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THE CALVIN FORUM * * * AUGUST-SEPTEMBER, 1941
Rediscovering
The Sovereign God

THE greatest need of our age is to return to God. With all its religion, the modern man—Christian though he often calls himself—has lost God out of the focus of his consciousness and the center of his daily living. This is the root malady from which not only the secularized learning of our day, but also the modernistic-humanistic leadership of many Protestant Churches suffers. This is its “sickness unto death.”

All this is only saying that we need to rediscover the sovereignty of God. For, let us be clear on the point, the sovereignty of God is not the pet notion of this or that little Christian sect—it is the very heart of the Christian religion. Deny the sovereignty of God, and you weaken the powerful sweep of divine revealed truth as it lies on the pages of Scripture from Genesis to Revelation. Moses, Isaiah, Jesus, and Paul—to mention no others—cannot be understood in the real meaning of their teaching without grasping the great truth, whether presupposed or expressed, of the sovereignty of God. To say that God is sovereign is simply to acknowledge God as God. God is not God if He is not sovereign. The little tin gods which the modern man has made to satisfy the needs of his soul, the great truth of divine sovereignty reappears. Then Isaiah and Paul become precious again. Then an Augustine and a Calvin, the latter of whom has possibly been misunderstood and maligned more than any other great Christian thinker, begin to speak once more to the heart as well as to the mind of man. When this happens, it is, to be sure, the sovereign grace of God that has wrought upon such hearts to make them turn from their own human, though religious, vagaries to the God that transcends man, the God of sovereign grace, the God of redeeming love, the God who teaches man to say: “Thy will be done.” “Have thine own way, Lord. Have thine own way. Thou art the potter; I am the clay.” Then man—enlightened man—discovers that the sovereignty of God is not only the source of all redemption and the ground of all his glorying, but that this same truth is also the deepest and most potent motive power for victorious, truly great moral achievement.

All the great minds and the God-fearing souls of the Church of the ages believed in a sovereign God. In the case of some of these, their Christian experience on this score was sounder than were their avowed doctrinal views. There have been those who mistakenly thought that they should deny the truth of Divine sovereignty, who nevertheless in the depths of their own Christian experience virtually acknowledged it. Was it not Abraham Kuyper who once said that every Christian on his knees believes in the sovereignty of God? To recognize that God is God and not man is to recognize His sovereignty. To recognize that God is the first as well as the last in our creation and in our redemption is to recognize divine sovereignty. To recognize the will of God as basic and ultimate for our moral life no less than for our redemption, is to recognize God’s sovereignty.

In days of great crises, when men feel need of returning to the Living God, the sovereignty of God is rediscovered. When all things in and about man fail him and he acknowledges that God alone can satisfy the needs of his soul, the great truth of divine sovereignty reappears. Then Isaiah and Paul become precious again. Then an Augustine and a Calvin, the latter of whom has possibly been misunderstood and maligned more than any other great Christian thinker, begin to speak once more to the heart as well as to the mind of man. When this happens, it is, to be sure, the sovereign grace of God that has wrought upon such hearts to make them turn from their own human, though religious, vagaries to the God that transcends man, the God of sovereign grace, the God of redeeming love, the God who teaches man to say: “Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?” “Not mine, thy will be done.” “Have thine own way, Lord. Have thine own way. Thou art the potter; I am the clay.” Then man—enlightened man—discovers that the sovereignty of God is not only the source of all redemption and the ground of all his glorying, but that this same truth is also the deepest and most potent motive power for victorious, truly great moral achievement.

This has been the glory and the boast and the power of genuine Calvinism, both before and after the Genevan Reformer who gave this truth its classic theological formulation. Caricatures there have ever been, and these caricatures have often gone parading under the beautiful name of Calvinism. But neither these caricatures nor the malicious dis-
tortions which its enemies have at times tried to pin upon this movement, should be confused with the genuine article.

There have been those who claimed vociferously that anyone believing in divine sovereignty was thereby cutting the nerve of all moral endeavor, but history itself is the most eloquent refutation of this baseless charge. There are still those who assert that belief in divine sovereignty in the realm of human redemption from sin makes that very redemption a practical impossibility. But both Scriptural teaching and Christian experience based upon man's freedom in the sense of his ability to save himself, is not to be confused with the denial of man's responsibility before the Living Sovereign God. The "logic" of human reason and the "logic" of the all-knowing mind and the profound heart of the Living God often conflict, but whenever they do, we may be sure that the puny "logic" of man is in error. When great crises are upon men; when the stark realities of life, stripped of all camouflage and tinsel, reappear; when man is thrown back upon his ultimate resources—that is the time when God reappears in the consciousness of man as the first and the last, as the all-sufficient, as the transcendant, as the God of sovereign grace, who redeems a sinner wholly, eternally, and to the uttermost. Then a Paul is born again on the way to Damascus and an Augustine sweeps all the cobwebs of human philosophizing aside by the response of his heart to the voice that says, "Tolle, lege!" Then a Luther emerges and a twenty-seven year old youth writes The Institutes.

This truth of the sovereignty of God, the keystone in the arch of the Christian system, must be rediscovered and restored if we would face life's elemental riddles, life's elemental passions, life's elemental miseries, life's elemental needs today.

There is, in more than one form, today apparent a return to this great truth. Perhaps this is too optimistic a statement. Perhaps as yet there is no general clear and intelligent reaffirmation of this truth outside of those groups which have kept the flame of the Reformed Faith burning throughout the centuries. And yet there is apparent in many circles and on the part of many leaders a groping after this truth. Perhaps the confession of the impotence and bankruptcy of all other ways of escape is more articulate than the reaffirmation of the old, yet ever new, truth of the sovereignty of God which alone can comfort the heart, give true vision to the intellect, and a lasting satisfying impulse to the will of modern man. However this may be, there can be no doubt that many recent utterances, both in the realm of scholarly thought and in the sphere of practical daily life with its blackouts, its blitzkrieg, its nihilism, loudly proclaim that there is no hope for man outside of return to the One Living Sovereign God Whom we know only through revelation. This more or less inarticulate cry must be met with the Gospel, the full-orbed Gospel, the Gospel of God's sovereign grace and of God's all-inclusive saving purpose, and of his all-comprehensive divine vocation to Christian living. Calvinistic institutions, Reformed churches, face a more glorious opportunity than has come to them in many decades. It was not a Calvinist, but rather a Liberal, who recently wrote these significant words: "Divine revelation and divine grace, as the ultimate ground of all human hope, are concepts which are destined to rise to new power in our thought and life. Pelagianism is going out; Augustinianism is coming in. I am saying to all my friends in the Presbyterian and Reformed Churches that this is a poor time for any of them, who inherit the Augustinian and Calvinistic faith in the sovereignty of God, to abandon it because of the rational paradoxes which it involves." (William Marshall Horton.)

This is a significant testimony. Even when we allow for the fact that it may be more of an historical judgment than a testimony of the heart, it is challenging to the highest degree. And what an indictment it is of the preaching and teaching and church life of many communions which bear the historically glorious name of Reformed or Presbyterian! Many leaders in Reformed Churches instead of glorying in, rather apologize for their name and their heritage.

Dr. John Newton Thomas, the Robert L. Dabney Professor of Systematic Theology at Union Theological Seminary, Richmond, Virginia, recently wrote an article under the title "The Sovereignty of God" whose two page introduction is more significant than the article itself. He imagines a visitor from Mars coming to his study with the pointed query on his lips: "I should like to know what is the cardinal principle of your theology in the Reformed churches." The response comes quickly: "The sovereignty of God." The Martian visitor then continues: "That is interesting, and I should like very much to hear your Presbyterian ministers as they preach on this great theme." Having been properly directed, he then goes out to listen to the preaching of Presbyterian ministers. After some months he returns to report that, though he has been visiting churches of the Presbyterian South for six months, he has not yet heard a sermon on the sovereignty of God. He continues: "I have heard many promotional sermons emphasizing the Christian's capacity for the tasks enjoined, I have heard evangelistic sermons, predicated on the ability to turn from sin, and others stressing responsibility for world conditions and the ability to mend them—if you should ask me, sir, I should say that the cardinal principle of the Presbyterian Church in the United States is the freedom of man." Somewhat perplexed, the Southern Presbyterian minister now walks over to his shelf, draws out a little black book, blows off the dust, thumbs for a moment through its yellowing pages, and then triumphantly presents...
to the man from Mars the Confession of Faith. After studying it for a moment, the visitor observes: "Yes, here it is," and then significantly continues, "but in my judgment, sir, if I may be permitted to say so, the convictions which are vital, the doctrines which are real, are the truths your prophets herald from the pulpit, the counsel your pastors whisper at the bedside of the sick and dying. I care nothing for a doctrine which reposes cadaverously in your Confession, however beautifully embalmed or perfect its state of preservation. I am interested, not in the dead, but in the living."

What a confession! What an indictment! And who can deny its truth? The admission made by this Southern Presbyterian professor applies to many more communions bearing the Reformed or Presbyterian name besides his own. The preaching of Reformed pulpits has in many cases become flabby, pale, colorless. From the sublime heights of divine sovereignty many church leaders, teachers as well as preachers, have slid down to preachers of a moralistic betterment-of-humanity type. And the tragedy of it all is that these things usually have their rise in the theological seminaries and colleges of the church, the very institutions where the flame of truth should have been kept burning in the midst of the darkness of humanism, of man-centered thinking and living, which has come over the modern world and, to a large extent, over the Christian church since the days of Kant and Hegel, of Schleiermacher and Ritschl.

These are days for a Renaissance of Reformed thought, a revival of Calvinistic theology. We need biblical, God-centered, consistently Christian scholarship and teaching in our institutions of learning, where the leadership for every other phase of life is trained. We need professors whose teaching is God-orientated, God-centered, and God-directed, and who will inspire young men for the ministry of the gospel that have caught the vision of the sovereign God of the Scriptures. This will be a new Renaissance and a new Reformation in one. This will lift the pulpit which now in many Protestant churches is both in contempt and in decay back to its former position of leadership, prophetic leadership, courageous leadership, fearless leadership, genuinely uplifting leadership. This also will involve a reformation in Christian living. It will mean the revival of personal piety, of family worship, of Sunday observance, of Christian education, of Christian ethics and morality. For a mighty revival of a biblical, living, vital, and experiential embracing of the sovereignty of God in thought and life!

Next to the pulpit—if so much as next to it—this revival of a vital faith in the sovereignty of God must begin in our educational institutions. As Dr. John E. Kuizenga has recently put it in an address before his alma mater, Hope College: "We need more of God on the campus." And I would like to add that the only way to have more of God on the campus is for each one who gives guidance on that campus to have not only an experiential knowledge of God in his own heart, but a scholarly, comprehensive, and fundamental grasp of the presuppositions and implications of the God-centered Christian world and life view whose original elements lie on the pages of Scripture, God's revelation. It is time we got rid of our pernicious dualisms in which we unciously parade "God" in chapel services, student YMCA and YWCA, and Christian student associations, and possibly in our promotional literature, but in which that same God is ignored, denied, and therefore repudiated in philosophy classrooms, in science laboratories, in lectures and textbooks on history, literature, sociology, economics, psychology, pedagogy, and art. This "atheistic" dualism must cease in our Christian educational institutions if Christ is to come to his own and God is to be recognized as God.

Have we of the Reformed faith possibly come to the kingdom for such a time as this? The realities of life allow for no boasting—only for a recognition of the gravity of the hour, the solemnity of the task, and the urgency of the opportunity.

C. B.

** Colleges Amid The Defense Program **

EDUCATIONAL leaders throughout America have become deeply concerned about the effects of the Defense Program upon the work of colleges. It has affected pronouncedly the numbers of students enrolled. Many have discontinued their studies in the college or have gone directly from high school into "the university of life." It has brought about a distinct shifting of students into those fields of interest that might effect a deferment from military services or that might enable them to secure a more favorable position when drafted.

Educators have been playing with all sorts of devices. Some would encourage the offering of a complete college course in three years, because most students become 21 in their fourth year of school when they are subject to a call for defense service. Others are contemplating recasting their entire curriculum so as to "git in" with the educational objectives of military service. And so they are getting "all worked up about the situation" in the face of the fact that from the authorities at Washington wise warnings have been issued to the effect that institutions must carry on as much as possible as heretofore.

One enterprising college president "question-naired" about five hundred colleges in order to find how large an enrollment is expected this Fall. No one knows, but over half of them expected a sharp decrease in the number of students that would appear for registration. It is expected that a very large number of young people will succumb to the lure of high wages that are now being offered by practically all the concerns that are utilized in the
promotion of the defense program. It is the war-time philosophy that is being developed, namely, that we must live and labor for the present emergency only. It is the Esau-principle by which he was prevailed upon to sell rich future values in order to satisfy a keenly felt present need.

Colleges will lose their high and distinctive calling when they forget that their work is essentially prophetic in character. It is their business not to prepare for the present primarily, but for a future of ten, twenty or more years hence in which properly adjusted living must be attained. That is the reason why educators cannot look with complacency upon a situation that calls young people away from the seat of learning to a seat in the office, in the factory, or upon the farm. That is the reason why they look with misgiving upon the tendency to drift to those courses that will help the students in being deferred from or preferred in the army service. A balanced country will call for trained men in other fields than in those of engineering, chemistry, and medicine. That is the reason too that they feel that a philosophy that seeks to satisfy only the immediate needs of man is so "animalistic," so inadequate. A broad cultured education that gives men a sound foundation that remains with them through life, coloring their view of things, helping their grasp of things and directing their approach to things is a value whose price is above rubies. Such a program calls for a sound, broad, and long-ranged philosophy. And only a college equipped with a basic Christian philosophy is equal to such a high and noble task.

H. S.

Can Christian America Be Allied With Ungodly Russia?

ANY a Christian takes his personal ethics seriously. He has, therefore, become confused by the way things are shaping themselves in world affairs. He is compelled as an American citizen to lend support to a government that has been attempting not only to overthrow the American system of government but is also committed, judging by its articulated doctrines and historical manifestations, to the eradication of Christianity. There are many evidences of the presence of radical Red representatives throughout America who are dedicated to these felonious purposes. We are asked to give sacrificially, until it hurts, so that that government may not in the present strife perish from the earth. Others, much more vociferous, are spouting their vituperations against the American leaders for allying with a government as ungodly and as subversive as that set forth by the Communists of Russia. And it certainly is not superfluous for a Christian to think through a situation in which he is asked to take up the cudgels for the side that represents ungodliness.

Nazism and Communism represent, judging by what they have been saying and doing, two mighty anti-Christian forces. But their methods of operation seem poles apart. True, Hitler has been using with a great deal of enthusiasm the method of propaganda, but its effectiveness has been limited pretty well by the territorial boundaries of the German Reich. Outside of the Reich the method has proved to be too slow and ineffective. Hitler preferred the sword to the pen. Not scholars but soldiers must do his work. Not ink but blood must win his converts. His was and is the method of ruthless military aggression. Stalin, however much his doctrine may call for bloody revolutions, has by and large used the other method. He found insidious propaganda most feasible. He works from within outward. He has his representatives scattered and stationed throughout the entire country, hawking his wares. This being a country which honors the principle of free speech, as well as free thought, it was admirably suited to the dominant Red method.

Now it is always good strategy to meet an antagonist in his own field with his own weapons. It is folly to use a pen against an enemy that comes with a dripping sword. It is ridiculous to meet bullets and bombs with pieces of printed paper. The latter may have a place in modern warfare, but its value, I fear, has been grossly over-evaluated. The method of education is altogether too slow, too uncertain and too inadequate. The Hitlerites will by the use of military force crush a nation within a week. It takes years to win a nation by literary weapons. That is the reason that the more immediate danger is from the side of the occupant of Germany's throne. To take care of that danger is our first job.

And whatever aid we may give to Russia must be regarded as being granted not so much that Communist Russia may be maintained as that Nazistic Germany may be crushed. It is a matter of joining hands against a military bully who threatens to immediate extinction any nation that dares to insist upon its national rights. True, it is a dangerous game that we are playing, but we must in self-defense play it. Meanwhile we must keep our minds alert, our eyes open, and our powder dry.

The fight against the Communism of Russia as it raises its ugly head in this country need not, indeed, must not be discontinued. In this particular battle at the present stage of warfare the power of the pen must be made manifest. Mind must be pitted against mind. Word against word. And any weakening in this fight will invite a defeat as crushing, even though not as swift as that which threatened the nations over-run by the Nazi juggernaut.

H. S.
PUBLIC opinion in the United States in respect to the second world war is slowly crystallizing into two well-defined positions which are diametrically opposed to each other. On the one hand we have those who are violently opposed to intervening in a conflict which is regarded by them as an Old-World affair. On the other hand we find those who are firmly convinced that the United States is not a mere spectator, but deeply involved in the issues that are fought on the battlefields of Europe, Asia, and Africa.

By the former group, which has senator Wheeler and Charles Lindbergh as its most outspoken advocates, the gospel of isolationism or non-intervention is loudly proclaimed, and through the “America First Committee” an extensive propaganda is carried on.

The opposite view is championed by our President and the most influential members of his cabinet, as well as by the standard bearer of the Republican party in the last election. It is also supported by most of the reputable newspapers in the country.

In both camps we find the opinion held ranging from a more moderate to an extreme position. When we seek to delve into the motives that underlie the position taken, we again find a wide variety, ranging from the most sordid motives imputed by raucous opponents, to the most idealistic ones, as the championing of the four “freedoms” by the President.

Notwithstanding the confusion caused by the fact that mere political expediency often dictates the utterances on the subject and much superpatriotic verboseness is a mere gloss, the issue is clearly drawn. Intervention or non-intervention is the fundamental issue. There is the real cleavage point in opinion.

It is self-evident that no Christian can remain aloof from the burning question of today. His position is not to be determined, however, by motives of political expediency, but by the eternal principles laid down in the Word of God. As Calvinists we have a world and life view which does not hesitate to express itself on all human relations and seeks to subject them to the glory of God as the ultimate purpose of human life. Does Calvinism have anything to say on the vital issue of today? Is it compatible with either non-intervention or its opposite? When we examine the historical position of Calvinism on this burning question, it becomes clearly evident that Calvinism is ranged very definitely on the side of a policy of intervention, and that from Calvin on all of its leading exponents have been outspoken in their condemnation of the policy of non-intervention.

It is my purpose in this article to present a brief survey of the opinions expressed by some of the leading exponents of Calvinistic thought upon the subject.

The Position of Calvin

In an excellent study (De Internationale Streekking van het Calvinisme) H. Koffyberg has shown the bearing of Calvinism upon international relations. A thorough study of John Calvin’s works and letters gives convincing evidence that the great Genevan reformer must be considered one of the fathers of modern European diplomacy and a strong advocate of a system of alliances and treaties as being divinely demanded for the interrelaton of Christian nations (p. 21). Calvin was a warm advocate of the policy of intervention as shown by his extensive correspondence with most of the crowned heads of Europe, and his advices in many of the armed conflicts of his own troubled times.

While adhering strongly to the stand that warfare is only the last resort for the settlement of conflicts, he accepts the right of a government to engage in warfare in a just cause (Institutes, Bk. IV, Ch. 20). On the basis of a study of the several commentaries and sermons of Calvin, Koffyberg concludes that Calvin emphasizes the fact that no nationalistic separation exists among the nations, but that among Christian nations at least, alliances and treaties for the maintenance of justice among themselves are not merely desirable, but mandatory, so that the policy of armed intervention is even possible and necessary (p. 28).

Groen and Abraham Kuyper

This basic position of John Calvin has been followed by leading Calvinists down to the present day. Many of them, because of influential positions held in the affairs of the Netherlands, can also qualify as experts in the realm of international polity.

Groen van Prinsterer was an outspoken opponent of the policy of non-intervention. This to him was a greater atrocity even than war, whereby the injustice committed by the larger nations against the smaller ones was made possible and left unpunished (Nederlandsche Gedachten). In discussing the possibility of intervention being desired not by...
a government, but by the people themselves, he allows that circumstances may make this permissible, as had been the case in France. But he goes even further and maintains that, even without being requested, armed intervention may be legitimate (Ongelooof en Revolutie, pp. 297, 298).

Abraham Kuyper in his programme for the Anti-Revolutionary party in the Netherlands does not devote a separate article to international relations as was done later by Colijn. His position, however, in respect to the question of intervention is based upon the recognition of a divine authority to which all governments are subject, and their duty to exalt the honor of God and to maintain the sanctity of justice inviolate. He conceives of the nations as being parts of a mighty whole, a community of nations, bound to a higher justice than that which is particular and national, called to a common task and subject to the ordinances of God (Ons Program, pp. 298 ff).

Kuyper complained bitterly that the Netherlands in several cases of unrighteous aggression had remained silent and become guilty of dishonorable inaction. This he considered contrary to the calling of the Netherlands in the European community of nations (pp. 308 ff).

The Position of a Professional Jurist

One of the outstanding contributions to the advancement of Calvinistic thought with respect to international relations has been furnished by an eminent jurist, Professor D. P. D. Fabius. In his Volkenrecht he shows that the policy of non-intervention is a product of the revolutionary theory of international law, which does not recognize any higher authority above the sovereign state, promotes an unhealthy extreme nationalism, and has considered solemn treaties mere scraps of paper, thus virtually annulling all international law. In positing the principles of a Calvinistic international law ("volkenrecht") he makes the policy of intervention one of its fundamental tenets. Without infringing on the sovereignty of the individual nation in matters of their own jurisdiction, he maintains the right to intervene. It does not mean that every power has the right to meddle in all foreign questions. But there are cases which give a state the authority or even impose the duty to assert itself with force in conflicts outside of its own territory (p. 85). He then cites a long list of writers on international jurisprudence who have favored the policy of intervention, and at the head of this list we find the father of international law, Hugo Grotius.

Fabius is in entire accord with Strauch, who like Groen van Prinsterer, takes his starting point in a community of nations ("statengemeenschap"). From this follows the right of intervention, and Strauch considers this the keystone of the entire international order and the controlling power of the terror of war. Intervention is warranted by any violation of justice. This same writer makes a distinction between cases where intervention has been requested, and those in which this is not the case. In the case where intervention is requested, the state whose aid is invoked is bound merely to ascertain if indeed a violation of the right has been committed. The question of a common danger which otherwise warrants intervention can be ignored entirely. The nation which requests intervention thereby shows that its international existence is threatened by the action of its opponent in violation of international law. And from the nature of the community of nations it follows that every state has the right to treat the existence of another state as a question of vital importance for the entire international order. When a war is begun without good cause, then, regardless of any request, intervention is justified. And the great powers who in such a case even refuse to accede to a request for intervention, are also deeply guilty of the violation of justice.

Fabius heartily endorses the position taken by Strauch, and concludes that in international law the starting point should be taken in the idea of a community of nations and the principles of justice which bind them together. "Instead of the principle of non-intervention," he concludes, "the right to intervention must be posited, which right can also become a duty" (p. 98).

Bavinck’s View

These writers have all laid emphasis on the fact that armed intervention cannot only be justified, but is also demanded, by the fact that the maintenance of righteousness should be the highest aim of all governments. This is the task which has been entrusted to the authorities. This view is also clearly set forth by Bavinck. (De Navolging van Christus en het Moderne Leven, pp. 31ff.). In his Christendom, Oorlog, Volkenbond he makes a plea for a better understanding among the nations and advocates a sound internationalism. He also welcomes the League of Nations, despite its inherent weaknesses, as an attempt to promote cooperation among the nations. In his support of the League we find his example followed by other staunch Calvinists in the Netherlands, some of whom, as Colijn and V. H. Rutgers, have rendered eminent service to the League.

Bavinck maintains that war may only be waged in the service of righteousness, to safeguard the high spiritual and moral goods which otherwise would be lost. For these goods an individual and a nation must be willing to risk their lives, for they exceed in value all other treasures (p. 10). Bavinck is averse to a double standard of morality: one for the citizens and another for the government. According to Christian standards a state can also become a robber and a murderer (p. 67).
The Principle of Solidarity

The Calvinistic conception that the nations together form a community, a higher unity which has its own peculiar rights and duties, is based upon the scriptural view that the entire human race constitutes a unity. This organic unity of the human race is the result of its descent from one man, or one human pair created by God. By divine intervention, when man became disobedient to God, diversification in various races and tongues was brought about. This clearly shows that separate and distinct nations are ordained of God. But the fact must never be lost sight of, that they form a higher unity. Their relations can never be determined therefore merely by what is the right of the sovereign state; above them is the ordinance of God.

It clearly follows, as Anema points out, that the view that the state cannot be bound except by its own will is untenable. Alongside the sphere of its own sovereignty there is a communal sphere in which it is bound even against its will by general principles of justice and right (Schrift en Historie, p. 228).

The fact that there is no higher power above the nations except God, no super-state which exercises authority in the sphere of the interrelation between nations, and to which the question of sovereignty in this sphere might be referred, places the community of nations directly under the ordinances of God. The inescapable conclusion in respect to the question of intervention is that justice must be maintained, even if armed force should become necessary. According to G. M. den Hartogh every government is bound to oppose all illegal violence if needs be with united show of force (Christelijke Encyclopedie, Vol. V, p. 623).

The Position of Former Premier Colijn

This conviction has led the Anti-Revolutionary Party in the Netherlands to adopt as one of the planks in their platform the following article: “In regard to the relation with other nations it (i.e. the party) teaches that these too are governed by the ordinances which God has instituted over the nations; that accordingly together with the unalterable maintenance of our own national independence, there must be an energetic cooperation in the development of the right of the community of nations (“statengemeenschap”) and thereby in the peaceful settlement of conflicts between the nations, as well as the prevention, if needs be with armed force, of all unrighteous exercise of force, and in the development of a living together and working together of the nations, consistent with justice and righteousness of the peoples”.

In this article the Calvinistic state party in the Netherlands clearly adopts the principle of intervention as one of its policies. In the brilliant exposition of this article in the program of the Anti-Revolutionary party given by Colijn in his Saevis Tranquillus in Undis the historical position of Calvinism in regard to the policy of intervention is clearly maintained. His conclusion is that every state has the right to decide and regulate all questions that concern itself exclusively, but that in all questions that concern the community of nations international law must be maintained. This may involve intervention, and so Colijn considers that for the maintenance of peace and the execution of justice war is justifiable, when all other means have been exhausted and proven useless (p. 456).

This same position is taken by another eminent Dutch author, C. Smeenk, in his monumental work on social principles (Christelijk-Sociale Beginselen).

Divine Righteousness the Prime Consideration

In the present crisis in world affairs which our country faces, the voice of Calvinism is heard in no uncertain tones. According to the Calvinistic conception of international law non-intervention stands condemned. A scriptural view of the relation between states clearly teaches a joint responsibility for the maintenance of justice and righteousness in the world. Not human life but divine righteousness must be the prime consideration. God has entrusted to the powers that rule a sword not merely to maintain law and order within the borders of their own domain, but also within the realm of the nations as a community, where only God is sovereign.

In conclusion I would like to quote on this question a man who has devoted much of his time and talents to the study, interpretation, and teaching of Calvinism. Dr. H. H. Meeter in his Calvinism writes as follows: “A specific application of this moral principle (i.e., the Golden Rule) concerns the problem of intervention and non-intervention. May and should a State intervene in the affairs of another State when basic human interests, such as religious liberty, or the possession of life and property are jeopardized? Many have answered this question in the negative, and have maintained a policy of strict non-intervention. While from a practical point of view such a policy may seem expedient, because it enables a nation to escape difficulties for itself, from the Christian point of view a policy of absolute non-intervention stands condemned. God has made of one blood all nations of the earth, and they together form one family. We may not excuse ourselves from the obligation of intervention when basic rights are trampled on by tyrannous governments, by adopting the attitude of Cain: ‘Am I my brother’s keeper?’”

This is the historical view of Calvinism, the scriptural view on the policy of intervention.
Marriage and Its Corruption

"Bitterness is in the cup of the best of love: thus doth it cause longing for the Superman, thus doth it cause thirst in thee, the creating one! "Thirst in the creating one, arrow and longing for the superman: tell me, my brother, is this thy will to marriage? "Holy call I such a will, and such a marriage." "Thus spake Zarathustra."

-NIETZSCHE.

"And God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them."

-GEN. 1:27.

"And Jehovah God said, it is not good that man be alone; I will make him a helpmeet for him."

-GEN. 2:18.

HUMAN marriage!

What is its meaning?

For the benefit of the generations of men the sages of the world have given their answers, and savants have uttered their opinions. Still, the question persists, for there is no agreement in the answers. But, one thing has become clear, namely, that marriage is a mystery, often also a paradox.

It raises the buoyancy of the young man and gives joyous content to the dreams of young maidens. It has been the inspiration for the lyrics of ancient bards and for the idyls of modern poets. But it also was, and is, a cause for the cursing and swearing of mariners, soldiers, and workers; and a bubbling fountain of mockery as well as a scorching flame of cynicism. Cradle of noble deeds that give endurance in deepest tragedy, it is a source, alike, of serenest joy and profoundest grief. It supplies the ugliest gutter of human life with rotting, lewsome filth and, at the same time, gives drive and content to sculpture, painting, literature, poetry, and music. It is a cause of suicide and the means for the endless recurrence of life. Marriage on the one hand enthrals the head-hunter of Borneo and the Bushman of South Africa as well as the courtier in Europe's palaces while at the same time it is a vexing problem for the philosopher and scientist, the despair of the psychologist, a persistent annoyance for the social worker.

But, enough.

The question of our soul craves utterance.

Marriage, What Art Thou?

Nietzsche attempted an answer to the question. But as with almost all real philosophy so it is with Nietzsche's, it is so near and still so endlessly far from the truth. Marriage, he said, is the longing, sustained by the will to create the Superman.—How far this penetrates beyond the platitudes on Marriage with which literature, even much Christian literature, abounds.—But, we ask, when marriage has produced the Superman, what further purpose can it serve? None, as far as we can see. According to the implications of such a philosophy marriage would become meaningless and bound to disappear.

Besides, notwithstanding its profundity, Nietzsche's conception is essentially pagan. His Superman is his God. The will to produce the Superman by means of human marriage implies in final analysis that man must produce God. This is the most perverted conception of marriage we have met.

We find infinitely profounder teaching as to the nature and purpose of this institution in Scripture. According to it, human marriage is not a means to produce the Superman or God, but to enable man to be the image of God for the purpose of reflecting His majesty, beauty and glory in knowledge, righteousness, and holiness. This leaves man the creature of God. Thus God is his and he not God's creator.

Man the Image of God

Genesis informs us that at the dawn of creation God said, "Let us make man in our image and likeness." These words are often interpreted to mean that man is the bearer of God's image. That would, of course, imply that the image of God is not the essence of man's nature but something added. Such an interpretation leads to the misunderstanding of human marriage, since the latter is most vitally linked up with the fact that man is the image of God. Our view of the one must of necessity influence our conception of the other. Misunderstanding the one we misunderstand the other.

It is of the very essence of man to be the image of God. He is that. That is the goal and purpose of his existence, of his life, of Life itself. To be that is religion, the most vital part of man's existence, of man's being and nature.

After God had shaped the lump of clay into a human form He breathed into the nostrils and it became a living soul. The breathing of God is the sending forth of the Holy Spirit. Therefore, when God breathed into this clay, the Holy Spirit descended into it and created a heart and soul in it.
which in turn became a dwelling place for the Holy Spirit. Hence Adam, now a living soul, through the work of the Holy Spirit, was Spirit-inspired, Spirit-filled, Spirit-possessed, Spirit-controlled. Naturally, under such conditions the impress of the Holy Spirit upon Adam's soul was incisive. That impress was the image of God.

The masterpiece of an artist is in a very real sense a reflection or an image of the artist. It is a reflection of his soul, of his mind, of his understanding, and of his interpretation of the world. It gives him great delight to behold that reflection of himself. The beholding of it gives content and direction to his self-contemplation. And his contemplation of self, again, quickens his consciousness of self, which leads him to say, "I am." With this "I am" he reaches the very acme of joy in his own existence.

God created heaven and earth. He created man, the crown of creation, His masterpiece. The latter was His image in the most real sense of the word. He called it "very good." These words, "very good," were vibrant with the joy of God in the beholding of His self-reflection which led to self-contemplation and hence to the experience of "I AM" in the absolute sense which is the essence of being, of Personal (I) Being (Am).

Consequently, man, being the image of God, is a source of joy to God. This joy of God gives content to man's life and purpose to his existence. Man rejoices because God has joy in him. God has joy in man because man has joy in God. And so this cyclical process will go on through all eternity.

Man beholds in himself the image of God. An image is a means whereby we know him whose image it is. Because he himself is the image of God, man through spiritual introspection has intimate knowledge of that image and from that ascends to the knowledge of God. Such knowledge is eternal life for man, for Christ has said, "And this is life eternal, that they should know thee, the only true God, and him whom thou didst send, even Jesus Christ."

To be the image of God, then, is the task of man, it is his joy, it means knowledge of God for him. It is Life Eternal. But most important is that as His image he is an object of joy for God.

**Marriage for the Image of God**

Growth and development through activation and exercise is a law for human life. Genesis clearly indicates that the life of Adam as the image of God was also subject to that law. But how is the image of God to be activated and developed?

Soon after God had created Adam, perhaps on the same day, God said, "It is not good that man should be alone, I will make him a help meet for him." Then the Lord brought the animals in pairs to Adam. Comparison of his own situation with that of the animals made Adam conscious of his loneliness and evoked a desire for companionship.

This "not good" must not be taken as an indication that God now discovered that His work was incomplete. Nor must we consider the creation of the woman as an afterthought of God, but rather as the completion of a plan previously conceived. With the words, "It is not good that man should be alone," God announces that His image is still incomplete but that He is now going to finish it. They indicate the absolute necessity of marital companionship for man. Marriage, in other words, fills a specific need in the life of man, it is an integral part of man as God's creation.

Gen. 1:27 reads, "And God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them." Scripture makes mention here of two facts, the one that man is created as the image of God, the other that he is created male and female. The close juxtaposition of these facts suggests to us that they are intimately related. The two are united in one act, creation. The image of God, man, proceeds as male and female from the creating act of God. As male and female man is the image of God. This is the same as saying that man is the image of God in marriage. Further, in Gen. 2:18 it is stated that it is not good that the man should be alone. God took away that aloneness by the creation of male and female, i.e., marriage. By marriage, therefore, that which was not good was made good. We are forced to conclude that marriage is good for the image of God, that it belongs to it, that it is a vital element of it.

Adam's task, then, is to be God's image. The woman is to be a help for him in the performance of this task. She is "meet" to be his help for she, too, is God's image. But how is she his help?

The Trinity is one in essence and three in person, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. Scripture abounds in passages that indicate vital, personal, and social intercourse between the three persons of the Trinity. It is natural to conclude that to be the image of God man also must have vital, personal, and social intercourse. It is the woman who makes this possible and therefore she is a help for man. She is a help "meet" for him. She is all this in marriage.

Social intercourse within the Trinity is of a supremely vital, intimate nature because the three persons are one in essence, one in being. This oneness of being is the root and mainspring of this vital, social intercourse between the three. If man is to reflect this social intercourse within the Trinity his social intercourse must also be of a supremely vital and intimate nature and must therefore be rooted in one-ness of being and essence. This oneness is to be found in the fact that man is male and female, i.e., in marriage. Such also is the profounder meaning of the words Adam spoke when he beheld Eve saying, "This is bone of my bones and flesh of my flesh."
Roman Catholicism teaches that only the man is the image of God. Others hold that the man and the woman individually and independently from one another are the image of God. There is a measure of truth in the latter view. However, both are incorrect. The woman as well as the man is the image of God but that image is incomplete in them as individuals. It must be completed in the vital relationship of husband and wife, i.e., in marriage.

Our conclusion is that marriage is an institution created by God in which the Lord brings man and woman together in oneness of life for the purpose of activating and developing the image of God in intimate, social, i.e., marital, intercourse.

The Corruption of Marriage

Sin entered the world. It wrought havoc with God’s creation, including man, the image of God. Man lost that image, or rather, he tore it out of his soul and cast it from him. There was now no need, not even a possibility to activate and develop the image of God through the social intercourse of marriage. What isn’t there cannot be developed. And so marriage became superfluous, purposeless, meaningless. No matter what unregenerated men and women may attempt or do for the non-Christian it remains ultimately an unsatisfactory and, what is worse, often a dissatisfactory institution.

We do not deny, of course, that God does give His common grace to non-believers, and that therefore the image of God in the broader sense is left in unregenerated man. This, indeed, makes a modicum of marital happiness and joy possible for the unbeliever.—We hope to say more about this in a subsequent article.—Fact is, however, that for the non-Christian it remains ultimately an unsatisfactory and, what is worse, often a dissatisfactory institution.

Actual conditions justify these conclusions. Consider the divorce situation. One out of every six marriages in the U.S.A. ends in the divorce courts. What is the meaning of this? We are vitally connected with a Christian denomination among the membership of which divorce is less than one percent. There are other groups of churches of which the same can be said. Among the Roman Catholics divorce occurs also at a much lower rate. This implies that inside the church the divorce rate is much lower than one out of six. The logical conclusion is that therefore it must be much higher outside of the pale of the church. It seems to us that we may safely say that among those with no or loose church connections, and that includes at least half of our nation, one out of every four marriages breaks up in divorce. But that is not the whole of the picture. There is also a large group for whom divorce for several reasons is out of the question, although they desire it as much as those who can afford it. Next, we must remember that there is a large percentage of matter-of-fact marriages with no severe tension, it is true, but also void of real happiness. Biological drive and sexual attraction are often interpreted as love, and in a measure they do bind, but, when the God-created physical race-impulse has been obeyed and satisfied, marriage, for many, becomes merely something between a convenient arrangement for physical comfort and a burden to be gotten rid of if possible. These facts teach us plainly that marriage has been ruined and for many has become utterly meaningless and lacking the real God-ordained purpose.

Mighty thinkers have given much thought to marriage. They, too, are asking what is the meaning of this institution. They give an amazing and bewildering variety of answers. Here are a few taken at random. Count Keyserling says that marriage is a phase of the cosmic rhythm of tension between two opposite cosmic poles. Schopenhauer regards marriage and love as the desire of the next generation to spring into existence. Ellen Key views it as an institution for the continuation and the improvement of the race. Mary Austin calls it the soul maker. Extreme socialists and radicals cry, “Do away with marriage for it is the means for producing cannon fodder and cheap labor.” Psychoanalysts, biologists, sociologists, etc., all have a different definition for this institution, whereas on the other hand many equally able writers refrain altogether from telling us what marriage really is.

What may be the reason that there is so much dissatisfaction with marriage and why cannot students agree as to the meaning and nature of marriage? The answer is that outside of real Christianity the institution of marriage has lost its meaning and purpose. That is the reason why the institution, or rather, the shell of it, leaves man dissatisfied and cannot be accurately described. It proves our contention that marriage has been corrupted.

In our next article we hope to show that Christ has restored the institution which we now in distinction from corrupted marriage call Christian Marriage. We also intend to discuss the nature and character of Christian Marriage.

God’s All-Embracing Grace

Every man is born depraved and helpless; Naught of good dare any mortal claim. We would all be under condemnation Unless we called the mighty Savior’s name.

All this side the lake of fire is mercy, Every drop of water is God’s grace; Every breath of air His lavish kindness, Every sunbeam radiance from His face.

All earth’s souls are blessed by His forbearance; To the very least His good is given; And to this for His redeemed are added All of the eternal joys of heaven.

—VERNA SMITH TEEWISSEN.
Calvinism and Scientific Method

In The Banner of November 9, 1939, an article appeared from the pen of Dr. C. Van Til of Westminster Seminary, Philadelphia, under the caption "A Calvin University," in which he raised the question of the validity of the current scientific method for a Calvinistic University. Asks Dr. Van Til: "If we had a Calvin University would we wish the faculty of that institution to engage in their research and teaching in accordance with current scientific methodology?" This question elicited considerable discussion in The Banner and also The CALVIN FORUM on the subject of proper procedure in scientific pursuit.

What is this commonly accepted procedure adopted by scientists today? It is presented by Dr. Van Til as involving three assumptions, or three 'fatal steps',—fatal, asserts Dr. Van Til, with respect to the Christian position. The first step is the assumption that the "object of science", to use Dr. Abraham Kuyper's terminology, i. e., the whole universe as field of investigation for the scientist, consists of brute facts,—facts that are as yet uninterpreted. The universe of fact, i.e., the totality of existence, has meaning, to be sure, but it is the scientist's task to search out this meaning. However, in his investigation from beginning to end he may not be biased in favor of some preconceived interpretation of the universe or of the facts with which he is dealing. To be biased at the outset would not be scientific. He must arrive at his conclusions on the basis of his findings. His bias would tend to determine his conclusions from the outset, or if his bias should be wrong it will only hinder his investigation and prolong his search; therefore a first requisite for the scientist is that he remain neutral with respect to all interpretations and that he view the object of his investigation as being uninterpreted. The second step in this scientific procedure is the assumption that theoretically any hypothesis is as good as any other in seeking to explain the facts we are investigating. We must seek that hypothesis which to our understanding best explains the facts we have observed. The third step is to test the truth of whatever hypothesis we adopt by experience, i.e., by further empirical investigation or experiment. This third step demands that we continue our experimentation until we are convinced that the hypothesis we have adopted, and no other, best explains the facts in question.

The question is, what must be the Christian's attitude toward this scientific mode of procedure? Can he consistently use this method without ultimately doing violence to his Christian faith? Or, if this method is applied consistently, must it inevitably lead to the rejection of the Christian position? Or, may it possibly be true that the Christian in his scientific pursuits, not only may, but must, use this scientific method within its proper limits and bounds, to arrive at the secrets of the universe in so far as these may be known? We believe our last question states the truth more precisely. We shall have to explain what we mean by the Christian's use of the scientific method within its proper limits and bounds.

In the pursuit of science we must differentiate between the empirical aspect and the interpretative aspect of science. The empirical aspect is descriptive in character; while its interpretative aspect is philosophic in character. The empirical aspect of science engages in experimentation, in weighing, measuring, analyzing, etc., its object, to determine its nature or to arrive at an understanding of its existence and mode of operation. The interpretative aspect of science seeks to arrive at the meaning of things and of the universe of which these are a part. Whence is this universe? How is it sustained? What is its destination? Whence comes evil, and what is its nature? Such, and similar, are the questions it seeks to answer. Science as a whole includes both these aspects. It is true that the term 'science' is often used by many as referring only to its empirical aspect; but it is equally true that a 'science' this is worthy of the name cannot be satisfied with mere observation and description.

It is this empirical aspect of science that places the first limitation upon the Christian's use of the current scientific method. His use of the scientific method must be limited to this aspect of science. But it is within this bound that he is not only permitted to use the scientific method in his inductive studies, but here he must use it in order to be scientific. In the field of empiricism, wherever the object of his study is unknown to him, the Christian scientist stands on a par with the non-Christian scientist. Both face the unknown; by investigation and experiment both seek an understanding of their object; and only one scholarly procedure is open to both. Inasmuch as the object of their search is unknown to both, whether they like it or not, they must assume it to be a "brute"—i.e., uninterpreted—fact, the meaning of which they are seeking. As they proceed to investigate their object, both must...
assume the theoretical relevancy of any hypothesis. They cannot very well do otherwise. Finally, it is evident that both the Christian and non-Christian scientist can only test the truth of the hypothesis they have formed by further experiment.

The following illustration may serve to bring out our meaning when we say that there is only one scholarly procedure that is open to both the Christian and the non-Christian scientist in so far as they deal with the purely empirical aspect of science. A garage owner has two mechanics in his employ. The one is a Christian, the other is not. The employer wishes to test the mechanical skill and intelligence of his two employees. He therefore makes some maladjustment on his car so that after a short drive the motor will stall. Both employees are completely ignorant of the maladjustment that has been made by the owner. Their employer now takes both in his car for a drive to see who of the two will by and by most readily analyze the source of trouble. It is clear that at the outset this stalled motor, caused by the maladjustment, is a brute fact for both of them, i.e., at the outset it is unknown, uninterpreted for them. For the employer it is not a brute fact, to be sure, for he knows the nature of the trouble and its attendant meaning. But for his employees the source of trouble is unknown and they must proceed to search for it. It will be clear that for both there is only one way to arrive at the nature of the trouble, viz., by investigation and experiment. Both will immediately, as they view the situation, form their own opinion, idea, or hypothesis what it may possibly be. But theoretically one hypothesis is as good as another. They can only check up on them by experiment. The fact that one is a Christian and the other is not, makes not a particle of difference in their scientific procedure with respect to this purely empirical aspect of the stalled automobile. Nor does it make a particle of difference for them that for the owner this is not a brute fact, so long as they themselves do not know. All that remains for both is to investigate what the source of trouble may be. The meaning of this stalled motor car and its pre-interpretation by the owner is, of course, an entirely different matter. We shall say a word about that later when we speak of the interpretative aspect of science.

In a similar way the universe, i.e., the totality of existence, presents itself to Christian and non-Christian alike as an object for their investigation in order to arrive at a knowledge of the nature of its existence and of the laws of its operation. Both follow the same scientific procedure, viz., the inductive method, in seeking to know its secrets. Man, in his scientific pursuits, is knowingly or unknowingly obeying the divine injunction: to have dominion over the earth and to subdue it. To the Creator this universe is pre-interpreted, to be sure; He Himself has given it its meaning. But to man many of its secrets are not yet known; and these secrets both the Christian and the non-Christian must seek to know by this one scientific procedure which is open to both.

The Christian’s use of the scientific method has a second limitation placed upon it. His use of it must be limited first of all, as we have just pointed out, to the empirical aspect of scientific pursuit. But a second limitation is placed upon his use of it, also within this empirical realm of science, by all that has been divinely revealed to him in the Bible about the universe or its parts. It must be plain that in every case where God has revealed a certain truth about anything in His universe, man may not assume that to be a brute or uninterpreted fact. Neither may he, to that same extent, assume the theoretical relevancy of any hypothesis. This would be to ignore the truth God has revealed to him about that object. This could no longer be classed as scientific procedure for the Christian; for true scientific procedure may never ignore any truth that is known about an object. It would be just as unscientific for the Christian to ignore the truth God has revealed to him about any object as it would be for both the Christian and the non-Christian to ignore in their further scientific pursuits facts or truths about something that have already previously been demonstrated to be such. Such ignoring of truth would be folly. It would spell death for true scientific progress. No one of sound mind will ignore a truth which he accepts about something, regardless whether this truth has been revealed to him by another or whether he has discovered it himself. The non-Christian scientist will, of course, not accept any truth about an object that comes by way of divine revelation; but that is a different matter which does not concern us now. The point here is that the Christian, in the empirical aspect of science, is limited in his use of the scientific method also by whatever God has revealed about an object. Whatever God has spoken the Christian may not ignore, nor assume a neutral attitude toward it.

Let us again illustrate our point. The non-Christian anthropologist in his scientific study of man at the outset does not know whether man has only body, or is constituted of soul and body. What the nature of man is he seeks to determine by his investigation applying his scientific method. However, divine revelation leaves no doubt for the Christian that man is constituted of body and soul. Accepting this divinely revealed truth about man therefore, the Christian can not, and may not, assume that man possibly has no soul. Here he is limited in his use of the scientific method by the truth God has revealed to him about his object.

Strictly speaking, one might perhaps say that this can hardly be called a limitation of the use of the scientific method. It would perhaps be more correct to say that wherever divine revelation has spoken, we need no longer apply the scientific method. Our search ends, or rather, it is not even begun where the truth about an object is revealed to us. Though the Christian and non-Christian differ in their accep-
tance of truth, it holds for the non-Christian also that he need not apply his scientific method to that which is already known to him.

Be it said, then, with respect to the empirical aspect of science that wherever God has not specifically revealed to us anything about the object of our investigation the Christian and non-Christian scientist alike must use the scientific method in seeking to arrive at a knowledge of the universe. The Christian and non-Christian have in common this one universe as the object of their investigation. In this universe there are many things, the nature of which, its laws and operations, God has not revealed to His children. This realm is the realm which is already known to him.

At a single glance, the empirical realm of science, it remains to turn our attention to arrive at a knowledge of the universe. The Christian and non-Christian have in common this one universe as the object of their investigation. In this universe there are many things, the nature of which, its laws and operations, God has not revealed to His children. This realm is the realm which is already known to him.

Having seen, then, that within certain limits and bounds the Christian as well as the non-Christian must use the current scientific method in the empirical realm of science, it remains to turn our attention to this method as applied to the interpretative aspect of science. This aspect of science, as we have seen, is philosophic in character. It concerns itself with meanings and interpretations. It aims at a unified conception of the universe, for the construction of which the various branches of sciences must contribute their respective parts. It results in a world and life view. It is to this aspect of science that the Christian cannot apply current scientific methodology. Already with respect to the empirical aspect of science we have seen the Christian's scientific method restricted by certain bounds and limitations; but with respect to the interpretative aspect of science the Christian's procedure must be guided entirely by God's special Revelation. Unless he so restricts himself it will lead ultimately to the rejection of Christianity, as Dr. Van Til has rightly and unwaveringly maintained in his Banner articles.

It is here that Dr. Van Til's main contention, or major premise, viz., that there are no brute or uninterpreted facts but that all facts are God-interpreted, has special force (see his article, "Facts", Banner, Feb. 16, 1940). The interpretative aspect of science allows for no neutral zone. This cannot be stated too emphatically. It is here that Dr. Van Til's illustration of 'Eve's neutrality' and its tragic effect for the human race is very much to the point. (Cf. article "A Calvin University", Banner, Nov 9, 1939.) Everything in the universe has meaning. Everything has been divinely pre-interpreted by God who alone has given all facts their meaning. The whole universe is the product of God's creative thought. In His providence He directs all to a certain pre-determined end. This God has plainly revealed in His Special Revelation. The Christian may never lose sight of this. To assume, in the face of these divinely-revealed truths, that the universe of fact is brute fact and has not been pre-interpreted by anyone, involves a flat denial of the most important truths God has revealed to us about the universe of fact, and would indeed be a most unscientific procedure for the Christian. It would lead to a denial of his Christian faith, as Dr. Van Til rightly contends. By such an assumption which is contrary to fact, as the Bible reveals this to us, he would rule out the God of the Scriptures at the very outset and he would consistently end up without Him. Man, by searching cannot find out God! The result at best would be a most distorted conception of the universe which would not be truth but falsehood.

We now return to our illustration of the maladjusted stalled motor car. To be sure the stalled automobile was not a brute fact, i.e., uninterpreted and meaningless to the owner. He had pre-interpreted the whole affair. Nor was it a brute fact, in the sense of meaningless, for the two employes. It might conceivably mean very much for them. But that in itself had no bearing upon the empirical method which they must follow to detect the source of trouble. The only common sensible procedure was to experiment until they had found the source of trouble to their own complete satisfaction. But it is apparent that the matter becomes entirely different when they seek to understand the meaning of this entire affair. There is only one correct meaning of it, viz., the meaning the owner has given to it. But if at the outset they should assume that this stalled motor is a brute fact, absolutely uninterpreted beforehand by any one, the owner included, —as current scientific method proposes to do in its procedure to interpret the universe,— how then can these mechanics ever arrive at its proper meaning? In their own minds they ruled out to begin with the possibility of knowing its true meaning for them, when they assumed the whole affair to be a brute fact,—uninterpreted by anyone. So also the assumption of brute fact precludes the Christian interpretation of God and the world.

Similarly, it would seem that the assumption of brute-fact if consistently carried out in scientific methodology precludes any unified construction of the universe whatever. The universe may be pantheistically construed or otherwise, by the non-Christian, but whatever construction of it is given by him, that same construction will be the underlying assumption that lies beneath the assumption of brute fact. This, of course, is inconsistent with the assumption of brute-fact. It may be pointed out, as it seems to us, that right here is to be found the inconsistency of non-Christian science with its own methodology, applied to the interpretative aspect of science. Does not Dr. Van Til also suggest this inconsistency in non-Christian science with its own methodology when he says: "In my humble judgment the current scientific method is based upon the assumption of the truth of a non-Christian conception of reality and can in consequence never conclude that Christianity is true unless it is prepared to deny its own principles." (Banner, Nov. 9, 1939.)
It is plain that Calvinism has a very direct bearing on the question of scientific method. It cannot assume a neutral attitude toward this question. Calvinism holds to a God-centered world and life view. He is the center of all things. The true meaning of things cannot be sought apart from God. Calvinism does not allow the assumption of brute-fact in the absolute sense. It holds that God is the Creator of the universe, and as such he sustains it by His Providence, and is guiding it to His own predetermined end. He has pre-interpreted every fact from the smallest to the greatest. All things are the unfolding of the counsel of His will. In his Special Revelation God has revealed to us many basic truths with respect to the totality of existence, and it is in the light of these revealed truths and consistent with them that the Christian must pursue his study of the great works of God.

The Ethics of War

The Teaching of Scripture

If there was ever a pertinent time for a discussion on the ethics of war, that time is the present. This is especially true in America where our leaders are faced with the problem of determining what place we shall take in regard to the present world conflict. And as Christians we must strive to make our nation formulate its policies in the light of God's Word.

Historically, all views upon the ethics of war have been located somewhere between the extremes of militarism and pacifism, the former claiming that heavy armaments and military aggression are both justifiable and desirable, while the adherents of the latter theory refuse to sanction or to participate in any war, regardless of its occasion or justification. In both of these camps there have been those who sought to find a Scriptural basis for their position. And yet if we examine the Scriptures we find that they do not in any way condone either extreme. The position of the Christian citizen must lie somewhere in between the extremes of militarism and pacifism. Let us briefly examine the teaching of Scripture on the ethics of war.

War in the Old Testament

The Old Testament tells us a great deal about war. We find that war had a deeply religious significance for God's people, the children of Israel. Jehovah Himself often commanded the Israelites to enter into battle with their enemies, and He led them to victory. Moses and the children of Israel even sang at the close of their escape from Pharaoh's hosts, “Jehovah is a man of war: Jehovah is His name” (Ex. 15:3). Israel was accompanied by the priests when they fought, who reminded them that Jehovah was their strength and that He would conquer the foe for them (Deut. 20:1-4). Furthermore, Israel entered into combat with sacrificial rites, as is exemplified in Samuel's offering before the battle with the Philistines (I Sam. 7:8-10). In this sense the prophets spoke of sanctifying war, which was for them an act of preparation (Jer. 6:4; 22:7; 51:27, 28; Mic. 3:5; Joel 3:9). The Old Testament teaches very clearly that Jehovah works out His purposes in history by means of wars, punishing the ungodly nations and chastising His covenant people.

But while the Old Testament does not condemn war, neither does it cater to a bloodthirsty militarism. Let it not for a moment be supposed that God commanded the children of Israel to attack righteous nations wantonly. The sins of the neighboring nations of Israel were an abomination unto the Lord and called to heaven for just punishment. Just as God Himself destroyed Sodom and Gomorrah because of their iniquity, so too He called upon His people to destroy their ungodly and blasphemous neighbors. In such just wars Jehovah assured His people of the victory. But when Israel fought contrary to the commands of God—when she engaged in unjust warfare—she was smitten and put to shame (Num. 14:39-45). Moreover, war was certainly not glorified as such. David, the outstanding warrior of the Old Testament, was forbidden to build the temple because he was a man of war. War was purely an instrument in the hands of God for the execution of justice.

No Pacifism in the Old Testament

Before we pass on from the Old Testament teachings on war, we must comment on a few passages which are appealed to by the pacifists. The latter make the claim that the sixth commandment, “Thou shalt not kill,” prohibits all war. This, however, is clearly not the case. Long before the Israelitish period, God had said, “Whose sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed” (Gen. 9:6). In other words, God commanded that murder shall be punished by death. But this does not mean that the judge who must sentence the murderer to death is himself guilty of murder. To affirm this would be to deny the possibility of maintaining justice. In other words, the judge is within his rights because he represents the state, to which God has delegated the task of maintaining justice. Certain things are both permissible and necessary for the state with its peculiar function, which in the hands of the individual would be both sinful and disastrous with respect to the maintenance of public morality.
sixth commandment, however, is addressed to the individual and not to the state. Hence, it by no means teaches pacifism.

It has also been contended that the eighth century prophets teach pacifism. Of course, they did condemn wars of aggression. And at times they even counseled Israel not to wage defensive war. The prophets, however, intended to teach that it was sinful to rely upon force of arms to the exclusion of trust upon Jehovah. “Woe to them that go down to Egypt for help, and rely on horses, and trust in chariots because they are many, and in horsemen because they are very strong, but they trust not unto the Holy One of Israel, neither seek Jehovah!” (Isa. 31:1). Passages such as this one do not teach that all war is wrong, but rather that trust in Jehovah is of primary importance and must not be overshadowed by trust in arms. Moreover, when we look at the prophetic teachings in their totality rather than at isolated passages, we find that they are far from pacifistic.

The Significance of Romans 13

In the New Testament there are no direct teachings on the subject of war. This does not mean, however, that the New Testament is indifferent on the matter. It does mean that Christ and His disciples assumed the Old Testament to be sufficiently explicit on the subject. Scripture is an organic whole: Christ came not to supplant but to fulfill the teachings of the Old Testament. Christ and the apostles regarded Scripture as divinely inspired, The guarantee of the truth was for them contained in the words, “It is written.” We must remember that Christ cannot be divorced from the rest of Holy Writ. To accept Him implies an acceptance of the Old Testament.

While the New Testament does not deal with war directly, it does lay down some vitally related principles. Romans 13:1-7 teaches that civil governments are divinely established institutions, and that as such, they are coworkers with God in the punishment and restraint of sin. They are a terror to those who do evil. The government “beareth not the sword in vain: for it is a minister of God, an avenger for wrath to him that doeth evil.” The clear teaching of this passage is that God has placed agencies in the world for the preservation of justice. And there is no warrant anywhere in Scripture for limiting the power of the government to the maintenance of justice only within its own borders. And, it may be added, any argument for pacifism is also an argument against a nation’s internal police force. It virtually means the overthrow of all force—which would leave a mad reign of sin and chaos. And so it is very significant that the New Testament speaks of civil governments as the divinely established organs for the maintenance of good order, for the restraint and punishment of sin. This is the ground upon which the just wars of the Old Testament, and indeed all righteous wars, could be waged.

The So-Called Pacifistic Passages

Pacifists have often claimed to base their theories upon certain passages of the New Testament. Their views are based upon a literal interpretation of the teaching and example of Jesus as recorded in such passages as Matthew 5:38-40; 5:43, 44; Romans 12:19, and I Peter 2:21, 23.

A proper interpretation of these passages, however, demands that various considerations be kept in view. The pacific interpretation is based upon a superficial view of Christian ethics. Scripture is not so much nomistic as principal. It lays down principles which are accompanied by illustrations. In examining a passage, therefore, we must seek to grasp the principle which it conveys, which is quite different from a slavishly literal interpretation which neglects the context. Furthermore, we must remember that each individual passage must be interpreted in the light of Scripture as a whole. Even in secular writings we can do violence to a man’s thoughts by removing them from their context. What is more, Scripture contains no blanket judgments; circumstances alter a case, and sometimes very greatly. With these thoughts in mind we shall examine a few of the typical passages which the pacifists adduce to favor their theory.

The pacifists commonly quote the non-resistance passages, of which one of the most outstanding is Matthew 5:38-40: “Ye have heard that it was said, An eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth: but I say unto you, Resist not him that is evil: but whosoever smiteth thee on thy cheek, turn to him the other side also. And if any man would go to law with thee, and take away thy coat, let him have thy cloak also.” This passage, no doubt, teaches that we should be unselfish and return good for evil. We should be willing to sacrifice rather than to uphold our petty dignity. Such an attitude of unselfishness will tend to make the offender ashamed of his conduct. In other words, if a man smites you on the cheek and you turn the other cheek, he will in all probability be ashamed of himself and repent of his evil. But if he continues to smite you, you are certainly not admonished to keep turning your cheeks to the unprincipled rogue. The non-resistance injunctions are fulfilled when we cultivate a placable spirit, but they never demand that we ourselves do evil by encouraging wickedness and permitting it to go unpunished.

Many New Testament passages show very clearly that absolute, or unconditional, non-resistance is not taught. At Christ’s trial before the Sanhedrin He did not acquiesce when He was smitten, but, on the contrary, He rebuked the offender, saying, “If I have spoken evil, bear witness of the evil: but if well, why smitest thou me?” (John 18:23). In like circumstances Paul rebuked the high priest Ananias very sharply when the latter issued the command to strike him on the mouth (Acts 23:2, 3). On two occasions Jesus drove the money changers out of the temple with a display of physical force. And even
though it be argued that Jesus did not use the whip which He carried—for which there is no sound basis—no one can see in that display of righteous wrath the pusillanimous, non-resistant Jesus of the pacifistic interpreters. It is not a pacificist Christ who cries unto an iniquitous generation, “Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites!” If Jesus were a pacifist, He could never have spoken of God as the One Who would “miserably destroy those miserable men” (Matt. 21:41). A weak and non-resistant Jesus would never have said, “But these mine enemies, that would not that I should reign over them, bring hither, and slay them before me” (Luke 19:27). No, when the law of God is flouted, Jesus does not stand by in feeble non-resistance. The Christ of the Scriptures does not speak the words of one who will acquiesce to the enemies of God and of righteousness.

The New Testament not Pacifistic

Again, the pacifists point to passages such as Matthew 26:52 to prove their theory. Here we read the words which Christ spoke to Peter, “Put up again thy sword into its place; for all they that take the sword shall perish by the sword.” Jesus here condemns those who trust in the sword rather than in God. He did not tell Peter to throw away his sword. He merely told him to put it back in its sheath, because this was not the time to use it. But the disciples customarily carried swords for their defense. And Jesus not only consented to this, but in His last discourse He commanded His disciples to carry a sword, telling them that if they had none they should sell their cloak to procure one (Luke 22:36). Certainly, this indicates very clearly that Jesus approved of the use of the sword on certain occasions.

A number of passages from the New Testament show that it does not intend to teach pacifism. When Jesus healed the centurion’s servant at Capernaum, He did not chide the centurion for his military profession; but, on the contrary, he said, “I say unto you, I have not found so great faith, no, not in Israel” (Luke 7:9). Furthermore, Cornelius, the centurion, was an honored man in the Christian community. He was “a devout man, and one that feared God with all his house, who gave much alms to the people, and prayed to God always” (Acts 10:2). And when the soldiers came to John the Baptist and asked, “What must we do?” he did not tell them to forsake their calling. He told them among other things to be content with their wages (Luke 3:14), implying that there was nothing inherently wrong with their occupation. In Hebrews 11:32ff. we find a glowing tribute to all the great warriors of the Old Testament and their mighty works of war. Add to this the fact that Jesus Himself was the greatest of all warriors. He is pictured as the One Who will trample upon the necks of His enemies. He is the Conqueror Who shall come in triumph to judge the nations, and to sentence His enemies to everlasting perdition. And add once again the fact that the whole Christian life is portrayed in terms of war symbolism in the New Testament as well as in the Old (Cf., f.i., Eph. 6:10-20). All these are indications which can point only in one direction—the New Testament as well as the Old teaches the necessity of just wars.

Retributive Justice and Love in the New Testament

Another New Testament doctrine pointing in the same direction as the above evidences is that of retributive justice. The doctrine that sin is and will be punished fills a very prominent place in the circle of New Testament thought. Christ pronounced in no uncertain terms the destruction of Jerusalem for its blindness and disobedience (Matt. 23:37ff.). Jesus’ picture of the last judgment (Matt. 25:31ff.) dooms the wicked to eternal punishment, as do also the eschatological pictures of Matthew 24, II Thessalonians 2, and the Revelation. And if retribution is a work of God, it is preposterous to suppose that it would be criminal for the Christian to be a co-worker with God through the state, to which God has given the power of the sword.

The New Testament teachings on love shed further light on the ethics of war. In Matthew 5:43, 44 the Christian is taught to love even his enemies. Matthew 22:39 teaches that we must love our neighbors as ourselves. These passages are sometimes quoted by pacifists along with the non-resistance passages. In fact, however, love for our dear ones, for ourselves, and even for our enemies may at times demand resistance. Love seeks the welfare of its objects. In this respect the law of neighborly love has three applications for a nation. Love must govern a nation’s relation to the race as a whole, to the enemy, and to its own population. Neighborly love may at times, therefore, demand that a nation bear arms on a threefold ground to preserve justice and thereby further the interests of the race, to chastise the criminal nation, and to be a guardian to its own citizens. And thus we see that love for ourselves and for our neighbors, far from leading to pacifism, may at times call a nation to war.

What, then, shall we conclude as to the Scriptural teaching on war? First of all, let us not forget that, though sin may make wars necessary, peace is always the ideal of the Christian. Not only individuals but also nations should heed the injunction: “Follow peace with all men, and holiness, without which no man shall see the Lord” (Heb. 12:14). Furthermore, it must be evident that militarism with its unjust aggression, exploitation, and reliance upon human strength stands under the severest condemnation at the bar of God’s Word.

Pacifism — Its Errors and Evils

But pacifism also stands condemned on many scores. Pacifists must look with derogation upon the Old Testament and the history of Israel. And this is, in fact, precisely what they do. A quotation from a typical pacifistic pamphlet may illustrate.
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this low and unworthy view of the Old Testament: “There is no doubt that some writers of the Old Testament believed that God sanctioned righteous wars. Indeed, some very bloodthirsty passages are to be found... The teaching of the Old Testament is less valid for Christians today than the higher revelation of the New Testament” (Eddy and Page, “What Shall We Do About War?”).

The New Testament likewise fails to receive its due in pacifistic literature. The pacifists fail to grasp the unique soteriological position of Jesus and see Him as a mere teacher and example. Jesus is more than a social reformer, He is a Savior. His teachings must be taken in that light. Moreover, the pacifists do not see the teachings of Jesus in their totality, as we have already noted. Christian thinkers, however, must learn from the whole Christ and from the whole of Scripture, not from a fragmentary Christ or a mere portion of Scripture removed from its context.

Pacifism further fails in that it does not take sin into consideration. It is an idealistic view. Jesus said, “There shall be wars and rumors of wars.” Of course, that does not mean that we must, therefore, fatalistically resign ourselves to wars, and not seek peace. But the significance of Jesus’ statement lies in the fact that wars shall always be with us because sin shall always be with us. And sin is the cause of war. Because sin cannot be eradicated in this life, neither can wars be done away with. As long as sin wrecks its havoc upon society, it will be necessary for the governments which God has given us to strive to restrain sin and preserve justice, even though they must resort to the extreme of war to do so.

Finally, pacifism must be condemned because it does violence to Christian ethics when it demands that a man shall refuse to bear arms for his government. The Christian’s duty toward God, toward the state, toward his fellowmen, and toward himself may all lead him to war at times. God Himself, as a God of justice, may command war. The state, moreover, has been appointed by God to wield the sword of justice. Our duty to God demands that we support His agents even to the point of war. God has instituted governments for the purpose of maintaining justice and curbing the results of sin. And we must support the state in war; for war is a matter which concerns the state: it is a legitimate exercise of the state when it is waged without confidence in the strength of man and with trust in God.

As we have already seen, love for our fellowmen also condemns pacifism since we must at times take up arms for their welfare. Our duty toward ourselves reinforces this argument. Absolute non-resistance is not a Scriptural position. It is our Christian duty to protect our own lives and those of our loved ones against assault.

Allegiance to the Government

This, then, is the Scriptural teaching on war—that while militarism and aggression are an abomination unto the Lord, the state is not only justified but under solemn obligation to God to wield the sword when justice is at stake. And the duty of the Christian citizen is to subject himself and give all allegiance to his government, which is ordained of God. And we may only refuse such allegiance when we know that the demands of our government are incompatible with allegiance to the King of Kings; for indeed, how preposterous it would be if in pleasing our rulers, we would give offence to God, for Whose sake we obey those rulers.

Let us pray that in these troublous times our leaders may be able to discern the cause of justice, and may exercise their God-given authority with wisdom. If our rulers are ordained of God, they are also responsible to God. Only when all nations and all rulers look up to the sovereign God for guidance, only then shall the world find lasting peace—for then He Who rules shall be the Prince of Peace.

High Cost

Since selling fruit to Adam and Eve
When happiness was lost,
The supersalesman sells his wares
At never a lower cost.

His deals are closed in utmost haste
Lest truth and conscience win;
So pleasure-seeking customers
Grab for some gilded sin.

The gilt wears from the purchased thing.
The dupe is soon beginning
To feel all pleasure flee away
In the high cost of sinning.

—ALBERT PIERSMA.

Shekinah

Country churches are painted white
With showy shutters of gaudy green,
And their spires point upward by day and night
To the God above who is unseen.

City churches are brick and stone
With stained glass windows, where the light
Falls rainbow-hued, while priests intone
Prayers to a God beyond their sight.

But God is there in the quiet lane
Or the bustling city’s busy street.
When morning is high or when daylight wanes,
He is there, the anxious soul to greet.

Although unseen by mortal eye
His presence is in the holy place;
And men may touch the life divine
And greet the Master face to face.

—LAURA ALICE BOYD.
Credimus ut Intelligamus

.... A Dialogue

Ecclesiasticus: An Average Christian.
Agnostus: A young agnostic scientist.
Magister: The Teacher.

Ecl.: I want to introduce my new friend, Agnostus, Magister. The other day Atheisticus said he hated me and then Agnostus befriended me. He said he did not like Atheisticus either.
Agn.: We agreed that we could both afford to ignore Atheisticus and his blatant fanaticism. After all one does not oppose the false nose of a clown in the name of art or anatomy.
Mag.: So you feel quite attracted to one another?
Ecl.: Yes, but Agnostus vexes me by laughing at my faith as heartily as he did at Atheisticus.
Agn.: That is just what I do not have. Both Ecclesiasticus and Atheisticus are so sure they know what they believe. I only know that I know nothing.
Mag.: That might be pardonable modesty, or an attempt to escape the responsibility of knowledge, but, what do you think of Ecclesiasticus and Atheisticus? Do they know what they claim to know?
Agn.: No, frankly, I do not believe they do. Both Ecclesiasticus and Atheisticus are sure they know what they believe. I only know that I know nothing.
Mag.: That might be pardonable modesty, or an attempt to escape the responsibility of knowledge, but, what do you think of Ecclesiasticus and Atheisticus? Do they know what they claim to know?
Agn.: No, not quite as crass as that. Ecclesiasticus has one opinion, Atheisticus has another. I quote Tennyson:

"I take possession of man's mind and deed—
I care not what the sects may brawl.
I sit as God, holding no form of creed,
But contemplating all."

Mag.: At least you do not seem to be afraid of high places. But, tell me, would you grant that you know what you see, and that the scientist knows what he learns by experiment?
Agn.: That is the only real knowledge there is. We cannot know the things that Ecclesiasticus calls "spiritual" because no one can see them.
Ecl.: At that point, I could not answer Agnostus, Magister. I too have wondered whether we really know things by faith. How can we be sure?
Mag.: But, Ecclesiasticus, are you not then granting Agnostus his first assumption, that the only way of real knowledge is sight or logic?
Ecl.: Yes, what else can I assume?
Mag.: Here is a red feather, you both know it is here?
Both: Yes, surely.
Mag.: If you wanted to be sure that 12 times 12 is 144, you could reason that out to your own certainty?
Both: Certainly.
Mag.: Suppose you closed your eyes or refused to look at my feather, or refused to exercise your powers of arithmetic, could you be sure of these things?
Both: Not absolutely, we might believe it, but that is all.
Mag.: It follows then, that even the things of sight and logic we must learn to know by obeying certain laws?
Both: It seems so, surely.
Mag.: But you cannot see Christ or figure out Christianity on paper and so you both doubt that such things can really be known?
Both: That is it, exactly.
Mag.: If there were two distinct classes of things to be accepted as true, there might also be two distinct ways of knowledge, might there not?
Agn.: Please say on, I cannot answer that immediately.
Mag.: Well, the things that stand below us or on our own plane, the things we can see and handle, these things we should know by experiment, should we not? This is not the sphere for faith? The Church leaders were wrong, were they not, when in the middle ages they persecuted the scientists for experimenting with the shape of the earth, because they accepted by faith that it was flat?
Agn.: That is entirely true.
Mag.: Your friend, the scientist, who accepts the theory of evolution, unproved and unprovable, is he exercising faith or sight?
Agn.: That seems like a kind of faith.
Mag.: Is his evolution then a fact of knowledge, or an opinion?
Agn.: By my own reasoning, I must admit it is only an opinion.
Mag.: Might there not be a whole class of things that are not subject to sight or logic, but must be known by faith?
Agn.: I will not grant that they are known by faith. They are opinions, faith is mysticism, it is a crucifixion of the mind in favor of religious sentiment.
Ecl.: And I say, even though the Bible is unscientific, I accept it anyway.
Mag.: But wait, Ecclesiasticus, why say it that way? That is like saying, "Oatmeal is not steel shavings but I eat it anyway." Who wants religion to be scientific?
Agn.: I want it to be, or I cannot accept it.
Ecl.: Eddington and Jeans were scientists and they accepted Christianity.
Mag.: Yes, Ecclesiasticus, they were and they did. But the fact that they were scientists does not give us an argument in favor of Christianity anymore than their science would make them authorities on medieval art. Their testimony to Christianity means no more than their own. They did not accept it as scientists. They know science by means of their eyes and ears, they know Christianity by faith.
Agn.: Now you are talking my language. Sight is knowledge, faith is sheer mysticism.
Eccl.: Yes, I must say, you sound disappointing to me, Magister.

Mag.: Oh, wait, I have not finished. I was only establishing the thesis that Agnostus and his scientific method has no right to bind Christianity to his method, any more than I would have a right to tell him what to see under his microscope. Science and sight belong to the restricted sphere of things below us. If the scientist accepts things above him, he does so by faith, not by sight. If he does not, he has not hurt Christianity one whit, he has only refused to exercise a higher way of knowledge. Every class of facts has its own way of knowledge. You cannot know this red feather if you refuse to look. You cannot know that 12 times 12 equals 144 if you refuse to count. You cannot know Christianity if you refuse to use faith.

There is no more reason for denying knowledge of religious truth by way of faith, simply because faith is not sight, than there is for refusing to drink lemonade because it must be drunk and cannot be eaten with a fork like spinach.

Eccl.: I know that my Redeemer lives!

Agn.: How do you know, you cannot see him.

Eccl.: I know by faith.

Agn.: Prove it to me.

Mag.: You can prove it just as well as you prove a scientific fact, but by using Christianity's method, not "scientific" method. "He that will do the will of my Father which is in Heaven, he shall know of these things, whether they be of God."

As for you, Ecclesiasticus, you should lose your inferiority complex. Pull off Agnostus' wax nose of scientific authority. Let him use that in its proper sphere. It does not belong in the sphere of religion any more than faith belongs in his laboratory.

ALA BANDON.

---

A Storm

A storm—and the raindrops that pelted the pane
Cried out by their unruly sound
To that part of my nature that answered the call
Of this reckless deluge pouring down.
I stood at the window and watched the mad shower
As it blew in its ruthless career;
And a lightening flash suddenly brightened the sky,
While loud thunder claps rang in my ear.

But, while thrilled at the beauty and might of the storm,
I thankfully whispered a prayer
Beyond the night heavens that greeted my eyes,
To the glorious Infinite there—
That He, the Creator, Whose absolute power
Had bid all this havoc to start,
Was the same blest Redeemer Whose marvelous love
Had planted such peace in my heart.

—VERNA S. TREUWISSEN.

---

Perfect Love

When I came home from a journey
My little sonny cried,
"See, I've brought your paper and slippers
What more can I do beside?"

I smiled at the little fellow,
Standing, eager, at my knee,
"I should like a drink of water
If you would bring it to me."

He brought me the brimming goblet,
Griny fingers clasped over the rim.
But the trickle of dirty water
Went all unnoticed by him.

I drank the cup as he brought it
While mingled emotions strove:
It was far from perfect service
But its source was perfect love.

And I thought how I serve my Father,
How faulty my labor, and poor,
But He accepts my offering
If only my love is pure.

—LAURA ALICE BOYD.

---

Passing Ships

Our lives, like ships,
Each other pass on sea,
The sea of life; bound
For eternity.

* * *

A lad and I passed
Side by side and he
Had something in his soul
Which lifted me.

We briefly met.
We'll never meet again
On this old earth
Of sorrow, death and sin.

And still, I see him
Ever since we met.
For his one soul-spark
Lingers in me yet.

Now, since he's gone,
That little spark became
A God-sent purge and a
Transforming flame.

—ALBERT PIERSMA.
THE editor of THE Calvin Forum has requested me to write another article on the Sabbath question, reviewing the discussion so far. Let me first acknowledge the very great kindness done to me both by him and by the two scholarly brethren who have participated in it. One may, as the result of much study, take a certain position on a theological subject, but it is not easy to secure for it both competent and friendly public criticism, and without this there is danger that one will consider his arguments to have more validity than they really possess. We remember Proverbs 18:17.

As to Calvin and the Synod of Dort

Prof. Kromminga devotes the first part of his first article mainly to showing that Calvin did not really, in the Institutes, teach that the Commandment was abrogated. In this he has a measure of success. It is true, as he argues, that Calvin assigned to the entire Decalogue such permanence and universality of authority as the divine Moral Law as excludes the abrogation of any one of the commandments. It is true, also, that he does not say, in so many words: “The Fourth Commandment is abrogated.” This being the case, Prof. Kromminga finds Calvin’s position quite satisfactory. In this, as it noted, he differs from many other students and admirers of the General reformer. My own copy of the Institutes has an “Advertisement” by the editor, the Rev. Wm. M. Engles, and was published by the Presbyterian Board of Publication. Apparently that Board could not allow the Institutes to go out as their publication without a word of protest and correction. The editor says:

“The most decidedly objectionable feature in the Christian Institutes is to be found in the explanation of the Fourth Commandment, where the author asserts the abrogation of the Sabbath. In Calvin’s view, the ordinance was a mere type of better blessings, and, with the types and ceremonies of the old dispensation, was done away by the introduction of a new and better dispensation. In this opinion there can be no doubt that he greatly erred. . . .”

In spite of the learned professor’s argument, it has not become clear to me how there can be an abrogation of the Sabbath, upon which it rests. Let the reader figure it out for himself if he can.

Prof. Kromminga quotes only from the Institutes, but Calvin wrote also other books. Perhaps the professor overlooked the two quotations I made from his commentaries on the Pentateuch. Let me give again what he says in Genesis. Having discussed the Creation Sabbath, and having assigned to this institution universal and permanent significance, he adds:

“Afterwards, in the law, a new precept concerning the Sabbath was given, which should be peculiar to the Jews, and but for a season.”

Does not this assert that the Fourth Commandment was a law limited to Israel, and temporary, passing away with the coming of the New Dispensation? If not, what does it mean?

It comes down to this, then, that Prof. Kromminga is right in pointing out that Calvin taught the permanence and authority of the Ten Commandments in such a manner as is not to be harmonized with the abrogation of the Fourth, and that I am right, too, in saying that Calvin taught such abrogation. The net result is that Calvin is shown to be inconsistent with himself! This need not surprise us, since this inconsistency has characterized the Reformed theology ever since. In the seventeenth century there was in the Netherlands a long and earnest debate on the Sabbath question, but it led to no result, because both parties to it accepted the premise that the Decalogue remains of universal and permanent authority. So long as this premise is maintained, either we must all become Seventh Day Sabbatarians or we must give up the problem as insoluble. The Synod of Dort was guilty of the same inconsistency in holding that the Fourth Commandment is a divine commandment for the Christian church and yet saying that the day has been changed and that such “strict observance” as was demanded of Israel is not demanded of us. Who authorized the said Synod to declare that the commandment could be observed on the First Day, when it specifies the Seventh? And what is meant by the remark that “strict observance” on our part is not necessary? Could anything be more vague? If not strict obedience, then what kind of obedience? Is not anything less than perfect obedience sin, when we have to do with a divine law? In general, it must be said that this deliverance does the famous Synod no credit. In marked contrast to its other doctrinal utterances, this one was adopted hastily, without careful examination of the Holy Scriptures, and professedly only as a temporary compromise. It was a shabby piece of work for such a body.

Prof. Kromminga has shown that I was in error in saying that the doctrine of the Synod of Dort was the same as that which Calvin contemptuously called the teaching of the “false prophets”. He shows that those men taught the change of day, but otherwise the duty of strict observance, while the Synod teaches the change of day without the duty of strict observance. There is therefore an important distinction between the two, and I am grateful to him for pointing it out. However, this question now emerges. Is not the position of the said “false prophets” the doctrine in which we have all been brought up, and which is preached to this very day in nine-tenths of all Christian Reformed and Reformed Church pulpits?

In his second article Prof. Kromminga touches briefly upon the silence of the New Testament epistles with regard to Sabbath keeping. He does not deny or discount such silence, but thinks it quite natural if the apostles held substantially the same view that there was something ceremonial and something moral in the Fourth Commandment, adding:

“If these assumptions are correct, let any one who will explain how the Apostles and the Jerusalem Council could have exorted to Sabbath observance”. This is a strange remark. For three hundred years ministers who were loyal to the Synod of Dort, (or at least thought they were) have held these views and yet have preached Sabbath observance with all their might. Could not the apostles, if they had the same views, have done the same? At least, they could have explained that the ceremonial part was no longer binding, but that the moral part was—which would have saved a world of trouble! I am afraid that the readers of the Calvin Forum will not be able to accept this as a satisfactory explanation of the apostolic silence.

The Old and the New Covenants

With great care Prof. Kromminga considers the relation between the Old and New Covenants, and rightly so, for here lies the heart of the problem. He says:

“In Jeremiah 31:31-34 the difference between the Old and New Covenants is unfolded. The passage does not at all place the difference in a change of law, but in a change in the way the law is given, to wit, not outwardly, but by inscription in the hearts of the people.”
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Then, referring to the discussion of St. Paul in the third chapter of II Corinthians, he says:

"In the whole context there is no hint of the abolition of the old commandments, not even in vs. 14, to which attention was especially directed."

This is true. The passage, however, as rendered in the American Revised Version, does assert the abolition of the Old Covenant, as follows:

"Until this very day, at the reading of the Old Covenant, the same veil remaineth, it not being revealed to them that it is done away in Christ."

The relation between this statement and the abrogation of the Decalogue lies not in the words themselves but in the fact that, according to the scriptures, the Old Covenant and the Ten Commandments are the same thing. The passages are given in my second article. This identification Prof. Kromminga admits, in the fifth of his thirteen propositions, although he calls it an "occasional" identification. Be it so, an occasional identification in the Holy Scriptures is sufficient to establish the doctrine, for the word of God cannot be broken. The Decalogue and the Old Covenant being thus the same, when the apostle says that "it", namely the Old Covenant, is done away in Christ, it is equivalent to an assertion that the Decalogue is done away. How this can be reconciled with his other teaching is a problem which we will consider presently.

When God, speaking through the prophet Jeremiah, says that He will establish a new Covenant,

"Not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers in the day that I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt"

He is referring to the Ten Commandments, with their supplementary statutes and ordinances, and to nothing else in the world; as any one may see who turns back to the 19th and 20th chapters of Exodus, who pays attention to the identification of the Covenant and the Commandments, and who accepts St. Paul’s exegesis in the third chapter of II Corinthians. In promising that the New Covenant should not be external but written in the hearts of His people, the Lord says substantially this:

"I will make a New Covenant, in which my people shall no longer be governed by external commandments, as in the covenant made at Sinai. I will cause them to know and cherish correct moral principles in their hearts, so that they shall be able to decide for themselves what they ought to do."

This is precisely the profound difference between the ethics of the Old Testament dispensation, the period of spiritual child­hood and bondage, on the one hand, and that of the New Testament dispensation, the time of adult freedom in Christ, on the other. (Cf. Galatians 4:1-11.)

As to the Change from Sabbath to Sunday

With regard to the change of day, Prof. Kromminga adduces Acts 2:37 and I Cor. 16:2, as proofs that the time of observance of the Fourth Commandment was shifted from the seventh day of the week to the first. He is frank enough to say that these are "mere shreds of evidence," I can not concede them even that much validity. With regard to Acts 2:37 you can get no show of proof to that effect except upon the supposition that this was the only meeting St. Paul had with the believers at Troas, for if he had two or three others the same week, all special significance is lacking to their having had one also on Sunday. That this was the only time they got together is not asserted in the text, and it is most unlikely, for the apostle was there seven days, and Sunday was the last day of his stay. That this meeting is mentioned and not the others finds a ready explanation in the miracle that was wrought. Moreover, they met at night, which is quite compatible with their having worked all day, as they probably did. Then how does this prove that they had their day of rest on the first day of the week?

The passage in I Corinthians 16:2 supplies nothing at all. Prof. Kromminga sees clearly that this was not an act to be performed in a gathering of the believers, but by each one in his own home, yet he says:

"It extends the connection of Sunday with worship beyond the strictly public sphere into the private."

Does it? What connection has the passage with worship of any kind? No doubt the early Christians began to hold their meetings for worship on Sunday, and probably this was started in apostolic times, but the passages cited do not prove it, and even if they did have such meetings on that day, this is still far from proving that they had any notion of obeying the Fourth Commandment in so doing.

With almost all of Prof. Kromminga’s twenty propositions I find myself in agreement. I should like to call attention particularly to his 11th proposition, in which he says that the Israelitish elements in the Decalogue are not limited to the Fourth Commandment. This is a valuable point. In the Second Commandment all representation of things in heaven and earth is forbidden. This includes all sculpture, painting, and idolatry. Yet we pay no attention to this commandment, excusing ourselves by saying that this means only that we must not make such images for religious worship; but that is our own unauthorized addition to the law, put in to excuse ourselves for not obeying it. The ancient Jews, as Josephus tells us, understood it as it stands, and so it ought to be understood and obeyed by any one who thinks that the Ten Commandments are still of unaltered authority in the Christian church. In the Fifth Commandment the promise refers to the land of Canaan, and in the Tenth the wife is listed as a piece of valuable property. In the Deuteronomy version, the Sabbath is to be observed in commemoration of the deliverance from Egypt. We pay no attention to all of these things. Why not, if the Ten Commandments, in their capacity as a legal document, are not abrogated?

Just What in the Decalogue Is Abrogated?

Turning now to the articles of Dr. Murray, we find ourselves in hearty agreement with him when he says:

"If the fourth commandment is not binding in the Christian dispensation, then we have to take one of two positions. We have either to take the position that the fourth commandment occupies a different position from the other nine commandments in the decalogue, or to take the position that the whole decalogue has been abrogated in the Christian economy."

He then proceeds to refute the first of these positions, but as it is not mine, I have no further concern with this portion of his argument.

Concerning the silence of the apostolic epistles, he makes a slight mistake, in speaking as if it had been alleged that the New Testament is silent. Of course this is not the case, and has never been alleged, so far as I know—certainly not by me. There is a good deal about the Sabbath in the four gospels. With the rest of his first article I have no quarrel, for it is devoted to showing how important is the weekly day of rest. Certainly it is; but the question under debate in this discussion is whether our observance of it is to be based upon the Fourth Commandment. Let a man speak ever so highly of the day of rest, he will hear from me no word of objection, but only of hearty agreement, so long as he does not say that the duty of observing the Sabbath is tied to an article of an abrogated Israelitish covenant. When that is said I object, for that is to bring the people of God back into the bondage of the law.

In his second article Dr. Murray seeks to show that I accept the continuance of the moral principles involved in the other nine commandments but deny it with regard to the Fourth. In this he misunderstands my position. I hold that all of the commandments are abrogated, in their strictly legal significance, as commandments to be obeyed by God’s people, but that any moral principles contained in them abide with undiminished authority. Herein I admit no distinction between the Fourth Commandment and the rest.

This distinction between the moral principle involved in a commandment and the commandment itself may be somewhat difficult to grasp, if one is not accustomed to it, but I believe
that it is valid and that it is essential to any sound reasoning upon the subject in hand. To illustrate: the legal principles involved in the laws of the state of New York are valid also in Michigan, but the statutes themselves are not. The moral principle that children should honor their parents is good in China as well as in America, but it did not become the duty of the Chinese when and because it was embodied as law in an Israelite decalogue. Neither is it our duty for that reason.

When Dr. Murray argues in suport of the abiding authority of the Ten Commandments from the use made of them in the New Testament, he has a legitimate argument, and a very strong one. It is true that the apostles constantly speak of moral duty in terms of the Decalogue, and that we therefore are led to think that it is of permanent validity. This is the origin of that conviction on the part of the Christian church at large, that this is absolutely true of the Ten Commandments.

One omission in Dr. Murray's article attracts our attention. Since he is a defender of the Westminster position, we expected him to expound the two propositions of that doctrine, viz., that the Fourth Commandment is of abiding authority, and that we therefore are bound to keep it. I do believe that it is their duty to do so. I think that this duty does not arise, for Christians, out of the legal principles of the Ten Commandments, but it has the Christian liberty to apply that principle to his own situation according to his own judgment, always seeking therein to please the Lord, not himself, and always looking sincerely and prayerfully to God for guidance.

In conclusion, allow me to guard against certain possible misapprehensions about the Fourth Commandment. In reading the Ten Commandments from the pulpit and in using the Fourth Commandment, if we consider them as referring to the moral principles of nine of the commandments, speaking, naturally, in the terms to which their readers were accustomed, without asserting their continuance as law. As to the Fourth Commandment, either they did not recognize any abiding moral principle in it, or were afraid that if they urged the keeping of it they would be misunderstood to teach that it was a Christian duty to obey it as it stands.

One omission in Dr. Murray's article attracts our attention. Since he is a defender of the Westminster position, we expected him to expound the two propositions of that doctrine, viz., that the Fourth Commandment is of abiding authority, and that we therefore are bound to keep it. I do believe that it is their duty to do so. I think that this duty does not arise, for Christians, out of the legal principles of the Ten Commandments, but it has the Christian liberty to apply that principle to his own situation according to his own judgment, always seeking therein to please the Lord, not himself, and always looking sincerely and prayerfully to God for guidance.

One omission in Dr. Murray's article attracts our attention. Since he is a defender of the Westminster position, we expected him to expound the two propositions of that doctrine, viz., that the Fourth Commandment is of abiding authority, and that we therefore are bound to keep it. I do believe that it is their duty to do so. I think that this duty does not arise, for Christians, out of the legal principles of the Ten Commandments, but it has the Christian liberty to apply that principle to his own situation according to his own judgment, always seeking therein to please the Lord, not himself, and always looking sincerely and prayerfully to God for guidance.

In conclusion, allow me to guard against certain possible misapprehensions about the Fourth Commandment. In reading the Ten Commandments from the pulpit and in using the Fourth Commandment, if we consider them as referring to the moral principles of nine of the commandments, speaking, naturally, in the terms to which their readers were accustomed, without asserting their continuance as law. As to the Fourth Commandment, either they did not recognize any abiding moral principle in it, or were afraid that if they urged the keeping of it they would be misunderstood to teach that it was a Christian duty to obey it as it stands.

One omission in Dr. Murray's article attracts our attention. Since he is a defender of the Westminster position, we expected him to expound the two propositions of that doctrine, viz., that the Fourth Commandment is of abiding authority, and that we therefore are bound to keep it. I do believe that it is their duty to do so. I think that this duty does not arise, for Christians, out of the legal principles of the Ten Commandments, but it has the Christian liberty to apply that principle to his own situation according to his own judgment, always seeking therein to please the Lord, not himself, and always looking sincerely and prayerfully to God for guidance.
he would not even seem to saunter away the holy hours. On his return from his tour in Europe, the ship that bore him arrived at the wharf in this city on Sabbath morning. His family were at Newark; a little more than a half hour's ride in the cars would have taken him there. His affectionate heart yearned to greet them; but it was the Lord's Day and his heart was still single. So he tarried in the city until Monday, and rested the Sabbath day, according to the commandment."

Is it not true, as Calvin says, that "those who adhere to it (viz. to the doctrine of the 'false prophets') far exceed the Jews in a gross, carnal, and superstitious observance of the Sabbath"?

(4) Because in linking Sunday observance to the Fourth Commandment we obscure its reminder of the resurrection of Christ. Calvin makes the striking remark that if God now required obedience to the Fourth Commandment of Christians "it would be putting a veil over the death and resurrection of His Son." (Harmony of the Last Four Books of the Pentateuch. Vol. II, p. 444.)

Is not this exactly what has taken place, and is taking place to-day? The Christian Sunday was originally instituted and observed as a joyful memorial of the resurrection of our Lord, but as a result of our legalistic teaching ninety-nine per cent of our people now connect it with the Fourth Commandment, not with the resurrection at all. Thus we "have drawn a veil" over the death and resurrection of the Son of God. Let us remove the veil. Let us teach our people frankly the Christian view, that the commandment is not God's law for us, and let us re-focus their attention upon the resurrection by a weekly celebration of it.

**From Our Correspondents**

**The Reformed Church of America**

Grand Rapids, Michigan


Dear Dr. Bouma:

I T IS with pleasure that I accept your invitation to serve as correspondent for the Reformed Church in America. As the occasion warrants it, I shall from time to time send you items of information regarding activities in the denomination in which I serve.

The 135th regular session of our General Synod recently convened in Holland, Michigan. Someone has said that ministers' meetings are the most disorderly groups that ever convene. The statement may stand as a general observation, but in the instance of our recent Synod meeting, to which I was a delegate, the judgment does not hold. There were, to be sure, some irregularities due, in part, to the fact that on the morning of June 10 Hope College held a special convocation at which the honorary degree, "Doctor of Humanities", was conferred upon Her Royal Highness, Princess Juliana of the Netherlands. In anticipation of this impressive event some of Synod's business had to be dispatched a bit rapidly, and there were necessary rearrangements involved that made a few of us feel it would have been to our profit as a Synod had the Princess delayed her visit for a week.

A special feature of our Session was the presentation of Dr. E. D. Dimment's grand pageant, "The Pilgrim". This pageant, acclaimed by all who saw it as a masterpiece, was designed to herald the seventy-fifth anniversary of Hope College. The celebration of this memorable anniversary began with an all-college "Sing" on June 14 and concluded with the dedication ceremonies for the new Science Building the following week. We are grateful for this new and much-needed building, now in the process of construction, and for the laborious and consecrated efforts of President Wichers in securing the necessary funds. It is our prayer that this new unit on our college campus may serve to deepen and strengthen our denominational loyalty to the cause of Christian education. Allow me to remark here that there are men and women in our denomination who share with me the conviction that the same principles which justify a Christian college also justify a Christian elementary day-school.

The retiring president of our Synod, Dr. E. F. Romig, gave a significant report on the State of Religion in our Reformed Church. Perhaps the most significant thing about it was the statement of his views on Original Sin. He frankly said that he finds himself unable to believe that our children are "sinful and guilty before God". There is certain to be some controversy on this matter. Possibly the time is here to take a doctrinal inventory of our clergy. It will do no harm so long as we labor in the interests of God's revealed truth.

In conclusion, may I assure you that many of us are gratified to learn of your decision to remain on the Calvin Seminary Faculty.

Fraternally,

Leonard Greenway.
Another Netherlands Letter

Dordrecht, March 6, 1941.

Dear Prof. Bouma, Brothers and Sisters:

I fear there has ever been a time in which we feel separated, it is ours. There are many miles between you and us; but besides those miles is still so much more. We are an occupied territory, and you are not; and what this means to us, I cannot tell you in detail, but yet I may say a few words about it. It means that we are not allowed to speak freely about all kinds of subjects of public and church life, for the occupying authorities keep a strict censorship. That is, when we put ourselves on their standpoint, quite consistent and understandable, but it is not pleasant for that matter. Of course, it is not my intention to agitate against the new authorities, for I do not believe that it is either my duty or my right. My intention is in these letters to keep in touch with those brethren and sisters, who read THE CALVIN FORUM and, as far as possible, to tell you something of our position.

As to the churches, I have great pleasure in telling you, that so far we have been able to keep our services undisturbed. It is the same with our collections for the churches and other Christian purposes. But it is not the case when we want to hold meetings. When more than twenty people want to be present, we have to ask permission of the head, a judicial functionary, of the province. We have to add an agenda of what will be discussed at such a meeting. When a political subject is mentioned, no permission is given, and that is also understandable. I refer to what I have said above. Church papers, making a political allusion are discontinued; though there is naturally much difference of opinion as to what is politics and what is not.

The spirit in the churches is generally so that we believe, as we read toward the end of Romans 8, that all things work together for good to them that love God. I hope that this will be a source of grief to the church that, owing to the circumstances, there can be no contact with our mission-work in the Indies. Recently we got a telegram through the Red Cross, which may contain 25 words at most, that all mission work is permitted to continue there, and there are those who say that our American sister churches have contributed money for this work. Of course, we are very happy about this. For it is now the time in which we experience the truth of the fellowship of the saints more than ever before. This is fortunately the case here. To prove it, I can tell you that of late prominent leaders of various churches have kept regularly in touch with each other to discuss the difficulties which beset the path of the churches, instead of opposing each other, as formerly happened but too often.

The Synod, begun in Sneek in 1939, but never closed, was begun again at Utrecht this month. [This letter was written in March, though not received until August.—EDITOR.] It is said that the report about the doctrinal differences is ready now and I hope that it will both be discussed and that an agreement may be found. Such things should not be kept dragging. There are so many practical questions, that we should at last settle the points regarding the Confession. The Free University and the Theological School also continue their work undisturbed. Also the Rector of the latter institution, Dr. K. Schil-der, can join in again. His voice is again heard by the students, though his pen cannot reach us in papers and periodicals.

You will be anxious to hear what our daily life is like. I do not think I need give a detailed account. We have to be economical with all kinds of things, fuel, clothing, food, etc. But as you see, we are still alive. Our papers inform us that the use of a large quantity of meat is not good for the health. We are told extensively how to make use of substitutes for various articles of food. We eat different stuff to eat more. [Whatever that means!—EDITOR.]

The difficulties did not fail to come. Some of the Jewish boys were astonished to see us praying with uncovered head. I was quite sure that I did this according to the head. I was quite sure that I did this according to the head, who read THE CALVIN FORUM and, as far as possible, to tell you something of our position.

Bringing the Gospel in Palestine

Another arrival in Palestine (June, 1940), we went to Haifa, Palestine April 16, 1941

Dear Brethren and Sisters:

Soon after our arrival in Palestine (June, 1940), we went to Jaffa-Tel Aviv, being invited by the local assembly to start a work among the Jewish children. We both like this work especially, and were not the words of the Savior, "Suffer the little children to come unto Me, and forbid them not," addressed to Jewish children, although they surely include the children of all nations? The Lord laid on our hearts the poor children of the Jemenite Jews (Who here came from Jemen, Arabia). They live in a special quarter between Jaffa and Tel Aviv. Poorly dressed, they spend almost all their time in the streets. Often we would observe them from our window, digging in the rubbish or heaps of banana leaves that were thrown away, to find some eatables there. To our first children's meeting there came only one girl. My wife spoke with her, told her a Bible story, and showed her pictures. Next day she came again, and on the third day she brought five children with her. Gradually this number increased and, at times, rose to fifty. The average number was twenty-five, and their ages between five and fourteen. We had to divide them into groups. They came four days a week for two hours each time. The first half hour we took them all together for prayer and singing, followed by Bible stories, told to them in groups. As most of these children had no opportunity to visit the school, we then gave them some reading and writing, drawing and modelling from plasticines, and for the older pupils a little English. All was done in the Hebrew language. The teachers were my dear wife, two young men (one of them a newly-converted Jew), and myself.

The difficulties did not fail to come. Some of the Jewish boys were astonished to see us praying with uncovered head. I proposed to buy each of them a new hat, provided that they would find a Scriptural ground for this talmudical custom (covering the head). I was quite sure that I did this without any material risk. Afterwards they refused to hear anything about Christ. They called us "Nozri" (Nazarenes), and a number of them ceased to come, or they would come for the purpose of trying to persuade their comrades to go away, telling them that the Jews are forbidden to learn from the "Gollim," and even spreading the lie that we secretly teach children to worship idols, etc. Once we found our entrance door marred with rotten tomatoes and other dirty stuff. At other times they would throw stones in. We slept under a verandah in the open and often found many small stones that had been thrown in by the aid of their slings. Praise God that such harm was caused. He helped us endure and maintain. Then, by and by, the children became accustomed to coming, and they began to love the school. We noticed with joy that they gradually changed their attitude toward Christ. Their tender hearts deeply responded to the love of Christ, His beautiful parables, His wonderful works of compassion and justice.
Our weak human love also did not remain without response in those poor, forsaken children of the street; once when my dear wife had to stay in bed for a few days, you should have seen their warm sympathy and love. When in the morning prayer I mentioned our teachers, I was interrupted by a little girl who said, “and the lady teacher, too.” Her name was Carmelle, a highly gifted girl with hands with loving and lively, with two beaming eyes in a tiny face under a rich crown of hair. Later, in recess time, she drew a number of the girls to a separate room and prayed with them for the sick lady teacher. And their singing—how joyfully they would sing the hymns about Christ, or the songs about Zion! Those radiant eyes and glad voices, singing “Hosanna” to the Son of David—how they reminded us of the children of Jerusalem in the time of Christ, when they glorified Him at His entrance into the Holy City. Was it not some symbol of the glorious day still to come, when the children of Israel will greet Christ with the words, “Blessed is He Who comes in the name of the Lord”? Our children carried these jubilant melodies into the streets and huts of the poor Jemenite quarter, so spreading the Good News. A woman said to us, “Our whole family is singing your songs of Zion.”

Sometimes the children would stand in the street at our window and sing “Eli, Eli”—God is love. The thought that Christ taught us to love all, even our enemies, was quite new to them. They were convinced that God loves only the Jews, but, often to the shock! And the Lord sent His Messiah only for the chosen of Israel. Once I showed to the elder children the three pictures of the heart (black, white, and golden). A girl said—and there was real sincerity in her voice—“I would like to have the golden heart. I promise not to say bad words any more.” Another one joined her. Once I told them how faithfully Daniel prayed despite the royal prohibition. “He opened the window,” I said—“and fled,” quickly finished one of the girls, clapping her hands with impatient joy. Still greater was her admiration when she heard that the prophet did not flee, but was marvelously kept safe in the lion’s den, through his strong faith.

The three and a half months passed quickly. We had been very much encouraged, although the outward conditions of our living were rather primitive. Our flat, the windows of which were on a level with the street, was situated close to a very noisy market, and the cries of the Hebrew and Arab sellers almost deafened us. The summer nights were hot; we slept in an open court yard with the stars looking down upon us. Often we were waked by fat rats from the market, and we had more than one fight with them. But oh, how we loved that work in spite of these little drawbacks—or perhaps, because of them. There is a special charm in living simply with those to whom you bring the Gospel news.

At Haifa and Jaffa

On October second, we returned to Haifa and our work there. Seated in a big lobby, surrounded by trunks and furniture and greeted by the “Shalom, Shalom” of the children, we slowly moved away through the sandy ways of the Jemenite quarter, happy in the assurance that we left the work in good hands. Two English sisters of our assembly in Jaffa continue it, and they tell us that they experience the same joy there as we did. One of the blessings of the work was that one of our young assistant teachers, a Russian boy of sixteen, surrendered to Christ. He had been brought up by his own parents, but he had no personal assurance of the new life. One day he came to me for a personal talk, and he said with simplicity, “I want to be born again.” After a talk, he gave his heart to Christ in sincere prayer.

Besides the children’s work, there was a joyful opportunity to minister in the local Russian-Hebrew assembly together with brother Ostrowski, as well as in the Arabic and Armenian assemblies. There were added some new members to these assemblies during last summer, and we had the joy to be present at their baptism. The baptismal service was done in the sea-shore near Jaffa, the Biblical Joppa. The rhythmic noise of the waves was mixed with our singing of hymns in Russian, English, and Hebrew. In days gone by the apostle Peter lived here with Simon the Tanner. Tanning is practiced here till now. How we loved to remember! It was here that Peter had the vision that led him to Cornelius. They show you on the shore, near one of the old houses, a trough hewn in the rock, supposedly the workplace of Simon. It was a very happy baptism we had there. It is a fact that the son of Abraham in these days to confess Christ openly by going through the water. It means a lot of persecution for them, much more than in other countries. But it encourages us to see the Jewish youth here and there listening to the Gospel message in their Hebrew tongue. The deep suffering of the nation awakens a spiritual seeking. We were witnesses of the horrible raid on Tel-Aviv, which cost over one hundred thirty civilian lives. In our harbor of Haifa we look daily on the sunken ship which had housed illegal Jewish immigrants. The boat was exploded by unknown hands, and up to now the bodies of about two hundred men, women, and children have been brought to the surface; and the divers still continue their sad job. These poor refugees found their cold grave in sight of the promised land, yea, at its very shores. What a tragic fact!

Preaching in Jerusalem

In August, on the anniversary of the destruction of the temple, we visited the Walling Wall in Jerusalem. Many Jews prayed there, mourning and weeping. I had been there ten years previous, and when talking with the young people, I had asked them, “Why do you Jews not believe in Jesus Christ?” One of them answered, “Because He offended the law.” “When did He do that?” I asked. “Did you ever read the Gospel?” And he replied, “Oh, no, this is forbidden.”—Now again I talk with a young Jew about Christ. He said, “I admire the style and the spirit of the Gospel.” This is, of course, only an occasional impression. Yet we can feel in the soul of Israel an increased interest and sympathy toward Christ. They start to look on Him Whom they have pierced, but not yet with the spirit of grace as it is prophesied by Zachariah. They look also on us, His witnesses. May God help us to reflect His image, “His style and spirit” in our daily life, to attract to Him the seeking souls with the cords of love. Pray for Israel, dear friends, for their special difficulties. They are in constant danger to be boycotted by the Jewish society, to lose their work; therefore only the very bold ones come to the meetings.

We have a number of Jewish Christians in our assemblies at Jerusalem and Tel Aviv. In Haifa we have only three. We have been paying already a long time about some special work among the Jews in the big city of Haifa. And now, on February twenty-second, we started this work here on Mount Carmel, in a little house in our garden, which is situated at the main road. My dear wife painted an inscription on a big board—“Bethel” Gospel Room—in English and Hebrew. By a strange coincidence the municipality arranged at the same time a drinking fountain for the public close to the little house. Our brother and co-worker, a Jewish believer, chose for his first sermon Isaiah 55, “Ho, everyone that thirsteth, come ye to the waters . . . .” The workers who prepared the well had to hew out a hard rock, and the little stones which they broke out were used by us to make a path from the street to the Gospel Room. All things—even such small things—work together for good. Before the beginning of the work we had a special prayer meeting of the members of our assembly in the room. At the first Gospel meeting we were shown a number of Jews who quietly and attentively listened to the message. We felt ourselves surrounded by prayer. Our Brethren at Jerusalem, Jaffa, Tel Aviv, and Nazareth had held us up with their prayers. Will you kindly join them? The opening day my wife, in her consecutive morning reading, read just the passage from Ezra, where we read how the enemies and even the friends tried to hinder the rebuilding of the temple. And we are already tasting some-
thing of that opposition. Oh that the Lord would give that hunger and thirst for His Word to the soul of Israel, while the Word is still freely preached!

Sacred Scenes in the Holy Land

Last autumn we spent one month in Jerusalem. My mother and sister live there now; their house is situated on a hill opposite the temple area. According to tradition, this is the place where Hannas, the High Priest, lived. From here we daily saw the Holy City, the Mount of Olives, and Gethsemane. At eventide, in the rays of the setting sun, the city reminds us of the Heavenly Jerusalem with her golden streets and gates of pearl. Eastward, 3600 feet below, we see the blue surface of the Dead Sea, and behind it the mountains of Moab with their sacred sites, as from which Moses had that wonderful vision of the Promised Land before his death; we visited the Jordan again and the excavations of Jericho, which again brought home to us the literal truth of the Bible records. On the Mount of Olives we visited the military cemetery of the English soldiers, victims of the last war. A sister from the Midlands had asked us to find the grave of her fiancee; and how glad we were when we found his name in the list of over 2500 soldiers, and could send her some flowers from the tomb.

Many soldiers come to our meetings, especially in Jerusalem. Some have received the Good News and were baptized. Mr. Cupples, who works among the troops, invited me to speak in their hut. Many attended to hear about the Gospel in Russia. Some of the soldiers are members of assemblies in Great Britain, which we had the privilege of visiting. They are in fellowship with us here and it brings us a blessing. Not long ago a sailor of a Norwegian vessel, walking in the streets of Haifa, saw the inscription of our Hall, and since he has become a regular visitor of the meetings. His mother is a Christian and prays for his conversion. We took him up to our home together with two Christians from among the troops, and they helped him much by their testimony. He prayed with us. Now he has left the harbor. We pray that he may come out into the full light, and would value your prayers for him. Brother Ostrovski visited us; he translated my booklet, Science and Religion. We together visited Nazareth. It was a beautiful spring day, and the almond trees were covered with snow-white flowers. Here and there we could see patches of blue, red, and white anemone. All this reminded us of the blue, red, and white anemone. All this reminded us of the invisible image is seen everywhere in the halls of the YMCA building. In the top of the main tower there is a quiet room for prayer. When you have entered you see on the closed door a frame carved into the wood. This action has deeply impressed us. May God help us to offer in our Hall only the pure waters of life!

Calvinism in New Zealand

Dunedin S., New Zealand, August 7, 1941.

Dear Dr. Bouma:

SOME three months have elapsed since last I penned a few lines to you, and as some interesting sidelights on Calvinism have appeared since then, I thought you would appreciate them, as indicative of the attitude towards Reformed teaching in New Zealand. In these days of acute crisis men are searching for a solid basis upon which they can look to build their faith. The supreme contribution of Calvinism at the moment is that it stands before a bewildered world with an answer to the "Whys and wherefores" of 20th century perplexity.

From some quarters in New Zealand here there comes a slighting criticism of Calvinism. One hears derogatory remarks passed about the "cranks" among the students who are anxious to make themselves acquainted with the teachings of John Calvin. It is not unusual to hear the charge reiterated again and again that the Capitalistic System of our day is one of the greatest (if not the greatest) inheritance of the great Reformer's teaching. From the same source one hears that if Calvin were alive to-day, his "Doctrine of the Authority of the Word of God" would be much in line with what goes under the name of Orthodoxy(?). But the spirit of John Calvin is abroad in our midst rebuking such shallow criticism. Two quotations from the Professor of New Testament Studies in Knox Theological College, in a recent lecture, show how men are finding a stabilizing factor to their faith in the great Reformed doctrines—"For our day the essence of Calvinism is to be found in these words, 'The Lord reigneth, let the earth rejoice'". And again, "The solid Calvinist position is a rock which stands despite all things." One could wish for more along these lines, but we can rejoice at that evidence in itself.

The members of the Theological Students' Prayer Union which is affiliated with the Inter-Varsity Fellowship of Evangelical Unions has just received for distribution to its members two papers read before the Calvinistic Society, Melbourne, Australia. The first is entitled, "Aspects of Calvinism Bearing on the Nation and the Church", by the Rev. Professor John Gillies, M.A., B.D., President of the Society. It is an admirable brief treatment of the chapter on Civil Government, and is most timely for our time. The second paper by the Rev. Stuart A. B.D., "Reformed Faith in the Modern World". His essay is a survey of Reformed tendencies at work in the world today, mentioning in particular the work of Karl Barth; the Rev. Swanton indicates, however, the weaknesses of Barth's position particularly with reference to the doctrine of Biblical Inspiration. Both these papers have come to a group of interested students at a time when John Calvin's teaching is much under discussion.

I received a letter to-day from a prominent young minister of our New Zealand church, and the contents of it were like a breath of fresh air from the hills. This young man took his theological course in Edinburgh, Scotland, and this is what he says: "One of the most profitable exercises I have ever done was one on 'Calvin's Doctrine of the Word of God'. This compelled me to read his Institutes right through. After I had convinced myself of Calvin's balanced view of Scripture and his profound insight into the Faith, I was able to enjoy his work immensely. I wrote my exercise with much less respect for the theology of the past fifty years, and for higher criticism of the Bible, than I had before I started Calvin. It seemed to me that a great deal we had been taught brought us not one inch nearer God. This is by way of making the suggestion that you read Calvin's Institutes for a first-hand glimpse of the foundations of Presbyterianism, and also that you may judge of the very little progress which theology has made since the day of this master scholar." I have quoted this part of the letter at length to give your readers an indication of the atti-
tude of a young New Zealand enthusiast for Calvin's works, who on his own admission was "critical and modern in theology" before reading them.

I would like to voice a word of appreciation of your editorial in the April number of the Forum on "Days of World Crisis". The essential relation of Calvinism to the crisis is a distinct message of encouragement to us all. In New Zealand there is a growing admiration for the outspoken comments of our great statesman, Franklin D. Roosevelt. Whenever new comes through that the spokesman for "the arsenal of Democracy" will be broadcasting, all listeners have their radio sets tuned in, and we never turn away disappointed. Many homes in New Zealand have just been plunged into mourning as the casualty lists from Greece and Crete have been coming forward. These things, however tragic they appear, make our people the more determined to see this ghastly business through to a finish.

This brief survey must be brought to a close. Let me close on a note of thanks for the privilege of making this small contribution towards the unity of all interested in Calvinism in interested prayer for the work in our land.

I am, yours sincerely,

JOHN N. SMITH.
more to cement the bond between these Boers than the translation of the Bible into their language, thereby giving fixity to their common speech; and secondly this presentation of the ancient faith of the early pioneers, the ‘Voortrekkers’, to the public in the carefully prepared articles of this three-volume work.

We admire the persistence of these South African Calvinistic students and their editorial Committee, Dr. H. G. Stoker, Rev. F. J. M. Potgieter, and (later) Rev. J. D. Vorster. To edit a three-volume work of this sort, with the many problems that arise and difficulties to be met, is no small task indeed. What may well surprise us is that upon completion of this three-volume work they have decided to continue the propaganda for the cause by the publication of two series of pamphlets which will appear from time to time, one a popular series, the so-called “ossesweerkeels” (a series named after the “oosweer”-covered wagon—of the pioneers), the other intended to be more scientific, the “verkennersreeks” (the scout or informer series).

In conclusion we may be permitted to make a suggestion. What has been accomplished in South Africa may also be done here. Students, endowed with the spirit of youth, with a genuine love for Calvinism in their hearts, and sensing the need of heralding its message out into the world of today, could not organize themselves into similar Calvinistic societies at the Christian Reformed, Reformed, Orthodox Presbyterian colleges and seminaries and perhaps elsewhere, to do for our English world what our South African students are doing for theirs? Difficulties no doubt lie athwart our path, as did for them. Questionings such as these may arise: Is there sufficient interest among the students to undertake such a venture? Will a sufficiently large staff of qualified writers be available, who know what Calvinism has taught on the subjects to be assigned and who have sufficient mastery of the field to speak with some degree of authority in it? And will there be a sufficient market, when once the work is published? Such questions such as these may arise: Is there sufficient interest among the students to undertake such a venture? Will a sufficiently large staff of qualified writers be available, who know what Calvinism has taught on the subjects to be assigned and who have sufficient mastery of the field to speak with some degree of authority in it? And will there be a sufficient market, when once the work is published?

In pursuance of this plan he places his reliance on Method. Bowman's discussion is indeed as much an experiment in the methodology of metaphysics as it is a systematic statement of philosophical views. His specific proposal is to use the concepts of function and system to render the concept of spirit luminous and persuasive, and then to extend their application to all the concrete actualities of human experience. By “function” he understands a type of connection between entities which stand related as determinant and determined, and by “system,” a whole of functionally related elements.

Now spirit is, Bowman argues, a system of subjective events, or, as he prefers to say, a system of experiences. This involves him in a repudiation of Naturalism. Spirit is for him radically subjective or non-physical. It is an ultimate, aboriginal, and irreducible mode of being, essentially distinct from “matter.” It is, moreover, not a substance. It is a time-conditioned system, that is, a functionally organized manifold of subjective events to which Time is integral.

If Bowman is anti-naturalistic, he is also anti-monistic. He quarrels with Whitehead, Santayana, and Holt because they deny the ontological distinctness of Spirit, not because they acknowledge the existence of “matter.” Bowman holds that there are two well-nigh absolute types of substance—physical and spiritual. For him these are two radically distinct kinds of existence, each of which is a true ontological opposite of the other. He is thus committed to a fundamental duality. Any monistic prejudice which tends to obscure the absoluteness of the cleavage between the two ultimate modes of being he regards as fatal to an understanding of the world, and as apt to issue, not in a genuine monism, but in a dualism more invidious than that which it is designed to obviate. Thus Santayana’s naturalistic monism issues into the dualism of existence and essence, and that of Whitehead in the dualism of Process and Eternal Objects. Both systems are, on account of their initial monistic assumption, fatal alike to the interests of spiritual life and to the scientific interpretation of nature. The remedy lies, says Bowman, in the recognition of two mutually independent modes of reality, each of which occurs in the form of a closed system.

But duality is not dualism, and while endorsing the one Bowman repudiates the other. He holds that the two alternative modes of being, distinct and metaphysically irreolvable as they are, are not unrelated. The homogeneous systems he calls the physical and the spiritual enter into relations of a highly determinate character and so constitute a heterogeneous system from which arise certain new possibilities of being, especially the various types of value. It is these that give the universe its sacramental character. The condition upon which the world acquires this character is the compresence, in the total scheme of things, of subjective and physical systems. Values, he insists, can best be represented as functionally dependent upon the conjunction of the physical and spiritual. This is evident in the case of sensory properties. Here the world of pure physics is clothed in qualities which it acquires in a perspective supplied by spirit. All other values arise by a similar impregnation of the natural by the spiritual.

The Monism that Bowman thus reinstates describes the universe as a time-conditioned manifold of two homogeneous systems in functional relation. In other words, the supreme reality is the heterogeneous system of Being. That supreme reality is God. He is obviously not the Christian God. As in all systems, Time is integral to him. He is not eternal in the timeless sense, but his being defines itself in relation to its time conditions. He is one with the world. The physical is that region “within the ambit of His nature . . . where the undulations of His spirit die out in infinitesimal vibrations and cease to function as a time-compelling power of consciousness.” It is this failure to honor the ontological disjunction between creation and creation that vitiates Bowman’s entire reconstruction and disqualifies him as a spokesman for Christianity. Incarnation he regards not as an anomaly, but as a universal principle of human life, and Christ as but an exalted instance of

**PROFESSOR BOWMAN'S PHILOSOPHY**


**D**

Bowman was professor of Logic in Princeton University from 1912 to 1926, and professor of Moral Philosophy in the University of Glasgow from 1926 until his sudden death in 1936 at the age of 53. In 1934 Prof. Bowman delivered at Princeton, under the sponsorship of the Vanuxem endowment, a series of six lectures on the Metaphysics of Experience, and these lectures constitute the substance of the book under review. The book is divided into three parts. The first, an elaborate reduction of the first three lectures, is the longest and most severely reasoned, and is the only part prepared for the press by the author himself. The second consists of the notes for the spoken lectures, so far as they exist in writing, and the third comprises supplementary material on human nature and morality, and marked by the author for inclusion in the finished work. The whole is ably edited by Prof. J. W. Scott of the University College of South Wales and Monmouthshire, Cardiff, Wales.

There are two things that Prof. Bowman sets out to do. He undertakes on the one hand to discredit the reigning naturalistic monism, and, on the other, to lay bare the outlines of an adequate theism. He seeks to serve both these ends by rehabilitating the concept of Personality. Under the influence of positivistic modes of thinking, Spirit has fallen on evil days. Bowman proposes by a new analysis of its content to make the concept available again for metaphysical investigation.
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it. Goodness he believes to be within the power of man inasmuch as he is one with God. It is achieved in the measure that he permits the light of the spirit to break through the meshes of the flesh.

Bowman's book is thus no guide to Christian thinking. It is, however, a subtle piece of metaphysical reasoning, full of learning and insight. It is a fitting monument to an eminent philosopher. **Henry J. Stor.**

**A QUAKER AUTOBIOGRAPHY**


The present reviewer though, as he believes, fairly catholic in his literary tastes, confesses an especial weakness for autobiography. There are many who give preference to biography, largely probably because of its supposed greater objectivity. Now, although many biographers notoriously are exceedingly biased in favor of their subjects, it cannot be denied that author and subject being distinct personalities greater objectivity is possible. This advantage, however, is more than offset by the disadvantages. It is obvious that all the biographer can tell you is that his hero acted thus and so, but when it comes to motivation, when you ask why he acted as he did, then the biographer can only rely on inferring motives, both invidiously unreliable. If instead he appeals to what his subject himself asserts to have been his motive, he, namely, the author, plainly is falling back on that very autobiography supposed to be less objective. The autobiographer, however, cannot only tell you what he did, but can tell you, and only he can tell you, just why he proceeded as he did. Not only that but he can tell you all he thought and precisely how he felt prior to, during, and after the event.

The reviewer once shared the prevailing notion that only men of great distinction should attempt autobiography. This idea has completely abandoned. Irwin Edman, in his charming *Philosopher's Holiday*, points out that everybody has been somebody: "An infantry officer, a fox-hunting man, a prisoner, a prison-warden, an author, a publisher, a president, a president's wife, a foreign correspondent, a prep school boy, a baby. One enterprising baby of my acquaintance," continues Edman, "has already arranged to publish his memoirs in conjunction with a famous psycho-analyst as soon as each of them has learned to write intelligible English."

Jones's autobiographical books well illustrate the fact that the charm of an autobiography depends much more upon the manner than the matter. The Jones autobiography suffers from the fact that it is a third autobiographical volume. There is some, though not at all annoy-

**A SAGA OF MATANUSKA VALLEY**

**ANOTHER MORNING.** By Wessel Smitley. Harper & Brothers, New York. 1941. $2.50.

A NOther morning is an absorbing story of twentieth century pioneering. It is an account of the grim yet hopeful new day faced by the settlers of the Matanuska Valley in Alaska. It is another morning in a strange land of sombre contrasts where a handful of pioneers leaving much more comfortable conditions even on W.T.A. face a difficult struggle to win the land and the long battle with the complex machinery of our era. And it really is morning for the day of new hope comes.

The novel is really a saga rather than a plot. It is episodic, and in my opinion, half a dozen chapters could be utilized as artistically complete short stories with but minor alterations. True, there is the general interest in the success of the project as a whole, but there is no graduated thickening of climax. This does not greatly imperil the interest of the tale or destroy the cumulative effect of the many dramatic units. The units teem with vivid detail and they furnish a rich menu of experience: disheveled railway coaches crammed with chattering pioneers and dry baby goods; chunking steamers full of retching immigrants; blistering debates at loud-mouthed meetings; huge saws crunching through virgin trees; dynamiting the incredible cold pressing through covering and wall; the company doctor in his selfless devotion, untiring and blanket. But she is courageous too and returns after a wilder-...
As an artist, the author relies on economy of phrase and sharply etched detail. There is no richness of phraseology, hardly a purple patch. The diction is spare, hard, sharp, and readily grasped. But it is none the less vivid for that. The content is so alive and the style so flexible and transparent a medium that one reads with delight. Only infrequently do the details slip from artistic wholes into mere catalogs.

 Essentially, “Another Morning” is an exhilarating book. It treats of fresh material in an individual and forth-right manner. There is in it the crudity of pioneer phraseology and life. But who would expect a group of W.P.A.ers moving into a raw land to talk in the silken rhetoric of the salon of Queen Victoria, or to behave as elegantly as a Park Avenue rector. But though crude, there is no vulgarity as there is in *Grapes of Wrath*, and none of the pitiless naturalism of *For Whom the Bell Tolls*, where the fascists are slaughtered with cold-blooded glee. There are marvellously sympathetic descriptions of trees. Anybody who loves trees should read this. They live, these sturdy Alaskan trees with their roots in the cold earth. They are defiant and proud and glorious, and one hates to see them blasted.

JOHN TIMMERMANN.

---

**Do You Know That**—

John Calvin’s birthday is the 10th of July. . . . The famous American Shakespeare scholar Kittredge of Harvard died recently at Barnstable, Mass. . . . Many educated people ought to turn to their dictionary to look up the difference between “evangelical” and “evangelistic” . . . . Paul wrote thirteen—not fourteen epistles. . . . You may get all the available news about the Netherlands by subscribing for *Knickerbocker Weekly*, 10 Rockefeller Plaza, New York City. . . . There is a sharp difference over the Korean shrine worship policy between some leaders in the Presbyterian Church U.S.A. and the official board of missions of this church. . . . Calvin Seminary (Grand Rapids, Mich.) now offers courses leading to the Th.M. degree to all qualified persons whatever their place of residence. . . . Al-Azhar University at Cairo is the intellectual center of the Moslem world and has some 13000 students. . . . The great Dutch statesman-theologian, Prof. J. Slotemaker de Bruïne, a leading figure in the Christian social and industrial movement in the Netherlands, passed away last May. . . . Bloomfield Seminary (Bloomfield, N. J.) is one of the official Presbyterian (U.S.A.) seminaries, and that it has served chiefly the foreign language groups in that communion, such as Germans, Hungarians, etc. . . . Under the auspices of the Moody Bible Institute there was held this summer at Cedar Lake, Indiana, a radio conference . . . . Five percent of all Presbyterian Church buildings in England have been destroyed by enemy bombing and that ten percent have been seriously damaged. . . . Pastor Marc Boegner is President of the National Council of the French Reformed Church and of the French Reformed Federation. . . . Sir Josiah Stamp, author of Christianity and Economics, a devoted Christian, with honorary degrees from Oxford, Cambridge, Harvard and Columbia, and economic adviser of the British government, was recently killed in an air raid. . . . The next American Calvinistic Conference is scheduled to be held at Calvin College and Calvin Seminary at Grand Rapids, Michigan, in the first week of June, 1942 . . . . Wessel Smittor, the author of the recent novel “Another Morning”, is a graduate of Calvin College. . . . The National Union of Christian Schools promotes the cause of parent-controlled Christian day schools, both primary and secondary, and has its headquarters at Chicago, Ill. (10119 Lafayette). . . . The World Digest of September, 1941, condensed and reprinted Dr. Henry Ryskamp’s article, “The Emergency Challenges Democracy”, which appeared in the June—July issue of THE CALVIN FORUM. . . . Bert Kruithof’s recent novel, *Instead of the Thorn*, is both genuinely literary and truly Christian in spirit—a story that ought to be found in every church library and in the hands of the Christian reading public.

---

**Be Still**

Little mortal, little mortal,  
Striving restlessly on earth,  
Ever wont to vainly struggle,  
Conscious of a fancied worth;  
There is One Who raised up mountains,  
And Who formed each smallest clod,  
Pause to hearken for a moment—  
“Be still, and know that I am God.”

Little mortal, little mortal,  
When with hardships you are tried,  
When you look for human forces  
That will rally to your side,  
Do you ever stop to wonder  
Why you often must retreat?  
There is One Who claims the battle,  
Who has never known defeat.

Little mortal, little mortal,  
Loved in all your helplessness,  
Steadied by a tender mercy  
When you tremble at the test,  
He Who made you will not leave you,  
Though He chasten with the rod,  
For He only seeks to prove you—  
“Be still, and know that I am God!”

—Verna Smith Teeuwissen.

---
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