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The Deeper Issue In The European War

Our editorials on the European War, which have appeared in the September, October, and November issues, have evoked some reaction. A young minister from Kansas wrote: "I appreciate your stand on the present war in Europe." The occupant of the manse of the First Presbyterian Church at Fort Meade, Florida, penned these appreciative words: "The War in Europe is the finest and most truthful presentation of the cause I have seen." But if the assent is outspoken, the dissent no less so. Two correspondents, one from Chicago, the other from Iowa, have taken the time and trouble to formulate their views. We appreciate this expression of their opinions and convictions. We have no doubt they are expressing the view of many, just as we have reasons to believe the editorial position is shared by many. This circumstance can make for a profitable discussion. The Calvin Forum welcomes controversy—wholesome controversy. Let us talk things over and reason with one another.

Our Associate Editor, Dr. Ryskamp, elsewhere in this issue presents and comments on the article from our Iowa correspondent, in which the economic significance of the war is brought forward. We add some comments and reflections to the Chicago communication from the Rev. Mr. Huissen. His letter follows.

Cobwebs of Propaganda?

Dear Dr. Bouma:

When the October issue of the Calvin Forum came to my desk, I thought of letting you know that I take rather serious exception to some of your utterances. Upon second thought I refrained. But now, when the November issue has reached me, and I read your editorial on "The War in Europe," I can contain myself no longer.

If the Christian Century has become a little balanced through a flood of protests that has come to the Editor, who knows the same may happen to the Calvin Forum. If pacificist cobwebs are dangerous, the cobwebs of propaganda are no less so.

Let it be known at the outset that the writer of these lines is no pacifist. Nor does he hold any brief for the Christian Century. But if you wish to raise your voice in solemn protest against this reading of contemporary history," allow me the privilege to do it to yours.

That the modern, anti-Christian totalitarianism is a menace and the opposite of all you and I hold dear is admitted. When you condemn it with vigor and gusto I say, "Amen." But when you labor under the idea that Britain and France are fighting this menace, I must part company with you and I stand in amazement how you can so contend. To the contrary, one can readily prove, quoting chapter and verse, that the present war, like the last one, is the age old fight for the balance of power and nothing more; your assertion to the contrary notwithstanding.

You state in the Forum of October, page 26: "And now that the two great democracies of Western Europe are about to lock horns with the totalitarian states of Central and Eastern Europe, are we witnessing the beginning of a titanic struggle between autocracy and democracy, ...." My answer is, No, brother, we are witnessing no such thing. Of course, that may develop but if it does it is quite accidental as far as the Allies are concerned.

Let us look at a little of that contemporary history against which you raise your voice in protest. As early as 1915 voices were raised in Britain itself against the type of a peace that was ultimately inflicted upon Europe in 1918 at Versailles. But even from there on what is the record of Britain? I can do no better than recount it briefly by quoting an editorial from The Chicago Daily News. I take this step advisedly because The Daily News can by no stretch of the imagination be accused of being pro-German. It was one of the first papers to advocate the repeal of the arms embargo. But speaking on "Time to Think Now," written after the repeal of the embargo, it has this to say about the possibility of getting into the war:

"What would be the wiser course would be to take careful stock of the probable situation we may have to face. Such a course would first summarize the results of our intervention in the European War in 1917, and boldly calculate whether the fruits of that departure from our traditional aloofness of Europe's wars justify its repetition.

"What are some of the features of such a review? We unquestionably went to war in 1917 because Germany was sinking our ships on the high seas, and killing our people. By helping to win the war we stopped that.

"But we had other objectives. We fought to end military autocracies and fostered the democratic ideal. We hoped, by defeating Germany, to promote adjustment of international disputes by peaceful methods, instead of resort to force. We aimed at substituting the rule of reason and law, between the nations of the world, for the rule of the sword. In all we were bitterly disappointed.
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"But this is not all. We contributed decisively to the victorious conclusion of the war. But our proposals for peace were ignored; we were compelled to make a separate treaty with Germany. We stood helplessly at Versailles and saw Britain and France impose a ruthless and impossible peace, which we knew contained the seeds of the war that has now come. We gave more than generously of our means to our allies; accepting settlements that meant reparation of about one-third of our advances and then saw these promises to pay repudiated, while we were called by our former allies a nation of money-mad Shylocks. We made a Nine Power Pact for the Pacific and then, when we sought to prevent Japan from breaking separate treaty with Germany. We stood helplessly at our means to our allies; accepting settlements that meant reparation of about one-third of our advances and then saw these promises to pay repudiated, the while we were called by our Nine Power Pact for the Pacific and then, when we sought to prevent Japan from breaking her word, we were abandoned by Great Britain and France. We deliberately abandoned our primacy in naval power, sinking nearly a million tons of warships to prove our devotion to the principle of peaceful negotiations as a substitute for war, only to witness a cynical world renew its costly race in armaments.

"These things we have seen. They are a part of our certain knowledge. They ought to weigh heavily with us in making a new decision."

Let me add a little of that contemporary history to this. I assume you know that Haile Selassie is living in London at present and how he got there? You undoubtedly know that Britain has just requested the privilege of Mussolini to send an ambassador to Albania? Certainly you are conversant with the fact that Britain has given Russia the assurance that, if and when Poland is reconstituted as a nation, she will not be troubled about the slice she got out of it? Assuredly you have heard of the efforts on the part of Britain to form an alliance with Russia?

Now when there are three dictators, all cut out of the same cloth (Stalin and Mussolini are not any better than Hitler, are they?), and you flirt with two to exterminate the one, you are not fighting an ideology, you are not fighting totalitarianism, are you? That is the work of hypocrisy.

As for our own country, we have repealed the arms embargo. No one will seriously question that it is an unneutral act. But it places us in an embarrassing position. Those who favored repeal should openly advocate war. The position of the repealers who at the same time wish to stay out of the war is an untenable one; certainly un-Christian. What they are doing in effect is just this. They say to the Allies: you people are fighting our war. We gladly furnish you the guns and cash price for these instruments that you can use in the privilege of dying for us. What a cowardly, despicable position that turns out to be.

On "THE DEEPER ISSUE" we are perfectly agreed. It need not have surprised any Christian that Stalin and Hitler came to an agreement. When the Christ of God and all He stands for is the issue Pilate and Herod can always become friends and smooth out minor differences. But it is nonsense it seems to me to think that the ideological issue will be settled with a military victory. If that be so, if it becomes the final struggle of Christ and the Man of Sin, since when was the Church of Christ called upon to enlist the armies and military machines of the world in her behalf? You and I must resist the godless totalitarianism of our day, not with poison gas or bombs, but with the Word of God and perhaps in the concentration camp. Then, I say: "Lord, give me grace to do it if I must."

REV. C. HUISSEN.

The Editor Makes Reply

Dear Brother Huisen:

I have read your letter with great interest. Of course, if you meant merely to state your conviction and to give your view on the subject under discussion I might simply place your letter and let it stand without comment. You are entitled to your own view of the matter, and, no matter how much you may differ with the Editor, you would be given an opportunity to express your conviction on the pages of our magazine.

However, this letter cannot very well be placed without comment. You assail the position we have taken. Do the arguments advanced hold? Do you prove your case? And, now that the subject is carried from the realm of editorial writing into the realm of debate, it is a matter of arguments, proof—for both you and me, of course. Our readers, who take a deep interest in this issue, will want to weigh the argument, pro and con. Meanwhile, your letter also offers a welcome opportunity for the airing of various aspects of the discussion on the present European War, which stands so much in the center of our interest today.

Stating the Issue

Let us try to keep the issue clear. The position which I maintained and which you assailed may be stated as follows. This war is not just a war for the balance of power between England and Germany, but has a much deeper significance. It is a clash between totalitarianism and democracy. The lineup of Germany with Russia against the two strongest democratic nations of Western Europe is at bottom a conflict and clash of two conceptions and practices of government. Democracy is on trial. The rising tide of totalitarianism with its deification of the state, its intolerance, its persecution is the sworn enemy of the civil and religious freedom which is championed by the democratic nations and enjoyed by its citizens. If England and France lose this war, it will be a dark day for our free institutions, first of all in Europe, but also throughout the world. The British Empire and the United States are the foremost powers in the world today standing for the defense and spread of those free institutions which we associate with democracy and which are being threatened everywhere in the world today by the totalitarian powers (Russia, Germany, Japan). This is also of great significance for the question whether there will continue to be an open door for the Christian missionary enterprise, especially in the Orient. Wherever totalitarianism has gone, a nationalistic (or, as in the case of Russia, an international) paganism has arisen to give battle to the policy of religious freedom under which the Christian Church and the missionary enterprise are allowed a chance to develop. All this is inseparable from the war that is now raging in Europe. If Russia and Germany should defeat England and France, it would mean a tremendous boost for totalitarianism and all that it involves, and a serious setback for civil and religious freedom throughout the world. We already witness what all this means religiously in Russia, in Germany, and in the Orient wherever Japan is getting the upper hand. This being the case, there is a very real sense in which England and France (and we may now add: Finland) are today fighting the battle of democracy, and of the free institutions associated with democracy, against the rising tide of totalitarianism. That is the deeper issue in the present war, in which, on that account we, both as Americans and as Christians, are deeply interested, and in the light of which our attitude must be determined.

This summarizes the editorial position of THE CALVIN FORUM as stated more or less clearly over a period of three years. (See issues of Dec. '36, April '37, Sept. '37, Nov. '38, Aug.-Sept. '39, Oct. '39, Nov. '39).

Over against this you maintain that this is not a war of ideologies, but that "the present war, like the last one, is the age old fight for the balance of power, and nothing more." These are your own words and I think you state the issue pointedly. You protest against the main contention of the editorials to the effect that the deeper issue in this European War is the struggle between democracy and totalitarianism because you hold that "the present war, like the last one, is the age old fight for the balance of power and nothing more."

Clarifying the Issue

Now if our discussion is to be fruitful and clarifying, both for the readers of THE FORUM and for you and me personally, it would seem to be important to keep this clearly before us. For one thing, the point at issue is not whether England and
France are fighting for their self-preservation. Of course they are. There is hardly a nation that goes to war that is not prompted to a large extent by the desire for self-preservation. But the question is whether that is the only thing they are fighting for. Or, better still, whether that is the only issue at stake in the present war. You say it is. You hold that a country like England is only prompted by the desire to maintain the balance of power between the European nations, so that no other great power may grow unduly strong and wrest the position of power which she has from her. That this is part of the total picture is beyond dispute. But that this is the deeper issue involved in this war is quite a different matter.

Let us use a comparison. Think of Holland in its heroic struggle with Spain. In those days, 1588, England and Holland were allies against a common foe. Of course, both England and Holland were fighting for self-preservation, but this does not mean that there was no deeper issue involved in this struggle between Holland and England. The fate of the Spanish Armada sealed the fate of the hold which Roman Catholic Spain had upon Holland. In that war—in fact, in that very battle—the deeper issue was whether Protestantism or Roman Catholicism, whether freedom of religion or the intolerance of the Roman inquisition were to hold sway in Holland and Great Britain. However much both England and Holland were fighting for self-preservation and the balance of power, the deeper issue involved in that struggle was the future of Protestantism, Calvinism, together with civil and religious freedom, in Northern Europe.

Now you deny that there is any such deeper issue involved in the present European War, and for this you seek to offer proof. I believe I am analyzing your letter correctly when I say that, after the introduction stating the main contention, your argument falls into four parts. 1. You speak of the "record of Britain" as stated in an editorial of The Chicago Daily News. 2. You give instances purporting to show that Britain has been flirting with two of Europe's dictators. 3. Then follows a paragraph on the repeal of the arms embargo by our congress. And 4. you have a final paragraph on what you consider the proper way to resist totalitarianism. Let us take up these points in order.

The Record of Britain

First, as to what you call "the record of Britain." Now some of the things mentioned in this connection are facts beyond dispute. Many of the terms of the treaty of Versailles were both unfair and unwise. As far as the hope of a permanent world peace is concerned, we surely came out of the war "bitterly disappointed." We did not have the influence at the Versailles council table that we wished. Our financial loans have not always been properly appreciated by the allies and they have defaulted on the payment of these debts. Great Britain and France, as the mentioned instances show, have gone back on us in not supporting us in the enforcement of an international pact. And we have sunk a million tons of warships, to prove our devotion to the principle of peaceful negotiation as a substitute for war, only to witness a cynical world renew its costly race in armaments.

I grant all this and I believe even more could be added to this list. When the editor of The Daily News urges that all these facts should be weighed by us as a nation in considering the advisability of getting into a European War, he is undoubtedly right. But, having granted this, I believe it is in order to point out two or three things. First, there are also some other facts to remember in this connection which are just as important and which The Daily News editor omits. Secondly, when you use this series of facts as you do, you not only make the same mistake as the Chicago editor, but in making this one-sided series of facts the basis for an indictment of Great Britain, you also become grossly unfair to that nation. And, thirdly, the question must be raised, what has all this to do with the contention for which you must offer proof, viz., that there is no such deeper issue as the struggle between totalitarianism and democracy involved in the present war?

Let us take up these points one by one. That there are other facts offsetting and balancing the use made of the facts by the Chicago editor, is clear to anyone who will study the record. As to the peace hopes, is it not true that other nations were just as hopeful (possibly we ought to say: naively) as were we on this score? As to the failure of the United States to make the Versailles treaty a better pact than it is, must we not remember that our representatives were perfect strangers to the age-old grievances of the minorities on the European checkerboard? As to the war loans (on which the nations have so shamefully defaulted), was the granting of these loans all an act of unselfish generosity and a matter of playing the good Samaritan on our part, or was it also greatly to our advantage industrially and commercially to grant such loans? As to the scrapping of a large part of our navy, did not the Allies do the same thing? Was this not done by most nations at the time that disarmament was the watchword? And if it be true that Great Britain and France, as the News editorial states, went back on us in the matter of an international pact, is there anything comparable to our going back on the civilized, forward-looking nations of the world when we, through our high-minded war president had done more to create an instrument for world peace and world understanding in the League of Nations and its Covenant than any other nation, gave that civilized world a slap in the face by refusing to ratify that Covenant and to join that League? If there is to be a call at this late hour for confessions from those who are undoubtedly responsible for the defeating of the greatest modern effort toward a practical world peace, we of the United States may well take our place on the sinner's bench first. You will grant that if the series of facts enumerated by you are to be evaluated aright, such facts as those enumerated in this paragraph should come into the picture as well.

Now when you use this one-sided series of facts from the Chicago editorial to make up "the record of Britain," the unfairness toward that country becomes apparent. I shall not repeat what has just been said but only ask: Is Britain (which itself in the interest of a hoped-for world peace greatly reduced its armaments at the time we and some other nations did—so much so that at the time of the recent Munich pact she was far behind in an adequate armament program)—I ask, Is Britain to be charged with guilt for the fact that we reduced our naval armaments "only to witness a cynical world renew its costly race in armaments"?

But it is pertinent, in the third place, to ask at this point: How does all this material which you quote in this connection establish the position which you seek to champion? That it is all designed to cast unfavorable reflection upon Britain is clear. That this may be effective in creating a strong aversion to making common cause with Britain in some future war is also clear. But, apart from the injustice which this does to Britain, is not all this beside the point in your attack upon the editorial position of THE CALVIN FORUM? In other words, how does all this prove that the real issue in this present war is not the issue between totalitarianism and democracy? Yet that is the basic point on which you take issue with the stand of THE CALVIN FORUM, is it not?

As to Flirting with Dictators

Your next line of argument, however, would seem to come closest to the point at issue. Here you argue that Britain cannot be said to be fighting a war for democracy and against totalitarianism, because she has recently been flirting with two of Europe's three dictators. For this contention you offer four instances of proof, each in the form of a rhetorical question.
Question 1: "I assume you know that Haile Selassie is living in London at present and how he got there?"—Yes, I am aware that the former king of Ethiopia is living in London at the present. Also that he got there and is now enjoying political asylum there through the good services of Britain. How this proves the point you are trying to make, I confess not to understand. If England's action with reference to Haile Selassie proves anything for its attitude toward the Italian dictator, it would appear to prove the very opposite of what you claim. When the Italian forces ruthlessly attacked Ethiopia, and its king fled for safety, what was more natural than that he should be protected by Britain and given asylum, first in Palestine (the British protectorate to which he fled on asylum there through the good services of Britain. How this has requested no such privilege. There is and can be no credit of England to have done this, just as it was to the credit of the Netherlands to give asylum to the German Kaiser in 1918. Have hatred and animosity for Britain gone so far that even her creditable acts are charged against her?

Question 2: "You undoubtedly know that Britain has just requested the privilege of Mussolini to send an ambassador to Albania?"—Here I must reply: No, I do not know this, Britain has requested no such privilege. There is and can be no British ambassador to Albania for the simple reason that Albania, being now conquered territory under Italy, has no ministers or ambassadors from any power. You may have heard or read that Britain, in sending a new ambassador to Italy, is accrediting him to King Victor Emmanuel as "King of Italy and Albania," the present formal title of this sovereign, but surely this is something entirely different from what you describe as hands being reached out by the British to Albania.

Question 3: "Certainly you are conversant with the fact that Britain has given Russia the assurance that if and when Poland is reconstituted as a nation, she will not be troubled about the slice she got out of it?"—I am sorry that I must again contest your facts. The assurance with which your rhetorical question is stated has no basis in fact. Just what the future boundaries of Poland will be if and when the Allies win the war, no one can say at this juncture. It is quite possible that, in case the war should soon be terminated by an Allied victory, Russia might keep that part of Poland which is now under her power. This matter is complicated by the fact that as yet Russia is not at war with the Allies, whereas it is not at all impossible that she may be before this war is over. Be that as it may, it is not a fact that Britain has given Russia the assurance you mention.

Britain's Abortive Pact with Russia

Question number four points to Britain's attempt of last summer to form an alliance with Russia just before the Russo-German pact was consummated. Now at first sight this would seem to corroborate your contention that England is not interested in fighting the menace of dictatorship. But if one carefully considers the facts and does not overlook the realities of international political life, this does not at all follow. Let us remember that the point is not whether we approve of this attempt on the part of England this past summer to form a pact with Russia. Not only on prudential, but also on higher grounds, it was a wrong move. If the pact had been consummated, it might have led to disastrous results and England might soon have found itself in an impossible position. I personally believe that England today is happy that this attempted pact failed. But the question before us is not whether this was a good or wise move, but whether such flirtation with the Russian bear proves that England cannot honestly be fighting totalitarianism today.

Now, of course, if Britain were today the ally of Russia in its fight against democratic, liberty-loving Finland, and were also fighting Germany on the side of France, then, to be sure, you would be perfectly justified in holding that she is only fighting a war for the balance of power without standing on the side of democracy and freedom over against autocracy and totalitarianism. But this, of course, is not the case. If you object that, after all, Britain might be the ally of Russia today in case the attempt of last summer had succeeded, I would suggest not to lose sight of the following: First, that though the world today does not know the terms of the proposed pact, there is every reason to believe that it would have been, at most, a promise not to attack one another while each is working out its own destiny. Secondly, that this attempt at a pact took place before Russia became aggressive in Eastern Europe. I do not think that any well-informed person would think it possible for England to have attempted a non-aggression pact with Russia if and when Russia was actually on the aggressive against democracies as she is today.

If we keep these facts in mind, it will not be difficult to see that what England was apparently attempting last summer at Moscow, was to form a pact with a potential enemy in order to have a free hand to defeat the immediate enemy, namely Germany. You call this "hypocrisy," but is this not a rather rash and sweeping judgment? England at no time contemplated fighting against any democracy, nor to fight with Russia for the furtherance of her anti-democratic and anti-Christian aims. It was an attempted game of diplomacy to keep one enemy at bay while the other is fought off. Before you have a right to call this hypocrisy, you will do well to become more closely acquainted both with history and with the difficulties under which every honorable and righteous government labors in meeting the exigencies of international planning and intrigue. Surely, against a third party, who is a menace to both, two parties differing seriously and deeply on other matters, may join hands without being insincere about their differences.

Two Illustrations

Let us try to make this concrete. Suppose you lived on the frontier in the American wild west in the middle of the previous century. Suppose your neighbor were a very undesirable person; in fact, a godless person and an unscrupulous freeloader. Suppose your neighborhood were one night attacked by a group of thugs and you could not at once get the aid of the police. You might readily then make common cause with this neighbor of yours against the mob who threatened your family and his just at that moment. Would you therefore be insincere about your differences with your irreligious and unscrupulous neighbor? Surely you would not by that act of co-operation be untrue to your own religious and moral convictions as long as you did not join hands with your unprincipled neighbor in his own godless and immoral exploits.

Also history offers a number of instructive cases. To mention but one. In the seventeenth century William of Orange (William III) sat upon the Dutch throne. Now the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries were the days when the great underlying issue in Europe's wars was that of Protestantism and civil liberty on the one hand, versus Roman Catholicism coupled with despotism on the other. No one will doubt that this was the deeper issue in the wars of those days, least of all a Calvinist. Now in 1688 the British depose their Roman Catholic King, James II, and call in none other than the Dutch king William III to occupy the throne of England, together with Mary. This is known in England as the Glorious Revolution. At this juncture William III, being the great champion of Protestantism and civil liberties, found himself confronted by the powerful Roman Catholic king of France, Louis XIV. The next year he formed the Grand Alliance against the powerful, Roman Catholic, French sovereign. And who were members of this Grand Alliance? Not only Protestant Holland, England, and Germany (Holy Roman Empire), but also Spain—Roman Catholic Spain. Through the exigencies and complications of international politics Holland's former Roman Catholic enemy was now a member of this alliance. But we surely do not doubt that underlying this struggle between William and Louis XIV was the issue of Protestantism and civil liberty as over against Romanism and despotism, and it will not enter the mind of any student of history (least of all of the Calvinistic student of history) to consider William III insincere or hypocritical on this deeper issue because of his taking Spain into the Grand Alliance of 1689.
Let us remember that, whatever may have transpired between the British and the Russian negotiators in Moscow last summer, we have not an iota of proof, nor have we any reason to believe, that Britain was proposing anything that would strengthen the hands of a totalitarian power in its fight against any democracy. Whichever way you look at the British attempt at a pact with Russia, the sincerity of Britain in its stand for democracy against totalitarianism in the present war is in no way compromised by this—otherwise unfortunate—episode.

Neutrality and International Law

Your letter has two more paragraphs, one on American neutrality and the repeal of the arms embargo, and the other on what you conceive to be the only way to fight "the ideological issue."

To do justice to the former subject would require an article by itself. Strictly speaking, however, it is not necessary to go into the matter here at all, since it was brought in nowhere in the FORUM editorials and cannot be said to have any direct bearing upon the main contention which you must prove. And yet, I cannot refrain from making two observations on what you say in this paragraph.

First, I am convinced that you could not have made the strong statements or have passed the sweeping denunciatory judgments which you do in this connection if you had based your remarks about this most intricate subject not merely on daily newspaper reports but upon a careful study of the pertinent aspects of international law. If you would but have read a few chapters on the subject in such a work as Oppenheim's International Law (see e.g. especially pp. 483-4 and 423 of Volume Two), you could not—whatever your ultimate stand in the matter itself might have been—have written as loosely as you did. "No one will seriously question that it is an unnatural act," is a mere assertion on your part. Hosts of scholars and leaders in various walks of life, of the most varied political and religio-moral background, dispute that very thing and have plenty of good authority in both national and international law to make their case one which is not so much as touched by a few bold statements or wild assertions to the contrary.

And, secondly, it is impossible for me to pass up your expression about the "untenable," "cowardly, despicable" position in which the repealer finds himself. You apply these uncomplimentary adjectives to "the repealers who at the same time wish to stay out of the war." You state that the repealers should openly advocate war. Apparently you mean that whoever touches a word of the arms embargo must, if he is not to be inconsistent, now openly advocate going to war on the side of the Allies. If he does not, then your trio of uncomplimentary adjectives is made to apply to him.

Embargo Repeal and Going to War

Now is this a fair and tenable position? It would be, if the persons to whom you refer took the stand that under no considerations would they ever agree to our country's entering the war. But the overwhelming majority—if not all—of the so-called repealers are exactly the persons who refuse to take that stand. They were and are against the radically isolationist position which holds that America should under no circumstances whatever enter the present war. So your uncomplimentary adjectives would seem to be justified only if applied to a group in which reality does not exist! If, however, you apply them to the actual repealers, then you can only be said to be grossly in error and that from two considerations.

First, the present arrangement under repeal of the arms embargo is entirely within the moral demands of international law. The reason is that, although in reality, by reason of circumstances, the Allies and not Germany do largely benefit from such repeal, the opportunity to buy arms under the rules determined by congressional legislation is Germany's just as much as that of the Allies. If that were not the case, the repeal of the arms embargo would be a violation of one of the basic moral demands for neutrality under international law.

And, secondly, it cannot be maintained that the only ethical way to support a nation in the justness of whose cause we believe and who may already now be said to be fighting a cause which is not only theirs but ours as well—that the only ethical way to lend support to such a nation (or group of nations) is to at once go to war on their side. There are many different ways in which one can lend support to such nations. Which of these ways is the best to follow, considering all the moral demands of the situation, depends upon a number of factors. For one thing, it is a basic principle of international dealings, according to Calvinistic writers on the subject, (as, e.g., Colijn) that the geographic position of a nation enters very really into the consideration of the immediacy of the duty to actively support another nation in a struggle against an unjust aggressor. There are also other considerations, but we have neither time nor space to enlarge upon them now. If we consider only this one point, viz., that a neighboring nation has a more immediate duty to come to the support of a nation unjustly attacked, we already see clearly that the absolutistic claim that there is only one right way to be sincere about supporting a nation, or group of nations, at war for a great cause, is untenable. If the European nations can hold the violence and aggression of such dictators as Hitler and Stalin in check and bring the war to a successful close without our active participation in the war, it is quite conceivable that other—equally ethical, and not selfish—considerations may make it desirable for us not to join hands with them by actually sending our troops as we did in the World War, but by giving them various other forms of aid possible under the rules of international law.

A Few Misunderstandings

Your closing paragraph is rather puzzling. It bristles with misunderstandings and a confusion of things that ought not to be confused. How you find the positions you here ascribe to me anywhere in the FORUM editorials is something I cannot understand. After stating that "we are perfectly agreed" on "the deeper issue," you write: "But it is nonsense it seems to me to think that the ideological issue will be settled with a military victory. If that be so, if it becomes the final struggle of the Christ and the Man of Sin, since when was the Church of Christ called upon to enlist the armies and the military machines of the world in her behalf?"

Now if you will take the trouble to read the editorials again, you will find that there is not the remotest suggestion that the great struggle which I see going on in the world today between totalitarianism and democracy is in any way linked up with what you call "the final struggle of the Christ and the Man of Sin." I have brought no such bit of eschatology into the picture. Secondly, neither is there the remotest suggestion in the FORUM editorials that would justify anyone in concluding from them that "the Church of Christ" is "called upon to enlist the armies and the military machines of the world in her behalf?" Even the most casual reading of these editorials will show that not one word was said about the duty of the Church in reference to this great struggle. That both Communism and Nazism are persecuting the Church, and that we as Christians are deeply interested in that fact, is, of course, suggested and is, I trust, accepted by all. But the question what duty the Church may have in reference to the present war was completely outside of our purview.

An Important Distinction

The question discussed concerned our duty as a nation and as citizens in the present international situation. Now just as true as it is that the Church must fight—and fight only—with spiritual weapons, so true it is (and this truth only pacifists will deny) that the state, both in its internal and in its international relations, has on proper occasions the right and the duty to use the sword. On that, of course, all Calvinists are agreed.
In this light it will possibly become clear that in your last paragraph two things are confused that should be clearly distinguished. Your last sentence reads: “You and I must resist the godless totalitarianism of our day, not with poison gas or bombs, but with the Word of God and perhaps in the concentration camp.” Now this is perfectly correct if by it you mean to say that the Church must preach and testify against godlessness and not as a Church take up arms against it. It is also perfectly true if you mean to say that, in case we were citizens of a totalitarian state, we should not take up arms against the totalitarian position and policies of our government, but in case our objections and protests went unheeded, should even be prepared to go into the concentration camp, just as Niemöller has done. But your statement is utterly fallacious if it is made to apply to the duty of the state and to our duty as citizens in obeying the state when it carries on such a war. And that is precisely the only sense in which the subject was discussed in our editorial.

You differ from the stand of The Calvin Forum only if you insist that your statement holds also in this last relationship. I cannot believe that you would so hold. That would be taking the position of the pacifist—the very position against which my last editorial was largely directed—and you are, of course, not a pacifist. But that being the case, your statement on this score also loses all point as directed against my position.

Can War Settle Ideological Issue?

To say “It is nonsense to think that the ideological issue will be settled with a military victory,” as you do, will not stand. It was an “ideological issue” that was settled in our own Civil War. Make full allowance for economic and other factors that entered into the Civil War, but, when all is said and done, you will either have to call Abraham Lincoln a hypocrite or grant that a great “ideological issue” was settled in the Civil War. Again, when Holland finally gained the victory in its long-drawn-out war against Spain, a great “ideological issue” was settled as far as Holland was concerned. Make due allowance for economic, political, and other factors that entered into this struggle, “the deeper issue” that was settled by the Eighty Years’ War was that great “ideological issue” as to whether Roman Catholicism, with its inquisition, persecution, and intolerance in church and state, or Protestantism, with its religious and civil freedom were to be victorious in the Low Countries.

It is that sort of a “deeper issue” which we witness again as involved in the present European struggle. In both cases that deeper issue is again that between freedom (civil and religious) and tyranny. In the sixteenth century this tyranny, intolerance, and persecution were associated with and grounded in Roman Catholicism, whereas the civil and religious freedom was associated with and grounded in Protestantism. In the twentieth century the relation between the religious and the political factors has undergone a great change, but the clash between despotism and freedom, autocracy and democracy, persecution and religious liberty, is just as real today as it ever was in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. The present-day despotism in Europe is called totalitarianism and goes hand in hand with hostility to Christianity, whether in the form of a Nazi paganism or of a Russian Atheism. The non-totalitarian nations of Europe (as well as the United States) may be said in the main to uphold those principles of freedom, civil and religious, which are inseparable from the best Christian traditions intertrenched in our Western civilization. This is the deeper issue involved in the present European struggle and toward it we as Christians, as American citizens, and as a leading Christian and democratic nation of the world cannot be indifferent.

Sincerely yours,

The Editor.

And have not the happenings of the last two months—since the recent editorials and the above letter of our correspondent were written—strikingly confirmed the reality of this deeper issue in the European struggle?

Russia, long silent and inactive internationally, has now turned loose on Europe for the realization of its dream of winning the world for Communism. Its anti-God propaganda is now to be spread by military subjugation. Ruthlessly its battalions are seeking to crush the weak. Its dastardly and unprovoked attack upon brave little Finland has stirred the sympathy of all the civilized world. The alignment of the totalitarian and the liberty-loving nations is going forward, and playing behind and under this line-up is the clash between our historic Christian civilization with its freedom of worship on the one hand, and a resurgent paganism that would make man the slave of false gods, on the other.

What will the future bring?

Only God knows.

It is a comfort to know—to know by faith—that the Almighty ruleth in the heavens and laughs at the defiance and revolt against Him which is evident on every hand today.

Meanwhile let us not lose sight of our Christian duty in the midst of these trying and challenging international developments. And let us strive to see clearly what is the real issue behind the European struggle today.

C. B.
The Religion of The Navahos

The religion of the Navahos is very much in the limelight these days. There is a group of people in our country, headed by the present Commissioner of Indian Affairs and supported by a Secretary of the Interior, that constantly glorifies the Navaho religion. This group never seems to tire of making the general public believe that this is a very beautiful religion and should be retained at all costs. They seem to think more of the Navaho religion than of the Christian religion. A few years ago I was addressed by a young lady who asked me whether it was true that I was a missionary among the Navaho people. When I replied in the affirmative, she said, "Shame on you. Why do you go to rob these people of their beautiful religion?" I said, "Please, tell me what do you know about the Navaho religion?" She answered, "Nothing, but I hear that their religion is very beautiful." A good many people rave about "the deep beauty, spiritual guidance, consolation and disciplinary power of the Indian religions" without knowing what they are raving about.

Encouraged by the Government

The Indian Office is doing all it can to encourage this religion. Our Navaho people are told that they should adhere to the Navaho heritage by all means. The Navaho medicine-man who is the religious leader of the people is placed upon a pedestal. A few years ago the Post Office in Gallup was dedicated by Navaho medicine-men. And last summer we had the sad spectacle of a new $450,000 hospital at Fort Defiance, Arizona, being dedicated by medicine-men. What an inconsistency! Inconsistent with medical science itself; inconsistent, too, for officials of an enlightened nation which likes to call itself a Christian nation.

Of this dedication the medical director of the Navaho Service wrote as follows: "Three avenues of approach to the Great Spirit were employed, each freighted with a hope that all go well with the new hospital, the staff, and the many patients to be served throughout the coming years. There was a Protestant invocation, a Catholic benediction, and in between a Patriarchal ceremony conducted by representative medicine-men, who in the most impressive manner scattered corn meal and pollen to the four points of the compass, and chanted their songs and prayers while standing on a ceremonial buffalo robe. This chant and the prayers to the Great Spirit marked the most solemn moments of the ceremony."

In response to this we wrote this doctor a letter calling his attention to the inconsistency of the whole business. We called his attention to the fact that Navaho religion does not know of a Great Spirit; that the Navaho language does not even have an expression for it; and that nobody was helped by this sad spectacle except that the prestige of the medicine-men, which had been waning under previous administrations, had received a tremendous increase.

What Does the Navaho Believe?

What then does the Navaho believe? We can begin by saying that the average Navaho is rather religious or, what is more correct, superstitious. Their religion is a form of Animism or Nature Worship. They believe that they have a body but that there is something standing within that body which looks through the eyes, hears through the ears, talks through the mouth. They call that something "Ayisizini," which means, that which stands within. But not only is that their conception of a human being, but everything that exists has something standing or lying within. A tree, a rock, a river, an animal, and even their gods; they all have that something standing or lying within. We often hear and read that the Navahos worship the Great Spirit. Now this is not true. In the first place, this is not true because they do not know anything of the idea of spirit as we think of spirit. When we think of spirits, we think of beings without a body, as angels, and God. But even the Navaho gods have bodies. In the second place, this is not true because they do not know anything of the idea of Spirit as we think of spirit. When we think of spirits, we think of beings without a body, as angels, and God. But even the Navaho gods have bodies. In the second place, this is not true in the sense of the worship of a supreme being who is the Creator of all. The Navahos do not know of a supreme being who has called everything into existence. The term, Great Spirit, is not Navaho, it is a term which Christians have originated hoping that thereby they could make plain to the Navahos what they mean by their God. Our pioneer missionaries were wiser. When in Bible translation they came across the term, God, they did not translate it. The Navaho language had
no word for it. When they read the first verse in the Bible, “In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth,” they translated, “Hodeyadan God ya’dlhil in’dah nahasdzan a’yilah.”

It may be true that traces of monotheism are found in the Navaho legends and language, showing that once upon a time they worshiped only one God, but today they worship a multitude of things, not only supernaturals but also many other objects. They even worship animals, as owls, coyotes, and bears. An Indian chief is still angry with me, because I pointed out to him the folly of praying to a bear. He looked rather intelligent, and so I put to him the direct question, “Do you pray to a bear? A bear cannot hear your prayers, a bear cannot help you.” His answer was, “Do you think that a bear cannot hear my prayers? Last week I was in the forest upon the mountain. A bear came right for me and was going to harm me. I prayed the bear not to hurt me. And then the bear sat upon haunches and waved his paw at me to show that he had heard my prayers. And you say that bears do not answer prayers.” Many Navahos even pray to spiders and snakes.

**Chief Objects of Worship**

The chief objects of worship, however, are a multitude of supernatural beings. The Navaho language has two names for these beings; namely, **Diyini**, and **Yei**. **Diyini** is usually translated by the term, Holy Ones, which is not entirely correct, for **Diyini** has no ethical connotation. It carries the idea of separation, but not separation from sin so much as separation from weakness. These supernatural beings are not moral, neither immoral, rather un-moral, for they have nothing to do with morality. **Yei** means things, or beings, to be feared.

These supernatural beings are represented by the medicine-men wearing masks in their various ceremonies; and also in their sandpaintings which they make in connection with these ceremonies. There is also some worship of images but not as gross as you find among other gentle peoples. Still it can also be said of our Navaho Indians in the inspired words of the Apostle Paul that, “When they knew God, they glorified Him not as God, neither were thankful, but became vain in their imaginations and their foolish heart was darkened. Professing themselves to be wise they became fools and changed the glory of the incorruptible God into an image made like a corruptible man, and to birds and four-footed things and creeping things.”

**Johonaei**

As in many other pagan religions the sun-god plays an important part. Originally he seems to have been of the greatest power; yet his cultus to-day is not as important as that of other gods. He is not appealed to as frequently as some other deities are. Certainly his concubine, Asdzan-nadlei, and one of his sons, Nayenezgani, receive more prayers than he.

Sometimes the statement is made that the Navahos worship the sun. This, however, is not true. They worship Johonaei, which literally means, “Bearer of the day.” It is their belief that the sun is a highly polished brass shield. This shield Johonaei carries across the skies every day. From the east to the west he carries it. Especially in the summer the day is very long and then he gets hungry and longs for rest. In the evening he comes down to the earth, covers his shield with a cloth, walks over the earth at night back to the east, to resume his journey the next morning. As his wages for a day’s work he receives a human life. Upon one of his journeys, he committed adultery with a maiden Asdzan-nadlei by name. The part Asdzan-nadlei played in this act does not reflect to her credit. The result of this act was the birth of Nayenezgani, the Navaho savior.

Johonaei is the creator of all the great game animals. When there is an eclipse, the Navahos believe that monsters are eating the sun, prayers are offered that the monsters might not accomplish what they are trying to do. A journey is interrupted and work ceases during an eclipse of the sun. The younger generation, however, pays little or no attention to this and other customs. The following is one of the prayers offered to Johonaei, “Father give me the light of your mind, that my mind may be strong; give me some of your strength, that my arm may be strong; give me your rays that corn and other vegetation may grow.” But it seems that as time went on the attention was shifted from Johonaei to Asdzan-nadlei who today perhaps is the most revered deity of the tribe.

**Asdzan-Nadlei**

Asdzan-nadlei means “the woman who ever changes.” She seems to be a personification of ever-changing nature. The Christians rejoice that their God is unchangeable, that he is ever the same, today, yesterday, and forever. This deity is the only deity among the Navahos who is wholly beneficent. She seems to take the place in the Navaho religion, which the Virgin Mary takes in the Roman Catholic worship. Most of the Navaho gods are angry with the Navahos. And a great part of the life of the average Navaho is spent to appease these angry gods. Asdzan-nadlei is the unnatural result of the union of a mountain top and a cloud. As she grew up she was visited one night by Johonaei, the sun bearer. He finally took her as a second wife and built a beautiful home for her on an island in the Pacific Ocean, where she is living today.

It was this deity who made the Navahos from different parts of her body, and still takes care of them and sends from the west the plentiful rains of the summer and the thawing breezes of the spring. Plants of all kinds are her gift to the Navahos. She also gave them five pets, a bear, a great snake, a deer, a porcupine, and a puma—to watch over them. When she gave them these animals she admonished the Navahos as follows, “These animals will not desert you. Speak of no evil deeds in the presence...
of the bear or the snake, for they may do the evil
they hear you speak of; but the deer and the porcu
pine are good—say whatever you please to say in
their presence." Asdzan-nadlei is never represented
in any way by the Navahos. As the sun bearer on
his journey to the west approaches the home of the
second wife he is represented as singing:

In my thoughts I approach,
The Sun God approaches,
Earth's end he approaches,
Estsanatlehi's hearth approaches,
In old age walking
The beautiful trail.

Nayenezgani

Nayenezgani is the savior of the Navahos. His
name means literally "Slayer of the Enemy Gods." As
stated before, his birth was the result of the
adultery of Johonaei and Asdzan-nadlei. When the
boy grew up he demanded of his mother that she
should tell him who his father was. This for some
time she refused to do. At that time the Navaho
people were troubled by a great many man-eating
monsters. The world was in a pretty
shape, and this all because of unnatural sin of
women. These women sinned against nature and
as a result many monsters were born. It seemed
that these monsters would destroy the Navaho race.
Nayenezgani felt very sorry for his people. Having
obtained from his mother the knowledge that
Johonaei was his father he set out to visit him in
order to get weapons to destroy the monsters. Over
a rainbow he walked to the house of the sun. When
he claimed his sonship, Johonaei submitted him to
every test to see whether he was really his son.
First he led him around and around in a labyrinth
until an ordinary human being would have lost all
sense of direction, but the boy got out. He then put
him in a sweathouse and poured boiling water into
it. But the boy was not scalded. Next he placed
him in a room where great knives were sweeping
back and forth from the ceiling. However Nay­
enezgani was not injured. Finally he had to guess
what the Sun God was thinking about. After the
boy had successfully withstood all these tests, Johonaei had to admit that the boy must be his son.
He wanted to know what he had come for. He
answered him that he had come for weapons by
means of which he might destroy the enemy gods.
Johonaei gave him Lightning with which to fight,
and a shield to defend himself.

Nayenezgani killed a good many monsters. The
Navahos today point to the lava beds near Grants
as the coagulated blood of some of these monsters,
to the petrified wood which is found all over the
reservation as their bones, to a skull-shaped hill as
the head of Yei-tso, one of the giants. Most of these
monsters seem to have been imaginary beings how­
ever. He did not do away with the real troubles
which are bothering mankind. Very ingenious ex­
cuses are given why he did not destroy Hunger,
Poverty, Father and Mother Louse, Old-Age, and
Passion. Neither did he destroy Sin and Death. And
here the Christian missionary finds a beautiful point
The sprinkling of corn pollen is a very important

in the likenesses of their gods. Sickness is caused by the evil spirits, and it is in order to drive them out that ceremonies are being held. The immediate cause of sickness is very often supposed to be the killing of an ant, a spider, a snake, or another insect or animal.

The actors in these ceremonies are the medicine men or singers and their assistants. In almost every healing chant some medicine is used, but this is only of minor importance. All the emphasis falls on the chant itself.

In connection with the chants, many prayers are offered to the gods. The dancers wear masks and garments such as the gods are supposed to wear—a certain garment personifying a certain god—and the fact is that the sick often address their prayers to the dancers. Some disguise themselves with branches of evergreen and look like walking trees. To the good gods, prayers are being said for blessing and help; to the evil gods, prayers are being said, ceremonies and sacrifices are being made, for the modification and appeasement of their wrath.

Sacrifices, Prayer Sticks, Sand Paintings

The sacrifices of the Navahos are not bloody in their nature. As a sacrifice, Navahos are, in the first place, accustomed to bring cigarettes of their own manufacture. These cigarettes are made of sections of a certain weed, cut away between the joints. They are painted and filled with native tobacco and lighted symbolically by the rays of the sun shining through a rock crystal. After this, they are sealed with wet corn pollen, and set out with many a prayer as an offering to the gods.

In the second place, they bring as a sacrifice certain prayer sticks. These sticks are all whittled to a point at one end—to set them into the ground. They are made of wood, painted, and are about two inches long.

In the third place, they bring for sacrifice small fragments of clam shell, turquoise, yellow abalone, cannel coal, and mother of pearl. To these may be added rock crystal, red coral, and feathers of birds. The sprinkling of corn pollen is a very important element of almost every Navaho ceremony.

In some respects the Navaho religion is more spiritual than many another pagan religion. As stated before, there is little image worship. The nearest they come to the representation of their gods is in the masks the medicine men wear for their ceremonies. These masks are supposed to represent the likenesses of their gods.

Another way in which they represent their gods is in their sand-paintings. The medicine men make pictures of their gods with colored sand on the floor of their hogans. These sand-paintings are destroyed the very day they are made and are therefore not permanent. These are legendary, symbolic, and medical; legendary, because they often refer to incidents related in Navaho legends; symbolic, because practically everything, even the colors used in these paintings have a symbolical meaning; medical, because they are made to cure diseases.

Superstition

Much can be said about the superstitious nature of these poor people. They are, for instance, terribly afraid of death. Even a hogan in which a person dies is thought to be polluted ever afterwards. For that reason it usually is burned or partly broken down. And no Navaho—except some of the younger and educated—would dare to use any of the material of such a hogan for any purpose, not even to make a fire to warm himself by, or to cook a meal over. They move in a world full of evil spirits which may harm them in many ways and at any time. They do not know Him who through death destroyed him who had power of death, that is, the devil; and delivered them, who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage.

Witchcraft still holds sway among the Navaho people. Much evil, disease and bodily injury is due to secret agents of evil, in consequence of which belief in witchcraft and shooting of evil is widespread. Witches can shoot evil into a person from great distances.

No Happy Hunting Ground

The Navahos do believe in the life hereafter. This life is lived in the lower worlds. They came up from below and there they go when they die. It seems to be a life of dreary existence. In the Navaho mind there is much vagueness and cloudiness about it. It is a sort of Hades. There are different degrees of punishment, and the greatest happiness appears to be a negative something; namely, not to be punished. From that place the deceased are able to go forth to inflict upon the people of this world. They call the place, Chindi-tha, which means, among the devils. They absolutely know nothing about a Happy Hunting Ground.

Obscenity

For obvious reasons we will not say much about the immoral characters of some of these legends and ceremonial songs. Mr. J. C. Morgan, a full blood Navaho, has long contended that many of these stories are "rotten to the core and not fit to be told." Our Christian Navahos often complain about the debasing character of some of these performances. These charges frequently were denied, but recent scientific publications transcribing Navaho songs and legends from records are undeniable proofs. In fact, if I should quote here some of this foul, lewd material, I fear that this periodical would be banished from the U. S. Mails because of its obscenity.
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**Christianity's Impact**

Among these benighted people Christian missionaries have now been laboring for some forty years, and in spite of all the opposition of old-paganism, semi-paganism, and neo-paganism the work has not been in vain. It is true there is still much darkness. The present administration is to blame for some of it. One might say, the morning has come, and it is still night. But in the darkness of that night I see little spots, some brighter than others, reflecting the light of the world. Some are like smoking flax, at the point of going out, others are like shining stars. They are our Christian Navahos. Many a Navaho has learned to pray to the true God. In many a home Christian songs are heard. And one who has seen the Navaho Bible class composed mostly of Christian young men and women at the recent Flagstaff conference, cannot help but take courage. They are the future Christian leaders of the Navahos. Gradually “the deep beauty, spiritual guidance, consolation, and disciplinary power” of the Christian religion are taking the place of much ugliness, of misguidance, of despair, and moral weakness of paganism. We read of the Apostle Paul that his spirit was stirred in him when he saw the city of Athens wholly given to idolatry. If this article may stir us up to greater missionary endeavor, the writing of it shall not have been in vain.

**Chastening Love**

An Alpine traveler came one day To where a sheep lay near the way The shepherd standing by. He wondered if it ill could be, And when he came so he could see, He heard the shepherd sigh. "It has a broken leg," he said, As tenderly he stroked its head And wiped a tear away. And when he saw the shepherd weep He knew how he must love that sheep That by the pathway lay.

That sheep whose leg was neatly set Apparently was suffering yet. He asked how it occurred. "I broke its leg," the man replied. "That sheep always my will defied And from the pathway erred."

"To danger warnings gave no heed, And other sheep astray would lead. It was beyond control. The situation was so grave, 'Twas done the erring sheep to save: It grieved me to my soul.

"From this time on that sheep will be The most obedient sheep," said he "No longer will it stray. No longer will a menace be When well it will be fond of me And at my side will stay."

The Lord, obedience to obtain, Oft lays us on a bed of pain Or sends some other ill. We cry to Him in our distress, He stretches out His hand to bless: Henceforth we do His will.

—M. Kulikamp.

Detroit, Mich.

**Invocation**

Eternal God, lead us, we pray, In this New Year from day to day; Creatures of time, in self undone, We look to Thee, O Timeless One!

Before us is a road unknown, Without Thee we are travelers lone; Fearing our chartless course to run, We look to Thee, Omniscient One!

Changing each day is life's fleet scene, Confused, we move as in a dream; From each dawn to each setting sun We look to Thee, O Changeless One.

Help us to shun the paths of sin, O'er evil thoughts the vict'ry win; For pardon for all wrongs now done We look to Thee, Merciful One!

Guide us, we pray, through all our life, Till one day, freed from earthly strife Through Christ who has the vict'ry won, We live with Thee, O Holy One!

—H. P.

**Eternity's Kiss**

When in Christ I am happy and free, I am almost afraid for I see, There's a touch of eternity there. Down the reaches of time, How distant the clime, Earth has bound man to grief everywhere. But when happiness thrills, The soul that it fills, Has a glimpse of eternity's bliss. How impressive that thought With what awesomeness fraught: I was touched by Eternity's kiss!

—M. M. Jellema.
Louis Bourgeois
Chief Composer of
the Genevan Psalter

LOUIS BOURGEOIS, (pronounce Boorzhwa) the composer of eighty melodies in the Genevan Psalter, was born in Paris soon after 1500. In 1541 he was appointed precentor of one of the Reformed Churches in Geneva for which he received the colossal sum of sixty florins. From the minutes of the Council of Geneva—about the only source for his life—we know that he probably combined his work of precentor with that of schoolmaster. He was admitted to the citizenship of Geneva gratuitously, and later excused from military duties in the town guard to be better able to perform his artistic labors. When his salary was reduced to fifty florins, and he complained that he could not make ends meet, he was given two measures of corn "for that once, and in consideration of an expected addition to his family." When he petitioned the council again, now supported by Calvin, he met with a new refusal. In 1551 Bourgeois was arrested and imprisoned on the charge that he had altered the tunes of some of the psalms, but was released within twenty-four hours at the personal request of Calvin. Later Bourgeois's alterations were adopted by the council. He was also successful in having his idea of psalter boards approved, so that the audience would be sure to sing the correct number, for which invention he received sixty sols (or nickels).

In 1557 Bourgeois left Geneva for Paris, because Calvin was opposed to Bourgeois's idea of publishing the psalter with chords. It was the idea of the composer that the audience could easily sing the psalms in four parts, if they only used the solfeggio method. Though historians have been down on Calvin for his interference with the work of the great Bourgeois, present-day opinion among leading composers really justifies Calvin, for it is generally advocated in the church world that audiences sing hymns and chorales in unison. Calvin was not opposed to four or six part singing as such—at least this cannot be proved—but he was not in favor of changing a church audience into a singing school. And in this he was absolutely right.

Besides editing several editions of the Genevan psalter Bourgeois in 1550 published a work on the right usage of singing the psalms, in which he made a plea for abandoning the Guidonian method in favor of the solfeggio method. The present writer wonders whether the Paris-Gallin-Chevé method based on the same principle, but adopting numbers for notes, is not a direct offspring of Bourgeois's idea. It is certainly impossible to teach most people our intricate way of musical notation intelligently, whereas the solfeggio method has proved to be even successful for children.

In the well-known work of Douen on the Huguenot psalter the origin of many melodies of the psalter is traced. It has been held against Bourgeois that his melodies are hardly original, and that he adopted chants and folksongs, but first of all it must be repeated that it is easier according to several musical authorities to compose a symphony than a new melody, and further it must be remarked that it shows a great genius when one can adapt sacred melodies from secular sources with such ingenuity and variety as Bourgeois did. For, however subtle the distinction may be between secular and sacred music, Bourgeois has certainly shown that he understood this difference.

And, more than this must be said. Not only did Bourgeois compose many more melodies than Pierre Dubuisson (also called Maitre Pierre), and Matthias Greiter, but his melodies are on the whole much more forceful and striking than those of Pierre to whom we owe most of the sweeter tunes like Psalms 61, 74 (116), 84, 88, 89, 192, 146. From Greiter we have the stirring tunes of Psalms 1, 2, 15, 36, 91, 103, 104, 114, 130, 137 and 143. At least those are the old Strasburg psalter tunes. But from Bourgeois we have the best, like Psalms 19, 24, 33, 42, 72, 73, 86, 118, 119, 130, 134, marvelous melodies.

It is true that the tunes of Bourgeois do not fit in so well with our American temper and our Anglo-Saxon hymns, but it is certainly an honor for the Dutch Calvinists that they have held on to those melodies more than any other nation, and it would be an honor for American Calvinists of Dutch descent, if they would teach their children the heritage of Maitre Pierre, and of Matthias Greiter, but above all of Louis Bourgeois, greatest of psalm chorale composers.

Professor Acquoy in reviewing the work of Douen wrote of Bourgeois as follows: "For every emotion he knows how to strike the real tone. He can shout and complain, pray and thank, rejoice in God, and humiliate himself before him, yea, even thirst for God. The secret of this is his true piety together..."
with his musical genius; his thorough knowledge of the old scales together with his unlimited masters of melody. Moreover he is a magician when it comes to rhythm, accent and syncopation.’’

It has been said more than once that there are no melodies for church music like the Dutch or Genevan psalms. They are by far profounder, richer, stronger and sweeter than the Anglo-Saxon hymns and even than the German chorales. Here is a musical heritage which is the glory of Calvinism.

And the amazing fact is that the Calvinists are so little aware of their own artistic contributions. How wonderful it would be, if composers would work out the splendid melodies of Bourgeois and others in choral preludes, in choral fantasias, and in sonatas and symphonies, and if choral clubs and oratorio societies would sing them in modern harmonies, and in stately or free rhythm. Bourgeois is one of the greatest artists of all time, but we Calvinists of the twentieth century do not understand him.

The Present War and Economic Factors

by Cornelius Bontekoe and Henry J. Ryskamp

A Discussion

Economic Background of Current Conflicts
Cornelius Bontekoe
Instructor Christian High School, Hull, Iowa

The problem presented in “War, Peace, and Pacifism” is always an important one, but it is of special interest now when there is a possibility that this country may become involved in the coming European struggle. Because all our thinking today is motivated and influenced to a greater or less extent by the conflict, it is necessary to get behind the present situation and restudy the historical background. A clear conception of the historical causes (if such is possible) will help to reveal the true nature of the conflict. This background, in turn, will prepare us for a more intelligent analysis of our position as Christians toward our government when and if it again decides to interfere in European differences.

It is trite to say that history is the result of many and complex forces. Ideology is one of the important things that go into the making of history. However, “power politics” and “balance of power” have been important factors in European history for the past three centuries. But underlying these is the economic conflict. I am aware that there are some who claim to be “economic determinists,” and they glory in their blindness. At the other extreme, however, are those who consider any vital economic approach to history as being sordid and perhaps not quite Christian. But it must be remembered that any important policies of government affect, among other things, powerful economic interests in society, and any attempt to conceal or evade this fact would lead to stultification of thought.

Now then, is the “deeper issue at stake in the present international struggle” one of ideologies, i.e., Dictatorship versus Democracy or is this little more than a smoke screen by which the powerful interests of society hope to win over the majority of people. It is the latter who must contribute lives, wealth, or service for the realization of perhaps less noble ends.

Some Historical Background

The first important imperial war in the modern world was “The Seven Years War,” 1756-1763. Europe, and particularly England, was beginning its industrial advance. Raw materials were needed for the factory, and markets for the finished product. The great man in that day was William Pitt because he saw this, and for this reason directed the war in such a fashion that England would get India and the rich St. Lawrence and Mississippi River valleys in the New World. This conflict between England and France culminated in the Napoleonic Wars, which left Europe, and especially France, the great commercial and industrial rival of England throughout the 18th century (1688-1815), in a crippled state. England was left relatively free to continue its industrial advance, and it will be remembered that England acquired much of, and solidified her entire empire (from the smallest crown colony to what later came to be her glorious dominions) in the 19th century.

During the third quarter of the 19th century Germany became fairly well unified, and after her tremendous victory over France in the Franco-Prussian War (1870-1871), she began her rapid industrial development. It wasn’t long before Germany was crying for raw materials and markets. She was acquiring an empire in Africa, was increasing her trade with South America, and was laying the groundwork for the Berlin to Bagdad railroad in order to gain trade with the Orient. In all these things she was competing with British business interests. This industrial and commercial rivalry finally led to the World War. I am aware that other and important forces were also at work, but, none-the-less, this remains as the significant determining factor in that war.

We all know the result of the war. Formally it ended in the Versailles Treaty. There is much in that treaty that was good, but also much that was unjust. Perhaps Wilson saved it from being nothing more than a treaty of vengeance. (We must not forget that France could not forget the treatment she received from Germany in 1871). In short, Germany was bled dry. Besides this, there are those who say that the Allies used Wilson’s principle of “the right of self-determination” to set up a group of democratic governments in Central Europe to encircle Germany.

If this is a correct though incomplete picture of the history of Europe since 1756, and if there is any sequence or causality in history at all, then it must follow that the present conflict in Europe has its roots in this background.

Germany After Versailles

But Europe was not through with Germany after Versailles. She did not disarm as she promised to do. She did little really to assist Germany in the terrible days of inflation. Then in the mid-twenties, when Hitler was still painting and had dreams of becoming an architect, Chancellor Brüning of Germany went to see Monsieur Pierre Laval of France concerning a possible loan to Germany, fundamentally for the purpose of saving German civilization. He warned the French minister...
that things were going to happen in Germany if they didn't receive help, and that France and the Allies would eventually have to pay a great price if they refused to give aid to Ger-
many in this dark hour. But M. Laval remained adamant. We all know the result—Hitler. Germany was on her back crying for help, and the German people responded to the appeal Hitler made to them. It must not be forgotten that Hitler is the expression of the German people. Personally he may have gone "awry," but in many respects he is doing for the German people what they want as well as what they want done.

Besides persecuting Jews and purging communists from his brown-shirted ranks, Hitler is unifying not only Germany but also Central Europe. It is a fact that the Balkan States never will have economic prosperity until there is some economic order in Central Europe. Germany and the Balkan States are to each other what the East and the West are to each other in the United States—economically they are dependent. Besides unifying Central Europe, Hitler is regaining territory that was taken from him after the last war under the guise of Wilson's noble principle of self-determination. He is making trade connections with South America. He is restoring the pride and self-respect of the German people, and perhaps he had to become barbarian before he could win recognition and justice from a more (or less) civilized world. He, no doubt, is also interested in regaining the German colonies lost after the last war—supposedly lost to the League of Nations, but in reality to England and her Allies in the form of "protectorates" and "mandates."

As to the "Real Issue"

In short, from the economic point of view, Hitler is again trying to make Germany a great industrial nation, and in doing this he is cutting into the vested interests of Britain and other allied powers. I am not justifying Hitler's economic program, much less his "extra-legal" or immoral acts, but am merely trying to present what many of us fail to consider when excitement runs a little high. If the "real issue" in this conflict is Dictatorship versus Democracy, then what of the following facts?

1. Britain's lack of firm opposition to, and perhaps conniving with, Hitler when the latter took Austria and Czecho-
slovakia.

2. Britain's failure to help Poland in any effective way, though she had a treaty, i.e., a moral contract, with Poland guaranteeing the integrity of Polish territory and pledging assistance to Poland if she were invaded.

3. The wavering policy of Mussolini. It would seem Italy does not like her friend on the other end of the axis, and in the meantime England is courting her for her friendship.

4. The shrewd diplomacy of Stalin. There is little that can be said with any degree of confidence concerning Russia. It may be questioned whether the whole issue is settled be-
tween Germany and Russia as a result of the German-
Russian Pact. Though the two nations do have many im-
portant things in common—their attitude toward "re-
ligion, morality, and government"—what of their ideolo-
gies? Are Stalin and Russia no longer interested in the ideals of communism? Or is Stalin leading the Western World into war, and thus preparing fertile soil for the spread of communism? Or is nationalism on the increase in Russia, and is she playing the game of territorial aggrandizement?

5. The indifference of the people toward this war. If the democratic countries are fighting for the defense of democracy, I would at least like to think that the people would be willing and eager to protect what the governments so vociferously say is being threatened. But there is some-
thing ominous in their apathy.

6. The increasing power of the government in democratic countries. The power of Daladier and Chamberlain is in-
creasing in scope and authority to that of the dictator. Wars and depressions are the most difficult problems a

democratic country must face. Perhaps it is necessary to give the government more power to realize the victory against such foes. But let us not forget that means help to determine ends, and if there were a vital interest in democracy, intelligent men would not do and employ policies that will lead to the sure destruction of democracy.

As to War and Peace

Dr. Bouma's testimony, adopted by the Synod of the Chris-
tian Reformed Church, refutes a prevalent idea that obedience to the government is absolute save when it infringes on the freedom of religious worship. The solution suggested in "War, Peace, and Pacification" makes it necessary for all of us to know when the government is acting unjustly, especially when it demands obedience to its decisions. Romans 13 does assume (if one may state it that way) that the government is relatively just. There are times, however, when "rulers are a terror to the good work." Things are not always carried on "with good order and decency." Often things done are "repugnant to the Word of God."

In a complex world motivated by complex interests and desires, it is difficult to know whether the determining factor or factors adopted by the government is (are) repugnant to Scripture. But, any consideration of the problem of obedience to the government when that govern-
ment is at war must take into consideration the economic factors at work. The economic factor should not be con-
demned merely because it is economic, but no government is just which throws its citizens into a war which is motivated primarily by imperial interests. Perhaps it is not only the right, but also the duty, of every Christian to warn the gov-
ernment against pursuing a war that has this as its major issue.

Observations on the Present European Conflict

Henry J. Ryskamp
Professor of Economics, Calvin College
Grand Rapids, Michigan

THERE is in Mr. Bontekoe's article a timely reminder of the need for recognizing the economic background of current conflicts. His survey of modern history from 1756 to the present leaves no doubt as to the significance of this factor. For those who are familiar with the history of the period from 1914 to 1939 it is indeed clear that the military engagements of the World War were followed immediately, and continuously thereafter, by the disastrous economic war-
fare that led up to the events of 1938 and 1939. We cannot in the light of what recent history reveals ignore the fact that man's economic needs and his economic organization affect the trend of cultural development and do play a very important role in precipitating military conflict.

Economic Determinism

We cannot, as Mr. Bontekoe intimates, take the position of the economic determinists that the economic factor is the all

important one. The need of physical survival and the need of economic organization to make this possible is of very great importance. But throughout history individuals and groups have proved that there are other kinds of motivation than the economic. Our economic endeavor and organization is a product of man, and of the whole man. To say, as one-sided geographic and economic determinists do, that economic events determine the course of history is to ignore the fact that it is man whose course they are said to determine. Man is not passive, not a mere pawn to be moved about by the forces of nature. Man is an active agent. It is man who recognizes his needs and who recognizes and utilizes the resources of nature to satisfy them. And it is the whole man, not the man of appetites only, man with body, mind, and spirit who recog-
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nites his needs, recognizes means of satisfaction, and who devises methods of using them. Man is in this respect differ-
ent from the animals. Both are dependent on nature but man
distinguishes between methods of satisfying needs and chooses
what he thinks best. Moreover man changes his very environ-
ment to suit his needs. The impact of his mind, of his thought
are everywhere manifest in the world of today.

Important as economic motivation is, therefore, it is not the
all important or most important kind of motivation. It is
among all peoples a manifestation of something deeper, some-
thing more spiritual. As a creature possessed of body, mind,
and spirit man has always recognized other ends of existence
in addition to the economic. And economic attitudes have always been based on the spirit of moral and spiritual attitudes.
Adam Smith was a moralist before he became an economicist;
individualistic, utilitarian in his point of view. His followers
in their emphasis on enlightened self-interest manifested little
appreciation of the real nature of man and society, of the rel-
ation of the individuals to his fellows and to his God. The
Physiocrats who gave us the popular phrase, laissez-faire,
recognized only so-called laws of nature, and insisted, there-
fore, that natural law must regulate our economic conduct.
The representatives of both of these schools opposed the
narrow economic nationalism of the Mercantilists. In each of
these cases rather definite ideologies had their influence on
economic behavior, and one may fairly make the point that
ideologies do seriously affect an economic as well as our
political organization.

Narrow Economic and Political Democracy

Nationalism has all too generally been selfish, its purpose
having been too frequently that of holding onto and getting
selfishness as much as growth in the service of others, help-
the freedom to give oneself, to express oneself. These two
fulness to others as well as to ourselves. And the combination
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of today, in spite of her often bad imperialistic record, recognize the autonomy of many parts of the empire, and is there not opportunity still for all these parts to add their distinctive contribution to the empire and to the world? Is not the economic competition of Britain with the rest of the world in the main competition of men with men?

On the other hand, is there not in the communistic and in the Nazi world a real threat to individual self-expression? Is it not openly contended in those countries that the individual exists only for the state? Do these states permit religious freedom? When they compete in the world market, do they not compete as nations using the ruthless bargaining methods of states that can set the standard of living as low as they please within the country and thus temporarily ruin the world market for others? Do these nations give much more than the emptiest of lip-service to cultural distinctions and local autonomy within their empires? Does not the world face the constant threat of the extension of their sphere of influence, by means of an imperialism more condemnable even than that which has gone before and which is now disintegrating?

If the answers suggested by these questions are correct then there is more at stake at present than rival imperialistic systems. There are basically different motivations on the two sides. And whatever may have led to the pronouncement of the new ideologies of the Nazis and of the Communists the fact remains that the world is faced by them and their consequences now.

Mutual Aid Among Nations

Can we be indifferent toward the economic conditions of other nations in time of peace? We never have been in the period during which modern communication has permitted contact with other nations. Nations have as a rule sought to take advantage of other nations and particularly of the more backward nations. May we be indifferent to their economic conditions in time of peace? We have an obligation as nations as well as individuals to seek the good of others as well as our own. This obligation holds equally well for the political as for the economic. There is good biblical ground for condemning attempts at world-wide dominion, but there is also a scriptural mandate to be of assistance one to another, culturally as well as economically.

Can we be indifferent toward the economic needs of other nations in time of war? Again, we never have, and we have learned that any attempt to disregard such needs is likely to hurt the very causes we should like to aid. May we be indifferent if injustice is likely to result from conflict, particularly when we are in a position to be of influence? Real and unselfish influence should be exerted in time of peace, but if a real issue develops may we ignore our opportunity and neglect our duty in time of war, and merely stand by? If it appears that in the present conflict the best that we can do is to furnish economic and moral support, must we not be ready to do that, and be ready also to give constructive aid when the time for a peace settlement arrives?

All this is too difficult in a sinful world, a reader is likely to protest. But what is the alternative? Altogether too idealistic, some one may insist. But is not this the challenge that faces the Christian in every relation of life, the duty to do the seemingly impossible?

Dizzy Heights....

I WAS watching two little girls playing an ancient game of childhood and unconsciously teaching us all a lesson. They were walking with their heads craned far back so that they looked straight up into the blue sky. The best they could manage in the way of walking was a dizzy reeling back and forth until they fell in giggling heaps. If, dear reader, your dignity permit, try it sometime. Your antics will cause even your best friends to wag heads and click tongues at such unexpected but evident inebriation. It is a child's game, a splendid way to capture the carefree mood of youth, but it's a poor way to walk.

We will all, in sport or seriousness, be making New Year's resolutions. Idealism is a fine thing, it lifts us out of our ruts and relieves our noses of their wearisome grindstones. But if our resolutions and ideals are so ridiculously out of time and mind and we insist on keeping our head straight back and our gaze straight up, we are going to reel and fall. Such idealism is good child's play, but it is a poor way to walk. It may give a comforting sense of unreality but walking requires much more realism. Somebody separated those two and they should have gone together. Without making bland generalizations, let me give a few examples and say, "Adieu."

God said, in the garden, to Adam, "You may live forever." There was his ideal. But God said also, "Thou shalt not eat of the tree." That was his realism, his obedience in which he was to walk. But one day he listened to the "Dizzy Heights" idealism of a long black worthy coiled in a tree, who said, "Eat and be like God," and man looked straight up, lost his sense of reality and fell.

Again, Someone said, "Be ye perfect, as your Father in Heaven is perfect." That is idealism and if it is taken as it stands, and as some do, and offered to the soul struggling desperately with his boot straps as he is lodged in the morass, that soul will look up to that dizzy height and fall deeper. That Someone who gave the ideal never gave it alone. Take it as He meant it, based on this profound bit of realism, "Except a man be born again . . . ." and you have something!

Adieu,

ALI BANDON.
Question: Do not those who claim that Christians are no longer under the law but under grace have sufficient biblical grounds in Gal. 3:23-25?

Answer: Let’s read it. “But before faith came we were kept under the law, shut up unto the faith that should afterwards be revealed. Wherefore the law was our school-master to bring us to Christ, that we might be justified by faith. But after that faith is come, we are no longer under a schoolmaster.” Now, of course, there can be no doubt at all but what those who believe that we are no longer under the law but under grace are standing on solid ground. This passage constitutes good ground. Indeed, there is another text that is still more expressive on that point than this one. Here is Rom. 6:14. Listen, “For sin shall not have any dominion over you, for ye are not under the law, but under grace.” That is surely clear enough. So my answer is that the biblical proof for that position is overwhelming. The question is now answered, but to say no more is to leave, I fear, a mistaken impression. The party who submitted the question may feel that this touches the bone of contention between the pre-millenarians and their Christian opponents. But that is not the case at all. The problem lies in the interpretation of the phrase, to wit, “not being under the law.” Some think that this means that we are in no sense subject to the law. It has absolutely no authority over us at all. The law is done. It is through as far as those under grace are concerned. They even feel that it is inappropriate to read the law before a gathering of Christian people assembled for public worship. The ones that beg to differ take the position that we are no longer under the law as a school-master to Christ. We are no longer under it as a hard taskmaster that drives us to the foot of the cross. The law need not be kept to merit salvation. It failed in that function, or rather we failed in attempting by the law to present ourselves spotless before the Judge. But it is still in force as a guide to teach us the way of gratitude and sanctification. So there is a difference. There is not a single Bible student that can escape the truth that we are no longer under the law. That is stated in so many words. But on the other hand it would seem to be equally impossible for a Bible student to assume that the will of God as expressed in his law had no longer any regulatory authority over us. Paul, to whom the appeal is made by those that despise the law, earnestly urges the Christian readers to do the things stipulated by the Decalogue.

Why Did Not His Face Shine?

Question: Why did not the face of Moses shine the first time he came down from Mount Sinai?

Answer: Presumably the brother is thinking of the time when Moses received the tables of stone from God and went down the mountain side to find the people of God serving the golden calf. This is presented in Ex. 32. This is contrasted with the second descent of Moses when he brought the tables of stone safely to the Israelites. On this second occasion there was a striking illumination of the face of Moses. This is recorded in Ex. 34. There is no reason given by Scripture, as far as I know, for the lack of facial illumination on the occasion of the first descent. In fact, the Bible does not even deny that his face shone also the first time. However, the assumption of the brother that Moses did return the first time without his face aglow with an arresting illumination would seem to be correct in the face of the fact that so much is made of it the second time by the Bible writer.

Whatever answer may be given to this inquiry, it can only be speculative in character. May I suggest the following: Note that the shining of Moses’ face was revelatory in character. That is to say, God wished by it to reveal something of it to his people. Moses himself was apparently entirely unaware of it at first. It was to express or symbolize something to the Israelites. It seems to me that the key to the problem must be sought here. In the first descent from the mount Moses had already been informed about Israel’s idolatry. He came down representing the judgment of God. God’s face did not and could not shine either directly or indirectly through Moses upon a sinful people. But when the great leader
came down the second time he came as an angel of God bringing down to them an indication of divine good will. God had been reconciled. Moses sensed that. As God's mediator he revealed it by a shining appearance. The illuminated countenance spoke to Israel of a God who in loving-kindness and tender mercies was approaching his sinful people. That could not have been revealed in the first descent. There was anger there expressed by the shattering of the tables of stone. But it was entirely appropriate in the second.

Has Each Christian A Guardian Angel?

Question: Has each Christian an individual guardian angel? In Acts 12:15, it is said that what Rhoda heard was Peter's guardian angel. What is meant by that?

Answer: Judging from the Jewish literature after the Exile the idea of individual angels was very common among the Jews. Jesus spoke about it as if it were well known to all. In Matt. 18:10, one may read, "Take heed that ye despise not one of these little ones, for I say unto you, that in heaven their angels do always behold the face of my Father which is in heaven." Something similar to that is found in Hebr. 1:14, "Are they not all ministering spirits sent forth to minister for them who shall be heirs of salvation?" Ps. 34:7 speaks of the angel of the Lord that campeth round about them that fear Him and delivereth them. An angel came and strengthened Jesus in the garden. And there are passages in the Bible that speak in the same vein. Now, of course, our curious and prying minds have a thousand questions that they would like to have answered. These matters are not revealed to us, and we need revelation to get the facts in the spiritual realm. Reflection can give us little more than speculative results. But enough has been revealed in this matter so as to give us an abundant reason to be consoled, comforted and encouraged.

May Vows Be Broken?

Question: Was it right for Jephtha to make the following vow, "If Jehovah wilt indeed deliver the children of Ammon into my hand, then it shall be that whosoever cometh forth from the doors of my house to meet me, when I return in peace from the children of Ammon, it shall be Jehovah's and I shall offer it up for a burnt offering"? Must a sinful vow be kept in the spirit of "I have opened my mouth to Jehovah, I cannot go back"?

Answer: These questions take us to the eleventh chapter of the Book of Judges. Now if it could be established that Jephtha made this vow by the Spirit of Jehovah that came upon him when he became Israel's deliverer, then, I presume, that we would be compelled to place our stamp of approval upon it. The Spirit's guidance is infallible guidance. But such a Spirit that moved Jephtha to serve as Israel's deliverer did not necessarily take possession of every detail of the man's life. This Spirit gave him the will, the wisdom, the strategy, and the power to make a successful campaign against Ammon, but it did not guarantee him infallibility of thought and action in all that he accomplished or was to accomplish.

It appears to me, that this rash vow was a natural expression of the man. He was an illegitimate child of a disreputable woman. He had been driven from his home. He lived in the mountains and gathered about him a gang of questionable characters as associates. He was a sort of a desperado. He was accustomed to say and to do things rashly. This vow would seem to be a true reflection of Jephtha and not of the Spirit. Then, too, even the spirit of bargaining with God which he manifested looks a bit dubious. It was not an act of faith, and what is not of faith is sin. I would call this vow unnecessary, uncalled for, and an expression of doubt and therefore sinful.

As a general rule man should, of course, keep his promises to God and to men. He must do what he...
vowed to do, but his vows must be legitimate vows. A writer once put it this way, "The matter of a vow must be something that has a plain and direct tendency either to the advancement of God's glory, and the interest of his Kingdom among men, or to the furtherance of ourselves in his service, and in that which is antecedently our duty." That is to say, if we must vow, let us vow what God wills us to do. God would hold no man to his vow if his vow calls for a sinful act. Jephtha virtually vowed to commit murder on the condition that God would give him a successful campaign.

He may not have realized the implications of his vow, but he should have realized or have withheld it. Sinful vows must be broken. God can find no pleasure in them. Men who make them should be filled with deep contrition and sorrow, and then ask for release. The angels in heaven will rejoice over one sinner that repenteth, and that also includes repenting because of a rash decision. But Jephtha never saw its sinfulness. His hesitancy was apparently not due at all to the feeling that his vow was not right, but to a sense of personal loss when he realized that his only child must be sacrificed, if his vow is to be kept.

H. S.

---

**Leafless**

Hiding nothing now
In some sheltered bough,
With not a stitch of clothing on,
The tree, a plundered skeleton,
Stands in the cold of autumn-day
In naked self-display.

* * * * * * *

So every leaf that covers me
Shall as the leaves from this old tree,
By autumn-winds be torn away;
And I shall stand all stripped of sham
Before my God just as I am
In naked self-display.

—but ALBERT PIERSMA.

Grand Rapids, Mich.

**My New Year's Wish**

What shall I wish you for the new New Year?

It is a path of silence silvering
Where golden moments treasure in the spring
And where too happy hours hang quivering.

It is a lacy tree of promising
Where tender precious thoughts have nourishing
And gentle noble virtues flourishing.

Have there a sturdy oak of beckoning
To test accounts and give a reckoning
That urges you a time for mellowing.

And then I wish for you a back-fence alley
To see the sunlight linger in a valley
To go with a small child sometimes to dally.

More I would wish you one star in the sky
That speaks to you of God and life on high
That you may follow Christ and dare to die.

Then you shall live and in the coming year
In spite of toil or sorrow, conquer fear;
And you shall have a gift, the gift of cheer.

—JOAN GEISEL GARDNER.

---
Big Business and Social Responsibility


Dear Dr. Bouma:

In response to your invitation to write a letter from the Chicago area, I am sending you a few notes. Whether they will meet the requirements of a scholarly journal like The Calvin Forum I do not know. From the beginning your paper has maintained a high standard, and some of my friends in other denominations who see it and read it think it is a splendid venture.

Inasmuch as you are teaching Ethics in Calvin Seminary you will be interested in some remarkable things that were said the other evening at a banquet of business leaders, men who are at the very center of the business world of our country. Harold H. Swift, who inherited the packing business from his grandfather Swift, was one of the main speakers at the dinner of the Economic Club. He talked more like a social reformer than an industrial magnate. I will give you one quotation from his speech, as reported in The Chicago Daily News.

"I am talking chiefly to the young fellows here who will run Chicago fifteen years from now. This is a changing world. Every now and then one of my friends drops dead from heart failure through trying to stand the strains, such as 56 holes of golf, at 50, that he could do at 25. Those who don't realize they have changed are fools. We are equally foolish if we do not realize social and economic changes. The surest thing we know regarding the world during the next generation is that it will be something we don't expect. Today industrialists are fairly shouting that labor has the right to collective bargaining. An industrialist had said that ten years ago, his associates were something. Mr. Lyon went on to say that "throughout most of our history economic freedom was regarded as a social objective of primary importance. Few more effective attacks could be made on proposed laws than to indicate that they would interfere with the right of an individual to enter business as he chose. Not only was this believed good in itself, but this view was supported by a confident belief that such liberty would secure a maximum of national income, produced in an efficient and economical manner.

"One change which is taking place is a diminishing regard for individual freedom as an end in itself. While this feeling is still strong, it appears to be in conflict with a feeling that security may be of more significance than liberty. This is fortified by a doubt in the minds of many as to whether the maximum income for the nation, to say nothing of the most equitable distribution and the greatest security, can be produced by that degree of independent action which has characterized America in the past."

Much more could be quoted along this line from Mr. Lyon's illuminating address, but this suffices to indicate that some of our foremost business leaders are really doing some intelligent thinking about our greatest national problems. To hear a man in Mr. Lyon's position—chief executive officer in the Chicago Association of Commerce—seriously considering "the most equitable distribution and the greatest security" is both interesting and highly encouraging. If this attitude should become the prevailing attitude in the American business and industrial world, we ought to be able to solve our economic problems without a great social upheaval.

In Chicago, as everywhere else no doubt, we are all hoping for an era of greater tranquillity. May the peace of God, through faith in Jesus Christ, dwell in many hearts. From year to year the conviction grows upon me that that is our greatest need. Then we have a foundation upon which to build better human relationships.

Cordially yours,

E. J. Tanis.

War Over Scotland

Free Church College,
Edinburgh, Dec. 4, 1939.

My dear Dr. Bouma:

It seems a long time since I had your very kind letter, for which I warmly thank you. It seems much longer still since I had the very happy privilege of your fellowship in our little home at Lochcarron. Then we could enjoy the peaceful repose of the shelter of the great hills, of the placid waters of the loch and the general restfulness afforded by nature's prolific bounty of charm and beauty.

But a great change has taken place, not in nature, but in the relations of sinful men to one another.

Here, in Edinburgh, we had, and are still having, sharp reminders that we are in the War Zone. Hitherto, however, no damage of any kind has been done. But you can understand that to leave the class room twice for safety in a gasproof shelter is not conducive to concentration on study. Still we are going on with almost the usual number of Divinity students. There is no appearance of the calm of normal being in the least
Calvinistic Study Groups in Australia

Editor, The Calvin Forum,

Dear Sir:

A FEW years ago Calvinism was practically dead in Australia. As regards the larger Christian denominations, despite the retention by some of them of Calvinistic standards, and the existence of a large conservative and evangelical element, there was practically no interest in or support for the distinctive doctrines of Calvinism. In fact Calvinism was generally assumed to be discredited and disproved.

Concurrent with the obscurity which befell the Reformed Faith, there was to be found depreciation of exact theological thinking, contempt for doctrine and creed, and disproportionate stress on conduct at the expense of belief—tendencies by no means confined to liberal theological circles.

Having regard to this situation, even a small-scale recognition of Calvinism as the most complete expression of the Christian faith, and as a theology with a special message for the world of today, is a source of gratification. For some time past a number of the younger ministers of the Presbyterian Church of Australia have been turning to Calvinism. Further both among ministers and laymen, even where the distinctive position of Calvinism is perhaps rejected or only imperfectly accepted, there is increasing respect and a willingness to inquire as to the contribution which the Reformed Faith has to make.

Feeling that Calvinists, through coming together, could help one another by way of mutual encouragement and study of theological questions, and at the same time influence others, the Rev. Arthur Allen, minister of the Free Presbyterian Church at Geelong, Victoria, has recently succeeded in forming Calvinistic Societies in both Melbourne, Victoria, and Sidney, New South Wales. In Sydney denominational representation is wide, and the society is fortunate in having as its president Principal Hammond of the Church of England. The Melbourne Society is predominately Presbyterian at present, drawing its support chiefly from the Presbyterian and Free Presbyterian Churches. This is due largely to the fact that Presbyterianism is relatively not only much stronger but also more conservative in Victoria than in other parts of Australia, and also because there is not the same degree of Reformed tradition to be found in some other denominations in Victoria as is the case in New South Wales. The Melbourne society is also favored by having a well known theologian as its president in the person of Professor Gillies of the chair of New Testament Studies at Ormond College—the Presbyterian college in the University of Melbourne.

It is to be hoped that the fact that Australia, as a loyal dominion of the British Empire, has felt the necessity of declaring war on Germany in an endeavor to preserve the rights of small nations, will lead an increasing number of Australians to see the truth of the Calvinistic view of human nature and from that to obtain a richer insight into the Gospel message.

F. MAXWELL BRADSHAW.

Hawthorn, Victoria.

Australi.

Jew and Arab in Palestine

Kuwait, Persian Gulf, Nov. 14, 1939.

Dear Editor:

FOR the time being, the Palestine problem has almost completely faded out of the picture. More important events obscure it. However, it is merely obscured, but has actually become much less acute. Partly because the rebellious parties were tired of the struggle, partly because of the measures taken by the powers in charge and partly because of the promise that Jewish immigration would be definitely restricted and eventually stopped, there was a decided lessening of turmoil in the Holy Land as the summer wore on. And now that another world war has broken out this problem, a left-over from the previous great war, is apparently almost forgotten, though it is a problem that still awaits a future solution.

One feels keenly that the main crux of the trouble lay not so much in actual external facts as in fears: perhaps we might call them ideological. However that does not minimize them, for it is ideologies that are rending the world to pieces these days. Had there been the right attitude of mind on both sides all the trouble might have been forecome, and all might have benefited. The irrigation of barren wastes, the draining of pestilent swamps, and the erection of many factories were benefited. The irrigation of barren wastes, the draining of pesticent swamps, and the erection of many factories were benefitted. The irrigation of barren wastes, the draining of pestilential swamps, and the erection of many factories were benefitted. The irrigation of barren wastes, the draining of pestilential swamps, and the erection of many factories were benefitted. The irrigation of barren wastes, the draining of pestilential swamps, and the erection of many factories were benefitted.

The Scotsman (our principal daily paper in Scotland) who expressed to me in writing his high appreciation of the tone, quality, and sincere appreciation and apprehension of what this country is fighting for—and not for herself alone.

I shall be glad to hear from you any time you have some minutes to spare.

My daughter and I are here alone; my wife and grandchildren are at Lochcarron—for safety.

With the season's greetings and cordial good wishes,

D. MACLEAN.

[Note of Editor: Many of our readers will recognize the name of Dr. Maclean as that of one of the outstanding leaders in the Free Kirk, Professor of Church History at the Free Church College, a leader in the movement for International Calvinism, and Editor of The Evangelical Quarterly, the foremost evangelical magazine in the British Isles devoted to the scholarly exposition and defense of the Reformed Faith. With deep regret we make mention of the fact that the proposed Fifth Calvinistic Conference that was to be held at Emden, Germany, in 1940, in the preparation of which Professor Maclean has taken such a leading part, cannot meet in the historic city of John a Lasco on account of the war. May God be merciful unto all the brethren of the faith in the countries at war, whether on the German or the Allied side, and may peace soon return to the harassed and stricken people of the Continent and the British Isles!]
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that the Arabs rose in revolt. The Jews throughout the world suffer because they are considered a special race, but they themselves consider themselves a special race, and show that they do so, specially in Palestine. Could they have co-operated, there would have been room for thousands of Jews without crowding out the original inhabitants: or making them feel that they were crowded. On the other hand it is said that there were also certain Arabs who, while they roused the populace, made money by selling land to the Jews.

This problem will have to wait for its solution, as so many other problems will have to wait, "till the war is over." If a solution can be found to the satisfaction of the Arabs, the Mandated Power will gain friends throughout the entire Mohammedan world, for the settlement concerns not only the somewhat less than a million Arabs in Palestine, but the hundreds of millions of Mohammedans, who are scattered throughout the world. Politically the Islamic world may be broken up into many divisions, but the radio, harnessed to religious feeling, has made for a real Mohammedan solidarity that unites them all together.

In the Persian Gulf we feel very little of the world war. Prices have risen somewhat and trade suffers from some interruption, but on the whole life goes on much as usual. But whereas in the previous great war we were kept very much in ignorance, we can now listen to the news, in English, from England, France, Italy, Germany, Palestine and India. For the Arabs, also, who before cared so little for what was going on in the outside world, there are now news broadcasts, in Arabic, from England, Italy, Germany, Egypt, Palestine, Syria and Bagdad. They spend so much time listening to them evenings that they are almost better up with the news than the missionaries, who, perhaps, listen to only one broadcast in English.

G. J. PENNINGS.

Calvinistic Discussion Club in Western Michigan

THE Calvinistic Discussion Club whose membership lives in Grand Rapids and Western Michigan met on Friday afternoon, November 17, at the home of Professor Welmers at Holland, Mich. All members were present. Professor Bouma was in the chair. Dr. John G. Van Dyke of Grand Haven, the secretary of the Club, was the speaker and the subject was: "Platonic Thought and Christianity."

The speaker touched only briefly by way of introduction on Plato and Plotinus, and then delimited his subject so as to discuss the Neo-Platonic "re-interpretation" of Christianity as advanced in our day by Dean Inge, known as the (former) gloomy Dean of St. Paul's. Dr. Van Dyke has made a thorough study of this subject, already for some years past in connection with some of his advanced courses taken in Theology, and has read practically all (some 30) works of Inge. The following is a brief résumé of the line of thought developed by the speaker.

Dean Inge is the chief modern spokesman for and interpreter of Plotinus. Witness his two-volume work, The Philosophy of Plotinus, delivered as Gifford Lectures at St. Andrew's in 1917-'18. There is something fascinating about his type of thought. It has the warmth of mysticism about it. It has a wide appeal in our day, as the popularity of the works of the Dean shows.

But as soon as we test this Neo-Platonic "re-interpretation" of Christianity with the Reformed Faith, we find they not only cannot be harmonized, but they must be declared to form an antithesis. The irreconcilable conflict between these two is seen when their view is compared on the following fundamentals:

1. The Word of God.

According to Inge, there is no special, infallible, supernatural revelation in Scripture. Plato, Plotinus, Jesus, John, and Paul are alike inspired. Christianity teaches that Scripture is the inspired and infallible Word of God. This is an axiom, an ultimate truth that does not admit of proof. Christianity will have to shine by its own light.

2. God and the Absolute.

Inge holds that God is the Absolute, but he denies that this Absolute has any attributes. Moreover, God is not personal. He is supra-personal. He is not "other" to man. But Inge's God is not our God or the God of Scripture.

"The Calvinist in speaking of God knows Him to be 'other' than self. He has experienced that God comes to him, and not that he first came to God. . . . God is for the Calvinist not a dark background, but a Triune God, a personal Being who in the Eternal Son revealed Himself as the God of love and mercy. . . . In Christ he is. And when he hears the Savior say, 'I am the Way, the Truth, and the Life', he being in Christ, knows God metaphysically, epistemologically, and morally. . . . For the Calvinist, God who thus revealed himself in Christ, is absolutely God, eternal, and eternally self-sufficient. He is the eternal ground of all things. Created things are; but they are by God's creative act. . . . But as they came into being there was laid in them the divine will as ordinances, according to which they manifest themselves in a kaleidoscopic variety."

3. Creation and Created Things.

The central belief of the Neo-Platonists in reference to created things is emanation. When they speak of "created" things, they mean something entirely different from what we mean to convey by that word. They mean that the eternal, eternally overflows.

Over against this Neo-Platonic error the speaker then set forth the biblical conception of creation, developing especially the meaning and implication of the conceptions of cosmos and universe.

4. The Atonement.

Modern Neo-Platonism is at a loss what to do with evil. According to it, evil is the inseparable condition of good in a world of will. For Inge, sin is lack of attention. It is lack of looking spirit-ward. It is unspirituality. It is no wonder that this implies a distorted idea of "redemption", "atonement".

Atonement is a matter of attention. It is in our own hands. Redemption is not from sin in the biblical sense but must be viewed as a matter of making better that which is capable of improvement. There are three stages in this self-atonement: the purgative, the illuminative, and the unitive. We are, in this view, not redeemed by Christ, but like Christ.

Dean Inge claims that this position is that taught in the Fourth Gospel. This Dr. Van Dyke disputed and he proceeded to show from this very Gospel how the biblical view of sin and atonement is diametrically opposed to it. Incarnation, sin, and atonement as taught by John are at every point irreconcilable with the construction of these as given by Dean Inge's Neo-Platonic Mysticism. "I believe I have demonstrated from this Gospel that the Atonement means for Christ and every unbiased reader of the Gospel that Christ gives his life for his sheep, those who believe, for those whom the Father had given him."

The difference between the "unity" between God and man as taught by this Neo-Platonic Mysticism and as taught by Scripture was put into these two sentences: "Unity that coördinates God and man qualitatively is unsatisfactory because the 'otherness' of God is resolved into self-awareness, into a static condition in which activity ceases and utter monotony abounds. A unity in which God remains 'other' than self but in love gives himself and we in love give ourselves to him, is life and activity. 'And this is eternal life that they should know thee, the only true God, and him whom Thou didst send, Jesus Christ.'"

C. B.
Religious News and Comments

• Niemöller

The "Utrechtsch Nieuwsblad" recently carried an item which should be passed on. This newspaper received information from a source which has been in very close contact with Captain Niemöller for the past several years. Here is the information:

Since the war against Poland, Pastor Niemöller has been treated by the German authorities with more consideration than before.

Regarding the offer Captain Niemöller made, namely to assume command of a U-Boat, in exchange for his release from the concentration camp, this now is proven to be completely untrue. However, pressure had been exerted upon the pastor for the purpose of causing him to make such a proposal.

It is regrettable that in the United States, some editors of daily papers editorially condemned the brand of Christianity supposedly represented by Rev. Niemöller. Far better it would be to suspend judgment until all the facts are actually known. And that may call for patience till the war is over.

• A New Dutch Bible Translation

The Dutch Bible Society in 1936 (Sept. 8) decided to give the Dutch speaking people a new translation of the Bible. On November 1, 1939, the New Testament was ready. Eleven scholars had been engaged for the New Testament work. One of them was a Reformed scholar of note, Professor F. W. Grosheide. He also chairmanned the committee of eleven.

Since scholars of different denominations produced this new translation, it is worthy of note, that the translators, together, and each one personally, assume full responsibility for their product. From reports in the church journals it appears that the churches are quite satisfied with the new translation.

• The Reformed Church at Amsterdam

The great Reformed ("Gereformeerde") Church of Amsterdam (Central) does not grow. On the contrary, it has declined in numbers at an alarming rate. Just now, one of its ministers (Dr. B. Wielenga) has been retired. But no pastor will be called to fill his place. There is no need for it.

In 1921 Amsterdam's (Central) Church numbered 22,000 members. Now it numbers slightly less than 14,000. A loss of 8,000 in 18 years! Why? For years there has been a steady exodus of members who labor in the city, but build a home in the suburban, or country districts. The suburban churches of Amsterdam have grown at a rapid pace. Besides this exodus, another factor is co-responsible for this sad situation: Many people forsake the religion of their fathers. When you consider that only 8 pastors minister to this flock of 14,000, you look for pencil and paper and find out how many souls are entrusted to the care of each pastor.

In these days, when personal work and personal contact are required in almost every line of human endeavor, and especially in religious work, no pastor can do justice to his calling if his flock numbers 1700 souls.

The Reformed Churches have a large number of candidates who have received no call. There is no work for them. But when you look at large congregations like the one in Amsterdam, you see one reason for the ministerial oversupply.

• Rationalism and Modernism

The Presbyterian quotes O. P. Kretzman, who wrote on "The Decline of Modernism" in "The American Lutheran" as follows:

"The main tap-root of modernism was rationalism. Rationalism itself was the eighteenth century reaction to orthodoxy and pietism. It is interesting to note that there are always three stages in any movement away from orthodox Christianity to a rationalistic interpretation of historic Christian belief. First comes the desire to defend Christianity by reason. The second stage is marked by a distinction between public preaching and private thought, particularly among the clergy. The pulpit remains comparatively orthodox, while the study becomes naturalistic. The third and final stage is the elevation of reason as the final authority in matters of faith."

Undoubtedly, the author is correct in saying that defense of Christianity by reason is a step away from historic, orthodox Christianity. Christ has told his church to witness, to testify, to give a complete exposition of the truth in Christ; but he reserved the actual convincing of mind and heart to the Holy Spirit. John 3.

But why should Christians have an inferiority complex so that they want to show an unbelieving world that Christianity can be proved upon the position of the unbeliever?

• The Christian Sabbath

That the problem of preserving the Christian Sabbath is not confined to the United States only, may be gathered from two articles in the Presbyterian Record, official monthly of the Presbyterian Church in Canada. Malcolm Gillies writes about "The Christian Sabbath" that, "like all the institutions of God, the day itself is its own best defense," and that "the Day has been of vital importance to the life of man." He enumerates three classes of people who exert all their power to break down the Day.

1. "Some men of business who regard it as a real barrier in their way," and who "at all costs speed up its commercialization."

2. The craze for amusement which converts the "Day into a time for giddy pursuit of pleasure": excursions, motoring, cinemas, and games.

3. "Good citizens" so-called, interested in church and religion, but whose religion is only a veneer. They "use all kinds of soft words about all Sabbath profanation, and by their own lax observance . . . are speeding up the degradation of the Day, and encourage others to go further in that direction."

The remedy suggested is to teach the young by wise and sound instruction, in Sabbath Schools, Bible Classes, etc. The "deepest need today is to get back to God," a "baptism of the Holy Spirit." Unquestionably, the need of our day is a return to the God of our fathers. When the Christian lives in the presence of God, the Day will be filled with activities of worship and devotion. The mind and heart must be occupied by something. If it is not devotion to God, it of necessity must be devotion to self.

Since Canada, like the mother country is at war, and since war is no respecter of man, or institutions or God, the Lord's Day Alliance of Canada finds its task greatly increased. It realizes that "deeper than the need for physical recuperation through the weekly day of Rest, there is the need for moral and spiritual enrichment." But these come to us only in the way of surrender to God.

• Communism and Pacifism Akin

Many thinking people have suspected that Communism and Fascism are closely akin. Now in the "Moody Monthly" Morris Gordin writes about the two. Mr. Gordin is the former Press Commissar of the Communist Internationale, and author of "Utopia in Chains." He ought to know about the subject.

In the article referred to above, Gordin finds that "with all their (communism and fascism) seeming irreconcilable hatred of one another, they have a great core of identity, both in their politics and economics, increasingly so in their economics. Is it possible that in essence, fascism is communism from the top, while communism is fascism from the bottom? The world is beginning to wonder whether Hitler is not the champion of a brown Bolshevism and whether Mussolini is not aiming to..."
achieve a black Bolshevism. They are both already on a rampage of confiscation of private property.

The capitalists in Germany today find that they are no longer owners but merely agents working in technical positions for the absolute state. This is true also in Italy and it is beginning in Japan. It is military necessity which is bolshevizing fascism. On the other hand, Stalin is beginning to produce a fascist bolshevism.

Under the terrible stress of war the real issues are coming now to the surface: God or Marx; class and racial hatred or the Gospel; Mein Kampf or I Corinthians 13. The writer is convinced that the real revolution needed today, as ever, is John 3, . . . Ye must be born again.

Although Calvinists will not agree to the author's conclusions in every respect, it is certainly worth while for everyone to read this clear article.

• Mohammedans at The Hague

In The Hague, not the capital of the Netherlands, but the seat of its government, there are 300 Mohammedans organized in a Mohammedan Society. Recently they have taken steps, necessary to become a Mohammedan religious Communion.

A FINE MANUAL ON CALVINISM


ANY people, otherwise intelligent, still have the most distorted and peculiar conception about John Calvin and the system of thought that goes by his name. And even many who have a fairly correct picture of the specific doctrinal position of the Geneva Reformer—say, in distinction from that of Luther and the Roman Catholics—have not the least conception of Calvinism as an all-inclusive world and life view in which all subjects are related to God and His will. This latter conception of Calvinism as a God-centered philosophy of life, based throughout upon Scripture, is the conception which a modern follower of John Calvin as Abraham Kuyper has set forth and has given scholarly construction, historical grounding, and practical effective realization in modern life.

It is this conception of Calvinism that Dr. Meeter, who is Professor of Bible and Calvinism at the only American College named after Calvin, sets forth and gives practical application to the problems of modern life. It is this conception that inspired the founders of Calvin College. They built a collegiate institution not only to give future ministers the requisite preparatory training for theological study but they also held that every phase of human thought on the cosmos, on nature and on human society, must be viewed and constructed in the light of the will of the Triune God who revealed himself in Scripture.

I hope no one will conclude from this that this is a book only for scholars, or even for college students only. In fact, the book in the very form which it now has appeared serially in a young people's magazine, The Young Calvinist, and its material has been used with fine success by Calvinistic young men's groups who were interested to know what the will of God is in its application to the problems of modern life. This is a book for everybody who can read. It is written in untechnical language. There is nothing abstruse in it. It brings the theological and the political ideas of Calvinism home to everyone that is able to read. This is the great merit of the book, which ought to be placed in every church and private library and ought to be used as a manual for the study of the principles of the Word of God in their Calvinistic interpretation to the problems of our day.

There is no better way to show the wide range and the practical bearing of this book than to enumerate the chapter headings, each of which speaks for itself. Here they are. The Fundamental Principle of Calvinism; The Place of the Bible in the Calvinistic System; The Place of Faith in the Calvinistic System; Calvinism a Balanced System; The Main Points in the Theology of Calvinism; The Calvinistic View of Common Grace; Calvinism and Culture; Calvinism, Politics, and the Bible; The Origin and Function of the State; The Best Form of the State; The Form of Government; The Task of the Government; The Authority of the Government; Civil Liberty; The Sovereignty of the Social Spheres; The Relation of Church and State; Internationalism; Internationalism, the League of Nations, and Calvinism; International Law; Calvinism and War; The Bible and War; The Christian Citizen and War. This shows both the fundamental theological, God-centered grounding of the entire system and its vital and practical bearing upon the burning issues of our day. An index and a detailed table of contents greatly aid in making this manual serviceable for everyone. We understand this is the first volume, to be followed by a second on the social and economic ideas implicit in the Calvinistic system. However, this volume is quite complete in itself and deserves to be read and studied widely.

Of course, a manual of this type has its limitations. That is inevitable. The theological scholar who is looking for a critical and scholarly study of Calvinistic thought, historically and systematically, will be disappointed if he turns to this manual. But he should not blame the author, who clearly states his aim in the Preface. Dr. Meeter does not pretend to give an original contribution to critical scholarship on the subject under discussion. If this were intended as a critical theological treatise, one might express the wish that the theological reasoning had

• Europe Needs Some Willebrords

November, 1939, it was 1200 years ago that Willebrord, the great Anglo-Saxon missionary to the Frisians of the Lowlands, died in his Lord. The anniversary has been the cause for retelling many of the great, miraculous works of the Saint. Legend has it that he in various places of the lands that now are the Netherlands produced water from the ground. Tradition claims that Willebrord at one time had 12 poor men quench their thirst from a bottle of water. Though all 12 drank their fill, the water in the bottle did not diminish. The city of Flushing still pictures the bottle in its coat of arms. The pope gave Willebrord a chestful of relics, to be used as substitutes for Frisian sacred objects of veneration.

Little did he know that in a later age his own bones would serve the same purpose.

Just now it looks as though all of Europe and especially the Eastern part of it, needs a few Willebrords, to call back from paganism the God-denying and God-defying authoritarian people.

J. G. VAN DYKE.

Grand Haven, Mich.
been a little closer in such chapters as III and IV. Also the discussion of the relation of Science and Philosophy on pp. 81 and 82 is rather unsatisfactory. Perhaps Theology is not brought into that encyclopedic discussion because that is where the difficulties would begin to crop out. Now there seems to be no difficulty whereas in reality there is, especially for a thinker who embraces the Calvinistic system and gives the place to Scripture which he should and which Dr. Meeter very properly does. But this in no way detracts from the great value of this book.

Some readers of a more critical cast of mind might stumble over the frequency with which the expression "the Calvinist maintains," "the Calvinist holds," etc., appear in this book. But this is inevitable in a book which within so limited a compass is to be a manual presenting the Calvinistic solution of so many ethical problems pressing for an answer in our day. Behind the rather dogmatic expression "the Calvinist holds" usually lies a good deal of careful study and research. The author is especially well at home in the writings of the modern Calvinistic group in the Netherlands, that group which has accomplished more than any other group of Calvinists in the world to give both scholarly and practical construction and application of the principles of the Reformed Faith to the ethical issues and moral problems of our day.

This is a fine book for the rank and file of the intelligent church membership. It ought to have a wide sale and the second volume should be called for soon.

C. B.

ON PUBLIC WORSHIP


BOOKS that help us to worship God well, are welcome, indeed. For it is no small matter to worship intelligently, warmly and decorously. Worship is the acme of religious life: it is intrinsically the life of heaven; it moves on the plane of eternity. Christians being what they are, it is small wonder that their worship, whether private or public, is woefully weak. Their Christian work is very far from perfect; their worship doubtless is more imperfect still. God's people are earthily minded in a sad measure. Hence it is not strange that it is exceedingly difficult for them to lift their hearts up on high (Sersum corda) to God in heaven. They allow themselves to be caught in the toils of time, contrary to the genius of the eternal life planted in their breasts. In consequence, they seldom hear the bells of eternity ring.

The conduct of public worship engages Prof. Blackwood in the book announced above. It is not the least of the duties properly devolving upon the minister of the Gospel. It is a sorry fact, indeed, that Protestantism has not generally appreciated public worship at its proper value. Its estimate of this department of ecclesiastical work can be gauged by the relatively small measure of time allotted to the science of public worship (Liturgy) in the seminary curriculum. In a seminary with which the present reviewer happens to be closely acquainted, one, yea verily, one semester hour is devoted to the curricular principles and conduct of public worship, despite the fact, that the conduct of public worship is admittedly the chief business of the minister of the Gospel. Leadership in the sanctuary is certainly a matter of consequence and should receive a measure of attention commensurate with the immense importance of the corporate worship of the people of God.

Dr. Blackwood's book was designed to be helpful to the official in charge of public worship. The title of the book should, perhaps, not be taken too seriously. Possibly it was chosen for its catchiness. The author seems to have a fondness for it. His book on Homiletics is styled: The Fine Art of Preaching. Throughout the book now under review, the matter of the minister's decorum in the pulpit is in the foreground. That aspect of the conduct of public worship certainly needs attention in the average Protestant church. Those of us who are called upon to officiate at public worship should read Prof. Blackwood's book. The value of the volume is this, that it leaves one, as he rises from its attentive reading, with a positive dislike of crudeness and awkwardness and clumsiness in the conduct of public worship, and an equally positive resolution henceforth to wax ever more decorous in the prosecution of this sacred business. The author did not mean to deal with the theological fundamentals of public worship, as the title of his book indicates. But it is safe to say, that he does not discount the value of a deep and clear insight into the divine truth and ethic of public worship for the development of the refined feeling that is the prerequisite of the truly cultured conduct of the Sabbath worship of the congregation of the Lord. For it assuredly goes without saying, that pulpit proprieties must be deeply rooted in spiritualities, if they are to be a sweet savour of Christ unto God and fraught with ministerial joy and congregational edification.

The volume under discussion was written largely for ministers, prospective and effective. But a layman can well read it; it is non-technical in its approach and language. Incidentally the author states many things in which the congregation is no less interested on its own account, than with a view to their minister. The eldership, as charged with responsibility for the minister's proper conduct of public worship, should consult it, in order that they may exercise their supervisory function at public worship effectively.

Such laymen as read the present volume will undoubtedly begin to sense their need of a book that deals specifically with public worship as considered from the angle of the worshipper in the pew. The matter of his decorum will naturally be less prominent to such a lay reader, than the light that God whom we worship through faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, sheds upon holy worship, as regards its distinctive character and specific purpose, in the sacred Scriptures. Possibly Dr. Blackwood will one day write such a book. If he undertakes to do it, he will discover that this task is far and away more difficult than the writing of the book now before us. If he addresses himself to this labor of love, he will meet with a fine opportunity to show why the distinctive genius of Calvinism is peculiarly suited to the creation, by God's grace, of spiritually beautiful worship.

S. VOLBEDA.

A NON-EVOLUTIONISTIC ZOOLOGY TEXT

FUNDAMENTALS OF ZOOLOGY. By Wm. J. Tinkle, Ph.D., Zondervan Publishing House, 1939. 492 pp. $3.00.

THIS is a textbook which has evidently been prepared for a beginner's course in Zoology. The author devotes the first nine chapters to a general survey of the field. He then follows the traditional custom of treating the animal phyla one by one, devoting in most cases a chapter to each phylum. The Arthropoda and the Choradata are treated more extensively.

Chapters thirty and thirty-one are devoted to a critical consideration of the fossil records of animals and man and the supposed evidences for evolution. The thirty-second and final chapter deals with conservation.

This textbook is unique in that it does not approach the subject with an evolutionary bias. In this respect it differs from all other modern textbooks of Zoology. We congratulate the author, who is no doubt a Christian who believes in creation, upon his successful attempt to give an unbiased account of the facts. However, we deem that the Christian viewpoint should have been expressed more positively, even at the risk of being called unscientific. A Christian, if he is to give meaning to the facts of science, can no more be purely scientific in the sense of stating nothing but facts than an evolutionist when he states these facts in the light of his theory.

The book has an attractive appearance. It is generously supplied with well-chosen illustrations. The portraits of various men of science with short biographical sketches add to the value of the text.

The publishers are also to be congratulated upon what we believe is their first publication of a science textbook.

EDWIN Y. MONSEA.
PROFESSOR HONIG'S DOGMATICS


DR. HONIG was one of the earlier graduates of the Free University of Amsterdam. His thesis on Alexander Comrie was published in 1892. I well remember the pleasant days spent in studying it with pleasure in my student days. Through it I first became acquainted with Comrie en Holtius' Examen van het Ontwerp van Tolerantie. In 1903 he was appointed as Professor of Systematic Theology in the Theological School of Kampen, and he served in that capacity with honor until the time of his comparatively recent retirement. During this period several worthwhile studies appeared from his hand, and now he has crowned his work with the publication of his Dogmatics. He is recognized in the Netherlands, not only as a fine scholar, a man of learning, but also as a humble and pious Christian.

The present work is dedicated to the memory of four Reformed dogmaticians, by the study of whose works the author has greatly profited, namely, Charles Hodge, Henricus Eskehorn Gravenenjeer, Abraham Kuyper, and Herman Bavinck. With characteristic humility Dr. Honig explicitly disclaims the pretension that his work should be placed on a level with the great works of these illustrious men. Though it covers the whole ground of Dogmatics, it is of a different nature than the works of these great scholars to whom it is dedicated. The author has called it a "Handbook", and this is indicative of the fact that he intended it to be of the nature of what we would call a textbook. Repeated requests to publish such a work convinced the author that there was a demand for a work of that kind, and he seeks to satisfy that demand by the publication of this volume. It is not surprising that there was such a demand, for there was nothing of the kind on the market in the Netherlands. Bavinck's Magnalia Dei, it is true, has already been in circulation for more than two decades, but this could hardly be regarded as an adequate textbook for students. The work of Dr. Honig, however, will serve the purpose admirably. It covers the whole ground in a thorough manner, and is yet kept within proper bounds. The material is divided according to the usual scheme: Theology, Anthropology, Christology, Soteriology, Ecclesiology, and Eschatology. The chapters may be rather long, but the contents have been divided and sub-divided in a way that makes it comparatively easy to locate the material wanted. This is something which, I am sure, students will appreciate. The table of contents is correspondingly detailed. While this compensates in a measure for the absence of an index, yet the want of this must be regarded as a deficiency in a work of this kind. This want may not be so keenly felt while the book is being used as a textbook, but will prove to be a real handicap when it is used as a book of reference. And this is just what it becomes in course of time even for those who have used it in connection with their school work. In later editions of the work this want ought to be supplied. It is also regrettable that the work appeared in one, rather cumbersome, volume instead of in two more handy volumes.

The author acknowledges his dependence on the works of Kuyper and Bavinck, and says that he always continued to consider himself as their pupil. The influence of these two great dogmaticians is quite noticeable throughout the work now under consideration. And though the author himself studied at the Free University in the days when Kuyper had charge of the department of Dogmatics, he says that in his work he adhered particularly to the standard Reformed Dogmatics of Bavinck. But the fact that he is greatly indebted to these two men should not be taken to mean that he merely reproduced their ideas in a somewhat abbreviated form. He shows considerable independence of judgment and in some instances does not hesitate to differ with them. It is quite evident that the material which he derived from them passed through the alchemy of his own keen mind. Moreover, he by no means limited himself to the study of the masterful productions of these two paragons of Reformed theology. He frequently consulted the older literature on the subject and refers to it time and again. And anyone who has ever read anything of Dr. Honig knows that he is also well acquainted with more recent theological literature. One valuable feature of the work, especially for us in America, is that it reflects a thorough knowledge of the Dutch theological literature of the last half a century. It also takes careful notice of what appeared on the German market in more recent times. There is little evidence, however, of a thorough acquaintance with Scottish and American Reformed theology. Though Hodge, Vos, and Warfield are mentioned, other important names, such as those of Cunningham, Candlish, Crawford, Smeaton, Breckenridge, Thornwell, Darby, Girardeau, and others, are conspicuous by their absence. But the work of Dr. Honig has this in common with most of the theological literature that is published in the Netherlands.

We are very grateful for the Dogmatics of Dr. Honig. He has enriched us with a most excellent handbook of Reformed theology. A commendable feature of the work is that it often gives the doctrines their proper historical setting, and thus shows how they reached their present stage of development. This not only makes the study of those doctrines more interesting, but also puts one on guard against the errors that should be avoided. A second point which deserves special mention, is that the work is thoroughly Scriptural. It is abundantly evident that the author regards the Bible as the final court of appeal in his theology. In recent years many so-called dogmatical works have appeared which are more philosophical than theological. They seek to substantiate doctrinal truth, not by Scripture, but by human reason, human experience, or the moral consciousness. This work is not of that kind. The author indeed takes due notice of the rational proofs that have been and can be adduced, but clearly shows that for him the truth of a doctrine does not depend on such proofs, but on the teachings of Scripture. The Bible and not human reason, experience, or the moral consciousness, is regarded as the source and norm of theology. For that reason Scripture proof is made very prominent; and this is entirely as it should be in a work of this kind. It is of the utmost importance that our future preachers should be taught to see this. Another point to which I would call special attention, is that the author is not an extremist. He repeatedly gives evidence of a well-balanced judgment, and may therefore be regarded as a safe guide for students.

Dr. Honig has written in such a manner that it is a pleasure to read what he has produced. His reasoning is sound, and the manner in which he presents material is always continued to consider himself as their pupil. The influence of these two great dogmaticians is quite noticeable throughout the work now under consideration. And though the author himself studied at the Free University in the days when Kuyper had charge of the department of Dogmatics, he says that in his work he adhered particularly to the standard Reformed Dogmatics of Bavinck. But the fact that he is greatly indebted to these two men should not be taken to mean that he merely reproduced their ideas in a somewhat abbreviated form. He shows considerable independence of judgment and in some instances does not hesitate to differ with them. It is quite evident that the material which he derived from them passed through the alchemy of his own keen mind. Moreover, he by no means limited himself to the study of the masterful productions of these two paragons of Reformed theology. He frequently consulted the older literature on the subject and refers to it time and again. And anyone who has ever read anything of Dr. Honig knows that he is also well acquainted with more recent theological literature. One valuable feature of the work, especially for us in America, is that it reflects a thorough knowledge of the Dutch theological literature of the last half a century. It also takes careful notice of what appeared on the German market in more recent times. There is little evidence, however, of a thorough acquaintance with Scottish and American Reformed theology. Though Hodge, Vos, and Warfield are mentioned, other important names, such as those of Cunningham, Candlish, Crawford, Smeaton, Breckenridge, Thornwell, Darby, Girardeau, and others, are conspicuous by their absence. But the work of Dr. Honig has this in common with most of the theological literature that is published in the Netherlands.

We are very grateful for the Dogmatics of Dr. Honig. He has enriched us with a most excellent handbook of Reformed theology. A commendable feature of the work is that it often gives the doctrines their proper historical setting, and thus shows how they reached their present stage of development. This not only makes the study of those doctrines more interesting, but also puts one on guard against the errors that should be avoided. A second point which deserves special mention, is that the work is thoroughly Scriptural. It is abundantly evident that the author regards the Bible as the final court of appeal in his theology. In recent years many so-called dogmatical works have appeared which are more philosophical than theological. They seek to substantiate doctrinal truth, not by Scripture, but by human reason, human experience, or the moral consciousness. This work is not of that kind. The author indeed takes due notice of the rational proofs that have been and can be adduced, but clearly shows that for him the truth of a doctrine does not depend on such proofs, but on the teachings of Scripture. The Bible and not human reason, experience, or the moral consciousness, is regarded as the source and norm of theology. For that reason Scripture proof is made very prominent; and this is entirely as it should be in a work of this kind. It is of the utmost importance that our future preachers should be taught to see this. Another point to which I would call special attention, is that the author is not an extremist. He repeatedly gives evidence of a well-balanced judgment, and may therefore be regarded as a safe guide for students.

Dr. Honig has written in such a manner that it is a pleasure to read what he has produced. His reasoning is sound, and the manner in which he presents material is always clear. This, again, is as it ought to be in a handbook for students. The clarity of the work gives evidence of the fact that he has digested his material well, for if he had not, he would not have been able to write with such clearness. It will not be difficult for any of those for whom the work is intended to follow the author's line of thought. Even ordinary intelligent church members can read and study the work with great profit, though they may have to forget about the German and Latin quotations. The argumentation is sound and logical, and on the whole quite convincing. This does not mean that there are no points on which one might be inclined to differ with the author. It would be a rare book indeed, if this were not the case.

The author's diction and style are, as far as we can judge, beyond reproach. His language is entirely free from the peculiar word-formations and strange constructions which sometimes make the Dutch rather unintelligible for us. We in America appreciate this very much. We hope that many of our students and ministers will purchase and study this valuable recent addition to our Reformed theological literature. They will greatly profit by it. Both the author and the publisher are to be congratulated on the production of a work so fine and of such outstanding value.

L. BERKHOF.