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IS CHRISTIAN SOUL-SAVING CHEAP RASCALITY?

AN EDITORIAL

ETERNAL vigilance is the price of liberty. We Americans are wont to boast of our liberty. Especially in these days of dictatorships, totalitarian states, autocrats, and intolerance, we possibly are learning to appreciate more deeply the boon of liberty. We should likewise learn to be on our guard against every assault, openly or under cover, that is made upon these liberties which have ever been the boast of our republic. No complacent It-can't-happen-here attitude will do in these days of growing autocracy and government interference.

There is no sphere in which government interference is so readily resented by American citizens as in the sphere of religion. This country has set an example to the whole world of freedom of religion, of separation of church and state, and of a hands-off policy on the part of the government in religious affairs. Officially this is a Christian nation, as representative courts of the land have declared again and again. At the same time, there is absolute freedom of religion and irreligion for every American citizen as such. The government has no right to discriminate against any of its citizens on religious grounds. And the government is at no time justified to make propaganda for any religious views of one group of its citizens at the expense of the views of another group.

This would seem to be a simple principle and one would expect the American government to have no difficulty in maintaining it. However, certain recent utterances from official government sources at Washington may well make us pause and reflect. As reported in last month's CALVIN FORUM, in Greenbell, a government housing project on the outskirts of Washington, D. C., federal authorities gave religious groups the right to hold services only at such a time when the government-sponsored undenominational community church holds no services. This is an unwarranted interference on the part of the government with freedom of worship. An even more disquieting phenomenon of this kind is seen in the attitude of some of the recent spokesmen of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the Commissioner himself included.

In the July, 1936, issue of the CALVIN FORUM there appeared an Open Letter addressed to Mr. John Collier, our Commissioner of Indian Affairs, under the caption: Is Our Government Promoting Paganism? In that letter the charge was not only made but fully substantiated from official and public utterances of leading men in the Office of Indian Affairs, that that government office was promoting and encouraging the pagan religion of the American Indian.

The missionaries who drafted that letter were not asking the government agencies to make propaganda against the pagan religion of the American Indians. They were simply asking that the government keep its hands off; that its official spokesmen should leave the Indian free to make his own choice in religion; that there should, to say the least, be no opposition against the Christian religion; and that all propaganda for, and promotion of, the pagan religion of the American Indian on the part of government agents and agencies should cease. The letter closed with the pertinent question: Has the Commissioner of Indian Affairs the right to use his authority, his office, the Indian schools and public moneys, to make propaganda for and to promote paganism? (The CALVIN FORUM, July, 1936, p. 272.)

If someone should ask whether there is today after a year and a half has elapsed, any change in this thoroughly un-American policy of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, he can find the answer in a report recently made by a committee to the General Conference of Christian Reformed Missionaries held in the heart of the Navaho country, Gallup, New Mexico, just before Christmas. We urge our readers to give this report their careful attention. It is found on another page in the present issue of the CALVIN FORUM. Significant as the quoted recent utterances of Mr. Collier are, undoubtedly the most revealing expression of the spirit and attitude of the present Indian Office at Washington toward religious affairs on the Indian reservation came from the pen of an administrative assistant of that office, D'Arcy McNickle by name. In a book review of Oliver LaFarge's The Enemy Gods, which appeared in the December first issue of Indians at Work, this assistant of Mr. Collier wrote as follows:

The Indian has always had "friends," and it has sometimes seemed that the "friends" have been his worst enemies. We wince when we recall the days when hairy-chested frontiersmen set about systematically to rid the public domain of the vermin who pestered the overland trails. Colonel Chivington at Sand Creek, Colorado, was forthright. Vermin was vermin. But really, it was after his time that the Indian fell upon evil days. The abolitionists, the humanity lovers, out of employment after the Civil War, found the naked, hounded red man and cuddled him close. They offered Bibles instead of bullets, and there were Indians who thought it was a poor exchange. A dead
Indian, they would say, is better off than Mr. LaFarge’s Myron Begay, at the moment when, frenzied by the cheap rascality of Christian soul-saving, he stood up in a kind of missionary pep-meeting and denied his gods.

This is indeed a most revealing utterance from an official in the Office of our Commissioner of Indian Affairs. It is also a disquieting utterance. Here we are told in plain English that those who pretended to be the Indian’s friends were sometimes his worst enemies; that it was bad enough for the Indian to have been killed off ruthlessly by the white man before the Civil War, but that the Indian fell upon evil days when those came who brought him not bullets but Bibles! And if you ask why the bringing of Bibles to Indians meant the beginning of evil days for them, the answer is quite apparent. It is because that meant the acceptance of the Christian gospel and the discarding of the false gods of the Indian tribe by those who came to conversion. Mr. McNickle has such contempt for this bringing of Bibles to the Indians and the consequent conversion of some of them, that he quotes with unmistakable sympathy the Indians’ judgment that a dead Indian is better than one who has denied his gods, and—as if it were necessary to remove the last vestige of misunderstanding on this score—he then takes a pot shot at the Christian Church and the missionaries and the gospel by calling the whole missionary endeavor “the cheap rascality of Christian soul-saving”!

The cheap rascality of Christian soul-saving!

Let that phrase sink into the soul of every Christian. That is the estimate which a government official connected with the Indian Office in Washington places upon the self-sacrificing efforts of the missionaries to bring Christ to the American Indian! That sentence is a slap in the face of all the noble Christian missionaries to the American Red Man from the days of David Brainerd and Jonathan Edwards on the frontier at Stockbridge, Massachusetts, to the hosts of consecrated workers in the Southwest country ministering today to Navaho and Zuni, Apache and Hopi, and the rest of the tribes.

We thought this was a Christian country.

We were under the impression that the President of the United States, the superior of both Mr. Collier and Mr. McNickle, assumed the highest office of the nation with a solemn oath to Almighty God and with his hand placed in reverence upon the Bible.

History tells us that what has made the white nations great is the Christian civilization brought to our pagan ancestors in Europe through a Book, known as the Bible, and through the preaching of missionaries from that Book.

We always thought that our government officials were at least nominally Christian and would have enough good sense—if not religious belief—not to offend the deepest convictions which Christians hold concerning sacred things.

We knew there were many unbelievers—yes, downright atheists and pagans—in our country. We would not dispute them a place in this land for one moment. In fact, we believe in the religious liberty of anyone and everyone—the atheist included. That means that he shall not be discriminated against as a citizen by reason of his religion or irreligion. That means that the government shall accord anyone the right to hold any views he desires in the matter of religion.

But we were always naive enough to think that this also meant that the government and its officials should at no time make propaganda in favor or against any religion. We thought it pure Americanism that the American Indian has the right to cling to his pagan religion if he so desires, and that he could also from free choice become a Christian if he so desires. We thought the government should keep its fingers off and should stop its religious (as well as irreligious) propaganda.

The cheap rascality of Christian soul-saving!

We would not think of using designations such as these for any honest effort, whether in the religious or in the governmental sphere. But if the terms must be used, we do not hesitate to say that this latest utterance from a subordinate of Mr. John Collier against the greatest civilizing and uplifting force for the American Indian that has ever come to him is the cheapest bit of rascality that has issued from a Washington office for some time.

It is the sort of utterance we might expect from Berlin or from Moscow. But we will not swallow it as coming from a government official of the American nation that still believes in respect for anyone’s religious convictions.

Is Christian America going to take this slap in its face from a government official in Washington with the silence of indifference?

Will this contemptuous reference to the greatest cause on earth on the part of a government official in a free Christian country go unchallenged?

If Niemöller and his colleagues in Germany are prepared to suffer in prison for their protest against the despite done to the Christian Church and its message of salvation on the part of an autocratic government which would paganize the Christian Church, have we not enough stamina to let our protest be heard against such contemptuous attacks upon the cause of Christ as Mr. McNickle indulged in?

Shall we deny our Lord and Savior by silence?

Shall we allow sinister forces in our national life to jeopardize the religious and civil freedom which have ever been the boast of America?

C. B.

Martin Niemöller and Martin Luther

At the present writing the well-known German pastor Martin Niemöller is on trial for treason before a Nazi court. There is a good deal of irony in the situation. This man was an intrepid commander of a German U-boat during the world war. He attained distinction in the military defence of his native country, the Germany which he loves as only Germans can love their fatherland. And today, less than two decades after the close of the war, he has been in prison more than six months and stands trial for treason against his country after having preached the gospel of salvation in a prominent German pulpit for years. The ground for the charge of high
treason reduces to his fearless refusal to submit to the dictates of the State in its attempt to subjugate the Church and the pulpit to its autocratic and increasingly anti-Christian ideology and policies. Every Protestant Christian is deeply interested in Pastor Niemöller's trial. Niemöller and Luther! Who can help associating the two? Despite all the shouting of Rosenberg and his crowd that they are the spiritual son of Luther. Both drew their final inspiration from the liberating, God-honoring, 1 and Christ-exalting truths of the New Testament. Both had the courage to defy the authorities which had the power of life and death over them when these issued orders of submission which involved being traitors to Christ and to His cause. And both have exhibited that trust in God and peace of soul under the most trying circumstances of life which is the marvel of the world. Read these words of quiet but magnificent faith from the pen of the prisoner in Cell 448 in the Berlin jail. He wrote them recently to his wife before he went on trial. "There is no reason for you to be worried about me. God has taken us to Himself and swept us into a fiery furnace, and yet He has always said and shown us that He means it all for our good. He will still the flames at the right moment. I am happy and at ease in my heart and have really only concern and prayer that you and the congregation and the children lack for nothing because of my absence. I think often of the others who must pass through the same vale with me and if I have any plea it is that the congregation will not grow weary in its prayers of intercession. All my anxieties come from without and not from within me. I am the free master of all things and the happy child of my Father in Heaven. Let us thank God He upholds me as He does and allows no spirit of despair to enter into Cell 448. Let the parish office know that in all ignorance of what is coming I am confident and that I hope to be ready when I am led along paths which I never would have sought for myself." Indeed, this is the spirit and faith of Martin Luther incarnate. God grant Niemöller as great a spiritual victory over the dictator of Germany as Luther achieved over the head of the Roman Church! C. B.

Paging a Preview of Pageant

A NEW religious monthly has made its appearance. It is a religious picture magazine. Publishers are the Board of Christian Education of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. A Preview has come into our hands which reflects the proposed set-up, content, and spirit of the new venture. The pictures which adorn most of the thirty-six pages are attractive and the articles are written in a style calculated to catch the eye and ear of the religious public. It is when one turns to the ideas advanced that a feeling of deep disappointment—I did not say, surprise—steals over the Christian reader. Here are some of the most characteristic utterances which show which way the wind is blowing and what the prevailing westerlies will be on the pages of this new journal. "The tenant farmer system has perpetuated in economic forms the slavery which the negroes endured in an earlier legal system. It must come to an end if our civilization is ever to approach Christian levels." Or this deliverance from the Rev. Mr. Zimmerman, who "uses pulpit and plow to champion the farmer's cause." He writes: "I felt sorry for country people. My heart has always tended to go out to the underdog, and farmers, except for rare temporary periods, have been the losers in the urban-rural economic struggle. The farmers' schools, churches, amusements, and social position have all suffered from this defeat. As a rural missionary, I hoped to bring them greater economic efficiency in farming, a higher, more dignified religion." On another page the words of John D. Rockefeller regarding the ideal of church union are quoted with unmistakable sympathy, as follows: "Thus individual and non-essential differences would be preserved while on the fundamentals of religion—God's love and Christ's living spirit—all would be united." Apparently the creed that will be preached on the pages of Pageant is that of the trinity of church union, economic uplift, and a warless world. I thought I had recently read from such leading men from the same general camp as Charles Clayton Morrison (Christian Century) and Samuel McCrea Cavert (Federal Council Bulletin) that this kind of "social gospel" with its "Roll up your sleeves, get busy, and build a Christian world," was, if not exploded, at least antiquated and unable to cope with the deeper needs of our age. Possibly this announcement from 440 Dearborn Street, Chicago, and 297 Fourth Avenue, New York City, has not yet penetrated to the Philadelphia offices of the Presbyterian Board of Christian Education. Meanwhile this type of "Christian education" from the official Board of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. confirms a number of apprehensions which lovers of the Reformed Faith and the Westminster Standards have had for some time.

C. B.

Prayer as Psychological Exercise

A COLUMNIST in an Eastern paper recently wrote an article under the caption, The Power of Prayer. She told the story of a big, husky business man who lost a grip on himself and, having resorted to a "top-notch London specialist," was told by the latter: "There is just one thing that will fix up people like you, and that is—prayer." Neither the doctor nor the patient was a churchman, and, upon the expression of frank amazement at this bit of advice, the doctor explained: "That does not matter. I'm not talking from the religious angle. Simply as a psychological exercise, prayer is the most powerful medicine for sick minds." It is not uncommon to hear such psychological laudations of the value and power
of prayer in our day. At first blush, such words of recommendation addressed to an apparent unbeliever sound good in the ears of a Christian. Whoever recommends prayer must be a pious person. At least, he recommends a pious act. But is he pious? And is the recommended act pious? To answer that question fairly we must discriminate. It is conceivable that a person might, upon the advice of this psychologizing doctor, begin or resume to pray and truly find his God. But—and that is the important point—not as long as he saw no more in prayer than this doctor did. I'm not talking from the religious angle, said the good doctor. But prayer is nothing if it is not viewed from the religious angle. Simply as a psychological exercise—said the doctor—prayer is the most powerful medicine for sick minds. But the truth of the matter is that "simply as a psychological exercise" prayer is not prayer—it is at best auto-suggestion. It is one thing to follow the Coué method of auto-suggestion, it is quite a different matter to pray. That prayer as prayer has great and valuable psychological value no one who knows anything experientially of prayer will deny, but such psychological effect is inseparable from the degree of faith on the part of the suppliant in the reality of God who is the object of prayer. Merely as a psychological exercise prayer is a mockery. Psychology did not call prayer into being, neither can psychology save it from falling into disuse. "He that cometh to God must believe that He is and that He is a rewarder of them that diligently seek Him." (Heh. 11:6). Prayer is indeed a powerful medicine for sick minds—yes, and for sick souls as well. But only the prayer that is a two-ended relation can do that. Only the prayer that is made in faith, nothing doubting. And the faith that is needed is not in oneself, nor in the efficacy of a merely psychological exercise, but faith in God. From this point of view prayer is indisputably one of the most valuable bits of psychotherapeutics, a medicine in fact that Christian pastors, doctors, and psychiatrists could and should use and recommend to their "patients" freely, but only when there is faith—religious faith—on the part of the suppliant. Simply as a psychological exercise prayer is a denial, not an affirmation, of God.

Lowering of Theological Standards

WHEATON COLLEGE, Wheaton, Illinois, is an orthodox Christian college with a good reputation. It has grown phenomenally in the last decade. Not only has it maintained a strong Christian character but good academic standards as well. In view of this fact it is regrettable that lately the Wheaton authorities have seen fit to announce as the introduction of a course in Theology what is merely an expansion of the College Bible Department, and to offer from now on a Bachelor of Theology degree for such expanded Bible work done by the student in college. According to the official College Bulletin, it apparently all began when, upon receipt of a certain gift last July, "the Bible Department of the College (was) named the Orinda Childs Pierce Memorial School of Theology." Such usurpation of the term School of Theology was unwarranted. A Bible Department in a college, however excellent, simply is not a School of Theology or a Seminary. The matter has just recently been carried a step farther when—apparently again in an attempt to satisfy the terms of a bequest—the authorities established "within the Theological Department of the College the John Dickey Memorial Theological Seminary Training Course." This means, as the Bulletin again explains, that "the present Bible major will be strengthened by the addition of Hebrew and certain other theological subjects" and is on the strength of this augmentation called a Theological Seminary Training Course upon whose completion the student is given a Bachelor of Theology degree. That this is dragging down acknowledged academic standards is apparent from the fact that schools of recognized standing, whether orthodox or liberal, all insist upon a three-year theological training after the student has completed a regular A.B. course in college. This means that Theology is properly viewed as a type of professional study, just as in the case of Law and Medicine, to which only college graduates should be admitted. Wheaton now calls its extended Bible Department in the College a Theological Seminary Training Course, and offers a student who has specialized in Bible while in college a Bachelor of Theology degree (which is a professional degree) at a time when he should receive only a general cultural A.B. degree. Even the recommendation which is added to the effect that the student take one graduate year of college study before taking the Th.B. degree does not alter this fact. If the granting of bequests (or, possibly, their acceptance) is responsible for such compromising with the legitimate standards of theological study, it is quite clear that bequests are far from an unmixed blessing. Especially in view of the fact that the liberals have frequently contended that we of the orthodox group are weak in maintaining academic standards, this latest move of the Trustees of Wheaton College must be deplored. As a college, Wheaton was maintaining good academic standards, for which it deserves congratulations. Why should it now pretend to be what it is not, viz., a professional school for the study of Theology? Why should it lower the good name of Theology by equating it with a course in Bible in college? And why should it offer a degree for professional study to the student who has merely completed a college course and is entitled only to an A.B. degree?

Honoring Motherhood

OUR sentimental and humanistic age has a striking way of glorifying mothers combined with an equally striking way of dishonoring motherhood. Strange as this may seem, it is the naked truth. I doubt whether there has ever been a time when more is done for the mother and her children, both socially and medically, than in our age. And I doubt likewise whether in the history of our Western, Christian civilization motherhood has ever fallen upon such evil days as in our age. How these two can go to-
together is possibly not so hard to explain. It is our
sentimental humanitarianism that prompts our age
to be very considerate and kind toward mothers.
But it takes more than this sentimental humanitar-
ianism to cultivate the right attitude toward mother-
hood. Science is doing a great deal to increase the
means and agencies that may serve mothers in our
day and age. But science stands next to helpless—
in fact, is totally impotent—to furnish the needed
spur for the promotion of motherhood. Motherhood
is a vocation. It is a solemn duty, as well as a
privilege, but either way it involves sacrifice. Mother-
hood requires self-denial. Motherhood leads to
glory, but only by way of suffering, pain, giving of
self for others. That is why our age glorifies mothers
and increasingly tramples upon motherhood. We
must get back to the simple but beautiful truth that
marriage is the God-ordained institution for the
cultivation of the highest form of human love and
the reproduction of the human race. Fatherhood
and motherhood must regain the place of honor in
our philosophy and practice of marriage. The curse
of increasing childlessness will be averted only when
young people will begin to think differently of mar-
riage and will not divorce it in their anticipated and
realized conjugal love from parenthood. What God
hath joined together let not man put asunder applies
in its original intent to the marrying parties, but it
may with equal propriety be applied today to that
which in marriage was never intended to be
sundered. Our industrialized and commercialized
civilization is increasingly undermining marriage
and the home, but it is often forgotten that the spot
at which this process of undermining is most vicious
is the tender spot of a decreasing motherhood. One
of the customs frequently most damaging to mother-
hood is found in the practice on the part of the wife
to continue her life of employment and financial gain
outside of the home after her wedding day. I know
the considerations that are commonly advanced in
extermination of this custom, but after all is said and
done the simple fact remains that, barring exceptions,
the evils far outweigh the advantages in the
situation under discussion. It is a serious condition
that one-half of the thirty thousand women teachers
in the New York City public schools are married. It
would be an illuminating bit of information, I believe,
if statistics were also available of the number of chil-
dren which these 15,000 married lady teachers have.
There is only one solution for the designated evil and
that is to get back in our thinking and living to the
Christian, the biblical view of marriage and paren-
thood. Parents and pastors have a marvelous oppor-
tunity as well as a solemn responsibility to cultivate
the truly Christian attitude toward marriage in the
thinking of their young people. If it be true that the
education of the child begins long before its birth,
it is no less true that the education for marriage and
parenthood begins many years before the wedding
ceremony takes place.

C. B.

GOVERNMENT GLORIFICATION OF PAGANISM
A REPORT

To the General Conference of Christian Reformed
Missionaries, Meeting in the Gallup Chapel,
Gallup, New Mexico, December 17, 1937.

DEAR BRETHREN:

TWO members of the Government Policies Com-
mittee at an informal meeting decided to pre-
sent the following report concerning recent an-
nouncements and statements of The Indian Office,
as an indication of present policy in respect to re-
ligious matters.

First of all, we would state that the Indian Office
has in recent months been much more moderate in
its statements concerning religious matters than dur-
ing the early period of the present regime. The
number of references to the policy respecting the
religious life of the Indian and the work of the mis-
sionaries have also been fewer of late.

There have been, however, a sufficient number of
clear statements to show that as far as the attitude
of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs is concerned,
there has been no change from that which was so
emphatically announced a few years ago; and a re-
cent review of The Enemy Gods, a book by Oliver
La Farge, reveals a deep-seated hostility to the work
of Christian missionaries, on the part of the reviewer,
who is an official in the U. S. Indian Office.

We present the following quotations in evidence of
the above:

1. In reply to an enquiry from the Haskin Informa-
tion Bureau, the Commissioner of Indian Affairs
wrote, "Responding to your query, the present policy
is to help Indians get on their feet, individually and
collectively, and materially and morally. On the
negative side, the policy is to stop dictating to Indians
how they shall live, what their religious affiliations
shall be, and so forth."

Following a statement about the policy regarding
lands, resources, schools, and self-government, the
Commissioner closed his reply by stating: "Indian
administration today has no dogma or set pattern
for even one tribe of Indians and certainly not for
250 tribes, each with a past, a present and a future
peculiar to itself. Half of the Indians are living like
white people and will go out into the white world.
The others we hope will strengthen their group
identities while at the same time participating more
fully in the general life of the country." (Signed:
John Collier, Commissioner).

All that is reasonably assuring. The content of the
hope mentioned in the final paragraph undoubtedly
includes far more than the ordinary newspaper
reader would surmise. This will be clear from the
following:

2. At the close of an address before the Southwest
District of Kiwanis International at Clovis, New
Mexico, October 18, 1937, the Commissioner, Mr.
John Collier, said:
“There is another side to Indian life which in the Southwest is well known. That is the cultural or aesthetic side. And while too much stress should not be placed upon the mere economic significance of the Indian’s spiritual life, it is a fact that Indian culture supplies one of the major tourist attractions in Arizona and New Mexico. But the white man’s concern with the spirit of the Indian must go beyond mere money considerations. There are precious things here, wrought out in the ten-thousand year life of the Red Race in our hemisphere before any white man came. Ancient as these things are, they are still young and want a future. There are elements of the good life, the disciplined, the generous, courageous life, which already have entered into the romantic literature of the world, and which appeal deeply to the white spirit of America. At the very least, these physically frail but spiritually profound Indian civilizations have a value, an importance not less than the value and importance of such physical wonders as the Carlsbad Caverns, the Grand Canyon, and the Redwoods of the Pacific Coast. We do not want the Indianhood to die out from the Indians. The policy of the Government now is that the Indianhood of the Indians should live on. And such, I believe, is the point of view of Americans as a whole.”

What Mr. Collier means by the Indianhood which he desires to see preserved is undoubtedly the native religious life. The entire program of the Indian Bureau with respect to changes in the Indian’s life as it concerns physical and material matters shows that. The Indian Bureau is willing to substitute scientific medical care and hospitalization for the native way of caring for the sick by the medicine-men. It is willing to establish Banking and Loan facilities, to encourage business activity, and the use of modern mechanical equipment, and many other practices of civilized life, provided, the Indian adopts these, while continuing upon the old native way spiritually. This opinion is further substantiated by the following quotation from a message from Commissioner Collier, read by Chester E. Faris, as the Commissioner’s representative, at the American Indian Day Celebration in Rochester, New York, in September of last year. The Commissioner stated:

3. “You have met here to offer thanks after the manner of your own tradition, for the good things that have come to you, and that is as it should be.

“It is always good that any people, or any group of people, should maintain not alone a beautiful ceremony, but with it the spiritual foundation in which such a ceremony must preserve its roots. I think that you, the Indians of New York State, have succeeded in retaining both the spirit and the reality of your traditional commemoration. Such a thing is not easy to do. You have been beset for many years by influences which would tend to destroy all that is native and much that is traditional.

“That you have preserved your identity as a people in the face of an ever-mounting pressure across three centuries of time, is in itself an eloquent indication of the tremendous surge of your Indian consciousness and of your Indian inheritance.

“This strength has drawn to you many friends whose admiration for your courage and your determination has made them assist your cause. Among these friends are many officials and people of influence and power in New York State. Among them also, and particularly within recent years, is the Federal Government itself.”

Other quotations might be made from the message to show that the Commissioner wholeheartedly desires the continuation of “the native heritage,” and why not? If he believes as he recently stated, according to a quotation appearing in The Mission Echoes, “I doubt if there is any one of you here who knows of any cultural value which our civilization has to offer the American Indian,” he is merely showing consistency by encouraging what we have been accustomed to calling paganism.

4. Our final reference will be to a statement made by D’Arcy McNickle, Administrative Assistant, Office of Indian Affairs, in a recent article concerning La Farge’s new book. In his review of the book, appearing in the December 1 edition of Indians at Work, Mr. McNickle states:

“The Indian has always had ‘friends,’ and sometimes it has seemed that the ‘friends’ have been his worst enemies. We wince when we recall the days when hairy-chested frontiersmen set about systematically to rid the public domain of the vermin who pestered the overland trails. Colonel Skivington, of Sand Creek, Colorado, was forthright. Vermin was vermin. But really, it was after his time that the Indian fell upon evil days. The abolitionists, the humanity lovers, out of employment, after the Civil War, found the naked, hounded red man, and cuddled him close. They offered him Bibles instead of bullets, and there were Indians who thought it a poor exchange. A dead Indian, they would say, is better off than La Farge’s Myron Begay, at the moment when frenzied by the cheap rascality of Christian soul-saving, he stood up in a kind of missionary pep-meeting and denied his gods.”

Hatred for the Gospel of Christ is found elsewhere than in official Russia and Germany today. An official paper, published at the expense of the American taxpayer declares hatred of the missionary enterprise and flaunts defiance to the Christ and His Great Commission, by showing its disrespect for “the cheap rascality of Christian soul-saving.”

Your committee would suggest that we consider whether or not a protest should be made to the Indian Office for this insult to the entire Christian Church, and its Head, the Lord Jesus Christ.

Respectfully submitted,

The Committee.

(Note—Publication of this report in The Calvin Forum was requested by the General Conference of Christian Reformed Indian Missionaries. Editorial comment may be found on another page of this issue.—Editor.)
CALVINISM AND DEMOCRACY

Johannes Zandstra, Ph.D.
Lansing, Illinois

(CALVINISM is a theology, but it is more than that. It is a view of life, a philosophy of life. And it has some very definite implications for political life as well.

Calvinism as a theology teaches us the doctrine of salvation by sovereign grace, as well as the doctrine of predestination; that God is love, as well as the truth that God is just. Calvinism as a philosophy of life teaches us that, though we are not of the world, we are nevertheless in the world. It teaches us that we bear the image of God, and as such we are to bear witness in the world. It teaches that we must seek to know the world. Adam was enjoined to subdue creation, to search it and find it out. We are not merely permitted to be scientists, we are commanded to be such. We are to show God's justice in the world.

One important way of doing this is to take an active part in matters of law and government. But we are also to show God's love in the world. We must be our brother's keeper. We must seek and create beauty in the world, as nature reflects God's handiwork. Love of beauty is a gift of God. We must leave our stamp on art. Summing it all up—also for our intellectual, our moral, and our aesthetic life, the Calvinistic philosophy is: Live to the glory of God!

In religion we are led to see the light. Christ said, "I am the Light of the world." They who have been granted to see the light cannot bask in the light alone. They become reflectors of this light to those about them not in the light rays. As the sun beyond the horizon cannot be seen, but the clouds and atmosphere in the path of its light can be seen to reflect this light, so man by grace in the Light, reflects that Light on a darkened world. He cannot help reflecting, any more than the moon can fail to reflect the sun, when in its light rays.

And if we have seen the Light we have been revealed the Truth. Christ also said, "I am the Truth." Man is rational, that is, man knows by thoughts. In order to express the truth, man does so by way of thoughts, by way of principles. Calvinism is such a set of principles. It is the human attempt to express the revealed Truth.

So then we again emphasize that Calvinism is a set of principles. It is a system of thought. It is a systematic expression of one's beliefs. This system of beliefs, as I pointed out, not only covers our religious life. It also covers our everyday life as citizens of the world. Calvinism must also have principles to live by. I know these political principles have not always been made explicit. In the Netherlands such men as Groen Van Prinsterer, Kuyper, and Colijn have accomplished much in this field. And though in our circles in this country we have sometimes felt foolishly apologetic about our views, the world has recognized these three Hollanders as great world statesmen. Colijn has been an important figure in the League of Nations.

As to Democracy

Now democracy is not a set of beliefs or principles. It is not a view of life. Democracy does not give us rules of life to live by. It does not express the truth. It does not give us principles for the attainment of happiness. Democracy is a form of government. Democracy is a system of regulations which governs our lives as citizens.

So you see that Calvinism and democracy cannot be said to be compatible or incompatible. Calvinism is a view of life; democracy is a form of government. The question we may properly ask is, Can a Calvinist, believing in the principles he judges to be true, live by these principles in a democracy?

The distinction between a philosophy of government and a form of government is important. We must not confuse the practical workings and execution of law and administration with the principles that give rise to such practice. In other words, a man may believe in democracy as the best form of government for a much different reason than you and I do.

You have already surmised that our beliefs will in some way affect our attitude in a democracy. If you believe that man is good by nature and must merely be given a chance, or if you believe that man is evil by nature and must be guided into good citizenship, this will make a difference. Now this gives rise to the idea of policy of government. The policy of men in political control is immensely important. They may lead us to war or to peace, to poverty or to sharing in the good of the land. And these policies depend upon their view of life. It is at this point that we as citizens can exert ourselves in a democracy. We can help in shaping the policies of government. We can take an active part by asserting our beliefs.

It is said that John Calvin, the founder of our world and life view, favored democracy. His government at Geneva was an attempt to institute such a form of government. Now I realize that his government at Geneva would hardly be considered a thorough-going democracy today. Americans especially, would cry the alarm of a fierce dictatorship. But we must remember that in those days of kings and emperors, his form of government was quite radical. Whether he would favor a democracy as we have it in America I do not profess to know.

I wish to point out at least three fundamental principles of Calvinism which hold for government. And I wish to show how these can be expressed in a democracy. And further I wish to show that they will affect the policies of our government.
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The Principle of Authority

Foremost of Calvinistic principles is the principle of authority. Authority for the Calvinist is real. It is not man made. It is not merely a practical necessity. Authority is vested in God. When a man votes, he exercises the authority given by God, and he must execute his duty as such. When a man is elected to office, he has the authority from God and must execute his duties as such.

For many in our country the situation appears quite different. They are believers in the Social Contract theory. This theory essentially holds that authority lies in the person. The person votes, and in so doing gives up some of his authority to this official for practical reasons. It is considered best for organization in society to have an administration. The official, therefore, is only responsible to the people.

How do these views, so different, expressed in the same form of government, affect the policies of these different groups?

If the official is a Calvinist, he will execute his duties regardless of the whims of the public. He feels that he is directly responsible to God. He must rule by principle. He cannot be controlled by machine politics. He cannot be a gambler which is one instance in this case where he may gamble against his principles. As he lives by the principles, so he must rule by these principles.

Let us suppose an actual case. Suppose a law is being considered to permit gambling. Let us suppose that an official is opposed to this law because of principle. Whether or not the public is in favor of the law by a large majority, this official will fight the adoption of this law with all his might. But despite his efforts the law is passed. What must he do? Must he bomb race tracks, hack slot machines? No I think not. The State is the authority and he must respect it. Authority of the State is also from God. Even though the State uses this authority wrongly, it nevertheless must be respected. There is one instance in this case where he may resist this authority. That is the case when he is forced to gamble which is against his principles. But the advantage of a democracy is that we are guaranteed the right of a free conscience.

The official holding to the Social Contract theory, by his very theory must play the role of the puppet. He must do what the people want. Majority opinion and not principle is what must rule the day.

You have not heard much mention of the Social Contract theory. It is not a popular phrase. Yet, the constant appeal to the majority public opinion is an indication that the theory is not dead. The minority leader is not as highly respected as the majority leader. To be popular with the public appears to many a person as tantamount to being right. Also this view comes out when we note the tremendous efforts on the part of politicians and newspapers to swing majority opinion to their point of view.

The Principle of Individual Freedom

Another basic principle of Calvinism in respect to politics, is the principle of individual freedom. The idea of individualism is expressed in religion by the doctrine of personal salvation. The emphasis is on the personal. The church cannot save the member, neither is the church directly responsible for the sins of the members. The member is responsible to God. Now in the same way, the Calvinist maintains that man as an individual has rights and duties for which he is responsible only to God. Hence, he believes in individual freedom. That is, there are certain phases of our lives the State may not control. We must preserve freedom of conscience.

In respect to this principle the Calvinist feels at home in a democratic form of government. I know of no other form of government whence these individual rights are more explicitly guaranteed than in our American democracy. We have the right to believe as we see fit. We may worship God in the manner we please. We may express our beliefs, be this expression written or oral.

Is this one principle we hold in common with others who believe democracy is the best form of government? Do all believers in democracy understand this principle in the same way? Or does the Calvinistic conception have something to offer in the form of governmental policy?

The Calvinist's conception of individual freedom differs from many others in at least two respects. In the first place the concept of a "right" is unique.

The Calvinist believes that as a citizen man is a moral being. He is just as moral as a citizen, as he is as a church member. He must live by moral rules. A "right," therefore, is not a privilege to do what one pleases in respect to some phases of one's life. It is not a license which foregoes responsibility. For the Calvinist a right is a duty. We have no rights in and for themselves. We only have rights to live up to moral laws, or God's command. In fact, a "right" is a God-given privilege to live up to His command. The idea of freedom, therefore, is not the popular conception that man can do what he pleases.

Hence, it is obvious, that the attitude of the Calvinist is going to affect his policy in government. He believes in freedom, but not in the sort of freedom which finds its bounds in the other man's rights. His conception of freedom is based on morals and is not changed by the density of population. The Calvinist not only demands the privilege to exercise duties issuing from these inalienable rights, but he demands it for others. He is as much concerned about others' rights as he is about his own. In fact he takes freedom so seriously that he demands that the government create opportunity, if such opportunity is denied, that his fellowman can exercise the duties accruing from these rights. The Calvinist in action defends the weak against the strong. It has been called the philosophy of the underdog.

The rights of man are therefore not mere characteristics such as having a nose and ears. They are moral characteristics and these entail moral responsibility. Here again the Calvinist lives by principle.

"Rugged Individualism"

In contrast, allow me to present a view which has been practiced from time to time in the history of our government, though not always as an explicit view until quite recently. It is the view which has adopted the inviting name "Rugged Individualism."
In this view rights are viewed primarily as opportunities of the individual. In consequence, many of its followers have not been the sort that men who maintain this view on rational grounds, are proud of. They are the opportunists. A right, in this view, is a right in and by itself. It is not a duty. I do not say that men who hold this view do not believe in duties. There are honorable men who hold this view. They are only the hangars-on, the opportunists, who forget about the duties. But the philosophers of this view do not hold that the right itself is a duty. A duty is quite apart. These rights may be exercised at any expense. Duties come afterward. It simply gives a man the opportunity to do what he pleases as pertains to these rights. These rights are held to be well-nigh sacred. This view stands for non-interference of the government in business. However monopolistic, whatever the consequence for the rest of the citizens, government must not interfere.

The policy this school of thought follows has been called laissez-faire, i.e., the let-it-go policy, the less government the better.

To my mind this is but one step removed from anarchy. In practice it follows the law of the jungle—might is right. Such individualism does lead to contradiction. Though it seeks freedom, it finds slavery to power. It preaches non-interference of government, but spends fabulous sums to maintain lobbies to support legislation which is in their favor and suppress that which is not. This view must end in failure; its principles, if they may be called such, lead to chaos. It is a view like this that gives an occasion for the remark of Mussolini to describe us as the “blundering herds of democracies.”

**Sin and the Nature of Man**

The other respect in which the Calvinist's view of individual freedom differs from many others pertains to the concept of the individual. His view of man is not a common view.

The idea of democracy, as you know, made its biggest strides with the philosophy of Rousseau and Voltaire. The theory of man for Rousseau was that man is all right. What makes man bad is his environment. By nature he will do the right thing if you only give him a chance.

This view has been echoed again and again through education, politics, and criminology. Let the child go, let him follow the inclinations of his nature. He'll come out on top. Let men have plenty of liberties and your government will pan out well. When the criminal commits a crime we should be nice to him. After all he wasn't at fault, it was the environment. Of course there is just enough truth in this, to give it popular appeal. The decline of cultural and moral training in the schools, has of course been the result. Criminals have grown into gangs. Fortunately, in all these fields we are beginning to take a more sensible attitude.

The Calvinist, in contrast, holds that the nature of man is not good, it is infected with evil. Good for the Calvinist is a moral achievement. Men do not seek the good by nature. Men are selfish, greedy, haters of men and God. By God's grace they have a moral sense, and by moral struggle they achieve the good.

Just a glance at the history of the world gives ample proof that the Calvinist is on the right track. The Calvinist as a result is no dreamer. He is a realist. He sees things as they are. He does not depend on human nature to do the right thing. He believes in putting restraints where necessary. He believes in moral control. He is an idealist, but not an idealist that closes his eyes to the facts. Philosopher Wenley, not a Calvinist, but nevertheless a shrewd observer of man, said, "Man is recalcitrant. He does not want to learn the good. You have to beat it into him."

American leaders have often failed to take these facts into account. The late President Wilson was a man of ideals and principles. He was ready to sacrifice all for what he thought was right and good. But the events of the World War proved that his confidence in men and nations was not warranted. Man does not seek the good. They are ready to use moral ideals and sacred beliefs for their own designs. When we are dealing with man, it is well to know man.

**Society an Organism**

There is a social principle which is a basis for the aforementioned political principle. Calvinism believes that mankind, the whole of societv, is an organism. Man does not stand to man as two pebbles on a beach. Man stands to man in a relationship of brotherhood. We belong organically to the same family. Man and man are interdependent, but not like the parts of a machine. Parts of a machine can be replaced. A loss of a man is irreparable. This stresses the worth, the value of man. Every man has a function to perform in society. If he fails, he harms society. He may think it is his own business exclusively whether or not he fills his place well. But man fails society when he fails himself.

There is one social law basic to all social laws. It is the law Christ Himself gave, "Love thy neighbor as thyself." If a man fails to live by this law he not only fails his neighbor, but he fails himself. He is related socially to his neighbor as his hand is related to his mouth. If the hand fails, the mouth will suffer. To love your neighbor means to live for your neighbor.

There are many opposing theories of society. For some, society is a close organization in which the State is important and not the individual. The individual must bow to the will of the state. Germany has and still exemplifies this theory. Russia's grave fault today is this—the individual has become a slave to the state. The state is not the servant of the people. For others the contrary is the case. And this is true of many Americans. The individual is so important, that the organic unity of society is disregarded. Each individual is regarded as self-seeking. And so far correct. But they draw from this the principle of the survival of the fittest. "Seek personal gain by power, cunning, and craftiness," becomes the social law. Success then must be described as the achievement of getting the better of your fel-
laws. The ambition of each is for power, to lord it over his fellows. The policies of these opposing groups is a matter of history. The political fight for power by way of party and political machine has usually been prompted by this view. International diplomacy has come to mean, get what advantage you can by power or cunning. The nations of the world assume no moral attitude towards one another. Whether the plans were right or not I am not ready to say, but Woodrow Wilson did try to introduce a moral attitude in international politics. This high ideal was trampled under foot by a self-seeking world of nations. Moral integrity, moral law are only used as means to gain an end. When no longer of good use they are thrown into the discard.

This disregard for the fundamental social law has, is, and will lead to war and destruction. Disregard the laws of health and you have destruction of health. Disregard the basic law of society and you have social decay.

Our Duty as Calvinists

What shall be the policies of the Calvinist in respect to this social law? The Calvinist will take an active part in the affairs of state. The problem of his neighbor is his problem. He is related to his neighbor by the ties of an organism. The Calvinist cannot sit by the side of the road and watch the race of men go by. He is in the race of men. Love thy neighbor is positive. This is the only way to permanent peace. As followers of the Prince of Peace, for peace we must be actively engaged.

Live by principle, by moral law, is the keynote for Calvinism in politics. If mankind fail the moral law, culture will fall into decay, civilization will tumble into destruction.

A THEORY OF LAW

Dorr Kuizema, LL.B.
Attorney-at-Law

Law, according to Holland's definition, is a rule of external human action enforced by a sovereign political authority. This definition posits the state as necessary to its enforcement, if not to the existence itself of law. Sanction of law of course, needs the strong arm of the state, but could we not have law without the state? Conventions of external human action there would have to be, and be somehow regarded and observed, even if there were no state. It is the fact of the existence of human beings side by side and of the needs which they have that require expression which account for rules of action. The State is an invention growing out of the need for governing and to enforce upon people their duty to observe rules for human behavior.

What Are Rights?

The need for law grows out of the necessity for regulating human conduct. How has this need become recognized? Is it because without this regulation we humans overstep certain bounds? But why do we recognize bounds and how are they marked? We assert to do what we claim we may do and what we desire others shall do or refrain from doing. And to be able to have others permit us to do what we claim we may do or to have them do or refrain from doing what we think they should or should not do is a truly marvelous thing. It is because it has been recognized that we have what is called "rights" that this has become possible. What then is a right? Holland's definition is: "The capacity of one person by a strength not his own but that of the opinion or force of society to have others do or refrain from doing certain things." But this makes right only that which we can have enforced for us; and not something inherent in the nature of things. It requires society and the state for enforcement. It almost identifies right with law.
human society was to function at all. Still it cannot be said that this spontaneity is all wrong. For, it has to do with all our fundamental human capacities, needs and desires; and these must find utterance. They are the mainsprings of our existence; they are our very human nature, and what is to be done about them? The trouble is we don’t seem to have wisdom and sense enough for self-control; and need outside-control. That’s our eternal shame. We couldn’t be anarchists if we would.

But now we have come to the source or beginning of our law. It lies in a sense of right and wrong which is founded in the human psychical elements and is expressed through the control of human relations. The psychical elements must find outlet and expression, and find it only through the human relations in their various ramifications.

The human psychical elements are many, giving rise to many different kinds of relationships. Love and the sexual facts give rise to marriage and the family. And in order to promote the family relationship and for natural, loving care of offspring, promiscuous sexual relations, and even polygamy and polyandry are taboo. Bodily needs require fulfillment, and work and business are encouraged in all possible ways, and the rewards thereof confirmed to the earner. Personal initiative and incentive are recognized as desirable and are protected unto a capitalistic society. Right of property is a naturally recognized result of affirming to the earner the result of his labor. Love of and right of possession are deeply grounded in human nature. Upon it is founded our present form of society, which very naturally gives scope and opportunity for expression to it.

When we come to the need of human expression in the arts and love of knowledge and wisdom, we find that society provides opportunity for that too. So also for religion and the free exercise thereof, and whatever other human urges there may be for which men seek expression. The inner urging and surging of man’s heart and mind and will must find its expression, and does find it through the manifold human relationships.

**A Constant and a Variable**

But now, although the human psychical elements are the same in all men and are always the same elements, differing only in intensity in different people, the human relational circumstances vary to some extent from time to time. That is to say there are modified expressions of attitudes toward what the proper relational conduct should be from one time to another. Of course the sexes don’t change and there will always be men and women and children. There will always be bread and drink and clothing and shelter required for our bodies, and we shall always need expression in art, literature and religion. But whether there shall be free love or marriage and whether monogamy or polygamy or polyandry depend on various kinds of attitude toward the sexual facts. And whether with bread-getting through private initiative or socialism, or with art, ideas and religion we shall have personal freedom or be communistically controlled, depends on a world of difference in attitude, resulting in very different kinds of relationship, or notions of what those relations should be.

What now must the attitude of society toward the human relational elements be? Must it be the free development of them, or must it be the strict preservation of present molds? Or is there a third possibility: recognition of the immutability of certain relational facts, but permitting the growth of environmental variation of conduct upon the relational facts, within the natural limits set by those facts? And therefore to prohibit all Utopian revolution not based upon them? Where are the limits and what is Utopian?

**What is the Purpose of Law?**

The next question, after considering the source of law is: What is the purpose or function of the law? To regulate human relations, is the usual answer. That is a true one as a general proposition. But how regulate them? May our common law have any fixed policies as to the kind of society we should live in? Or is that a matter for the state only? But if that is a matter solely for the state, then the state determines our common law also, and it becomes political law. Now, so far as the every day human relations in society are concerned—in society as at present constituted—these are usually regulated daily and piece-meal as they come up. General policies of how society ought to be constituted don’t seem to have any great concern with these daily regulated relations. Doubtless, state concerns played their part years ago, in making these now everyday relations what they are. They just don’t clearly appear to affect our daily concerns now. Nevertheless the law’s function is two-fold. It deals with the immediate, i.e. it must decide individual cases as they come up in the light of things as they are. But at the same time it must keep watch of any social movements and fall in line with those that seem to give a directing shape to human relations. Law never can be revolutionary. It must allow society to function freely in the business it has to do. It must do this by letting each individual do his share of the world’s work that must be done. We are gregarious beings and must work within the society of mankind. If that shall be possible then society must be rendered possible. It cannot be a house divided against itself. Every man can live his own life only in co-operation with the existing state of the historical period he lives in. The purpose of law, therefore, is larger than dealing with law suits merely. Its larger purpose is to make it always possible for man adequately to live his life and to do his part of the world’s work and to that end to make possible and secure a society that has the approval of men generally in the historical period of the world they live in so that life may be so lived and the world’s work may be so done as may then be required.

Of course, if any one wants a radically different society than the one he lives in, and is impatient to wait for its gradual coming, then revolution only can bring it. But then again, revolution having been successful, there must be such law as will make that society possible and its particular life therein pos-
sible of living. It would seem however, that any revolution which establishes a society that runs counter to human nature may have a hard time to establish and enforce its needed rules. But that is another matter, and does not change the philosophy as to what is the purpose of law and the kind we need.

How is Law Determined?

We have seen where lies the source of law and what is its purpose. How do we get the law? How is it determined? Make it? Yes, but that is more easily stated than done. Even statutory law is not always easy to make. That appears so clearly when there is lacking an adequately directed attitude toward the human relations we try to regulate. For instance we shall never get a socially minded government giving to the wielders of the tools of production the profits of industry while labor itself maintains its large-wage-getting attitude toward our capitalistic form of industry. But possibly long before a socialistic government is brought about we may recognize the justice of giving labor a larger share of its own work. We do this to some extent now, but as yet it is being enforced only by the opinion of society and not by law. Further development of our capitalistic state may require its legal enforcement in time to come. We can see that this may come about very naturally. In the natural way—so to speak—most of our law does come about. Law widens with life itself. It grows as man grows. And sometimes very fast, witness its growth in the field of airplane law and the radio.

Fundamentally, all law is determined from right. Right has a threefold basis in human nature and the human relations. It concerns the demands of men not to be hurt, to receive what is their due and not to be deprived of that which is their own. From this trinity of basic notions come forth the many ways in which man tries to find expression in sex life in securing bodily sustenance and shelter giving expression to art, ideas and religion and what of else there may be in life. We experience the needs of this threefold demand psychically. But when we talk about its scope we must use terms and concepts. Law does the same. Law is expression and judgment concerning right relations among men. Complete liberty of living is the desire of every man. But it is difficult of fulfillment consonant with the granting of this liberty equally to all men. A truce must be called and bounds fixed. And if the bounds are not regarded, the state must enforce such regard because war between contestants for the right or might of the stronger, society cannot tolerate. This fixing or defining of the bounds is the province of the law, and is done by recognizing human needs and need of expression through human relations and judging that a man should go thus far and no farther. This judging is, of course, based upon human experience, religious attitude and sage insight, to all of which the law is not a stranger. Lawmakers idealize their lives and live their ideas as well as do the laity. But legal, as distinguished now from non-legal judgment is a balanced judgment, because it must take into account many legitimate desires and claims, but which have to be balanced with one another in order that life may be lived harmoniously.

Law, Morals and Custom

And so law comes about through judgments that must fit in with the ideas of society. There must be harmony between the judgments on various relations of life that crowd one upon the other. Honest folk conduct themselves in the main in conformity with morality and law, because their own judgment is in the main the same as that of the law. We do not speak now of legal intricacies in technical spheres of life, for these are brought about by the complexity of life as it specializes itself. But the fact that honest folk do observe the law fundamentally, shows that we are all kin to everything human, and thus capable of comprehending the judgments of the law.

All of us grow up in society and to some extent know its aims, and quite largely what is expected of us. Laws often reflect the customs we see round about us, and the morals that are observed generally. Law has grown from primitive beginnings in a primitive state of society. If civilization were swept away, we should have to begin again making all kinds of adjustments accordingly as our judgment determined what attitude we should take toward the expressing of our human nature through the human relations. As civilization progressed and society became more complex, we should in time again have a complexity of relations, with a complex system of administration. We can't have primitive and simple laws for a complex society like ours. No stare decisis would do in such a case. No doubt, into these balanced judgments of the law has gone much of unbalance or bias that many people object to and would like to get rid of. That is their privilege, and with much they will no doubt succeed in time in spite of stare decisis. But they shall have to be ever on the watch. For, having got rid of some unbalance, others will slip in. Meanwhile we must live our life and we can do it only in the state of society in which we happen for the time to be living albeit it is constantly changing, and mayhap according to our way and contrary to other people's way of thinking. Possibly the most we can hope for is a good compromise between our own and these others' judgments of what we believe ought to be, hoping meanwhile to convert the other fellow to our way of thinking altogether some day. And along will come the law to crystallize perhaps all too soon, our own thinking into rules of living—let us hope then—not too solidly against our subsequent maturer judgment.
MODERN TRENDS IN ART AND MUSIC
Henry J. Van Andel, A.M.
Professor of Art and Teacher of Organ, Calvin College

Church Music in the Church

While the process of secularization goes on in every realm of thought it is refreshing to note that in the world of organ and church music the trend seems to be reversed. There is a decided current in America and in Europe to use for church services only such music as is sacred in character. The vocal music is improving right along, and is becoming more stately and serious. The secular offertories are disappearing from the service programs, and being displaced by vocal selections. For preludes the more quiet and dignified types of music are being advocated, choral preludes, andante movements, figures on sacred themes, and even adagios and graves of the same character. For postludes also organists are beginning to make a distinction between concert and church music. In the new hymnals the so-called evangelistic hymns are disappearing together with the monotonous strains which move around the tonic, or repeat the tonic too often. Cantatas and oratorios are being published and studied which have either a classical or a modern atmosphere, but which are decidedly worthwhile. There is a general effort to weed out the post-romantic sentimentalities of the preceding century and of our own day. Whoever wants to keep posted should not neglect to read The American Organist, or The Diapason. The latter is more popular, but worth while, for it keeps to the high standards of true musicianship: church music in the church, concert music in the concert hall.

Back to Bach

One of the most amazing new trends is the fashion to play Bach and his predecessors. The romantic type of music is neatly set off by the severe compositions of the older composers who continued in the old modes, and also by the rather rigid polyphonic music of Bach's predecessors. Moreover it cannot be denied that there is something in Bach and in at least some of his predecessors that is very serviceable for the religious worship, because it is dignified, serious, and equanimical, and because many old themes seem to be linked up with old German or "Dutch" chorales.

In the Sunday Mormon programs we find a good deal of secular music set to sacred words, and we would not wonder if others are continuing in this fashion. But the majority of church programs begin to show a great appreciation of the worship music of such great masters as Bach, Mendelssohn, Bossi, Franck, Karg Elert, Rheinberger, Reger, Buxtehude, Sweelinck, Arcadelt, Palestrina, Brahms, Handel, MacDowell, Guilmant, Widor, the Russians, and of such moderns as Kreckel, Stoughton, Clokey, Edmundson, Cor Kee, Willem Oranje, Andriessen, Sowerby, Noble, James, Bingham, Rogers, Barnes. Either kind of program, mixed or purely ecclesiastical, has a preponderance of Bach, or at least one Bach number.

The greatest factor in this return to Bach, we believe, is not the law of action and reaction, that is in this case, a reaction against romantic and modern music, but much more the fact that there is no music that is more practicable than Bach's for church service. First of all, Bach has a great amount of easy and moderately difficult music. Second, there is never anything mediocre or monotonous about him, if one takes the trouble to master him thoroughly, and to understand him. Third, there is not a composition of the worship type but one can find a chorale to match it as an introduction and as a conclusion. Finally, there is hardly a composition by Bach, but it can be used for all purposes, as a prelude, as an offertory, and as a postlude. Each requires a different registration, and a different tempo, of course. Moreover, offertories should be played with expression, postludes purely rhythmical without expression, and preludes can be treated either way. But we cannot think of any master whose church music has so much elasticity as Bach's. It is this discovery, we venture to guess, which has made Bach so popular.

However, Bach has one more quality which makes him beloved with those who thoroughly enjoy him. This is the fact that there is no organ music that is so rhythmical as Bach's. In order to bring this out Bach should be played with Diapasons and Flutes only, leaving even the thick flutes out, and only with an occasional cornopean, or tuba to flavor the climaxes. If the full organ is used for the climaxes, one should be very careful with the sixteen foot stops and couplers. For Bach should never sound muddy or noisy, but always clear and resonant. The louder the organ rises, the slower it should proceed. And the time should always be as measured as of a clock. No rubato when Bach demands majesty. No wavering. No tremulant. Nothing but puritanic regularity.

Mendelssohn's Star is Rising

There was a time when Mendelssohn was called a third class composer. That was when Wagner and Grieg, and Tchaikowsky, and the other warhorses were in vogue. But with the return to Bach, Mendelssohn has gained in popularity. Is it because Mendelssohn revived Bach after he had been forgotten for about a century? Perhaps, but there may be other reasons. There is a melodiousness in Men-
Bach hardly attains, because the latter insists almost continuously in breaking up his themes, at least when he resorts to freer treatment. Bach hides his thoughts. He is the great Sphynx whose mysterious language the uninitiated have called pitter-patter. Mendelssohn is straightforward, he preserves his tunes. On the other hand, Bach’s chords are on the whole simpler, whereas Mendelssohn’s harmony is more complicated. He loves the seventh and ninth chords, and he is fond of introducing a fifth and a sixth part, a challenge to small hands and small feet. But there is more. Bach turns to the tragic. Mendelssohn lifts you to the victorious. Bach glories in minor keys. Mendelssohn shouts in major triads. There is discipline in Bach. There is an overwhelming richness in Mendelssohn. And the same holds for their oratorios. Bach speaks of the majesty and the faithfulness of God. But Mendelssohn in his Elijah and in his St. Paul thunders at you that God is infinitely good and merciful, full of loving kindness and forgiving grace. Bach is at his best when he prays, Come sweet death. Mendelssohn is at his greatest when he comforts, But the Lord is mindful of His own.

**SIN—GRACE**

I revelled in the dust,
Clutching the things of earth,
Delighting in their pleasure,
Thinking they were joy-giving,
Trusting in them for peace.

I grovelled in the dust,
Felled by the very things I grasped,
Deceived by fleeting pleasures,
Bereft of real joy of life,
Robbed of all peace of mind and heart.

Then I heard a voice from above:
“What profit if all this ye gain
And lose your very soul?
These things lead but to death,
But I give endless life.”

I raised my eyes from the dust,
And let slip the things of earth;
I reached for the things above;
The first touch brought me peace,
A new joy filled my heart,
A heart united with God.

—H. P.

**VAPOR**

Twenty-seven dollars worth of perfume
in a chaliced vessel
—relic of affluent days.
It was my valued earthly treasure, too much prized;
I used it sparingly, only for rare occasions.
Twenty-seven dollars!

Then a brief time I used it lavishly
And breathed it giddily;
What was it that he said comparing me?
—Ah, burning memory!

Now I as easily and lightly crash the crystal
Upon resistant pavement.
I shall walk away without one backward glance;
Never again can I walk far enough or fast enough
To find him.

—JOAN GEISEL GARDNER.
THE subject of the relation between Calvinism and Capitalism is of transcendent interest and importance for every present-day Christian, but especially for the Calvinist. This subject has been in the limelight for some years. Scholars like Weber, Troeltsch, Tawney, and Robertson have written solid books on the subject. Of late, with the growing interest in the discussion of the evils of the economic order, the question as to whether capitalism must be considered grounded in Christian Ethics, more particularly Calvinistic Ethics, is one that will not down.

Also on the pages of THE CALVIN FORUM this issue has bobbed up again and again, in articles, in editorials, and in letters from our subscribers. Nor is this surprising. For a Calvinistic magazine that is interested in the exposition and the defense of the Reformed Faith both in its basic beliefs and in its social implications, the issue of the relation between Calvinism and capitalism is inescapable.

We propose to discuss certain angles of this subject in a series of articles, of which this is the first.

**A New Book**

The immediate occasion for doing so is found in the appearance of a significant book dealing with this subject. This book we will make the theme of this first article. As such it will admirably serve to introduce the subject in its larger aspects. We refer to the new book of Dr. Hyma, known to many readers of our magazine as the author of The Christian Renaissance. He has also edited not so long ago a new manuscript of Thomas a Kempis' Imitation of Christ, and in 1928 wrote Luther's Theological Development from Erfurt to Augsburg.

The new book on the subject under discussion is entitled: *Christianity, Capitalism and Communism*. It bears the sub-title: A Historical Analysis. Its author, Dr. Albert Hyma, is Professor of History at the University of Michigan. The publisher is the author himself at Ann Arbor, the seat of Michigan's University. Its imprint is 1937. Its price $2.75. It is a volume of over 300 pages.

We do not hesitate to call this a valuable and significant book. It is written by a scholar who knows his field and quotes extensively from his primary sources. The book is a scholarly historical study, and yet it is written in such a form that any person of average intelligence can enjoy it. Though the author draws upon sources in Latin, Italian, French, German, and Dutch as well as English, he nowhere parades his learning nor loads down the pages of his book with foreign quotations. The references in the footnotes prove what extensive research and solid scholarship has gone into the making of this work, but the author makes it easy for any person who reads English to enjoy the benefits of his study.

As Dr. Hyma presents the results of his historical research into the question of the connection between Protestantism (especially Calvinism) on the one hand and capitalism, together with communism, on the other, he furnishes the statements from many theologians and moralists that have never appeared in English before. This study introduces the reader to a large range of Reformed theological writers who— even to many modern Calvinists—are in many cases known only by name. The reader becomes not only acquainted with the views of such modern and recent writers as Weber, Troeltsch, Tawney, Robertson, Doumergue, and Sombart, but he also hears speaking to him from Dr. Hyma's pages the voices of Luther and Calvin, Voetius and Duns, Clappenburg and Zanchius, Aquinas and Duns Scotus, Melanchthon and Zwingle, Amesius and Rivetus, Macovius and Polanus, Baxter and Perkins, Jeremy Taylor and Burroughs.

**Dr. Hyma's Central Theme**

Dr. Hyma discusses his subject in the following nine chapters. I. Wealth and Poverty in the Medieval Church; II. Martin Luther's Attitude toward Capitalism; III. The Economic Theories of Calvin; IV. Communism among the Catholics and Protestants in the Sixteenth Century; V. Sixteenth Century Protestantism and the Rise of Capitalism; VI. Calvinism and Capitalism in the Dutch Republic; VII. Puritanism versus Capitalism; VIII. Capitalism versus Puritanism; IX. Communism and the Sit-Down Strike Movement.

We believe we are doing our readers a service and only justice to this significant book by presenting in brief compass the contents of these nine chapters.

Chapter I is devoted to the medieval view of wealth and poverty. The author contends correctly that it is impossible to understand the ethical views on economic subjects of Luther and Calvin without a clear understanding of the medieval theological ethics in which these views were grounded in part, and against which in part they were also a reaction. Thomas Aquinas and Roman Catholic Canon Law are his chief sources. At the close of this chapter, in which the subject of the ethics of usury and interest is introduced, Professor Hyma formulates the theme of his book in this paragraph:

"Now the question arises, Did capitalism grow naturally out of the environment which we have just discussed, or did the Reformation cause its rapid rise for the most part at least? Is it true, as many scholars have said recently, that wherever Protestantism went, capitalism followed it? Again, is it true that before the Reformation the peoples of Western Europe could not break away from the rules laid down by Aquinas and Aristotle concerning usury and the dishonor which was attached to 'big business'? Finally, is it true that the vocation of each
individual was looked upon in the Middle Ages as something of little significance, and that not until Luther and Calvin had endowed it with a religious character, was it regarded with proper respect?"

The author holds that "the last three questions should all be answered in the negative." He sides with those Roman Catholic scholars "who have rightly asserted that the Protestant writers in Germany, led by Max Weber and Ernst Troeltsch, failed to study thoroughly the medieval mind."

This indicates the author's central position. With the exception of the last chapter (which deals with the American situation, especially of recent date) the entire book may be said to be a refutation upon historical grounds of the Weber-Troeltsch thesis that modern capitalism is the true and legitimate offspring of Calvinism and Puritanism.

**Luther, Calvin, and the Anabaptists**

Chapter II deals with Luther's attitude toward capitalism. The author here sets straight a number of views and interpretations of present-day writers on the subject, among them Troeltsch. His argument is quite effective in bringing out the need of interpreting the various utterances of Luther on usury, interest, rents, tithes, and taxes in the light of the spiritual soil in which these grew. That spiritual soil, he holds, is Scripture, especially the five books of Moses, rather than the scholastic writers and canon law. He also, quite plausibly, explains a number of alleged inconsistencies in Luther's writings on the subject. Luther is both quoted and interpreted with care and apparent fairness.

The economic theories of Calvin are taken up in Chapter III. Hyma laments the fact that many modern writers speak so glibly about Calvin's views on the subject under discussion without going to the sources. He takes sharp issue with Weber and Troeltsch for their unpardonable misunderstanding (not to say, misrepresentation) of Calvin. He points out that Calvin made a distinction between legitimate and illegitimate usury, and that for these he sometimes employed the designations respectively of usury (considered sinful) and interest (considered legitimate). However, the author points out that in this he did not differ essentially from Luther, who had set forth a similar distinction some years before. Hyma enumerates no less than ten points of agreement between the position of Calvin and that of Luther on this matter of the legitimacy of interest (pp. 79-80), and expresses his agreement with Doumergue in the latter's amazement at the distorted and misleading judgment of Weber and Troeltsch on this point.

A very interesting chapter is the fourth, dealing with Communism in the sixteenth century, both among Catholics and Protestants. He holds that modern Communists are in no way justified in appealing to Scripture (Acts 4:34-37) for support. Moreover, he shows that, although Luther was in the main favorably disposed toward the "communism" of the Brethren of the Common Life, he was the sworn enemy of the "communism" of the peasants who revolted against the duly constituted authorities. In this connection the "communism" of the Münster (Westphalia) Anabaptists comes in for treatment. He shows that all the great Reformers—Menno Simons, the great Anabaptist leader in Holland, included—were strongly opposed to communism and turned sharply against the communistic venture of the Anabaptists of Münster.

**Calvinism Arch-Enemy of Capitalism?**

Did 16th century Protestantism in any special way promote the rise of capitalism? That is the main question answered in Chapter V. The author holds that the stand of Calvin and Calvinists on interest did not greatly promote capitalism. In fact, the view on this score of such Reformers as Melanchthon and Bucer, Luther, Zwingli, and Calvin did not form much of a contrast with the medieval view. The truth about the "bank of Geneva" is that no such bank was founded, as is alleged, under Beza, and that the ecclesiastical authorities somewhat later strenuously opposed a similar venture proposed by the civil authorities. All in all, there was very little difference, taken in the main, between the Roman Catholic and the Protestant view on Capitalism. In fact, says the author, "Protestantism is more anti-capitalistic than Catholicism" (p. 300). This somewhat surprising statement (to a criticism of which we shall revert later) is reinforced by such statements as that Calvin "showed a decidedly anti-capitalistic attitude in frowning upon all attempts to secure a superabundance of temporal riches"; and that a "careful study of the French sources will demonstrate the true character of Calvinism as the arch-enemy of capitalism."

This leads the author to raise the question as to the explanation for the remarkable rise and progress of capitalism in such a Calvinistic country as the Netherlands in the 17th century. This he discusses in Chapter VI. Dr. Hyma holds that the reason for this development must not be sought primarily in its Calvinism, but in other, non-religious, secular factors. Not the real, strict Calvinists were the leaders in the commercial, financial, and cultural development of the 17th century Holland, (p. 144). The author apparently agrees with Beins (whom he quotes) that "the leading Calvinists in the Netherlands between 1569 and 1650 shared the views of their contemporaries on the most vital social, economic and political questions." (p. 145). He then quotes Dutch Calvinistic theologians of that century to disprove the Weber-Troeltsch thesis, and in the closing part of the chapter the contention is stressed that essentially secular—not religious—factors are responsible for the rise and progress of capitalism in 17th century Holland.

**Puritanism and Calvinism**

Chapters VII and VIII deal with the attitude of the Puritans toward capitalism. The author quotes a large number of Puritan writers to prove that Puritanism could not have promoted capitalism. In fact, in these chapters we repeatedly find the statement that Puritanism was decidedly "anti-capitalistic." (See pp. 217, 218, 224, 225, 228, 237).

The final chapter is of an entirely different nature. Under the title, Communism and the Sit-Down
Strike, the author gives us a discussion, the heart of which appeared as an article in The Calvin Forum of July, 1937, dealing with American democracy and the menace of communism as coming to expression in the sit-down strikes of recent date. This chapter has the plea for the study of history before social reform is undertaken in common with all the other chapters of the book. And we may possibly close the survey of the contents of this significant volume with the following sentence on the next-to-the-last page of the book: "It is, therefore, the sincere hope of the present writer that he may have induced some wayward wanderers who do not sufficiently appreciate what the founders of our nation have done for us, to return to their history texts before they shall attempt to reform our social organism."

A Valuable Book

The main drift of Dr. Hyma's argument is clear from this survey of the contents of the book, we trust. He repudiates and refutes the thesis of Max Weber and Ernst Troeltsch which maintains that Calvinism is the fruitful mother of modern capitalism. In this he stands in the main on the side of H. M. Robertson, who, five years ago, in his Aspects of the Rise of Economic Individualism also assailed the position of Weber. Dr. Hyma's book, however, is written not from the economic but from the religious and the historical point of view. As such the book is quite unique.

From all this it is apparent that Dr. Hyma has written a significant book on an important subject. The book possesses abiding interest and value for the history of Calvinistic ethical thought. Its significance for the pressing socio-economic problem of our day needs no emphasis. It is a book of interest and value for historians and economists, but no less for theologians and for pastors who are in earnest about seeing the bearing of Calvinism upon the issues of our day. In fact, it is a valuable book for all who are in any way concerned about knowing the will of God as revealed in His Word for one of the most pressing and threatening problems of our day.

This book ought to be bought and read. It ought to be placed in every church library. Our readers ought to request their local public libraries to procure a copy. There is so much distorted writing and propaganda concerning Calvinism afloat in our day. This book will do a good deal to correct erroneous impressions and views.

Does this mean that we have no criticism after the reading of this book? Hardly. But such criticism as we have we hope to weave into the further discussion of the problem of the relation of Calvinism and Capitalism, of which this book review is but the first article.

And may I suggest to those of our readers who are inclined to ask what all this historical argument as to Calvinism and Capitalism has to do with the burning issue as to the proper and just socio-economic order of our day, that they remember that, though history does not speak the last word, it most assuredly must speak the first word in any such serious problem as the one we are facing in this series of articles.

BOOKS

THE IMITATION OF CHRIST


For those who are accustomed to associate The Imitation of Christ, the most widely read book after the Bible, with the name of Thomas à Kempis, there is a surprise in store. In 1929 Paul Hagen, city librarian of Lübeck, discovered an old manuscript in Dutch which had formerly belonged to the Sisters of the Common Life. Professor Jacobus Van Ginneken, Rector of the Catholic University of Nijmegen, Netherlands, published it at Nijhoff's, the Hague (1929, price 24 guilders) together with a study on the authorship, of which the book by Malaise is both a translation and a summary of the arguments. Dr. Van Ginneken comes to the conclusion that The Imitation was not written in Latin, but in Dutch, and not by Thomas à Kempis, but by Geert Groote. He bases his conclusion on the following arguments:

1. The order of the Lübeck manuscript is more logical and, therefore, more original than the one of Thomas, though the Lübeck manuscript contains only the second of the three books: 1. Admonitions very useful for a spiritual life. 2. Admonitions concerning interior things, consisting of three parts: a. of interior conversation; b. of the interior discourse of Christ to the faithful soul; c. of interior consolat

2. Thomas did not only change the order of the different parts, but he even changed the order of the chapters except in Book one, and in Book two, part a, which does not improve the natural development of the themes.

3. Thomas, moreover, tried to improve upon the Latin text, and did not always succeed, for he sometimes missed the meaning of the original, and in one case introduced the "heretical doctrine of Predestination." The volume is stronger, if the interpolations are left out.

4. Thomas finally inserted twelve chapters, seven prayers, and numerous passages of his own, according to Van Ginneken, because, naturally, the shorter manuscript is the earlier one.

5. The catalog of Rooklooster, Brabant, names Gerard Groote as the author of the Interior Conversation, and Petrus Horn, in his biographey of Groote, attributes the same work to Groote.
6. It is under the title of the Interior Conversation, comprising both Books one and two that John Gospin, abbot of Windesheim, brought the volume with him to the Council of Constance, in 1416. The name Gospin became gradually corrupted into Jean Gerson by French copyists, which fact explained that the French claimed Gerson as the author of The Imitation. But in 1416 Thomas was too young (36) to write a mystical work.

7. The logical order of the Lübeck manuscript corresponds with the turbulent life of Geert Groote. Hence The Imitation ought to be looked upon as a diary of Geert Groote.

8. There are some expressions in The Imitation, viz., “vile sinner,” “covered with shame,” “deserved hell,” and “all creatures are in arms against me,” which could hardly have been written by a devout and peaceful man like Thomas, but very well by a person like Groote, who once led a worldly and restless life, and then came to conversion.

9. Malaise, at last, mentions that certain “scholars who are experts in this matter” have come to the conclusion that the “added” chapters are in the style of Thomas à Kempis, “but that it would require too much time to review their arguments here.” These scholars, apparently, are Van Ginneken and Hagen.

What shall we say in answer to all these learned arguments? First of all, it does not strike us favorably that Malaise takes for granted that Groote wrote the original Imitation, then proceeds to fit it in with Groote’s life, and at last compels the reader to collect Van Ginneken’s arguments from the text in his own fashion. Since the authorship has been a matter of controversy for centuries, we would expect the learned translator to do his utmost to convince the American public of the scientific character of the conclusions of the European scholars who contend that Groote was the author of The Imitation, and to attack seriously the scholars who still maintain that Thomas was the author.

The strongest argument seems to be the parallel between the correct order of The Imitation and the life of Groote after his conversion. We fail to see, however, that the order is personal. Every Christian passes through the same stages. He first becomes convinced of the vanity of this world, then learns to see the sweetness of a walk with God, the usefulness of Christ’s precepts, and the glory of his consolation. It does not matter whether the meditations on the Lord’s Supper come after this or between the second and the third steps of this process. Even from a general Christian point of view this does not make much difference.

The next strongest argument seems to be that Thomas could not have used expressions like “vile sinner.” We cannot agree to that. The Christian Renaissance was almost protestant in its character, and even if it had not been, devout Catholic Christians of the Thomas type might use such biblical expressions very well. We call to mind the famous “Flemish prayer” of Gezelle, the Belgian priest, who confesses

De wereld wil mij achterna,
Al waar ik ga en sta,
Of ook mijn ogen als.

Was Thomas too young to have written The Imitation shortly after his thirtieth year? We doubt it very much. Mystical natures are never too young to write mystical works. And Thomas strikes us as much more of a mystic than the active and rebellious Geert Groote.

The rest of the arguments are of too subjective a nature to make much of an impression on the reader who wants to be both sympathetic and critical.

The argument on the style of Thomas à Kempis might be most convincing if it gives us only a glimpse of the style devices Thomas and Groote used. But here we are left in the dark. If it could be proved from the Dutch works of these two authors that The Imitation was originally written in Dutch, and that either Thomas or Groote was the author, or that both had a certain share in the composition of this famous book, we would feel much gratified.

But the best we can say now, is to repeat what was said by some other critic in 1917. When Van Ginneken’s work appeared in print, viz., that it is interesting, but not convincing.

H. J. V. A.

THE GRACE OF GOD


The late Dr. Bryan, author of this book, was for thirty years minister of the Church of the Covenant in Chicago. From the biographical sketch, which the book contains, we learn that he was a man of scholarly attainments, a preacher of more than ordinary ability, and a wise counselor at ecclesiastical assemblies. He was a staunch Presbyterian of the old school, who had a passion for Reformed truth, and sought assiduously to inculcate this into the minds of his parishioners. In a time when doctrinal preaching was becoming increasingly unpopular he persisted in it and continued to present to his church from Sunday to Sunday the great redemptive facts of the Bible. While some have spoken of him as a “fundamentalist,” he certainly was not one in the historical sense of the term. He was soundly Reformed in his presentation of the truth.

The main body of the book now under consideration consists of the lectures which the author delivered in 1917 on the Thomas Smyth Foundation at the Columbia Theological Seminary of the Presbyterian Church in the United States. The inquiry which forms the subject of this book may be regarded as a very timely one, since a type of theology has been developed in many of the theological schools of our country, and has found favor in a large number of churches, which is far more concerned about its agreement with the prevailing science and philosophy than about its scriptural basis, a theology in which the supernatural is a vanishing quantity, which stresses the love of God and forgets all about His righteousness, which denies the reality of sin, while admitting the existence of evil in the world, and which for that very reason feels no need of the grace of God.

It is a sad fact that there are many people today in so-called Christian churches who, when the word “grace” is mentioned, think only of gracefulness, ease and elegance or attractiveness of movement, manner, attitude, and so on, and have not the least idea of what is meant by the grace of God. Naturally, they feel no need of that of which they have no conception whatever. In view of this fact it is no wonder that the author should inquire, whether the facts as we know them today warrant the assumption that we do not need the grace of God any more.

The author is thoroughly convinced that we are still very much in need of divine grace, and bases his affirmation on a thorough study of the moral law, to which we are all subject and which puts the natural man under condemnation; and of the origin, the nature, and consequences of sin, from which there is no escape except by the grace of God. In the final chapter he acquaints us with what Modernism has to say about our need of grace. Here he carefully distinguishes between different classes of Modernists.

This is a very timely book, and one which every Bible believing student will welcome. There is nothing superficial about it. It is thought-provoking and suggestive. It contains a good deal of close reasoning, but its presentations of the truth are always logical and clear. One who follows them with an unbiased mind will find it hard to escape its conclusions. Moreover, the book is scholarly and up-to-date and contains many references to and quotations from modern scientists, philosophers, and theologians. We sincerely hope that it may have a wide sale, and may serve to awaken once more the sense of man’s dire need of the grace of God unto redemption.

Grand Rapids, Mich.

L. Berkhof.
THE PASSION OF CHRIST


It is a common saying among ministers in the Netherlands, that a preacher's preparation of Lent-sermons is not complete until he has studied Schilder's Christ In His Suffering. The correctness of this statement will be evident after reading the volume herewith announced and reviewed.

The book is not merely an addition to the great number of existing works on the Savior's passion, but definitely enriches it. To Mr. Zylstra the translator, and to the Eerdmans Publishing Company, a salute for having successfully undertaken to bring this splendid book to so large a group of potential readers.

As to language—there is rugged vitality in the book. The thoughts of the learned writer have not been emblazoned in the translation, but, on the whole, wing their flight in rhythmic movement until they alight in the reader's mind, there to commune with him about the passion of our Savior and Lord.

As far as the external appearance of the book is concerned, it is a beautiful specimen of the printer's craft.

The author is professor of Dogmatics at the historic theological School in Kampen, Holland. Before the Reformed Churches of the Netherlands called him to occupy this chair, he wrote a work in three volumes on the sufferings of Christ. The first of these is now available to the English-speaking world.

Schilder has the ability to penetrate into his subject and to state his ideas in penetrating fashion. He has been, so to speak, with the disciples. With them he listened to the Lord. He has watched the Master. He has seen the Mediator. He has heard the Christ, majestically calm, announce to the disciples his sufferings and death. And he caught a glimpse of the reason why Jesus calls Peter a fisherman.

Although the book is written in popular style, so that it may be read by all who love the Lord, superficial reading it is not. It is highly stimulating. The reader will frequently pause and say—how can this be? But upon reflection he discovers that underneath the thoughts presented, lies the strong foundation of sound exegesis.

The season of Lent is nigh at hand. The book of Schilder is here. Most heartily do we recommend it to one and all. May it perform its ministry of seeing the Savior, to the glory of our God.

The genius of Edwards is evident from the more than four hundred pages of his own writings given here. Some of his works are given in full, others in part. There are the youthful essays on insects, the soul, and the rainbow. These already show an ingenious mind. Then there are the personal narratives in which we see a side of Edwards not ordinarily known. They are what Carl Van Doren calls "the lyric ecstasy of an
eloquent heart." There are also several sermons, one a funeral sermon for David Brainerd, the touching farewell sermon to his Northampton congregation, and of course, "Sinners in the Hands of an Angry God." The bulk of the work consists of his theological and philosophical writings. Among these are treatises on the freedom of the will, original sin, religious affections, and the nature of true virtue.

From a reading of Edwards' works one comes to the conclusion that his greatness lies in his intense godliness, his genuine emotions, and his knife-blade logic. His great desire was to restore the truth of the sovereignty of God to New England. He was a "God-intoxicated" man. He was also a man who loved. A great injustice is done to him by those who refer to him only as the preacher of terror. His personal narratives and letters and his great treatise on "Religious Affections" show definitely that benevolence in its highest sense was his great concern. But added to his grace was the power of his mind. His "Freedom of the Will" is as precious a braiding of logic as ever came from the mind of man. He is a match for philosophers because he is one himself. Yet he does not worship reason with the rationalists.

What a man Edwards was! A kind soul, a stern preacher, an untiring logician, a simple child before God. Is it any wonder that he could be minister to a congregation, missionary to the Indians, and president of Princeton?

This book, which fits into a pocket, contains enough for a year's reading and a life-time's reflecting. The editors and publishers have served us well. The form of the book is a delight. That makes it as pleasant to hold in the hand as in the mind and heart. And the contents should restore to any witting Calvinist his self-respect.

Hawthorne, N. J.  
Bastian Kruthoff.

CHRISTIAN CHARACTER TRAINING


In twenty chapters, the author of the book here announced deals with various aspects of character education among the adolescent youth, all treated in a direct and concrete manner that gives every page a touch of actuality and vitalism. Properly dedicated to the Reformed Organizations of Christian Young Men and Young Ladies in the Netherlands, the book moves logically forward from a more general discussion in the field of character and its direction, bodily development and conduct, temperament and instincts to a somewhat detailed treatment of the more outstanding instincts at this age level, and in the remaining 250 pages quite specifically turns the reader to the functional aspects of character in youth, its capacities, its types, and its main relationships in life, the discussion of which is needed in order to bring the whole thesis to the climax of self-education, self-education among girls, self-education among boys, and character education in societies proper.

The author, a minister of the gospel and a writer of wide and ripe experience, gathered both in Europe and in South Africa, comes to us here at his best. The volume before us compared with two of his earlier books, Karakter Opvoeding bij Kleuters and Persoonlijkheid en Karakter is easily the most outstanding. A most carefully selected survey of contributions by scholars to character education is here presented. There is a chapter almost every one that Dr. Los has well posted in the literature of this field, not only in ancient and modern periods but as well concerning American authors and European writers. No less than four hundred writers and characters are quoted for illustrative purposes.

Throughout, one feels that the writer is thoroughly oriented. Added to this he succeeded splendidly in presenting a sane and sound popular discussion of a topic that bristles with scientific terminology in similar books. The human touch of a tender hand and a tender heart one feels again and again when the author with Christian convictions in positive direction and with Christian optimism gives expression to his zeal for the youth.

And this touch becomes all the more real if the reader observes how the author consistently and often in a masterful way evaluates all movements and tendencies in character education in the light of his own Christian philosophy without wavering. The Christian tone, the tender regard for youth, the supreme devotion to the norms of Scripture, and the fine distinctions made for the sake of the well-being of young people mark this book in the opinion of the reviewer as a real mine of golden expressions, as a trusted guide for all those interested in youth and in youth movements, and as a splendid source for basic positions from a Reformed point of view amidst the present day welter of naturalistic discussions of character education.

Dr. Los in character education very favorably compares with an expert guide in mountain climbing in the Alps. He knows the chasms, and crevices, and abysses, and above all he loves to guide adolescent youth around or across them.

The book is a jewel for all who are called upon to guide young people.

Grand Rapids, Mich.  
HENRY VAN ZYL.

MARRIAGE

MARRIAGE IN THE LUTHERAN CHURCH. A Historical Investigation. By Gerhard E. Lenski, Ph.D. Lutheran Book Concern, Columbus, 0. 1936. $2.50.

In this book the pastor of Grace Lutheran Church, Washington, D. C., offers a 377-page study of marriage views and marriage practices in Lutheranism. Chapters I-IV are rather introductory and do not deal with the Lutheran Church. Chapters V-VIII are devoted to Luther's views on marriage, his own marriage, and his attitude toward the bigamous marriage of Philip of Hesse. The remaining chapters deal with later Lutheran marriage views and practices, a special chapter being devoted to marriage in the Lutheran Church of America. In connection with the subject of marriage, the author from time to time also deals with the related social views and practices. The final chapter is a summary. The last 25 pages offer an extensive bibliography, much of which is, however, not restricted to the marriage question. An alphabetical index would have greatly enhanced the serviceableness of this informing volume.

C. B.

MARCH SONG

Winter has gone  
The March wind whistles shrill  
And snow is in the air;  
I do not see the sun  
Or flowers fair.

But somehow in my veins I sense the song  
Of snow-cups underground pushing along  
Toward light and children's life  
Where laughter rings among.

I hear it in the tune all nature sings;  
Last week I saw a flash of robin wings;  
The clouds have promise in the sky—  
No fear, oh fie!

I know there is an urge in everything  
We've turned the corner to the splurge of spring.  
Aha, aha, the March wind shall not scare  
Because we are aware.

—JOAN GEISEL GARDNER.
RELIGIOUS NEWS

Ecuador permitted the exiled Jews from Central Europe to colonize within its borders on the condition that they become agriculturists and not business men. But the Jews were business men and not farmers. These Jewish colonists are now drifting to the cities and becoming industrialists. The Ecuadorian government has ordered all such Jewish business men to leave the country within thirty days. This decision was adopted on the 18th of January. It was apparently not in consideration of the Jew that the Ecuadorians once seemed so considerate. They had land from which they themselves were unable to extract a living. It would be nice to let the poor Jews at their own expense develop agriculture in the waste fields of that country. But even the land did not want the Jews and refused to support them. Hunger drove them into business and the government will drive them out. This is a far cry from the Spirit of the Jewish Rabbi that once trod Galilean soil.

President Walters of the University of Cincinnati finds that the percentage of increase in the institutions of higher learning is dropping at an alarming rate of speed. Latest official reports show that there are 1,183,252 fewer boys and girls in the first six grades than ten years ago. The reduction in the first grade within the last few years is more than twenty percent. At this rate the educational bill of this country can be sharply and drastically cut. But it is regarded as alarming in spite of the educational savings that may be involved. The hope of a nation rests upon its children. Birth control, the principles and methods of which have been discussed recommended and propagated, is doing its effective work. The nation is standing on its last legs when it has, by whatever method, persisted in the No-Children-Wanted spirit.

Dr. Adolf Keller writing in The Presbyterian Survey finds three foes menacing the Christian Church in Europe. First, the menace of new poverty. Here he includes financial poverty and leadership poverty. Second, the revolutionary state with its totalitarian claim and secularistic philosophy. Third, the modern secularism and Christian humanism. He is right. But has he not missed the very greatest menace when he failed to see the corruption of the human heart which gives birth to all sorts of menaces both within and without the church, and which constitutes fertile soil for the reception of the above mentioned perils? The heart filled with the Spirit of God, fortified by the Scriptural injunctions, and dedicated solely to God is immune to such dangers.

The Ministers' Vacation Exchange Department of Church Management will soon begin to function. Its business is to arrange exchanges between ministers for a month or longer during the Summer months. In this way many ministers can secure a vacation without any expense to the congregation. It is a bad idea but it should be strictly limited to the cases where such ministers would not be able to secure a vacation without it. The ministerial work is strenuous, particularly from the point of view of a constant nervous strain of which the preacher himself may not be aware. From that he should seek to be released fully for at least a few weeks per year.

A great deal of discussion was occasioned by an article in the American Magazine on "Why I don't go to Church." The reasons almost invariably can be summarized as follows, because I do not get what I want. Now although one does not get what he wants, he certainly may get what he needs. But apart from that, the approach is exceedingly selfish. Here are a couple of other approaches that might well be taken into consideration. Doesn't God call me to worship him in fellowship with fellow Christians? Can't I contribute something by joining wholeheartedly into the spirit of worship? But selfish we are, and selfishness determines our choices. And there are few things that impoverish as much as selfishness does.

An archdeacon reports on the state of the church within his diocese. The subject is that of gambling. A survey of the diocese shows that 24 ministers out of fifty-one were against gambling on church premises. Twenty-one said that it was all right. The report continues, "The Church in General Convention witnessed against it. So has our bishop. Yet we sell chances; we whirl wheels, we give prizes, we do a thousand things to get something for nothing, rather than give God a tithe of what we possess or of what we earn. When will we dignify our gifts to God by giving Him outright that which is already His, instead of playing around with a false sense of generosity, hoping to get back that which we give?" God give us more of such archdeacons! He resents taking such contributions in the name of God. And just because dubious methods of securing funds for ecclesiastical and benevolent purposes can be found in virtually every denomination, it is high time that some protests be lodged and that the people be educated in methods of supplying funds for the Kingdom that will not be distasteful to God.

The Radiant Church Hour, recently introduced in a St. Louis Community Church, consists of a Sunday Evening Service with a master of ceremonies, a theme song, a guest soloist, a question box, religious plays, and interviews with leaders in church work. What's the object anyway? Is it to draw crowds? It will fail when the novelty wears off. Is it to wean men and women from other institutions of entertainment? It will fail because it can not hope to compete with commercial interests. Is it to raise the cultural standard of the people? It has cheapened its function as the Church of God. Is it to edify the people? Why adopt an inefficient method? The Word of God edifies. The Word of God builds up the faith. The Word of God instills hope and new courage. The Word of God calls men to a new life. There simply is no substitute for the plain and convincing witnessing for the truth of God.

Japanese Christians send help to the Chinese refugees whose homes have been devastated by the present hostilities. At first glance this strikes us as a tremendous example of Christian good will. But this is exactly what we would expect Christians to do. It is a sad commentary upon the Christianity of the past when one is surprised at its functioning on this occasion. The Japanese government will undoubtedly welcome this sort of work. It will help them to solve a tremendous economic and social problem which their own devastations have left to them. It is not necessarily generosity and tolerance on the part of the Japanese authorities. It is self consideration that is on the throne in this matter.

Russia has its pilgrims. Orthodox priests, Baptist ministers, and others are traveling from village to village bringing the message of Christ. They earn their own living and consecrate their leisure time to preaching. The Government has issued orders to local authorities that only priests be admitted that belong to churches officially registered and that services may be held only in buildings under the control of the Government. Christianity simply seems to be ineradicable. No government can ever force God out from the hearts of men where He has taken possession. And neither will any authority succeed in blowing out the light of Gospel kindled in the heart of the Christian. The compulsion of letting the light shine can't be removed by persecution.
Dr. Ralph Gerard, professor of psychology in the University of Chicago, is positive that he has found the solution to what is known as sin. It is a matter of cerebral maladjustment. The old portion of the brain (Hypothalamus) and the new portion (cerebral cortex) must be integrated. That sin has created a good deal of cerebral maladjustment can hardly be doubted. But that sin is due to such maladjustments is quite another thing. Men somehow or other seem to want to shy away from the plain Pauline statement that sin is transgression of the law of God. That depletes our vanity altogether too much.

Princeton Seminary has gone Barthian. It is reported that Emil Brunner of the University of Zürich has been invited to become professor of Systematic Theology by the Board of Trustees. Brunner has expressed his willingness to come at least a year. Brunner was formerly closely associated with Barth, but has turned away from that direction at which they will look askance, particularly because of the peculiar view of the Scriptures to which Brunner has given expression in his writings.

A historian, a rabbi, an officer of the American Birth Control League, a zoologist, a psychologist, and a member of the First Humanist Society have organized for the purpose of legalization of Euthanasia. It is significant that no Christian minister has been invited to join or had the conviction necessary for affiliation with the group. That may be due to the fact that Christian leaders are by no means convinced that it is morally right to bring about a painless death for those who may be regarded as hopelessly crippled, or who may be doomed to a life of pain, or who may prove to be a constant social liability. We are not so sure that it is morally right to take life even though the subject himself may desire it. Strange, isn't it, that many advocates of euthanasia are opposed to capital punishment. And yet it is not so strange when one realizes that both positions fit in nicely with the philosophy that keeps God out of account.

Last month at the Evangelical Theological Seminary and North Central College, both located at Naperville, Ill., a meeting was held by The General Evangelical Young People's Union. These young people resolved: "We, the students of the Evangelical Church, believe in closer federation among all Christian denominations and union of the most similar denominations, whenever the essentials need not be sacrificed and efficiency can be promoted... We as a group recommend to the leaders of our Church that as rapidly as feasible they move toward merger with the Church of The United Brethren in Christ." Here is clear illustration of the dangers of conferences and meetings. And since we have had cases of meetingitis in this country of ours, judging by the reports in our religious press, it is well that we become aware of them. Something of the spirit of mob psychology controls such meetings. Men and women can be swung in line for any position advocated by an influential speaker. The power rests with too few. Men and women are not taught to think things through personally. Glib tongues are doing much more than calm brains. We would rather listen than think. We would rather receive the convictions of others than to come to one of our own. That is the reason groups of young people meet to determine if possible, the policies of an ecclesiastical and even of civil government. They have become both the victims and the tools of well meaning leaders.

In 1936 the Ezhavas, a community of lower class Hindus numbering about a million, objected to their subordination in the Hindu fold. They threatened en masse to embrace the Christian religion. But then the head of the community issued a proclamation that opened the Hindu Temples for these lower caste Hindus. With this proclamation the previous leaning toward Christianity has by this time virtually disappeared. It is obviously a good thing that they did not join the Christian community. One can never become a real member of the Christian community because of his desire for greater social privileges. Christianity offers no such boon. It insists that the servant of you all is the greatest of you all. It insists that man must humble himself, indeed must lose himself, if he is to benefit by the spirit of Christ.

L. Gains, 25, colored, appealed to the supreme court of the State of Missouri against the decision of the University of that state for refusing to accept him as a student. His appeal was in vain, on the ground that the state allows tuition to its own negroes so that they can enter professional schools of the State Universities of Kansas, Illinois, and Nebraska. By this arrangement, it is declared, no constitutional right of the Negro has been taken from him. But would the constitutional rights of a white person in Missouri be infringed upon if the University, for no other reason than his color, would refuse admission to him? Would it settle the matter if the authorities would say, we'll give you tuition to go to another state to study? Christianity has still far to go before it can remove the color lines and impress upon this nation the fact that all men are created equal before God, and that we must love our neighbor as ourselves regardless of our neighbor's color.

Washington is becoming, we are told, the crime capital of America. Racketeers are fleecing the public. Six thousand men are reaping a harvest of one hundred thousand dollars daily. The capital is infested with the gambling mania. Robberies and burglaries are of common occurrence. The public of Washington looks on appalled, but it can do nothing for it has no voice in the government of this independent community. But it is equally deplorable that the alarmed citizenry have developed the consciousness that nothing can be done save by the use of the ballot. The best work of Christianity is not done via the ballot booth. There are such things as letting one's light shine effectively, of functioning as a leaven, and of witnessing in and out of season by direct and indirect contacts for the principles of Justice and righteousness. It's not primarily the vote of the citizenry that determines the policy of its government but it is their fundamental convictions made effective and insisted upon.

Aaron King, an Amishman in Chester County, Pennsylvania, was fined $15.35 because he had kept his 14 year old daughter from the public school for fear that her attendance in said school might draw her away from her people and her church. This father's fear was not ungrounded. There can be no doubt about it but what education in the public school would mean his daughter away from the peculiar customs and beliefs characteristic of some of the Amish groups. And these things are vital in the estimation of these Amish people. May they not preserve them for their children and their children for them? A system of schools more directly controlled by the parents, such as the Free Christian School Movement in this country, would help to meet such exigencies as that by which this Amishman was confronted.