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Prayer for Labor Day 1937

O THOU Who hast made man and given him the commission to till the soil and develop the forces resident in Thy creation, we thank Thee that we have labor for our hands. After a period of unemployment we recognize Thy undeserved provision in the prosperity that is again returning to our nation. We thank Thee for the crops of 1937. We thank Thee for the upswing in trade and in industry.

O Lord, we hang our heads in shame when we consider our sins as a nation. There are the sins of ingratitude, of vain and boastful self-reliance. We pray Thee for a return to our nation of the spirit that prompted the godly settlers of early Massachusetts to recognize their unworthiness, their dependence upon Thee, and to express their gratitude for undeserved blessings in the realm of the natural no less than of the spiritual.

And now that our nation has become economically great and strong, teach us to feel our calling before Thee. We pray Thee especially for righteousness and justice in industrial relationships. May employers and employees recognize their duties rather than assert their rights, and may they heed Thy holy ordinances for the ordering of the relationships in human society. Keep us from the turmoil of civil war. May we be kept from all unnecessary clash of force and from bloodshed. May we be kept from all irresponsible radicalism on the one hand, and from injustice and oppression of the weak by the strong on the other.

Bless everyone who has responsibility for the promotion of peaceful and just relationships in industry. That justice may dwell in our land. That each laborer may have a sufficient return for his labor to enable him to support his loved ones. Teach Thou the captains of industry to see their responsibilities not first of all in the light of their financial ambitions but in the light of the needs of the men and women for whose economic, physical, and moral well-being they have a responsibility.

Bless employers and employees in their frequent conferences these days. Grant in Thy common grace that men may have consideration for social justice, and grant that those who have been redeemed by the blood of Christ may show forth in their industrial attitudes and decisions that they know the higher righteousness which is wrought only by Thy special saving grace in their hearts.

Bless the Christian laboring men who have banded together to stand apart from the world that knows Thee not. Bless them as they seek to know Thy will for a social and industrial order in which the weak shall not suffer at the hands of the strong. Give wisdom to the leaders of the Christian Labor Association in our land, and of all Christian industrial organizations in whatever land, to be effective in serving Christ as their King in the particular sphere in which Thou in Thy providence hast placed them.

Bless the leadership in our churches. We thank Thee for the growing sense in the pulpit of a responsibility to Christ, our King, in every realm of human life and endeavor. Keep us from the danger of preaching a mere moralistic, "social" gospel, on the one hand; but deliver us no less from such one-sided preaching which deals only with saving the soul from eternal destruction and does not emphasize the call to live a full-orbed Christian life here and now. May we believe with all our hearts that the Gospel has the promise for this life as well as for the life to come.

And all this we pray in the name of Jesus, who died that we might live, who saved us from eternal doom, and who as our Lord called us to an all-inclusive life of service.

AMEN.

The New Deal at its Best

THE crushing defeat which President Roosevelt sustained by the 70-20 vote of the Senate, burying forever his attempt to appoint to the Supreme Court a bloc of justices known to be favorable to his legislative program, will have far-reaching results. The country has reason to be happy, not only because the days of the rubber-stamp congress seem to be over, but especially because the judgment of the Senate's committee on the reorganization of the federal judiciary was vindicated. That judgment read: "We recommend the rejection of this bill as a needless, futile, and utterly dangerous abandonment of constitutional principle. That was not only the judgment of partisan opponents but no less that of an overwhelming group of those who had been swept into office on the crest of the wave of the President's popularity. Recognizing this as a distinct victory for our American institutions, this should in no way blind us to the merits of much of the legislation proposed by the President and passed by Con-
gness. The intelligent Christian citizen has no reason to be a blind partisan and repudiate all that is included in the New Deal. We have the New Deal at its best in the Social Security Act embodying as it does a type of legislation long overdue. The Social Security Board, consisting of three members and having full charge of the administration of all federal social security matters, recently celebrated its second birthday. In May of this year the constitutionality of this legislation was upheld by the Supreme Court. Millions of people will benefit under the terms of this act. These beneficiaries include unemployed workers, needy aged, needy blind, and dependent (especially crippled) children. Under the terms of this act the individual states are required to enact appropriate legislation covering the set-up in their territory before they can benefit from the federal grants. Such concurrent legislation has now been enacted in all the states of the Union as far as the unemployment features of the act are concerned. In accordance with the provisions of this act those who are over 65 and have actual need will be entitled to a modest support from the government. Moreover, some 21 million wage earners fall under the unemployment-insurance clause. The fund for this purpose is raised by taxing the employer (and in some states the employee as well) to the extent of 3% of the wages paid. All administrative expenses are paid by the federal government. Such unemployment compensation is to be paid to workers who lose their job through no fault of their own. The benefits amount to about one half of the worker's weekly wage, the minimum being $15 or $16. It is regrettable, though possibly unavoidable, that workers of small employers (those employing less than eight), domestics servants, and farm help are excluded from the benefits and conditions of this act. In answer to the question when these benefits will take effect it must be said that Wisconsin is already making such payments now; that 29 other states will begin to do so next year; and that the rest will follow in 1939.

C. B.

The Sino-Japanese Crisis

ONCE again the menace to world peace potentially present in the leadership of every fascistic nation has become apparent in the aggressive action of Japan on the Asiatic mainland. Tokio's war crowd has gone off on a spree. Japanese bombs have laid waste peaceful Chinese cities and are threatening to terrorize many more. Already Peiping has been insolently occupied. Another four provinces in the north of that sorely divided republic known as China have been converted into a puppet state under Japanese control. One pause to wonder. By the time these lines are read by our subscribers many things may have happened and some of our questions may have been answered. Is Japan really determined to fight China? Does Tokio consider this the time to subjugate its neighbour, before the consolidation of the Chinese forces under Chian Kai-shek reaches an advanced stage? Is Japan only interested in extending its control somewhat farther into northern China, or is it ready to match its powerful and efficient war machine with the forces of the Nanking government? And is Chiang Kai-shek really determined to fight it out at this time? Has sufficient nationalism been aroused in the breasts of the lethargic Chinese that at last this sleeping giant is aroused and prepared to fight off the invader unitedly? Can Tokio bank on the support of that group of generals and their armies who have shown Red leanings and a decidedly anti-Japanese and anti-fascist spirit? And when one views the matter from the international angle, some other serious questions press for answer. Does Japan have a war understanding with Hitler? Are present hostilities mayhap the beginning of a conflict in which Tokio will play ball with Berlin, and China and Russia will be forced to oppose a double aggression on the part of two of the outstanding fascistic nations of the world? Will diplomatic maneuvers on the part of the outstanding democracies of Europe accomplish anything in the face of the determination and belligerency of Japan? And if such an international outbreak of hostilities should occur, what part will Britain and Italy and our own country play? The picture bristles with possibilities, almost all of which are dreadful to contemplate. One thing is certain. The growth and expansion of the Japanese power is fraught with serious danger to the peace of the world, and to the spread of the Christian religion as well. No Christian can take the position that it is the duty of the Chinese nation to allow itself to be swallowed up by its aggressive neighbor. Unless a different spirit takes possession of the leaders at Tokio, war—real war—appears inevitable, and as for the prospects of Christianity and the missionary enterprise in that situation, there is the growing intolerance of the Japanese people toward those who will not conform to the Shinto shrine worship. What is happening at many mission schools in Korea and Japan of late serves as an ominous commentary on the prospects for the freedom and spread of the Christian religion. Germany is not the only country where nationalism has been exalted to the level of a religion. And a nationalistic religion is religion in its most intolerant form. We will see. Meanwhile—Jehovah reigneth!  

C. B.

Revolt on the Navajo Reservation

IMAGINE the largest tribe of American Indians in revolt against the United States Government! Imagine them asserting their rights not by warfare and the wielding of tomahawks but by resolutions passed in a convention consisting of delegates from regular chapters on the reservation! Imagine these wards of the Government delivering speeches of denunciation against the present policy of John Collier, Commissioner for Indian Affairs—speeches (in Navajo) full of fire and winding up with quotations in English from Patrick Henry: Give me liberty or give me death! Imagine them passing a resolution addressed to the United States Senate demanding no less than the resignation of John Collier and insisting that their tribal council shall not be a hand-
picked group selected by a Washington bureaucracy but shall be elected by the tribe in accordance with the democratic methods that are the boast of the American people! This is what actually happened when on July 23 and 24 some 600 Navajo tribesmen from the entire reservation met in Farmington, New Mexico, in solemn conclave. To this meeting report was rendered by a tribal delegation recently re- but shall be elected by the tribe in accordance with the democratic methods that are the boast of the American people! This is what actually happened when on July 23 and 24 some 600 Navajo tribesmen from the entire reservation met in Farmington, New Mexico, in solemn conclave. To this meeting report was rendered by a tribal delegation recently re-

Authority and Liberty

THE discussion at the recent convention of The National Union of Free Christian Schools, held at Sheboygan, Wisconsin, centered around the above indicated theme. The issue is certainly a timely one not only in the field of education but in every other sphere of human interest.

Respect for authority has been waning. The exercise of civil authority is regarded as an encroachment upon personal liberty. And personal liberty is our god. Parents may not exercise their parental authority for they would thereby hinder the free self-expression of their children. And hasn't the value of self-expression been recommended by our psychologists? Teachers may not be authoritative either in the thinking or the conduct of their pupils. It may hinder the development of some latent power that the child possesses. And thus we have argued for the dethronement of authority.

However, men theorize and argue after they have lived. They justify the expulsion of authority after they have expelled it from their lives. And the cause of such expulsion is not to be found in the free spirit of democracy prevalent in America. Democracy and authority are quite compatible. The cause for such dethronement of authority must be sought in the humanistic spirit that is prevalent in our world. This has created conceptions of authority and liberty that are dangerously erroneous. Authority and liberty are justifiable and compatible conceptions only in the world of theistic thought. The only authority that one needs to respect—just because it's the only authority that is real—is that which comes from God. “The authorities that be are ordained of God.” If that be true there is no option in the matter. It must be respected. The only liberty worthy of the name is that in which one can function without hindrance in the realization of his purpose in life. To define liberty as the privilege to think, act and speak unrestrictedly is nonsense. No-one can do that. Not even God. He is restricted by his own nature. Men are restricted by the entire sub-human world, by the world of human beings, and by their Creator. And failure to recognize such restrictions places men in bondage. Proper adjustments to such restrictions liberate. Aviators are free to fly as long as they adjust themselves properly to the limitations of flying. Consumers of electricity are free to use that great power as long as they adjust themselves to its laws. Failure to make the adjustments means possible death. And death is certainly not liberating.

However, it is not optional with the State, nor with the parents, nor with the teachers whether they would exercise authority. They are invested with it by God and must exercise it. The necessity of the exercise of authority comes from above. Yet there
are beneficial results in the form of enabling those who are under authority to make quicker and easier adjustments.

What a long painful circuitous route a child may take if he without being subject to authority has to work out his own salvation in the field of education. We have tried it in this country. The results have not been reassuring. Teachers have liked it. They needed only to teach their subjects. It was not incumbent upon them to teach their pupils. The pupils were not compelled to learn a definite amount of material in a definite way and to arrive at a definite objective. They were not forced to go the easy and direct road to reach the purpose of their education. They were bound by the very failure on the part of the teachers to teach with authority. They had not been forced to see the facts and to make the necessary adjustments to them.

"Ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free," said Jesus. The master Teacher did not leave the matter optional with the disciples. There is a note of compulsion in "Ye shall know the truth." What is the truth? This that there is a God in heaven whom men must learn to know as He has revealed Himself and then adjust yourself to Him. That can be done by love which easily makes all the other adjustments necessary. It also informs us that there are men next to us to whom adjustments must be made. That can also be achieved by complying with the law of love. There is also a large subhuman world, and to it too adjustments are imperative. God demands that dominion over that field be exercised. And such dominion can be exercised only when we have understood the laws operating there and have adjusted ourselves to them. When all such adjustments are made we can without hindrance glorify our God. And in that unhindered function man will find his greatest freedom.

H. S.

CHURCH AND STATE IN HISTORY
Diedrich H. Kromminga, Th. B.
Professor of Church History, Calvin Seminary

The problem of the relation between Church and State is a live one. A recent Christian Reformed Synod appointed not less than two committees to study and advise the churches on as many phases of this complicated problem; one, to look into the detail of the Christian relationship and attitude to war, and the other, to inquire into the matter of a creedal statement on this head. And this denominational occupation with the problem of the relation between Church and State is merely symptomatic of the wider interest which it arouses at the present time in the Christian world from one end to the other.

A Burning Issue

Of this worldwide interest, there are abundant evidences in the Christian press. The March, 1937, issue of the magazine of the American Society of Church History brought two historical articles bearing on the relation between Church and State; one, by Wilhelm Pauck, of the Chicago Theological Seminary, on the Nature of Protestantism, and the other, by Conrad Henry Moehlmann, of the Colgate-Rochester Divinity School, on the Baptist View of the State. Last year, there came from the Harvard University Press a volume of 542 pages by W. K. Jordan, dealing with The Development of Religious Toleration in England during a very limited period of that development. And the same year brought a volume of 456 pages by Sister Mary Augustina (Ray) from the Columbia University Press, on the subject of American Opinion of Roman Catholics in the Eighteenth Century. A couple of years earlier, John M. Mecklin wrote his Story of American Dissent (Harcourt, Brace & Co.). The prominence of this relationship in the field of Missions finds striking illustration in a volume published by the International Missionary Council and written by James Thayer Addison, on the Medieval Missionary (176 pp., 1936).

Other recent publications plainly refer to the causes that lie back of this notable interest which today is manifest in our subject. They are mentioned in a study of Church and State in Contemporary America, written by Wm. Adams Brown in association with a committee of American Christians appointed by the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, (Scribner’s, 1936, 360 pp.), which volume was the December choice of the Religious Book Club. The most radical revolution in the relation of Church and State has come about in Russia, and of that revolution Matthew Spinka of the Chicago Theological Seminary has told the story as far back as 1927 in his book, The Church and the Russian Revolution (MacMillan, 330 pp.). The eyes of the Christian world at large are still fixed upon the persecuted Russian Church, as is manifest from an article in the religious magazine, Christendom, issue of the winter of 1937, answering the question: "What has happened to the Russian Church," by briefly telling of developments in the Russian Orthodox Church in Soviet Russia and in exile. The article is from the pen of P. E. T. Widdrington. By its side we find another article by Sir Walter Moberly, on the Oxford Conference, which met in July of this year, having been prepared by the Universal Christian Council for Life and Work, which was set up after the Stockholm Conference of 1925. The conference at Oxford dealt specifically with the subject of Church, Community, and State, particularly with a view to the situation in Russia and in Germany.

As long as relationships are settled and stable, they are apt to elicit little comment; but when they be-
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In the Early Church

The present situation of the Christian Church in many of these countries reminds one vividly of the situation of the early Church and its members in the pagan Roman Empire under the persecuting emperors, Decius and Diocletian. And in Soviet Russia at least the modern persecutors have cherished the hope, that now the Christian Church would soon pass out of the world as it entered nineteen centuries ago, to wit, as an altogether insignificant group. In other words, we face the fact, that in the course of history, the relation of Church and State has almost passed through a complete cycle, and that at present it is again approaching the point from which it started. For our proper orientation, it will be well, briefly to recall at least the main steps in that historical movement.

The early Church came to the notice of the rulers first of all through the contradiction which it elicited, in its pagan Graeco-Roman environment. Almost from the start the State evinced the inclination to side with the opponents of the Church, and, as the significance and vitality of the new organization was increasingly better realized, the enmity of the State crystallized in conscious, studied, systematic attempts to root out the Church. It was at the height of the crisis, that the persecuted Church suddenly found relief and reward for its meekly born sufferings in the imperial recognition and favors granted by Constantine the Great.

However, this recognition and these favors were to be dearly paid for. It was by no means unsympathetic acknowledgement of what was great in Christianity, that motivated the establishment of the Church by the State, but the rulers had their own political end in view in their recognition of the Catholic Church: it was to be an additional bond of union, to hold together the unwieldy empire. As far as this imperial aim is concerned, the move turned out to he a failure; perhaps no single factor contributed so much to the ultimate dissolution of the empire as the divisive force of, and the bitterness engendered by, imperially dictated and enforced doctrinal decisions. But also for the Church the union with the State proved to be disastrous in its results. Not only did imperial favor attract converts of inferior spiritual quality, and not only did imperial enforcement of conciliar pronouncements result in schism upon schism, but in the orthodox Church itself the loving embrace of the government caused intellectual and spiritual strangulation. We can trace the phenomenon straight through the Byzantine empire to its Russian offspring; and the Bolshevik revolution appears from this angle as perfectly intelligible as a revolt not merely against the Tzarist regime, but also against the Holy Synod. Meanwhile, the gradual absorption of the old Eastern Empire by the Moham­

In the Middle Ages

That the West drifted gradually away from the East and ultimately broke entirely with the East, was only partly due to differences of race and language and to the far more thorough permeation by the barbarian invaders; it was also due to ecclesiastical tiredness of imperial control. The whole situation was such as to permit of and even to invite a radically new experiment, for which the speculative basis was laid by the great Augustine in his philosophy of history, elaborated in his reply to pagan critics at the occasion of the fall of Rome: his City of God. His failure properly to discriminate between the Church as an object of faith and the Church as a concrete historical institution was so much of an aid to the Papacy in setting up its claims to supremacy over the temporal power. With the revived Western Empire the issue had to be fought out in long years of hazardous conflict, but the outcome at first apparently favored the Papacy; however, only with the result of bringing out the possibilities of unspirituality in the supreme earthly spiritual power; and the decline of papal power came hard upon the heels of its triumph.

The medieval critics of the Papacy operated with surprisingly modern concepts, such as popular sovereignty, though of course under God. It was the Christian community, through which in their theory both the spiritual and the temporal rulers derived their authority from God. This theory is, of course, not necessarily universalistic-imperialistic, but to it can be given with equal facility also a nationalistic turn, either in the royalist or in the democratic sense. The kings were in the majority, and their previous acquisition of power over the churches of their lands largely frustrated the Reformation in such countries as Spain and France.

In the Age of Reformation

Under the influence of the prevailing theories and of the inmemorial tradition of religion as an affair of the State, the lands that broke with the Papacy and with Catholicism in the Reformation drifted one and all into Territorialism, whether the territory was a duchy or a kingdom, and whether the form of government was monarchial or republican. In the German principalities and the Scandinavian kingdoms, in royal England and Scotland, and in republican Switzerland and Holland, each country had its established Protestant Church. This reversion to Byzantinism in national form was nowhere more marked than in Lutheran lands, and the present emergence and success of political totalitarianism
in Germany with the resultant difficulties for the German Church must be viewed and evaluated and interpreted against this historical background.

The dangers of state-controlled religion appeared early in Lutheran "dead" Orthodoxy, to which the Reformed Netherlands promised to furnish a parallel. But together with the Reformation forces had emerged, which tended to mitigate the evil. They can be collectively designated as dissent. France had, next to its established Roman Catholic Church, a dissenting Huguenot minority. In Germany, the Thirty Years' War gave the Calvinists standing ground next to the Lutherans; and remnants of the earliest and most radical of all the dissenters, the Anabaptists, were never completely rooted out. In England the enforcement of conformity resulted in the separation of Presbyterians and Congregationalists, of Baptists and Quakers. And the Netherlands, having learned toleration in the struggle with Spain, became a haven of refuge for all kinds of dissenters from the most varied lands. There was to be at least no stagnation of thought in Protestantism. Gradually dissent attained to toleration in England, and, though much more slowly, also in Germany; and there with the relation of the government to the established churches also had undergone an essential alteration.

However, before this outcome was reached, the dissenters had had much to suffer for their convictions, and under stress of more or less severe persecution, the newly discovered continent of America assumed to them the aspects of a most welcome haven of refuge. By the end of the colonial period, the majority of Americans were dissenters, and only a minority were in established Churches. This prevalence of dissent and multiplicity of denominations was one factor, probably the more important, that produced the American innovation of disestablishment in the sense of the perfect equality of all churches and religions before the law: the realization of a free church in a free state.

The Modern Situation

The other factor has its roots in the humanism of the Renaissance and in the struggle against the endless religious wars and disputes and bickerings of divided Protestantism and the resultant spiritual exhaustion and lethargy. In England and America it appeared as deism, in Germany as the Enlightenment. The Deism of such American revolutionary leaders as Franklin and Jefferson actively cooperated with American dissent, prominently of the Baptist type, to bring about the constitutional provision, that the federal government is never set up an establishment of religion, and the individual states followed this lead or gradually conformed to it. Thus we have first of all here in our country that Christian novelty of the denomination, of which Adams Brown says, that it is an ecclesiastical body with the limitations of a sect, but with the consciousness of the Church Universal. We have at last regained that perfect freedom, which the early Christians enjoyed within their own Christian bounds amidst all the persecution of a pagan government, of communing with one another or of breaking off communion as they pleased or felt duty bound to do. We have that freedom, as yet without the persecution; let us hope and pray, still for a long time to come.

At the time of the American revolution, Deism was also mightily at work in Catholic, absolutistic France; and there it produced a revolution which gave the world a first passing glimpse and taste of an irreligious or anti-religious State. Since that time, there has been abundant reaction, but the reaction often was itself merely the form in which rationalistic, humanistic thought gained control or perpetuated its control over the governmental machinery; and what, in that position it has done to the Christian religion, is manifest in the theological development of thought in the universities and in the migration from oppression to America of such groups as our own, the German Reformed from the principality of Lippe to the region of Sheboygan County, Wis., and the orthodox Lutherans from Saxony to Missouri. But neither the succession of pietistic revivals nor the crop of fundamentalist secessions have been able to check the progressive dechristianization of Europe and America. And it is this modern development, which was bound to affect and alter the relation between the Church and the State.

The alterations, which it has so far accomplished, are of various types, and their various types are significantly distributed over the various countries according to the type of Church each country had or has. Where the Church and the State were so intimately merged as in Russia, the revolution has assumed not merely an anticlerical, but an antireligious form. In countries, where Church and State were both absolutistic but where an international Church was claiming the right to dictate to the government, the opposition has taken on the form of anticlericalism shading off into antireligion, as in France, Spain, and Mexico. In Germany, the Lutheran deficiency in ethical-social emphasis together with the territorialistic tradition and the final attainment of the long deferred national unification has led to attempts to absorb rather than to abolish the Church. In England, where the process is less far advanced than on the continent, a tendency toward disestablishment is plainly discernible; and in our country, which had disestablishment from the start, this has come to mean more and more in practice an attitude of more or less respectful tolerance for the Church as a venerable institution of not overly much usefulness in its present form in the modern world.

It is plain, that, whether Christianity will regain something of its lost dominance in society or whether it will occupy still more plainly the position of a minority, the relation between Church and State is bound to hold the public attention for some time to come.
FOLKLORISM AND CALVINISM

Henry J. Van Andel, A.M.
Professor of the Holland Language and Literature, Calvin College

THERE is a vast folkloristic movement going on in our United States which deserves our attention not only as American citizens, but also as Calvinists of Dutch descent, because of its religious and cultural aspects.

For the last ten years, and possibly for a longer period, folk festivals have been held in the main cities of our land to picture the costumes and manners of our European forefathers. The tulip festivals in Holland, Michigan, in Pella, Iowa, and in Pantego, North Carolina, are only particular phenomena of this general interest in European folklore. Much bigger and more general festivals have been held in the Western and Eastern States. Plays and pageants are being given to reproduce the wealth of European life. Songs are being translated into English to show American young folk how their brothers and sisters across the Atlantic sing and play. Costumes are being tailored to show Americans how young European parades and dances. Juvenile books appear in print, many of them gorgeously illustrated, to make the children acquainted with the weird, fantastic, and adventurous tales of pagan times and of the Catholic middle ages, or to inform them about later European pastimes and customs. Whole series of schoolbooks are at present being edited to give pupils of the third and fourth grades an idea of European sociology in practice, so as to prepare them for the more difficult subjects of history and economics. Cultural books on all kinds of subjects are found on the shelves of public and private libraries, and due honor is given to the nationality of all kinds of geniuses.

Americanism and European Folklore

Louis Adamic’s article in Harper’s Magazine a few years ago, accusing American educators that thirty million young people are dangling in midair, because they have roughly been torn loose from their ancestral roots and do not know how to adjust themselves to their new fatherland is still ringing in our ears. And to mention one more item, the serious plea to teach American children two years of the language of their forefathers so as to give them the key to the civilization of these forefathers, and through this a deeper appreciation of our American culture, seems to be gaining ground, for Italian children are being taught Italian in New York, and Polish children Polish in Chicago. Some racial groups like the Poles, the Germans, the Italians, and the Scandinavians are even so proud as to publish a monthly or a quarterly, beautifully illustrated, to make American young people proud of this European heritage, and to foster a proper attitude towards their ancestors and towards themselves.

It cannot be denied that this folkloristic movement is of tremendous importance for the further development of our national life. Sociologists seem to agree that this is the most important way to make contributions to American life, to cultivate a true appreciation of our synthetic American culture; and of our standards of living, and to bring about color and variety in our daily humdrum. Educators seem to realize that we cannot live happily and harmoniously until we have found out how much of our mode of living, of our schooling, of our music, literature, painting, sculpture and architecture we owe to Europe, and how little we have originated ourselves. Religious leaders are interested in pageants and plays depicting not only the crusades and chivalry, but also the reformation of Luther and Calvin. Feeling is general that we cannot live on a high plane except when we build on the foundations of the past. And our past reaches back not only to the creation of Christianity, but, thanks to God’s common grace, also to these dark times from which our language, our nursery rhymes, and much of our folklore and folksongs sprang. It may be true that much of our natural and cultural existence is of pagan origin, and, therefore, ought to be subjected to a thoroughgoing examination and purification. It may also be true that our modern civilization is falling gradually into the clutches of a pernicious, satanic spirit which tries to use everything for the glorification of the senses. But it cannot be gainsaid that the present folkloristic movement is invading our public schools, and our public life; that it is making big strides forward and reconstructing our national life, and even our church life, and that we, Christians, ought to make up our mind as to what we can accept, and what we have to reject, so as to keep this movement within the bounds of Christian decency, and so as to make it profitable for the up-building of the kingdom of God in all fields of human activity.

Dutch Calvinism and Dutch Culture

As Calvinists of Dutch descent we have a peculiar calling which I would like to outline in a few sentences, but which ought to be thoroughly studied lest the folkloristic flood overwhelm us. Festivals should be kept within the bounds of Christian Sabbath keeping, and of Christian morality. Museums should not neglect to show the religious background of our fathers, for faith was one of the strongest motives of their migration and development. Songs should not only create the impression that the Dutch were cheerful and optimistic, but that the secret of their optimism was the Christian Renaissance and the Calvinistic Reformation. Books and articles should not only illustrate Dutch social life, but also their intense religious existence. Courses in Dutch history ought to be given in our Christian high schools, and American and Dutch readers ought to be prepared for the grammar schools and the junior highs. There ought to be a general return to the reading of Dutch fiction and Dutch theology in our homes, and there will be if our Christian schools will set one hour a week aside in the middle grades for the reading of American readers on Dutch life, in
the higher grades for the reading of Dutch books, and in our senior highs for the study of Dutch instead of German; and for the reading of Dutch history in Dutch. At present we are letting our opportunities slip by.

Not only that, but we are not realizing that our very Calvinistic outlook demands that we retrace our steps and make some new beginnings. Public school teachers are preparing Dutch sociological readers for the third and fourth grades, and are clamoring for instruction in the ancestral tongue, instead of in German, French, or Spanish. The first foreign language in our American schools ought not to be foreign, but it should be the language of our pioneers. This is the only way to cultivate true independence, true self-reliance, true patriotism, and true humanity; but, we hasten to add, the only way also to create true Christianity, for it is in harmony with Psalm 78, and with the parental promises in our form of Baptism. There is no future for Calvinism apart from its history. There is no future for Dutch Calvinism in America apart from Dutch culture and Dutch history, for the most glorious pages of Dutch history are the struggle of the Dutch Calvinists for religious and civil liberty. The folkloristic movement is upon us, and the Calvinists of Dutch descent are not ready for it.

**DETACHED VERSUS INTEGRATED TEACHING**

Henry Van Zyl, Ph.D.

Professor of Educational Methods, Calvin College

"Whirl is King, having driven out Zeus." — Aristophanes.

"A double-minded man is unstable in all his ways." — James 1:8.

"With Whom is no variableness, neither shadow of turning." — James 1:17.

"Do not err, my beloved brethren." — James 1:16.

W HENEVER in its course throughout the ages within the boundaries of tribal life or in the larger realms of a western civilization, such as we see today, the reformers among mankind struck out for new paths with new ideas and a different emphasis on values, there were always in the main two large camps, the one clinging to the Old Institutionalism and the other staking everything on the New Individualism.

We find this antithesis among the Hebrews, whenever among them some individual despised the Covenant and turned to idols; among the Greeks, when Sophists came with a brand new gospel, "man is the measure of everything," and changed from a religious universe to a so-called scientific outlook upon life; among the leaders of the Southern Renaissance in Italy around 1400, many of whom set aside the morality and literature of the Church and worshipped pagan literature with a chief emphasis on form to be mastered even at the expense of moral right and moral wrong so that "vice ceased to wear a veil"; among the Reformation and Counter-Reformation leaders in the sixteenth century, the former shifting the emphasis from the Church to the Book and from the special class of priests to the priesthood of the believers; and among the people of today where rugged individualism in the field of economics before long covered the land in the majority of schools and colleges, where many of the teachers in elementary schools, of the instructors in high schools, and of the professors in colleges break loose from the moorings of the past and in some way or other dedicate their all in all to self-expression of themselves and their charges.

Hence, the complaint of Aristophenes quoted above, can be fittingly applied to each one of these periods where the New challenges the Old, and where whirl and chaos and confusion and strife are—at least for a season—on the throne. Now mankind cannot do without symbols; and thrones and crown—even the thrones for cherry queens and the crowns for Standard Oil Stations—are of those symbols man innately yearns for. The reasons for this innate urge is not far to seek. Man by nature longs for symbols giving expression to unity, wholeness, integration, and oneness. This urge for thrones is bound to find an expression as long as man is man. Now, the difficulty is not that there is no king, but that there are altogether too many of them. In the present world of conflicting ideas in philosophy and psychology, in natural science and art, in morality and religion, in standards of right and wrong—we are faced with a host of kings if we view the separate systems, and taking a survey of the whole we are forced to conclude that Whirl is super-king. Unity is gone.

The Problem in Education

Especially in the realm of education there is a Babel of confusion, of detachment, of division, and of practices and theories born of "winds of doctrine." Individualism would seem to reign supreme; a boundless subjectivism prevails and integration of the parts into a whole is conveniently ignored or openly scoffed at. The scientist often claims that he must be impersonal; the philosopher refuses to integrate his views with theology though both branches are identical in substance; the classroom teacher may not practice relational teaching by slowing the relations between religion and life; and a host of individuals live in one world on Sunday and in another on the other days of the week. All along the line we witness a separation of what should be one whole.

Even knowledge is one, personality is one, and truth is one, and even though we all hold that unity in thinking, in institutions, and in one's character is an ideal ever to be pursued—yet we see confusion
born of separation of what is basically one written large over textbooks in the realm of education. If Plato would rise from the grave and finish reading some two hundred modern books on principles of education, psychology, and educational psychology—supposing, of course, that he would not quit in disgust after having read a representative dozen—he might in righteous wrath upbraid the authors by accusing them of having thrown his Republic into the discard and having sacrificed all internal relations of ethics, metaphysics, and epistemology to their highly petty subjectivism.

**Modern “Scientific” Education**

Two cardinal features characterize the bulk of modern educational literature; viz., a superficial approach and treatment prompted by the desire to use only the scientific methods of quantitative investigations in imitation of research workers in the physical, chemical, and biological laboratories; and a tentativeness which leaves nearly all conclusions pertaining to the highest nature of the child dangling in mid-air. The result is that questions of ultimate reality and ethics and philosophy and religion are set aside as irrelevant. The process of disintegration and detached teaching moves one ever farther away from unity. More and more trees are observed, but no single woods. More and more specialization appears, but totality is lost. One’s horizon is shrinking. One’s perspective is narrowed. And the conflict between New Individualism and Old Institutionalism continues unabated at the expense of the latter. The individual and his experiment have ever more the right of way. He loses his sense of cosmic reality, and his world of personal interests is more and more limited. There is a process of growing detachment—away from the highest needs of man.

That this conflict is so pronounced today should not surprise us. In the first place, old institutions may cling to a dead orthodoxy and may stubbornly refuse to grow with a changing world over the road of adaptation, so much so that a new individualism insisting on reform, out of sheer reaction, may ignore all bounds and cut loose from the past as so much rubbish. But if, in the second place, educational literature preaches this New Individualism as from the house-tops, there seems to be nothing to check the flood of subjectivism. Then, of course, conflicts are bound to come.

Take, for instance, a modern situation or two. Man is an individual but also a social being. Anyone who wants to do as he pleases does, to be sure, stress his individual nature but violates his social nature, and the inevitable result is that instead of having and enjoying a much lauded freedom he can thrive only of adaptation, so much so that a new individualism on licentiousness. Anyone who refuses to grow with a changing world over the road may be readily guilty of detached teaching and may fail to provide opportunities for integrated learning. And since there are so many more ways of going or doing wrong than right in particular cases, it would seem natural that the history of education and of pedagogy would give ever so many instances of detached teaching, because the classroom teacher or professor failed to see his problem whole and taught detachedly.

**The Problem of Restoring Integration**

All of this prevailing confusion in teaching and preaching in our day of specialization—a fruitful source for detached living all along the line—should urge all teachers and preachers to render a ready ear to Dr. John Dewey, who, rightly I think, calls the problem of integration in teaching the deepest problem of modern life. In his Quest for Certainty, while he discusses the central human problem of the Good in a chapter labeled with his characteristically naturalistic terminology, “The Construction of the Good”—as though man in the role of creator is prepared to construct his own Good—he has this significant because truthful and pertinent challenge to every teacher and preacher in the land.

The problem of restoring integration and co-operation between man’s beliefs about the world in which he lives and his beliefs about the values and purposes that should direct his conduct is the deepest problem of modern life. It is the problem of any philosophy that is not isolated from that life. P. 255.

No one vitally interested in his calling of dealing with youth can escape the implications of this “deepest problem.” It is, indeed, the noble task and supreme duty of any teacher to see life whole, to teach with the compass toward integration, and to fight tooth and nail any and all enemies that coax him to teach in isolation, separation, and confusion. It is the problem of the teacher of science as well as of the teacher of religion. Both should quit themselves like men.

Meanwhile, let us never forget that with all of our enthusiasm for integration the task is a most difficult one, because we know in part, and it requires nothing less than the highest loyalty to fundamental propositions of mind and subject matter, of faith and reason, of things seen and those unseen, of the Creator and His creatures.

(In this article Dr. Van Zyl has introduced the discussion of a basic issue in all education. He will work out this theme more fully in two or three subsequent contributions.—Editor.)
THE ETHICS OF REINHOLD NIEBUHR
A CRITICISM

E. F. J. Van Halsema, Th. M.
Pastor Northside Christian Reformed Church, Passaic, N. J.

In the previous issue of The Calvin Forum I spoke of Niebuhr the Critic and Niebuhr the Physician. In this concluding article I wish to present a brief criticism of Niebuhr’s ethics.

An Appreciation

There is much in Niebuhr’s ethics we can appreciate. When Niebuhr criticizes the views of the liberal church concerning the goodness of man and the progressive victory of reason; when he insists that ethics has its ultimate standard in the will of God and that the will of God is expressed in the commandment of love; when he views life in two dimensions, measuring the depth of human depravity and scaling the heights of the transcendent ideal; when he claims that ethical fruitfulness is determined by the quality of tension between the historical and the transcendent—it seems at times as if one is reading the work of a Reformed authority on Ethics.

Here is a serious attempt to understand and deal with reality. The facts of reality, today often hidden under a shiny coat of varnish, often pictured in rosy colors, are presented by Niebuhr in their naked ugliness. His pessimistic view of reality is refreshing because it is so true.

Here is a man of action who has seen the ideal, who has no patience with complacent attitudes or with the “perverse sinners” found in every congregation “who can go into emotional ecstasies about the ‘City of God’ and yet not see how they are helping to make their city a hell-hole.” Speaking of the oriental soul as a bird, freed from its cage, with no wings to fly, and of the occidental soul as having wings but so fascinated by its gilded cage that it does not care to fly, Niebuhr, believing that the soul is the victim of the natural world, believes also that it is the master of the world. The bird must wing its way to the heights. Conditions in human society call for improvement. The ideal ever beckons to higher spheres. Mundane horizontality must be placed in the light of the transcendent. Prophetic religion must guide our feet from the depths of despair to the sunlit hills of hope.

Deeply conscious of the difficulties involved in bringing the groups of our complex society under some kind of ethical control; seeing the need of “a robust ethical idealism, an extraordinary spiritual insight and a high degree of intelligence” for the performance of the social task, Niebuhr believes that civilization needs religion, a dynamic religion, doing justice to the needs of the inner life as well as to the mundane interests of society. The other worldly aspect of religion, too, must be preserved for “a religion which is perfectly at home in the world has no counsel for it which the world could not gain by an easier method.”

This, and more, we appreciate in Niebuhr’s ethics.

Niebuhr’s Theological Presuppositions

Although Niebuhr is an “arresting critic of social strategy” rather than a systematic theological thinker, his criticisms “penetrate frequently into the assumptions of Christian social ethics far enough to become involved in theology.” Rejecting an absolute determinism, an ethical idealism unsupported by religion, the monistic as well as the dualistic view of life, he subscribes to a theism which maintains the transcendence and immanence, the creator and creature concepts. When Niebuhr teaches that man is sinful, that life must conform to the will of God, that man must learn to love and forgive, we are in hearty agreement with him. But when he elucidates his statements he gives them a content and setting which cannot be ours. We shall prove this with respect to his teachings concerning God and man.

When man must conform to the will of God, it is necessary to know that will. Niebuhr refers in his teaching oftentimes to the Bible but he does not consider the Bible the authoritative source of our knowledge concerning God and man. The Bible contains, according to him, “irrelevant precepts deriving their authority from their—sometimes quite fortuitous— inclusion in a sacred canon” and “social and moral standards which may once have had legitimate or accidental sanctity, but which have, whether legitimate or accidental, now lost both religious and moral meaning.” The story of the Fall is not regarded as actual history, Jesus entertained historical illusions and Paul’s “Christ-mysticism, bordering as it does on the very edge of the magical” is unacceptable to Niebuhr.

From this it is evident that he approaches the Bible with a subjectivity which is not compatible with the objectivity of the Bible as a norm for our conduct. The result is a terminology which is more general than specific. He calls God the transcendent One, he says that man must lean on “the transcendent realm” but fails to say that God, revealing Himself in Christ, has given us a norm for our conduct in His Word. He rejects and accepts what conforms to his own ideas. Though Niebuhr’s ethics is religiously founded, it lacks that specific Biblical definiteness and authority which we may expect in what is known, and what is taught by Niebuhr, as Christian ethics. It cannot maintain its authoritarian character when it presents itself in autonomous garb.

Man and His Sin

From Niebuhr’s diagnosis it has become clear that society’s ills are attributable to man’s sin. The man who sins must become a man who loves and forgives, if society is to be redeemed. We agree and disagree. Though Niebuhr states that man is morally responsible, that sin is rebellion against God, his view
lacks a solid foundation. How are we to know that man is responsible and sinful? We answer because the Word of God tells us of man's high origin and man's disobedience. If this is not true but if, on the other hand, man has slowly evolved through the centuries and has not yet succeeded in shaking off his animal impulses, why, we ask with Dr. H. Bavinck, should men be expected to live as children of God, if "egoistic and animalistic inclinations belong to man's nature and essence?"

Dr. Niebuhr says that the story of the Fall in Genesis, though not actual history, is a "myth," a very valuable myth. He appreciates this myth to which Christianity owes its "primary basis" and which conveys the thought that the world has a meaningful existence, that God is Creator, that life in itself is not sinful, and that the material world is good. The author of Genesis 3 employs the myth to teach the truth that man is fighting against his better self, the highest good. The story of the Fall is repeated continuously in history. The author was obviously a man of deep religious insight but he did not record history. In fact he was too sweeping in blaming man "for nature's wantonness and for the brevity and mortality of natural life."

Niebuhr calls the doctrine of original sin a doctrine "bedeviled" by Christian orthodoxy which tried "to construct a history of sin out of the concept of its inevitability" and make an account of the origin of evil out of what really is "a description of its nature." Niebuhr's contention is that inherited corruption destroys "the freedom and therefore the responsibility which is basic to the concept of sin," that the orthodox doctrine is self-destructive and that Genesis 3 does not teach an inherited corruption but an inevitable fact of human experience. Accepting the doctrine of total depravity one cannot, according to Niebuhr, maintain the sinfulness of man because sinfulness postulates freedom and responsibility on the part of the sinner.

These objections to "original sin" and "total depravity" have been made by others. We should remember, however that man in his depravity remains a free moral being. He may sin of necessity but he sins freely. Having lost the will to will the good, he acts nevertheless freely when he wills evil. "Semper est in nobis voluntas libera, sed non semper est bona."

Our objection to Niebuhr's view of man's sinfulness is that it lacks authority and factuality. Though Niebuhr is stating truths, he does not state the Truth as revealed in the Word of God. And if the diagnosis is faulty, how can the proper remedy be expected?

The Remedy for Sin

Niebuhr's remedy is love and forgiveness. Men must be redeemed from the sins of greed, fear and hatred which make life intolerable. With keen insight Niebuhr presents the need of grace and contrition but he is silent about man's regeneration by a supernatural act of God. Man's need of adjusting himself to his fellowmen is greater than that of coming in the right relationship to God. "The conversion of life which is most needed is that which will express itself in terms of the economic and political relationships in which men live." This emphasis is not the primary emphasis of the Scriptures.

These, then, are some of Niebuhr's theological presuppositions. It does not surprise us to see that Wie­man and Meland in their American Philosophies of Religion classify Niebuhr among the neo-supernaturalists, who, as the authors point out, deny that the Bible is the only infallible rule of faith and practice; who accept the historical Jesus instead of the "Christ of the Christian faith," believing that "the important thing about Jesus was not his teachings, not his ideals, not even his moral character" but "his com­plete submission to God." This neo-supernaturalism differs radically from traditional supernaturalism. Niebuhr's view of God and man is not scriptural. Hence the Christian theist, taking the Bible as his standard, has serious objections to the ethics under discussion.

Niebuhr's Ethics Applied to Society

When Niebuhr applies his love ethic to society he meets with the stubborn resistance inherent in man's nature, especially in collective man. He says society must be coerced into "tentative harmonies." This is an inconsistency in Niebuhr's thought. When love and love only is the will of God and when love implies non-resistance, as Niebuhr states, it should be followed to the very end. Niebuhr feels that this is impossible in society as it is constituted and therefore "the ideal principle must be sacrificed to guar­antee its partial realization." He says that the ques­tion of violence has two perspectives, the pragmatic and the perfectionist one, and that both have their legitimacy. The question seems to be in order to ask whether Niebuhr does not get here into difficulty because he has left the biblical foundation. God is a God of love, but He is also a God of righteousness. He has revealed precepts to man which must be obeyed. He has given the sword to the government to prevent murder and injustice, he has given the rod to the parents to correct their children. Love is indeed the fulfillment of the law but in this sinful world punitive and preventive measures must be taken lest evil gain the upperhand. A father may forgive his son but he must also punish him. The State must punish the criminal not only to save itself from self-destruction but also, and primarily, because God has commanded it. Such punishment is not a compromise of the ideal of love but it is the will of God as much as it is the will of God that we should love. Personality must be developed, protected, and defended. The murderer must be resisted, the oppressor must be opposed by non-violent or, if need be, by violent means. Forces inimical to the general welfare must be controlled. The Lord requires of us that we do justly and love mercy. Shailer Matthews may say that the Christian should give, not get, justice, Niebuhr does not agree with him. Nor do we. The Christian may not be passive. He must oppose all sin. He fights disease of soul and body, not only in the individual but also in the life of collective man. The biblical principles of social justice are his guide. He gives justice and tries to
get it. When Niebuhr advocates justice we have, of course, no objection to his doing so but we claim that such a position on his part conflicts with the love ethic he advocates. This would seem to prove that his ethic is inadequate and differs from the biblical ethic which stresses the fact that God is both love and righteousness.

On Property and Authority

Niebuhr’s ideas about property are such that he directs the full weight of his dynamic personality against capitalism, claiming that the Marxian program will “provide the only possible property system compatible with the necessities of a technical age,” a position which endangers the right of the individual to private property, a right inherent in human personality, and taught and defended in the law of God.

If need be, Niebuhr will oppose the government. Having no patience with Barth’s “luxury of pessimism,” he follows Brunner in the use of techniques which aim at necessary adjustments in the social world. No religious scruples withhold him from setting aside Romans 13. The Calvinist, even though he recognizes “the holy right of rebellion,” cannot allow any tampering with this foundation stone of authority. The danger of Niebuhr’s position is that since a solid basis is lacking there is nothing to check eventual practical measures except one’s own reason.

Niebuhr has no hope for society other than that some time “the ark will land” after the turbulent social flood. He has no basis for that hope other than his faith in the triumph of love. He misses the assurance that the City of God will be perfected by Jesus Christ. He makes no mention of the New Jerusalem, the City of Righteousness, over the gates of which the erstwhile inscription “posse non pessare” of Paradise Lost has been replaced by the words of glorious reality “non posse pessare” of Paradise Regained.

Final Evaluation

When Edwin E. Aubrey states “the theology of Reinhold Niebuhr embodies a dangerous divorce of collective ethics from individual theology,” we do not readily concur. It is true his ethic is a social ethic, but it is equally true that Niebuhr is interested in the ethical change of the individual. In his Interpretation of Christian Ethics he devotes a whole chapter to “Love and the Individual.” Our criticism is of a different kind.

Although Niebuhr’s ethic is a challenge to the modern church with its superficial analyses, to the orthodox church with its complacent attitudes and oftentimes gross neglect of the social field, our objection is that Niebuhr’s presuppositions, though similar to, are not identical with those of an ethic based on the Word of God. Divorced from biblical moorings Niebuhr’s ethic fails to do justice to the individual, resorts to techniques which conflict with the Scriptures and fails to do justice to society. His remedy and strategies have lost the christian flavor.

The Calvinism which Niebuhr appreciates, criticizes, and scorces; the Calvinism which proves itself, far from being “a petrified dogmatism,” a virile power especially in brave little Holland, possesses the virtues and lacks the weaknesses of Niebuhr’s ethics. Calvinists may never have attained the full-orbed life of the individual and society, but Calvinism is satisfied with nothing less.

ONLY OBEY

“I long for an experience,” this one said;
“I cannot feel that I am saved,” she cried;
“And I can never understand it all”
The skeptic then replied.

To these my answer is the same, and simple:
Only obey;
Wait not for God to give you an experience
Heed Him today.

He has commanded us to search the Scriptures
They testify of Him;
The Word was flesh and it has dwelt among us
With touch of seraphim.
That channel is the path of deep experience,
His word will give you proof if you are saved
And in obedience you will find Him dearer
Than anything you had.
Then you may still not fully comprehend Him
How can a finite reach the Infinite!
But Jesus will stoop down to our misgivings
And give us faith for it.

Only obey—this is the simple answer
To every cry of human hesitance;
Less than the dust, we are the wayward creatures
Of His Omnipotence.

And shall we dare defy with puny phrases
His Holy Word today?
Or shall we reach the heights in being willing
Just to obey?

—JOAN GEISEL GARDNER.

QUIETNESS

Let me learn quietness, a gentle voice
Refraimed from speaking guile, or passing on
Unkindness, or the questioning upon
Someone’s dear reputation, but rejoice
To give another by a word of cheer
A ray of hope and light to lift his fear.

Let me learn quietness, a gentle mien,
The meekness of the Christ, that silent strength
Of patience that endures, until at length
The enemy is won to heart serene;
Make me a vessel fitted for thy Word,
Thy confidence my joy and strength, O Lord.

—JOAN GEISEL GARDNER.
The Rise of Fundamentalism

It is true that we Presbyterians in these days have little to boast about and much of which to be ashamed. There exists, however, just as clear a distinction between modern Presbyterianism and true Presbyterianism as between Christendom and genuine Christianity. The past fifty years have been the most disastrous in the history of Reformed Presbyterianism. The same period has witnessed the rise of what is popularly termed Fundamentalism, as a party, factor, or faction in evangelical Protestantism.

Fundamentalism—I refer particularly to it as it exists apart from the historic denominations of Protestantism—is rapidly coming to be considered by many as synonymous with aggressive evangelistic and missionary activity. It is an outstanding phenomenon in contemporary religious history. It has attained such a state of maturity and is so well equipped with the instruments of publicity and with capable and scholarly exponents that it can well afford to listen without panic to anything here said which may be heard beyond the audience for which it is intended.

If the denominations be considered as individual steps in the ladder of approach to the divine ideal for the Church on earth, then of course, in our view, our own is the nearest approach to that ideal. If, however, the ideal be considered as the centre point of a target, there may possibly be others equally close to that centre. If the latter presents the truer picture, then we should at once adopt what is best in the others and thus advance to a still closer position. The others have nothing of value which we may not legitimately appropriate. In fact we must do so if we are true to our own creed. If Fundamentalism has anything we ought to have, let us by all means have it, but it is quite unnecessary for us to throw away our own distinctive attainments. Neither is it at all necessary that all the Presbyterians within a nation be included in one nation-wide organization. It may be that we shall have to discard much that is not at all essential to true Presbyterianism.

Scotch Presbyterianism—Its Apostasy

The rise of Fundamentalism has been contemporaneous with the apostacy of Presbyterianism. This is the phenomenon which confronts us as we survey the fifty years which have just passed. There is a cause. Something was amiss in Presbyterianism fifty years ago. We can study it best in the land which has been its most congenial home. Fifty years ago Presbyterianism was supreme in Scotland, but it declined because of the failure of its leadership in at least four particulars, the first three of which we shall merely mention and proceed to discuss the fourth more particularly, for it is here the house-cleaning will probably have to begin.

First, it surrendered the oversight of the education of its children to a Ritualistic, Anglo-catholic, Methodist, Materialistic parliament at London. Second, its aggressively conservative leaders surrendered the education of the ministry to teachers who ridiculed or undermined her historic documents, while its more moderate conservatives connived at a process of doctrinal and moral laxity and even of criminal larceny in high places unsurpassed for effrontery in the history of Christendom. Third, it failed to appreciate and appropriate that which was of value in English Puritanism and Methodism and in the revivals of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries which culminated in the visits of Moody and Sankey. Fourth, it assimilated many questionable things which came in with the last named revival, from Congregational, Methodist, and Plymouthist circles.

It is with this last defection of Presbyterianism that we are now more immediately concerned.

Moody's Successors

During the present year the centenary of Moody's birth is being celebrated. Fifty years ago Moody was at the height of his popularity and influence. As Calvin may be considered the Apostle of Reformed Presbyterianism, so is Moody the Apostle of Modern Fundamentalism. Modern Fundamentalism is the result of the failures of Presbyterianism. Fundamentalist leadership, scholarship and finance have been recruited chiefly from Presbyterian circles. Shall we then surrender our Presbyterianism and go over to the Fundamentalists? Shall we leave Calvin and follow Moody?

We may freely grant that Moody was a great man without endorsing the verdict of "The Christian" of London, England, which begins its Moody Centenary number with this on the birth of Moody. "Since apostolic times no event in the history of the Christian Church has proved of greater moment." This business of placing one mere man in the Church above another is hardly Christian and is characteristic of many features of Modern Fundamentalism which would have been repugnant to D. L. Moody. If we assert that those today who are eulogizing D. L. Moody and operating the institutions which he founded have to a large extent abandoned his doctrinal position and his moral principles it may be that we are doing more in praise of Moody than all the hero-worship which is being lavished on him in print during the current celebrations.
Let us look first at the sphere of conduct, and remember that we are speaking to Presbyterians. We are warning them not against Moody, but against his successors. By his successors we do not now mean any individual person, publication or institution, except as specifically named herein, we mean non-denominational Fundamentalism as a whole, as represented by the majority of its leaders, Boards, or Associations.

**Conduct and Biblical Interpretation**

We shall compare the position of Moody with that of his successors from the point of view of orthodox Presbyterianism. In the case of Moody his moral principles were scriptural while some of his methods of evangelism were open to question. In the case of his successors their moral principles are unscriptural while their methods are open to question.

Presbyterianism has a very explicit standard of orthodoxy. Scripture is the ultimate standard, while the subordinate standards are the Westminster Confession and the Catechisms. Let us take the shortest and simplest—a document which should be found in every Presbyterian home—The Shorter Catechism.

Forty of the one hundred and seven questions in The Shorter Catechism deal with the Ten Commandments. D. L. Moody wrote a book on the Decalogue entitled Weighed and Wanting (London edition, Weighed in the Balances) a volume which is not only in full harmony with the moral principles of Presbyterianism but with those of the earlier evangelical Anglicans, Methodists, Baptists and Congregationalists. The successors of Moody have discarded the Decalogue, considered as an explicit and objective moral code or as a complete summary of moral obligation for all men.

Conduct must conform with doctrine and Christian doctrine must be based on Biblical Interpretation. The moral principles of Moody's successors are unscriptural but we believe the men themselves are honest. They base their principles on what they believe to be the correct interpretation of Scripture. The difference then between Moody and his successors is that each adopt different systems of interpretation. Moody's was the orthodox method. His successors have adopted a method which compels them among other things to abandon the Ten Commandments, as noted above.

If Moody could come back to the class-rooms of the Moody Institute and of many of the Bible Colleges identified with Modern Fundamentalism, and hear some of the doctrines which are there taught and then look over the shelves of the publishing department of the Institution which he founded, he would find that the people now in control have acted in somewhat the same manner as the Modernists in our Presbyterian institutions. They have not eliminated all that is orthodox,—they have even published Weighed and Wanting—but they have introduced new principles of morality and a new method of interpretation which changes the meaning of a large part of Scripture. Some of them are, like the Modernists, propagating heresy with the help of the endowments and equipment contributed by orthodox Christians.

**Dabney on Moody**

History that is partial is not true history. I have no recollection of having seen in print anything in criticism of D. L. Moody by a living author who professes loyalty to our Reformed Faith. Moody was not without criticism from such sources during his lifetime. With the criticism from Ritualistic, Sacerdotal and Modernistic sources we are not now concerned. Criticism from orthodox circles should be interesting even were it not instructive.

The late Robert L. Dabney, D. D., LL. D., Professor of Moral Philosophy in the University of Texas, and for many years Professor of Theology in Union Theological Seminary in Virginia, was a man whose praise is still in all orthodox circles throughout the land. He writes:

"Intelligent Christians will watch the results of these mammoth meetings with interest, that 'by their fruits we may know them.' It is probably impossible to eliminate the chaff from the wheat as yet in the reported results in Great Britain. No one is competent to decide how much of the apparent enthusiasm was due to curiosity, to animal sympathy, to a species of religious fashion and social furor, to the impressive stimulus of vast multitudes singing or agitated with a common impulse, and how much to divine truth and sanctifying grace. We have seen the London press, with Mr. Spurgeon, after six months' experience, pronouncing the successes in that city delusive. It is very apparent that the supporters of the effort in Brooklyn were disappointed, though loth to confess their failure. We incline to the conclusion that this method, with its monster congregations and extraordinary incidents, is mistaken; that it will prove a waste of money and labor as compared with the more humble and unobtrusive, but permanently fruitful, work of parochial laborers, and that it will be found more promotive of an unwholesome religious dissipation than of holy living". (Discussions by R. L. Dabney, D. D., Vol. 2, p. 95.)

**Kennedy on Moody's Work**

Let us now hear a different type of man: a successful pastor and evangelist, an intimate friend of Spurgeon, who left behind evidence of the effectiveness of his own methods. No name is better known or more highly honored in orthodox circles today in the northern half of Scotland than that of the man who spoke as follows:

"'Not with observation' cometh 'the kingdom of God' when, in the power of the Holy Ghost, it entereth into men's hearts, and is established there. How altogether secret is the visit of the Holy Spirit! How mysterious is His work 'in secret' when He cometh! How far is the Consciousness of the convinced sinner, from giving any indication of the coming of 'the Kingdom of God'? Sin and Satan are reigning and raging within him.
Now, as never before, is he conscious of the power that works in opposition to the kingdom—to the will and to the grace—of God. . . . He can expose his wound unreservedly only to the Lord, or partially in friendly conference with one whom he regards as well acquainted with the troubles of a wounded spirit.

“What a contrast to this is the labour employed by men in these days, to make as ostentatious as possible the progress of what they call the Lord’s work.' With placards and advertisements the coming of the Revivalists is announced, choirs are trained to add the attraction of a concert . . . . Before assembled crowds, inquirers and converts are paraded, and they seem well inclined to be the victims of the unwise display. ‘Cases' are hurriedly and rudely handled, amidst the excitement of an inquiry room; and so-called ‘inquiring' are often ready to tell out their case, to any trumper who may be presumptuous enough to deal with them. And a proclamation is made of results throughout the land. And this they call the coming of ‘the kingdom of God!' So they say, but Jesus saith, ‘the kingdom of God COMETH NOT WITH OBSERVATION.'

“In these days the vines have ceased to be flourishing, and ‘the keepers of the vineyard' have taken to mushroom rearing, the decay in the vineyard having furnished the soil that suits that kind of growth; and yet they lack skill to discern whether the produce of their labour is poisonous or safe, which makes their culture a rather dangerous kind of work. But the rapid growths shall be followed by as rapid a decay, resulting in such a polluting of the atmosphere of the vineyard, that nothing healthful and delicate can thrive in it—for all that is healthful is delicate, and cannot endure rude treatment or an atmosphere which carnality has tainted.” (Sermons, Rev. J Kennedy, D. D., pp. 291-2.)

“By their Fruits ye shall Know Them”

The visits of Moody and Sankey to Scotland divided the Presbyterians into three parties. One party enthusiastically supporting, one indifferent, and a minority hostile to the American visitors. It is significant that the circles which supported Moody are now almost wholly Modernistic or Non-Presbyterian while the circles who opposed him are still loyal to the historic Reformed Faith and to the older methods of worship and evangelism. These latter are the circles which constitute the backbone of orthodox Presbyterianism in Scotland today.

If we look at the United States we find that approximately the same conditions exist. Those who today are most true to the Reformed Faith are those who were either not affected by, or who resisted the new methods. It is well-known that Moody came from a Congregational and Unitarian environment and thus ended up closer to the orthodox position than he was when he began. The burden of our criticism must therefore rest on our conservative leaders who failed to direct his wonderful evangelistic zeal into true Scriptural channels. We need a Moody, but we need one who will bring us still closer to the fidelity that Christ requires from those who would worship and serve Him acceptably. It is essential to any adequate study of D. L. Moody to take account of the facts and views expressed in the quotations we have given above.

Methods and Morality

Methods may sometimes, because of our ignorance, have to be judged by their fruits. But there exists a very different criterion for moral conduct—an explicit objective code, The Ten Commandments. James writes, “For whatsoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all.” It is right here that the recognition of such a code touches the quick in our modern consciousness. Here our personal loyalty to Christ is tested; to these “all things whatsoever” that He has commanded. It may be comparatively easy to renounce and denounce theft, murder, vice and avarice. It is not so easy in modern business or society to devote one day in seven exclusively to God or to act as if the non-observance of the Fourth Commandment is specifically sin. The tendency is to look around for a way of escape. If we can fit that way into a passably orthodox creed or system of interpretation, so much the better.

The Modernist has discovered one way of removing the difficulty. His method is much more honest and also more easily detected and refuted in the Presbyterian Church than the method adopted by many Fundamentalists. We cannot here enter further into this question except to say that the ingenuity employed by some to escape the implications of the Fourth Commandment rivals for brilliancy the cleverest work of skeptical and Jesuitical scholarship. They have also discovered that a stick of dynamite will destroy in a moment that which may take years to replace.

But whatever may be said—and there will be differences of opinion—as to the Scripturalness, the propriety or the fruits of those new methods brought into prominence by the Moody and Sankey revivals, the assertion is here made, with every confidence in its accuracy, that if Moody had inoculated the moral principles and preached the doctrines now rampant in the institutions which he founded and among his successors in nondenominational Fundamentalism generally his name would never have become as it has, a highly honoured one in Evangelical Protestantism.

But—and this is the important lesson for us—the worst enemies of true Presbyterianism and of the true Faith are not these successors of Moody whom we have defined, but Presbyterians—even Fundamentalists—who repudiate by their teaching, or nullify by their indifference or their conduct, those principles of morality so plainly and faithfully expounded by D. L. Moody in the little book of his which we have cited.
Holland Again has a Christian Government.

The elections for the second chamber secured a majority of 56 out of a hundred seats for the Christian political parties: 17 for the anti-Revolutionaries or progressive protestants, 8 for the Christian historicals or conservative protestants, and 31 for the Roman Catholics. The premier, Dr. Hendrikus Colijn, a son of the secession church of 1834, tried again to form a cabinet with the help of the conservative and progressive liberals, represented by ten members. But as one American paper had it, with the help of the Socialists, because they want a radical departure from historical lines in economics. Colijn, however, did not succeed this time in including the liberals in his cabinet because they insisted on strict neutrality for the government as a whole, and on the liberty for themselves to make plain to the nation that politics has nothing to do with Christianity. The outcome was that Colijn formed a cabinet of which two members are anti-revolutionaries, two christian historicals, four Catholics, and one neutral member for the department of aquatic engineering, who had no objection to the cabinet's open stand for the conservation of the Christian fundamentals of national life. Holland stands as a unique example in the modern world of a country with an outspoken christian government. Also as an example of the application of Calvinism to politics. We may take courage.

A Novel on Colijn.

A so-called biographical novel on the life of Colijn has been published by Bosch and Kenning at Baarn, Netherlands, the title Levensroman Van Dr. H. Colijn by Rudolf Van Reest. The book is illustrated with seventy photos and sells at an acceptable price. He ought to find some readers in America for it has been recommended unstintingly. But still better would be an English translation. Colijn is a world figure in Christianity. The idea that the new philosophy would mean a virtual denial of the doctrine of common grace seems to be unfounded. Vollenhoven and Dooge weerd take pains at every occasion to bring out that they hold on to this Calvinistic truth, and even the Rev. S. G. De Graaf who attacked the term “algemeene genade” wrote in his article on “The Grace of God and the Structure of Creation” in Philosophia Reformata, 1936, I, that “we must continue to build on what Calvin taught about general and particular grace,” and he concluded his article as follows:

“The unbelievers certainly know about the divine things, about the unseen things, about His eternal power and divinity in order that they might have no excuse (Romans 1, 20), and God was good to the heathen nations in order that they might seek Him, or that they might touch and find Him (Acts 17, 24), but Himself they know not, and His name they know not.”

The New Calvinistic Philosophy.

For those who are interested in the development of the new Calvinistic philosophy we continue to recommend the Philosophia Reformata, the philosophical quarterly published at J. H. Kok’s at Kampen, Netherlands. The last issue (1937, II) contains a brilliant article by Prof. Dooge weerd on the relation of the categories of thought and the categories of life.

For a popular scientific exposition of the Sphere Sovereignty Philosophy we recommend Christelijke Haatsidee by Prof. Dooge weerd, published by the Libertas Drukkerij at Rotterdam, and procurable at Zondervan’s Bookstore (815 Franklin St., Grand Rapids, Mich.). This is a most enlightening booklet which ought to be in the hands of every intelligent Calvinist, for it contains a brief and clear analysis of the difference between Greek, Catholic, Humanistic, Lutheran, and Calvinistic conceptions of the State besides a short review of the new Calvinistic epistemology. It was written for Calvinistic propaganda clubs, and has already enjoyed a second edition. For America we ought to have an English translation, for no Reformed student or layman can really afford to be ignorant of its contents.

The new philosophy provokes criticism as well as appreciation. Professor Hepp seems to have stopped his attacks in a series of brochures at the request of the Board of Trustees of the Free University of Amsterdam. But now two new pamphlets are out, both published at Kok’s, one to condemn the new views as unrefuted, and another to defend them as scriptural. The first one is entitled Philosophia Deformata by Dr. H. Steen, and the second, Op Gods Woord Gerond, by the Rev. J. M. Spier. Dr. Steen rejects the antithesis of Scriptural and Unscriptural philosophy as made by Prof. Vollenhoven.

The idea that the new philosophy would mean a virtual denial of the doctrine of common grace seems to be unfounded. Vollenhoven and Dooge weerd take pains at every occasion to bring out that they hold on to this Calvinistic truth, and even the Rev. S. G. De Graaf who attacked the term “algemeene genade” wrote in his article on “The Grace of God and the Structure of Creation” in Philosophia Reformata, 1936, I, that “we must continue to build on what Calvin taught about general and particular grace,” and he concluded his article as follows:

“The unbelievers certainly know about the divine things, about the unseen things, about His eternal power and divinity in order that they might have no excuse (Romans 1, 20), and God was good to the heathen nations in order that they might seek Him, or that they might touch and find Him (Acts 17, 24), but Himself they know not, and His name they know not.”

Common Grace and Christian Scientific Knowledge.

At the recent annual academic meeting of the Free University of Amsterdam Prof. Dr. V. Hepp unfolded some theses, of which we quote the following:

3. The basis for the unity of scientific knowledge is revelation.

4. This revelation comprises both the revelation of God in nature and history, and particular revelation before and after the fall of man.

7. Any knowledge (wetenschap) which does not recognize this revelation, must be looked upon as pseudo knowledge.
8. God through his common grace has taken care of this, that pseudo knowledge does not reject all apriori judgments of revelation, but accepts some of them. Accordingly, pseudo knowledge possesses some fragments of true knowledge. Christian knowledge should enrich itself with these fragments. But, even if Christian knowledge needs these fragments, and even if Christian university and college professors ought to cooperate in some way or other with those who do not recognize the principle of revelation, this necessity does not create a neutral zone.

In Memoriam Jan Zwart, Dutch Organist.

Jan Zwart, the organist of a Lutheran cathedral at Amsterdam, must be looked upon as a calvinistic artist: for his defense of the Reformed fathers, who abolished organ music in the church services rather than have bad music; for his defense of the famous Calvinist Jan Pieter Sweelinck, who laid the foundation of organ music by insisting on a counter-melody for the pedal; and for his untiring efforts to demand a place in the sun for choral preludes based on Genevan psalms which for centuries have been sung by Calvinists not only in the Netherlands, but in many more countries. Not the least for his last labors which caused also others like Cor Kee and Willem Oranje to write striking preludes in the modern style, and perhaps Andriessen to write organ sonatas of a sterling quality, Jan Zwart deserves to be commemorated throughout the Calvinistic world. There is a subtle beauty hidden in the Genevan psalms, and we may say in the Dutch psalms, for not only have the Dutch maintained them as no other group, but most of the melodies are based on original Dutch songs and carols; there is a subtle beauty hidden in these sturdy Dutch chorales which we have hardly begun to realize, and Dr. Winfred Douglas points out in his recent book on Church Music in History and Practice. Too long have we labored under the impression that the

Genevan psalms were the only music the world has ever received out of Calvinist hands. We had forgotten that the Calvinist Sweelinck is really the father of true organ music, and that the Calvinist psalms and songs—we need only mention the well-known melody of Valeries, We Gather Together, or We Praise Thee, O God, Our Redeemer Creator—contain themes which will be exhausted by composers in centuries to come. If we ought to have church music in church services, as Jan Zwart and Winfred Douglas contend, let us not forget that Bach has only a few selections based on "Dutch" chorales, and that there are new Dutch composers who have created a wealth of beautiful preludes, based on genuine Calvinistic melodies. We owe this development to Jan Zwart.

GRIEVE THIS WAY

"The creation itself also shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the liberty of the glory of the children of God."—Romans 8:21.

No longer shall this warblers song trill forth
Midst the medley of ev'ning choristers;
His body, pulsing with an inner worth,
Once poured from flute-like throat throbbing raptures.
His soul within was not a denizen,
Dilating forth it reigned ethereal,
He trebled lays the Lord instilled in him,
As tho' to blend with those sidereal!
Smeared with blood, his body limp and flimsy,
He lies in the dust by the highway, dead.
Hush! from the woods a soft toned melody,
No dirge is that, for by this soft tune lead,
More tongues join in tuneful expectation,
Heralding the glorified creation!

—Henry R. Idsinga.

LETTERS

Criticism and Appreciation

Dear Dr. Bouma:

Your editorial on recent happenings in the Presbyterian Church of America hits the nail pretty squarely on the head. As I see it, Arminianism is as much an issue as Dispensationalism, but, of course, the two are by no means unrelated. You are absolutely right when you say that the question for the P. C. A. is whether or not it really means to be Presbyterian. Recent events are evidence that it does.

Congratulations on the Forum's success. Its policy has always seemed a bit vague to me. Evidently not all the articles that have appeared could pass the muster of Calvinism, and some of the book reviews have been too uncritical. But the Forum is definitely a class by itself. It is serving a unique purpose. And it has published a great many excellent contributions. May it flourish increasingy.

Fraternally yours,

R. B. KUIPER.


Falstaff in Geneva

Sirs:

Mr. Kruthoff's article, "Falstaff in Geneva," [The Calvin Forum, Aug., 1937] is the finest expression of the enlightened young Calvinist's outlook that I have ever encountered. I hope all intelligent young Calvinists will read it, and take heart.

HERO BRAT.

Marion, Mich.

Appreciation

Gentlemen:

We find your paper stimulating and informing, a welcome addition to our home reading material. Thanks to the editors who do such constructive and difficult work in addition to their numerous other duties. May the Holy Spirit give abundant guidance.

EDWARD J. WOLTERS.

Hope College, Holland, Mich.
A Protestant Reformed Church

The Calvin Forum.

Gentlemen:

I came close to resolving to ask you to please cancel my subscription. At the time I subscribed, I looked forward to something different from what your magazine is presenting from month to month. Your articles, though as a rule well-written, are too general. What they, as a whole, lack is thoroughness of treatment and depth of insight. One reason for this is that they are too brief for an adequate development of the subjects dealt with. Then, too, your articles lack that special Reformed color.

Occasionally an article appears that was placed merely to fill space. At least this is my impression. Take, for example, that article from the pen of Luther Craig Long, and appearing in The Forum for the month of July. I have no fault to find with this production, but what is there really in it for us readers? What food for thought? What new ideas? The content of your paper should measure up to the literary and scholastic achievements of the members of your illustrious editorial staff. But does it? And what is the trouble with many of the members of your staff? Why do not more of them write?

But for all this, I wish to continue reading your magazine. My desire is that this thread of contact between you and me remain intact.

Respectfully yours,

G. M. OP Hoff.

Byron Center, Mich.

The Lodge Question

Dear Dr. Bowma:

I hasten to renew my subscription. Just returned from Fort DuPont, Del., where I was stationed for a few weeks. I have enjoyed the articles in The Forum very much. Permit me to make a few suggestions. Avoid articles that say the same thing in different words. Do not fail to comment on the shortage of space. At least give us something new (not ballyhoo) on the lodge question. I would be very helpful to your readers. What food for thought? What new ideas? The theme of the month is "Scholastic Achievements of the Members of Your Illustrious Society." I remain intact.

My desire is that this thread of contact between you and me remain intact. At least give us something new (not ballyhoo) on the lodge question. I would be very helpful to your readers. What food for thought? What new ideas? The theme of the month is "Scholastic Achievements of the Members of Your Illustrious Society." I remain intact.

Cordially yours,

CAPT. P. C. J. GOREE, 36th Engs.

Albany, N. Y.

Righteous Indignation and a Request

My Dear Dr. Bowma:

I have read your very interesting public reply to my letter and the rather flattering character analysis it contained. I may further add that I do not reply that matters of this kind are not always discussed in The Forum for the month of July. I have no fault to find with this production, but what is there really in it for us readers? What food for thought? What new ideas? The content of your paper should measure up to the literary and scholastic achievements of the members of your illustrious editorial staff. But does it? And what is the trouble with many of the members of your staff? Why do not more of them write?

But for all this, I wish to continue reading your magazine. My desire is that this thread of contact between you and me remain intact.

Respectfully yours,

G. M. OP Hoff.

Byron Center, Mich.

Righteous Indignation and a Request

My Dear Dr. Bowma:

I hasten to renew my subscription. Just returned from Fort DuPont, Del., where I was stationed for a few weeks. I have enjoyed the articles in The Forum very much. Permit me to make a few suggestions. Avoid articles that say the same thing in different words. Do not fail to comment on the shortage of space. At least give us something new (not ballyhoo) on the lodge question. I would be very helpful to your readers. What food for thought? What new ideas? The theme of the month is "Scholastic Achievements of the Members of Your Illustrious Society." I remain intact.

My desire is that this thread of contact between you and me remain intact. At least give us something new (not ballyhoo) on the lodge question. I would be very helpful to your readers. What food for thought? What new ideas? The theme of the month is "Scholastic Achievements of the Members of Your Illustrious Society." I remain intact.

Cordially yours,

CAPT. P. C. J. GOREE, 36th Engs.

Albany, N. Y.

Anent Communism and Strikers

My Dear Mr. Editor:

Permit me to congratulate The Calvin Forum upon the many scholarly articles that have found their way into its pages. I have read with especial profit and interest such articles as deal with the socio-economic problems of our time.

In your October issue Dr. Hyma, in his article "The Bull's Eye," suggests that "Communism is a fallacy," and that the sit-down strike is "symptomatic of Communism." I hasten to renew my subscription. Just returned from Fort DuPont, Del., where I was stationed for a few weeks. I have enjoyed the articles in The Forum very much. Permit me to make a few suggestions. Avoid articles that say the same thing in different words. Do not fail to comment on the shortage of space. At least give us something new (not ballyhoo) on the lodge question. I would be very helpful to your readers. What food for thought? What new ideas? The theme of the month is "Scholastic Achievements of the Members of Your Illustrious Society." I remain intact.

My desire is that this thread of contact between you and me remain intact. At least give us something new (not ballyhoo) on the lodge question. I would be very helpful to your readers. What food for thought? What new ideas? The theme of the month is "Scholastic Achievements of the Members of Your Illustrious Society." I remain intact.

Cordially yours,

CAPT. P. C. J. GOREE, 36th Engs.

Albany, N. Y.

The Lodge Question

Dear Dr. Bowma:

I hasten to renew my subscription. Just returned from Fort DuPont, Del., where I was stationed for a few weeks. I have enjoyed the articles in The Forum very much. Permit me to make a few suggestions. Avoid articles that say the same thing in different words. Do not fail to comment on the shortage of space. At least give us something new (not ballyhoo) on the lodge question. I would be very helpful to your readers. What food for thought? What new ideas? The theme of the month is "Scholastic Achievements of the Members of Your Illustrious Society." I remain intact.

My desire is that this thread of contact between you and me remain intact. At least give us something new (not ballyhoo) on the lodge question. I would be very helpful to your readers. What food for thought? What new ideas? The theme of the month is "Scholastic Achievements of the Members of Your Illustrious Society." I remain intact.

Cordially yours,

CAPT. P. C. J. GOREE, 36th Engs.

Albany, N. Y.
one cares to have it point to. The author might have reasoned with equal logic: "Speeders are law-breakers. Sit-down strikers are law-breakers. Hence, "sit-downers" are "speeders" (or, "sit-downing") is symptomatic of "speeding"!"

At this point the reader begins to wonder whether it is not just barely possible that the sit-down strike may be symptomatic of something else? Economic insecurity, perhaps? Some kind of "terrific resentment," perhaps? Let me hasten to say that I am not suggesting that these men be given a raise in wages. Perish the thought! For, of course, they "have neither the intelligence nor the industry nor the integrity to use the money properly," as the writer observes.

The author's natural retort to this will be, "I mean only to point out an analogy. What happened in Italy is likely to happen here. I see symptoms."

The answer must be that there is no true analogy. For, judging from the Fascist (?) sources which are quoted, the Italian strikers were already communists before ever they attempted to take over management of the factories. Have the American strikers dispossessed the factory owners or taken over the management of industry? Can the author, without begging the question at issue, provide his readers with genuine and dispassionate evidence that the American sit-down strikers are Communists, or that their leaders are Communists, or that the Communists are "enabling" the strike? His binding vaguely at a radical "atmosphere" in the labor camp or about the White House will hardly serve the purpose. The "atmosphere" about the universities, too, has long been under suspicion—the suspicion that their economic philosophies are ancillary to the economic interests of an owning class.

But even if it were granted that the unsuccessful Italian experiment happened two decades ago and our own situation have something in common, it still does not follow that any inference can be made such as "strikers' disrespect for property leads to Communism. The author, by making this inference, turns it into the fact that non causal or "false cause." He observes some kind of relation between the two and promptly infers that it is a causal connection. He argues that wherever the asphalt melted there was a heavy mortality among infants from what was popularly called "summer sickness" and involved hypothesis tending to establish a causal connection between melted asphalt and "summer sickness!" Later, of course, it was discovered that the relationship is only a causal analogy, and our own situation have something quite different from melted asphalt.

One of the ironic features of the author's discussion of the Italian experiment appears to be that his complaint is that it was not successful. His horror of the American sit-down strike is, obviously, that it may be successful. But there is no need of exposing additional fallacies. The article is an amusingly transparent example of wishful, and not of logical, thinking.

At the risk of seeming a little "school-marmy," I would like to suggest to the author that, after satisfying his harmless fancy for consulting authorities of the far-away and long-ago, he acquire a certain amount of supplementary insight into the matter by putting himself directly in touch with the American labor movement. Joining the C. I. A., or six months' work in a factory, or even a day on the picket line would assist him mightily in keeping his subsequent arguments in focus.

There occurs a charming little verse in one of Ebenezer Elliott's "Corn Law Hymns," which it may not be amiss to quote. It reads:

"To fall'n humanity our Father said,
That food and bliss should not be found unsought;
That man should labor for his daily bread;
But not that man should toil and sweat for nought."

My second, and chief, point of criticism may be briefly stated. It is that I see no sort of justification for calling in religion, or things Calvinistic, to bolster up an argument that—From the point of view of logic—is wholly fallacious. Obviously, a persuasive air of sanctity is easily achieved by a few prudent references to the Bible and Dr. Abraham Kuyper, or by making a generous use of such phrases as "sacred," "holy," and "hallowed" rights of property, and the like. But what leads the author to believe that readers of THE CALVIN FORUM are taken in by such "insinuations" as "the thought! For, mere Christian thinking act out as an argument and embellished with religious phrases and allusion? Since when has Calvinism laid off its historic respect for a well-reasoned, valid argument to wallow in sentimental and musty phrases?

Why should the author suppose Calvinists can be frightened or persuaded by such musty phrases? Or why should Calvinists suppose, without good argument, that God is to be worshipped on the flanks of the multi-millionaires and the men with a hundred houses? Since when has He forsaken the poor, despaired and oppressed—the men in the author's quoted words, "with no eas' or drudgery Kate. And since when has Calvinism become a kind of Let's wife, a pillar of salt, for ever standing still and looking backward with unholy nostalgia at the doomed Gomorrah's of a bygone age? Since when?"

DIANA DE KRYGER-MONSMA.

Johns Hopkins University,
Baltimore, Md.

BOOK REVIEWS

A PHILOSOPHER ON INDIVIDUALISM


Our economic order having broken down it was to be expected, three or four years ago, that men should turn against the Liberalism and Individualism which fostered it, and that they should find it wanting. Crises do not lend themselves to calm discussion, they tend rather to short circuit thinking. It is characteristic of our inability to understand and to evaluate justly that some of us should indeed have considered Individualism to have been altogether inadequate to meet the needs of a new day. When the turn of events and particularly the influence of class or position causes us to lose our heads the quiet but penetrating criticisms of the philosopher of history may, however, give us pause. Hocking's title, The Lasting Elements of Individualism, might as well, had it been written a year or two earlier, have been exchanged for one such as, The Ineptness of Modern Liberalism, or The Blindness of Present-Day Individualism. For his book, although in the main positive, deals at great length with the weaknesses of Individualism.

Really a treatise on the philosophy of history this little volume devotes a large part of its discussion to the principle of the "dialectic" in history. It presents in brief Hegel's view of human history as a long, continuous argument. Progress, as students of this view of history know, "is not a steady forward motion, but an alternating movement." "An idea incompletely valid will lead by reaction to an opposing mode of thought; the thesis calls forth an antithesis." In this "slow tacking progress" the race has had to mingle thought with experience, its logic "spread out through long stretches of time." This is not the trial and error experience of the pragmatist but "a form of experience in which each imperfect thought furnishes a clue to its successor." Hocking having presented Hegel's philosophy of history in this way points out the difference between Hegel's and Marx's application of the dialectic, Hegel's dominant theme of the historical argument being given as thought, metaphysical truth and human duty, Marx's as "economic efficiency and the consequent ordering of society."

Recent history does not conform to either Hegel's or Marx's conception of the dialectic, according to Hocking, but does call for renewed emphasis on a real dialectic—"an appeal to thought filed experience rather than a blind groping." This latter is for Hocking, however, a "consecutive induction" rather than a consecutive deduction or a forcing of an a-priori mold upon the facts.
After reviewing the history of Liberalism and finding the roots of Individualism, not in the rise of the middle class and in the Industrial Revolution as did Marx, but in the enfranchisement of the individual who in the Middle Ages came gradually to know himself as a face man, no longer belonging either to bishop or to lord, Hocking surveys the Liberalism of John Stuart Mill, and then points out the weakness of the dialectic of Mill on the one hand and of Karl Marx by contrast on the other.

The enthusiastic follower of Mill will be interested to read that Mill "appears to us today as a thinker of fine mold, standing on the edge of a turn in the lane of history, and sublimely unaware not only of what was happening, but of the fact that he bore the seeds of that change in himself." Thus Mill was, it seems, unaware of the world for which he was prescribing. But this is not all,—liberal as he intended to be, Mill laid down, as Hocking subtly points out, an "illiberal basis" for his plea for liberty. So "we see in Mill the strange spectacle of a collectivist, in respect to method, arguing for Individualism; the precise counterpart of Hobbes, an individualist in method arguing for Collectivism."

If Mill is revealed to us as having been inconsistent Marx is criticized as being no less a sinner in this regard. And if Mill's Liberal state fails to include in its "hopeful," "optimistic" program the provisions for correcting the severities of living, the various applications of Collectivism or Marxism in Communism or in the National Socialist State fail as miserably today. Mill's "Liberalism has ceased" even "to beget Liberals" and Marxist philosophy as applied in socialistic experiments kills real individualism. What both of these men wanted and thought their principles would evoke, their systems made impossible, if Hocking is right.

Hocking finds, as the dialectic (a synthesis as well as an alternating movement) would suggest, elements of truth in both. In his Co-agent State he argues for the dynamic of the collective state in which one finds not just "the will to exist" (of the Liberal state), but also the "will to act," in accordance with which the state has not only a "destiny," that of becoming great and rich, but a "mission," a real purpose in this world. He argues also for the irrepressible individual of the Liberal State who must after all be the real entity, the real unit of society, but whose purposes can in many instances be realized only through the assistance of that extension of himself which he finds in the state. This co-agent state according to the author will have a positive role to play in the field of international relations, in the field of economics, and in the field of common life. In a day in which every thinking person is wondering what the role of the state should be, this program of the Co-agent State deserves very careful reading.

In this volume Hocking indicates that modern Liberalism not only misses its mark but misconceives the nature of or rather the method of arriving at a free society. His emphasis is on a Liberalism and on an Individualism that would be liberal in the sense of promoting all that Individualism implies for each individual, to the extent, of course, that he is capable of achieving it. The state he regards as an extension of the individual and necessary for his realization. But it is only one of the institutions necessary to fulfill and complete the individual's life. The role of the State in the present he insists is to be determined in accordance with the dialectic, as he defines it. This "thought-filled experience" which he insists must be substituted for blind groping is not the voice of God, is not the counsel of God made plain in the course of events, although the thinking and terminology is suggestive of this. Or if it is, it is a revelation that comes to us only through experience. The individual who must profit by this experience is not by nature good, as the Liberal would have it, nor by nature bad. He becomes both through his experiences. So Hocking leaves us with the problem of the entrance of evil unto the life of men and of nations, and he leaves us with the question as to whether shall be the final criterion for the thought that is not to be mere groping.

Hocking's individual is, however, a real entity and he quite summarily dismisses those theories of the relation between society and the individual that do not recognize the individual as the real unit of society. He deals incisively with those theories and economic philosophies that make all of the State and little of the individual. Although one cannot help suspecting that others basing their statements on some other premises than those of Hocking might argue as neatly as he does, one must notice that his interpretations of present day theories and events are not only penetrating but useful. According to the pragmatic test of the man to whom this book is dedicated, John Dewey, Hocking's ideas strike one as workable. His discussion does suggest the possibility of giving form and content to his philosophical and economic constructions. Not infrequently, theorists, Christian as well as non-Christian, propound ideas and use phrases that, though "high sounding" and beautiful, lack a source of reality or seem impossible of application and execution. Hocking's analyses and suggestions may help others to avoid this and to give content to their thinking.

H. J. B.

THE MOSLEM WORLD


This is an engaging and informative account of the Moslem world and the work of Christian missions in the midst of it. The author is a United Presbyterian by birth and has first-hand knowledge of his subject, having been President of the American University at Cairo since 1916. The book is written in simple and interesting fashion and can be read profitably by any person of average intelligence. One is disappointed not to find the cross and the atonement of Christ, together with the necessity for repentance and faith in Him, mentioned in connection with the missionary task in Chapter 8. Apart from this the little book is an up-to-date and very helpful account of all that is worth knowing by the general reader on the Moslem world with its 250 million adherents of the religion of the false prophet.

C. B.


This little book is in some ways very much like the one of Dr. Watson just noted, but it is possibly more elementary. Its author has had his first-hand contact with Moslems in India, where he has been a missionary since 1910. The little book is especially suited for use in missionary study groups, but is also suitable for the average church library. It is regrettable that insofar as the real heart of the missionary task comes into the discussion, the terms used are rather vague and general. The typical but disappointing terminology of "the common task of remaking the world" is found in this as well as Dr. Watson's book. To neither of them does the cross seem to mean what it meant to Paul.

C. B.


ANYONE having more than a passing interest in the Moslem world and Mohammedan missions will greatly appreciate this quarterly review under the editorship of the well-known Dr. Zwemer. Dr. Zwemer has for years been a world-wide author on things Mohammedan and, upon exchanging his active missionary connections for the professorship of Missions and the History of Religion at Princeton Seminary a few years ago, continued at the head of this valuable magazine. There are some seven associate editors, of whom Prof. Dr. D. B.
Macdonald of Hartford is undoubtedly outstanding. Each issue of this quarterly offers a variety of articles on Islamic history, religion, morals, and missions, and in addition pages of book reviews, surveys of periodicals, and current topics—all of Islamic life and thought. The missionary interest is woven throughout the periodical and at times discussions of the Christian missionary task are offered. These are distinctly conservative and biblical as might be expected under the editorial guidance—if not authorship—of Dr. Zwemer. Although occasionally a highly technical article appears, it may fairly be said that the review succeeds admirably in combining scholarship with a popular and interesting presentation. In publishing this quarterly Dr. Zwemer is doing a great work for the cause of Christian missions.

THE CHRISTIAN AND MONEY


This book is better than its title. Or, rather, the sub-title redeems the erroneous title. There is no such thing as Christian materialism. It is misleading and incorrect to say, as the author does in the Introduction: "Materialism has to be redeemed." Nor does he mean this. The book explains that he means to offer a discussion of the proper use of money. It is really a popular treatment on the subject of Christian stewardship. The discussion is lucid and helpful in many parts. Under "Getting Money" such subjects as, tainted money, interest, unearned increment, and speculation come in for brief treatment. Under "Spending" there are such paragraph headings as, The Power of the Consumer, The Public Be Satisfied, Human Costs in Industry, Labor Conditions, etc. In a way it is, and in another it is not surprising that under the head of "Giving" most of the space is devoted to the foreign missionary enterprise. This part is possibly the least satisfying. The current liberalistic notions about the missionary task are rehashed here, though it must be said that also some good replies are made to objections against missions on the part of those who would gladly have the whole enterprise stopped. On the whole it may be said that this book is least satisfying when it deals with missions and the Kingdom and that its value lies in a number of fine things it offers on Christian moral standards in getting money.

DICTATORSHIP VERSUS DEMOCRACY


The author of this incisive little book is deeply convinced that the paramount international issue is that of the struggle between democracy and dictatorship. The title is derived from an utterance of Mussolini made in October, 1930. Said he: "The struggle between two worlds can permit no compromise. . . . Either we or they! Either their ideas or ours! Either our state or theirs!" What The Calvin Forum has stated editorially in its issue of last December under the captions, "The State of Liberty Assumes New Meaning," and "The Struggle Between Democracy and Dictatorship," might be said to be the theme of Mr. Armstrong's little book. His argument is clear and convincing. He exhibits the true spirit that animates the three dictators that command the European scene today. His presentation is fair. The inference of all this for the responsibility of America with a view to her own safety as well as that of democracy throughout the world is reflected in the following sentences: "Here, then, is a new factor to be considered and with it a new decision to be made. Which is more dangerous? To proceed on the belief that the apparently imminent trial of strength between the democratic and dictatorial philosophies of life will not in fact occur, and that even if it does the present internal structure and peaceful foreign relationships of the United States can continue unmarrwed by absolutism's triumph over most of the rest of the world's surface? Or to recognize that the test is only too likely to occur (many would say it is already far advanced), that we are immensely about the upshot, and that we most be alert to favor in every way possible our friends and resist in every way possible our enemies?" (p. 81.) The motto about making the world safe for democracy may still prove to have been born thirty years too soon!

A POEM ON PEACE


No one can help being moved by this 24-page poetic indictment of much in our modern social life, especially the folly of war. Who can deny the misery here sung? And who would wish to glorify the butchery they call modern warfare. Insofar as this poem inspires one to abolish war and may remind also men in high places of the misery it entails, it may serve a good purpose. But this is as far as the Christian can go in his appreciation of Mr. Christian's poem. It is saturated with the humanistic and out-and-out pacific spirit that defies man, dethrones the Christ (though he speaks of "Christs"), and thinks physical suffering and misery the deepest there is. The poem is written not only in the free verse form which reminds one of Walt Whitman, but it also breathes the spirit of that noted American Humanist. If there were any doubt on this score, the reminder of that outstanding contemporary Humanist, John Haynes Holmes, in the Foreword will serve to remove it.

COMMUNISM


This little pamphlet, with the subtitle, "A Deadly Foe to the Christian Faith Assuming the Guise of Christianity," points out the anti-religious as well as anti-Christian character of Russian Communism and warns against the propaganda for this atheism in our own country. In two passages the author makes the point that the Hutterian Brethren "have for four centuries practiced the type of communism which was in vogue in the first church in Jerusalem," but that they "on the ground of their experiences" are "convinced that national communism is impracticable." It would be, in our estimation, distinctly worth while if the author would give a discussion of the difference between these two forms of communism. Mr. Horsch, who, if we mistake not, is himself a Hutterian Mennonite and incidentally also a subscriber to The Calvin Forum, will find the pages of our magazine wide open to such a discussion. The misuse which has again and again been made of the "communism" of the early church and the "communism" of certain Christian sects in the service of the defense of modern economic communism would seem to make such a discussion highly desirable.

CONFESSING CHRIST


A fine, practical book on the meaning of public profession of one's Christian faith before the Church. These are intimate, spiritually warm, and helpful words with young people of covenant parentage about taking the step of confessing Christ. The booklet, neatly bound, is especially suitable for presentation by pastor or parent to young Christians.
A MODERNIST ON CHRISTIAN EDUCATION

Dr. Cole correctly summarizes that the average child of Protestantism in America is subject to two cultural movements, to wit, Christianity and secular idealism. The family and the Church furnish the first and the public institutions the second. He is correct, again, in assuming that this situation baffles youth and will in time force them to surrender the one or the other. However, he believes that too much discrimination has been made between the two movements and that it is high time to re-appraise the two and to dovetail them. This is the task to which the President of Kalamazoo College has set himself in this book.

Part one is called the religious quality of character. In it is a careful and critical review of the conclusions of scientists about the animal ancestry of the human race, about the forces operating in the development of human character, and about the comparative value of the Eugenist and Euthenist theories of molding forces. The author adopts a thoroughgoing evolutionistic view of human development and sustains his position and amplifies it by the use of numerous citations from leading scientists.

The second part represents the endeavor to point out the principles of the Christian enrichment of personal character and to show how the two cultures can be utilized in Christian training. The author would give to secular agencies the function of holding up personal character as an ideal. To Christianity is delegated the responsibility of identifying the imperishable values of Christianity with the gems of experience set in secular situations. And the Churches areentrusted with the task of lifting everyday values of the children into the range and rapture of divine worship.

There is a wealth of suggestive and stimulating material in this volume that well repays the trouble of reading. It probably represents the best and the latest in the field of so-called "Christian education." The author is an out and out evolutionist in his concept of the development of man. He apparently believes in character training as the chief objective of education. His view of man and of the objective of education are both at variance with the position of Christian Education as held by the proponents of the free Christian School in this country. Neither the first nor the second can be harmonized with the Scriptures as interpreted by the Orthodox group.

Anyone that honestly hopes for a congenial co-operation between the secular and the religious educational forces can do so only by erasing the line of demarcation between Humanism and Christian Theism. That can only be done by watering down the distinctiveness of either one or both, Dr. Cole is a modernist. His Christianity is modernistic and by that very token is not historical Christianity at all.

Though I find myself at variance with the fundamental spirit and thrust of this book, I must recommend it as a source book of the modernistic conception of education and of valuable materials on child psychology, as a revealer of the divergence of opinion between secular and Christian education, and as a stimulant for rethinking the entire problem of the education of children from Christian homes. H. S.

SERMONS BY KARL HEIM

By translating another volume of Prof. Heim's sermons the Reverend John Schmidt, pastor of the Augsburg Lutheran Church of Detroit, Mich., has again laid the English-speaking Chrisitian world under obligation to both Prof. Heim and himself. The eleven sermons comprehended in this volume of 169 pages are delightful reading. The professor is true to the rule that preaching should be the exposition and application of God's own Word and that the sermon should, in material respect, confine itself to the chosen text.

The learned author is possessed of the felicitous gift of simplicity and clarity. There is a conspicuous absence of theological apparatus, but rich thought, emotional fervor, apt illustration and happy timeliness are everywhere in abundant evidence.

Perhaps nothing is quite so outstanding in these sermons as the deep sympathy with which the author addresses himself to a lost world, to the bitterly disappointed and cruelly disillusioned people of our age and day, to the Christian whose heart is surcharged with sadness and sorrow; and to the believer who is confounded and perplexed in the midst of the frustration of modern life. The book breathes the spirit of tender compassion; its messages are instinct with sweet comfort; the truth conveyed and the spirit in which it is transmitted are calculated to inspire the reader who trembles at God's Word with hopefulness and cheer. All this is due to the fact that, like a true Barnabas, the professor preacher lovingly, understandingly and insistently calls his readers' attention to the tender mercies of the Lord. He glorifies the grace of God as the only but effectual medicine for sin-sick souls. As one reads he catches the very breath of our compassionate High-priest, Jesus Christ.

Preachers may well copy the fine example of intelligent sympathy which the Tuebingen professor sets them, and study to adapt the truth of God's Holy Word to the needs of the present age after the pattern of the gifted author of this volume.

The sermons contained in The Living Fountain do not constitute a series. The title of the volume is derived from Rev. 7:17. According to the proper translation of the passage the phrase means: the fountain(s) of the waters of life. These fountains certainly abound in the garden of the Word of God.

S. VOLBESDA.

VERBAL INSPIRATION

A DEFEENSE of the doctrine of verbal inspiration written from the point of view of the strict Lutheran, Missouri Synod, Church. Dr. Kretzmann, who teaches at Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, shows what the self-testimony of Scripture is on this point; quotes the historical testimony of the early Church, the self-testimonies of many, also Lutheran, theologians deny verbal inspiration; and answers certain objections commonly raised against this doctrine.

C. B.

SOUTHERN BAPTIST SERMONETTES

The author is professor of systematic theology in the Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary in Texas. He may be a dogmatician in the classroom, but in this volume he is a thoroughgoing homilete. This book is an expression of the conviction that religious views must be translated into and find expression in Christian living.

Since the sermons are arranged in somewhat progressive order, it is reassuring that the writer discusses the subject of faith first of all. There is here no analysis of faith but a practical portrayal of what faith does and can be expected to do. This is properly followed by a similar treatment of repentance, Sermons on spiritual food, prayer, assurance, Christian ideals and on the Spirit follow.

These sermonettes are introduced by texts with which some connection is made, are read with ease, and should serve to promote practical Christian living. Excellent for devotional reading.

H. S.