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The Three Horsemen Ride Again

SPECULATOR, Profiteer, and Hoarder are riding rough-shod over the economic lives of the American people. During the war and the post-war period of World War I these three riders were held responsible for a crime committed against our country from which it had never completely recovered. Indeed, we tasted the bitter fruits of their riding in the bewildering economic collapse during the early thirties. When the horsemen rode, from 1916 to 1920, it took only four brief years for the dollar to lose half of its value. A ten pound bag of sugar skyrocketed to $2.67, a dozen eggs called for an outlay of 92 cents, and a pound of butter required the expenditure of 76 cents. It is reported that what the people bought for one dollar in 1916 in the form of food, fuel, shelter, and clothing required an outlay of no less than two dollars in 1920. That’s what was called inflation.

Henry Morgenthau, Jr., Secretary of the Treasury, has disclosed the fact that the rate of increase today approximates that of those hectic days before the twenties. He pleads almost frantically for 130 million Americans to stop the horsemen and to defeat this thing coming upon us like an irresistible scourge. I fear, however, that he has pleaded in vain. The vast majority of our citizenry, almost without exception, are riding horses of various sizes, that are unmistakably of the same color. The only ones that are not riding are those that have no opportunity to do so. These riders too have the same label, “Speculator, Profiteer, and (or) Hoarder.” Men are by nature first of all individualists and afterward Americans. They are sold on the principle, “If I am benefited, the whole may be benefited.” They have manifested little enthusiasm for the proposition, “If the entire country be blessed, I also shall reap the blessings.” Selfishness in any form never pays in the long run. It comes back like frugality. It has toyed with the idea of utilizing the surplus of grain and cotton held in its storehouses. How is it possible that the government can continue to hold in reserve seven million pounds of cotton and permit the price to rise from 9 cents in 1939 to 17 cents in 1941? How can the government put a rigid quota on the importation of Canadian wheat, when there are almost 500 millions of bushels of wheat available from our neighbor, when flour is permitted to rise 15% in a year? The government must itself lead the way. It must stop the three Horsemen. The citizens of this country are too busy for that—too busy riding their own horses.

The Flames of Anti-Semitism Also Kindled in America!

ONE must be prepared to expect almost anything in America. Are we not the melting pot of the nations, of ideas and ideals, of men? But it happens repeatedly that some men and some ideas too refuse to melt. And except they melt they are very sure to become a liability rather than an asset to the nation. The various isms that come from Germany, Russia, Italy, India, and other countries can be and will be tolerated if they but yield to the spirit of Americanism. But there are isms, such as Nazism, Communism, and many others that are very resistant, that have come not to be molded but to mold. They refuse to fit into the American setup and persist in remolding the setup to satisfy the conditions of their own identity and growth. Such things as will not melt, will always constitute a source of potential danger. They need the heat of public opinion and perhaps of governmental reaction applied to them so as to make them pliable or to reduce them to ashes.

There has always been Anti-semitism in the world. It has flared up time and again in the course of history. It has raised its ugly head in America repeatedly only to be reduced to silence and inactivity by the general apathy of the American public. Henry Ford, a giant among the industrialists of the world, not long ago threw his weight on the side of the Anti-semites. With all his weight the movement soon bogged down in the mire of American indifference and antipathy. It was contrary to the genius of Americanism. Charles Augustus Lindbergh set up an asset to the nation. The various isms that come to the Anti-semites. With all his weight the movement soon bogged down in the mire of American indifference and antipathy. It was contrary to the genius of Americanism. Charles Augustus Lindbergh for a long time the honored and pampered hero of an admiring populace, also recently in his Des Moines speech left the clear impression that he had joined the ranks of Jew-haters. Scribner’s Commentator and Atlantic Monthly, both powerful and influential magazines in this country, recently lent themselves to this un-American cause by placing their columns at the disposal of the Anti-semites. America cannot remain America if that spirit of intolerance be
Lacking a Proper Sense of Authority

We have learned to love and to regard democracy as the best form of government. It is recommended as the form of government that offers the greatest amount of individual initiative and freedom, consistent with the best interest of the whole. But like all other human institutions it has its defects. And not the least of these defects is that it tends to breed contempt for the properly constituted authorities. Such contempt is subversive of well-regulated and effective home-life, church-life, national life. All these we have come to cherish and to appreciate as indispensables in a democracy that will endure.

A glaring illustration of this phenomenon, to wit, lack of proper sense of authority, occurred within the last year in the Whittier (Calif.) Boys Reformatory. In less than six months, it is reported, 217 boys escaped from a school that houses but 232. Equally significant is that many of these boys returned voluntarily. Father Flanagan, the founder of the successful Boys Town near or in Omaha, was called by the state authorities to take such action as may be deemed necessary to put a stop to the escaping-propensities of these boys. He had abolished the lost-privilege cottage where boys were kept in virtual solitary confinement as punishment. He had just shortly before pleaded with the boys "to cooperate with a new humane administration so that you can soon take your normal place in society." That same evening sixty boys left the reformatory. The good father explained the conduct as the result of a restlessness and a confusion brought on because the boys had been subject to seven investigations within a few months, five new heads within a year, and repeated questionings on the part of psychiatrists, psychologists, case workers, probation officers and the like. However, the real difficulty, no matter how many contributing factors there may have been, is that they had and have no respect for authority. And they needed an authority. The very fact that many boys returned voluntarily indicated that they themselves sensed they needed the guiding and controlling hand of the authority which they by their conduct spurned. They were, as a matter of fact, not sufficiently mature to go on their own.

Authorities will always have to deal with reactionaries. Like the poor we will always have the rebellious with us. They refuse to occupy what appears to be their proper place in the world. Lose the concept of God as the Supreme Sovereign in the world, and of others, men and women, who have by divine arrangement been clothed with authority in the home, the Church, or in the state, and you'll find a democracy-destroying virus at work. These boys at Whittier did not need the grace of an Omahan father, but of the heavenly Father to teach them to respect those who were intrusted with their care.

Thanksgiving Worship

Thanksgiving is an urge of singing joy
A surge of love toward the Giving One
It is an attitude of mind begun
Within the heart, that nothing can destroy.
It colors every fiber of life's tapestry
Its passive voice is godliest content
In action it will cheerfully be spent
In giving and in loving tirelessly.
It is like mercy blessing those that give
And multiplying like a merchant's coin
In evidence of will and work that join—
Thanksgiving is a pleasure curative.

Such be my thanks, O God, in sweet accord
The vital breath of worship to my Lord.

—Joan Geisel Gardner.

Like a Ship in Passing

We met but briefly, like a ship in passing—
Yet there is pleasure in remembering;
There was no sham about her, one could feel it,
And when she spoke it was as sunbeams sing;
A sweet young face above a round white collar
A knotted scarf of blue (to match her eyes)
Tied at her throat—a fragrant feminine flutter—
To make you think of pleasant summer skies;
Like music in far reaches of the mind;
To make you think of pleasant summer skies;
She had a quality of simple goodness
So memory clings to her and leaves a trace
Of lingering hope to find again her grace.

—Joan Geisel Gardner.
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The Kingdom of God and the Conflict of Ideologies

The conception, the kingdom of God, is not an individual but a corporate idea. The kingdom is given a prominent place in the preaching of Baptist John and of Jesus and in the teaching of the New Testament. It is based on the Old Testament idea of a corporate, social, political movement having very tangible relationships. The kingdom which was lost by the Jews and longed for by those of Jesus’ day was a theocratic kingdom and in these terms people thought. Even at the conclusion of the ministry of Christ, His disciples asked, "Wilt thou at this time restore the kingdom to Israel?" To think that John the Baptist had any nebulous, intangible purely spiritual kingdom in mind in his preaching to the people, is highly imaginative and is to utterly remove John from his environment and setting. No, the kingdom preached by John and by Jesus as at hand is the kingdom of the prophets of the Old Testament, with its definite corporate relationships.

The establishment of this kingdom was conditioned on repentance and acceptance of the King. But Israel did not repent. Rather it rejected and crucified the king who was presented to the people. Because of this fact some teach that the kingdom was postponed until such a time as Israel repents and that the present Gospel age is a by-product of the rejection of Christ, the King, and a mere parenthesis in the progress toward the establishment of the kingdom. This appears to us to invalidate the bona fide offer of the kingdom preceding the Cross of Christ, for had the Jews accepted Christ as their King there would have been no Calvary, and no salvation. He came to die. We prefer, therefore, to think that the kingdom as announced did begin and only those who received the King entered the kingdom. Witness, "As many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God." "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." That kingdom certainly was a spiritual kingdom.

This fact does not invalidate the prophetic promises concerning the earthly phases of the kingdom, but it applied them to a later form of the kingdom, namely, that in glory. The present kingdom offered by John and established by Christ is the kingdom in the form explained in the thirteenth chapter of Matthew. The kingdom is the manifestation of the rule of God on earth in Christendom, but obviously not all those included in the sphere are truly redeemed persons.

The Kingdom in Scripture

The Scripture presents the historical sweep of the kingdom of God. This kingdom is one, with several forms or phases. The first phase of the kingdom was theocratic. It was the rulership of God over chosen people through prophets and kings. God’s law was the basis. God’s prophets were his spokesmen and the king the executor of his will. The practical manifestation of the theocracy was not always as satisfactory as one might desire. The next phase of the kingdom is that of Christendom of which, of course, the true Church of Christ is a definite part. This is the external reach of the rulership of God on earth today. The third phase of the kingdom will be the universal phase when the kingdoms of this world become the kingdoms of our Lord and of His Christ. That will be the kingdom of glory. That will extend over the whole of the earth and the golden prophecies of holy men of old will then be fulfilled.

In the present form of the kingdom, we find in the Gospels the synonymous use of the phrases, "Kingdom of heaven" and "Kingdom of God." Attempts have been made to differentiate between them. If any differentiation should be made it would be that the kingdom of God is the larger term and embraces the saved of all ages, whereas the kingdom of heaven embraces the professing sphere of Divine rule upon the earth in this age. Unquestionably the kingdom of God includes all phases of history and all redeemed of all ages, whereas many designated as "tares" in Jesus’ parable and as "bad fish" in the parable of the dragnet may be within the kingdom profession but without salvation. The church, however, when used in its Scriptural sense of the redeemed, is not synonymous with the kingdom. The Church is an elect people called out to witness to Christ in this age.

The Kingdom in Present-Day Life

Nevertheless we believe that we may correctly use the word "kingdom," in spite of objections, to the present work of the Spirit through the Church for surely this is a phase of the kingdom of God. This kingdom is also corporate, with social and
political connotations. It is therefore essential that we return to the conception of the work of the Spirit in our age as a kingdom concept. Just as there is a transition in political philosophy from an "I" to a "We" outlook, we must reemphasize the corporate aspect of Christianity. Political philosophies are emphasizing the group, the community, the State, rather than the individual. Unquestionably we have something to learn in this field in our Christian thinking. The kingdom has been considered a matter of individual concern to be approached by evangelism. It is in this, but it is also a larger concept of a community relationship.

The message of the kingdom today will be a parallel message to that of the day of John the Baptist, for it is a time of transition from one form of the kingdom to another. We are in a day of darkness when human life is held very cheap and when hate, terror and conflict are rampant in the earth. One almost feels that the message of the angel having the everlasting Gospel to preach unto them that dwell on the earth, saying, "Fear God and give glory to Him for the hour of judgment is come" is the message of our day. We have a human premonition that this is an hour of judgment for the nations, that the prophetic word of God is moving on and that our preaching must consist of the announcement, "Repent for the kingdom of heaven is at hand." This in our estimation is the most pertinent message for our day. We are to repent as individuals, to enter the present form of the kingdom. We are to prepare, to be ready for the impending form of the kingdom. With this conception of the kingdom of God modern world views are in conflict. We do not use that term "world view" in its pure, philosophic sense, but as a social philosophy. The phrase itself was a popular one in Germany during the confusion of the post-Versailles and pre-Hitler era called by the Nazis "Fourteen years of shame." During that time men often spoke of "Der Krieg Der Welten­ schaungen," the conflict of world views. Since that time, in countries where there is still free speech the world views are in even more intensified conflict.

Possible Forms of Government

The possible kinds of human government are relatively few. First, there is monarchy. This is absolute when there are no limitations on the powers of the sovereign. It is limited when the sovereign rules by either a constitution or common law. The second is oligarchy. This is the rulership of the few or the election of rulers by a few. If absolute power and authority is assumed by the few an oligarchy becomes an autocracy self-derived. In a limited sense England is an oligarchy. Sir Anthony Eden speaking in behalf of a bill extending the suffrage in 1928, felt it necessary to say to the House of Commons, "We have not got democratic government in this country today; we never have had it and I venture to suggest to honorable members opposite that we shall never have it. What we have done in all the progress of reform and evolution of politics, is to broaden the basis of our oligarchy." Another form of oligarchy is the class government of the proletariat under the leadership of the Communist Party as illustrated in Russia. Third is the tyranny. This is a state in which the sovereign is reigning without common law or a constitution. It may be a benevolent tyranny or a despotic tyranny and it implies the arbitrary exercise or even abuse of authority. Fourth is a timocracy. This is the state in which honor or glory or property become the ruling principle of authority. Fifth is democracy. This is a government in which the supreme power is exercised by the people by direct election or is delegated to representatives by election who are the instruments of the people in a republic. Sixth is theocracy or the rulership of God through prophets and a king. We may really summarize governments today under three kinds, first, the dictatorship of a class such as in Russia. Second, the dictatorship of an individual such as in Germany. Third, the government by representatives as in the United States. Most governments will find their place in one of these three predominant groups. Therefore, we look at them.

Russian Communism

Russian Communism is not a pure Communism. It is actually a dictatorship of the Communist Party, which has very small numbers and which rules over a vast multitude of people. We have called it a substitute for the kingdom of God for it is an attempt on atheistic foundations to produce millennial conditions. It is an effort to do without God what the world has failed to do with God. The dialectic of Communism is one of idealism. It purports to be the vanguard in the world revolution which will permanently free the masses of people from all exploitation, making them the owners and the producers of all wealth. All sacrifice is to contribute toward the lifting of the conditions of the masses. By this non-profit cooperative idealistic effort a great appeal has been made to the youth of the world for a better world.

May I give two illustrations of the appeal of this idealism.

A friend of the writer is a successful business man of sixty years of age. His home is in the suburbs of Boston. Church membership, participation in service clubs, humanitarian interests, family loyalty marked his life. His son, a splendid physical and mental specimen was sent to a prominent New England college. There a professor interested him in communism and thoroughly converted him to the view. The father learning of this removed him from the school and entered him in a local Boston College. The former professor corresponded with the boy and succeeded in convincing him that he must break with his family. The boy went to work in the steel mills of Pittsburgh for a period, then continued college in the mid-west; married a girl devoted to communism and now is actively engaged in the com-
National Socialism

The second counterfeit to the kingdom of God challenging the world is national socialism. Under this may be summarized all the military dictatorships of the vested interests. Here in the beginning was a revolution which came out of capitalism itself from those holding the control of the means of production and determined to keep it. It was reactionary capitalism on the march. That this ultimately became indistinguishable from Communism in its manifestation does not invalidate the observation that it is a second category of substitute. Due to its conflict with democratic capitalist nations it has been forced to resort to a mass movement of revolution embodying the pagan conceptions of race, blood, soil and conquest. The movement is a combination of the theories of Marxian Socialism, of Spengler’s pessimism and of Nietzsche’s philosophy of force. Spengler, who wrote his Decline of the West before the first World War, prophesied this new movement of men of force in this century. To him, the opportunity of waging a decisive war was the high moment and privilege in the destiny of a people. Combining these in the national socialist philosophy, Hitler proposed to bring material privileges to the masses of Germany by excessive Nationalism, by intense international conflict, by liquidating the freedoms of life, and by ordering the existence of all. That non-Germans within the orbit of the new order were to be subject to a peasant-like semi-slavery did not dim the Messianic nature of the movement. That the theory involves war, conquest, terror, sacrifice is evidenced by what the world has already seen. Nevertheless, it has been of sufficient vitality to challenge the allegiance and the self-giving of millions of young people who are giving their lives for the Führer.

Democracy, Equality, and Liberty

The third substitute for the kingdom of God is democracy. There are those who confuse democracy with the kingdom of God. Of all possible governments we hold democracy to be the most productive of Christian work, thought and life. We honor democracy. We believe in democracy. We owe a great debt to democracy and we choose democracy as a type of government under which to live, but democracy is not the kingdom of God. The success of democracy, however, is based upon the efficacy of the truths of the kingdom of God.

Equality and liberty are the dominating concepts of American idealism. The conception of equality, so emphasized by our government radicals, found its way into the thinking of English people through Wat Tyler as a result of whose labors the ideal flared at times into open revolt. It was advanced by John Locke’s theory that the mind at birth is like a tabula rasa, an empty wax tablet ready to receive impressions, and that all future distinctions among men are the result of what goes on in the world, men being unequal only because they make themselves so. This was developed by Helvétius and Rousseau until it found a home in America under the leadership of men like Thomas Jefferson and is expressed in the New Deal of our own day. Even the present four freedoms bandied about by politicians and radicals include “freedom from want” which is another way of expressing the ideal of equality.

Liberty as a concept came to us from the ancients through the Magna Charta, the Petition of Right, The Bill of Rights and The Habeus Corpus Act, through the work of Roger Bacon, Voltaire and Diderot, through the theories of Turgot and Adam Smith in laissez-faire, through the French Revolution, through Benjamin Franklin, Tom Paine, Alexander Hamilton and James Monroe, until America became “the sweet land of liberty.” Lincoln coupled liberty and equality in the Gettysburg address stating that this government was “conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal,” yet these two conceptions are in constant conflict and the pendulum swings from one to the other, for men want both privileges.

Where there is equality there cannot be liberty. Where there is liberty there cannot be equality. Jeremy Bentham made this clear in the fundamentals of Utilitarianism. Therefore he chose liberty for had he advanced equality first no liberty would remain. With liberty there can be a measure of equality. Hence, the American democratic ideal has been the mediating position between the two. Communism and National Socialism are founded on
equality with no liberty. Therein the divergence from our American way is seen.

**Christianity, Equality, and Liberty**

One element in a democracy is able to keep the equilibrium between equality and liberty in practice, namely religion, that is, the Christian tradition. It is easy to see that American democracy's effective functioning is dependent upon morality, concern for one's fellow man, and internal individual restraint developed only by Christianity. That the practical manifestation of the American Way is materialism, unrestrained greed in capital and labor, self-indulgence in drink and lusts, injustice and class strife, reveals the disintegration of the Christian influence upon national life.

This may be described as the breaking over of a river into flood proportions. We think of man as body, soul and spirit. With the body man has earth contact, with the soul social contact of affections, volitions and intellect, and with the spirit God contact. Enlarged to mankind, for the body we have the economic relations, for the soul the political relations, and for the spirit the religious relations. In these three great realms of our nation, we have economically capitalism, politically democracy, religiously Christendom. Imagine, therefore, democracy as one bank of a river and Christianity as the other bank, and capitalism as the river itself. The "power revolution" of the twentieth century, in the production processes of capitalism, has caused this part of the nation to overflow the boundaries of government and of religion. The flood has been helped by the disintegration of the religious dam holding the economic division of man's life in its proper place. Simultaneously the government has increased its controls in an attempt to compensate for the break-up of Christendom, resulting in flood proportions of the river and fascistic tendencies in national life. Hence the evils of our day have come from the over-development of capitalism, from the abandonment of Christianity and from the over-development of government agencies. For this reason many are pessimistic about the outlook for democracy and already some of our government leaders proclaim that there is a movement toward fascism in America.

*This article will be followed by another from the pen of Dr. Ockenga on "Conflicting Ideologies and the Coming Kingdom."—Editor.*

---

**Monologue on Death**

Ruth Bernice Hoekenga
Alameda, California

**DEATH, I saw you today.**

I wandered through a costly palace of golden rims and marble walls, of dribbling waterfalls and warbling birds, of keen artistic structure, of rarest flowers and awe-inspiring melodies, in which you are concealed. They were trying to make your presence unseen, unnoticed, but I saw you. I was in a Crematorium. Everything was beautiful! I rammed up those tiny winding steps; I paused and smelt the fragrant blossoms and gorgeous flowers; I listened to canaries caroling a frisky little tune. That was life!

But as I started gazing at those bronze-covered urns, those flower-covered sanctuaries, I felt a strange ominous feeling. I was not looking at those beautiful metal-covered urns; I was not looking at the glass in front of them, nor at the flowers all around them; I was looking at something utterly different—not something beautiful, but something grim, ghastly, ugly! I was looking at you, Death. They tried to disguise you and veil you to make you look beautiful, but I saw you in all your unattractiveness. I was in a Crematorium where men try to escape that which is to come by burning up their bodies, by destroying their souls; but, that cannot be; that soul cannot be cruelly destroyed. It lives on, is interminable!

* * *

**DEATH, I saw you today.**

I rode through your cemetery. It was beautiful with blue skies above, sea-gulls circling overhead, and roses blooming forth in brilliant colors. I was there, but you were also there. I stood by the tomb of someone I had known, and I read the carved out tribute to that person. I stood on the green grass above him and plucked a rose from a near-by bush. I was there, but you were also there. You were ugly and you know why. The very thought of you made me shudder. I thought of that person's life—his reckless, careless life. I remembered how you came one day as he was speeding down the highway to destruction. Your crooked hand was beckoning him to follow you. He yielded and you urged him to go faster. He went faster, and you took him here. You were ugly because his life was ugly.

* * *

**DEATH, I saw you in the headlines today.**

I saw you floating on the cruel waves. You were calling to a poor, discouraged woman standing on
the busy bridge above you. She was weak, tired, and all courage and faith had left her. You called. You called louder. Slowly, she climbed on top of the railing and pinned a note to the garment she removed. You winked your eye and told her of the sweet peace awaiting her. You told her that she would be free from every care. You looked good to her, so she believed you. With sudden resolution she sprang into that chilly, icy water to meet you. You caught her and brought her to the bottom of that murky sea. That was her grave. I stood there silently for a moment. I was trembling, wondering where her soul was going to go. I walked on. I had seen you from that bridge.

** * * *

**Death,** I see you many times all through the day. I see you in the form of a vicious fire, licking victims with your burning tongue. I see you rising high above a city, over the houses, through locked doors and barred windows. Men are trying to get away from you to hide from your clutching arms. But they cannot hide. You have been sent as a messenger of the one above all. You have been sent by God! You have come to take away the wicked, the ungodly, and to stop evil. You are the black horseman! Men are afraid of you, but they see you, Death. You will be with them forever. You will go to hell with them. They will have to be with you perpetually. Eternal Death!

** * * *

**Death,** I saw you today. But you were not ugly, black, a grim spectacle. You wore a white robe and had a sweet smile on your face. I saw you in that same cemetery in which I had seen the black horseman. I stood over my father's tomb. There was a small lump in my throat, but I was not sad. I plucked a rose from a shrub by the grave and pressed it to my heart. I saw the blue sky above me, and I heard the birds sing. I was not afraid.

I read the inscription on that tomb—"For we know that all things work together for good to those who love the Lord." That was his favorite text. I thought over his life as it had been told to me. He had died when I was but a tiny child. I remembered very little of him, but yet I love him. He had been ready to preach one night and you came and tapped him gently on the shoulder and said "It's time to go." He put his hand in yours, and you led him out. There was mourning here, but rejoicing in heaven. You were with him only a few minutes, and his soul went above to heaven. You were not ugly. You were beautiful! You were no cruel instrument of destruction, but merely the means by which that dear father was brought above.

** * * *

**Death,** I saw you as I read a little story.

An ocean vessel was just leaving port filled with happy people, anxious for rest and pleasure. The boat sailed out into the high seas, and the journey was very calm and enjoyable. Toward night, however, the water started to become rough and violent; the lightning flashed, and the thunder roared. The boat had lost its course! The angry waves tossed it about like a tiny ball, and the passengers aboard the life-boat, the giant steamer sank beneath the waves. Many of the crew were suffering severe mental and spiritual anguish. They were yelling and screaming at the sight of the black robed man of death. The young sailor lad, however, smiled and gallantly tried to get a hold of drifting timber. Then you appeared in your white robe, and as waves surged over his head, his clear voice could be heard above the roaring waves—

"Jesus Lover of my soul, Let me to thy bosom fly. While the nearer bosom roll— While the tempest still is nigh."
As the last words were being sung, a huge wave came over him, and as his head went under you smiled at him. That death was glorious!

* * *

Death, I have not seen you face to face.

I have not felt your presence very near. But I will some day. I also must have an appointment with you. I do not know when or where it will be, but I know that I'll be ready when you call. I hope that I shall not be drifting idly down the stream of life, or fighting for honor, respect, or reputation. I trust that I shall be fighting on the field of unbelief and sin, with a shield of faith, a breastplate of righteousness, and the armor of the spirit of God, breaking down wickedness and building up forts of faith, belief, and pure Christian character. And when I hear you call, I shall hand my sword to someone else; I will smile and say “My time has come, my work is done, I have fought the good fight of faith.” I will place my hand in yours and give my last breath in praise of God. And when upon my grave they stand, may they pluck a rose and stand unafraid, and say:

“The Lord hath given, The Lord hath taken away, Blessed be the name of the Lord.”

The Social Implications of Christian Marriage

In our previous two articles on this subject we found marriage to be an institution created by God for the purpose of activating and developing His image. We noticed that, when through marriage that image reflected the divine glory, majesty, and honor of God, He, the divine Artist, rejoiced. But the image of God was lost through sin and consequently marriage lost its purpose, meaning, and content. However, through the work of regeneration by the Holy Spirit in the heart and soul of the elect, this image of God is restored and it, as well as the original, stands in need of activation and development. For that reason God also restored the institution of marriage. This institution is restored for the Christian only. And, although God’s common grace makes a modicum of marital happiness possible also for the non-Christian, only the Christian is capable of full-orbed, purposeful marriage.

The Social Nature of the Image of God

The image of God is essentially of a social character or nature. There is social interaction or intercourse within the Trinity and therefore the image of God, i.e., of the Trinity, must also be of a social character. Eph. 4:23, 24 and Col. 3:10 inform us that the restored image of God consists of knowledge, righteousness, and holiness. A moment of reflection will reveal to us that these are social virtues.

The knowledge here referred to is not of a merely intellectual character but is also of a psychological nature. It is knowledge proceeding from intimate, loving, social relationship. In Semitic feeling and thinking it approaches the idea of love. Love is a social attribute or virtue. It is, and can only be, activated and developed in social relationships.

The same is true of righteousness. Surely, man, the image of God is righteous. Righteousness belongs to his being and essence. But as such it is a power or a potentiality. This power or potentiality craves action or activation in order that through it it may develop. We can speak of righteous acts only in connection with social relations and the activation and consequent development of righteousness can be evoked only by social intercourse between person and person.

Holiness, too, is of a social nature. Surely, it is a quality of man’s being. As the image of God is holy. But, as we have remarked before, in last analysis holiness is devotion. Orthodox theology abounds with definitions of holiness in both negative and positive terms, mostly the latter. Whether the authors of these definitions are in every instance aware of it may be questioned, but it is true nevertheless, that the great majority of these definitions are written against the background of the fact that holiness is devotion. It is devotion to God and in so far as it is also devotion to man it is devotion to God through devotion to man. Also this third attribute or virtue of the image of God is, therefore, of a thoroughly social character or nature.

The image of God, therefore, consists of social attributes. Marriage is given in order that in the most intimately social relationships of which marriage is capable, these social attributes shall come into play, shall be activated, exercised, developed, and attain to greatest glory and beauty. Marriage is the institution par excellence in which, to the infinite joy of the Creator, the social intercourse of the Three Persons of the Trinity is reflected. Therefore Christian marriage is of a highly social nature and for social purposes.

The Universal Image of God and Its Social Nature

At this point it is necessary that we are reminded of it that the image of God resides in the human
race collectively as well as in the individual separately.

The individual can be the image of God to but a limited degree but the human race in its entirety reveals that image more completely. All real development and genuine progress in the civilization of the human race is the result of the activation and development of that universal image of God.

Each individual drop of ocean water reflects the brilliance of the sun and the moon but together they give a fuller and a more impressive reflection. The reflection of the sun in the dewdrops thrills our heart with joy because of its beauty but the reflection of the setting sun on ocean or lake overwhelms, overawes us with its sublimity. So it is with the image of God. In the individual it inspires us with its beauty, in the race it overwhelms us with its sublimity. A sublimity which only God can fully fathom and appreciate.

This implies that the one human race is an intricately connected whole. It is the one universal image of God. This oneness of the universal image makes the human race one. Each individual is vitally linked up with the whole and the whole is there because of the individuals. The whole could not reflect the glory of God if the individuals were not vitally interrelated, the individuals could be the image of God to but a very limited extent if they were not united in the whole. The oneness of the universal image of God makes the human race one great society. The essence of the image of God in the individual is, as we have noticed of a social nature. What is true of the individual image of God is still more true of the universal image of God. Because of this social nature the one is activated and developed in the social intercourse of marriage and the other social intercourse of human society, which, however, is inspired and sustained by the social intercourse of marriage.

The Universal Image of God
Socially Developed in Marriage

We have stated in different connections that human marriage had as its purpose the activation and development of the image of God in the individual. A question which now arises is, does marriage have the same purpose in regard to the universal image of God? The answer to this question is an emphatic yes. Human marriage is the instrument to be used in both instances. This is possible. Every individual marriage is vitally connected with the marriage of two pair of parents, i.e., with two other marriages and these again with others, and so on ad infinitum. Considering this we begin to realize that every individual human marriage is linked up directly or indirectly with every other individual marriage. Well may it be said that the whole human race is "united in marriage."

Marriage, we found, is an institution for the most intimate social intercourse. If then the human race is one in marriage this oneness or unity must also be, and is, of a highly social nature. Again, every individual marriage through its direct and indirect connection with every other human marriage is socially related to the human race or total human society. The social virtues and attributes of the image of God, being activated and developed in the social intercourse of the individual marriage, now can and do assert themselves in the social intercourse between the individual marriage and total human society. They agitate the social capacity of the universal image of God and activate and develop the latter. And, for clearness' sake, once again, the activation and development of the image of God in each marriage adds its little quota to the activation and development of the universal image of God in total, human society.

The Social Development of the Universal Image of God in a Mixed Society

Human society is mixed. It consists of regenerated and unregenerated individuals, of Christians and non-Christians, of those in whom the image of God is restored and those in whom this transformation has not taken place. But we found that the human race is one and that in such oneness it is the universal image of God. Does that mean that both categories of persons mentioned above contribute in their marital relations to the activation and development of the universal image of God? Yes, it does mean that.

We have noticed that the unregenerated or the non-Christian has lost the image of God in its narrower connotation. Neither is it restored in him through regeneration. But, as we have seen, he has retained it in the wider or broader sense.

We should never forget that God has at the fall of man exercised his common grace. That means that there are some feeble remnants of the image of God left even in the unbeliever. As we have suggested, this makes a modicum of marital happiness possible for him. He, too, still has some vague idea that marriage is for the activation and development of love. His conception of love may not be what it should be and often be nothing more than a caricature because it is ultimately based upon, and issues into, selfishness, the idea is there and often becomes an ideal. He also wishes to strive after justice in his marital relations. True, his conception of it is not based upon God's divine revelation but, it is there. He also speaks much of devotion to one another. In marriage devotion to one another must definitely issue into devotion to God. But with the unregenerated it does not and therefore his devotion to the other becomes in last analysis devotion to self. Nevertheless, the idea of devotion lives in the soul of the unbeliever and he often strives hard to translate it into both, an ideal and a reality.

There is, therefore, a remnant of the image of God left in the unregenerated soul and he seeks to activate and develop this remnant in the social inter-
course of marriage so that he may add his quota to the activation and development of the universal image of God in social intercourse with human society. But how little he succeeds. Even his "Social Gospel" which was his most hopeful, his most conscious, and his clearest expression of his desire to accomplish all this has during the last decade turned into a cry of despair and, under the pressure of the present world catastrophe of hatred, has been silenced.

The remnants of the image of God in the unregenerated individual as well as in a society of only unregenerated cannot be activated and developed into the beauty of the universal image of God which was intended at creation. It is only because we have a total human society in which the regenerate and the unregenerate mingle in social intercourse that this activation and development is accomplished in a measure.

**Mixed Marriages a Detriment**

Does the foregoing mean that the Christian must seek intimate social connections with total human society through the social bond of marriage with an unbeliever? Must the regenerate marry an unregenerate? To the contrary. Scripture, in many places enjoins upon the church and its members to come out of the world. The church, heeding this commandment of Christ, has always frowned upon the believer's marriage with an unbeliever. It has always disapproved of intimate social relations with the world and also of mixed marriages which often result from such relations. There is, indeed, hardly a greater human tragedy thinkable than the marriage between a believer and an unbeliever. In such a union the image of God in the heart and soul of the believer longs and yearns to be activated and developed. This is impossible, however, for in the social interaction of such a marriage the affinity of mind, heart, and soul, and the consequent social responses so necessary for this activation and development are lacking. Such a marriage is not a Christian marriage. In it the social virtues are squelched rather than activated and developed and therefore such a marriage becomes a detriment rather than an aid for the activation and development of both, the individual and the universal image of God.

**Christian Marriage and the Social Development of the Universal Image of God**

The Lord has said unto the Church that she should be a light unto the world, the salt of the earth, and a leaven. Isn't that impossible if the Christians abstain from marriage with the world?

The Christian Church of the first three centuries and of Europe of the Middle Ages has consistently preached and practised refrain from such marriages. Notwithstanding the cynical denial of it by modern, atheistic iconoclasts, it can be said that the Church during these centuries has raised the morality of these nations where it became established. By confining their marital relations to believers the Christians of these times have activated and developed the universal image of God in these peoples and nations even although the unregenerated among them usually outnumbered the regenerated by far.

It is exactly when Christian marries Christian that their social virtues, developed in their marital relations, make such a tremendous impression upon those outside of true Christianity. If the Church and the individual members continue in their obedience to the injunction, "do not put on a yoke with the unbeliever," they will be a strong factor in the activation and development of the universal image of God., i.e., they will foster social love, social justice, social devotion in the total society of the human race. What they have developed in true Christian marriage they can hold up before the world as an example. And it does not require much knowledge of unregenerate society to realize how often it envies the Christian for his full-orbed marital happiness.

**Christian Marriage a Training School for Social Life**

That marriage is a training school for social life is universally recognized. Any university curriculum of social studies devotes considerable space to human marriage and the family because these highest institutions of learning consider it the basic social institution in which the individual is prepared for taking his place in human society. No sincere student of sociology will deny that marriage has a profound influence upon society at large. Radicals and extremists, it is true, wish to abolish it but their propaganda for this clearly indicates that their idea is that you cannot radically reform the state or society, which is their chief goal, if you do not first break the hold which marriage has upon it and that to accomplish this you must abolish this institution. Stronger evidence of the tremendous influence of marriage upon society will be difficult to obtain.

Among sociologists it is commonly agreed that a nation is strongest in those social virtues which are fostered in the marital life of the people. The conclusion of many that the decadence and dissolution of marriage has been a factor in the decline of the moral life of many peoples, and of the downfall of many a nation, is based upon the facts of history. Ideas similar to "the moral life of a nation never rises above the marital conceptions and practices of the people" are abundantly expressed by authors on the subject. We conclude, then, that it is generally agreed that marriage has a tremendous influence upon the life of human society.

If this is said of marriage in general, which is, as we have seen, in last analysis, not really marriage for the great majority, how much more true it must be of Christian marriage. How profound must be, and in reality is, the tremendous influence of Christian marriage upon society at large and especially upon the society of the Church which is restored
society and has, therefore, such vital social contact with restored marriage.

Conclusion

How zealously should the Church and the individual Christian guard this flower from Paradise. Both should strain their efforts to the utmost to protect it against the evils of mixed marriages and divorce, against the dry rot of radical sexologists and eroticists, against the many mistaken notions of psychoanalists who forget that marriage is first of all and predominantly a social institution. Let the Church teach, and the Christian believe, that marriage with all its various phases is given to us as an instrument to make us a more beautiful reflection of God's love, righteousness, and holiness.

The Bounds of Thanksgiving

"Giving thanks always for all things." Eph. 5:20

It is customary to take stock and seek out the things for which we can be grateful. Perhaps that procedure is necessary to make gratitude conscious, and yet, how strangely illogical and incongruous to cut life up into pieces that may not harmonize. For how can we single out a thing for which we may be grateful when the same thing may involve pain for a fellow-man? Or must we not rather view life as a totality and recognize that our whole habit of dividing categories is illegitimate?

We may be grateful for health, but what of sickness and the lonely hours of pain?

We may be grateful for food, but what of those who lack and suffer hunger?

We can thank God for peace, but can we if it be war, and carnage, and uncertainty? Thank God for home and friends, but also when close ties are torn to shreds? I take note that my cup runneth over, but what if I were draining its last bitter dregs? I walk by still waters, but what if it were a desert or the valley of shadow? I confess, "Thy grace is sufficient," but what if grace seems to be withheld?

Dare we face the challenge of Paul's inclusiveness when he says "The whole creation groaneth and travaileth," and in the same breath leaps to the high pinnacle of faith and says, "All things work together for good?"

Let us on this Thanksgiving Day, as we so often have done, go back to the historic heritage of the Pilgrim Fathers. Let us battle through the bleak cold and sleet of that rock-bound coast and approach the rough-hewn chapel of the wilderness, wind-swept and dreary.

As we join their service they are singing in measured strains with almost desperate eagerness the words of Psalm 34, or 116, or perhaps we may even enter into the holy-of-holies of a young mother's heart who sings with twitching lips, "Yea though I walk through death's dark vale, yet will I fear no ill . . ." and her heart is far away by a little pine slab on the hillside.

For what is old Elder Brewster going to thank God this day? For food? and the mind of the skin-clad frontier farmer harks to the few miserable ears he has eled from the rocky soil. For clothing? ruefully the preacher's eyes touch and seem to caress the shabby rags of his loyal flock. For shelter? as if in mockery the wind whistles, and shakes the little shack chapel to its foundations. For homes and families? but inadvertently the good elder's eyes sweep sidewise to the hillside where more headboards stand than there are souls in the little church. For civil and religious freedom? if we had seen them come that morning, thin little procession, guns in hand, eying warily every bush and tree, ears a-tingle waiting for the blood-curdling war-whooop, we would know how dearly that freedom was bought.

And yet, though the voice falters ever so little, Elder Brewster speaks: "O come, let us worship and bow down, let us kneel before the Lord our Maker, for we are the people of His pasture and the sheep of His hand."

"Oh, Thou Whose bounty fills my cup
With every blessing meet!
I give Thee thanks for every drop,
The bitter and the sweet!
"I praise Thee for the desert road,
And for the riverside.
For all Thy goodness hath bestowed—
And all Thy grace denied!"

ALA BANDON.

Education's Dilemma

Knowledge they seek, and come to me
To learn—to know
The lore of peoples gone; to hear and see
The progress made since long ago.
Progress that made men free
From many a savage blow
Dealt by tyrants who would ever be
Lords of all below.
Who seek to crush by cruel decree
All those who, to and fro,
Seek peace and peaceful pursuits. We
Would ever wish to show
That mankind holds the key—
The power, God-given—to bestow
The knowledge that makes men free!
Alas! this age of woe
Sees the hand of tyranny
Lay nation after nation low!
Knowledge they seek; they come to me!
God make me wise to "know,"
When I do not know!

—BESS DE VRIES.
The Sabbath Symposium

John Murray
Professor of Systematic Theology

It requires labor, as well as space in the printed page, to set forth what appear to the present writer to be inconsistencies in Dr. Pieters' review of the Sabbath discussion in the August-September issue of THE CALVIN FORUM. It is to be regretted that so much of this article will have to be devoted to these inconsistencies. If, however, progress is to be made and if issues are to be set in clear light, it is necessary that obscurities and inconsistencies be removed. Dr. Pieters has done much to bring the issues into clearer light, and he has compelled those who differ with him to examine anew the basis of their belief. He cannot be accused of lack of candour. But I do find myself under the necessity of pointing out inconsistency, if not self-contradiction, in some of his argument.

Inconsistencies

At the outset I must express regret that in my article of May, in speaking of the alleged silence of the New Testament, I may have made it to appear as if those whose arguments I was attempting to answer failed to acknowledge the references to the Sabbath in the four gospels. But what I had in mind was just the type of argument Dr. Pieters himself bases on the omission of any reference to the Sabbath in the decree of the Council at Jerusalem (Acts 15) and on the alleged silence of the epistles. The point precisely is that a certain kind of silence within the New Testament is used as an argument to show that the New Testament does not provide us with evidence to establish the permanent obligation of the fourth commandment. I was intent upon showing that this type of argument fails to take proper account of the other statements there are in the New Testament, statements which constitute evidence that the Sabbath law is regarded by the New Testament as invested with permanent validity and authority. In a word, the silence there is in certain parts of the New Testament has no right to be construed, in the matter that concerns this debate, as silence on the part of the New Testament as a whole.

Dr. Pieters says that with the rest of my first article he has no quarrel, "for it is devoted to showing how important is the weekly day of rest." He continues: "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" (p. 23). From even superficial reading of my first article, as well as of the second, surely nothing should be clearer than that the argument for the weekly day of rest was based upon the fourth commandment. Dr. Pieters has no ground upon which to suggest or insinuate that this was not precisely the argument for the weekly day of rest upon the fourth commandment, then he has missed the whole point of the article. And I must disavow responsibility for this.

Dr. Pieters says that it is a misunderstanding of his position to aver that he accepts the continuance of the moral principles involved in the other nine commandments but denies it with regard to the fourth. Now, no one needed to be in any doubt that Dr. Pieters holds that abrogation covers the whole Decalogue. This he made abundantly clear in the issue for February on pages 186 and 137. But in the February issue and in his latest article he also distinguishes between the moral principle involved in a commandment and the commandment itself. He says emphatically that while "all of the commandments are abrogated, in their strictly legal significance, any moral principles contained in them abide with undiminished authority" (August-September issue, p. 23). The distinction he draws is obvious, and there was and is no misunderstanding.

But if we are to believe Dr. Pieters' own statements we must draw the conclusion that he accepts the continuance of the moral principles involved in the other nine commandments but denies this with regard to the fourth, continuance, of course, on the grounds on which he contends permanence and universality may be established, to wit, that they belong to the moral law that existed before Sinai and have been re-affirmed in the New Testament as moral principles of the Christian life. We shall quote his own words:

"Under the New Covenant the people of God must look for moral obligation, not to something authoritative under the abrogated Old Covenant, but to the teaching of our Lord and of the holy apostles. That instruction coincides at almost all points with the commandments of the Decalogue, but, as we have seen, not with the Fourth Commandment.

"However, here arises an objection that must be considered. As every Bible reader knows, the apostles do quote all the other nine commandments as divine and authoritative. How can that be reconciled with the idea that they lost their authority with the death of Christ? The answer is not difficult, and is indicated at once when we ask the question: 'Did these commandments originate the duties required in them, or were they duties before the time of Moses?' Certainly the latter. Therefore they were a part of the Moral Law before the Decalogue was given, and being such, they remained a part of the Moral Law after the Decalogue was abrogated. It is as such that the apostles affirm and teach them, and in doing so they naturally employ the old and well known form of words. So far as the apostles do this, the Christian is bound to accept the said commandments as authoritative, not now because they were proclaimed at Sinai, but because of their original moral quality and their re-affirmation by the apostles. At the risk of repetition, we may state it thus:

"Whatever in the Decalogue is binding upon us is so binding, not at all because it is there, but because it has been re-affirmed by Christ and the apostles as a moral principle of the Christian life."

"The Fourth Commandment, however, has not been so re-affirmed, and therefore has no authority as a rule of conduct in the Christian life. That is what Calvin taught, and that is scriptural to the highest degree" (February issue, p. 137, Italics mine).

It is surely obvious that here a clear line of distinction is drawn between the moral principles expressed in the other nine commandments, on the one hand, and the fourth commandment, on the other. In other words, Dr. Pieters holds that moral principles of the abiding moral law are involved in the other nine commandments, but no such principle underlies the fourth. Yet in his latest article he says:

"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" (p. 23).
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The italics at the end are mine. Dr. Pieters will have to reconcile the italicised statement with the position taken in the other quotation. I cannot find coherence in these two positions.

Again, in dealing with apparently conflicting attitudes on the part of the apostles, he says:

"As careful and thorough exegetes, we must seek some general principle that will bring harmony into these apparent conflicting attitudes, and such a principle may be found, I think, 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" (p. 24).

On the basis of the position taken by Dr. Pieters in his article for February, my argument in reply was that, if permanent authority attaches to the moral principles expressed in the other nine commandments, because they were in operation before Sinai and have been re-affirmed in the New Testament, then, on the very same grounds, a principle of permanent authority may also be discovered in the fourth, for the reason that the Sabbath law existed before Sinai and has been re-affirmed by Christ. This part of my argument I again remind readers was, however, ad hominem. I still insist that it holds good if Dr. Pieters adheres to his own statements in his article of February, and that he will have to make rather a radical revision of some of his own statements quoted above if he is to bring consistency into the formulation of his position.

The Change of Day

The omission on my part to adduce the evidence in support of the position that the weekly Sabbath has been changed in the Christian dispensation from the seventh day of the week to the first calls forth Dr. Pieters' question, "May we take this as a tacit admission that, in his judgment, no proof of that assertion can be adduced?" The answer is, of course, that the omission implies no such admission. It was stated in the article for June-July that many questions of the greatest importance had to be left untouched, so far as my contributions were concerned. This was one of them. Professor Kromminga made brief allusion to the evidence in support of the assertion concerned in his article for April. In his latest article he has developed the argument and has given, in the judgment of the present writer, one of the most cogent pieces of reasoning that we possess. Professor Kromminga does not cover the whole field—he himself would not claim that—but within the brief compass devoted to the subject he has made us his debtors for an eminently worthy presentation of considerations frequently discounted but, nevertheless, of the greatest weight. I cannot claim to be able to add anything new to what Professor Kromminga has written and to what other representative treatments of the subject contain. I would simply refer to the admirable treatment of the subject by Daniel Wilson in his book, The Lord's Day, and to B. B. Warfield's summary of the evidence in his masterly article, "The Foundations of the Sabbath in the Word of God." However, if Professor Kromminga had not dealt with this phase of the discussion in his last article, an important hiatus would have been left in this particular series of articles, and Dr. Pieters was justified, at the time he wrote his last article, in calling attention to it.

The Decision of the Jerusalem Council

Dr. Pieters' use of the omission of any reference to the Sabbath law in the decision of the Council at Jerusalem (Acts 15) merits some further comment. There are, of course, difficulties both on the one hand and on the other; but I might be out of place to discuss these now. It must, however, be carefully noted that the particular findings of the Council are all negative in form. This of itself should caution us against any hasty conclusions regarding the significance of omission of the Sabbath commandment. The situation with which the Council had to deal is rather clearly outlined for us in the chapter concerned, and, as Dr. G. T. Parrys points out, the motive of the decree "was to prevent offence to the Jews who dwelt in every city, and the simplest explanation is that these four things were prohibited because they were the Gentile customs which were most abhorrent in Jewish eyes" (The Apostolic Age, p. 150). If this is the case—and it appears to be the most satisfactory analysis of the intent and motive of the decree—then mention or non-mention of the weekly Sabbath law does not come within relevant consideration. This matter would be extraneous to the question upon which attention was being focused. Dr. Pieters apparently assumes that the commandment bearing upon the weekly Sabbath was among the distinctively Jewish commandments, that it falls into a different category from other commandments of the decalogue, and would, therefore, be one of those things about which the Gentile Christians at Antioch would be sure to ask. He then proceeds to insist that allusion to it would have been necessary if it were to be regarded as binding upon the Gentiles. But this really begs the question. The apostles and elders were very obviously not dealing with the whole question of the moral law and of ethical conduct—a fact that Dr. Pieters quite clearly recognizes. And since this is the case it is quite unwarranted to draw any conclusions from the omission of the Sabbath law any more than from omission of some of the other commandments. The only basis upon which an inference, such as Dr. Pieters draws, would be warranted is the assumption that in this regard the fourth commandment possesses a different character. However, so far as this debate is concerned, that is to say, the question is, then, find in Acts 15 any warrant for Dr. Pieters' conclusion, and therefore plead that it is the type of argument from silence that cannot be understood as overthrowing the positive evidence we derive from both Testaments for the continued and permanent authority of the fourth commandment. Dr. Pieters' construction imports into the situation a series of assumptions we have no warrant to conclude were within the purview or consideration of the apostles and elders at the time.

Furthermore, it is not by any means to be taken for granted that we can cite murder, theft and adultery as things belonging to general morality and as well understood by the Greeks and Romans as by the Jews (February issue, p. 135). They truly belong to general morality in the true sense of that term, but who is to assure us that the Greeks and Romans had really any more intelligent and true recognition of the sanctity and permanence of these commandments as they were embodied in the Biblical revelation, than they would have had of the Sabbath commandment? Here again there is reason to believe that Dr. Pieters' unwarranted assumption is at work. At any rate, I do submit that he has taken far too much for granted in drawing so sharp a line of cleavage between the way the Greeks and Romans would have reacted to some of the other commandments and the way they would have reacted to the fourth.1)

The Strictness of Sabbath Observance

Since the editor has generously granted further space in the pages of THE CALVIN FORUM, I welcome this opportunity to discuss a phase of the subject of Sabbath observance that had to be omitted previously. This fragment has frequently been said and it is the position formally adopted in certain sections of the Reformed Church, that, while the fourth commandment is binding in the Christian dispensation, yet it is not to be observed with the strictness with which it was observed in the Mosaic economy. Now, I submit that this is an unwarranted inference, and that it proceeds from failure to make an important distinction, the distinction between certain temporary and ceremonial regulations governing the observance of the Sabbath in the Mosaic economy and the Sabbath law itself as enunciated in the fourth commandment.

1) Other considerations could be mentioned which offset Dr. Pieters' conclusions, particularly the consideration that the Judaistic commandment would concern the observance of the seventh day, whereas the Gentile Christians at Antioch would celebrate the first day, the Lord's day.
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It is, of course, true that there were certain ceremonial requirements under the Mosaic law that no one in this controversy, so far as I am aware, holds to be binding in the New Testament economy. For example, in Exodus 35:2, 3 we read, "Six days shall work be done, but on the seventh there shall be to you an holy day, a sabbath of rest to the Lord: whosoever doth work therein shall be put to death. Ye shall kindle no fire throughout your habitations upon the sabbath day." Here are two regulations that we do not hold obtain in the Christian economy, namely, the death penalty for non-observance and the prohibition to kindle a fire in our habitations. But the abrogation of such regulations, with the passing of the ceremonial law, in no way affects the strictness with which we observe the commandment. This may seem a strange conclusion, but it can be very easily elucidated and established.

There were many other temporary regulations governing the observance of the other commandments. For example, governing the observance of the fifth commandment, it was provided, "And he that curseth his father, or his mother, shall surely be put to death" (Exod. 21:17). Governing the observance of at least two of the other commandments it was provided, "Thou shalt not suffer a witch to live. Whosoever lieth with a beast shall surely be put to death. He that sacrificeth any Goat or Sheep unto the Lord only, he shall be utterly destroyed" (Exod. 22:18-20). In Leviticus 18 we have a list of abominations, and it is provided that, "Whosoever shall commit any of these abominations, even the souls that commit them shall be cut off from among their people" (vs. 29. See also Lev. 20:9-21, 27; 21:9; 24:10-16, 23; Num. 15:30-36). We have, then, abundant examples of the regulations governing, and of the severe penalties meted out to, certain violations of other commandments, and we do not hold that such regulations and sanctions are operative in the Christian economy. But are we to suppose that the strictness with which we observe these commandments has in any way been relaxed? Are we to suppose that, since capital punishment is not to be meted out for such gross violation of the fifth commandment as that of cursing father or mother, therefore we need not now as strictly observe the fifth commandment as did the Jews under the Mosaic law? If for certain forms of sexual uncleanness the death penalty is not now inflicted, do we less strictly observe the seventh commandment? Are these gross aberrations any less an abomination now than they were then? The very asking of these questions contains the answer. In view of the greater light which the fulness of New Testament revelation has brought to us, the commission of these abominations is only all the more heinous. The abrogation of certain regulatory provisions and sanctions has not brought one whit more to us. Indeed, it would be here true to say that the abolition of these regulations and sanctions only serves to enforce the sanctity of the commandments. Or, to put the matter more accurately, it is the fulness of revelation with respect to the inviolable sanctity of the first, fifth, and seventh commandments (among others) that made possible the abrogation of certain regulatory rules and sanctions. The sanctified heart vehemently recoils from any suggestion that abrogation of the ceremonial provisions removes the strictness with which the commandments are to be applied to thought and life. But the same principle applies to the fourth commandment. Abrogation of certain regulatory provisions and sanctions? Yes. But abrogation of the strictness with which we should observe the commandment? Surely not.

It appears to me, therefore, that although this proposition—that we observe the commandment but not with the same strictness—has a long history and can perhaps plead the authority of the Synod of Dort, it is nevertheless, a confused and confusing way of stating the matter and one fraught with devastating consequences in the application of the fourth commandment to the Christian life. Consequently the answer of the Westminster Shorter Catechism to the question, "How is the Sabbath to be sanctified?", namely, "The Sabbath is to be sanctified by a holy resting all that day, even from such worldly employments and recreations as are lawful on other days; and spending the whole time in the public and private exercises of God's worship, except so much as is to be taken up in the works of necessity and mercy," satisfactorily sums up what are the logical implications of the Sabbath law.

Escape from this position can be maintained on Dr. Pieters' position, that the Sabbath law has been abrogated in the Christian economy. On the position that the Sabbath commandment is still binding I can see no escape, for it is surely illogical, without support in evidence, and contrary to all analogy in the case of the other commandments, to say, that the fourth commandment is binding but not as strictly so as in the older economy. It was the British Reformers pre-eminently who perceived this, and it was they who carried to logical conclusions the principle that the fourth commandment in all its sanctity is part of Christian morality and is fulfilled in the Christian Lord's day.

It must be granted that the evidence for the transfer of the day from the seventh to the first day of the week is not as copious as is the evidence for the perpetually binding character of the commandment. But what we require in such a case is adequate evidence, and the kind of evidence argued by Professor Kromminga and others, to whom reference was made above, is evidence that is adequate.

It is surely grave misunderstanding to say—even if we should have to accuse Calvin of such—that in linking observance of the Lord's day to the fourth commandment "we obscure its reminder of the resurrection of Christ." Does it not rather add to what is signified by the fourth commandment to have the day of holy rest invested with all the meaning that the resurrection of our Lord imparts to it? And does it not add to the observance of the Lord's day as a memorial of Christ's resurrection that it should be invested with the sanctity of a divine commandment?

Memoria Amoris

You remain entwined within the beauty in my mind. Dimly I perceived you in the night—
Dimly recognized a soul to trust—
To contemplate us, joyous foes of time.

But not blight: decree—
A foreign night—

How soothing, passing by to say,
"Ah, sweet the uses of adversity." —C. V. Z.

THE CALVIN FORUM • • • NOVEMBER, 1941

72
**VOICES . . . from Our Readers**

**Democracy and Total Depravity**

The Editor,  
**CALVIN FORUM,**  
Grand Rapids, Michigan.  

**Dear Sir:**

In one of his addresses at the Synod of Iowa of the USA Presbyterian Church held at Ames the past summer, Dr. Mackay, President of Princeton Seminary, made the statement that democracy stands for three principles, or rather that there are three basic principles fundamental to the democratic system. First, the inestimable worth of the human personality. Secondly, the right of freedom of thought. Thirdly, the necessity of assumption of responsibility on the part of the individual. And, of course, the implication was that these three basic principles are themselves distinctly Christian conceptions.

I refer particularly to the first principle mentioned, that of the inestimable worth of the human personality. This was mentioned a number of times at Synod, and seemed to be taken for granted by that body.

Allow me to make this observation. Democracy is based on the idea of the equality of all men, rather than on the idea of the inestimable worth of all men. It seems to me that the latter idea overlooks the great fact of total depravity. Are not unsaved men, or all men in themselves, completely sinful and therefore completely worthless?

If in your opinion my observation is correct, I should like to suggest that you publish an article in your paper developing this theme and written by someone competent to deal with the subject.

Sincerely yours,  
G. A. ANDREAS.

Cedar Rapids, Iowa.

[**Reply**]

**My dear Mr. Andreas:**

In my estimation your point is very well taken. The error arises from confusion of the liberal-humanistic with the Christian-Biblical conception of democracy. You will be interested to know that another FORUM subscriber a few months ago also suggested an article on the subject of Christianity and Democracy. There surely is need of making some careful distinctions. Though political liberalism and Christian political ethics have many things in common, they are not the same. Our theological liberals are readily inclined to confuse them.

EDITOR.

---

**The Reformation and Assurance of Faith**

Dr. C. Bouma,  
Editor THE CALVIN FORUM.  

**Dear Brother:**

Will you please give this article a place in THE CALVIN FORUM? You wrote in the last issue, we need discussion. This encourages me to reflect on the contribution of Prof. L. De Moor about three basic principles of the Reformation. I enjoyed reading it and I agree with it as far as it goes. However, the principles mentioned were only three, namely, justification by faith only; the priesthood of all believers; and the authority of Scripture. To these principles should be added the most basic principle, namely, the unconditional gift of forgiveness of sin and eternal life to all men by the Gospel.

Prof. De Moor, speaking of Luther, says: “He had surrendered himself to the popular belief, fostered by the whole penitential system of the medieval church, that man could and must make himself fit to receive the grace of God which procures salvation. The self-torturing cry, ‘Oh, when wilt thou finally become holy and fit to obtain the grace of God?’ drove him into the convent.”

This doctrine of preparation to receive the grace of God is formulated in the Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent, Sixth Session, Chapter VI, where we read: “Now they (adults) are disposed unto the said justice when, excited and assisted by divine grace, conceiving faith by hearing, they are freely moved towards God, believing those things to be true which God has revealed and promised—and especially, that God justifies the impious by His grace, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus; and when understanding themselves to be sinners, they by turning themselves, from the fear of divine justice whereby they are profitably agitated, to consider the mercy of God, are raised unto hope, confiding that God will be propitious to them for Christ’s sake; and they begin to love Him as the fountain of all justice; and are therefore moved against sin by a certain hatred and detestation, to-wit, by that penitence which must be performed before baptism; lastly, when they purpose to receive baptism, to begin a new life, and to keep the Commandments of God.” Several texts are quoted to prove this disposition doctrine.

Luther rejected this doctrine, saying that disposition kills faith. He taught that we must not merely believe that Christ is the Savior of sinners, the devil believes that also; but we should believe Christ is my Savior. This faith gives us joy in Christ and brings forth of itself love and good works. If it does not, faith is not there.

The Catholics called such a faith arrogancy. Luther answered that they in their blindness do not know what faith and love are, and that God requires of us such arrogancy on His professed grace on penalty of losing our eternal salvation.

There was much discussion on assurance in the Council of Trent. Some held that there was no assurance of justification. Such assurance would cause pride and also indifference about good works. Moreover, in doubting was suffering and therefore doubting was held to be meritorious.

Others held that we could obtain a conjectural assurance. This is somewhat as they feel who answer the question, Do you believe that God has forgiven your sins? by saying, “I do not know, I hope so.”

A third party was of the opinion that we could attain to assurance. They said, God wants us to be thankful for the forgiveness, and it is absurd to think that we can be thankful for something of which we are not certain that we have received it. And we cannot think that assurance causes pride or slothfulness in good works, because the Holy Spirit is said to testify with our spirit that we are children of God. The Holy Spirit certainly will not cause pride and make us slothful in good works.

When the objection was made that such a view of assurance was too much in favor of the Lutherans, the answer was made that there would be no need to condemn Luther, if he only had taught that we can attain to such an assurance after justification instead of teaching that we are justified by such an assured confidence. The Council did not come to a decision on
this point; but they all agreed that one, when he regards his own weakness and indisposition, may have fear and apprehension touching his own grace; seeing that no one can know with a certainty of faith, which can not be subject to error, that he has obtained the grace of God. (Sixth Session, Chapter IX.)

The Catholics were right on their standpoint. If assurance of faith depends on our soul-condition, there may be doubt whether we have received grace, since we build on a foundation that can deceive us. Such a faith is subject to error. However, Luther also was right on his standpoint, namely, that God declares to us in the Gospel that He gives unto us the forgiveness of sin. If we should doubt this with the least doubt, we would mistrust the truthful God and make Him a liar. And, if in accepting this gift do not trust this precious gift is our own, we also make God a liar. If we accept something that is given to us, and we do not consider it as our own, we would mistrust the giver. We would think that he does not mean what he says. Luther did exactly what the Catholics said can not be done, namely, believe with a faith that can not be subject to error, since it is built on the sure promise of God.

We should remember that the discussion on assurance in the time of the Reformation concerned the question of present grace. Very little was said about the assurance of election. All the Catholics in this discussion accepted the assurance of election on the basis of election. (Sixth Session, Chapter XII.) They did not identify the assurance of justification and the assurance of election, since according to them justification could be lost again. Neither did Luther identify these two assurances. He built the assurance of justification on the grace of God offered to all men in the Gospel. He, accordingly, built this assurance on an objective basis. However, the assurance of election he built on a subjective basis, namely, on the assurance of justification itself and on the fruit of this assurance, love to God and Christ and the works of love.

I know that in connection with what I have written many questions can be raised; but what I tried to bring out is that the very fundamental question in the Reformation was whether the assurance of our justification must in the first instance be built on our soul-condition, or on the objective promise of God given to all of us in the Gospel.

Grand Rapids, Mich.

M. BORDUIN.

The Son of Man and the Christian Sabbath

Mission House, Plymouth, Wis.

October 22nd, 1941.

Dear Dr. Bouma:

I have followed with quite some interest the discussion in THE CALVIN FORUM on the Sabbath. To be sure, in many a respect I thought the papers to be wanting. In particular I missed the specific Christ testimony which pulsates in the Christian Sabbath. Perhaps it is our failure to emphasize this aspect that we have so much trouble with Sabbath observance. May I lay before you some of my own thoughts? It so happens that in my studies on Biblical Theology, I have had occasion to make a more minute study of Genesis 1-11. In these studies, I have given some thought also to the Sabbath. I ought to say that I go out from the simple fact that the Old Testament is Christian witness, i.e., testimony unto Christ.

I should begin with the word of the Lord that “the Son of man is lord also (indeed) of the Sabbath.” You know in what situation the Lord spoke this. He surely meant to say, that the Son of man, he himself, restores the Sabbath. He brings it with him.

The question arises, What is the Sabbath? It is here that I recall the story of the creation where the Sabbath is mentioned for the first time. If I see the meaning of that story correctly—Herder gave me the first hint—the story portrays God, the master technician, creating for himself a sanctuary in which man, as the priest, is to lead the whole of creation in a symphony of praise. The Westminster Catechism has caught the tune when it starts out with its first question, What is the chief end of man? The chief end of man is to glorify God and enjoy him forever. Which is, as you know, not only the Westminster confession.

As the sacrament of the creation-covenant God instituted the Sabbath. Genesis 2:2,3 celebrates in its very construction the excellence of the Sabbath. There are four active verbs describing the intensive activity of God in establishing this day as a sign and a seal of his set purpose. I sometimes wonder if the writer did not mean to say that it cost God a great deal of effort to establish the Sabbath. But whatever we may think of it, the fact is patent that, I speak after the manner of men, it was not divine exhaustion which brought on the Sabbath. On the contrary, it required a special exercise of power to desist when the inexhaustible riches of the creative-powers of God are so gloriously active.

In passing, I might mention that the Septuagint seems to read that God finished his works on the sixth day. According to our reading, he finished it on the seventh day. On this then he climaxes his creative purpose. Here he seals his everlasting covenant of grace with man that he is to be his peculiar people, his royal priesthood.

Man breaks this creation covenant. But God is faithful. He cannot deny himself, even if we prove unfaithful. Here it seems to me we must fit in the word of the Lord that the Son of man is Lord of the Sabbath. He restores in himself the broken covenant. He is the priest as well as the lamb of God which takes away the sin of the world.

Here now also comes in the fourth commandment which is given to God’s chosen people. Remember the Sabbath day. I believe that throughout the history of God’s people, the Sabbath was observed, more or less. But what the fourth commandment seems to say is this, Remember my covenant with you and sanctify it. It seems to me quite suggestive that Israel was, as far as we know, the only people to observe this day. Israel who is the people from whom Jesus Christ was to be born.

In this light, the fourth commandment has its very specific weight for the church today. It is good tidings, it is gospel that we have the Sabbath as a testimony that God’s covenant with man is not broken ultimately, not indeed because we are who we are, but because God is who he is, who spared not his only begotten Son. For this reason the observance of the Sabbath is to the church a gift of grace, a law if you will, but more to me a law, a promise, a foretaste, a pledge of a full restoration to the high office to which we are called by the high calling of God in Jesus Christ, his Son. It was once only the Sabbath which told men what they were in God’s good counsel. Now it is the appearance of Jesus Christ himself. For his sake, and only for his sake, do we today observe the Sabbath.

I wonder, if our church people would not think more highly of the Sabbath were they to see this connection more clearly? And again, would it not be doing away with a great deal of misapprehension, such as the blue laws, were the church to center its preaching of the Sabbath not so much on the Mosaic code, but very distinctly on the story of Jesus Christ. On this theme when it starts out with its first question, What is the chief end of man?—We are told to consider the Christian message of the Sabbath.

Yours very sincerely,

(Prof.) Karl J. Ernst.
From Our Correspondents

Ecumenical Calvinism

SOMETIMES ago, one of the nestor pastors of the Christian Reformed Church, the Rev. L. Van Dellen, wrote an interesting article in De Wachter in which he made a strong plea for church union among brethren of the same fundamental faith. This he could do for as a pastor of a Reformed Church he has committed himself to the task of closing the breaches opened sometime and somewhere by a manifestation of sin. The Belgic Confession, Articles 27-30, has often been accepted theoretically. The Apostles’ Creed has often been recited without a challenge: I believe in an holy Catholic Church. True ecumenicity is first of all spiritual. There must be unity of faith and of purpose. What is one inwardly should also manifest itself as one outwardly. We sincerely hope that this plea will not be buried in our denominational weekly. Let the church ponder upon this charge.

The Calvin Forum has something different in mind in introducing a new department. Its editorial staff, no doubt, accepts the foregoing as their sacred duty. The aim, however, lies in a different direction. This department is to be known as “Ecumenical Calvinism.” In a sense the Forum is blazing new trails. We do not know of any other magazine sponsoring such an ideal. In a greater sense, however, this new department is a natural outgrowth of what the Forum has always stood for. The Forum has tried to give us a complete picture of the Calvinistic world. On mooted questions it has asked various representatives to defend their point of view. We are thinking of the difficult question of an acceptable Sabbath observance. The Forum has been an organ through which the Calvinistic world has come into our homes.

Two things are aimed at. We hope to foster ecumenical Calvinism. We shall attempt to do so along these lines: We shall try to find out the problems different groups are confronting. This may open up suggestions. This may stimulate concerted thinking before we enter upon concerted action. Perhaps in serving the public, we may be a “feeder” in directing their thinking along ecumenical lines. We also hope to advance Calvinism. The world needs something definite. Calvinism may not be able to give this definite guidance immediately. Calvinists are confronted with new situations daily. Still Calvinism has a definite message. Calvinism is a debtor to the world to state its message in a language grasped by all intelligent Christians.

This, of course, may demand of us to state our message by way of contrast. We may compare our positions with that of others. Should we do so, our only goal should be to develop our own thoughts to serve any child of God.

Modern religious magazines are full of pleas not to be sectarian in these crucial days. We cannot help but wonder what people mean by “sectarian.” It cannot mean that we must follow church committees unquestionably. That would be both dictatorial and the selling out of conscience. It cannot mean that we must throw away our past. This is impossible to do. It cannot mean that we step over the boundary line of truth and error. This would be sin. If it means discarding pettiness we think the plea is Christian.

We do not see any harm, therefore, in ecumenical Calvinism. We believe we have a duty and a message in this world. We hold a sacred charge for the entire church. If other groups do not believe that of themselves, then they are responsible for not encouraging a closer fellowship. Let every group study its own contribution. A genuine Christianity can face truth found anywhere.

These days require much prayer for our brethren in captivity. The exercise of prayer on their behalf is already the finest manifestation of an ecumenical Calvinism. Much has been written about the sufferings of the Dutch. Let us include in our prayers also the French.

All mail between occupied France and the outside world has been suspended. A letter sent to Dr. A. Lecerf in December of 1940 was returned late in August of 1941. It was not even delivered. We admire the stamina of brave Huguenots. Catholicism could expel them, but it could not kill their Calvinism. The Catholic church simply spread Calvinism in the world and robbed France of some of its finest citizens. No doubt France would have had a different history today if the Huguenots had not been exiled. So we are praying for that little group still there.

Edinburgh was also interested in the safety of Dr. Lecerf, the great French Calvinist. He lectured in their city a few years ago. Through the Red Cross a message was delivered to him. This is his reply: “We thank God that you are all well. So are we. We remember our friends forever dear to us.”

Would that we could break through the encirclement of steel to say: “And we remember you!”

Holland, Michigan.

J. T. Hooogstra.

Westminster and the East

Goffle Hill Road, Midland Park, N. J.

October 18, 1941.

Dear Editor:

Of particular significance in the East is the meeting of the Calvinistic Philosophy Club on October 8, 1941, at Westminster Theological Seminary, Philadelphia. Dr. C. Van Til, president of the club, returned to the chair after his year’s residence in California on leave of absence from Westminster. However, he promptly turned the chair back again to the Vice-President, Rev. E. F. J. Van Halsens, and then proceeded to read a very thorough and learned paper on the subject of Common Grace. The particular problem before the club was that of the bearing Common Grace has on the question of the validity of non-theistic thinking, non-Christian thinking. Due to the time required for the treatment of Common Grace proper, the club did not get an opportunity to air that precise problem. That question will come up again at the meeting next spring, after the members of the club have had an opportunity to peruse the paper in the Proceedings.

Dr. Van Til on Common Grace

However, the discussion of Common Grace proper was most instructive. Dr. Van Til’s work was divided into four parts: I. Methodology; II. A. Kuyper on Common Grace; III. The Common Grace Controversy; IV. Suggestions toward solution.

Particularly pertinent was Dr. Van Til’s contention that Common Grace must not be viewed as an isolated problem.
Rather, it must be regarded as one aspect, an important aspect, of the whole problem of the philosophy of history. What is the value, the significance of the historical? This problem is one which could really rise only in Reformed theology, as in fact it has historically. Only the man who has truly "looked the Absolute in the face" will halt to ponder what may then be the significance of the relative, the historical. Furthermore, Calvinistic theology, rising from the contemplation of the Absolute God, recognizes that this world is now a world of sin and evil, a world in which the conscious creatures are totally depraved. The Calvinist then steps to marvel at the goodness of God to the reprobate.

De Gemeene Gratie, Kuyper's chef d'œuvre, next came up for a thorough overhauling. Differences of emphasis between Vol. I of this work and Vol. II were pointed out. Dr. Van Til gave as his conception of Kuyper's view of Common Grace the following tentative definition: it is primarily a restraining influence of God, working either with or without man, toward bringing out the creative powers of the universe unto "a certain development" whose end (conscious or unconscious) is the glory of God. Kuyper's treatment runs into some obscurity in the matter of territories or dimensions. He teaches that there is a realm for Special Grace, and a realm for Common Grace. In addition Kuyper speaks of a "realm-between" (tussen-erf) in which "God's people must vie with the children of the world for the glory of God." (Kuyper's words.) It is difficult to think of such "vying" except in terms of conscious participation. Would man have to mean the non-Christian addition to a height which the system of Christian doctrine cannot grant him? Kuyper also teaches that in the realm of Common Grace we find "communion of judgment" between Christians and non-Christians. Dr. Van Til searchingly analyzed Kuyper's language on these matters, language which inescapably appears to teach that there is a "neutral area" which Christians and non-Christians have in common and in which God can be glorified by both.

The controversy on this question was next given a thorough and dispassionate appraisal. Extensive research of all the relevant literature was in evidence. Not only was the American controversy reviewed with lucid presentation of the progress of the argument, but also the controversy centering around Dr. Schilder in The Netherlands. Although he cannot see eye to eye with Dr. Schilder, Dr. Van Til declared that the able Dutch theologian had done good service in calling upon Calvinists to think concretely on the problem, i.e., to think in full awareness of and justice to all the factors involved. Such considerations which we must fully honor are: the glorious absoluteness and self-consistency of God; the utter sinfulness of man; the matter of "territories," "realms" or "dimensions," a matter which demands thorough re-examination.

It is also along these lines that Dr. Van Til made his suggestions toward possible solution. We must think concretely on the problem, and free from prejudice. The problem must be considered as part of the problem of history, of the meaning of the relative. The lecturer stated that the problem is not yet solved, and perhaps never will be. Yet he felt that the long, hard road to solution lies in the direction he on good grounds suggested.

Reformed Bible Schools

The Eastern Reformed Bible Institute began with a flourish of enthusiasm and avid interest this fall. It meets on Thursday evenings in the Eastern Academy, Paterson, N. J. Its courses are: Bible (The Pentateuch), Reformed Doctrine, the Principles and Practice of Missions, and the Sunday School lesson. About 45 students have enrolled. An active publicity committee put the institution across with much greater effectiveness than heretofore. A public rally in its interest was held in one of the Christian Reformed churches in Paterson. The Rev. L. Borst (Reformed) and the Rev. P. Y. De Jong (Christian Reformed) spoke with pointed enthusiasm on the genuine need for such an addition to the present program of instruction in the churches.

Another such school, the Calvinistic Institute of the Bible, is located in Philadelphia. Some 35 students have enrolled this fall. These institutions are undoubtedly one of the proper instruments toward actualizing that greater and more vital Christian consciousness that America so sorely needs. These Reformed Bible institutes springing up throughout the country are concentrating in a specialized way on one of the first requirements for the growth of a truly wholesome and genuine Christian knowledge and life, namely, the equipment of the lay people in the church with the tools and the zeal to be effective modern laborers for the advancement of God's kingdom conceived along healthy, Calvinistic lines. We who worship and adore the sovereign God and His Savior must have more and more "propagandists" for the full-orbed gospel. To be such, they must be intelligently grounded in a point of view which looks, not as a museum of various interesting thoughts and things, but as a book which can be used as a springboard into our own "clever ideas," but as the repository of tremendous, progressive, living doctrinal realities uttered by the self-consistent voice of the sovereign God.

A New Church Council

In opposition to the modernistic, dictatorial Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America, a new council of churches was recently brought into being in the East. It is "designed to be the voice of evangelical Christians." Such a move is certainly not uncalled for. The presumption of the Federal Council to the position of being the voice of American protestants, and its dictatorial efforts to wipe all religious programs from the air waves other than those sponsored by it have long called for effective challenge. However, we cannot wax enthusiastic over the new ecumenical movement. The president of the new setup is the Rev. Carl McIntire of Collingswood, N. J. His close friend and adviser, the Rev. H. McAllister Griffiths, D. D., is to be in charge of its administration as general secretary. These are the key men, and they are both from a small group called the Bible Presbyterian Church in 1937. This split was launched on the premillennial issue and on a trumped up temperance issue. Men whose doctrinal perspective is so faulty that they are willing to disrupt a promising reform movement on such peripheral issues are hardly the men to serve as the spokesmen for orthodox Christianity in this country. It takes little daring to predict that truly Reformed church will not flock to their standard. It will be interesting to watch what a sizeable group like the Missouri Synod Lutherans will do.

Dr. Greenway at Westminster

A record opening-day crowd greeted Dr. Leonard Greenway, pastor of the Eighth Reformed Church of Grand Rapids, Michigan, at the thirteenth opening exercises of Westminster Theological Seminary. In his pointed address this able Reformed churchman gave clear evidence of his understanding of the deeper undercurrents of modern liberal "Christianity." The title of the address aptly suggests his theme: Historic Fact and the Christian Faith. We close by quoting just a paragraph to indicate the penetrating depth of his judgment on this central theme: "And so we conclude that Christianity is inwoven with history by unbreakable strands of living fibre. To put it philosophically, the contents of time have no mere negative relation to eternal truth; they are rather the instruments by which God has actualized truth for our salvation. To put it theologically, mankind can be saved, not by a divine fiat, but only from within, and this means that salvation had to be mediated through history. To put it practically, the gospel means 'Good News,' that is, Information about something that has happened. It means history, and therefore a gospel divorced from history is a contradiction in terms. . . . We are God's newsmen!" (The Presbyterian Guardian, October 10, p. 84.)

Cordially yours,

EDWARD HEEREMA.
South African Calvinists and the War

Potchefstroom, South Africa, September 1, 1941.

Dear Dr. Bouma:

This date brought us to the end of the second year of this gigantic struggle for and against world domination. How much innocent blood has already been shed! What, after all, does the ordinary man, he who is called upon to give his life in the struggles between nations, care for the ambitions of the man or men who bring about these ghastly wholesale legalized murders? What he wants is peace to enjoy the things the kind God has given him. I think that if we were to take a census of the deepest desires of the ordinary citizens we would find that more than ninety per cent are peace-loving and peace-wishing, and yet they are not allowed to live in peace and serve their God in proving their love to all alike. These are the thoughts of a peace-loving human being, even though he is far removed from the horrible realities of the actual strife. Wars always bring thinking people back to the everlasting and only realities of life. This has been and still is our own experience over here. Any period in our history which has called for sudden, violent and widespread death has called us to thoughts of the everlasting. The horrors of the present war have once again brought us face to face with the eternal realities and have shown us how really futile are all our so-called differences.

In life, as in death, there is really only one thing that matters, and that is our union with our Saviour. We are at the present experiencing in this country a very marked religious revival, I mean in this sense: people are asking themselves and others about the ultimate aim of all these happenings and are finding the only answer that really matters: God in His unfathomable wisdom is leading us through deep waters to the land of everlasting peace and love.

This renewed interest in religion expresses itself in a widespread desire for unity amongst the adherents of various shades of religious opinion. In South Africa this tendency is especially marked amongst members of the three Dutch Reformed Churches; from all over the country leaders of church opinion are coming to the fore with the proposal that the three Dutch Reformed Churches should lay aside their—after all—superficial differences and either unite or work more closely together. Dear friend, I have already in previous letters told you about the more or less unimportant differences that keep Dutch South Africa apart in ecclesiastical matters. The main fact after all is this: all three Churches have the same articles or formulae of faith, viz., the Belgic Confession, the Heidelberg Catechism and the Canons of Dordrecht. Why then three and not one? One in confession and yet three in expression. The present position can be explained on grounds of historical development and fundamental difference in practice, but in the final instance they are one, all three being Calvinistic in confession. Many of us feel that now is the opportune moment to unite or to work closer together for the same ultimate aim. The arguments for Church unity or closer co-operation are however not only of that religious character. Dutch-speaking South Africa feels that national unity is hampered by this unnecessary division into three different church groups, and considers church unity as a fundamental first step towards national unity. The present world war has aroused another deep interest in us, viz., national unity and liberty. We, Dutch South Africans, have always been like your great nation great exponents of national liberty. In our inmost hearts we have always been and still are a freedom-loving people; we want to be our own masters; we are fundamentally republicans. One of our Afrikaans writers wrote some twenty or more years ago a book about ourselves under the characteristic title, “Republikeins and Simmers”: republicans to the backbone!

The three Dutch Reformed churches have in the past time and again proved that they can work unitedly. Two of the best instances of this are the translation of the Bible into Afrikaans and the combined action in 1938 in regard to the Centenary Celebrations of the great Freedom Movement known amongst us as the Great Trek. At that time it was said in the press that there is another proof of this internal unity. Some time ago representatives of all three churches drew the attention of our government to the activities of communist agitators in South Africa and to the great dangers of any widespread intrusion of these doctrines into a country with so many millions of uneducated blacks. South Africa is one of the danger points in any systematic propagation of communist doctrines and practices. After drawing the attention of our government to the communist theories in the fields of economy, politics, social life and morality, the representatives of the three Dutch Reformed Churches briefly pointed out the extent of communist activities in South Africa, especially amongst the working classes and the black peoples. The representatives, claiming that they speak for more than half a million people, addressed the following requests to the government: 1) that the government should by law forbid that anybody representing the Trades Unions should be sent overseas and particularly to Russia to be imbued with communist doctrine and practice; 2) that taking into consideration the enormous influence Communism already exerts in our country the government should take care to tackle our labor problems in a sound and correct South African spirit; 3) that by law all public communist propaganda by means of inflammatory speeches, information meetings and “school” literature, with a purpose, articles in the public press and such like should be prohibited; 4) that by law should be prohibited that white and black should work together in factories, especially white girls and black men.

In connection with the foregoing I would like to answer a question you put to me in one of your personal letters. You asked me to tell you something about our particular opinions on the present political situation here and overseas, and more precisely about this new world order that is being drummed into our ears by radio and put before our eyes by daily press and best seller booklets. This is, of course, a dangerous topic—one's opinion is out of date the very moment it has been expressed. I know that you, dear friend, are as a Calvinist interested to know what we Dutch South African Calvinists think about all these so-called new things. In answering your question I would like to point out further that it is not easy to speak for others, even fellow Calvinists in South Africa. What I am going to say is my own personal opinion, though I may make bold to say that there are many Afrikaans-speaking people who think as I do. The Afrikaans-speaking Calvinist is a thoroughly-going republican and hopes that in the near future South Africa may develop into a Free Republic. As Calvinist he can never be a supporter of National Socialism, Imperialism of whatever color or type, Bolshevism, Fascism or any foreignism. As Calvinist he is a supporter of a Christian National Republic. Of course, we have over here amongst Afrikaans-speaking people practically all shades of political opinion, including National Socialism, Imperialism, Bolshevism, Fascism, but such people are not Calvinists, although they still call themselves Christians. As Calvinists we believe that God is also the Founder of nations and that He has in His kindness allowed to develop a separate entity, a nation of Dutch South Africans, that He has planted us in South Africa as our national home and that He will in His good time make us a Free Nation. As followers of Calvin we believe only in one form of government and we strive to obtain a Free Christian National Republic. And we shall hide God's time for us; we pray: not by force of arms but by gradual, national growth in the fulness of God's time. Calvinists are revolting against the idea that they will never destroy, but only by the grace of God defend. I hope, dear friend, that I have answered your question to your satis-
fraction: you will be able to deduce our attitude towards the present European struggle.

Here I shall have to end my letter.

With kind regards,

Sincerely yours,

J. CHR. COETZEE.

[Footnote by Editor: Our readers are, no doubt, interested in the stand which the Dutch South Africans take in the present struggle. The brief and somewhat guarded statements in the above letter of our South African correspondent are helpful. That they also raise more serious questions than are answered will be apparent to every thoughtful reader. We hesitate, however, to make any comment of our own, though we are tempted to ask some pertinent questions. It would be a sad story of the Dutch South Africans (who are, as is known, largely of the Calvinistic faith) should by their apathetic attitude toward the present momentous struggle actually play into the hands of Herr Hitler and the Totalitarianism which our correspondent informs us they decry as much as Communism. That these Dutch South Africans should in these days of crisis feel the stirrings of a new hope for a revival of their erstwhile independence as Dutch South Africans, or Boers, is perfectly understandable. By taking the stand they do take, however, the danger may not be imaginary that they frustrate all liberty and republicanism in their own land as well. The fate of the mother country of Holland ought to speak volumes.

The editor may be pardoned for these remarks. They may in turn serve our correspondent to explain other aspects of the position of the South African Calvinistic Dutch in the present world war, and, if that should be the case, we shall feel that our incomplete remarks will have served a good purpose. Meanwhile it may be helpful to append to this letter a paragraph which our faithful South African correspondent penned in a personal communication accompanying the present one. We are certain Dr. Coetzee (who, by the way, is Professor of Education at the Christian University College of Potchefstroom, Transvaal) will have no objection if these sentences from his personal letter are here transcribed. They follow.

"We who over here do receive THE CALVIN FORUM read it with 'vrug' [i.e., profit—Ed.], although we cannot agree with you on all political matters especially. We, Dutch South Africans, see things in a different light, because we live in the spot and have had more than a century of experience of the loss of our Dutch independence; but this does not mean that we favor the others. By no means. We fear them just as much—even more and with more right—than you do."
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**INSTEAD OF THE THORN**, by Bastian Kruithof. The Half Moon Press, 156 Fifth Avenue, New York, 1941. $1.50.

The more inventions and conveniences our highly mechanized civilization provides for our comfort and ease, the more we thrill to the hardships of men and women who worked with tireless energies to lay the foundations for our industrial order. Often times this story of man pitted against relentless forces of nature is one of brutal conflict and stark tragedy in which the human being reverts to a grim barbarism. The evidence of culture and education and art germinate slowly in the tracks of the pioneer. But the story of *Instead of the Thorn* is not of this type. Rather it is the story of an ideal nurtured through days of hardship, coming to fruition in the noble ambitions of the young man who becomes the teacher of the colony.

The story of the emigrant faced with the difficulties of adjustment to a new environment always constitutes a challenge to the ready acceptance that so frequently mark our own existence. Here we have a group of people choosing the isolation of a heavily wooded section of Michigan to establish a culture of their own and to enjoy the freedom that their new homeland provides them. It is a study in setting above all else. Mr. Kruithof has attempted to combine the tedious documentation of setting and incident required by the historical novel with a

---

**The Larder**

Row upon even row the glass jars stood Displaying pleasant fruits of field and tree Promising food enough, in rich plenty, Presenting honest labor that is good.

So she surveyed her larder with just pride Grateful to God for strength to do her part There was a song of praise within her heart As she beheld the shelves filled deep and wide. I saw the jewel-glint of plum and grape, The honey-golden globe we call the peach, And then this still-life picture seemed to teach Something beyond material and shape. I seemed to see in panoramic view The age-old cycle causing things to grow, And realized more clearly how they show The patient plan of God runs ever true: The lonely land, silent in winter's sleep, The fallow field, grown hard under the snow Yet holding in its bosom row on row Of waving green to make the pulses leap; Cold winter moons shine on the field from God, He sends the chilly rains of early spring, And then the warm sunrays for quickening So that the husbandman can turn the sod; Man works with the Creator in his toil, Ploughing and harrowing and sowing seed, Tending each plant according to its need Until the vegetation chorns the soil; In its due season fruits lie on the earth God gives the needed sunshine and cool rain, Man pulls the weeds and cultivates the plain And reaps a harvest of good things, and mirth; The matron then with glad heart gathers in The land's choice treasures—God gives her this part—

And she makes of preserving them an art Clasping the summer joys in winter's bin.

Let us enjoy the labor of our hand Grateful for every work that we can do; All that has always been is ever new How wondrously the All-wise God has planned!

—Joan Geisel Gardner.
purely fictional study in character and incident. It lacks the strong sense of immediacy that is uppermost in a pioneer picture such as Mari Sandoz's study of her father in Old Jules. The setting is drawn with a delicacy of touch that marks poetic response to natural beauty. From the opening sunset seen from a high bluff overlooking Lake Michigan to the last paragraph closing with the rhythm of waves lapping the beach as the evening star breaks through the shimmering west, the beauty of trees, sand, blue skies, laughing waters are always with you, an inseparable background in tune with the moods of the characters. Dogs, horses, and cattle are as much a part of the scene as the characters themselves. One might wish at times that the author could let his poetic fancy linger on lines of poetry in which the stern demands of accurate detail and an advancing plot could be ignored for the time. The scent of burning autumn leaves is no doubt a perennial inspiration to poetry in which the stern demands of accurate detail and an analytical material belongs as doctrinal material that has gone into the making of this volume.

Just as in the two volumes just mentioned the chief emphasis falls on the sects and cults of our day, so in this work the primary (though not exclusive) interest centers around the great historical bodies of the various groups of Christendom. The grouping of these religious bodies also follows in the main the historical line. Here are the families into which Dr. Neve has divided them. 1. The Eastern Orthodox Churches. 2. The Roman Catholic Church. 3. The Old-Catholic Church. 4. The Lutheran Church. 5. The Reformed and the Presbyterian Churches. 6. The Anglican and Episcopal Groups. 7. The Methodist Church Family. 8. The Union Bodies. 9. Congregationalists. 10. The Baptists. 11. Quakerism. 12. The Rationalist Group (Unitarians and Universalists). 13. The Adventist Bodies. 14. Independent and Unrelated Movements and Organizations. Under this last head the author discusses such groups as the Church of God, Plymouth Brethren, Christianphians, Jehovah's Witnesses (Russellites), Swedenborgians, Amana Society, the Shakers, the Mormons, Christian Science, and Unity. These last three are characterized as "fundamentally at variance with Christianity". The book closes with a treatment of Buechnerism, the last subject in the Appendix.

This work is perhaps rather a textbook. "Symbols (what the Germans call 'Konfessionskunde') than in Polenics, but it can serve as a textbook in either type of course. Statistics and bibliographies are rather full, but the doctrinal parts of the work are by far the most important and valuable. The discussion of the doctrinal position of each one of these groups and sects is both constructive as well as comparative and critical. The standpoint from which the doctrinal and creedal positions are evaluated is that of a mild but conservative Lutheranism. This means that for those of Reformed persuasion the discussion of the differences between the Reformed and the Lutherans is the least satisfactory. Although this part of the work will not be of great help to the adherent of the Reformed Faith, the rest of the work is almost as valuable to him as it would be to the orthodox Lutheran. It should perhaps be added in this connection that Dr. Neve's method consistently rules out the detailed discussion of the biblical ground of any of the doctrinal positions discussed. He takes the stand that this exegetical material belongs rather to Dogmatics. Also on this score the work is rather a treatise in Symbols than in Polenics, as, no doubt, the author intended it to be.

An occasional Germanism mars the style. The statistics are not as up-to-date, at least in some cases, as one could wish in a book published in 1940. The statistics on the Christian Reformed Church, for instance, are at least 15 years old. It must also be said that the work is not as strong in critical analysis and construction as it might be. Frequently when a critical question is raised and one gets set to read a worth-while incisive theological argument, the author quotes from other writers or, also, from letters received from persons whose opinion he solicited. The enumeration of sources is rather full and, in the main, accurate insofar as the present reviewer could control the matter. One exception to this is the title of Lütgert's three-volume work on German Idealism, whose title and number of volumes are both given erroneously. These, however, are insignificant and minor blemishes on what is in the main a very serviceable work of study and reference. It is doubtful whether in the English language any comparable work exists that offers such complete information and discussion of the history and doctrine of all the branches of Christendom. A real desideratum is a work of similar scope and aim written from the standpoint of the Reformed Faith. As long as such a work has not made its appearance, Dr. Neve's work is possibly the next best of its kind.

Clarence De Graaf.
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