures have passed legislation by which aid in some form or other is lent to those who send their children to non-publicly supported schools. Such aid, however, has so far not been given directly to such private schools. Louisiana makes textbooks free to all school children, whether in public or private institutions. The Supreme Court has placed its approval on this act. An Indiana law provides that students of parochial schools may use free textbooks when the local school corporation so authorizes under its own regulations.

NEW LABOR TEMPLE HEAD

In the place of Dr. Edmund B. Chaffee (deceased) the Rev. A. J. Muste has been appointed head of the Labor Temple in New York City. Mr. Muste is of Dutch extraction; was at one time a minister in the Reformed Church of America; became extremely radical during the days of the War and thereafter; stood for a while committed to the propagation of communism; but has lately undergone a great change of heart, having repudiated his endorsement of the Russian experiment. Mr. Muste recently addressed the student body and faculty of Calvin College, Grand Rapids, Mich., and held a conference-interview with a number of Grand Rapids pastors.

TEACHERS' OATH BILL

In many states so-called teachers' oath bills have been introduced into the legislatures and have been enacted. In Massachusetts this was done two years ago. Ever since, a large number of educators in that state, among whom the leaders at Harvard University (who surely cannot be accused of social and economic radicalism) have agitated to have this law repealed. Recently such repeal was adopted (though by small majorities) by both house and senate. However, the repeal failed of enactment into law by reason of the veto of Governor Hurley.

PYRAMIDOLOGY

Dr. George Steindorff, professor emeritus of Egyptology at the University of Leipzig, who at present is giving a series of lectures at the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, ridicules the "wisdom" of the pyramidologists. According to him, Egypt's pyramids were simply royal tombs. Popular notions, as is well-known, persist that the pyramids had mathematical and astronomical significance. The most popular theory assumes that the Egyptians knew the relation of the circle to its circumference, that is, the value of pi, but this noted Egyptologist pointed out that they had no such knowledge in the pyramid era.