

Calvin University

Calvin Digital Commons

The Calvin Forum

University Publications

1941

The Calvin Forum

Calvin College and Seminary

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.calvin.edu/calvin_forum

Recommended Citation

Calvin College and Seminary, "The Calvin Forum" (1941). *The Calvin Forum*. 71.
https://digitalcommons.calvin.edu/calvin_forum/71

This Book is brought to you for free and open access by the University Publications at Calvin Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in The Calvin Forum by an authorized administrator of Calvin Digital Commons. For more information, please contact dbm9@calvin.edu.



the **CALVIN** **orum**

Sweet Land of Liberty
Privilege and Duty

His Wonderful Name
The Christ of Christmas

Art and Morality
Wedded or Divorced?

The Coming Kingdom
Conflicting Ideologies

The Deluge
Geology and Scripture

Calvinistic Conference
June, 1942

THE CALVIN FORUM

EDITORIAL COMMITTEE

CLARENCE BOUMA..... *Managing Editor*
HENRY J. RYSKAMP HENRY J. VAN ANDEL
HENRY SCHULTZE JACOB G. VANDEN BOSCH

CALVIN FORUM CORRESPONDENTS

ARTHUR ALLEN *Australia*
STUART BERGSMAN..... *Northern India*
G. BESSELAAR *Vancouver*
ALLEN CABANISS..... *The South*
R. J. COBB..... *Britain*
J. CHR. COETZEE..... *South Africa*
SAMUEL G. CRAIG..... *Presb. Church, U. S. A.*
MARK FAKKEMA..... *Educational News*
LEONARD GREENWAY..... *Ref. Church in America*
EDWARD HEEREMA..... *The East*
JACOB T. HOOGSTRA..... *Ecumenical Calvinism*
S. LEIGH HUNT..... *London*
W. MARCINKOWSKI *Palestine*
WILLIAM V. MULLER..... *South America*
G. J. PENNING..... *Near East*
P. PRINS *Netherlands*
ARTHUR V. RAMIAH..... *South India*
WM. CHILDS ROBINSON..... *Atlanta*
JENO SEBESTYEN *Budapest*
JOHN N. SMITH..... *New Zealand*
EDWARD J. TANIS..... *Chicago*
LEONARD VERDUIN..... *Ann Arbor*
WILLIAM VERWOLF *Canada*
CHARLES VINCZE..... *Magyar News*

Address all editorial correspondence to
Managing Editor, THE CALVIN FORUM, Frank-
lin Street and Benjamin Avenue, S.E., Grand
Rapids, Michigan.

Address all subscription and circulation cor-
respondence to: THE CALVIN FORUM, Business
Office, at the same address.

THE CALVIN FORUM is published monthly, ex-
cept bi-monthly from June to September.
Subscription price: Two Dollars per year.

Entered as second-class matter October 3,
1935, at the Post Office at Grand Rapids,
Michigan, under the Act of March 3, 1897.

The CALVIN FORUM

Published by the Calvin Forum Board of Publication

VOLUME VII, NO. 5

DECEMBER, 1941

Contents

Editorial

Sweet Land of Liberty..... 83

Articles

"And His Name Shall Be Called . . .".....Henry Schultze 87

Art and Morality.....Jacob G. Vanden Bosch 89

Conflicting Ideologies and the Coming Kingdom.....
.....Harold J. Ockenga 92

The Cause of the Deluge.....Dudley Joseph Whitney 94

The Message of Christmas.....Ala Bandon 97

Second American Calvinistic Conference, 1942..... 98

From Our Correspondents

Christmas Greetings from War-Torn London..... 100

Calvinism in France..... 100

A Nazi-Censored Letter from the Netherlands..... 101

A London Letter..... 102

Sweet Land of Liberty

An Editorial

HERE is no greater boon which we as Christian citizens of these United States enjoy than the boon of freedom. Liberty is the watchword of our national existence. Our country is dedicated to the ideal of freedom—freedom of religion, freedom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom to develop our powers and to exercise our rights with the least possible interference from others.

The First Amendment to our Federal Constitution guarantees this freedom in unmistakable words. "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press, or the right of the people peaceably to assemble and to petition the government for a redress of grievances."

This has been our glory.

From every nation of Europe they have come to our shores, many of them persecuted and oppressed, to find a haven of rest, where they might worship God according to the dictates of their own consciences. There were Protestants persecuted by Catholics, and Catholics harassed by Protestants. Non-conformist groups, who would not adapt themselves to the compulsory standing order in some European country and were persecuted on account of it—all came to our shores and found freedom to worship God as they desired.

Many came from economic considerations. Many were suffering the tyranny of an enslaving economic system, with no future for their growing families. Our President has aptly spoken of a fourfold freedom which America has offered to its immigrants: freedom of speech, freedom of worship, freedom from want, and freedom from fear. Many came to seek freedom from want, desiring to improve their economic position, eager to escape the rigors of an economic society in which life was little more than a mere existence.

So they came from many countries and various races and found freedom and opportunity beckoning them.

* * * * *

Today we are facing a serious world crisis.

An unscrupulous dictator is breathing out threatening and violence against his neighbors.

The whole world is in suspense.

Millions of soldiers are facing one another armed with the deadliest weapons of warfare.

Death and destruction ride upon the high seas and rain from the skies.

What is the significance of it all?

Why this world crisis?

Why are we as a nation deeply concerned in this clash of arms in Europe?

For the simple reason that human liberty is at stake. All liberty. Not merely the liberty of one country that happens to be threatened by the aggression of a neighbor. All liberty is at stake.

The menace in the world today is the rising tide of totalitarianism headed by a ruthless tyrant. Hitler and his hordes are a positive menace to every free nation on the face of the globe. Nazism stands for the exaltation of the German race and the enslavement of all other races and nations. Nazism stands for the glorification of brute force as the ultimate reason in human society. It tramples under foot the great sanctions of our Christian social life. It fosters the most venomous type of race hatred, thus flying in the face of the most elementary principles of decency and Christian morality.

This heartless, cruel tyrant of Berlin stands for the absolute supremacy of the state (i.e., the dictator himself!); for the subordination of the church to that state; for the revival of paganism; for the persecution of racial and religious minorities; for the breaking of the pledged word; for ruthless militarism; for terrorism against the weak and helpless; for the destruction of freedom in every sense of the word and the ruination of all the finer accomplishments and hopes of our Christian civilization.

And if anyone should like to think that all this is of no concern to us as an American nation, he by that very fact only proves that he has no knowledge either of Hitler and his designs or of the actual world in which we live. There is no room for any democracy in a world in which Hitler comes to uncurbed power. He has declared so himself, and the actual conditions that face us today confirm the statement in a most solemn manner. No nation that believes in liberty for itself and for the nations of the world can be indifferent to this rising world menace. Least of all so great and powerful and responsible a democracy as is ours. The real issue that we face is a world struggle between freedom and tyranny, liberty and autocracy.

America, the country of freedom and opportunity, is being challenged by the most powerful war machine that ever was—a war machine at the beck and call of one man, and he a ruthless, conscienceless, unscrupulous, cruel, bloody tyrant.

* * * * *

In the face of this unprecedented world situation it is our solemn duty as a nation, and especially as Christian citizens of that nation, to guard the liberties that are ours. They are ours not only as a privilege to enjoy, but also as a trust to keep.

But how shall we guard these liberties?

I submit to you that we must do four things.

1. We must, nationally as well as individually, recognize God as the author of our liberties.
2. We must jealously guard the heritage that is ours from the enemies within.
3. We must cultivate a new patriotism, one that is neither militaristic nor pacifistic.
4. We must do our part as champions of international justice, righteousness, and peace.

I

We must recognize God as the Author of our Liberties

Here we must begin and to this we must constantly return. This is not a mere pious phrase to give religious decoration to an appeal. This is basic. It is our first and all-important duty.

Recognizing God as the Author of our liberties will keep us humble before Him. It is becoming to place ourselves in the scrutinizing presence of God, the just and holy God, the God of the nations.

Recognizing God thus will prompt us to thanksgiving. We will acknowledge the favors divinely bestowed upon our nation. We will be deeply grateful for the position which we enjoy among the nations of the world. We will praise Him for the civil and religious freedom which is ours in a world that is racked and tortured by intolerance and persecution. We will say: "Not unto us, not unto us, O Lord, but unto Thy name give glory!"

Recognizing God thus will prompt us also to confession of our sins. As Christians we know the difference which, by the grace of God, exists between us and many of our fellow-citizens who do not know or recognize God. But as Christian citizens we also know ourselves as part of our nation and jointly responsible for its deeds. We must acknowledge that we have sinned deeply as a nation. We have trampled upon the ordinances of God despite our national privileges. Also as a nation we must search our hearts and return unto the God of our fathers. Righteousness belongeth unto Him, but unto us confusion of face. "Let us search and try our ways, and turn again unto Jehovah. Let us lift up our heart with our hands unto God in the heavens, saying: We have transgressed and rebelled."

Recognizing God thus will also prompt us to prayer and supplication. We should pray for the nations of the world and their rulers. We should pray for the dictators—that God may change them. We should pray on behalf of the oppressed, the suffering, the persecuted, especially those who suffer for the faith. We should pray for ourselves, that God may clearly show us our duty, and may give us grace to do it.

This will put us in the proper frame of mind to recognize God as the author of our liberties. We will understand and recognize that there can be no

permanent liberty for our nation without the fear of God. Our Christian civilization is built upon the recognition of the great moral sanctions of the Decalogue and of the New Testament. Righteousness alone exalteth a nation. The God-fearing founders of our nation lived by the Word of God and learned their liberties in the light of its sacred pages. We must acknowledge that there is no liberty without law, and that God is the ultimate author of every moral precept.

The first thing to do if we are to guard our God-given liberties is to humbly acknowledge, honor, and obey the Supreme Author of these liberties.

II

We must jealously guard the Heritage that is ours from Enemies within

We have a heritage to guard.

I am not now speaking of ourselves as a Church of Jesus Christ. As a church we have a great spiritual heritage, of which we have spoken repeatedly on other occasions. Just now we are thinking of ourselves as citizens, Christian citizens, as an integral part of our nation. As a nation we have a heritage to guard among the nations of the world.

We have become a great and strong nation, one of the foremost nations of the world. In a century and a half a group of struggling colonies has been welded together into a powerful nation of one hundred twenty million. Financially, economically, and in many other ways we enjoy the admiration and command the respect of the entire world.

Yet this is not our real greatness, important though it is. Our real greatness lies in the task which in God's providence has been assigned to us in modern history. America is the haven of refuge for the persecuted and underprivileged of all nations. Economic opportunity, social freedom, and religious liberty—these are the goods which in God's providence have been intrusted to us in a measure such as no other nation can boast. The statue of liberty in New York harbor is an abiding symbol of the spirit, the idealism of our country. America is the land of opportunity. In it the lowest can rise to the highest position. Here is no class distinction. Here there is no poverty or want. Here there is no state church. Here is full freedom for each one to worship God as his conscience dictates and to bring his capacities and endowments to the highest possible development without alien interference. This is our national heritage which we are called to guard and to develop.

And this national heritage is today in jeopardy, not only from without, but also from within. Not only are democracy and freedom ridiculed in many parts of the world, but also within our own borders traitors of the same brand are at work.

Sad to say, on the part of certain American citizens there are foreign loyalties which are inconsistent with the obligations of their American citizenship. We used to speak of the hyphenated

American in a favorable sense of the word. Usually he was only bringing the finest elements of his own national past to the American melting pot. German-Americans, Holland-Americans, British-Americans—each brought their own contribution to our shores. Each was proud of his own antecedents and ancestry. Yet each wanted to be a good American. There was no danger in displaying two flags at social and patriotic meetings of these first and second generation American immigrants.

But this can no longer be said today. Certain foreign governments, hostile to our democratic institutions, are employing the hyphenated American as their tool of propaganda. Men within our borders use the very freedom they are enjoying in order to undermine that freedom. They have become traitors to America even though they have sworn off allegiance to any foreign power and have pledged fealty to the stars and stripes. Our government must take drastic action against such traitors, and ban such subversive influences that are hostile and foreign to our national ideals from our borders.

But our national heritage is jeopardized from within also in quite a different way. I refer to the intolerance of certain organizations not foreign but indigenous—in fact, boasting as some of them do of a one-hundred-per-cent Americanism. Here belong such remarkable but humiliating American phenomena as the Ku Klux Klan, the Silver Shirts, the Black Legion, and the like. They constitute the same intolerance as found abroad, but it is an intolerance of an American stripe. These groups believe in liberty only for themselves and have not learned the American principle that groups highly diversified, racially, religiously, and socially, can live together in our land only when each allows the other the same freedom which it craves for itself.

And thirdly, our national heritage is also jeopardized by the indifference of many so-called fine citizens toward their government and the affairs of their government. It is a sad fact that hosts of Americans take their politics very lightly. That is why government often falls into the hands of local bosses who manipulate it for their own unscrupulous ends. We must foster devotion to principle in matters of government. We must learn to stand for honesty, integrity, righteousness, devotion to public duty. The indifference of large sectors of our American citizenship toward matters of government and toward the election of its officials is a grave menace to our national heritage.

If we would guard our heritage from within, we must fight not only the fifth columnist of foreign complexion, but no less the fifth columnist to our American institutions who, sad to say, is altogether too typically American.

III

We must cultivate a new Patriotism, one that is neither Militaristic nor Pacifistic

The situation in America calls for the cultivation of a new patriotism. We have on this score out-

grown the period of childhood and *naïveté*. We have outgrown—have we not?—the childish patriotism to which many old-fashioned Fourth of July orators and political job-seekers with their spread-eagle-ism still frequently resort. Boisterous waving of the flag accompanied by an outburst of oratorical superlatives to the effect that, "We are the greatest country on the face of the globe," and the like, does not command the respect of a mature person who intelligently and sincerely loves his country and its institutions. Such a display is a left-over of the infantile stage in our American patriotism.

Our disdain for this sort of exhibition only proves that we are growing up. In fact we have outgrown that sort of thing, but—and here lies our danger—in the place of it we have not as yet developed a respectable patriotism for America come to the age of maturity. We must cultivate a new, a deeper patriotism. This we can do if we make real to ourselves the preciousness of the American heritage and the solemn responsibilities which it involves.

As we cultivate this new, this virile, this realistic patriotism, we must be on our guard against two dangers which threaten it. Our patriotism may be corrupted or undermined in two ways. First, by a narrow, bigoted, and sable-rattling nationalism; and, secondly, by a weak, spineless, and anti-Christian pacifism.

Until very recently the terms nationalism and patriotism were considered practically synonymous. Nationalism simply meant consideration for and loyalty to one's nation. As such it was not at all in conflict with a wholesome internationalism. Of late, however, the term nationalism has acquired a sinister new meaning. The nationalism that we have seen rising in Europe is of quite a different stripe. This nationalism, though boasting of its patriotism, is an evil, whereas patriotism is always a virtue. Someone has said, pointedly: Patriotism is love for one's own country—Nationalism is hatred for every country except one's own. This nationalism has no respect or consideration for the rights of other nations and it invariably goes hand in hand with a noisy, boisterous, boastful, ruthless militarism.

The other danger which threatens to weaken and undermine a genuine patriotism is pacifism.

The Christian should be a true lover of peace and should promote it to the limit of his ability, but the Christian is not a pacifist. If a professing Christian claims to be a pacifist, he is so far forth in conflict with the call of Christian duty. The pacifist is the man who sacrifices righteousness and justice to peace. He denies that the Christian has the right and the duty to defend himself and his loved ones, as well as his country, from an unwarranted attack. The Word of God tells us that we must stand for peace through righteousness. The Christian loves peace. If he be a true Christian, he will seek it with all his heart. But he also knows that there can be no peace apart from justice and righteousness. So it is in theology. So it is in the ecclesiastical realm.

So it is in the personal Christian life. And so it is in national and international affairs—as long as we live in a sinful world.

Pacifism undermines genuine patriotism. In the present world situation it is the actual ally of the violent and the oppressor. Whatever their intentions may be, the effect of the stand of all pacifists is the very opposite of pacific. If we had lived in accordance with the teachings of the pacifists, our Dutch ancestors of the sixteenth century would never have achieved their freedom from Roman Catholicism and Spanish tyranny. If European Christians had followed the urgings of pacifists, Charles Martel would not have stopped the Mohammedan hordes on the battlefield of Tours. Nor would we have achieved our freedom from England. In fact, there would be no American union today.

Our patriotism—the new patriotism we need—should be tainted neither with a bigoted nationalism nor with a weak spineless and anti-Christian pacifism. That a narrow exclusive nationalism cannot be our ideal is clear to all. That pacifism is irreconcilable with Christian ideals for our national duty is not as apparent to all. It is sad to observe that even in Reformed groups some have been infected with this poison of pacifism. But no Christian can afford to exalt peace above righteousness in a sinful world.

Modernism in religion and theology exalts peace without righteousness. It assumes the inherent goodness of human nature. It is an attempt to ignore sin and deny the justice of God in relation to sin. Pacifism in international affairs makes fundamentally the same blunder. It is not difficult to dig out a quotation from Scripture which seems to be pacifistic in meaning and purport. But the careful student of the New Testament readily recognizes this as a pious form of distortion and misrepresentation. The individual Christian and the nations of the world have a solemn duty to stand for righteousness and justice, and for peace only when it may be had without sacrificing these. Said Theodore Roosevelt: "Let us as a nation understand that peace is worth having only when it is the hand-maiden of international righteousness and of national self-respect." Not the pacifist but the Christian patriot is the true lover of peace.

Christian patriotism must of necessity be the sworn enemy both of a militaristic nationalism and of an unrealistic pacifistic internationalism. As America seizes its opportunity of cultivating a new and higher patriotism, she will do well to avoid both these counterfeits.

IV

And, finally, we must do our Part as Champions of International Justice, Righteousness, and Peace

This is a solemn duty which every nation has and which is grounded in the ordinances of God's Word. The Christian must stand for righteousness, justice,

and peace in his personal, his national, but also in his international relations. We as Christians have a right to expect that of our government, and insofar as we can bring our influence legitimately to bear upon the governing bodies, we must seek to drive home this duty.

When violence and oppression are resorted to by the strong nations at the expense of the weak—when these weak nations without just provocation are crushed beneath the heel of the oppressor—it is the duty of stronger nations to speak out, to denounce such acts, and to bring needed influence to bear so that justice may be championed in behalf of the weak by the strong.

A decade or two ago it looked for a while as though there would be a League of Nations and a World Court which could, at least in a measure, protect the interests of the smaller nations. That instrument is now almost completely non-existent. We are again living in a world where it is everybody for himself, where might seems to make right, where the strong crushes the weak *ad libitum*. It is in that sort of a world that the strong nations that believe in righteousness and fair dealings have a solemn duty to denounce the oppressor and to take measures that shall protect the rights of the weak and protect them from flagrant injustice at the hand of a cruel aggressor.

We have of late in America heard much of neutrality. Despite international brigandage, murder, and cruel assassination, we have heard neutrality lauded by many an American politician as the great international virtue. Undoubtedly neutrality has its rightful place and demands both in our personal and in our international life. We should keep out of quarrels that are none of our business. We should not meddle in other persons' matters. We should not meddle in the affairs of other nations when these affairs do not practically or morally concern us. Wars that do not concern us have been fought again and again by other nations.

But matters stand quite different in the present world situation. Only the blind or the traitors will say that the present world conflagration is no concern of us. It is our concern very really and very deeply. It is our concern with a view to our own national safety. And it is our concern with a view to the obligation which we as a strong nation have over against the weak nations that are being ground to powder and robbed of their freedom and independence.

When great moral issues are at stake, no person—least of all a Christian—has a right to be neutral. Then neutrality may be a grave sin. None other than Theodore Roosevelt, that fearless fighter for all that is just and decent and truly American, said in his *Fear God and Take Your Own Part* (p. 26): "As for neutrality, it is well to remember that it is never moral, and may be a particularly mean and hideous form of immorality. It is in itself merely unmoral; that is neither moral nor immoral; and at times it may be wise and expedient. But it is never any-

thing of which to be proud; and it may be something of which to be heartily ashamed. It is a wicked thing to be neutral between right and wrong."

It is a wicked thing to be neutral between right and wrong! That word may well sink deep into the soul of America, lest she sell her birthright for a mess of pottage. "The Christian religion," said Bishop Manning recently, "stands not for peace at any price but for righteousness at any cost."

Let us dedicate ourselves anew to our task as Christian citizens. Let us promote righteousness, and justice, and understanding, and peace—both within our own borders and among the nations of the world.

May God give peace to this poor, blundering world, but may it be a peace built upon righteousness and justice.

And may America not fail to do its part to that end!

C. B.

"And His Name Shall Be Called"

NAMING a person properly is to characterize him accurately. Due to the limitations of human observation, perspective, and evaluation, man has in the main failed miserably in giving names. The meaningless names with which children are burdened constitute an implied confession of the parents' inability to make proper use of the privilege of name-giving. Adam could do it. But that was before the Fall, when the shades of sin had not yet been drawn over his eyes.

"Wonderful"

"His name shall be called Wonderful."

That's a divine declaration. And God knew who and what He shall be. His name shall be called Wonderful, because that is precisely what He shall be. There shall be something of the miraculous, something of the supernatural about Him that makes this naming perfect. It is obvious that this is God's view. Men unaided by divine illumination have been unable to understand the propriety of such a name. The Babe of Bethlehem seemed to them but a child of parents of mediocre means, born under inauspicious circumstances, visited by simple shepherd folk, reared as Jewish boys were wont to be, and ending a life of suffering by being lifted up on the cross. There is nothing there that would justify the name. Yet men have loved this picture because it made Him seem like one of them. They apparently do not want Him to be wonderful.

Clever scholars with their scalpels have been cutting down the scriptural picture where there would seem to be some danger of its being regarded as wonderful. Why have men been resenting the fact that He is wonderful? This resentment has been persistent since the day of Pilate to the day of Hitler. Why? Is it because the fact that He must be wonderful is an indictment against man, an indictment which charges men not only with sinfulness, but also with inability to succor himself? Does the name Wonderful as applied to Christ imply man's total depravity? At any rate—He is Wonder-

ful, for God so evaluated Him. And He is wonderful no matter from what specific angle He is viewed. His origin, His character, His development, His function, His life, His death, His resurrection, indeed His everything is wonderful. That view of Christ is possible only when a person by the Spirit's guidance views Him as God does. And there can be no Christmas in the world unless men are willing to stand before the Child in wonderment.

"Counsellor"

Only the Omniscient can properly bear that name. Only the Jewish Rabbi from Galilee can be known as THE teacher. He can be Counsellor because He is the Truth.

He must needs be Counsellor because men are wallowing about in the ignorance and darkness of sin. There have been wise men galore. They have marched across the pages of history with their philosophies finely spun. Among them are Confucius, Mohammed, Plato, Cicero, Kant and many others. But their systems lived but for a day. They could not and therefore did not impart the truth that can make men free.

There have been other counsellors, but they could not bear the title with any degree of justice. Their counselling plunged the world into error. One sometimes has occasion to marvel at the profundity of human thought, but when it is examined by the only standard of true wisdom, it is found not to be the pure gold that it seemed. It was merely brass. It bore the character of the subjects that produced it. The world was therefore in dire need of the true Counsellor. Christ was and is God's unerring Teacher of truth. It is just when men refuse to give heed to the counsel of the Counsellor that the course of their thoughts and actions leads them to poverty in living and ruin in death.

The world of today is reeling sickeningly. It has not consulted the Counsellor. The Counsellor has counselled that men love their neighbors, but they have in their sinful folly decided on the course of

hating. The results have been tragic. Human blood has flowed with a stream that refuses to be dammed. Hearts are wrung into anguish because of their vain and ceaseless yearning for loved ones. Nations fade away and the people thereof are becoming like shadows of men hopeless, lifeless, and tired of looking for food that cannot be found. All the vexing problems that the best minds of the nations have been vainly wrestling with and that fill the hearts of men with fear and uncertainty can be traced back to the human refusal to be counselled. As never before the world needs to be counselled, and yet it has never more persistently rejected the only true Counsellor.

Christmas becomes a hollow mockery when one celebrates it and at the same time deems unworthy the counsel of the Counsellor whose coming to us occasioned the commemoration. God gave to the world a needful gift. He evaluated the world and judged that it was in dire need of the true Counsellor.

"Mighty God"

There has been on the part of men an inclination to deny the omnipotence of God, to say nothing of the omnipotence of Christ, in times of great national upheavals. "God could not stop the war, therefore He did not." So argued H. G. Wells during World War I in his *Mr. Britling Sees It Through*. There seems to have been and to be not the slightest concession of the possibility that God's power, representing His judgments, may be revealed in the war and the many other tragic catastrophes that befall the lot of sinful men and nations.

It is precisely the omnipotence of Christ that gives His love and wisdom any practical value. His love is not empty sentimentality that can accomplish nothing no matter how great its depth, its height, and its width may be. What Christ's love dictates comes to pass, because He has the omnipotence to do it. Christ's wisdom does not consist of abstract meditations and decisions. It is a wisdom that has omnipotence at its disposal to do its behest. It is just this combination of qualities in Christ that makes it impossible for the gates of hell to prevail against the Kingdom.

This element is indispensable for a cheering glimpse of the Babe. The tremendous forces arrayed against the Kingdom and the persistent rebellion of man who thrusts away the hand that reaches out to save him might otherwise well fill us with despair. Christmas would then not be capable of dispensing cheer.

If there ever was a time in which men need to see more than a helpless Babe in the manger, it is now. Christmas can't be Christmas unless we are able to visualize Mighty God in the cradle. That situation justifies the name Wonderful. To love the Child in the manger and to pity Him will never bring us to put our trust in Him. Our despair can be dispelled only in the realization that the Babe is Mighty God. And God said He was just that.

"Everlasting Father"

Again the deity of Christ is affirmed. He did not come into existence two thousand years ago. He was just revealed in time. He is not of time. Revelation of someone demands that he assumes the forms of time and space. But He belongs to neither. Time marches on. Men come and go. Wars will cease and be resumed. But it is of the nature of God to be everlasting. And Jesus is God, the same yesterday, today, and forever. He is the changeless Christ in a changing world. The Babe bears all the characteristics of a human being, for He is very man. He too shall taste of the limitations of time and space. Yet, paradoxical though it may seem, He is the eternal One. That ascribes unto Him the validity of permanency and dependability in a world where neither of the two are elsewhere found, search for them though we may.

But the Son who is given unto us is not abstract timelessness. He is Father, not a father, nor even the Father among fathers. To him as God the term is perfectly applicable. He is the true Father. All other fatherhoods are but faint reflections of His. The fact that the Child is Father guarantees to us His paternal concern, love, and care for us. And such reactions are direly needed by his erring children. He came into the flesh not to be taken care of, but to take care of. He was not man's concern, but man was His concern. Where men have been directed to recognize the deity of the Child, the concept of fatherhood has proved to be an unspeakable blessing. But frequently the Mighty God has been watered down to a sentimental father. Men forget that the divine fatherhood of Jesus gets its value from the fact that He is Mighty God. He *can* take care of us. It's valuable because he is Counsellor. He *can* direct His children unerringly. Such a child is borne unto us. Mortal eyes can't see in the gurgling, kicking babe in the cradle the everlasting Father. It takes divine illumination to enable us to visualize that the Babe is Father, everlasting Father. Isn't He Wonderful!

"Prince of Peace"

He is also called, and therefore is, The Prince of Peace. How beautiful that concept, once grasped, must be to restless man in a harried world! How eloquently men should be able to discourse about it! But the concept is all too frequently emasculated by the attempts to deny the Christ and to preserve the remnants of a Jesus.

The Prince of Peace must be Wonderful, Counsellor, Mighty God, and Everlasting Father, or He is nothing. Without these other qualities The Prince of Peace is only a beautiful name, and beautiful names are of no avail in a war-crazed world.

He is Prince. His is the authority and the power to bring peace. It is within his competency to soothe the restless souls of men, to bid the turbulent seas, and the more turbulent waves of humanity to "Be still." He can bind the devil and

his sinister hosts and cast them into the abyss. With a word He can order sin and its effects to "be gone," and that command cannot be resisted. He is Prince. He only bears the name of "Prince" with propriety.

Today, the thought of peace is in many hearts. Men talk about it incessantly. But how effeminate, how weak, how temporal are the conceptions of peace! The peace over which Jesus is Prince is of a radically different color. It is virile. It is just. It is eternal. His peace is no mere armistice. It removes all fear, for He drives out from its hidden lair the disturber of peace and crushes it. That peace of His is not realized by crushing some earthly dictator with ambitions toward world-wide dominion. But it is attained by reconciling God to man, and then man to God. Such reconciliations change human hatred into love, human selfishness into

altruism, and human sinfulness into righteousness. The Prince is not interested primarily in a temporary lull in the battle front, in a social reconstruction that will subdue somewhat and for a time the ugly passions of men, and in an economic system in which the restless spirit of fear may be vanquished for a time. No, He is the Prince of a peace that knows no cessation and that will tolerate no disturbance. His peace is the work of God.

Anxious faces will peer over into the crib at Bethlehem on Christmas day. A simulated cheer and peace may be expressed by the celebrants on the occasion. But the peace that far surpasses understanding will radiate from the cradle to the hearts of men only when they see the Child as God saw and sees Him. He is Wonderful, Counsellor, Mighty God, Everlasting Father, Prince of Peace. H. S.

Art and Morality

Jacob G. Vanden Bosch

Professor of English, Calvin College

IF the international scene in politics presents nought but confusion, the scene portrayed in the arts is not less bewildering. Aesthetic theories and interpretations of life in endless variety clamor for expression and jostle each other in the confusion of the hour. One looks for some degree of unanimity but finds it not except in respect to one thing—the indifference of the arts to the demands of the moral law. Even good people whose personal views of the good life are beyond reproach are sometimes so vague in their conception of the relation of art to goodness and so enamored of beauty that they become all too tolerant of artistic portrayals of life that are fundamentally bad. For the sake of beauty much that is vicious is condoned. Others there are who, seeing that art is altogether too often used to gild vice and forgetting that the cultivation of the beautiful is part of the cultural command God gave to man at the dawn of history, forthwith brand art as dangerous and deprive it of a rightful place in a Christian's life. Much has been written on the subject, so that it is hard to open new perspectives; nevertheless we propose to discuss the most popular views in current thought concerning the relation of art to morality with special reference to literature.

Undue Exaltation of Art

We begin with noting the theory that art outranks morality and truth. In the triad of ideals embedded in the soul, the love of truth, the love of goodness, and the love of beauty, the adherents of this theory ascribe superiority to the last of the three. Important as each of these may be admitted to be, and essential to the endowment of a full-orbed human

being, the love of the beautiful nevertheless should bear the scepter and lay down the law for the other powers. It would be admitted at once that regard for truth and righteousness is of higher and nobler order than the longing for wealth and fame or the craving for food and drink and other bodily appetites, but authority over all of them must be vested in the aesthetic instinct.

Viewed historically, this theory is substantially the same as that held by the ancient Greeks, whose outlook upon life was aesthetic and whose culture was based on the idea of symmetry, whether in line or color, in thought, or in conduct. It produced a civilization that shone with a quiet splendor and that has been the admiration of men ever since. At first blush this fact might be taken as proof of the validity of the theory. But he who scans history closely soon learns that beneath the surface of the "glory that was Greece" moral corruption wrought so insidiously that eventually glory turned into its opposite. And he also learns that the doctrine of the superiority of beauty has invariably flourished in times of moral decadence. In England, for example, the aesthetic movement of which the notorious Oscar Wilde was the inspiring genius could not gain a footing until the conservation of the Victorian era had been undermined by a materialistic evolution, a mechanistic philosophy, and higher criticism. And in America the theory of art for art's sake had no support so long as idealistic views of life and art prevailed; only when the naturalistic theories hatched in Europe were wafted to our shores and began to infect private and public life did it succeed in securing a firm toe-hold.

A Distortion of Values

To put beauty on the throne and to make righteousness its vassal is a policy that, in termite fashion, destroys the very foundations of life and art. For clearly, if it be true that the beautiful outranks the good, all forms of reality and value are distorted. Then fine clothes count for more than upright character, a beautiful face is more praiseworthy than a good conscience, and a graceful performance in dancing is more important than an act of self-denial. Then it must furthermore be true that the externals of civilization such as artistic homes and public buildings, beautiful streets and parks, and attractive landscapes are more essential to the glory of a nation than is a citizenry devoted to ideals of truth, honesty, helpfulness, and moral purity. In fine, the practical consequences of the theory amount to nothing less than the denial of morality and connivance at the evils that inevitably follow in the wake of such denial—scandalous living and the degradation of art itself. Does not the shocking mode of life of many an artist who is its devotee—we are thinking of Oscar Wilde and his group in England and many others both in France and in this country—confirm what we allege to be its dire results?

As a philosophy of life, too, the theory is devoid of any inspirational value. John Galsworthy was a novelist and dramatist of power whose standard for human conduct was the idea of proportion. Beautiful as his novels are from the point of view of purely literary qualities such as style, irony, and symbolism, the best he could do was merely to lay bare the sore places in the body social. But he had no remedy for existing evils, and with nothing profounder than a philosophy of proportion to build on he could not have any.

Divorcing Art from Ethics

Perhaps what seems to be a less extreme view is that art and morality are two separate domains, neither of which is superior to the other; that each is independent of the other and has its own standards; that a piece of music, or a painting, or a story may be good art and at the same time be immoral in its general tendency; in short, that an artist, if he allows himself to be controlled by moral considerations in his creative activities, is false to his high calling as the high priest of beauty. Of an author we have the right to ask merely what he proposed to do and how well he accomplished his purpose; never should we ask whether what he set out to do was worth doing. In other words, in judging a work of art we employ standards of beauty, and these only. We should not forget that when we read a novel, for example, we are not reading a treatise on ethics, or a sermon, or a volume of maxims, but a work of art in the judgment of which norms of beauty and goodness must be rigidly kept apart.

With respect to this position it is pertinent to observe that any work of art, be it a painting, a statue,

or a poem, is an organic whole. As such it has both content and form, and conveys a message as well as pleases. We cannot help asking whether what it tells us is good and true any more than we can help asking whether it is beautiful. The moral quality is just as much an integral part of the whole as is the aesthetic, even though the primary purpose happens to be to please. To segregate the artistic aspect and to concentrate upon it all our attention to the extent of ignoring whatever moral qualities there may be is, to say the least, the height of the arbitrary. To be sure, it is possible to distinguish between the beautiful and the good; it is possible even to maintain that each has its own nature and laws; but in our evaluation to ignore an integral part, say, of a novel is to do violence to its organic unity. This argument becomes the more cogent if we remember that in the creative process, in the intuition, the moral element is present as well as is the artistic.

Beauty the Ally of Goodness

Our opposition to the position that art constitutes an absolutely separate domain furthermore grounds itself in the consideration that art deals with life and that life in its very nature is moral. To haggle about non-moral areas is for our present purpose a waste of time. Never is any human being absolved from the duty of complying with the moral law, not even an artist in his creative activity. Always are there motives behind the decisions of men and women in fiction, and these motives are either good or bad. God has so made life that it is moral in its very nature. Whether we eat, or drink, or do aught else, we should do it to the praise of God. How absurd, therefore, it is merely to look at literature, which by its very nature portrays life, from the narrow point of view of beauty. Tennyson was right when in his *Palace of Art* he stigmatized the selfish enjoyment of beauty as an inspiration of the evil one, and when he affirmed it to be the task of the poet to serve life by glorifying those ideals which ennoble life:

The poet in a golden clime was born,
With golden stars above;
Dowered with the hate of hate, the scorn of scorn,
The love of love.

Art must not ignore morality. Let it be remembered that morality is a matter of obligation and is something to be obeyed because duty bids us, while beauty is primarily a matter of enjoyment and is something to be desired because it affords pleasure. Both may have a rightful place in life, both may be included in the cultural mandate of the race, but they are not mandatory in the same sense. Surely, obligation is more insistent than enjoyment. Such has always been the conviction of mankind, and correctly so. To inflict punishment upon the man who steals or murders commands the approval of men everywhere, but to regard that man as worthy of penalty, who, devoid of taste, builds for himself a house violating every canon of good art would by

common sense be regarded as atrocious. From the respective natures of the two, therefore, it follows that beauty should be the inseparable ally of goodness. In literature this became a noble tradition. Even Plato belonged to it; so did Edmund Spenser, Sir Philip Sidney, John Milton, Samuel Johnson, as well as Lord Tennyson.

Legitimate Realism

All an author has to do is to report life honestly, just as he sees it. His responsibility does not go beyond a faithful portrayal of actuality. If the reader wishes to exercise his right to evaluate the life portrayed, well and good; the writer, however, is in no way concerned with the ethical quality of his creations. So the argument runs. Undoubtedly realism has its place in literature, but denunciation of this type of realism cannot be too severe. If a novelist creates characters and is icily indifferent to their struggles and conflicts, their failures and successes, their sorrow and happiness, he merits contempt. If he remains unmoved by the sin that corrupts human life and cares not whether his men or women do right or wrong, or develop in the direction of good or evil, or lead others to ruin, he deserves the execrations of his readers. If he is in no wise concerned about the effect of his writing upon the reader, whether it be uplifting or corrupting, he justly arouses our indignation. Far from being merely a reporter, he reveals an attitude of indifference toward that which is indispensable to a sound human society. He is guilty of tampering with the very foundations. He should be reminded that the principle of portraying life honestly has its limitations because it is not the only canon by which his work is judged. The law of decency which God has inscribed on the tables of the heart must also be observed. So must every other moral principle. At least such is the ideal.

There is, however, room for realism in art. Life being what it is, literature cannot avoid dealing with manifestations of sin. The Bible may serve as an example. In many places it is a very realistic book; not every chapter is fit reading at family worship. Yet we reverence it as the Word of God. Many a novel which we condemn because of its philosophy of life we nevertheless read without compunctions of conscience just as we do non-fiction setting forth views from which we dissent. We would not dare to withhold from it the meed of praise which as a work of art it deserves. We are thinking of the realistic fiction of Dickens which, even though its philosophy of life is superficial and scarcely Christian, in the main is wholesome. In spite of his cynicism we honor Thackeray for mercilessly exposing the hollowness of the life of those who have no higher aim than to shine in society. We may repudiate ever so vigorously their outlook upon life; yet we in a measure enjoy the fiction of a Meredith, a Hardy, a Wells, a Galsworthy, and a Bennett. Nobody ever thinks of outlawing the Homeric epics on the score of their being permeated with a pagan

spirit. Certain types of realism even have the flavor of romanticism as was the case with the novels of Edward Eggleston who, when he was accused of portraying the improbable, in self-defense declared truth to be stranger than fiction.

The Limits of Realism

But let the realist beware, Literature deals with life, to be sure; but we remind him that to maintain that all aspects of life just because they belong to life are fit material for literary exploitation is sheer perversity. Cohabitation, for example, is a legitimate function of life; yet to portray it, as is sometimes done in poetry and fiction, is proscribed by the law of decency. If the realist feels constrained to treat aspects of sex life, he should do so not only with delicate regard for the law of decency but also with the realization that for the sex life, too, there are moral and spiritual ideals. Let him remember that some functions of the body are so personal and intimate that they admit of no literary portrayal. Let him further remember that the feelings of respectable people are keenly sensitive to the literary use of the obscene and the profane. If he chooses to focus attention upon life at its worst, upon wretchedness and crime, he should do so with restraint and with due regard for the final moral effect. If he prefers to dwell upon the guesome, the violent, the psychopathic, he should bear in mind that these too are not without ethical implications. Finally, if he is a real artist, let him not forget that immoral content because of the pain and the revulsion it causes may neutralize the artistic effect.

The theory of art for art's sake also breaks down when we consider the claim of the artist that, because in his creative activity he is spontaneous, he must let himself go and be unconscious of any restraint. To be aware of an inhibiting force would be to destroy spontaneity. Surely, within the scope of his own specialty the artist should be spontaneous and free. We hasten to add, however, that there is no great art without a free and intuitive conformity to its rules. Art always spells forth freedom and restraint; it always implies a force centrifugal and a force centripetal. When Paderewski played the piano superbly, he did not violate the laws of music but obeyed them. When Milton wrote *Paradise Lost*, he did not flout the high requirements of the epic but observed them. Precisely as they obeyed the requirements of their art were they free and did they achieve immortal greatness. If this is true of the purely aesthetic aspect of art, why should it not be true also of the moral and the religious aspects? We fail to see why a moral or religious conviction cannot be an integral part of a genuine poetical intuition, or why regard for virtue can be a check to inspiration unless the heart is hostile. No great writer has experienced his profoundest ethical convictions to be a hindrance to literary utterance. Edmund Spenser incorporated the teachings of John Calvin in his immortal *Faery Queene*; Shakespeare in his unparalleled tragedies showed that the wages

of sin is death; Milton in his sublime *Paradise Lost* justified the ways of God to man; Wm. Cowper with tender beauty sang of his yearning to walk with God; yet all of these, together with many others, are counted among the nobly great of all time and for all time.

The Good, the Beautiful, and God

In a theistic scheme of the universe there can be no sound explanation of the relation obtaining be-

tween the good and the beautiful without due recognition of God as creator and lawgiver of both realms. If in God these are one as his unity or simplicity demands, then surely, in spite of the divisive effects of sin in art and literature, there must be a constant relation between them. Moreover, it is according to the divine intention that man with his artistic ability serve God and his fellow men, which he can do only if he conform to the ideal of eternal beauty as it is in God, in whom this ideal exists as the "beauty of holiness."

Conflicting Ideologies and the Coming Kingdom

Harold J. Ockenga

Park Street Church, Boston

IN a previous article we have spoken of the conflict of social ideologies in relation to the Kingdom of God. We have given a characterization of three such current social theories or ideologies, viz., Communism, National Socialism, and Democracy.

Now each of these social theories makes absolute claims on the lives of men. The world view of each demands the complete loyalty of the individual. Rapidly it is coming to the point where the total control of the individual in every realm is demanded. This may be seen by increased regimentation, by enforced military service, and by requisitioned financial support. Once God claimed our all. Now this claim is made by the government. That democracy, national socialism, and communism are different ideologies accounts for much of the conflict in the world. Confusion cuts across the boundaries of every nation. In Spain, in Pre-Hitlerian Germany, in France of the Popular Front and in Russia, we have witnessed the bloody strife of intrafratricidal conflict. This we may also witness in America. If these human loyalties are demanded by governments for ideological movements, a much more fundamental claim and demand should be made by the church for the kingdom of God in our lives.

The Kingdom and Conflicting Claims

These ideological realms are at present in opposition to the kingdom of God. The tension between the two is constantly increasing. In many countries the hostility has broken out into the open and this may also occur in America. It is a foregone conclusion that the counterfeits of the kingdom will oppose, persecute and hinder the kingdom in its development. On the other hand, as the kingdom develops there may be a silent, slow and effective transformation from within any one of these realms by Christianity itself. The only hope for democracy is the enlargement of the kingdom.

Under the conflicting claims individuals must choose their loyalty. There is the problem of the loyalty to the State. The Scripture declares that we are to be subject to the powers that be. Our obedience to the officers of the State is to take the nature of an obedience to an institution established by God. That has the implication, "Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's." However, we must also be loyal to God and to the revealed principles of Christianity. It is quite conceivable, therefore, that the State, even though it be a Divine institution, may be under evil men who serve the god of this world, and will be in conflict with our loyalty to God. Wherever this problem of the conflict of loyalties occurs it is necessary for the believer to obey God rather than man. In this rests what is called a right to revolution. We believe this includes not only passive resistance but active resistance. We therefore do not embrace either Pacifism as a political philosophy or submission as a spiritual philosophy. This should answer the problem of the course of actions of those who are in conflict with civil powers which are substitutes for the kingdom.

The Coming Victory of the Kingdom

If the kingdom was among the people of Jesus' day in the person of Christ, for it was preached as at hand, if the kingdom exists in the Church which is the body of Christ, and if it will ultimately become universal at the glorious coming of the King, we must trust in its final victory. This gives us the comfort of knowing that the present prominent world views which are opposed to the kingdom are transient. A simple glance at the historic evolution of society will be of value. Once there was the patriarchal-plebeian society in which the vast majority of men were slaves. Later there came a feudal society with the lord-serf relationship, which was little above slavery for the masses then. Then came the capitalistic era of the *bourgeois*-proletariat so-

ciety in which the masses of men were transferred to a new kind of slavery. It is perfectly feasible that we are now in a transition to a new order, that the imminent new form of society is probably some form of Statism and will manifest a new privilege group and a new form of slavery. In every transition there has been a great upheaval socially. That we are passing through that time of transition now makes our conditions difficult. It is possible that the new form of society will run a course of hundreds of years as the other forms of society did.

It is also comforting to know that the kingdom of God is abiding. The course of the kingdom was plotted by Jesus who told us that it will continue until the harvest by the angels. Therefore we are convinced that there must be a kingdom movement today, namely some form of movement comparable to the movement of communism and national socialism. The great masses of the people are outside of the church and are unaffected by the moral standards and spiritual power of the kingdom. Whatever the movement, it must be simple enough to reach and include these masses, as Methodism did in the England of the middle 18th century. This movement must include the equivalent of evangelism, namely, the reaching and securing of individuals for Christian faith and life; secondly, it must include a political program, based on justice such as that taught on the Sermon on the Mount; thirdly, it must recapture education for Theism.

Education Without God

A startling article appeared in the *Ladies Home Journal* last spring by an undergraduate of a great Eastern University. The author chided the President of that university on the inconsistency of expecting from the students a crusading zeal for democracy and Christianity when the entire curriculum of the school was calculated to destroy faith in Christianity and democracy. "You, sir, were brought up from earliest childhood in an atmosphere of traditional Christianity and democracy. You read, learned and inwardly digested the Bible. Nearly every Sunday you went to church, and there you heard and believed sermons which postulated the divinity of Christ, eternal principles of right and wrong, the existence of the human soul, a personal God and a life after death. . . . During your youth you were also educated to think that man is superior to animals, that he is a free agent capable of choosing between good and evil. Loyalty to country was an ideal you came to cherish, and your schooling never caused you to doubt that man possesses certain inalienable rights.

"Unlike you, most of us have scarcely ever glanced at the Bible. When our elders refer to eternal verities, absolute ethics, we are likely to recall the lesson your instructors in sociology have driven home—that morals are relative to time and place, that what is good in one society is bad in another . . . our biology courses now conceive of man merely as one species of mammal. Furthermore, is not your

traditional doctrine of free will at odds with the basic assumption of modern science—determinism? . . . We know not whether to praise or curse the current flag waving, and a belief that the American system is much better than any other.

"If men are but animals, why not treat them as such? An animal has no rights. The law among animals is the law of the strong . . . If there is no natural law in the universe, how do you justify those inalienable rights which the Declaration of Independence asserts men to possess? . . . Why do you think America is worth defending?

"Personally I fail to understand how you, or any other college president, can expect us to become ardent Christians and democrats when the vital postulates on which these faiths are supposed to rest are daily undermined in the class rooms. One thing seems certain, and I state this with all the solemnity of which I am capable: you and other educators of the country are now rearing a brood of potential Fascists . . .

"No Promethean fires of faith and sacrificial zeal burn in our hearts. Our wishy-washy adherence to Christianity and democracy pales into nothingness alongside the incredible devotion of German youths to the Nazi creed."

Back to God!

I am pleading for a program to bring God back into education, business and politics. Without this our cause is foreordained to futility. The kingdom of God will continue to exist regardless of the governmental form of society, whether democracy, national socialism, or communism. The effect of the kingdom of God will depend upon the dynamic of the movement whether it is confined to the few or whether it reaches the masses. The power of the kingdom to conquer in any kind of society has been demonstrated and it can be experienced again. It conquered the patriarchal-plebeian form. It conquered the feudal form. It has existed and conquered in the capitalistic form and we believe that if we are on the era of a new form of society our attitude should be one not of defeatism but of hope.

In this kingdom movement I am not talking about the final form of the kingdom as universal. In the present form it will not be universal. It will still depend upon those who will receive the King. The ultimate universal form will be catastrophic. It will not be a gradual change. In a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, the King shall come in glory and a new order will be established by His authority and power. Conditions preceding that catastrophic coming are foretold in the Scripture as exceedingly evil, as tumultuous, careless, confusing and fearful. For that reason we know the present form of the kingdom shall not be universal, but the coming of the universal form in catastrophic manner may be near or it may be far in time and because we do not know the hour of that event we have reason to believe that our efforts for a kingdom movement would not be fruitless today.

A Program and an Outlook

Here is a concept then which is sufficient to provide a crusading zeal. Our prayers and our labors should be, "Thy kingdom come." Students need not go forth into the world defeated, pessimistic, hopeless and aimless, but they may go with God's dynamic and God's program as a profound influence upon the world. Our outlook is based upon a Sovereign God Who holds the destinies of man in the palm of His hands, Who knows the end from the beginning. It includes a God-revealed program, the fulfillment of which will make our lives tolerable

on earth. It includes a kingdom movement which, though accommodated to various situations, redeems by regenerating individual men.

This world view may be called new, but it is as old as Christianity. It is the conception of the kingdom elastic enough for any possible outcome of the present world strife. "Without revolution it has worked the greatest revolution, by accepting everything to transform everything, submitting to everything to rise above everything, renewing the world from top to bottom while condemning all violent subversion."

The Cause of the Deluge

Dudley Joseph Whitney

Exeter, California

IN the early history of geology belief in the fact of the Deluge was standard. Traditions of all races of men seemed to sustain the Genesis record, and the findings of sea shells and other fossils high on mountain sides indicated that the Deluge occurred.

Two causes however operated to overthrow this belief. One was the reluctance of men to accept the Scriptures as fact. The other was the apparent impossibility of deciding how the Deluge operated to cause the rocks to be as they are. First geologists thought there had been one great Deluge; then a series of Deluges, but finally the Gordian knot was cut, not untied, by deciding, arbitrarily, that earth processes such as operate now, extending through long ages, caused the earth to be as it is and that there was no more Noachian Deluge than some spring freshet on Chaldean plains long ago. Modern historical geology is based upon these postulates.

True, efforts to show how present processes could cause coal beds, petroleum deposits, fossils and other records of the past to form have failed completely. Nevertheless this has not hindered geologists from rejecting Deluge geology because they could not see how it could operate, even though the operation of present processes fails completely to explain existing conditions. This too is done even though the nature of fossils and the rocks most strongly indicates catastrophe, or the quick, cataclysmic deposit of the sedimentary rocks, thus indicating Deluge geology and contradicting evolutionary geology. Deluge geology therefore should be believed through the nature of the rocks and traditions of the event, even though the way it came about has not been understood.

Now, one of the most striking features of the crust of the earth is the extraordinary thickness of sedimentary rocks in many places, that is, rocks which have been laid down in water. Text books on

geology in discussing the matter speak of thicknesses of twenty, thirty or forty thousand feet of rock in different parts of the globe, and thicknesses of several miles are seen or clearly indicated in mountains like the Canadian Rockies, the Alps and the Himalayas. Standing on the bank of the Grand Canyon, one can view a mile thickness of rock, most of it laid down in thick, flat sheets like a stack of hot cakes. Oil wells have been sunk to a depth of two and three miles, going all the way through rock that was laid down in water.

Because we see these things we tend to take them for granted without thinking how extraordinary they are. No ordinary processes could possibly lay down such thicknesses of rock. Even though they could, where could such great amounts of material originate? Sediment now is laid down mostly in shallow lakes or in deltas at the edge of continents and rests upon the continental shelf. There is simply no way to account for rock many thousands of feet thick by processes such as operate now. Sea floor averages only about 12,500 feet deep, and only a few mountains rise more than 20,000 feet above sea level, but sedimentary rock—on land, not sea floor—oftener is thicker than normal ocean depth plus the height of high mountains. (The continents themselves average only a height of about 2400 feet above sea level.) Clearly only an extraordinary cataclysm could account for the immense thicknesses of the rocks, and an hypothesis is presented here on the nature of this cataclysm.

Water Within the Earth

Interestingly enough, the Genesis record gives a suggestion of this when it says that in the early part of the Deluge period the fountains of the deep were broken up. The implication is that great quantities of water came to the surface from within the earth. Granting that this is what happened, enormous

thicknesses of rock material from the crust of the antediluvian earth would be loosened up and, of course, settle down again, making the great thicknesses of rock which exist. The thing is very simple, taking the record as it stands, and if in addition we can find geologic processes which indicate that such a thing could have happened in the past, the hypothesis that this occurred would seem to be well founded.

Parts of the earth are violently disrupted occasionally now by volcanic activity, and significantly enough, water and other gases coming from within the earth are the great activating agency in volcanism. Just as an overheated boiler will explode, heavily water charged material within the earth where the temperature is very high may cause an explosion or series of explosions, such as destroyed Pompeii 1900 years ago.

The amount of water sent out during volcanic activity is enormous, as we will see soon, but certainly far less remains within the earth now, after the whole face of the earth with the possible exception of most sea floor has been made over through outpourings of lava and the agencies that stirred up and laid down the great thicknesses of sedimentary rock and caused the uplift of continents generally, than was there to begin with. Volcanism now can operate only from the dregs left from earlier eruptions.

Some definite data are available on the water of volcanism. Dr. A. C. Lane in his presidential address to the Geological Society of America in 1930 pointed out that from 100 openings like one parasitic vent on Etna would issue all the water of the ocean in 1,800 million years. A cubic mile of water would be sent out by such a vent in 600 years, and there are hundreds of parasitic vents on Etna. An enormous amount of water vapor, with other gases, thus even now issues from within the earth. It is what causes volcanoes to erupt. In the very nature of the case much greater amounts must have been locked within the earth before the crust of the earth was broken up by the Deluge.

In the Pacific Northwest, covering much of northern California, Oregon, Washington and Idaho, are great lava beds, covering about 200,000 square miles and averaging 2000 feet thick. Certainly the amount of water once held within the earth under this area to cause the eruption of all this material would seem to be beyond calculation. There are also other great masses of volcanic material in many parts of the earth, some far greater in amount than this, which were brought to the surface because the earth under them held great quantities of water under high heat and pressure. Water within the earth in the past must therefore have been sufficient to actually break up deeply all the land areas of the antediluvian earth and to provide the thicknesses of sedimentary rock that have been mentioned.

The Nature of the Early Earth

To discuss the subject intelligently a consideration of the probable nature of the early earth may be helpful. This will be considered from a naturalistic standpoint rather than on the theory that the earth was created by fiat—though all efforts to explain how the earth could take form *naturally* fail completely.

Geologists are uncertain regarding the condition of the early earth. The old idea, still often held, is that it began as a molten body which cooled. Striking pictures are drawn of hot rain falling on hot, newly hardened rock, to be vaporized again on contact with said rock.

There are many difficulties to this theory, so another is favored by some geologists. This is that the earth started much smaller than it now is and grew by the fall of "planetesimals" upon it, attaining its present size in that way, and that the present ocean and atmosphere came from within the earth in somewhat the same way that water and other gases issued from volcanoes.

There seem to be insuperable difficulties to this theory. One is that the fall of meteoric material on the earth is too small to build it up to any appreciable extent. Another is that sulphur is emitted in enormous amounts by volcanoes, and if the ocean came from within the earth so much sulphur would have been emitted that all living things in the ocean would be poisoned by its compounds. By the same token, this condition would exist if the earth was even a moderate fraction of the age geologists assert for it and had undergone a small fraction of the volcanic activity that they assert has taken place.

Pure physics indicates that if the earth had started hot—and its high internal temperature indicates that it did so—practically all of the water, sulphur, chlorine and some other substances, would be driven to the surface or near it. However, as the surface temperature reached a point several times that of normal boiling, the water of the earth, instead of remaining entirely in the atmosphere, would be taken up in great amount by the silicates of the hot surface, making a deep, universal ocean, extending thousands of feet down, said ocean being a mixture of water and minerals.

This is not merely a theory of the writer, but Harold Jeffreys, outstanding British physicist, holds this view, saying in his book on "The Earth" that "thus most of the ocean was once within the earth."

As cooling progressed and the surface hardened, much of the water would be locked within the earth, being the agency to break up the lands at the time of the Deluge and to provide the water of present day volcanism.

The subject is being discussed here on a purely naturalistic basis, although the writer believes in the divine ordering of the earth. Still, just how far the Creator used natural processes and how far pure fiat in the creation of the earth and to cause the

Deluge, no one can say. A naturalistic study of the problem of creation is at least not out of order.

The Earth Takes Form

Granting this hot "water glass" ocean to begin with, which provides the only reasonable theory yet advanced on a naturalistic basis for the condition of the early earth, the gradual cooling of the atmosphere and ocean would result in the precipitation of silicates, carbonates and other minerals to form the continents, making a great difference in the composition of the rocks of continental masses and those under ocean floor, and this great difference exists. Among other things, rock under ocean floor is far heavier per unit of volume than the rocks composing the continents.

The crust under ocean floors does not seem to have been disturbed since the earth took form except in a few places where volcanic action has uplifted islands, while we have seen that the material where the continents stand has been disturbed and mixed with water to a depth of thousands of feet. In this disturbance to the earth marine sediments have been mixed with land sediments in very great amount, though said sediments probably came from comparatively shallow seas and not deep ocean floor.

Only by some such process as this can be explained the great beds of salt and gypsum in some places and the enormous amount of chlorine as sodium chloride in the ocean as compared with the much smaller amounts of sulphur, for chlorine is emitted from most volcanoes in only very small amounts and sulphur in very great amounts.

On the antediluvian earth there therefore existed ocean beds and land areas, plus most probably shallow seas extending into the continental masses, and locked within the crust were enormous amounts of water, with other gases, which when they broke forth were not only "the fountains of the deep" but the agency for the stirring up of the sediment which now composes most of our non-volcanic mountain masses.

The Deluge account tells of a great downpour of water at the start, and possibly this was the cause of the weakening of the upper rocks so that the expansive force of the hot water within the crust could cause it to break through and destroy the antediluvian land.

At all events, only some process that was catastrophic in its nature could account for the great thicknesses of the sedimentary rocks that exist on earth, particularly since this rock is on land and not on sea floor, though land would be the source of most sedimentary rock and sea floor the place where one would think it would naturally be deposited. Evolutionary geologists hardly make even an attempt to meet this difficulty.

Mere splashing of water over the land, such as might occur if a giant meteorite struck the earth, would not wear away the land enough to make sediment form thousands of feet thick, and if it did, such

sediment would naturally be swept into ocean basins and not be deposited upon the continents. Some agency to break up the antediluvian earth from beneath must have operated. We already know how violent a volcanic eruption can be, and this develops from water held in the hot *magma* of the earth's crust, and since the antediluvian earth must have contained far and away more water within its crust than the present earth, the agency for the destruction of the ancient earth is indicated.

The observation can well be made here that only one catastrophic remaking of the earth by such a cause would be possible, for a boiler can only explode once. The sedimentary rocks, if they were laid down by catastrophe, as they seem to have been, were laid down in one catastrophe, not in a series of them.

The Uplift of the Land

In this problem of the Deluge and of geologic history generally a very important feature is how the land came to be uplifted. We have noted that much of the land areas, including many of the greatest mountain masses, *were laid down in water* and so presumably were formed below sea level, yet now such material often stands several miles above sea level. The condition exists, but the fact that it does seems astounding.

What caused this uplift? It cannot have been a shrinking of the earth due to cooling, as earlier geologists believed, with a corresponding wrinkling of the surface and a buckling upward of parts, for the earth is not known to be losing any more internal heat than is being produced by radioactivity and chemical action. It cannot have been by great lateral movements of parts of the earth's crust, for no agency is known which could cause such movements, and if they occurred excess weight would develop in the parts where material was piled up, and this excess weight does not exist, for all parts of the earth's crust of large extent weigh practically the same as other parts of equal extent, whether the area is covered by high mountains or deep ocean. The crust under deep ocean is simply denser and heavier per unit of volume than the material composing and underlying mountain masses.

Expansion of deep lying material must therefore have been the cause of mountain uplift. Thus, where the Alps stand water once stood, covering material that is now mountain top. Expansion occurred and the land rose. A similar process operated in every place where sedimentary rock now stands above sea level.

Remember that the Flood was not a covering of existing lands by the ocean, but a breaking up of the antediluvian earth and then the uplift of the present mountains. Skeptics may scoff at the idea that during the Flood the sea rose to cover present lands, but we can point to the fact that the material of many of these mountains was once below sea level and they as well as we must account for its having been under water. Their explanation has to be that when the

water covered it the material was low lying and below sea level (or perhaps lake level) and was then uplifted. Our explanation is the same, only we have one catastrophic remaking of the face of the earth and one great period of uplift. They have to accomplish the remaking of the earth by processes such as operate now extending over scores of millions of years and they are completely unable to do so.

The General Course of Events

What happened was that the earth was made by the Creator and populated by plants, animals and men. Through the wickedness of mankind a great aqueous catastrophe was caused in which the land was broken up and a myriad of living things were destroyed and buried, which now exist as fossils. Expansion of underlying material caused the uplift of mountains. The expansion was often uneven and there was tilting of portions of the crust; also much erosion and redistribution of material. Only in this way can the remarkable features of the earth's surface be explained.

Practically all races of men had their traditions of the Flood. They would hardly have had these if the Flood had not taken place. Also, the time of the Flood cannot be put back much before the time Ussher calculated for it, or about 4,500 years ago, considering the comparatively recent rise of the great nations of antiquity and other evidences to that effect.

Several hypotheses have been set forth on the cause of the Deluge. Some of these may have operated in connection with others. However, all theories of the Deluge that have been made to fit into the theory that the earth is millions of years old and went through a series of geologic ages do violence to both the Genesis record and to simple, common sense physics. The only kind of Deluge which will fit either Genesis or the traditions of mankind is a tremendous, earth-devastating, mountain-covering Flood that required weeks to reach its climax and months for the earth to be made habitable again.

The face of the earth shows clearly that the land has risen from the water, and that not long ago; also that the ancient earth was broken up to a great depth and remade, not just given a ducking in the ocean and uplifted, as a man might plunge a dish into water and lift it out again.

Modern geology is utterly incompetent to explain the condition of the earth upon any reasonable basis by the ages theory. Catastrophe is indicated conclusively by the nature of the rocks and the fossils therein, and this fits the Genesis record perfectly. Volcanism shows how water held at high temperatures within the earth can blow up mountains, and certainly when there was far more water within the earth an agency was available to disrupt all the lands of that time and to cause the great thicknesses of sedimentary rock to form. That a hint of this is given in Genesis provides further testimony to the inspiration and truth of that record.

The Message of Christmas

TO THE WORLD

—straining anxious eyes, red with anguish, burning with the fever of unshed tears, to the far horizons of hope where they see no hope
—fearing the future
—hoping with a hope that verges on despair
—fearing the worst
—not daring to trust, not able to trust any longer its dearest expectations
—disillusioned—discouraged—afraid—

THE ANGELS SAY, "Fear not!"

TO THE WORLD

—blindly groping for Truth
—following ideological will-o-the-wisps
—seeking an adequate philosophy
—not daring to hope that there be a Reality
—yearning for the peace of assured knowledge
—reaching for "What is" and finding empty hands close upon only "What ought to be"
—wearily awaiting ruin with closed eyes—

THE ANGELS SAY, "Behold!"

TO THE WORLD

—staring with the glazed, hunted eyes of a refugee child, claspings to its bosom its last shabby trinket
—saddened beyond the power of expression
—bereaved of life's dearest and best
—cynically masking its deep heart-break, or laughing too gaily at nothing so as to stifle the sobs, or openly crying out in tortured rebellion against the unrelenting stillness of a brazen sky, or quietly weeping out its lonely misery in an empty corner—

THE ANGELS SAY, "I bring you good tidings of great joy!"

TO THE WORLD

—hopelessly divided, torn asunder to form enemy camps
—fighting like street dogs for that of which there is enough for all
—shattered by false loyalties
—hating and hated, afraid of neighbors and friends
—snarling—biting—clawing—bleeding—

THE ANGELS SAY, "Which shall be to all people!"

TO THE WORLD

—perishing in the wilderness
—trembling on the brink of destruction and chaos
—lost in its sin, sinning in its loss—

THE ANGELS SAY, "A Savior!"

"GLORY TO GOD!" "ON EARTH, PEACE!"

ALA BANDON.

Second American Calvinistic Conference

June 3-5, 1942

THE First American Calvinistic Conference was held in Paterson, N. J., June, 1939. At that time it was unanimously decided to continue such conferences every two or three years and preliminary steps were taken to hold the next conference in the Middle West. Since then a Committee has been formed which is representative of various Calvinistic groups and churches throughout the land to carry forward preparations for a successful Conference to be held June 3-5, 1942, at Grand Rapids, Michigan, in the buildings of Calvin College and Seminary.

Committee

The 1939 Conference appointed a small committee to carry forward preparations for the coming assembly, it being understood that this skeleton committee would be enlarged so as to constitute a representative group from various Calvinistic bodies and from different parts of the country. This Committee was formed and has been active in making arrangements for the forthcoming Conference.

Members of this Committee include the following: Rev. John Bovenkerk, Minister First Reformed Church, Muskegon, Michigan; Dr. Samuel G. Craig, Editor "Christianity Today," Minister in the Presbyterian Church U.S.A.; Rev. C. E. Hayward, Minister Canadian Presbyterian Church, Dalhousie, New Brunswick, Canada; Dr. Jacob T. Hoogstra, Minister Prospect Park Christian Reformed Church, Holland, Michigan, President First American Calvinistic Conference, 1939; Dr. Edward Mack, Professor at Union Theological Seminary, Southern Presbyterian Church, Richmond, Virginia; Rev. George Murray, Minister First United Presbyterian Church, Boston, Massachusetts; Rev. L. Oostendorp, Minister First Christian Reformed Church, Battle Creek, Michigan; Dr. Stuart M. Robinson, Editor "The Presbyterian," Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; Dr. William Childs Robinson, Professor at Columbia Theological Seminary, Decatur, Georgia; Rev. John F. Schuurman, Minister Wyoming Park Christian Reformed Church, Grand Rapids, Michigan; Dr. K. J. Stratemeier, Professor Dubuque University, Dubuque, Iowa; Dr. John G. Van Dyke, Minister East Leonard Christian Reformed Church, Grand Rapids, Michigan; Dr. Charles Vincze, Minister Free Magyar Reformed Church, Perth Amboy, New Jersey; Professor Thomas E. Welmers of Hope College (Reformed Church in America), Holland, Michigan; Dr. Leon Wencelius, Professor Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, Pennsylvania; Dr. Clarence Bouma, Professor at Calvin Seminary, Editor "The Calvin

Forum," Honorary Vice President First American Calvinistic Conference.

To this representative Committee the names of three business men were added, viz., Messrs. William H. Boer of Holland, Mich., Edward N. Freyling and Henry Hekman, both of Grand Rapids.

The officers of the Committee are the Rev. John F. Schuurman, President, and the Rev. L. Oostendorp, Secretary. The latter's address is: 108 Greenwood Street, Battle Creek, Michigan.

Program

It has so far been the policy of Calvinistic Conferences, both here and in Europe, to select some solid subject, fundamental to the Calvinistic world and life view, and to set up the entire program around that subject. The subject so utilized at the Paterson Conference in 1939 was: The Sovereignty of God. (Copies of book containing these addresses, edited by Dr. J. T. Hoogstra, may be had at the Zondervan Publishing Co., Grand Rapids, Mich., at the price of \$1.50). The subject selected for the coming conference is: The Word of God. This is a basic subject, very much in the foreground today, and offering valuable perspectives into the Reformed Faith as well as the various schools of thought which Calvinism faces and which have the ear of Christian people today.

The program will cover three evening meetings and two morning as well as two afternoon sessions on the two intervening days. Meetings during the day will be of a more scholarly nature, where papers will be read to be followed by discussion. The evening meetings will be of a popular nature and the general public is invited. The last evening will be in the nature of a fellowship banquet with brief popular talks and toasts by a variety of speakers representing various Calvinistic groups.

The program follows:

Wednesday Evening, June 3: Dr. Harold J. Ockenga, of Boston. The Keynote Address on "The Word of God."

Thursday Morning, June 4: Professor Louis Berkhof—"What is the Word of God?"

Thursday Afternoon, June 4: Dr. Henry Stob—"The Word of God and Philosophy."

Thursday Evening, June 4: Dr. Oswald T. Allis—"Present-Day Use of the Bible."

Friday Forenoon, June 5: Dr. John De Vries—"The Word of God and Science." And Dr. Leon Wencelius—"The Word of God and Culture."

Friday Afternoon, June 5: Prof. Thomas E. Welmers—"The Word of God and Education."

Friday Evening, June 5: Fellowship Banquet—Talks and Toasts by Representative Men.

Speakers and Subjects

Dr. Harold J. Ockenga is minister of the Park Street Church in Boston. Both the minister and the church are known for their unswerving loyalty to the Word of God and the Reformed Faith. In this strategic pulpit in the heart of old Boston, the cradle of New England Puritanism, he is today sounding the great notes of the Calvinistic Faith in the midst of scores of churches where Unitarianism and Modernism are holding sway. Dr. Ockenga has written a number of books, is a popular orator, and is known to many in the Middle West as last June's Commencement speaker at Calvin College and Seminary. Dr. Ockenga will give a popular inspirational address on the general subject of the Conference. This keynote address is intended for the general public as well as for those participating in the Conference.

Professor Louis Berkhof is a mature and seasoned theologian with many years of teaching and a number of theological works to his credit. He is highly respected in his own communion and has taught theology for the past 35 years. He holds the chair of Dogmatic Theology at the Calvin Theological Seminary, Grand Rapids, and has in recent years become known throughout Reformed Christendom for his splendid manual of Reformed Dogmatics, which in a second revised and enlarged edition has just appeared under the new title *Systematic Theology*. Professor Berkhof, who taught New Testament subjects before taking up Dogmatics, will speak on the biblical-theological aspect of the general subject. In dealing with the question, What is the Word of God? he will, among other things, also take up the view of the Word of God which has in recent years been advanced by the Barthians.

Dr. Henry Stob holds the chair of Philosophy at Calvin College. He has studied at Calvin College, Calvin Seminary, Hartford Seminary, the University of Göttingen, and the Free University at Amsterdam. Grounded both in theology and in philosophy, he will cope with the problem what the relationship and attitude of a Calvinistic Philosophy should be toward the Word of God. Dr. Stob is one of the younger Calvinistic scholars in our country, a man of much promise.

Dr. Oswald T. Allis is a Bible scholar of distinction. He is thoroughly grounded in Biblical Philology, especially Hebrew and Semitics, and has served as Professor of the Old Testament both on the Princeton and the Westminster Seminary faculties. For years he was an associate on both of these faculties of Dr. J. Gresham Machen. Dr. Allis will deliver an evening address for the general public and in dealing with his subject, The Present Day Uses Made of the Bible, will also touch upon the Modernist and the Dispensationalist use and interpretation of the Scriptures. He has made a special study of dispensationalism and takes a sane, Re-

formed attitude toward this school of scriptural interpretation.

Dr. John De Vries is another young scholar. After holding a science chair at two Presbyterian colleges (Huron and Knox), he was called to the chair of Chemistry at Calvin College. He is a capable teacher and popular with his students, to whom he is a Christian friend and personal counsellor as well as a teacher in the laboratory. Dr. De Vries will discuss the place and significance of the Word of God for the student and teacher of Natural Science.

Dr. Leon Wencelius is a Frenchman who teaches his mother tongue at Swarthmore College. To Calvinists he is known for his scholarly researches in the aesthetics of Calvin and of Calvinism. He has written two works, both in French, on *The Aesthetics of Calvin*, and on *Calvin and Rembrandt*, on the strength of which studies he received his doctor's degree from a French University. Dr. H. H. Kuyper of Amsterdam, one of the best living historical scholars on Calvin's life and thought, has repeatedly spoken with high regard of the person and work of Dr. Wencelius. He will address the Conference on "The Word of God and Culture."

Professor Thomas E. Welmers holds the chair of Greek at Hope College, where he is also registrar. He is an ordained minister of the Reformed Church in America and loves the Reformed heritage. It will be for him to set forth some basic principles for a philosophy of education grounded in the Word of God. In so doing he will undoubtedly also take up some of the educational philosophies of our day and evaluate them in the light of Scripture. His subject is: The Word of God and Education.

Basis of Fellowship

The basis of fellowship at this Conference is not denominational or ecclesiastical. The Committee stands on the same basis as did the First Conference, viz., that of historic Calvinism as expressed in the classic creeds of Reformed Christendom. This includes Reformed and Presbyterian groups of whatever national or racial antecedents which are devoted to the Reformed Faith as historically expressed in the classic creeds of these churches. Participants in this Conference, however, are not churches or denominations as such, but individuals who are interested in the Reformed Faith and its application to modern thought and life and the problems this presents. Everyone is welcome not only to attend the meetings but also to take part in the discussions.

Arrangements

The meetings are open to anyone. There will be no fee of any kind. Headquarters of the Conference will be Calvin College and Seminary. Free lodging will be furnished to those who make application in advance.

Those who desire further information are requested to correspond with Rev. L. Oostendorp, Secretary Second Calvinistic Conference Committee, 108 Greenwood Street, Battle Creek, Mich. C. B.

From Our Correspondents

Christmas Greetings From War-torn London

FROM Great Britain I send you, my American brethren, greetings this Yuletide.

You are, most of you, unknown to me in person. I have never gripped your hand or enjoyed a heart-to-heart talk with you, but I feel an urge to wing you my Christmas wishes all the same.

The air that we breathe here in Britain is charged with war—the atmosphere that you yet enjoy is one of peace.

The noise and confusion of battle have, for us, invested the peaceful associations of Christmas with a new meaning. The very name, apart from its central significance—the Birth of Christ—glows with friendliness, warmth, domestic happiness, and the very spirit of freedom. You in America have this freedom and peace, and I can wish you its continuance with a sincerity born of adversity. I could wish you may enjoy such peace many years and yet not a minute more than it can be maintained “with honor.”

Until you have heard the dread drone of enemy planes high overhead, as I have—until you have seen the night sky turn to an angry red from which shoot tongues of flame—and have heard the sharp crackle of burning houses and the thud of falling masonry—you can never assess the full value of a peaceful Christmas and the freedom it betokens.

This is the lesson that is learned when one emerges from the air raid shelter as the siren sounds the “all clear” and you pick your way through the debris of the streets snowed under with slates, glass, furniture, shreds of clothes, and sometimes worse.

The lesson is further driven home when you find your own home riven and shattered, your office roped off as a “dangerous area” and your friends in hospital or—dead.

Perhaps the lesson sinks deepest when you perceive the terror in the eyes of the tiny child as the house shudders to the shock of bombs that deafen and stun as they explode.

I trust you may never pass through such an experience but that, the blessing of God resting on your “aid to Britain” efforts, the war may know an early close. If He should rule otherwise, your countrymen will not shirk the soldier’s supreme sacrifice in the cause of freedom for you are of worthy stock as a nation, know that “peace at any price” is a poor thing. Yet do we pray that God may enable you to embrace the peace you yet enjoy with open arms and an overflowing heart of gratitude this Christmas.

So may liberty still shine undimmed in your midst till its rays disperse the darkness which yet envelopes your brethren in Britain and the other nations at war, and above all may we each share in the victory of our dear Savior Who spent His life and gave His blood that His chosen people might have Everlasting Peace.

Yours in Jesus,

GEOFFREY WILLIAMS.

October 8, 1941.

Beddington Free Grace Library,

31 Brooke Street, London, E. C. 1, England.

P. S. A Christmas message from God’s Word in largest type so that they with failing sight (and he who runs) may read may be had free of cost on receipt of a postcard. G. W.

Calvinism in France

THE Rev. Dr. Marcel J. Brun, pastor of the *Eglise Française du Saint Sauveur* of Philadelphia, Pa., has sent me an interesting and an informative letter regarding the fortunes of Calvinism in France. This information and expression of fortitude make a fine sequel to our last month’s column. There are more heroes of faith than those who have been mentioned frequently of late. The stirring factual part of the letter is as follows:

“I learned that pastor Marc Boegner, who was the president of the Federation of the French Reformed Churches, has been appointed a member of the National Council, but that he has been under close watch from the Occupying authorities; his house has been searched, and his whole library confiscated and sent to Germany. Pastor Freddy Durrleman, who was the head of ‘La Cause,’ a Calvinistic movement for theological and religious revival among the French Churches, has been arrested and sent to prison. All this of course comes from private and secret sources because nothing of it appears on the few newspapers I was able to receive.

“After the fall of the French army, when Marshall Pétain took charge of the State, he announced the restoration of a social order based upon the three ideals of Fatherland, Family, and Work. He proclaimed that religion would be restored in education and that the atheistic attitude of the politicians was responsible for the moral collapse of the country. All this seemed to have been received with great enthusiasm among the French Reformed leaders. But as early as late January I received an article reflecting great disillusion about the results of the whole program. Particularly concerning the utilisation of the young men who were trained to be the future leaders of the religious organizations, and of the Churches. They were called upon to take charge of the new ‘Schools for the Youth’ and they all answered gladly. They thought they would be given the opportunity to teach the boys under their command the faith which made them what they are. But they discovered that they were not allowed to speak of religion; they had to teach patriotism, discipline, co-operation, but no place was provided for any religious basis. The consequence is that the religious organizations are today deprived of their leaders, that these have been taken by the State and that the State makes no use of their real value and gives nothing in exchange to the Churches.

“Although there is nothing explicitly expressed, the said article suggests the greatest concern to see the French Churches submitted to a treatment very similar to the one applied to the German Churches in Germany. Here is the conclusion of the article:

“If our young men continue to consider themselves as missionaries of Jesus Christ, then everything is all right. They will be the leaven, the salt and the light. But if, on the contrary, they are influenced by all that is not “they,” if they come to believe that they have received their mandate from men only and if they are driven into deviations that we do not dare to guess, then we would be not only dupes, but the victims of an overwhelming fatality. . . One can see the gravity of the situation and what troubling dilemma is confronting our youth organizations and our Churches!”

“It is impossible to read the warning contained in this article without noticing the similarity it shows with the famous letter of Karl Barth addressed to the French Reformed Churches at the end of 1940. The full text of it has been published in English by the ‘Christian News Letter’ (N. 29, January, 1941). I have here only the French translation of it, but I think you will have no difficulty in securing the issue where this letter was published in English.

“I couldn’t find any expression of reaction to this letter of Karl Barth, but judging from the content of the article on the French Youth, there is no doubt that it must have produced a profound impression.”

A French Calvinist on France's Defeat

Dr. M. J. Brun has done us another service of extreme value to all blue-blooded Calvinists. This is what our busy pastor and scholar has done for THE CALVIN FORUM:

"There is an article of a young Calvinist theologian,—whose name I would like to keep secret—which was published in different periodicals some weeks after the Armistice of June, 1940, dealing with the moral problem of defeat, humiliation and collaboration with the victor; I have made a free translation of it, in trying to express a few of the many problems involved; I am sending it to you here, hoping it will be taken as a document of first rank interest by the readers of THE CALVIN FORUM. The author is a man recently converted to Calvinism; he has found in the writings of the great Reformer such an interest that he decided to go to Holland to study from the Dutch theologians and lawyers the social and political implications of the doctrine. The ethical problems have always been his main interest and the following article deals with one of these burning problems for the French Christians of today."

Frenchmen have been gifted with clearcut thinking. They do not burden our minds with heavy and abstruse abstractions as German scholars seem to be fond of. Still this translation requires a good deal of reading and re-reading. We feel constrained to recommend these excerpts to our reading public. The faith is contagious. The philosophy is powerful. Besides, Calvinism can bear the strain. Read and re-read!!

"... It reminds us of those 'conversions' described by a French philosopher (Brunschvig) accomplished under the pressure of events. For instance, one whom we had denounced as our enemy, having triumphed over us because of the insufficient material defense built against him, now breaks through the more secret stronghold and attacks the citadel which we had considered impregnable; then occurs what is not strictly speaking a defeat, or a capitulation, but something which presents itself simply as an 'acquiescence.'

"Now let us analyse carefully the nature of this acquiescence.

"If I go no further than to recognize that my enemy has won a victory over me—perhaps owing to his greater strength or even his ability to make sacrifices in his preparations, while I proved myself unable to make them—I do not, at the same time grant that he had the right on his side. Between these two points, one being a plain statement of fact, the other an about-face, lies a gap which cannot be bridged logically, except if I have surreptitiously established in principle that if my cause had been just, it would have triumphed and, therefore, my defeat is in itself a condemnation.

"But whatever may be the philosophical, moral or religious reasons that I may strive to bring forth in order to justify such a change of attitude, can I pretend to conceal the fact that I am only trying to mask an indelicate and even unscrupulous action, by which I can only too conveniently rid myself of the principles upon which, until then, were based my convictions and my conduct? When Hegel, developing into an imposing, but at the same time hazy system, the destructive enterprise of Kant, was demonstrating that the existence 'in reality' was the same thing as existence 'in thought,' he was doing nothing other than providing his followers with an easy intellectual expedient allowing them to justify a very doubtful action whose object is to 'spirit away' a cultural patrimony which becomes incriminating or embarrassing in certain cases.

"Therefore, when I say that my enemy deserved his success, although I do not intend to pass entirely into my victor's camp, the fact remains that in acquiescing to my defeat, I place myself to an extent impossible to limit exactly (but at any rate willingly) under the yoke of my victor, with the unavowed hope that I will be able to pick up at least some crumbs out of the spoils made at my own expense.

Humiliation Before God—Not Hitler!

"It might be said: 'this judgment is too stern and even unjust and throws suspicion upon an act which is in itself legitimate. Why should my acquiescence in defeat not be permitted to expose to the light a situation I was enjoying as secure and in which I could not foresee the danger?'

"The answer is that here applies the distinction which we shall bring into the word 'humiliation,' when it means being humiliated before events or men and being humiliated before God.

"In the first place, experience teaches us how cautious we must be not to trust blindly a moral interpretation made 'post eventum.' As says the proverb: 'Good intentions pave the road to hell.' And in the second place, any 'mea culpa' should be considered suspect when the person who utters it is anticipating a tangible and immediate profit instead of an ultimate regeneration.

"But above all, this notion of humility or humiliation does not seem to have been yet correctly elucidated when it is used outside its original meaning which is religious. Properly speaking, it is only before God that humiliation is legitimate. The Creator inasmuch as He is beyond common measure with his creatures—either in nature or in power—can only himself call for humiliation; recognition of error, sin and wickedness on men's part always implies humiliation.

"It is true, however, that humility has become a general and permanent virtue in all religious souls of the Christian faith and indeed, God has given us the greatest example of humility in the Incarnation. We know that. But we know also and shall never forget that it is a spiritual temerity and a grave deviation to imagine that this incarnation and this humiliation carry with them any tangible advantage. Humiliation can be answered by forgiveness, but it carries in itself no automatic redemption, by a sort of sudden remission of all the consequences of the faults committed.

"Furthermore, Christianity has taught even those who have not been touched and moved by its dogmas that a mysterious connection exists between divine grace and the most complete destitution and human dejection. It is the reason why when we are most completely vanquished and confounded by men or by events, we must most vigilantly be on guard against the specific temptation of radically condemning ourselves as well as what we carry in ourselves.

Martyrdom or Cowardice?

"In every military defeat,—and especially in every national defeat—the greatest danger (a danger which shall always make it look formidable) consists merely—not counting the loss in material richness and precious lives—in this crucial temptation of yielding to a brute coercion or an insidious invitation and of questioning what we are, what is our worth, instead of consisting only in bearing the load of the inevitable and in taking the occasion of comparing the balance sheet of our assets and liabilities. It would be only through complacency and a too easy confusion that we might be brought to the point of abjuring the supreme good in ourselves, in failing to notice that our gravest error in that moment would not consist in 'being' what we are, but in 'betraying' what we are, as did the apostle Peter when he was at the mercy of the enemy in the court of the High Priest's Palace. To this coercion or this invitation shall be opposed, by any man worthy of the name, yea, even by any vanquished worthy of the name 'vanquished,' the most firm refusal and the most heroic determination to remain faithful. But if we yield, then let us be well aware that we are not choosing martyrdom,

'Heureuse cruauté dont la suite est si douce'
(*'Blessed cruelty whose consequence is so kind'*)

but we are acquiescing by calculation or cowardice to our own annihilation."

JACOB T. HOOGSTRA.

A Nazi-Censored Letter From The Netherlands

Dordrecht, Sept. 29, 1941.

Dear Prof. Bouma and Further Calvinistic Friends:

IT IS with great pleasure that I heard that my letters have reached you., and therefore I am writing you again to be in spirit with you. The holidays are over now. [This means the summer vacation.—EDITOR.] Going abroad was out of the question, so we went to our beautiful Veluwe. The weather was very rainy, hardly any sunshine all the time. [Here the Nazi censor used the scissors to excise some eight typewritten lines.—EDITOR.]

I have much pleasure in telling you that many more places for new ministers are being created. I told you before that I thought it was high time for us to do so. When there are not preachers enough, the congregations are sure to suffer for this in the long run. In the holidays I stayed on the isle of Urk in the former Zuyder Zee. My friend, who is the minister there, has some 3000 souls to look after. This is an absurdly high number. Prof. Dijk of Kampen, who is not in a position to speak to us, because he is not in our country, and Prof. Hepp of Amsterdam have repeatedly expressed their opinion and urged that 800 souls is enough for one minister. As you know, we have a large number of theological candidates, who cannot find a place. So you understand how glad we are, now that several new places are created. It will be for the

good of our churches. I look upon this occurrence as a proof that our churches are not yet aging. There is much spiritual need, [Right here in the middle of a sentence the inexorable scissors of the censor began to cut again and took out some thirteen typewritten lines.—EDITOR.]

Prof. Grosheide of the Free University of Amsterdam has just published a brochure on the doctrinal differences. This scholar enjoys a great reputation and has the confidence of everybody in our churches. He maintains that the differences are not so very important and that they seem greater than they really are. Some are certainly worthy of discussion, as for example common grace, the "verbondsleer" [i.e., the conception of the covenant.—EDITOR], the so-called pluriformity of the churches, the fusion of the two natures of Christ, and other points. Extensive reports have been drawn up about them, but I have not yet seen them, and nobody has who is not a member of Synod. We had better await quietly what will come, and hope that things will not create such a disturbance as in 1926, when the question of the trees and the serpent in Paradise stirred up so much trouble. [Dr. Prins here refers to the Geelkerken controversy and the consequent defection from the Reformed Churches of that group now known as the Reformed Churches 'in Hersteld Verband'.]

Fortunately Holy Scripture is not involved now, as was the case in 1926. At that time the Scriptures themselves were doubted by some people. Moreover, at that time it concerned really fundamental matters. In the present controversy we trust a solution can be found which will satisfy all groups, just as in 1905 at the Synod of Utrecht, when the matter of "veronderstelde wedergeboorte" [presumed regeneration—Ed.] was the issue.

We shall have to wait, though we have waited a long time already. When we are too hasty, we make rash decisions, and this is not desirable either! We hope that you may receive this letter in good health and in peace. Peace, not only as in Phil. 4:7, but also when there will be peace among the nations of the world. May our Lord hear the prayers which are constantly sent up and may He make His Kingdom come through all the confusion in the world. Most cordial greetings.

Yours faithfully,

P. PRINS.

A Few Annotations by the Editor

1. Although we have the assurance that Dr. Prins has dispatched a letter for THE CALVIN FORUM every month since the invasion, only two have arrived in 1940 and so far only three in 1941.

2. From the sentence in which Prof. Dijk is mentioned we are safe, it seems to us, in concluding that he is in a German concentration camp or in a prison. Dr. Prins writes: "Prof. Dijk of Kampen, who is not in a position to speak to us, because he is not in our country . . ." This is no doubt a garbled way of saying that this Calvinistic leader, who is not only an outstanding preacher and Professor of Practical Theology at the same Seminary where Dr. Schilder teaches, but also has for many years been one of the outstanding leaders in the Christian political party of which Dr. Colijn was for many years the head and moving spirit, is now in German custody. It seems to us we are justified in inferring from this statement that Prof. Dijk is one of the 70 leaders of the Christian political group which together with Dr. Colijn were placed in custody some months ago. It would seem that this also means these men are no longer in the Netherlands, as the original report read, but in Germany—probably in some concentration camp.

3. From this same sentence it is clear that Prof. Hepp is not in prison or in concentration camp.

4. Although extensive reports on the matters of doctrinal dispute in the Reformed Churches of Holland were presented at the Synod held for this purpose this Spring, no decisions have been reached, the reports are known only to members of

Synod, and it is at present not known how soon Synod will meet again.

5. A personal letter to the editor, which accompanied this letter for THE CALVIN FORUM, supplements some of the information given above. Because of the interest which the present plight of our brethren of the faith in the Netherlands has for our readers we here translate a paragraph or two from the Dutch original. Dr. Prins, our faithful correspondent, is pastor of a Reformed Church in the historic city of Dordrecht where the famous Synod of Dort met in 1618-19. Our readers will note how cautiously our correspondent got across the information that his preaching may at any time issue in his own imprisonment. He did so by a garbled reference to Paul and his letter to the Philippians (Chapter I, verse 7), which clearly escaped the keen censorship to which these letters are subjected.

Dr. Prins writes: "You must not form too sentimental a picture of our present living conditions. Personally I still perform my daily duties with great joy, even though my dear wife says repeatedly: I often think when I hear you preach, who knows how soon he may be lodging out [This is Dr. Prins' euphemism for being imprisoned!—Ed.], in some such way as the writer of that letter to Philip. In the first part of that letter you must have read this yourself, and if not, I suggest you read it once again. I believe that about in the seventh line of that letter he explains how he is lodged. This man Paul seemed to enjoy it very much! [Die Paul had het best naar zijn zin!] In that same sense my good wife thinks I may soon be lodging out too. But I always tell her that she knows just as little about it as you do. For the rest, if it had to be, I believe I would prefer being lodged with you people to being lodged where that man Paul was. If ever there was a time when we learn to live by the day, also in the matter of going lodging in the fashion in which Paul did, that time is now."

And here is another excerpt from this letter:

"Now I must close. I appreciate your deep interest in us and our people and your prayers in our behalf. Remember in these days especially the Netherlands ministers, that they may be firm in their adherence to Calvinism and may not resort to a thin, milk-and-water kind of gospel preaching—with its familiar dualistic background—in which the soul's salvation and getting to heaven is the sole concern. May our ministers be loyal to their great spiritual heritage. This is the coming test we will have to face. Whoever is not prepared to make sacrifices, cannot stand the test of the ministerial office in our country. For such sacrifices, sacrifices which must be made to the Lord and must be made willingly, we need one another's prayers. I trust you will pass on to your friends and to your churches that this is the one issue at stake and the great test that must be met."

May many prayers ascend in behalf of these brethren, not only that they may soon be liberated, but above all that they may be firm and loyal to the trust of the Reformed Faith in these days of persecution, imprisonment, and anti-Christian propaganda and tyranny. And may the Lord grant that grace to all His suffering children in all European countries under the heel of the treacherous dictator!

A London Letter

St. Paul's Chambers,
19 Ludgate Hill,
London, E. C. 4.

Dear Dr. Bouma:

IN these days when we are cut off from communication with our Reformed brethren in so many lands, it is a special pleasure to receive THE CALVIN FORUM month by month, with its scholarly articles and reviews, its helpful devotional expositions, and, not least, its interesting news items concerning the activities of friends across the ocean.

As you remark at the commencement of your stimulating editorial in the current issue, "the greatest need of our age is a return to God." The existence of such a need in Britain to-day

is made evident by investigations which Mr. Seebohm Rowntree, the well-known Quaker sociologist, has made recently in his own city of York. Some forty years ago Mr. Rowntree published a report on social conditions in the city, which attracted considerable attention at the time. Under the title, *Poverty and Progress: A Second Social Survey*, he has now issued a further volume, giving a detailed account of conditions existing in 1939. In the course of a chapter dealing with the religious situation, he declares that "the influence of the churches in York to-day is less than it has been during the memory of any one now living." During the four decades under review, while the adult population of the city has increased by half as much again, church attendance has declined from 35 to 17 per cent. The Anglican Church has lost by 27 per cent, and Nonconformity by 40 per cent, while Roman Catholic congregations show an increase of 26 per cent. There can be no doubt as to the seriousness of the situation disclosed by these figures, but on the other hand, it must be remembered that with the decline in social inducements to religious observance, the proportion of sincere worshippers in the churches is probably higher than it has been for years. Evolutionary philosophy and radical criticism of the Bible have gone far to undermine Christian belief among the masses. Social changes have also affected religious observance adversely; the organization of the churches is still based on the supposition of a closely knit local community, such as used to exist when the major part of the population lived in villages and small towns. Transport facilities had to a large extent destroyed this type of community prior to the War, and evacuation is now helping to complete the process. While there is little militant atheism in this country, it would be scarcely correct to describe the attitude of the non-churchgoing majority as one of mere indifference. In industrial centres particularly there is a considerable amount of diffused rationalism coupled with abysmal ignorance of Christian doctrine. In many of the newer districts the dominating public building is a cinema of monumental proportions, and one cannot help feeling that this is the real parish church of the community.

Austin Friars' and St. Paul's

The beautiful church of the Austin Friars, London, of which community Miles Coverdale, the Biblical translator, was once a member, and which since the Reformation has been used by the Dutch Reformed Church, is now a rubbish-heap. Its slender pillars, great XIV century windows, and elegant Gothic arcades, were not strong enough to withstand high explosive, and nothing now remains on the site but fragments of stone, lengths of planking, smashed tiles, red telephone directories hurled from an adjacent office by the bomb blast, a mound of curled lead and a stack of iron railings. Another victim of air raids is the historic Moravian Chapel in Fetter Lane, at which John and Charles Wesley worshipped from 1738 to 1740, and which has been used on occasion for meetings of the Sovereign Grace Union. On a recent Sabbath a congregation approaching a thousand assembled among the ruins of the Metropolitan Tabernacle for a service of solemn valediction to the famous sanctuary where for 30 years Charles Haddon Spurgeon preached the doctrines of grace. The company included Mr. William Olney, aged 92, who was present when the "prince of preachers" delivered his first sermon in the building 80 years ago.

"Is this the way to St. Powle's?" asked a Czech the other day, pronouncing the name of the cathedral as Londoners used to do when it was new. He was going to a special Czech service at which the congregation included M. Benes, and Mr. Drexel Biddle, representing the United States of America. For obvious reasons the service was held, not in the cold, vast spaces of the nave, but in the warmer low-vaulted crypt. The

sermon was preached by the Bishop of London, and the hymns were ancient Czech compositions famous in the history of the land of Jan Hus.

The Minister of Labour has declined to exempt "evangelists" of the Buchman Groups from service in His Majesty's Forces. Speaking in the House of Commons, Mr. Bevin explained that exemption was granted by his Ministry to men "engaged whole-time, since before September, 1939, by a recognized religious body in religious work analogous to that of a regular minister." The Young Men's Christian Association, though a religious organization, was not officially regarded as a "religious body", and had loyally accepted the Ministry's ruling. The fact that the Buchmanites were registered as a company did not constitute them a "religious body". Since Dr. Buchman has repeatedly declared that it was not his intention to found a new denomination, it is surely illogical for friends of his movement to claim exemption from conscription on the ground that the Groups are "a recognized religious body".

Religious Freedom in Russia?

In the course of a recent letter to *The Times*, Dr. H. S. Rushbrooke, President of the Baptist World Alliance, writes: "It is simply not the case that the U.S.S.R. recognizes religious liberty, either in principle or in practice. 'Freedom of religious worship and freedom of anti-religious propaganda', we are told, is recognized for all citizens. Why is freedom of propaganda restricted to 'anti-religious'? Why, when an earlier constitution allowed freedom of propaganda for or against religion, was one of these alternatives struck out? The publication of books and articles in a religious sense, and even of Bibles, has for years been impossible in Russia; and evangelisation is, of course, excluded. What does 'freedom of religious worship' mean? It is rigidly restricted by law to customary gatherings for formal worship at a registered meeting-place. No Sunday school, or any other school or class for the instruction of children in religion, is permitted. No children's services are allowed. No Bible study groups may be formed. No lectures may be given. No social gatherings may be arranged. The church may not possess a library. These are but a few of the restrictions imposed by law. In brief, practically all that gives warmth and reality to the fellowship of a Christian congregation is forbidden. I have restricted this letter to questions of constitution and law, leaving aside those of administration, on which much might be written."

One of the immediate results of St. Paul's preaching in Ephesus long ago was a conflagration of superstitious literature in the local agora. If the Apostle were to visit our metropolis to-day, it is probable that a bonfire of much larger proportions would soon be burning in Trafalgar Square. Times like the present seem specially favourable to the growth of systems which claim to possess inside information concerning future events. At an Astrological Convention held at Harrogate last Easter Week one of the delegates declared that April "seems definitely a bad month for Hitler, and he is likely on or soon after April 26, to experience a serious defeat." On April 27, as all the world knows, German troops entered Athens! Two other astrologers agreed that the configuration of the planets on May 11 was of a most extraordinary character. Both of them were sure that the world and the heart of man would experience a far-reaching and beneficial change on this date. One predicted "the emergence of a great spiritual leader", the other that "some great spiritual force is about to be released". On May 11 there emerged from an aeroplane, *via* parachute, Herr Rudolf Hess!

Fraternally yours,
S. LEIGH HUNT.

November 10, 1941.

Christmas Suggestion

What Finer Christmas Gift than
A Year's Subscription to
The Calvin Forum?

TREAT HIM . . . HER . . .

Friend or Relative,
Pastor or Teacher,
Father or Son,
Mother or Daughter

ALL YOU DO—

Send Us Two Dollars
With Name and Address of Your Friend
And Yours.

WE SEND YOU:

—A Receipt, of course! But also:
—An Engraved CALVIN FORUM Presentation
Christmas Gift Card
For You to Sign and
Send to Your Friend
At Christmas Time.

A Christmas Treat That Lasts Throughout The Year

Do It Today!

It is Never Too Early!

THE CALVIN FORUM,
Calvin College,
Grand Rapids, Michigan.

(Note: If you are uncertain whether your friend is possibly already a subscriber, drop us a card. We will inform you promptly.)