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Will Democracies Survive?

This question has received serious consideration from many earnest students of international affairs. Many Christian leaders look for the destruction of democracy either with longing anticipation or with great apprehension. The arguments that have been adduced against the retention of democracies usually follow three lines of thought.

The first is that a democracy is itself a violation of nature's inexorable laws. It is argued that such a form of government is based not upon natural laws, but upon moral laws. It demands, it is said, a society of intelligent beings with high moral ideals. Such a government is not known among the animals where the strongest and wisest become the leaders of the flock. Neither has such a government found favor in the industrial world. Here is where efficiency, realism, and man's natural needs have the controlling votes. It is an argument that flows forth from the conception of the dehumanizing of men, which is very apparent in these days of ruthless warfare. But may it not be true that it is just in times of great crises that ideals are submerged and that the animalization of men takes place? Isn't it true that when sin grips men, it tends to make them look downward and not upward? And sin has a way of asserting itself in the various manifestations of hatred that are so flagrant in a world when torn by war? When and if peace comes again, will not the spirit of man insist upon its rightful sphere above the beasts of the field? Christianity will not die. The gates of hell cannot prevail against it. And if Christianity prevails there is continued hope for democratic forms of government. Hitler knows that. He, therefore, is not and cannot be favorably disposed to the precepts of Christ.

A second line of thought is that democracies are doomed “because the technological development of the world has created an age in which natural law has taken precedence over moral law.” This line of argument has been very strikingly put by De Witt S. Snell in America Pays for Its Isolation. Here is his way of putting it: “But with the intensive technological development of the past few decades the animal side of life has become of supreme importance; moral and cultural values have become of diminishing significance, and the world has become little else than a vast jungle in which a spirit of ruthless competition between men and nations has replaced the relatively tolerant and cooperative spirit of a past generation. Technology has created a new type of leadership, a cold and calculating one, to which nothing is real but that which can be analyzed in a test tube or weighed in a balance. Character and conscience have little place in our present age, for these are intangibles, and in their place we have I.Q.'s and knowledge tests. Technology has created tasks in which the great majority of mankind have become a little better than cattle, each engaged in a task requiring the minimum of thought and effort.” It is the question whether machines will run men, or men will run machines—whether the man in the office can run the men on the job. The persistency of strikes is a clear indication that the spirit of man is not yet ready to lose its right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. One must lose confidence in man to lose confidence in at least some form of democracy.

The third class of arguments follows from an unbounded confidence in Hitler as superb leader of the new order, as a man who has the qualifications of a master over the new technological order. He is regarded as a sort of superman. But we have had supermen before. History has a way of dealing with them catastrophically. Even this day the life of Hitler seems uncertain, and no one is more aware of it than he himself.

Democracies may be “sick abed,” but they are not yet dead. They will survive just because men will arise from the valley of animalism to the heights where men are men. Will this be possible without the leaven of Christianity?

H. S.

Regulation vs. Regimentation

That democracy is not the most efficient form of government, though it may be the most desirable, is admitted by many lovers of our country and its system of control. There is, of course, a tendency to strengthen the hand of the president in times of emergency, and he is granted an authority almost as totalitarian as that of Hitler. This is granted to him. He doesn’t take it. But either way it is a telling testimony to the efficiency of placing the supreme power in the executive head. This is precisely the method employed in our efficient industrial endeavors, and it is a democratic rebellion against it that in no small measure accounts for our labor disputes.

America will not tolerate, either on the part of its government or on the part of the heads of great industrial concerns, the full regimentation of totalitarianism which denotes complete coercion except
for a short time and in cases of great national crisis, neither will America long tolerate the unabridged freedom of _laissez faire_ which implies no restraint, for that would make all industrial cooperation and development practically impossible. Somewhere between full regimentation and unabridged individual freedom must we find our form of government in these critical times. The democratic form of control calls for a full recognition of men as image bearers of God with a sense of personal responsibility. God would not permit Satan to deal with the primal pair nor with Job except on the condition that the image bearer of God be fully honored. In order to win, Satan must get his victims to will what he wills. God honors man’s personal responsibility. He insists that the devil does. He insists that we all recognize it in one another. Therefore men have felt throughout the ages that certain forms of slavery are utterly incompatible with the spirit of the Scriptures. And so is full regimentation. Let’s not regimentate. That is the evil against which we are aligned. Let’s regulate. That still recognizes men as men.

**H. S.**

**Neutrality vs. “Nonbelligerency”**

The status of the various nations in the present world conflict is difficult to define. Students of international law are trying to explain, and some of them to justify, a relationship other than belligerent and neutral. There are so many peoples that cannot be classified as in or as out of the war. Eagleton in the defense of a third position argues that no state is under obligation to be impartial. Wright advances the theory of a “supporting state.” Corbett writes about a “helpful” neutrality. Others prate about a “benevolent” or “malevolent” neutrality. And so the theories multiply trying to justify America’s present status among the nations.

It is obvious that a nation admits “nonbelligerency” only for the peoples friendly to it. Great Britain has no objection to the “nonbelligerency” of the U. S. A., but the Axis has. Germany likes the “nonbelligerent” Hungary and Rumania who gave her all aid short of war, but she resents the “nonbelligerency” of Turkey. Germany liked the “nonbelligerency” of Italy toward many nations, but she asked the strictest neutrality of Sweden, Yugoslavia, and Switzerland.

There must be something distasteful to the honest party in this drive toward a position other than that of belligerency and of neutrality. It is “born out of the desire to intervene under the name of non-intervention, to be in the war and yet not to be at war, and to justify breaches of neutrality or acts of war, perhaps with the hope that they will not result in a state of war.” And the only reason why a disfavored belligerent does not resort to reprisal or to a declaration of war is because it is believed that from a military point of view it is not expedient to do so.

There is no room for such neutrality (?) in the Christian consciousness. Our neutrality must be strict or it is not neutrality. Our aim must be whole-hearted, honest, and unselfish, or it is but a hypocritical gesture.

**H. S.**

**Students Want Stability**

From the various student publications of the colleges and universities of America there is being poured forth a flood of protest against the type of education to which the students are being subjected. A student of the University of Iowa declares: “We have grown tired to death of smatterings of knowledge dispensed by professors and instructors hired to teach that smattering and nothing more. We want to get our teeth into something vibrant and alive, something permanent, something which ties the present to the _truths_ of the glorious past.” A Wellesley student joins the chorus with this declaration: “All too many young people lack that certain inner richness which comes from the pursuit of knowledge for its own sake and brings poise and the perspective necessary for keeping calm in present crises . . . . Students read the newspapers and shudder. They read books by journalists, which attempt to perpetuate what the newspapers say, and are about as lasting. If they read Milton, for instance, or Plato, how much better off they would be, how much more stable and whole would be their view of life.” A representative of Yale waxes eloquent in his condemnation. Says he: “The elective system with its ill-concocted _mélange_ of sociology, psychology, economics and allied educational effluvia, has run wild, to the utter neglect of classical tradition and religious heritage which are the twin pillars of our society.” Even the girls of Smith College urge a change from the smatterings of knowledge to some of the more stable aspects of liberal arts. They are certain that “In making intelligent thinking a consciously acquired habit, a liberal arts course can contribute most constructively to life after college . . . . With this change in attitude, the women’s colleges might come at last to intellectual integrity.” In Princeton the boys are upset. The _Daily Princetonian_ complains that “in twelve months’ time the youth has been asked to junk all its old principles and accept an entirely new set. . . . The residuum of fifteen years of study has left it [the youth] extremely suspicious of European politics and ‘just causes.’ It was the older generation that taught youth its scepticism; now it is the older generation that asks youth to discard that for a new philosophy—and quickly too. . . But you just can’t flush fifteen years of study out of their brains in a moment.” And so runs the refrain, from coast to coast and from north to south. There is a consciousness that there is no solidity, no perma-
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nency, no worth-whileness in the education received. Education had as its objective to help the youth to earn a dollar after a while, but not how to live and to think. The results of our endeavors in the educational institutions failed to give the boys and girls such training as will enable them to ride wisely through the crises which have an irresistible way of recurring. There must be given to our students something basic, something integrating, something that can be used as a criterion, something that will help them to see little things in the light of the whole. Only a genuine Christian education will suffice. May that be one of the lessons that the present war teaches!

H. S.

What Shall We Preach?

Louis Berkhof
Professor of Dogmatics
Calvin Seminary

It is a sad fact, characteristic of our day, that large numbers of young men are leaving the Seminaries of our country without knowing what to preach, and that many ministers, who enter their pulpits on every Lord’s Day, are constantly vexed by the perplexing question, What shall we preach?

There really need be no uncertainty on that point. The King of the Church did not leave us in doubt as to the message that should be brought to a sinful world. He never surrendered the future of His Church and Kingdom to the uncertain inventions of man. He gave His disciples a very definite commission: “Go ye therefore, and make disciples of all the nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit: teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I commanded you.” It was a message given by the Lord who had received all authority in heaven and on earth, a message clothed with divine authority and intended for all the world. It aimed at winning souls for Christ and at teaching them a life of obedience to their heavenly Lord. It was the gospel of Jesus Christ, the good tidings of salvation for a lost world, a message of transforming power and of eternal and other-worldly significance, but also a message that is of the utmost importance for the present life in all its ramifications: in the home, in the school, in the Church, in social and civic life. It includes a call for service on the part of regenerate men and women, a call for the application of Christian principles in every domain of life.

The apostles were not in doubt as to what they should preach; nor were the great leaders of the Protestant Churches in the days of the Reformation. They felt duty bound to bring the message of the King, and dared not substitute a message of their own. Would that this general statement could also be made respecting the preachers of our day; but a large percentage of them are altogether in a quan- dary. What happened to bring about such a tremendous change, and to create the present confusion?

How It All Began

It all began with the loss of the original message, and came to a climax when the substitute that had been chosen proved ineffective. The really serious thing was that many Churches gradually lost the authoritative message of Christ. The chill winds of Rationalism swept over the land during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, and engendered an agnostic attitude with respect to God, Christ, and the Bible. Historical criticism gradually reduced the Bible to a purely human product, shorn of divine authority. What was once regarded as the infallible Word of God became, in the estimation of many, a mere fallible record of human experiences, a record containing all kinds of mythical and legendary elements, and devoid of all normative significance for future generations. There was a persistent quest for the historical Jesus, in which the Christ of the Christian confession was completely lost or retained only as an abstract idea. The Lord of the Church was divested of His supernatural character and brought down to the level of a human teacher: a wonderful man, it is true, a man of prophetic vision, a beneficent social reformer, the author of an exalted code of ethics; but not at all the very Son of God, not a King who has the right to command and to exact obedience of His followers, and who can send out His servants with an authoritative message of redemption. The King was dethroned, and robbed of the authority which He claimed when He sent out His disciples. Natural science, with its proclamation of the absolute reign of law, ruled out all the supernatural, including physical and spiritual miracles, special providences, and objective answers to prayer. Rousseau’s doctrine of the inherent goodness of man, now recognized even by some Modernists as one of the most pernicious teachings of the Enlightenment, made people feel smugly complacent and self-satisfied. They gradually lost the consciousness of sin and felt no need of redemption or of supernatural renewal. The idea of salvation by the atoning sacrifice of Jesus Christ was ridiculed and laughed out of court. The philosophy of evolu-
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tion, with its notion of continuous progress by natural forces, gave birth to the idea of the natural perfectionability of the human race. And the New Psychology offered a natural explanation of all that was once regarded as supernatural in the renewal of man.

The new knowledge was soon widely disseminated. It found its way into the Colleges and the Universities, and even into the Seminaries of our country, so that in course of time these became hotbeds of theological liberalism. It trickled down to the common people through an education divorced from religion, and through the agency of magazines and popular literature. Naturally, this onslaught on the historic faith of the Churches also met with opposition. There were always those who felt the importance of retaining their stand on the Word of God. They threw up their battlements, sought out weapons from their well-stocked arsenals, and engaged in a warfare that was largely defensive. In the ensuing battles they were at a distinct disadvantage. They had to fly into the face of a popular science and philosophy. They foolishly allowed the enemy to determine the line of battle, were always on the defensive, and therefore found themselves constantly retreating, from the first line of defense to the second, from the second to the third, and so on. And whatever offensive there was turned out to be weak, because it was largely of a pietistic nature. It concerned itself too exclusively with the best way of escape from this present evil world, and failed to offer a program for Christian living and Christian activity here and now. Many of those who meant well were regrettably oblivious of the fact that through the operation of the Holy Spirit in the hearts and lives of sinners the glorious resurrection life is already projected into the present, and must seek to assert itself in every walk of life. Religion came to be regarded as a matter of pure feeling, good for women but really unworthy of men, something that bore little or no relation to active life. Naturally, they who had lost the sense of the reality of the unseen, of things spiritual and eternal, and regarded only the material world as real, soon lost all interest in a religion that had no bearing whatsoever on the only life which they recognized. Chaos soon prevailed in the Churches.

The preachers who broke with the orthodoxy of the past, who denied the reality of sin and the necessity of redemption, and were entirely agnostic as to the future, finally found that they had no message which justified their continued preaching. They had ceased to be messengers, for they did not recognize the Lord and therefore could not speak of a message which they were commissioned to bring to the people. The old message had become utterly meaningless. It had become anomalous to speak of sin and grace; and it seemed heartless to cheer the hearts of the people with a check on some heavenly bank that did not exist. The sentiment began to crystallize that the Church might well go out of business. J. R. Campbell even suggested at one time that it might be well to burn all the Seminaries.

Enter, the Social Gospel

But at this juncture the preachers made a discovery which saved the day. According to Gaius Glenn Atkins they discovered the social gospel, a gospel that concerns itself with this world rather than with the world to come, and was therefore more in touch with the reality that was still recognized. It was a gospel that found its objective in the establishment of the Kingdom of God on earth, and in salvation here and now; a gospel that calls for the application of the ethics of Jesus, in so far as they commend themselves to the Christian consciousness, to every domain of life; a gospel according to which man has the exalted calling to work out his own salvation, and to change the wicked world into a kingdom of God; a gospel in which the supernatural might still be recognized pro forma, but which was in reality a gospel of pure naturalism. Literary, sociological, and psychological discussions soon took the place of the gospel of Jesus Christ. In an ever-increasing number of churches men soon heard only a gospel of human invention, a man-centered gospel, a gospel that is autosoteric, and a gospel that finds its chief aim in man.

This gospel had peculiar attractions for a great many prospective preachers, who had come under the dominating influence of present day science and philosophy, who found the only justification for preaching in the welfare of humanity, or who desired above all popularity with the masses. It is a gospel which liberates man from the authority of the Bible, gives due prominence to the goodness and greatness of man, makes him the captain of his own soul and the master of his own fate, and delivers him from the haunting fear of eternal punishment. It represents a religion that is entirely worthy of man, a religion of which he need not be ashamed because it is in touch with the reality of life. Moreover, it has the peculiar advantage of resembling at least part of the original message, the part that pertains to Christian living in this present world. The great commission also contains the words, “teaching them to observe whatsoever I have commanded you.” The ethical teachings of Jesus certainly form part of the gospel of Jesus Christ in the comprehensive sense of the word. At the same time it is a gospel that is completely emasculated. It calls for so-called Christian living, but denies the work of regeneration and of spiritual renewal which alone makes such living possible. It confronts sinners which stand in no living relationship to Jesus Christ with the ethics of Jesus, as if they could in any real sense keep the commandments of the Lord. By doing this it ignores the fact that Jesus intended these teachings for His followers, who were endowed by the Holy Spirit with the principle of a new obedience, and who were in principle enabled to follow the example of their Lord, though only at a great distance and with many imperfections. It
is a Kantian gospel of activism, in which the acceptance of a message becomes a matter of minor importance. Moreover, it is a gospel that reverses the divine order of redemption. It seeks to establish the Kingdom of God in the hope that this will result in changing individuals. It begins at the periphery of life, relies on external means, such as, civilization, good laws, education, and social reforms, and expects that these will in some way effect a radical change in the inner life.

That gospel was at once a gospel after the heart of the Unitarians, but gradually also found acceptance in many of the other Churches. Insistent cries were heard on every hand for a reconstruction of theology in harmony with the principles of the new message, which was no more the message of the King, but a message of man’s own invention, subject to all the interpretations which philosophy could put upon it. It differed radically from the original message. Washington Gladden made the transition from the one to the other, and then discovered that he could not use his old sermons any more. He had, to use his own words “barrels full of them,” but burnt them all. Great was the idealism with which the social gospelers began their tremendous task of establishing the Kingdom of God on earth. They were advancing nicely, the world was getting better, and the millennium was almost in sight, when—all at once—the great European conflagration started and the powers of hell were let loose in such a merciless, inhuman, and destructive war as had no equal in history. Yes, it became evident that man had made headway; but the new discoveries and inventions were made subservient to the wholesale slaughter of men. What a parody on the highly lauded universal brotherhood of man: The Kingdom of God, forsooth!

**The Great Disillusionment**

The social gospel failed miserably. Its advocates tried to make the best of a desperate situation by representing the world conflagration as the war to end all war. But the treaty of Versailles promptly blasted even those hopes. J. R. Campbell, once the great apostle of the new theology, turned his back upon Modernism and entered the Roman Catholic Church. Benjamin Fay Mills, first an ardent evangelist, and then an equally zealous Universalist preacher, returned to the orthodox fold. Others were so utterly disillusioned that they hastened their departure from this present world. This does not mean, however, that the social gospel was silenced at once. For several years the preachers continued to proclaim it, since it was the only gospel that was in harmony with their philosophy of life. But at the same time it soon became apparent that this gospel would not have such smooth sailing in the future as it had in the past. Contrary winds made the further journey hazardous and even pointed to the possibility of a complete shipwreck. And the developments of recent years leave little doubt as to the fact that Modernism in its current form has had its day and is now rapidly disintegrating. Walter M. Horton wrote in 1934: “No one who has kept in touch with the recent trend of religious thought and discussion can fail to be aware that something calamitous has been happening to the type of theology known as ‘liberalism.’” (Realistic Theology, p. 1)

Various factors co-operated to expose the insufficiency and the inconsistency of the social gospel. Liberal theology suffered all along from an inherent weakness, largely due to the fact that it had no fundamental theological principles of its own, but was ingrafted into the popular philosophy of the day, and merely represented an adaptation to natural science and historical criticism, to modern sociology and the new psychology. It was loosely constructed of elements of very unequal value, and never succeeded in becoming a well-integrated, closely-knit, and logical system. For many years it has already shown signs of disintegration. Leading Modernists themselves complained repeatedly of their utter inability to do constructive work. The structure was unable to withstand the storm and stress of post-war years.

Moreover, Fundamentalists made a united effort to tear the mask from the face of Modernism. They pointed out that it was falsely parading in the garb of the Christian religion; and that, while it continued to use the old familiar terms which were expressive of spiritual realities, it injected into them new meanings, entirely at variance with their Biblical connotation. But because Fundamentalism had its own inherent weaknesses, which could easily be played up and made the butt of criticism and ridicule, the Modernists did not worry over much about its attacks. This changed somewhat, however, when a man of the calibre of Dr. Machen took up the cudgels and pointed out the divergencies between the social gospel and the gospel of the New Testament. Walter Lippmann did not hesitate to say that in the controversy Dr. Machen had the best of the argument; and that the Modernists had yet to answer him.

**Humanist and Barthian Opposition**

Matters became far worse for them, however, when the Humanists entered the fray and also accused the Modernists of insincerity, dishonesty, and inconsistency. This was more serious, because the Humanists were so closely akin to the Modernists. They shared their conviction that the scientific method must be applied in theology, and now adroitly turned that method against the Modernists themselves, and clearly pointed out that its consistent application led to a position far beyond that of the Modernists, a position that virtually meant the negation of religion. They accused the Modernists of the impossible attempt to straddle two horses, which were pulling in opposite directions, and of dishonesty in their persistent flying of the
Christian flag. And when they charged the Modernists with inconsistency and want of intellectual honesty, they certainly struck a very vulnerable point. The fundamental principles of Modernism are not Christian but pagan, and its denial of the supernatural spells death for the Christian religion. And therefore it is neither morally nor intellectually justified in posing as but another form of that religion. It is exactly its duplicity that made it the dangerous hybrid which it proved to be. Dr. Kerr is entirely correct when he says: "Christianity is something new, or it is nothing. It is something supernatural or it is nothing. It is something that is wholly of God or it is nothing." (A God-Centered Faith, p. 26.)

And in addition to the three factors now mentioned the onslaughts of the Theology of Crisis should be taken into consideration, since it launched a powerful attack on some of the outstanding positions of Modernism. It absolutely rejected the idea of continuity and reinstated the distance between God and man. It repudiated the popular doctrine of divine immanence, and placed tremendous emphasis on the transcendence of God. It stressed the impossibility of man's discovering God and the necessity of the divine self-revelation. Man does not seek and discover God, but God seeks and discloses Himself to man. Man is not the potentially divine being which the Modernists see in him, not a person who can fellowship with God on terms of the greatest familiarity; but a sinner in open revolt against God, separated from his Maker by an infinite gulf, which he cannot bridge, and by nature not only unfit for communion with God, but also devoid of longing for it. His only hope lies in the good pleasure of God to bridge the gap and to come unto him and speak to him in His revelation. This theology of crisis, so diametrically opposed to the teachings of Modernism, did not fail to exercise a profound influence on many confused Modernists, whose faith was already shaken by recent developments. To be convinced of this one needs but to read the recent works of such men as Reinhold and Richard Niebuhr, Walter Lowrie, Wilhelm Pauck, Edwin Lewis, and several others, and the series of articles in the Christian Century on "How My Mind Has Changed During This Decade."

Attempted Solutions

And all this led to disastrous results for many a modernist preacher. The social gospel, based on a false idealism, proved to be entirely unworkable, and this left the disillusioned preacher without a gospel. His mind has changed during the last decade, but he is not certain as to the direction in which he must now move. The discordant voices that are at present heard in the camp of Modernism testify to the confusion that prevails. The best way, one might say, would be to return to the original message, but if there is any one thing on which the modernists seem to be agreed, it is that they cannot possibly do that. They cannot go back to the Bible as the authoritative Word of God, nor to a message that has its warrant only in the voice of authority. It is true, they say, that our message failed, but Modernism is more than a message; it is first of all and most of all a method and that method must be retained. Then Modernism will not have been in vain. This means, of course, that they want to discover for themselves a new message, and still refuse to be simply messengers of God.

Now the situation would not be so embarrassing, if they were all of one mind as to the direction in which they should move, and as to the message which they ought to bring; but they are not. Fosdick spurns the idea of a retreat, and calls for a movement "beyond Modernism." But this is rather indefinite, for the question remains, Beyond Modernism, in what direction? One might pass beyond Modernism into Humanism, but this is evidently not intended. He really desires an improved Modernism. It has been too intellectual in the past, and should place greater emphasis on the ethical life in challenging the present order of things. It should drop its sentimental belief in the goodness of man and take sin more seriously. Moreover, it should stress far more than it has done the reality of God, and should stop adjusting itself to every phase of human culture, sociology, psychology, and so on, and teach man to take position over against the wicked world.

Niebuhr, Horton and Morrison

Reinhold Niebuhr and Walter M. Horton call for a more realistic theology. The latter says that there must be "a resolute determination to face all the facts of life candidly, beginning preferably with the most stubborn, perplexing, and disheartening ones," and then through these stubborn facts "to pierce as deep as one may into the solid structure of objective reality, until one finds whatever ground of courage, hope, and faith is actually there, independent of human preferences and desires, and so cast anchor in that ground." (Realistic Theology, p. 38.) This, he feels, will deepen the consciousness of sin and of the need of divine grace. It will call for an individual as well as a social gospel, and for preaching more profound than that of the Modernists. The God that is preached must be a God that meets human needs, and the Christ that is proclaimed, a Christ who in some way has saving significance for the sinner. Like Niebuhr he would leaven his social preaching with some of the principles of Karl Marx; a strange concoction indeed!

Other Modernists are becoming sceptical about the leadership and domination of science in theological matters. Some other way of discovering a message must be found. They feel that science dealt too much in bare facts, and did not take sufficient account of moral values. In a recent number of the Christian Century the editor, Charles Clayton Morrison, says that science "has already led three gene-
rations away from Christianity, aided and abetted by liberalism in the Church.” (Jan. 17, 1940.) Hence it is felt by some that science must enlarge its method, or that a new method of obtaining knowledge must be discovered. Some feel that the way of intuitionism and mysticism may lead into the Holy Land. Otto has taught them rather convincingly that there is more in religion than the purely rational, that which can be understood and formulated by human reason. In fact, the irrational, the numinous, of which we become conscious in the depths of our feelings, forms the most important element in it and brings us closest to the heart of spiritual reality. John Baillie also in his recent work on Our Knowledge of God stresses the need of more immediate knowledge of God.

Finally, to mention no more, there are also Modernists who, under the influence of the Theology of Crisis, deem it essential to get back to the idea of revelation in some sense of the word. The editor of the Christian Century, known as an outspoken Modernist, made a remarkable statement in one of its recent numbers. Says he: “Liberalism looked at Christianity through the eyes of science. ‘Through nature to God’ was one of its watchwords. ‘Through man to God’ was another. Its doctrine of nature was that of an evolutionary process culminating in man. Its doctrine of man was stated in terms of the physical and biological process which, according to scientific discoveries, had produced him. Its God therefore became a cognitive inference, a deduction from the facts observed by scientific investigation. This is not Christianity. Christianity does not look at the world and man through the eyes of science; it looks at science, at the world and at man through the medium of its own revelation. Its God is not a goal to be arrived at by cognitive inference—at best such a God is only an idea of God. Its God is the given reality from which all Christian thinking sets out. And it sets out with a God who has revealed Himself. ‘Through God to nature,’ ‘through God to man’—these are Christianity’s true watchwords. Nature does not define revelation; revelation defines nature. Man does not define revelation; revelation defines man. And science does not define either man or nature; revelation transcends science, and puts science in its place—an honorable place, but not on the throne.” Christian Century, Jan. 17, 1940. Yes, some Modernists feel that they ought to get back to revelation, but this does not mean that they are inclined to return to the Bible as the infallible Word of God. That is a Rubicon which they will not cross. And, sad to say, they derive comfort from Barth and Brunner on this point.

The Way Back

And so the Modernists are today in a quandary. They have lost their message, and are becoming increasingly conscious of the fact that the Church of our day has no message of its own, and is therefore quite useless and ineffective. They are groping about for light, and are trying to discover some useful message, but refuse to sit at the feet of the Lord of the Church and to learn of Him what they should preach. They still feel that it must be a this-worldly rather than an other-worldly gospel, just another system for the regulation of the life of the world. They still prefer the wisdom of the world to the foolishness of the cross. And if they succeed in discovering some message to take the place of the original message, it will only be one which, like that of the false prophets, is a word out of their own heart. They will continue to preach, with great diffidence and hesitation, their own fallible opinions, and will not be able to address the Church with an authoritative, “Thus saith the Lord.”

What an immense advantage they have, who recognize Jesus Christ as the Lord of the Church, and therefore as the only one who has the right to determine the message of His servants. They need not start with an anxious quest for a message, since they are willing and glad to be merely messengers of the King, and are satisfied to know that the King has determined once for all the nature of the good tidings that must be conveyed to sinful men. And if they are ever in doubt about it, they have but to turn to the written record, which is always at their disposal. They can refresh their mind on that point as often as they wish, for the message is essentially the same for all generations of men. Not only is there no need of changing it at every turn of the road, but there is absolutely no warrant for such a change. Every essential change brought on in the message impinges on the rights and prerogatives of the King, and is a manifestation of disloyalty. Naturally, this does not mean that the form of the message may not change. Formal adaptation will always be in place, and a change of emphasis will frequently be required; but the heart of the gospel and its fundamental implications will be forever the same. May the day speedily come when preachers everywhere return once more to the message of the King, and substitute for their hesitant “I opine” or “I imagine” the authoritative “Thus saith the Lord.” Then the pulpit will again become a real power in the land.
The Enemies of Patriotism

Arnold Brink
Muskegon, Mich.

We are shocked almost daily by the information we receive about the atrocities being committed in Europe in the name of justice, a "New Order of Life," and under the professed blessing of God. The most dangerous myth with which we can delude ourselves is the one that finds expression in the words of Sinclair Lewis, the professed blessing of God. The most dangerous belongs in the universe of discourse of a Christian minister. The threat lies in the deeper springs of spiritual attitudes that, if left to go to their logical limit, will end in a repetition of the European debacle. The flower and fruit are in Europe, but they have grown from a seed that is here too. The fever is raging there, but the germ is just as truly here.

Let us by all means, "here highly resolve" that "It shan't happen here," but let us not close our eyes with a sweet-sounding catch-phrase, "It can't happen here." It very well can, and will, unless certain things definitely change. If it is not to happen here, we must experience a patriotic rebirth, and that involves recognition of the Enemies of Patriotism.

I.

The first enemy is false Nationalism.

It was Robert Louis Stevenson that said, "Man does not live by bread alone, but feeds on catch-phrases." One of those catch-phrases is the one that says with categorical certainty, "The only antidote for dictatorial tyranny is Democracy." The myth that is involved in that phrase is the assumption that Democracy always spells freedom, and that Dictatorship perforce spells tyranny. As a matter of fact, we are beginning to see the lines blur. Greece, a dictatorship, is fighting on the side of democracies, and previous democracies have lent their support to the Axis. Dictators do not need to mean tyranny, and democracy is not always free from tyranny. Tyranny exists where you find it, it may be anywhere. It rests on deeper foundations than forms of political organization. Solomon knew that: "Righteousness exalteth a nation, sin is a reproach to any people." The struggle is not between dictatorship and democracy, but between righteousness and sin. When the war in Europe or anywhere ceases to be such a struggle, it has forfeited its right to be carried on. The antidote for tyranny is not democracy alone, or first, but ever and always, a return to the law of God.

In thinking of nationalism and kindred subjects, we instinctively think of our own great national leaders, and two of them inevitably come to mind. A vast deal of biographical ink has flowed to prove or discount the Christian convictions of our great leaders. Whatever their private convictions, their public policy was far more often motivated by practical Christianity than our generation is likely to see.

In his first inaugural, George Washington said:

"Of all the dispositions and habits that lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supports. Where is the security for property, for reputation, for life, if the sense of religious obligation desert the oaths which are the instruments of investigation in courts of justice? Whatever may be conceded to the influence of refined education . . . reason and experience both forbid us to expect that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principles."

An age that holds justice and common honesty so cheaply that serious consideration is given to abolishing the oath in court—and that, paradoxically, assumes that salvation and indefinite progress is to be found in the way of universal, militantly pragmatic education, may well take notice!

Abraham Lincoln, in his second inaugural, spoke these familiar words:

"With malice toward none, with charity for all, with firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right, let us finish the work we are in . . . to do all which may achieve a just and lasting peace among ourselves and with all nations."

There can be no question of the patriotism of Lincoln and Washington. Neither can we doubt but that they were not nationalists. They were individualists, and so they conceived of a nation as a group of individuals, working together. The nation consists of individuals and exists for individuals and never vice versa. When we exalt the nation, any nation, above the individuals in it, that is nationalism. And nationalism is to true, democratic patriotism, what cancer is to sound flesh.

Jesus never said, "Love thy nation," although His own bitter tears over apostate Israel prove that He did love His nation. But He said, and Moses before Him, "Love God and thy neighbor," and that underlies the righteousness that exalteth a nation and thus conditions true patriotism in every age. Without it, democracies as well as dictatorships are doomed. When the slogan of our patriotism be-
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comes, “My country, right or wrong,” righteousness goes up the chimney in smoke, patriotism has flown out of the window, and the mailed fist of tyranny is heard rapping at the door.

But true righteous patriotism means national individualism as well. National individualism recognizes that the world is a group of individual nations working together. George Washington warned against unjust entanglements in foreign intrigues. But he also viewed it as a national duty to cooperate with European nations in the furtherance of common goals. One wonders if our refusal to join the League of Nations has anything to do with our consistent policy of selling war supplies to rapidly rearming nations for twenty years, following World War No. 1!

II.

The second enemy to patriotism, one that definitely gave every tyrant in human history his opportunity, is the practical philosophy of pragmatism. Not the theoretical philosophy of the schools, but the practical attitudes of the street-corner are here our concern.

The oldest and best “democracy” in the world, the theocracy of Israel, gave way to the tyranny of Saul, because they desired the pragmatic end of having “one to go before us in battle.”

The union of democratic city-states of Greece, for pragmatic ends, surrendered to Philip of Macedon.

The Roman Republic became the Imperial City because Julius offered her immediate practical returns.

The French Republic twice yielded to Napoleons, because they thought they were getting value for their investment.

Stalin dictates in Russia because he offered the peasants bread, Hitler in Germany because he offered “Lebensraum.” Too many national attitudes in America are being built on the slogan, “He gave us jobs.”

Like a child, this tired world has been playing the same game over and over, and laughs with greater glee with each repetition. Everybody knows that tired laughter must end in weeping.

The irony of it is, that pragmatism is never pragmatic. Has it ever fulfilled its boast of establishing a better world by means of its “New Order”? Look to the shadowed eyes and hollow cheeks of Russian peasantry for your answer. Ask the imprisoned thinkers of Germany, who are paying the price for thinking and speaking. Consult any of the poor misguided creatures of all ages who sold their birthright for a mess of pottage. Did they get the pottage?


We are a freak. Mechanically over-developed, and spiritually atrophied. Our art is photographic, utilitarian, or impressionistic. Our education is rationalistic, pragmatistic, and atheistic. And our religion, unless it falls into the same line, is rubbish. Jesus once wept over a young man who was so rich he was poor, over a city so religious that it crucified the Lord of Glory. Must He weep over America, with her keen intelligences, super-skills, ragged nerves, and rudimentary souls? Is it not time that we wept over our complacent self-satisfaction, our childish desire to eat our cake and keep it, our naïve forgetfulness of death, our blithe rejection of any truth that is inconvenient or difficult, our parade of mere gadgets and calling them Progress, our wilful pulling down of the shades over our soul-windows, and then wailing because we grope in darkness?

Like every people before us, we may be blind to the faults of our own generation, but all that childish casting away of ideals and principles—of righteousness, in favor of utility, righteous or not, is leading us by the nose in the direction of another Hitler, Stalin, Mussolini.

There is no real difference even now. Hitler takes God out of the text-books and substitutes Goth, symbol of racial supremacy. We take God out and substitute fate, chance, evolution, or human supremacy in His place. Hitler does it openly and boasts about it. We do it furtively and lie about it, but we do it just the same!

III.

The third enemy of patriotism, who stands behind the other two and hands forward the machine-gun that does the shooting, is Lawlessness.

But it is not called that. Its new name is self-expression. This is a myth that associates three terms and confuses them. Growth, freedom, and non-restraint. If we are to grow, we must be free, which means not free to do God’s will, but absolutely, falsely free from all laws, morality or tradition. Hitler feels he must be free to steal nations. We feel we must be free to steal property and call the stealing “investment finance.” Hitler wants to be free to kill the enemies that stand in his way. We feel we must be free to kill the unborn future generation that may stand in the way of our freedom, by means of divorce. Hitler wants God to let him kill, steal, destroy. We want God to let us go on, killing, stealing, and committing adultery. What is the difference? Hitler tramples God under foot and says, “God is blessing us.” We trample God under foot and say, “In God we trust.”
But why go on? Hitler and lawless America both know what the law of God is, but neither one wants to do it.

What is freedom? Freedom is obedience to justice. A dictionary stands as the law of speech. If I say, "I want 'moon' to mean 'cabbage,' and 'cow' to mean 'cowslip,' and 'man' to mean 'monkey,'" and then insist on talking in that fashion, we will soon find ourselves no longer free to talk at all, but from the window of our padded cell we will see the dictionary go blithely on, setting the laws for freedom of speech. Lawlessness is only self-destructive, like a loaded gun in the hands of a child, and the Maker of law and justice and truth is just as much self-sufficient as before.

By all means, let us sing: "God bless America!" . . . but not so boastfully, rather on our knees: "God . . . bless America . . . and save us from our own conceits."

**Is the Decalogue Abrogated?**

Dr. Albertus Pieters in the February issue of The Calvin Forum has taken the position that since the Old Covenant has been abrogated in the Christian dispensation, "this abrogation covers the Decalogue as well as the rest of the Mosaic law. Hence not only the Fourth Commandment but all the Ten Commandments are without legal authority in the Christian church and in the Christian life" (p. 136). This alternative, suggested by the present writer in the May issue, will have to be examined. The other alternative, that the fourth commandment has been abrogated while the other nine have not, was considered in the May issue.

It must be remembered that Dr. Pieters' position is that the decalogue is not to be identified with the moral law, that the moral law existed before the decalogue, that it abides after the decalogue is abrogated and that the decalogue is, therefore, simply "a partial, temporary and local formulation of the Moral Law" (Cf. p. 137). If, for the sake of the argument, this position were granted, it does not establish the abrogation of the Sabbath law set forth in our previous article. The Sabbath as an institution existed prior to the Sinaitic promulgation of the decalogue, and it was shown that in the matter of moral obligation Scripture does not warrant discrimination between the Sabbath law and the law of the other nine commandments. Therefore, even on Dr. Pieters' own presuppositions in this part of his argument, we should be required to contend for the permanent obligation of the Sabbath principle. This would just mean an application, to the moral law underlying the fourth commandment, of the same principle which he applies in the case of the other precepts of the decalogue. To put it otherwise, if the moral law temporarily and partially formulated in the other nine commandments abides, why should not the moral law expressed in the fourth commandment also abide?

**A Reply to Dr. Pieters**

John Murray
Professor at Westminster Seminary, Philadelphia, Pa.

But this ad hominem argument in the reference to Dr. Pieters' position is not enough. It is necessary to examine the position itself. Can this position that the decalogue has been abrogated be supported and validated?

**Historically Conditioned, But Not Abrogated**

There is and can be no dispute that the form of the decalogue reflects the conditions and circumstances of that period of revelation in which it was given. The language is the language of Israel, and the commandments were given in a form that was directly suited to the life of the people at that time. But this is exactly what we find to be true of the whole of Biblical revelation—it was given at various times in the very milieu of the life of the people to whom it was in the first instance directed. This is no less true of the New Testament revelation than it is of the Old. Each part of revelation is given in the context of a concrete situation. In a word, revelation is historical and therefore not given in abstraction from historical situations. Furthermore, revelation is progressive and organic and this organism of progressive revelation unfolded itself in direct contact with, and relation to, the needs of each particular generation. By the process of inscripturation it was, however, designed in the wisdom and grace of God to form a permanent deposit of revelation that is God's Word for all subsequent generations of the history of the world and of the church.

Now if the form of the ten commandments reflects the conditions and circumstances of the age in which they were given, this in no way provides a reason for their abrogation any more than does this feature of the whole of revelation in both Testaments establish the abrogation of revelation itself. Again, what intelligible or conceivable meaning can the idea of abrogation as applied to these commandments have? "Thou shalt have no other gods
before me.” What could abrogation mean in such a case? “Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain.” “Thou shalt not kill.” “Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor.”

We simply need to review these precepts, relate them to the unchangeable perfections of God of which they are the transcript, properly analyze the import of the word “abrogation,” and the suggestion that they could be abrogated becomes not only inadmissible but intolerable.

It is, of course, true that the principle of progressive revelation comes to bear even upon the ten commandments. As revelation advanced from stage to stage until it reached its consummation in the New Testament, there was ever fuller disclosure of what the implications of these commandments were and an ever enlarging exhibition of the length and breadth, and depth and height of their application. In the teaching of Jesus, for example, we have the emphasis upon what we may call the internalism and spirituality of the decalogue, that obedience is first and foremost a condition of the heart, that all outward conformity must spring from love and purity. Sin does not merely consist in the overt act of transgression but also in the desires, motives and intents of the heart. “Whosoever looketh on a woman to lust after her hath committed adultery with her already in his heart” (Matt. 5:28). But progressive revelation as to the import and application of a commandment is one thing, abrogation is another and, in this case, totally another.

**Law and Love in the New Testament**

We must, however, turn to the use made of the decalogue in the New Testament. We shall take Romans 13:8-10 as a typical instance. Paul is here dealing particularly with man’s relation and duty to man. “Owe no man anything, but to love one another: for he that loveth another hath fulfilled the law” (vs. 8). The pivot on which his exhortation turns is that, “Love is the fulfilling of the law” (vs. 10). It is always lamentable superficiality and distortion that would set love and law in opposition the one to the other. It is not love in opposition to law but love fulfilling law. Love is not an autonomous, self-instructing and self-directing principle. Love impels to the fulfilling of the law, but it does not itself excogitate that law. No statement of the New Testament more briefly and forcefully expresses the necessity of both love and law for the fulfilment of Christian morality than just this, “Love is the fulfilling of the law.” It is the epitome of our Lord’s teaching when he says, “Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind. This is the first and great commandment. And the second is like unto it, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets” (Matt. 22:37-40).

But more directly pertinent to our present purpose, Paul tells us here not only that love fulfills but also what the law is which love fulfills. “For this, Thou shalt not commit adultery, Thou shalt not kill, Thou shalt not steal, Thou shalt not covet, and if there be any other commandment, it is briefly comprehended in this saying, namely, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself” (vs. 9). Paul here cites four precepts. He reminds us by the brief clause, “and if there be any other commandment,” that he does not consider these four as a complete enumeration of the commandments that regulate the performance of man’s duty to man. He has quoted enough to make obvious what he means by the law that love fulfills. These four commandments are four of the well-known ten commandments and they are quoted in exactly the form in which they appear in the decalogue. Let it be distinctly marked that Paul is here dealing with the elementary principles of conduct in man’s relation to man; he is enunciating the great principle that must govern Christian morality and guide Christian sanctification—“Love is the fulfilling of the law.” And it is just then that he quotes from the decalogue in order that he may define or, at least, illustrate for us what that law is without which the all-determining principle of Christian ethics is meaningless.

Now, by what expedient of reasoning can the abrogation of the decalogue be maintained in face of such an appeal to its unmodified terms by the Apostle, and that in a context where he is enjoining upon Christian believers the discharge of those obligations that determine the character of the Christian life? It would surely be a travesty of the most obvious import of the Apostle’s argument.

**Love and Law in the Old Testament**

It should be noted that Paul in this passage says, “If there is any other commandment, it is briefly comprehended in this saying, namely, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself” (vs. 9). The last clause is a quotation from Leviticus 19:18. It is in this relation that he enunciates the principle which has all-comprehensive application, “Love is the fulfilling of the law.” It is significant that both elements of this cardinal principle he finds in the Old Testament. What the law is he defines or illustrates from the Old Testament, and that it is love that fulfills he also derives from the Old Testament, “Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself.” The words we have already quoted from our Lord, Matthew 22:37-40 enunciate the same thought as the Apostle, only by our Lord it is applied comprehensively to include our duty to God as well as our duty to man—“Thou shalt love the Lord thy God,” “Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself.”

It is both necessary and pertinent at this point to deal with a rather amazing statement made by Dr. Pieters in his article already cited, a statement both misleading and confusing. It is that “the Decalogue, so far from being the same as the Moral Law, does not even contain the highest Moral Law, according to our Lord, in Matthew 22:36-40” (p. 137). It is
important to observe that our Lord in this passage is quoting from Deuteronomy 6:5 and also from Leviticus 19:18. Deuteronomy 6:5 comes closely after the Deuteronomic account of the decalogue. And Leviticus 19:18 occurs in a chapter that is shot through with express reference to the precepts of the decalogue. Indeed it is questionable if there is another chapter in the Old Testament that shows in this respect such close affinity to Exodus 20 and Deuteronomy 5, the two chapters in which the decalogue is given. In the very context of the decalogue, then, we do have what Dr. Pieters calls “the highest Moral Law” (a phrase the present writer does not deem the most accurate but which I shall continue to use by way of accommodation). This shows that the decalogue was never intended to be placed in any other relation than that of complete complementation to, or dependence upon, that upon which, according to our Lord, all the law and prophets hang, namely, “Thou shalt love the Lord thy God,” “Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself.”

The Decalogue and Its Summary

It is, of course, true that the words our Lord quotes from Deuteronomy 6:5 and Leviticus 19:18 are not actually contained within the compass of the decalogue. But of what avail is this fact in establishing the abrogation of the decalogue? The relation that these words quoted by our Lord sustain to the decalogue, as it appears in the Old Testament, is just precisely the same as the relation they sustain to the specific commandments which, on Dr. Pieters’ own presuppositions, are binding upon the Christian believer (Cf. article cited p. 136). He will surely have to admit that “the highest Moral Law” is not actually stated within the compass of the specific and particular “required things” that are comprised in Christian duty. And so, if the fact that the actual statement of “the highest Moral Law” is not enunciated in so many words within the compass of the particular duties incumbent upon the Christian does not abrogate these particular duties, how possibly can the omission, as regards statement, of “the highest Moral Law” from the compass of the decalogue be any argument for the abrogation of the decalogue? We have simply to understand that things have to be stated in their own place and in their proper relation. And that is exactly what we find in the case of “the highest Moral Law” both in the Old Testament and in the New. That it should have occupied another place than that which it does occupy in both Testaments, and in both Testaments similarly, would have been singularly incongruous with its nature and relations.

This is just saying that what Dr. Pieters calls “the highest Moral Law” could not be contained within the compass of the decalogue, for the decalogue is an enumeration of the elementary and specific moral obligations. This “highest Moral Law” is not a specific duty in the sense the ten commandments are; it is the principle that applies to all moral duties. It does not express one duty that is on a par with others in a certain classification; it occupies a unique position and sustains to all the other commandments an all-embracing relationship. It prescribes the condition of heart and mind indispensable to the fulfillment of all other duties. It applies to all and therefore must occupy the position of preface or appendix. In a word it is not specific but generic, it is not particular but universal. It sustains identically the same relation to specific moral duties in the New Testament as it does in the Old, and in the Old as it does in the New.

The Old Testament, may we repeat, enunciates the two commandments upon which, according to our Lord, hang all the law and the prophets. But it sets these in their proper relation to the ten commandments. The New Testament reiterates these all-determining principles and by the words of our Lord interprets for us their significance. But it too places them in proper focus and relation to the other commandments. The place they occupy is thoroughly congruous with their nature and significance. Without them and the great truth on which they are based, namely, that God is the Lord and that God is one, there would be no decalogue. And without the decalogue we should not know how they are to take effect in the various relations of life. We cannot but see in the place they occupy in the statement of our obligations signal congruity with the place their very nature determines for them. The fact that the decalogue does not contain them has, then, no relevance whatsoever to the question as to whether or not the decalogue has been abrogated, nor to the question as to whether or not the decalogue is to be identified with permanent moral law. Hence we conclude that the datum Dr. Pieters adduces that “the Decalogue . . . does not even contain the highest Moral Law” does not in the least support his contention that the decalogue is not the abiding moral law.

Summary and Conclusion

Much more might be said to show that the New Testament treats the decalogue as a formulation of binding and permanent moral law and therefore as no less authoritative for the New Testament economy than it was for the Old. But we have reached the limits of our available space.

In concluding these two articles I feel compelled to state that their content has been in several respects different from what I had contemplated when I was asked by the editor of THE CALVIN FORUM to contribute to its pages on this question. The reason is that Dr. Pieters, with directness and candor it must be admitted, laid the axe to the very root of the tree. It was therefore necessary to defend the foundations upon which the Westminster view of the fourth commandment rested. That I have attempted to do. In the main, and to sum up, the thesis of these articles has been (1) that Scripture
does not warrant discrimination between the fourth commandment and the other nine, and (2) that neither Scripture as a whole nor the New Testament in particular warrants any such supposition as that of the abrogation of the decalogue but rather treats it as the compact summation of perpetually binding moral obligation. They are the transcript of the moral perfections of God as these come to expression for the regulation of the thought and conduct of men in their relations both to God and to one another. The fourth commandment, therefore, with the other commandments, enunciates a law of divine authority and sanction in the Christian dispensation.

Many questions of the greatest importance have had to be left untouched. But readers will appreciate that when foundations are attacked they must be vindicated. We hope that through this discussion which The Calvin Forum has presented to its readers there will result a deeper understanding of the grounds upon which the plea for the observance of the Sabbath rests, and that with more intelligent understanding will proceed apace a renewed appreciation and observance of the Sabbath institution as the perpetual memorial of God's work in creation and redemption and as the foretaste of the Sabbath rest that remains for the people of God.

The “Emergency” Challenges Democracy

Henry J. Ryskamp
Professor of Economics
Calvin College

The great depression was too much a matter of individual losses, of accusations and of counter accusations, of finding fault with employers, with laborers, and with the government to result in the building up of a fine morale. Returning prosperity contributed as greatly to a self-interest that had not been satisfied for years as it did to the solution of the problems which the depression revealed. We were beginning to live easily again, more unconcernedly, with more of an opportunity to demand things for ourselves and to get them. Life was not so compelling, our little lives could swing more self-centeredly through their own little orbits, and we were again becoming complacent. Now the world situation, as interpreted and defined by our president, is declared to be one of national emergency. And we are beginning (just beginning if at all) to realize that there is always something confining, directing, individually uncontrollable about this world in which we live, something to which we must bow, a purpose beyond our own; and more or less grudgingly we are beginning to give assent to the need of common action for the achievement of a purpose that is more inclusive than our own.

The Example of Germany

International rivalry is today being fought out on several fronts, the economic, the diplomatic, the propaganda fronts as well as the military. In this contest the totalitarian states, Germany especially, are the more successful to date. Germany's achievements in almost every kind of national and international activity are simply breath-taking in their effect. Her military and political successes have us glued to our radios, listening and hoping for what must seem to us as almost impossible reverses. Her propaganda control, both without and within the country, is not only equally successful, it apparently furnishes the foundation upon which her other achievements are built. And little of this could continue long if it were not for a measure of economic control that strikes us as incredible in view of the prostrate condition of Germany some twenty years ago.

Germany has something which the democratic nations have not yet developed. She has careful planning, thorough organization, detailed execution. Her organization involves the entire populace, and includes, therefore, not only the highest degree of centralization of authority and control but also complete and immediate readiness to respond on the part of the millions of the German people. Dictatorial this organization may be, and undoubtedly is in large part, but that it has succeeded in developing a morale, of which German responsiveness is in part the evidence, no one who is fairminded can deny. The German government was planning for war years before the war broke, and is already planning and building for the peace that will eventually come. This government is effecting a continuing organization that, it is expected, will be able to meet every strain, and that will give to each citizen his opportunity to live and contribute to the national life. Is it surprising that, our wishful thinking to the contrary, the German people have to such a great extent supported their government? In spite of much that they object to, and will no doubt grasp the opportunity to change, they are welded into one active organization today, not only by force of authority, but also by a recognition of
common interest and individual and collective achievement.

We are confident that democracy can stand the strain, that it is supremely worth while and that it is worth fighting for if need be, but in our democratic way we disagree as to what we should do at the moment, we hear a variety of points of view shouted out to us over the propaganda waves, we carry on our political activity indecisively, we are just beginning in a rather chaotic manner to fashion a war machine. Most of us are not even intensely interested in what is our collective responsibility to determine and to do. Yet that is just what democracy involves and that is what we are preparing to defend. We are engaged in organizing for a mighty defense, nevertheless we carry on as if we were out for a picnic, each determined to have as good a time as he can. Our government has not yet demanded much of us, but we are not slow to grasp the opportunity to demand all that we can for ourselves. Meanwhile serious problems are developing and will soon have to be dealt with.

**Economic Problems: Production**

To enable the government to carry out its defense program the people of this country must produce on a scale greater than we have ever achieved heretofore. This, it appears, we are beginning to do. In May of this year the Federal Reserve Board index of industrial production reached 150 as compared with the extraordinarily low point of 56 to which it had dropped in 1932. In May of 1937 the high point was 121, and in 1929, generally regarded as one of the greatest years in our history, the high point was only 114. Certain of the defense materials are, however, not being produced fast enough, and we are just beginning to get them to England in significant quantities. One of our real difficulties at present is the competition that has developed between individual and government buying. Increasing prosperity has practically done away with unemployment and has increased consumer purchasing power. Consequently consumer purchasing has taken a tremendous jump at the same time that the government has come into the market for its goods. The democratic way to enable the government to get what it needs would be for individuals to economize and to sacrifice voluntarily. Instead individuals are buying to satisfy needs that have gone unsatisfied for years and they are engaging in considerable "forward buying" because of the fear that goods may be unobtainable later or that their prices may be too high. The result is, of course, that the government has greater difficulty in getting what it needs and that it may have to resort to various kinds of control, more or less dictatorial, in order to get its goods.

**Government Income**

In order to meet all of its non-defense expenditures and to buy all that it needs to defend the country the government will have to raise approximately nineteen billion dollars in the fiscal year of 1942. The great increase in industrial production is expected to result in a correspondingly great increase in national and in government income. Our federal government income in 1920 was six to seven billion dollars, in 1941 it is estimated that it will be seven billions, while, with increased taxation, it is expected that it will amount to almost twelve billion dollars in 1942. Even such unprecedented income will fall far short of the expected nineteen billion dollars in anticipated expenditures. The difference of seven billion dollars will have to come from the savings of the people as loaned to the government. The democratic way to turn purchasing power over to the government is to submit willingly to heavy taxation, and to turn over current consumer income to the government through the purchase of defense bonds. The point to this last statement is thus that we, the citizens, must not spend all of our present income for ourselves but must turn over a large part of it to the government, either in the form of taxes or of loans. If we do not lend to the government but instead buy goods for ourselves we make it impossible for the government to buy what it wants and we tend to encourage price increases. The German government gets what it wants by means of various kinds of pressure. Our government will have to use similar means if we do not as individuals rise to the emergency.

**Price Control**

Prices of basic commodities, those needed by the government in preparing for defense, have gone up sharply during the last three months. Wages in our great industrial establishments are now higher than ever before in our history. The cost of living is beginning to rise, although not nearly so greatly as the demands for wage increases would suggest. All of this presents the threat of a general and rapid price increase, something that the government has been doing all in its power to prevent, and that it will continue to oppose with all of its ability. Not only the government, but all of us as citizens, should fear runaway production and runaway prices. Soaring prices would make government purchases difficult and individual purchases impossible. They might tend to increase wages and salaries, but they would just as certainly increase the government debt. Continued for any length of time they would bring on or represent inflation, a price structure so high that it is out of line with the quantity of goods and services produced, so high that money loses its purchasing power and people hasten to exchange money for anything that it will still buy. Continued price increases would be disastrous, not only to the government's program but also to the economic integrity of the country.

Again, the democratic way of meeting this threat of inflation would be cooperation on the part of employers, labor, and the public to prevent any price
increases except such as are unavoidable, for one price increase, whether of goods or of wages, is usually followed by another, until the chain of price increases becomes endless. The German government has simply cut through the Gordian knot of price troubles by fixing or suggesting prices. We shall have to act much more cooperatively and much more unselfishly than we have thus far if we are not to receive similar suggestions and control from our government. If consumer buying on credit as well as government buying on credit continues to increase the demands for goods and services such control will be inevitable anyway. And then it is to be hoped that it comes before the economic system becomes unmanageable.

Economic and Social Disorganization

In spite of our desire to continue in the democratic way while defending democracy certain changes in our economic and social organization are bound to come in as the struggle continues. And these changes, although temporarily necessary, it must be remembered will also carry with them a threat to the continued existence of democracy the longer they remain in force. Consequently, even while adapting our democratic system to meet the challenge of this emergency, we should be preparing to make the transition back to the usual democratic processes when the crisis is over. Germany is said to be building factories now for the making of many goods which heretofore during peace time she bought from other countries, with the intention of turning her working force into these factories and out of the munitions factories as soon as the war is over. We also shall have to prepare for the eventuality of millions returning to industry at a time when defense production must necessarily be discontinued or curtailed. And whereas Germany is making her preparation in characteristic dictatorial fashion we shall have to make ours in the democratic manner, if the present effort is to be worth while.

All of this raises the question as to what is really the democratic way of organizing our economic life, of organizing it not merely for an emergency, or for the transition from emergency to more normal conditions, but of organizing it in such a way that emergencies, national and international, do not arise. To this question we must now give thought and, if the answer suggests organization, not quite so uncontrolled or willful as we have had in the past, we must work cooperatively and with a will (individual and collective) to give effect to the answer. For that is the democratic way. And if the crisis which we are now preparing to meet means a disrupting of normal social relationships and a temporary break-up of such fundamental institutions as the family and the home we must now anticipate the dangers involved. We must not now bend every effort toward defense, irrespective of its cost to family life, church life, and individual life, in the expectation that when the emergency is over things will suddenly fall back into the old pattern. They did not do so after 1918. Any continued straining of individual effort or of social organization to accomplish some great end is bound to be followed by a period of relaxation and of readjustment after the effort has been made. Unless the inevitable reaction is prepared for, a crack-up of some kind is bound to follow. We experienced one in the period of the twenties and unless we are willing to take the risk of another we should take steps to prevent it now. Germany is already doing so in her way, we must do so in the democratic way for which we are fighting.

Many people in this country are inclined to attribute our rapid growth and our phenomenal industrial success to democracy. They may be right, but we should not jump to conclusions too quickly. Germany's achievements have also been phenomenal in the last few years, and our achievements are attributed by some keen observers as much to our wonderful natural resources and to our geographic location as to any form of governmental organization.

Christianity and Democracy

Just as some like to attribute our success to democracy others are inclined to identify democracy and Christianity. Certainly democracy as it has manifested itself in world history is not identical with Christianity nor does one have to be a Christian to appreciate the benefits of democracy. On the other hand just as a real Christian should be the first to see the weaknesses and limitations of democracy he should be the first to recognize the great possibilities of danger and of evil in other forms of government. The Christian knows that there is a higher authority than that of any dictator or of any majority. But he believes also that if there is respect for the source of all authority and recognition of the real nature of man, individual and collective, government, whatever its external form, will have in it many of the elements of democracy—recognition, for example, of the duties and rights of each human being as created in the image of God. The Christian if he is consistently christian, will be the first to manifest, and to insist on the right to express, real personality in all the affairs of life. He will always insist on the recognition and service of God first and on the service of one's fellows as well as one's self. And he will not long countenance any form of government that makes this impossible.

We need today a democracy that has individual and collective fibre, that serves society as well as self, and both of these not for their own sakes only but primarily because they have purposes beyond themselves. If that is admitted the Christian should be the first to contribute to the development of toughness of fibre, of integrity, of continuing purpose for time and eternity in government as well as in every other sphere of life.
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Dutch Reformed Churches
in the East Indies and in South Africa

G. Besselaar
Professor of Afrikaans Culture
University of Amsterdam

COME now to the second and smaller half of my theme: Dutch Reformed churches in the Southern Hemisphere. In this hemisphere I got to know two fields of labor of Dutch Reformed churches: the Netherlands East Indies on a visit of two months and South Africa by long residence.

The State Church in the Indies as an institution dates back to the times of the United East India Company (1602-1795). In the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries it rendered yeoman service. Fine work in Bible translation was done by eminent orientalist scholars among its ministers. In the Amboina group a live indigenous church was founded, soundly Calvinistic, and still so today. Just as the official church in the motherland the Protestant Church of India was reconstructed in the nineteenth century and is well represented today in the larger towns and at many outposts. The old days when the protestant minister was a modernist, an exception I was told. Many of the pastors sal­ried by government, are serious minded, hard working men who travel over a vast area and attend to their office in breaking the bread of life and visiting members who are in any way afflicted or dis­tressed in mind, body or estate. Especially the young men scattered over vast plantations, cut off from civilization apart from club and bridge parties, after all poor exponents of or substitutes for civilization, appreciate a kind word and even some mild form of admonition.

By the side of this government dispensation of the means of grace and the hope of glory the Gereformeerde Kerken in the Netherlands have made it their duty to visit members in the diaspora and work on the same plan as bore such eminent fruit in the sister churches in the States. They gather Reformed men and women into circles that meet regularly; at many a place such nuclei have developed into flourishing churches. Able young ministers have been called from the mother country, fine buildings have been erected and the existence of a live Reformed church proved many a time a stimulus to competition by the local government church.

The mission work performed by the Gereformeerde Kerken in the Netherlands on the densely populated isle of Java stands out as a beacon of light and guidance. The principle worked upon is that one home church or a group of home churches, sometimes a whole province, is made responsible for a well defined local area. They call a missionary min­ister, arrange for his training for this special sphere of work, defray the expenses of his outfit, voyage and settlement, provide his salary, and all the funds needed on that field. The results are almost stag­gering. What we saw and investigated during a week's stay at Djojokarta and again at Soerakarta or Solo surpassed anything we had seen in the Near East, the Far East and in many parts of the vast African continent. Whole laid plans of strategy, studiously thought out, methodically applied on the spot by able men and women of deep piety and high intellect and supported by a praying and paying home front yielded a harvest the fruit whereof did shake like Lebanon. Whole districts have been Christianized and work of outstanding merit has been performed in centers of hoary Moslem civilization like the two sultanates mentioned, citadels of the highest oriental culture. The basis of the work in Djojja is a system of up-to-date hospital service; in Solo it is educational in primary and secondary schools and a training college for secondary school­teachers in the management of which Hervormden and Gereformeerden work in close harmony.

The indigenous Javanese Reformed Church which is already in embryonic existence and is served by qualified Javanese ministers does not fall within the framework of this article except as a result of Dutch Reformed mission effort.

* * * * *

The last group of Dutch Reformed churches under review are those in South Africa. With the founding of the Cape Colony, 1652, the Dutch Reformed Church of the Netherlands was transplanted to the Cape which proved to be a Cape of Good Hope. The Nederduits Gereformeerd Church there has be­come like a tree planted by the rivers of water that bringeth forth its fruit in its season; the leaf did not wither and whatsoever it did was prospered. The beginnings, however, were very humble. The Dutch East India Company never intended this re­freshment station for travel-stained sailors to be­come a colony, so the religious needs of the garrison
and the officials were supplied by the ministers of calling vessels who preached the Gospel and dispensed the Sacraments. The settlement was successful and in 1665 the first permanent minister was appointed in the Rev. Jan van Arkel. The arrival of 200 Hugenots in 1689 introduced a valuable new element of piety and culture. For their spiritual wants they required the ministry in French to the older folks who did not understand Dutch. A bilingual pastor, the Rev. Pierre Simond, Frenchman by birth and verbi divini minister at Zierikzee, officiated till 1702 when the French element by intermarriage and habit had completely merged in the Dutch community. As the colony expanded, more congregations were formed in the interior, but at the close of the eighteenth century only seven of them existed: Capetown, Stellenbosch, de Paarl, Rodezeran (now Tulbagh), Zwartland (now Caledon), Uitenhage and Graaff Reiniet. From 1665 till 1824 these congregations resorted under the classis Amsterdam which arrangement with the slow means of communication prevailing then proved cumbersome, but at the same time secured continuity and careful progress. All resolutions taken at the Cape needed sanction at Amsterdam to become effective. The British occupied the Cape in 1795 provisionally till 1798 and in 1806 finally. During the Dutch interregnum (1795-98) the Dordrecht Synod church order was replaced by one issued by the Batavian Republic under commissioner Uitenhage de Mist and was marked by French Revolution influences. After the British occupation the Nederduits Gereformeerde Church was placed under government supervision; two commissioners attended the sessions of Synod with the right of veto. The governor used his powers to fill pulpit vacancies by appointing Scottish Presbyterian ministers who had to learn Dutch by an enforced attendance of six months at the university of Utrecht. These linguistic attempts did not always blossom into achievement and bore sometimes disastrous oratorical results of which still many anecdotes do the round. In 1836 the Great Trek (a Dutch word from South Africa embodied in English and American vocabulary) took place when 10,000 Afrikaners, one quarter of the white population of the Cape Colony, abandoned their beautiful homesteads in search of liberty in order to escape from British subjugation in defiance of the explicit terms of the Treaty of Muizenberg, 1807, which guaranteed their rights in the matter of language, church life, representative institutions, Roman Dutch law jurisdiction and their established ancestral native policy. This exodus was the genesis of the Afrikaner nation. They set out into the wilderness as the Israelites of old took to the desert out of the land of Egypt, the house of bondage. They were not a licentious rabble disinclined to order and rule, on the contrary they had built up in the southernmost peninsula of Africa a law-abiding, God fearing community which for close on two centuries had kept itself pure from the colored nations as sexual intercourse with them was considered incest.

They had perpetuated the best traditions in family life, in Church and State, as brought from the Netherlands when Calvinism was at its zenith. The first century and a half in South Africa had been the period of adaptation to the new country: new topography, in climate, in flora and fauna and native population. When physically and mentally acclimated, the ties with the old home country had grown slack, a new mode of life and outlook had made South Africa their one and own country. The Netherlander had become an Afrikaner, but he remained a Dutchman. Many of these points run parallel with developments in North America!

This Afrikaner nation was conceived not in polyglot and cosmopolitan Capetown, but on the ox cart of the sheep farmer in the interior. This ox cart (ossewa) was his home, his church, his fort; his throne and altar.

The Afrikaner nation was born in the travail of a struggle between Boer and Briton and Barbarian; it was baptized in the red waters of Blood River and Mooordspruit (1838); it learnt to walk on the plains of the Orange Free State and Transvaal and on the cliffs and the rocks of Natal; it went to school to learn to read and write in the Genootskap van Regte Afrikaners at the Paarl (1875); it went through the child's diseases and growing pains in two wars for liberty at the close of the nineteenth century and came of age on May 31, 1910, when the Union of South Africa was founded which laid down in Art. 137 of its constitution that "Dutch and English shall be the official languages of the Union possessing and enjoying the same rights, liberties and privileges." This law was enacted on paper and applied in daily practice in a country where two-thirds of the white population are Dutch speaking.

I considered it necessary to give these few historical details as background in order to explain the organization and standing of the Dutch Reformed churches in South Africa. The Nederduits Gereformeerde Church is the old established church in the country. In the Cape Province it counts 212 congregations, up to 100 in the Orange Free State, 130 in the Transvaal and 15 in the preponderately British province of Natal. Each province has its own Synod; the ministers are trained at the Theological Seminary of Stellenbosch, founded in 1859, and for the Transvaal at the theological faculty of the university of Pretoria since 1936.

By the side of this church there is the Nederduits Hervormde Church founded in the Transvaal in 1855 under the Rev. D. van't Hoff as a protest against the anglicising factor alleged to be working at the time in the mother church at the Cape. Next the Gereformeerde Church founded in 1858 under the Rev. D. Postma from the Christian Reformed church at Arnhem, Netherlands, at the instigation among others of Paul Kruger. If politics had a
share in the founding of the Hervormde denomination, deeper and more lasting convictions found utterance in the Gereformeerde church: partly subliminal Calvinistic consciousness worked as a reaction against methodist tendencies crept in or threatening to do so in the Volkskerk. Gereformeerde Church ministers are trained at the Theological School at Potchefstroom working in conjunction with the local Christian University College. The parallel with the Grand Rapids institutions is obvious! Mission work on the largest scale is done by the Nederduits Gereformeerde Church on her mission fields in Nyassaland, well nigh Christianized now, and in the Sudan. In one year she spent on her home and outside missions £85,000.

Time has consolidated the heritage of the turbulent middle part of the nineteenth century. The one church now balances the other, all three hold high the same three Standards of Reformed Faith. When the Free University professors Kuyper, Hepp and Van Schelven visited South Africa they preached in both Nederduits Gereformeerde and Gereformeerde congregations. I am not aware of one modernist pastor in any of the three denominations. When fifteen years ago modernism in a very mild form raised its ugly head in the Nederduits Gereformeerde Church, it was nipped in the bud: Prof. John du Plessis from Stellenbosch was unseated and pensioned off. That South Africa as a nation reacted vigorously is proof that it is Calvinistic at heart.

* * * * *

A few words in conclusion.

We have travelled under Polestar and Southern Cross and taken a bird's eye view of the achievements of Dutch Reformed churches in many lands and during many ages. I think the record redounds to the glory of God, the Creator and Preserver of His church and testifies to the loyal obedience, be it with human limitations, of these churches. In our era of strife and tumult and schism this record surely ought to be an incentive to come together, even with Reformed churches of a different origin in an ecumenical or, if this is too ambitious, in an international synod. The insistence on this proposal as it became vocal in the Synod of Sneek, Netherlands, in 1939, was strongly stressed by the representatives of the Christian Reformed Church of America and the Gereformeerde Church of South Africa. This subject should be broached in the church papers of Reformed churches as an independent tribune of Reformed thought in order to rouse and mold public church opinion internationally.

Polar Star and Southern Cross are known for brilliant light, guiding power and immutability. They are the brightest stars in their own constellations; have been for centuries the lodestar and cynosure to lead benighted and storm-tossed sailors to the haven of safety and rest; within the orbit of our solar system they are constant in relation to our own revolving planet. The course of our Reformed churches will be steered safely if we faithfully follow the guidance of the Captain of our salvation who on Patmos was seen to walk in the midst of the seven candlesticks and had in his right hand seven stars. He is able to do exceeding abundantly above all that we ask or think according to the power that worketh in us. Unto Him be glory in the church by Christ Jesus throughout all ages, world without end.

---

**No Eden**

No clouds. No storm.
No fear. No hate.
No laws. No rules. No dread of heavy labor.
No pain. No sickness ever.
No sin. No shame. No covering.
No fruit denied but one exception.
No eating of the tree of knowledge.

No heeding of God's warning.
No fear of serpent's guileful tempting.

No owning sin. No penitence.
No garden now. No joy of life.
No fruitful ground. No plenitude.
No God. No love. No fellowship.
No walk with God in early twilight.
No friendly angel yielding entrance.
No tree of life. No life forever.
No garden. No returning.
No Eden.

---AURENE.

**Sometimes, Yes**

A hurried sip of steaming morning tea
While warning clock-hands haunt and hasten me.
Yet pant I through the vestibule before
A coat of black ascends the pulpit stair;
I improvise a measure, I confess,
In which to hide imprint of tardiness.
My psalm-acquainted fingers glide along
While I relax throughout the opening song.
And, waiting for an "Amen" in my chair,
Anticipate each line of oft-heard prayer.
My head soon bows in affirmation-nod
While I roam far from worship and from God.
Until the "finally" or last "Amen"
Shakes me into the edifice again
And faithful fingers dance, while I sit calm,
To play the prelude to the closing psalm.

---MUSICUS.

---
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The Religion of Authority

YESTERDAY was the day of individualism; today is the day of totalitarianism. Finite man must bow to absolute authority; many find that in Caesar; we find it in God.

The authority of conscience is not ultimate. "It is not a legislator; it is a judge. It does not give laws either for action or belief; it receives them. It does not emit authority; it owns it" (Forsyth). An ill-informed conscience, as a wrongly adjusted compass, may lead to destruction upon the rocks. "Conscience," Knox said long ago, "requireth knowledge."

The authority of the Church is not ultimate. Its power to bind and to loose is conditional upon its adherence to the Apostolic confession. The Church is the servant, not the proprietor, of God. The Word of God is not what the Church proclaims; the Church is that which proclaims the Word of God.

The authority of the Word of God is ultimate. What is the Word of God? First and foremost Jesus Christ. Who is Jesus Christ? Every age, every party, every country, tries to get Jesus on its side. There is an eighteenth century Jesus, who looks strangely like a dignified moralist and a nineteenth century Jesus, who resembles in all essentials an enlightened democrat. Of the liberal Jews. In such manner, the world, carving its idols. The real Jesus, the stone cut out without hands, is the Catholic Christ, the comprehensive and complete Lord of the Bible.

* * *

Sir Walter Scott was once asked, where is the finest scenery in Scotland, in the Highlands or in the Lowlands. He replied that it was in neither but where the Highlands and Lowlands met. The plains of time and the mountains of eternity meet in Jesus Christ. The Catholic faith gains expression, not so much in the affirmation that Jesus Christ is more than man, as in the confession that He is more than God. He is God AND man.

A little girl was being put to bed by her mother, and as she turned out the light to go away, the little girl asked her to stay with her. "No," she said, "You've got your dolly and you've got your Teddy bear." "I don't want Dolly," said the little girl, "and I don't want Teddy, I want someone with skin on."

"Tis the weakness in strength that I cry for!
My flesh that I seek in the Godhead."

In Jesus Christ God's gracious deed meets man's desperate need. Behold the Mighty God—skin of our skin, flesh of our flesh, bone of our bone!

He who through faith accepts the fact of Jesus Christ cannot but submit to the teaching of Jesus Christ. When critics have spoken of the local limitations of the Galilean as though He did not always rise above contemporary error, it has always been a case of the local limitations, that is, the contemporary illusions of the critics. A denial, such as that of the reality of evil spirits, is peculiar to our own time. "If He was God," asserted some time ago a writer in the Hibbert Journal, "He knew there was no such thing as diabolical possession." G. K. Chesterton makes the effective rejoinder. "It did not seem to strike the critic that this line of criticism raises the question not of whether Christ is God, but of whether the critic in the Hibbert Journal is God." What does God know? The answer is, "God only knows." Spaceless and timeless Jesus Christ transcended His age. Aristotle was perhaps the wisest and most wide minded man of antiquity. But whereas he permitted the recognition of a radical natural difference between slave and free man, Jesus Christ initiated a movement which could exist in a world, with or without slavery.

* * *

"I believe in the Bible," said Luther, "because I believe in Christ." His guarantee is upon the Old Testament, which testifying to Him, cannot be broken. His imprimatur is upon the New Testament. "The Holy Spirit shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have spoken unto you." There are the Gospels. "He will guide you into all truth, for He shall not speak of Himself, but whatsoever He shall hear that shall He speak: and He will show you things to come. He shall glorify me, for He shall receive of mine and shall show it unto you." There are the Epistles, etc. The Holy Spirit glorifies the Son in completing through the Apostles His interpretation of the mighty events enacted within Palestine. The Epistles represent the zenith of revelation. Jesus Christ tempers His revealing...
winds according as His lambs are able to bear it. "In the Gospels Jesus was in contact but with timid disciples and not with triumphant apostles and martyrs and confessors. He is not yet in contact with the Church which was only founded in the Pentecostal act. He is the center of a group of brethren who did not yet owe their souls to Him in the final way which for instance differentiated the Peter of Acts and of the Epistles from Peter the denier. We may even go so far as to say that the relation in which Jesus stood to His disciples during His life, was not saving faith which means and moves in communion with Him and not mere intercourse . . . . After Pentecost the disciples never looked back and they forthwith turned Christianity from a conventicular group to a bold, public and universal Church whose King was not its prophet but its high priest." (Forsyth).

The living Word, Jesus Christ speaks to us through the written Word, the Bible. "The Bible," said Kierkegaard, "is essentially a letter from God with our personal address on it." Here we have not correct human thoughts about the Divine, but true Divine thoughts about the human; here it is not I who speak to God, but God who speaks to me. "When I read the Holy Scripture, neither Moses nor John addresses me but the Lord my God. The human authors must fall away; in the Bible God Himself must tell the narrative, sing, prophesy, correct, comfort and jubilate in the ear of the soul . . . . If they, the Holy Scriptures, have spoken all controversy is ended; when it affirms the latest doubt departs." (Kuyper).

Jesus Christ speaks as one having authority. Behold! a voice out of the overshadowing cloud, "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased: hear ye Him."

Modernity Town . . .

I WALKED the streets of Modernity-Town. In that town nothing could be countenanced that was not strictly modern. Everybody just naturally assumed that to be progressive was right, to be liberal was better. To say anyone or anything was conservative or reactionary was tantamount to saying that a liberal was better. To say anyone or anything was his house was older than the house and tore it down the old and build up anew. What was new was my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased: hear ye Him.”

Only one lonely soul who lived in a fine old house with a steeple on it, was neither liberal nor reactionary. He had lived in this addled town so long that he knew that "new" and "old," "modern" and "out-moded," "liberal" and "reactionary" were only relative terms. He had seen that which was old when it was new, and in the new he could see the seeds of decay and decrepitude. He alone knew that the liberal worshipper of modernity today would be the reactionary worshipper of conservatism tomorrow. He was dubbed "behind the times" by those who did not know. But he was "behind the scenes." He knew that every new play that faced a new-raised curtain would not be the last, but would also face a fallen curtain and would be forgotten.

And so, from out his steepled citadel he unceasingly intoned: "That which hath been is that which shall be . . . . there is no new thing under the sun. Is there a thing whereof it may be said, 'See this is new'? it hath been long ago in the ages which were before us."

There were many in Modernity-Town that would have liked to still the Old Soul’s intonation and break down his steepled house, the oldest one of all, and make of it a surrealististic theater. But they cannot. Because the Old Soul’s life is not his own and his old steepled house belongs to the King! 

ALA BANDON.

The Soap-Box and The University Atheist

Critical Observations by Krzepowsli

Dear Ala Bandon:

I AM glad to take this opportunity to thank you for honoring my letter with such an able reply. [See May issue, p. 217. —Ed.] To be frank, I had not expected a reply. I felt that my letter was not sufficiently constructive. In the present letter I continue the onerous task of being merely critical. I do not like this. I realize that it is easier to criticize than to improve. And so I could not blame you if your final answer to me were something like this: "Before you criticize my dialogue, try to write a better one." To this I could only answer that insasmuch as I believe myself wholly lacking in the artistic sense of the dramatic, I could not hope to improve upon your work.

If I have read the first six paragraphs of your reply correctly, you admit just about everything I say, with, however, two reservations. The first is that what I called an imaginary atheist is a being not so imaginary after all. He can be found in the parks of our larger cities. And the second is that you had no intention of handling the sophisticated atheism of the state university, but rather the cruder atheism of the parks.

I have no objection to offer. In fact I am going to agree with everything you say—but with some reservations. Thus when you say that your dialogue was designed to show that the methods of the soap-box atheist are "insaneally illogical" and that, therefore, we must suppose that he is not an atheist at all but simply a depraved being who hates God, I can only reply that the dialogue was not clear—or, at least, not conclusive. Furthermore, the dialectic by which you demonstrate this only serves to puzzle me. I agree that much that goes by the name of atheism is probably not atheism at all but represents only the evil defiance of wretched and blasphemous souls. But I should regard that as a matter of empirical evidence and...
probability rather than a matter of dialectical demonstration.

You write that the soap box atheist tries to prove from the Bible that God is evil. Now, so you reason, if God is evil He must exist, for if He did not exist there would be no point to calling Him evil. And so whenever the atheist rails against an evil God he presupposes His existence.

I agree, but with a reservation. Your argument may be a telling blow against the atheists of the park, but I am sure that it would not impress the atheists of the state university. They would answer, "So what? All you have proved—if you have proved anything—is the fact that certain stupid arguments against the existence of a good God logically presuppose the existence of an evil God. And that this represents a theological triumph over atheism is not clear."

Again, you reason that the atheist either has or has not a standard of goodness. If he has such a standard, he has obtained it from the Bible and so assumes God's existence; and if he has not such a standard, he cannot call God evil.

Well, this may answer some of the arguments of the soap box atheists but I am sure that it would not satisfy an atheistic sophomore. He would say that one could derive an adequate standard of goodness from Plato, Aristotle, and Confucius. Why should an acknowledged standard of goodness presuppose belief in the Bible as the Word of God? On the other hand, so he would reason, suppose we do get most of our notions of right and wrong from the Bible. What of it? Isn't it universally admitted by those Bible scholars who really have the right to talk, that the ancient Hebrews had a genius for moral reflection, just as the Greeks had a genius for aesthetic taste, and the Romans, for jurisprudence? The Hebrews accordingly ascribed to their local deity a high type of moral excellence, just as neighboring heathenists ascribed to their deities another, and possibly lower, type of moral excellence. But this hardly proves the existence of the corresponding deities. A being pictured as satisfying even the high demands of the Jewish moral consciousness might be wholly a fiction of the imagination. Furthermore, even the moralistic Hebrews apparently had their lapses as when, for example, they picture their deity as destroying Uzzah for trying to save the ark from an ignominious fall to the earth whereas, on the other hand, they picture David, a man who committed adultery and murder in rapid succession, as a "man after God's heart."

Here patriotism and national pride evidently triumphed over morals.

Now, so this atheistic sophomore would argue, the mere fact that the Hebrews ascribed a high degree of moral excellence to their deity no more proves that this deity existed than the fact that the Philistines ascribed a lower degree of excellence to their deities disproves that they existed. All that is proved is that the moral consciousness of the Hebrews was more acute than that of the Philistines. Inasmuch as the Bible appears to give paradoxical accounts of God's dealings with men, we may suppose that the Bible is simply a dramatic account of the development of the Hebrew moral consciousness. One may, therefore, appeal to the Bible without thereby implicitly asserting that God exists.

Your final argument is this. The atheist challenges God to strike him down if He exists. This challenge implies the assumption that God is just and would, therefore, punish the challenger's irreverence. Therefore, if He is not struck down, God cannot be evil, and so He must be good. For if God were evil He would "strike anyone, anytime."

To this I can only reply that I am unable to follow your argument. It seems to me that your argument ought to be this. The atheist challenges God to strike him down if He exists. This challenge implies that if God exists and if He is just, then the challenger would be punished for his irreverence. Since he is not struck down, either God is not just, or He does not exist, or, if He does exist and is just, He is long-suffering. (As a matter of fact, the experiment proves nothing except, perhaps, the primitive mental processes of the experimenter.) Incidentally, I don't know just what the methods of the "A" are, but if the experimental challenge of God's existence is typical, I should say that their methods are no more "insanely illogical" than some of the methods of the psychologists and the psychologists whenever they discuss such topics as soul, mind, and consciousness.

A word in parting. The arguments I have just outlined are presented in the hope that your next dialogue on the subject of atheism will put the academic atheist in his place. That this can be done by means of a dialectical demonstration seems doubtful. Should you actually succeed in doing it, you could confidently predict my unqualified admiration.

Fraternally,
A. KRISNAPOLEK.

From Our Correspondents

The Passing of a Great South African Calvinist

Potchefstroom, South Africa, April 14, 1941.

The Editor of THE CALVIN FORUM,

Dear Dr. Bouma:

AFRIKAANS speaking South Africa suffered a severe loss in the death on the 9th of February 1941 of Professor Dr. J. D. Kestell, one of the best known figures in our public life, a leader in ecclesiastical, social, and political life. It has been given to very few Afrikaans speaking men to occupy such an unique position in public life: minister of religion, editor of church organs, principal of a university institution, army chaplain, translator of the Bible, fountain head of advice to all workers in most varied spheres of life, writer of no mean name.

KESTELL was born some 86 years ago in the British colony of Natal, South Africa. His father was an Englishman from Devonshire and his mother an Afrikaans speaking Voortrekker girl. The young Kestell lived amongst people who had taken part in the Great Trek and thus grew up in the traditions of Dutch South Africa, becoming in heart and soul a Dutch South African. In later life he used to tell the younger generation about the heroes of the Great Trek he knew personally. Early in life he decided to become a minister of religion, for which purpose he went to the Theological Seminary at Stellenbosch and later on proceeded to Utrecht, Holland, for further study in theology. In 1882 he accepted a call as minister to Kimberley in the old Cape Colony, from where he was called to Harrismith in the old Orange Free State in 1894, and there we find him in 1890 when the war between England and the two Dutch Republics broke out. He went with the commandos to Natal as army chaplain. After the defeat of the Boer armies in Natal he returned to the Orange Free State and there became associated with the then already famous Boer General C. R. de Wet. This was the beginning of the famous trium-
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virate of Boer General de Wet, Army Chaplain Kestell, and State President M. T. Steyn—these three forming from now onwards the heart of the Boer action in the Orange Free State. And now in 1941 the three once again have become as it were one: they lie buried in Bloemfontein at the foot of the great Memorial erected to the memory of the 29,000 women and children who laid down their lives in the mighty struggle against England in 1899—1902, united in life and once again united in death, Statesman, Warrior, and Patriarch. Of him the late President Steyn once said: worth more than a whole commando! He attended the peace negotiations between England and the conquered Republics and was there elected secretary. In collaboration with D. E. van Velden he published later on the valuable historical work, The Peace Negotiations between Boer and Briton in South Africa.

After the war he returned to his former congregation as minister and in 1912 we find him as such in the principal congregation of the old Free State, viz. Bloemfontein. In 1919 he became the editor of Die Kerkbode, the official organ of the largest of the Dutch Reformed churches, but retired as such after some years of fruitful service, returning to Bloemfontein. He kept his connection with Die Kerkbode right up to the end of his life by contributing a weekly “Die stille Uurt” (The quiet word) on most valuable columns of that periodical and also a monthly “Ons maandelikse Wykbidstand” (Our monthly prayer meeting). In 1923 this old warrior was recalled to active service by being appointed principal of the Grey University College at Bloemfontein. There he did splendid service for Christian Higher Education until 1926.

From 1926 he started on the main task of his life: the translation of the Bible into Afrikaans. He was elected chairman of the inter-church committee for the purpose of translating the Bible into South African Dutch. His part of the translation was restricted to the New Testament and the beauty of the Afrikaans New Testament is in great part due to his fine literary ability. With the publication of the New Testament Scriptures in 1933 his life's task seemed to have ended, but for some eight years more God gave this child of His to Dutch South Africa as a guide. During the great Centenary Celebrations of 1938—hundred years since the Great Trek—Father Kestell, as he was now commonly called throughout South Africa, gave us his last great and lasting contribution, namely, the idea and ideal of “the total salvation of Dutch South Africa”, particularly our economic salvation—“Die Reddingsdaadgedagte”.

On the 9th of February 1941 his Master called him up for higher service. And gladly he went to meet his Saviour. And thus ended a rich and fruitful life—and such only by the grace of God through Jesus Christ. His chief collaborator in translating the Bible, Prof. Dr. J. D. du Toit, amongst us better known as the poet Totius, who also versified the Psalms in beautiful Afrikaans, wrote in Die Kerkblad of the 7th of March an In Memoriam. I wish I could transcribe this tribute by translating some of the more important passages.

Thus writes Totius: “When I reflect on the death of Dr. Kestell, my thoughts still move to and fro. And in order to say anything appropriate of such a balanced life one should oneself be of a balanced mood. Repose, peace, and communion with God—these characterise this God-fearing, well-balanced life. He was the right man to act as chairman in translating the difficulties of the Bible. God used his talents, his finely-formed personality to cause a grand work to be completed. Dr. Kestell, who never put aside his Greek New Testament, proved in our meetings that he was able to cope with any difficulty. He knew by heart all the meanings of every Greek word we met in translating. And, moreover, he was always able to reproduce in simple Afrikaans the deepest sense of the New Testament Scriptures. He was never obstinate, but always paid the most careful attention to suggestion of the other translators. On the other hand, if according to his opinion it was necessary, he could be rock-like in his determination. And then the healthy power of body and mind! When called upon to perform this mighty task he was already an old man in years, but this did not affect or reduce his energy. On the contrary. After a period of continuous and strenuous effort, if we others complained about fatigue, he would stand erect and with a smile say: Look, I am not tired yet! His interest in the translated Bible and in its further revision never slackened.”

With kind regards,

Sincerely yours,

J. CHR. COETZEE.

A New Zealand Letter

Dunedin, New Zealand,
April 15, 1941.

Dear Dr. Bouma:

This week we have just farewelled Rev. J. Graham Miller, LL. B., and his wife as missionaries-designate to the oldest field of the Presbyterian Church of New Zealand—the New Hebrides. Mr. Miller asked me if I would undertake the task of acting as correspondent to THE CALVIN FORUM on his departure, and almost the last word he had to me was one of gentle reminder. Before I get settled to the duty proper I would like to pay tribute to the sterling qualities of leadership, tact, courtesy, intellect, and deep spirituality which were woven into the warp and woof of Mr. Miller's life. His life bears the imprint of a robust Calvinism, and his well-well message summed up the aim of his work; he quoted the great Dutch Calvinist's words (Abraham Kuyper): “Prostrate before God; erect before men.”

The main topic in New Zealand at the present time, of course, is the war. It would perhaps be quite pertinent to that topic if I endeavour to give you an outline of the reaction of the conflict on the attitude and work of the Presbyterian Church of N. Z. There has been no very marked clash on the position that the Church should adopt, and the statement of the Assembly’s International Relations Committee has on the whole met with general approval. Briefly its pronouncement was on these lines . . . . “Acknowledging the Supreme Headship of Christ, the Presbyterian Church of N. Z. reaffirms her loyalty to the throne and recognizes the justice of the cause in which our nation is fighting . . . . we recommend our people to respond with a due sense of civic responsibility to such calls for service as the authorities may make, with due regards to the rights of conscience.” Then follows a statement on the one of the most vocal of the so-called “patriots”, “The solemn well message summed up the aim of his work; he quoted the great Dutch Calvinist's words (Abraham Kuyper): “Prostrate before God; erect before men.”

There are a few in the Church with pacifist convictions, but I think it would be quite fair to state that they are more vocal than numerous. The rights of conscientious objectors have been fairly safeguarded, and the Government has set up Appeal Boards to deal with applications for exemption from military service. In practically every case it can be said that fair treatment is given.

Naturally, with the large number of men sent overseas in the Expeditionary Force our Church has seen to the spiritual needs, by sending her chaplains. At the present time we have twelve chaplains away from our shores and some eight or nine serving in the various military camps in our land. You will realize the difficult situation which faces the Church by the temporary withdrawal of so many pastors. Fortunately the Government recognizes the supreme worth of maintaining the spiritual ministry in these critical days, and after representations from the Church’s Public Questions Committee, along with other denominations, regulations were gazetted granting exemption to theological students who had commenced their course prior to the outbreak of war. This has helped to ease the situation slightly but does not meet the difficulty entirely.
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Youth work is suffering from the lack of leaders. We cannot expect much else in the circumstances, but we can thank God that those who have grown old in His Service are again willing to take up the tasks that they had passed on to younger hands. In the City of Dunedin, for example, we have two ministers supplying pulpits, and doing excellent work despite the fact that they have passed the allotted span of three score years and ten.

There is a general feeling here that whether people are willing to admit it or not, God is calling to us in this most critical hour. Only two ways open to them—God is either the Sovereign Lord or He is not. Many of us had the privilege of conducting services on the recent National Day of Prayer, and we were able to point men and women to THE LORD GOD OMNIPOTENT WHO REIGNETH.

We face the future with a confidence that is begotten of an unfeigned trust in God. But our immediate task is to grapple with the problem of “God-forsaking,” here and now, in our present day and generation. For that task we have the sure Word of God, and with that weapon and the Sword of the Spirit, in His Name we go Forward.

I remain,
Yours sincerely,
JOHN N. SMITH.

A Missionary Voice from China

Tsingkianghsien,
Kiangsu, China.
May 15, 1941.

DEAR DR. BOUMA:

THE April issue of THE CALVIN FORUM reached us. We have learned to examine its contents with increasing interest. This interest is continually renewed by the timely material presented.

The very first Editorial of this issue produced a very favorable reaction. One sentence in particular expressed a deep-seated conviction which for a number of years has been responsible for many of the things we have said and done. We refer to the meaningful words: “Calvinists never are defeatists.” For a time like ours, how encouraging! What is more, how true! If true (and there is not a shadow of a doubt in our soul that it is true) with respect to the present world upheaval and particularly for those people who have to suffer under the hand of the oppressor, how much more ought this to be true with respect to missionary endeavor! The Calvinistic world- and life-view, which includes all spheres of man’s activity, certainly would not exclude that which must hold a primary place in God’s plan of the world’s history.

A recent letter, received here, clearly indicated that there are some leaders back home who seem to be under the impression that the work our church is doing in China is well nigh coming to an end. Should America become involved in war this seems to be a foregone conclusion. Perhaps some of the things we missionaries have said or written may have had a right to any. Their handicaps and unpleasantnesses may increase. Few missionaries, however, have had such varied experiences of hardship in missionary service as the Apostle Paul, who appropriately has been called “the greatest of all missionaries.” Not even a jail was able to dim his optimism. None of us, as yet, has had to live for thirty-three years in “occupied territory.” “It is enough for the disciple that he be as his master, and the servant as his lord.” What of it, if we should have to spend the remainder of our missionary life in “occupied territory,” as long as we are still able to give testimony unto the grace of God? As long as the message, which burns within our bones, still finds a channel through which it can burst forth into flames and kindle others with the same holy fire, can there be any thought of defeat? Missionaries from every section of China testify to the people’s receptivity toward the Gospel message. Never before were opportunities as bright as they are today.

Temporary withdrawal from our mission field may become necessary, and this the China Mission considers a possibility, but we also firmly believe that at some future date we shall be able to resume our work. The present period of history of missions in China may be described as a “grace developer period.” This time, above all times, is a time to grow in grace with God and men. To walk circumspectly amid a crooked and perverse generation, to retain dignity and respect among friend and foe, to speak words of wisdom such as none shall be able to gainsay, to remain completely loyal to the high calling unto which we are called, and at the same time not offend anyone, is not a task which can be accomplished in our own strength and wisdom. These are graces which are developed only when the Spirit of God dwells within our hearts. To take inconveniences, inconsistencies, annoyances and manifestations of dislike with grace, requires grace. During these last two years our experiences have made no demands upon us beyond these limits. What may come, we do not know, but thus far we are not aware of having been one moment in physical danger. If we were, it was entirely kept from our knowledge.

We frequently met with kindnesses, when we expected the contrary. Much depends on the attitude of mind with which we approach those with whom we have to deal. We frequently were happily surprised at the courtesy extended by those whom we might consider our potential enemies. Conditions may get worse, they may become ten, even a hundred times worse, even then we still could conceive of ways and means to carry on with the work which is dear to our hearts, the hearts of God’s people, and most dear unto the heart of our Sender. Missionaries, more than anyone else, must learn to adjust themselves to changes in the international picture. They as “world citizens” (a most becoming description of a Calvinist) are especially privileged to practice that which this term implies and can do so consistently with the welfare of the Church of Christ. Instead of allowing the spirit of the defeatist room within our hearts, we ought to put forth every effort to devise ways and means to continue the work of God in China, so that we can successfully overcome any crisis which may present itself.

Indeed, Calvinists never, never, no never, are defeatists! This also applies to those Calvinists who are engaged in missionary endeavor. They go onward unto victory, no matter how dark the times become. “There is a silver lining through the dark cloud shining,” and a very bright one too. Through it all the Lord is carrying out His plan of redemption, and does it most effectively, for His means unto that end are perfect.

Let us, once for all, banish from our hearts this spirit of defeatism. It is a spirit which is more prevalent in the world today than ever before in the history of mankind. It has all the potentialities of a contagious disease. Let us as a people of God hold fast to the faith which is able to overcome the
world and go forward in the power of our God, even until the
Lord returns. Let us never slacken in our efforts to perform
the task entrusted to His church. We are marching on toward
victory! We cannot lose "the war." Shout for joy, for the
Almighty, blessed, Jesus reigns!

A. H. SHIELDS.

India in Ferment

Telugu Village Mission,
Adoni, Bellary Dist.,
South India.
Feb. 13th, 1941.

The Editor,
THE CALVIN FORUM,
Grand Rapids, Mich., U. S. A.

Dear Sir:

With the war penetrating the outer layers, if not to the
core, of India's complex social, religious, political,
and cultural fabric, it is not surprising that there
are new repercussions on missionary activity.
Missions based on continental Europe have naturally been
totally cut off from their home bases, but all the work
hitherto done by these units has by no means come to a stand-
still. Sister missions of like policy and bias, but based on non-
enemy countries, have taken up slices of territory and have
in many instances undertaken the partial support of a limited
number of missionaries and Indian workers. For instance,
various American Lutheran organizations have between them
taken over the work of the former German Lutheran mission,
special help for the Basel Mission has been promised from
Switzerland, and so on.
Owing to the inevitable falling off in revenues from Great
Britain, Australia, and New Zealand, British missions have
naturally suffered to varying degrees with a consequent cur-
tailment in the scope of their work, but the silver lining is
observable even here.

Christian Missions in Days of War

The changed world missionary situation is producing a
changing outlook among many hundreds of well-to-do Indian
Christians of the professional classes, and these, along with
their less comfortably off brethren, are beginning to practice
the art of Christian giving with ever increasing freedom. Two
notable examples of practically independent indigenous mis-
sionary organizations come readily to mind.

The interdenominational National Missionary Society,
found about 35 years ago, is now an India-wide organization
and, according to its able Indian chairman, Dr. H. S. Hensman,
90% of its funds come from sources within India. The slightly
younger but equally evangelical Anglican Indian Missionary
Society of Tinnevelly claims to obtain some 70% of its revenues
from indigenous donors. But these two bodies are exceptional
as the great majority of missions in India depend for their
working funds and missionaries' salaries on Christian churches
and boards outside of India.

There is noticeable, however, a growing sense of responsi-
bility, both in this country and abroad, in regard to the
maintenance of Christian work in the present emergency. For
instance, a correspondent writes of a very recent decision of
the synod of the American Episcopal Church to add a sum of
$300,000 to their 1941-42 budget as "aid to Church of Eng-
land missions and war crippled churches."

Missions financed from the U. S. A. are doing good work
and have not as yet been embarrassed financially except for a
few losses due to "enemy action" and badly delayed remit-
tances.

The organization which I am privileged to assist, for
example, actually expanded its field during the year 1940. And
so numerous are the "Open Doors" everywhere that at the
moment we have no less than 25 separate groups of "Untouch-
ables" in as many villages asking to be taught and received
into the Christian Church.

To baptize these few hundreds of seekers would be a compar-
atively easy matter, but proselytising in a non-Christian
land is not such a simple task. Every missionary body that is
worthy of being an effective part of the Church Militant has
of necessity to base its work on the four-fold policy of: evan-
gelism, the establishing of converts in the faith, rendering
dispensary and hospital aid, and giving young and old ele-
mentary education based on Christian principles. Experience
has proved that to whittle down any of these essentials for
the sake of expediency or economy is to dangerously weaken
the entire structure of the growing church.

India and the War

Despite a certain amount of hampering at the hands of
pacifists, Satyagrahists, (non-co-operators), and other anti-war
agitators, India's war effort continues to mount. Enormous
strides have been made in the way of contributions in men,
materials, and money to the cause of democracy; and our
soldiers in East and North Africa have been winning the
admiration and regard of even hard boiled Australians and
the reckless doughty fighters from the South African veldt.

Christian India in the meantime rejoices in a rapidly growing
friendship and co-operation between the two great English-
speaking democracies of the West. For are not Britain and
the United States, with their magnificent 150 years' record of
missionary activity, still the bulwarks of Christianity in a
world of fast dwindling moral values?

Neither have we any delusions as to the survival of Chris-
tianity were India to be so unlucky as to fall under the iron
heel of the Nazis, or the ambitious opportunists from Nippun.

Mahatma Gandhi Has Opposition

A colorful personality named M. N. Roy burst upon the
Indian political horizon a few years ago. Finishing off a bril-
liant academic career at Harvard, Roy worked in the U. S. A.
for some years as a free lance journalist. He then traveled
extensively in Europe, writing and lecturing as he went.
Returning to his native India, Roy threw himself into politics
and, thanks to his forceful writing and speaking, soon became
something of an oracle in the "Congress" party.

Recently, however, Roy was thrown out of his party for
daring to disagree with and criticize Mahatma Gandhi and his
pundits over the matter of participation in the war against
the dictators. Since his expulsion Roy has gathered around
him a number of men with vision and a contempt for outworn
political shibbolets. With the help of these men Roy has
launched an entirely new political group known as the National
Radical Democratic Party which holds views not very dis-
similar to those of the National Liberal Federation under Dr.
R. Paranjpy, and the Hindu Maha Sabha under Mr. V. D.
Savarkar, to mention but two. All three organizations com-
mand a considerable following among the intelligentsia of
the country and all advocate full and active co-operation with
Great Britain in fighting the Axis powers. A few short ex-
tracts from M. N. Roy's recent utterances will, I think, serve
to show the trend of thought among a considerable body of
informed public opinion regarding the role they feel India
should play in order to safeguard democracy for many years to
come.

"Fascism being the embodiment of all the forces of reaction
in the world," observed Roy, speaking at Calcutta recently,
"whoever is fighting against it is an objectively progressive
force." Criticizing the Gandhi regime, Roy said: "Trained in
the atmosphere of Gandhism, people never stop to think that
political non-co-operation is possible only in the life of a social
Robinson Crusoe." He next voiced a view that is now held
by many, thus: "The decisive battles of this war will be fought
in the east; and we Indians shall have to fight those battles."
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The Gaikwar of Baroda

Educated at Oxford and a patron of learning, the Gaikwar of Baroda is the ruler over one of India's most progressive semi-independent states. Speaking a few weeks ago at the Hindu University of Benares where he has endowed a chair of Indian culture and history, the young prince declared: "I believe that there is a distinct type of thought and life in India which has been enduring through the centuries and which is India's greatest contribution to the world. In it, the Hindu and the Muslim, the Christian and the Parsi, find common ground." He went on to define this culture as "No other than the flowering of man's spirit, nourished by experience, colored by sympathy, quickened by intelligence—neither aloof nor austere, nor other-worldly, but gracious and kindly, and deeply human."

In conclusion, I would like through the hospitality of your columns to express my appreciative thanks to Dr. Loraine Boettner of Washington, D.C., for sending me his book, "The Inspiration of the Scriptures." This splendid little volume is one which I feel will repay careful study by everyone interested in the Bible. I shall take pleasure in introducing it to my Christian as well as enquiring non-Christian friends.

Fraternally yours,
ARTHUR V. RAMIAH.

In London Under Fire

Professor Bouma.

Dear Friend in Jesus:

I WISH you could witness the drama of London passing through the fire at this moment, for there is so much that defies description. Yet, let me assure you that though the intensity of the fire has increased tremendously, as I last wrote, the courage of the people has kept pace with the frightfulness of the foe. It brings to mind the words of Diogenes who, when told that the missiles of the enemy darkened the very heavens, replied: "So much the better: we shall fight in the shade!" The Germans have so joined [here a word is deleted by censor's scissors—EDITOR] bomb attacks to the dropping of vast showers of incendiaries, that the fire fighting services have risen to the highest pitch of heroism and in Britain it is they, and not the army, who are in the fiercest front line.

I cannot, of course, give details of raids, for the ears and eyes of the wild cat are quick, but I can say that "the battle is with confused noises and garments rolled in blood." More of those who were my colleagues a few days ago, working by day, have suffered personally or in their homes which are destroyed, but their spirits and their dogged determination remain invincible. Hitler's devilry fans the flame of their zeal in the cause of liberty and justice, for his acts are contemptible. Could you fully appreciate the human tragedy which Hitler has brought to many a little home in England, you would, one and all, rise in righteous anger, throw away the last shackle which yet keeps the full force of your fury from flaying the foe of God and man. One colleague said: "It's my poor old granny I worry about. She is too infirm to fly to a shelter and she trembles and keeps crying not for fear of her own safety but lest her dear ones should be snatched from her." Again, when having lunch in the only café remaining in a once busy thoroughfare, the proprietor said: "They can't find my pal Sam. He was seen going in just before a bomb dropped, but it is useless to search any more. There is nothing of military importance near, but I suppose it furthers Hitler's 'New Order.'"

I did not expect to be able to write you so soon, because I was thrown into the air by a military car which failed to stop in time. Everyone expected to find me dead or badly injured, but so far I suffer only from bruises and minor cuts. It was a miracle—at least the driver and onlookers thought so. When I got alone, the words of Charles Wesley's hymn seemed very real to me and I sang them from my heart—

God of my life, Thy gracious power Through varied deaths my soul has led, Oft turned aside the fatal hour Or lifted up my sinking head.

Whither, O whither should I fly, But to the loving Savior's breast? Secure within thy arms to lie, And safe beneath Thy wings to rest.

I have no skill the snare to shun, But Thou, O Christ, my wisdom art. I ever into ruin run, But Thou art greater than my heart.

Now to return to others, I went to make a purchase at a greengrocer in the city where I had called the day before, but found only a "shell" gutted by fire. The little stock lay a heap of ashes still amouldering. And what of the shopkeeper and his wife? A piece of cardboard informed me. It read: "Business as usual at No. 93!" And there with a barrow I found them serving as if nothing had happened! The grim pluck of the people beggars description and I am more than ever convinced that God endues them with special courage. Did you know of the cases of even little children (one but 6 years of age) ignoring their own safety to dig with their hands to find "baby," you too would agree that a supernatural courage is given.

The Library [this is the Beddington Free Grace Library which Mr. Williams sponsors. See THE CALVIN FORUM, Vol. V, pp. 61 and 76—EDITOR] still stands unsnatched through the protection of Providence and we continue, undismayed by the ravages of war, to circulate works of truth both at home and abroad. Friends in lands where war has not impoverished everyone, begin to sense our deep need and to send their help, so that we thank God and take courage. My home in Beddington Gardens has been bombed, but we ourselves and the books in my home escaped, as we had removed to a safer district a little before. Both daughters have had bombs near their dwellings, but they also have come to no harm. So also is my dear old friend, the aged blind lady of whom I have written before. She is resolute and unafraid, for she knows that Jesus is her refuge and underneath are His everlasting arms in the raid area, yet still lights her own gas fire and boils her kettle for tea. When I feel to need cheering up, I go to visit her and I am nearly always rewarded. Her courage and confidence are contagious, for the fervor of her faith has its foundation in Jesus her Lord. It was during the anti-aircraft fire in the last war that she lost her sight and she is a living witness to the mighty power of God in sustaining and using for His honor and glory a poor old blind lady—yet rich in faith. Do you think such folk are worthy of your country's aid to protect from Hitler's destructive forces even if it means the supreme sacrifice for your brave God? I must close now thanking you and trusting that the work which God has laid upon me shall continue and help to spread the truth as it is in Jesus throughout the earth.

Yours in Jesus,

GEOFFREY WILLIAMS,
A Letter from the Netherlands

Dordrecht, April 1941.

Dear Prof. Bouma and Readers:

It is perfectly natural that you want to hear something of our churches and spiritual life. But for obvious reasons it is not so easy to send you information. Our Synod is not yet closed, the doctrinal differences not yet settled. The sessions held in March were not open to the public. More important were the relations of Church and the occupying power and they occupied the minds in the first place. Spiritual life has not decreased, but the power to bring new members into our Reformed Churches has not yet become great enough. This capacity to find new members, we call "werfkracht" and I do not think that I know an equivalent word for that in your language. As there is so little I can tell you, I shall copy an article I wrote the other day for one of our remaining papers and from which you may get an impression of the situation of the Calvinists in the midst of our people.

The power to bring in new members is indispensable for any organization wanting to remain alive. In particular this "werfkracht" cannot be missed in the church of Christ, which is far more than an ordinary organization. Of late years much has been written on the problem, church and evangelizing. We have gradually come to see the place which evangelization ought to have in the church. On principle, we Dutch and Reformed people, want to settle the relation between church and evangelizing. The Synod of Utrecht in 1923 has shown us the way and has laid it down that the church itself should busy itself with evangelization, and not a group of amateurs. The church as institution and as organism. The members of the church, and in contact with the church and under the direction of the church. Now this pronouncement cuts very deep. It does not concern a supposed case, but it contains a positive call. For this reason we find among the pronouncements of the Synod of Utrecht in 1923 also this one: Evangelization belongs to the duty of the churches. I should like to stress the word duty, for there were those who so stressed the word church. The church has to take this task in hand and not some society or other.

In my opinion this question has by no means clearly and completely been put. Though there had never been a contrast between a society and the church, even then the urgency of the case had been equally great, then the command Christ had given to His church, would not have been weakened for a moment, as a town lying on a mountain must spread the light. Evangelization is a task of the church. But what is wrong with our churches? Why have they so little "werfkracht," can we put this down only to the evil and unwillingsness of the world, in which the believers make propaganda? Is there not a serious flaw in the churches? It is no doubt easy enough to say that the message of the church is contrary to the natural inclination of mankind and that for this reason people are not willing to listen. But with this assertion, however true, we must not think we are dismissed from serious self-examination.

Professor Bavinck wrote one of these days:

"Our churches may have many splendid virtues, but they possess extraordinarily little 'werfkracht'. We have evangelization-committees and their work is excellent, but spontaneous preaching of the Gospel by every member of the church and in all relations in which he is placed, this is what we miss in an appalling degree. The number of persons who, without being told to do so, but only because they cannot be silent, go to others to speak with them about Jesus, is frighteningly small among us. In this respect we are very guilty of neglect towards our own surroundings, but also towards the young churches on the domains of the mission. We may hope and pray that the churches may become different in this respect from what we are, that they will show a great 'werf-

---

Eastern News Letter

Goffle Hill Road, Midland Park, N. J., June 9, 1941.

Dear Mr. Editor:

Perhaps the outstanding news in the East is the meeting of the Eighth General Assembly of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church at Westminster Theological Seminary, Philadelphia, June 3-5. No doubt the outstanding business transacted by this Assembly was the formation of a Committee of Nine for the purpose of studying the relation of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church to the social world and to other churches with a view to making a greater impact upon the modern world with the full-orbed gospel message of Calvinism, and with a view to enlarging the sphere of influence of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church.

This is both a large order and a significant move. In this step is involved a recognition of the fact that we are living in

---
a new age and that perhaps our methods of attack need some refurbishing or alteration. The aim of the Assembly was that
the essential message of sovereign grace need not and should not be compromised one iota, but that the best and most effective
up-to-date means available should be implemented for the modern warfare against the age-old natural antipathy of man
to the gospel in all its glorious comprehensiveness for every sphere of human interest. It will be most interesting to see
what this promising shoot will bear. The members of the Committee of Nine are: the Rev. Edwin H. Rian, president of
the Board of Trustees of Westminster Theological Seminary and sponsor of the plan; Professor R. B. Kuiper; Dr. C. Van Til;
Dr. Robert Strong, pastor at Willow Grove, Pa., and Moderator of the Assembly; the Rev. Clifford Smith, pastor at
Bridgeport, N. J.; the Rev. Burton Goddard, pastor at New Carlisle, Mass., and a student at Harvard. Three elders elected
to this important committee are: Dr. Gordon Clark of Wheaton College; M. F. Thompson, Esq., of Philadelphia; C. A. Freytag
of Orange, N. J.

A noteworthy little book made its bow at the Assembly. It is a convenient cloth-bound black book containing the standards
of the Government, Discipline and Worship of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church, together with some fine suggested forms for marriage, burial and other services. Students of church order will find these up-to-date documents highly interesting, if not instructive.

While speaking about church assemblies, it might be of interest to take a brief look at the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. (Northern Church) meeting in St. Louis, May 22-29. Just one fact will throw much light on the dark truth of the powerful control the “Modernists” hold over that denomination. In the election for moderator Dr. Henry Sloane Coffin, president of the thoroughly liberal Union Theological Seminary of New York, polled 404 votes in running just a step behind the winning candidate, Dr. Herbert B. Smith of Los Angeles, who polled 461 votes. It should be noted that Dr. Smith is a member of the Permanent Judicial Commission which by its decisions ordered the ousting of Dr. Machen and others in 1936.

Calvinistic Philosophy Club

The spring meeting of the Calvinistic Philosophy Club was held at Westminster Seminary on May 7. J. R. Bos, principal of the Eastern Academy, presented a paper on “Plotinus and Neo-Platonism.” This paper prompted considerable discussion on the question whether an emmanation philosophy like that of Plotinus can be classed as pantheism. It was pointed out that only on the sound basis of the creation concept can the ever-lurking danger of pantheism be avoided. The second paper was read by the Rev. Edward Heerema on “God in the Theology of Schleiermacher.” Discussion ensued on the question whether it is possible to state that a thinker has made some positive contribution to genuine Christian thought and life even though the thinker’s systemic principle is fallacious. This is a recurring question, and it makes its shadowy appearance frequently among those who take their theology seriously. If a man’s thinking is fundamentally wrong, can it still be said that on some score or other (with Schleiermacher, on the score of his teaching on the social character of the church) such a thinker can make a positive contribution to Christian thought and life? Perhaps the answer to that question must always be a qualified one. The Club members pretty well agreed that the first duty of the student is to uncover the basic systemic principle(s) of any system, and that the judgment arrived at here should be crucially determinative in any further appraisal.

Plans for the fall meeting involve a change from the usual menu. The Club plans to devote the entire day to a considera-
tion of the question of the relationship between Common Grace and Philosophy. What does Common Grace have to say as to
our approach to and the validity of philosophy in general—thinking of philosophy in the broad meaning which the history of philosophy has generated? Dr. Van Til will read a brief paper outlining the lineaments of the problem. The meeting will be held in early October.

Westminster Commencement

A superb day and an exceptionally large audience heralded the twelfth commencement exercises of Westminster Theological
Seminary on May 6. If weather permits, the exercises are usually held in a spacious outdoor auditorium enclosed by tall hedges and a stone wall. The speaker’s platform is the generous balcony of Machen Hall, the main building on the 22-acre campus. This outdoor auditorium was once a formal garden. A fountain spouts water from a lion’s mouth. The address was delivered by Gordon H. Clark, Ph.D., Professor of Philosophy at Wheaton College, Wheaton, Illinois. In driving home his message on "A Protestant World View," he strongly urged that each of the graduates and other clergymen present concentrate on making one substantial contribution to the Calvinistic circle of thought and life. Five graduates of former years received the Th.B. degree, ten senior students were graduated with the Th. B. degree, and two men received the graduate certificate in recognition of one year’s graduate work.

This correspondent feels constrained to make one more reference to Westminster Seminary and its work. The May issue of the Westminster Theological Journal has been off the press for some time now. Each new number of this journal enhances one’s judgment of its merit. Students and ministers of Reformed persuasion can find in this periodical a thorough and studious approach to the significant problems and questions of present-day theology. The full and critical book reviews are no small contributing factor to this entire impression. In this section the noteworthy scholarly works in the various departments of theological interest are given a thorough overhaul. All in all it would seem to this correspondent that a student of theology of Calvinistic persuasion could hardly afford to do without this estimable journal.

Cordially yours,

Edward Heerema.

The present issue consists of 32 instead of 24 pages. It is an enlarged number in view of the combination of two summer issues into one. This is the June-July issue appearing about the first week of July. The next issue will be for the months of August and September and will also be eight pages larger than usual. It is scheduled to appear about the third week of August. Apart from these two combinations during the summer season, THE CALVIN FORUM will continue to appear every month as heretofore.
CALVIN'S chief work, The Institutes, is known altogether too little even by those who boast of being his spiritual sons and daughters. This is regrettable. There is a little Dutch rhyme about the little use which is actually made of this classic in theology, "meer geprezen dan gelezen", which is sadly true. Why have you, Mr. Calvinist, never read the Institutes? If you have, we beg your pardon, but we think it a safe bet that our incriminating question in the overwhelming majority of cases contains more truth than rhetoric. We are convinced that one of the reasons for this disuse into which the Institutes has fallen is due to its size, and another the proximity with which many heresies which themselves are largely out of date are treated by Calvin.

Suppose someone would condense the 1600 pages of this solid work into a little over 200. And suppose most of the polemic material which suited the age of Calvin were either left out or greatly reduced. And suppose that the main line and the constructive argument of this masterpiece were all compressed into these 200 pages. Then wouldn't you take up the Institutes readily and read it through? Well, Dr. Kerr has done this very thing for American readers. In Dutch a very small compend of this Calvin classic by the Rev. Elzenga has been in use for years. Dr. Kerr practically does the same thing for the English reader in this Compend. And he has done more. He has reduced the 60 chapter captions of the original to 25 and has adopted a bit more modern terminology for these headings. On the other hand, the set-up of the four books has been retained.

And lest this Compend should displace the original, the editor has on every page indicated in the margin book, chapter, and paragraph in the original whence the given condensed portion is taken. This reference to book, chapter, and paragraph of the original is also found in the Index, so that the Index not only refers to the sections of the Compend but also to those of the complete original. Moreover, Dr. Kerr has furnished one of the best indices of Calvin's Institutes in existence. It is a much more complete index than that in the complete edition in Allen's English translation of which the present work is a compend. The Index is a real index, one that helps a man to find what he wants and one in which the terminology of Calvin is retained and at the same time the terminology of our day is also included. This, together with the fact cited above, that the references in this Index are both to the complete and to the abbreviated edition, makes it doubly valuable for the student of Calvin's thought.

And if any student of Calvin should speak disparagingly of a compend, an abbreviation, a digest—the retort lies at hand. This compend, my thorough and devoted student of the great Genevan theologian, is not for you. You just read and study the full original of 1600 pages. This Compend is for others. It is for those who have long been wanting to read this classic of Calvinistic thinking but have found no time to do so. It is for those who feel rather sheepish when someone asks them whether they have read the Institutes. It is for the man who wishes to get the feel of the total structure and thrust of this classic in the time which a 20th century reader can give to it. It is for you, my good friend, so that you may be able to master in limited compass the master-thoughts of the greatest theologian-statesman-moralist of the age of the Reformation. Dr. Kerr has made it forever impossible for you to retain your self-respect if you must answer the query, Have you read Calvin’s Institutes? in the negative. Go thou, who namest thyself after John Calvin, spend two bucks and fifty cents for this book, and after reading it through once, take it down from the shelf right often.

C. B.

WAR AND PEACE
THE CHRISTIAN ATTITUDE TOWARD WAR. By Lorraine Boettner. Grand Rapids, 1940, Eerdmans Publishing Co. $1.00.

This book recognizes Scripture as the Word of God and holds that both the Old and the New Testaments contain authoritative teaching on the problem under discussion. Boettner holds that pacifism is anti-Christian; that the consequences of war are not all bad; that war is caused by sin; that war may be a divine judgment on the nations; that the Christian has a duty to fight in response to the government's call to arms. In the main his conclusions are the same as those embodied in the Testimony on War and Peace adopted some time ago by the Synod of the Christian Reformed Church.

On the subject of the conscientious objector and the question whether a Christian is ever justified in refusing to bear arms and disobey his government, Boettner also agrees with this Synodical Testimony apparently. The citizen must obey the call to arms of his government, "unless he can find a Scriptural command or principle sufficiently clear to justify his refusal" (p. 70). After first quoting the present reviewer on the solemnity of the duty on the part of the citizen to obey his government for God's sake, he makes the same restriction which has been made editorially from time to time in The Calvin Forum and which the Testimony mentioned above also recognizes. Says Boettner: "If, however, the citizen is convinced that the particular war into which his country is about to enter is morally wrong, it becomes his duty to protest to the proper governmental authorities and to seek to prevent the nation from entering upon what he believes would be a murderous or suicidal course. Or if, having joined the army, later evidence brings him to the conclusion that the war is unjust, he should voice his protests and refuse to take any further part in what he believes to be the mass murder of his fellowmen. Even though such action should bring upon him ridicule, hatred, imprisonment, or even death, let him stand up and take the consequences like a man. When the government commands the citizen to do something which God has forbidden, or to refrain from doing anything which God has commanded, the government has then stepped out of its lawful sphere, and it is his right and duty to disobey such a command" (pp. 70-71).

A wholesome book on a serious and pressing problem.

C. B.

CALVINISTIC PHILOSOPHY
THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE CALVINISTIC PHILOSOPHY CLUB FOR 1937 (60 cts.); FOR 1938 (60 cts.); FOR 1939 ($1.00); FOR 1940 ($1.00). To be obtained from the Secretariat of the Club: Edward Heerema, Goffe Hill Road, Milldam Park, New Jersey.

One of the most hopeful signs of the revival of Calvinistic thinking in this country is the activity of various discussion and study groups of younger scholars who make the God-centered type of thought associated with St. Augustine and John Calvin an object of studious endeavor. Such a group is found in Michigan. An account of its recent activities may be found in the previous issue of our magazine. Another such
group is that which calls itself Calvinistic Philosophy Club and is located in the East. For the past four years this group, headed by Dr. Van Til of Westminster, has not only had meetings where papers were read but has also placed these papers within reach of the general public in mimeographed form.

Possibly the best and most helpful way of introducing these four sets of scholarly papers to the public is to list their topics discussed. Here they are: A Society for Calvinistic Philosophy; The New Scholasticism; Calvinistic and Scholasticism; The Philosophy of the Law-Idea; Pre-Socratic Philosophy; Plato; Beyond Humanism; Common Grace; Sören Kierkegaard as viewed from the standpoint of Calvinistic Philosophy; Stoicism, the Porch to Christianity; The Approach to Facts. A few of these papers are book reviews. Most of them deal with questions that are of interest to the student of a God-centered, Scripturally grounded philosophy and theology. The influence of the new Amsterdam school of Calvinistic Philosophy is apparent throughout. At times one finds that adulation is stronger than objective critical sense. Sometimes there is found a God-centered, Scripturally grounded philosophy and theology. There are points dues to D1'.

The New Scholasticism; Calvinism and Scholasticism; The Christian, more particularly, a Calvinistic system. of thought. There are points that carry on in the spirit of which they are the basis for hope
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CHRISTIAN REFORMED MISSIONS

Within and beyond the bounds of the Christian Reformed Church the author of this attractively bound book is well known as a writer on missionary subjects and as the editor of The Missionary Monthly. This latest of his volumes on the missions of his denomination brings their history down to the present and covers a period which is practically co-extensive with Dr. Beets' life in America, whither he came as a young man in 1886. Practically from the start he has had a more or less direct interest in the life and work of the denomination, as is evident from the fact that in 1895 he entered upon the ministry of the Gospel. In 1901 he was made secretary to the Board of Missions and he served till 1910, resigning because of the press of other duties, only to resume the secretariaship in 1917, from which date onward he was in continuous service till the year of his retirement in 1939. In 1920 the scope of his duties was widened and he received the appropriate title of Secretary of Missions.

It is plain, that Dr. Beets writes from firsthand knowledge. In most of the major developments of which he speaks he himself has had a more or less direct share. He tells the story with great fulness of detail and in a simple way. His appeal is to the rank and file of people, and he has the avowed aim of stimulating their interest in the cause that is dear to his heart. He traces the expansion of Christian Reformed Missions from the earliest attempts among the American Indians to its present occupancy of numerous posts in New Mexico, and adds chapters on the work in China and in Nigeria, and on the work among the Dutch in Brazil and Argentina. The copious illustrations and the popular presentation make the book well fit for gift purposes, for which it is evidently intended. To many former workers the author pays tribute as a friend to old acquaintances, and he does not fail to mention the faithful cooperation of Mrs. Beets throughout the long years of toiling and trusting. It harmonizes well with their career that the proceeds from the sale of the volume beyond its costs go to the Board of Missions. Though the book would be a fitting close to the work of its author, we hope that the Lord may yet add years of service to his life.

D. H. KROMMINGA.