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United We Stand
An Editorial

As a nation our relationship as citizens is much like that of the members of a team who, in spite of direction and control by owners and coaches, can voluntarily do very much toward bringing in victory or toward losing the game. As Americans, living under and fighting for democracy, we have ends that are ends of our own choosing, we have symbols, such as our flag, that are our own, we have a leader who is our own, rallying songs and cries that are not forced upon us but that we have chosen. That being the case we should in time of war be united as never before. Of all groups, of all nations, we should have and give to the world an example of fine morale.

Morale is the “serious, sober, persistent, and patient determination to succeed in a group enterprise.” It is sometimes defined as “collective will.” It depends on the subordination of individual purposes to the purposes of the group. When present it means that the many act as one. When absent from a group of free individuals the group may be less effective even than another group of unwilling individuals forced to act together against their will. Free France, we are told, lacked morale. When the Nazi blow was struck it seemed that she was incapable of resistance. One of the finest achievements of a group of free men, morale is apparently one of the most difficult ends for free men to achieve.

* * *

In a world of free men, in a democratic world, there are many ways of thinking, of doing, of living. In a totalitarian world there is one way of life. It is the free thinking, the free discussion, and the deliberate choosing of the ways of life that gives democracy its high purpose, its toughness, its justice, and, in the long run certainly, greater freedom for all its members. But in this freedom of individuals and of groups in a democracy lies one of the greatest threats to unity of action. Individuals in their false, perverse conception of what is good for themselves often defeat the purposes of the group to which they belong and therefore defeat themselves, and groups, jealous of their possessions, functions, and prerogatives are easily thrown into conflict with other groups and thus into defeat of their own ends. This is true to such a great extent today that our common, national effort is endangered.

Even without the subtle attempts of the enemy to frustrate our effort to get together to defeat totalitarianism, many men would continue to look out for themselves as long as dire need did not compel
them to work together, and groups would regard each other with suspicion so long as men thought one group could profit at the expense of the other. Such manifestations of morale destroying efforts were only too common before the war and have continued after we were plunged into the conflict. Knowing human nature to be as shortsighted and as perverse as it is we can expect this and deal with it, as democracies or free groups ordinarily know best how to deal with it, in the hope that men may be brought around to enthusiastic support of what proves to be for their best interest. But in a world at war, with all the weapons human ingenuity knows how to devise, we must be on our guard against the sinister efforts of the enemy to take advantage of the very perversities and weaknesses in human nature that we have just mentioned.

* * *

It is the military warfare that commands the headlines, that is taking the lives of our young men, our sons and brothers, that is upsetting our lives. But it is another kind of warfare that may bring us defeat. The little group in the corner that so willingly accepts the statement that the present war has been precipitated and desired by capitalists who expect to be enriched by it; that apparently believes the rubber shortage to have been planned in order that people might be made war-conscious; that insists that this is not our war but England's and that England has done little to meet her responsibility for it but has passed it on to us; or that passes the remark that the President wanted this war to continue the emergency or to continue himself in power, "He is a dictator anyway,"—does such a group realize that it may be playing the enemy's game or fighting his war? Those who develop highly critical attitudes toward whatever is done to unify the nation in its war effort, who pass on unproved statements, who hurl epithets at individuals and groups, are doing what our enemies would like to have us do and are encouraging us to do. There appears to be ground for the belief that both the Japanese and the Germans are attempting to foment conflict between the negroes and the whites in this country, are encouraging race hatreds, are seeking to use political differences to create disagreements and dissension, in order to impede our war efforts. This is psychological warfare, a kind of conflict which the democracies have learned their foes are about as skilled at fomenting and carrying on as they are skilled at fifth column tactics and modern military combat. True, dissension is likely to occur anyway. In a period such as this large numbers of individuals find their lives turned upside down. Frustration makes them bitter and critical, and in a democracy they have not only the right but, we believe, should have the privilege of fairly airing their grievances. Besides the situation in this country before and during the war has been far from a happy one: whites have been and are unfair to the negroes; powerful pressure groups, the labor and the farm groups, for example, in their attempts to get justice for themselves do threaten to bring disaster to us all by way of causing higher prices and class feeling, and the party in power does not always forget politics in its endeavor to lead the nation in its all out efforts to win the war. Individuals who are frustrated are inclined to place the blame on somebody, a group unjustly treated is bound to feel aggrieved at the group responsible for the mistreatment. These are times of tension. If tension is not relieved in other ways we are inclined to take it out on individuals and on groups. And the enemy is smart enough to know this and encourage it. Indeed this, we have learned, is a large part of modern warfare.

* * *

We are at war in what is undoubtedly the greatest conflict of the ages. We are compelled to meet the enemy in military combats that may be more disastrous than we realize, we are in danger of fifth column activities within our own borders on a scale that may dwarf those that actually occurred in the conquered countries of Europe, and we may be fighting for our foes by falling into the trap of psychological warfare skillfully set for us by them. If ever there was a time when men in a democratic society should appreciate their common ends and mutual needs, when they should realize the interdependence of individuals and groups it is now. If ever the motto, "In unity there is strength," had meaning it is now. We should be alert to hostile propaganda of every kind, also that which lurks in our suspicion and criticism of each other. Does that mean that we should no longer criticize each other, that we should simply mouth what we are told to say? Certainly not. Above all it does not mean that we should use the method of the dictators and forbid all open criticism of the government. If we permitted that we might almost as well fight at all. We are fighting to preserve the liberties we have enjoyed in a democratic country and we should while fighting preserve and deepen the meaning of this democratic way of life. But in a time of crisis, of all times, it is better to withhold criticism of situations concerning which we know next to nothing. Now, certainly, we should be skeptical of fault finding, and we should demand proof of critical statements, instead of accepting them and passing them on. And now every one of us should maintain the balance born of experience, not insist on our own points of view or foist them onto others. A willingness to listen to others and to accept helpful constructive criticism will prevent tension, making statements or setting forth arguments for one's position on any side of the case in a heated, bitter fault-finding way will create tension. There are tension producers a-plenty without our adding to them by the way in which we advocate the policies of the administration or cuttingly snipe at them. As someone said recently what we need is "tension re-
Easter Contrasts

THE story of Jesus from birth to grave is a story of changes. Each change brings an ever more profound degree of suffering. Each change... with the exception of one. That exception is the transfiguration. But the necessity of the exodus, of which Moses and Elijah spoke, caused the glorious contrasts of the transfiguration to fade into the shadows of ultimate suffering.

Easter however is the story of contrasts. Now Easter does not mean to me merely the anniversary of the Resurrection. Neither do I look upon it merely as an event. To me Easter is the story of Jesus whose crucified body was at one moment reposing in the tomb, and the next moment resurrected unto glory. It means to me a crisis, in which the Lord of Glory rises from the tomb of death and poses in the tomb, and the next moment resurrected unto glory.

And it is precisely this fact that is rich in contrasts. The Christ arising from the grave gives rise to contrasts such as man had witnessed never before.

Darkness — Light

Darkness was brooding somberly upon Joseph’s lovely garden. Whatever light the nocturnal luminary might send forth, it was screened out by the foliage of trees and shrubs. Within the tomb darkness is complete. But suddenly the earth heaves its groaning bosom in uncommon agony. Broken is the calm of nature. In blinding contrast with the darkness heaven’s messenger descends. His appearance is like lightning and his raiment white as snow. Heaven’s brilliance rends the gloomy darkness of the grave. Easter has come.

Despair — Hope

A tomb. The tomb. And within the tomb the body of our Lord. How often since that day of man’s first disobedience in Eden’s garden had the earth opened its cruel mouth to receive the dust of man! From the first garden to Joseph’s garden... tombs, and more tombs. Mary Magdalene and the other Mary had been “sitting over against the sepulchre.” Other women had looked “how the body was laid.” Soon they would return. For what purpose? To anoint the body of the Lord! Utter futility. It is the gesture of despair, of hope destroyed. From the city they approach. Their hands are full. They carry ointments to the dead. The tomb. The hungry tomb which took the body for he is risen... Yes, yes, but is there hope? Is there hope? “Fear not ye; for I know that ye seek Jesus which had been crucified. He is not here for he is risen... Yes, yes, but is there hope?” Shall we see him? “... and lo, he goeth before you into Galilee, there shall ye see him.” What about the costly ointments? I suppose they left the ointment in or near the empty tomb. The ointment of despair is useless now. “And they went out and fled from the tomb.” On wings of hope the women ran to bring the tidings of hope revived to the disciples of the Lord.

Death — Life

Tenderly the loving hands of Nicodemus and friend Joseph had eased the limp frame of the Master from the cross to the ground. Torn are the hands and feet of the lifeless form. Bloody is the back, and an open gash breaks the contour of the side. Certainly, precious spices in extravagance of love are poured upon the remains and kept in place by cloth adapted to the purpose. But, none the less, the Master is dead. Silent are the lips which said
"Ye are my friends." Immobile are the hands which broke the bread of the New Testament. No longer do the eyes speak the unspoken words of love and mercy. The Master gave up the ghost. He died. He was buried. Death!

But no, Easter means contrast. Easter means life. No, the tomb is not empty. It is full of life. It is teeming with life. The Master arose. Napkin and bandages have collapsed because the lifeless form is no longer encased by them. Christ arose. Angels speak.

Aimlessly Mary Magdalene wanders through the garden. The man whom she meets and addresses says one word, "Mary." It is the word of life, by the voice of life from the source of life. The living Savior meets the women bearing Easter tidings to slow disciples. He who was dead meets them. Says he: "all hail." Wonderful words of life: All hail.

Abnormal — Above Normal

Another Easter contrast is the change from the abnormal to the super-normal. Death is not a phenomenon connected with the normal scheme of things as portrayed in Genesis 1 and 2. It is a phenomenon connected with sin. It belongs to the brief period during which man lives. It belongs to the horizontal. God spoke: in the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die. And man is passively brought down to the grave. The death which came to Christ was inflicted upon him.

But Easter morning changes all that. The passive gives way to the active. Certainly, God resurrected the Redeemer. But "he is risen from the dead." He arose. He arose from the tomb.

His resurrection is not like that of Lazarus. Lazarus returned, or was returned, to a life of sickness and death, a life of the horizontal to-the-earth-declining level. But Jesus is endowed with super-normal qualities. He "appears" to his disciples. If before Easter he has emptied himself of all glory, "taking the form of a servant, being made in the likeness of man... becoming obedient unto death..." now he is being exalted and needs to appear unto his disciples and friends. He now is endowed with life and glory such as he shall share with all his saints when the last chapter of world history is concluded and the abnormal period gives way to the eternally abiding new and reborn creation. The vertical line, the line away from dust, from the earth, is his. Glory is his possession.

Wages and Reward

Death is the wages of sin. Adam lived until he was nine hundred years old. But he died. Jesus the last Adam does not attain to nine centuries, not even to one century. He died when he was but one-third of a century old. His death is the "wages of sin." As Redeemer who holds in his infinite embrace all those whom the Father had given him, he stood forth as the all-out guilty one. He was reckoned with the transgressors, being the focal point of guilt. He was forsaken of God. What this means we cannot fathom, for

None of the ransomed ever knew
How deep were the waters crossed;
Nor how dark was the night the Lord passed through,
Ere he found his sheep that was lost.

But Easter—what contrast! The Savior rises from the gloom and darkness of the grave and is being exalted unto glory. Why? He enters upon his reward. For the Redeemer not only was the focal point of our sin and guilt, but he is also the perfect man who was obedient. He was obedient unto death. When the Father forsook him on the cross of curse and death, he cried out "My God, my God..." The glory of the mount of Transfiguration he might have claimed for himself alone. But then only as the one and only perfect man. Now at Easter he is exalted as the Redeemer of his people. His resurrection glory is a double glory. Glory because he was obedient as the perfect man. Glory because he was the Savior and Redeemer. His reward is my reward. His reward is the reward of all God's precious saints. "Him who knew no sin, he made to be sin on our behalf; that we might become the righteousness of God in him." Wonderful contrast of Easter: my death-wages on him; his life-reward on me!

Shame — Glory

No, the grave is not the seat of glory. It is the seat of shame. Man who was created good, and in the image of God walks erect upon the earth. Man who is, even in the period between the first and the last paradise, inventive, discovering the secrets of nature, finally is laid low. The physical organization, the body which holds the mighty ships that cross the oceans, upon a steady, predetermined course in spite of storm and tides, finally dissolves in the unobserved destruction of the grave. The grave is man's shame. Jesus shares in it. No, do not make the burial of Jesus a part of his exaltation. The king who entered into our destroyed kingship, shares in our shame.

But only a short while. His body need not abide in the soldier-guarded tomb for a thousand years. He shared our shame, but now, on the glorious day of Easter, he exchanges shame for glory. His glory is honor. From the abysmal depths of shame he rises to inexpressible heights of honor. "Wherefore God also highly exalted him." The "hour" of which Jesus spoke seven times (in the Gospel of John) had come on Good Friday. It was the hour in which the Son glorified the Father and, glory be to God,—it is the hour in which the Father glorified the Son. Blessed contrast of Easter!
Running parallel with the contrasts of Easter, I experience the cry of the publican: "Be merciful to me a sinner." It is the cry of repentance. It is also the cry of faith. It is the cry to God for mercy, for deliverance from sin and guilt. It is agony of the soul oppressed by the consciousness of guilt, in the presence of the Redeemer. And the contrast is there too. Did I hear aright? Yes,—"There is therefore now no condemnation for them which are in Christ Jesus." If I am in Him, then his reward is mine. I can hardly understand the impact of the words. But as my heart is burning within me on the way to my Emmaus he opens to me the scriptures. Now I understand: "this is life eternal that they should know thee, the only true God and him whom thou didst send." He and I: "My hand thou holdest in thy own to keep me near thy side."

Easter contrasts. Blessed contrasts. And now? The strength and portion of my heart, My God eternally.

**Amoral Art and Rational Morality**

**W**e are living in an intensely practical age. We all know this to be so, and perhaps feel inclined to brand the remark as not only a commonplace, but as the veriest commonplace of the commonplace. Nevertheless, we may fail to realize fully how completely the pragmatic spirit motivates all our efforts and conditions all our thinking, even our theorizing.

It should not surprise us, therefore, to discover that this practical attitude also colors men's view of so seemingly impractical a matter as beauty. There was a time when men generally believed, as did Emerson when he wrote his "Rhodora," that beauty is its own excuse for being. Viewed psychologically, beauty was that which pleased, and the more disinterested it was the better. Or if one were an idealist, he would insist upon beauty's being in close partnership with the good so that all art should, while it pleased, at the same time have a tendency to make men good. But today the practical spirit prevails. So delicate a reality as the beauty of art must justify its existence by the manifestation of a definite function in life. If art has a right to exist, it must do more than give innocent enjoyment; it must also demonstrate its usefulness in the art of living.

**Art, Life, and Practicality**

In order to justify this pragmatic motivation of artistic endeavor it is necessary to look upon art as merely a means to an end, as something amoral or non-moral. So far forth, then, this view makes common cause with the art for art's sake theory, which completely severs every consideration of the good and the true from the nature of the beautiful. The coryphaei of this modern view do not shrink from declaring themselves, as artists, to be in no wise under the sway of any moral law that is outside and above them. To them, art is amoral.

Paradoxically enough, art, though amoral, must serve a practical purpose; it must help in the art of living. Life, if it is to have any meaning, must be purposeful. Hence conduct is of the utmost importance. To learn how to direct our own conduct we must know life, the more of it the better. We must understand the inward urge of ourselves and of others, together with the relative worth of each form of gratification. As long as we are ignorant of these matters, we are likely to be ruthless in our judgment not only of others, but even of ourselves, and we are in danger of destroying that which deserves toleration or encouragement. By comparing one kind of life with another and one type of gratification of impulses with another type, we gradually build up a rational morality. But since we cannot by immediate experience become acquainted with enough of life to enable us to evolve the necessary rules for conduct, we employ such works of art as paintings, poems, dramas, and stories as a means of increasing our knowledge of it. In this way art is an aid to morality, and the place of art in life has been vindicated.

Furthermore, art, being amoral and instrumental in its nature, should assume a sympathetic attitude toward life. As a means of insight into life art must sympathize with every aspect of it, no matter how sordid and sinful it may be. To the artist nothing human is too vile to be portrayed. All of life, even its most repulsive manifestation, has the right to express itself and to defend itself. Because life is lived not in a vacuum but in social relationships it is subject to judgment and criticism. But if "it is to be fairly judged it should be allowed to plead for itself, and art is its best exponent," so says Professor D. H. Parker in his Principles of Aesthetics. Hence art must be completely sympathetic with life regardless of the havoc wrought by sin, sympathetic even to the point of feeling one with it and of expressing it fearlessly.
Art, Sin, and Temptation

At first blush this theory may have a good deal in it to commend itself to us for approval. Does it not make art a means to an end? Does it not recognize the value of conduct? Does it not dignify art by investing it with a noble responsibility? So it would seem until we study the theory a little more closely and find implications that make us pause and demur.

Imaginative sympathy with life, thus runs the contention, can have no corrupting effect on the will because there is no actual participation in any form of evil. To the reader of fiction, for example, there is not offered any opportunity to commit a sinful act. What is experienced, is experienced only in the imagination and is therefore not real. There is, it must be admitted, some truth in this contention. When we read Macbeth, Shakespeare compels us with his consummate art to be deeply interested in the criminal careers of Macbeth and Lady Macbeth and artistically to be sympathetic with them to the extent of eagerly following their fortunes to a tragic end, yet we do not feel that murderous desires have been aroused in our hearts. Only in people with murderous inclinations would such desires perhaps be fanned into an irresistible passion. If, however, lust is portrayed, the case is not so favorable. Lustful scenes have, as a rule, a much stronger appeal for the normal human being than have theft and murder. Their power to soil the imagination is very subtle indeed. Then, too, we must distinguish between adults on the one hand and children and adolescents on the other hand, inasmuch as the latter are far more susceptible to defilement by the obscene, whether frankly portrayed or suggestively hinted, than are the former, as judges of juvenile courts abundantly testify. Furthermore, the fact of man's sinfulness makes it dangerous to assert that participation in sin through the imagination only does not cause moral harm. Since all the powers of man are weakened and corrupted by sin, imaginative sympathy with sinful passion may have a disastrous effect morally in the lives not only of the young, but even of adults.

Intellectual Inhibition and "Needed Outlet"

Another line of defence with which the exponent of the amoral theory seeks to fortify himself is that in all art appreciation implies a certain amount of intellectual effort, and that thinking has a tendency to check action. In reading a story of crime, for example, since there is no opportunity to carry into immediate effect the act suggested, there is time to reflect upon its seriousness and consequences so that no immoral results ensue. Besides, the reading of such a story gives insight into the nature of crime and its motives, which insight is desirable if an individual is to shape his conduct with a view to living the fullest life. In spite of the measure of truth there may be in the argument, however, our faith in the Biblical teaching concerning the sinfulness of man's heart leads us to believe that not every reader can assume a purely intellectual attitude to crime or lasciviousness and that not in the case of everybody does thinking inhibit action. There may be bad impulses slumbering in the soul which the reading of bad books inflames into hot passions that seek gratification in the overt act. Did not G. Stanley Hall, the great psychologist, in his work on adolescence assert that scientific study had led him to the conviction that within the heart of every man slumber the germs of every evil? And what is still more telling, does not Scripture affirm the heart of man to be desperately wicked?

The adherent of the amoral theory fortifies himself with still another consideration. Imaginative sympathy with evil, says he, provides a desirable substitute or outlet for evil impulses. The inclination to immoral acts residing to a greater or less degree in every heart should be drained of its driving power by a kind of vicarious indulgence such as the arts provide. But is it not just as good psychology to hold that because all the urges of man's heart are tainted by sin even what is called vicarious indulgence may inflame the passion? How can we be sure that what is supposed to afford relief or outlet or to serve as a safety valve may not act as a stimulant? Finally, does Scripture make allowance for mild indulgence as a means of draining passion?

God, Goodness, and Beauty

We register an objection of a still more fundamental character. For the man who holds the rational morality theory there is no absolute and objective norm for human conduct. Whatever norm there may be is to be discovered by the method of experiment. God has not spoken and the Decalogue does not have ultimate authority. The Christian cannot but denounce such a teaching with indignation. For him God has spoken. God has made known his will. Having made man a moral being by creating him in his own likeness, God has revealed to him his ordinances which he must observe if he is to live in harmony with his own God-given nature and if he is to answer the purpose of his existence. It is not by the positivistic method of experimentation that man will ever build up a satisfactory moral code; it is by revelation that he has it.

Nor can we acquiesce in the denial of the universality and the absoluteness of the moral law. Rational morality aims at providing merely a flexible code or to serve as a safety valve may not act as a stimulant? Finally, does Scripture make allowance for mild indulgence as a means of draining passion?
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which is "suited to the diversity of individuals and sympathetic with their every impulse and fancy." The only concession to external constraint possibly allowable is that which is made necessary by "the existence and perpetuation of social life." Rational morality, therefore, flouts the divine law which demands that we love God above all and our neighbors as ourselves, and which, as it is articulated in the ten commandments, is valid for every mortal always and everywhere. Only by obedience to this divine law can the sacredness of personality be maintained.

Finally, we cannot assent to an interpretation of beauty which is chiefly functional or instrumental. We believe that beauty is a divine creation. "Thine is the kingdom and the power and the glory." "By his spirit he hath garnished the heavens." "Out of Zion, the perfection of beauty, God hath shined." In an ideal sense, beauty should never be considered apart from truth and goodness. Nevertheless, being a divine creation, it has a sphere of its own and laws of its own. To reduce beauty to a functional status in life, be it to justify its existence, cannot but result in its degradation. Beauty will cease to be beauty. If, on the other hand, we maintain its divine origin and character, it will forever retain its luster and value.

Science vs. Seance

A Study in Spiritualism

In the present series of articles on Spiritualism, we are especially interested in the polemical approach to the cult. Such a polemical study must of necessity include two main elements. The sect has a theology that must be evaluated. But the whole movement gained its first impetus from the purported occurrence of certain "phenomena." To explain these phenomena, the devotees of what was later to become a cult adopted the hypothesis of the contact with disembodied spirits of dead people. As we shall indicate later, there is some probability that the hypothesis was really prior to the phenomena, but the fact remains that there are actual phenomena that require some sort of explanation. The Christian polemical must face and explain these phenomena, for whose explanation Spiritualism has adopted the hypothesis of spirit survival and communication. Many other elements have entered into the system and tend to complicate and confuse one, but this is still the central, pivotal contention. If it can be proved that other factors cause these phenomena, the whole movement is largely discredited. By their own claim, even their theology stands or falls with their central hypothesis, because their theology is purportedly derived from the "revelations" received from these spirits who have progressed so far in the series of psychic planes of existence, to be in a sense "adept" and speak to us with a measure of authority.

In the spirit of Psychic Research, we can study the phenomena without the theology, but in the spirit of Polemics we cannot study the theology without the phenomena.

We must face, however, the realization that at best we can do no more than set up alternate hypotheses over against that of Spiritualism. This is not proving that the spirit-hypothesis is false. That is to say, magicians, hypnotists, and parapsychologists, may duplicate the phenomena of the seance-cabinet, but that is not per se a proof that the medium's phenomena might not be caused by spirits. The fact that the Egyptian magicians could produce snakes from rods, and blood from water, does not prove that Moses' miracles were not produced by Divine intervention. The matter finally comes down to setting up an array of alternate hypotheses, and accepting that one or those as covering the facts, that harmonizes with our basic philosophy of life. No man can escape a bias. It goes almost without saying that the bias of the author will lead him to reject any hypothesis that is out of harmony with Reformed Bible interpretation, and at least accept tentatively any hypothesis that is not out of harmony therewith. Therefore the most important part of our discussion will fall in the purview of this article, as suggested by its title. What has true Science to say in explanation of the phenomena that occur in the field of psychic experiences? We shall in this article set up some of the theories advanced by scientific and near-scientific students to account for psychic phenomena. A sketch of the important teaching of Scripture on the score of these phenomena and the spirit-hypothesis will engage our attention in a succeeding study.

"The Hand is Quicker Than the Eye . . ."

The first alternative hypothesis was really an accusation levelled against Spiritualism, and it continues to be a formidable hurdle for it to cross. It is the theory that the phenomena are not in any sense objectively real, but are all produced by the medium fraudulently. This has been the opinion of professional conjurers virtually without a break from the time of the Frenchman Robert Houdin who first became suspicious of the Davenport Brothers, and the team of Kellar-Fay who exposed their methods after first spending a time in collaboration
with them, all the way down to Houdini, Thurston, and Blackstone of contemporary fame. There is no doubt that the majority of professional mediums are cheap mountebanks. There is very little that a clever artist in sleight-of-hand cannot do, especially in the semi-gloom of a seance-cabinet, aided by the intense “will-to-believe” of the average bereaved sitter. However, it is rather striking that a lifelong scientific student of psychic phenomena, utterly unbiased by spiritualistic faith, namely Harry Price, does not speak so highly of the argument of the magicians. In commenting on the Carl Murchison symposium published under the auspices of Clark University, he said, “I think the scientific standard of the book is lowered by the reprinting of the chapters from Houdini’s A Magician Among the Spirits, a collection of mediumistic tricks most of which no fake medium outside a lunatic asylum would dare to use.” (Price, Fifty Years of Psychic Research, p. 69). It is true that the fraud hypothesis is not a compelling argument. The fact that someone can produce sights and sounds that look very much like spiritualistic phenomena, does not prove that the other phenomena are not real and caused by an utterly different influence.

Nor does this hypothesis meet the compelling corroborating testimony offered by the psychic experiences of many who are not mediums and are not trying to “produce” anything. One thinks of the remarkable experience of Pierre Van Paasen, related in his recent best-seller, Days of Our Years. He sets that down without trying to hazard any theory. In his rented French home, a black dog ran down his staircase nightly at a certain hour and melted away into thin air before his eyes. He witnessed it night after night. Neighbors saw it. A neighbor’s dog tried to attack it and died horribly. Finally the local Abbé adjured it, and the apparition was not repeated. Or there are the numerous well authenticated cases of “haunted” buildings, many of whom Price has investigated thoroughly. There is the “Rosalie” seance of Price that he describes in chapter eight of his book cited above. There are the numerous “poltergeist” phenomena whose occurrence is unquestionable, but whose explanation is still held in abeyance. A remarkable case of that was described in a recent issue of World Digest (Nov. 1941). In short, magicians are limited quite generally to the physical phenomena of Spiritualism, and that does not tell the whole story. It is true that Spiritualists must to their embarrassment witness seemingly bona fide cases of their famous telekinesis, levitations, apports, sights, sounds, lights, gusts of wind, direct writing, seeming materializations, spirit photographs, and even ectoplasmic production, all produced by apparently supernatural means only to see then the conjurer carefully expose every step of his leger-demain. An interesting case of a seeming “apport,” that is, production of a physical article not previously in the room, is related by Mulholland The medium D. D. Home used to specialize in apporting a bouquet of flowers as a proof of spirit presence. Mulholland spent an entire evening with a magician friend, Joseffy, and was not away from him a moment all evening, and at the close of the visit the magician tossed a table scarf over his arm and extracted from under it a bouquet of roses with the fresh dew still clinging to their petals.

Sometimes spiritualists refuse to admit that conjurers work by known physical laws. Conan Doyle was absolutely convinced that Houdini was a medium of a high order and did not know it. Houdini’s challenge that his spirit would return to earth if possible, has not been accepted, say spiritualists, because Houdini was a medium of so high a rank that he immediately went to a psychic plane of the after-life too high to allow for any return.

Many spiritualists continue to believe in the genuineness of “spirit photography,” in spite of the fact that the faces that appear on the photographic plate rather obviously resemble a posed photo from an old album, or even look like a snapshot of a partially decayed body in a coffin. Raupert, the Catholic writer, as well as Price, have rather interesting theories to explain bona fide spirit-photos, if such exist, but that must wait until later. It is interesting to note that “ghosts” on the photographic plate are an old problem in photography to which recent experiments with “invisible glass” promise a solution. It is possible that recent experiments in “black light” photography may add some data of significance in photographing seances. A random snapshot taken in the Norge plant of Muskegon, with the face of Christ appearing upon it, has raised some speculation of which the author has heard something but has not been able to investigate.

“Seeking New Horizons . . .”

When we go from physical to mental or psychic phenomena, the facts are not so easily deflated. These phenomena include automatic writing, often executed upside-down and backwards, in a strange script, and at an incredible rate of execution, visions, obsessions, impersonations, trances, apparitions, hallucinations, clairvoyance and clairaudience, hyperaesthesia, and its opposite, immunity to pain, prophecy, divination, precognition, psychometry, veridical dreaming, writing and speaking. In this field magicians have been active too. They have tried to duplicate especially mind-reading, or psychometry, and by a combination of clever deduction plus the law of averages, have succeeded fairly often. But there remains a large margin that is unexplained by known laws of psychology. Even fraud holds possibilities of interesting speculation. Fraudulent mediums may not only be self-deceived into thinking that they wield supernatural power, but they may even begin by exercising carefully planned methods calculated to deceive, thinking all the while that they are executing every step of the process, only to find that they delve into it so deeply that
they find themselves convinced that they are actually wielding a supernatural power. Mulholland began as a purely fraudulent stage mind-reader, and at last, he says, it began to "get" him until he began to believe he was exerting supernatural power. Seabrook begins by explaining all Black Magic as purely psychological and ends by admitting that there is something more, something hellish.

I think we need not doubt that many spiritualistic mediums wield a real power, whether consciously or unconsciously. We need not say that the power is supernatural, let us say that it is "super normal" or "paranormal." That is the careful conclusion to which more than one reputable scholar, working through the years in the field of psychical research, has come.

"The New Psychology . . ."

This leads us to the tentative conclusions arrived at through the recent experiments in the field of the mysterious powers of the human mind, that may go far to explain some of the phenomena of spiritualism. Some of these experiments and conclusions fall in the sphere of psychology or "parapsychology." They are derived from experiments in hypnosis, autosuggestion, and telepathy. Other conclusions lie rather in the terrain of metaphysics and are the result of observations in the field of precognition, clairvoyance, and like phenomena. These have to do especially with the nature of time.

Since the time of Anton Mesmer's first experiments with what he called "electrical fluid" and later "animal magnetism," all the way through the host of stage entertainers who have "put to sleep" farmhands from Maine to San Diego, down to the latest type parapsychological laboratory at Duke University, hypnotism has never failed to produce startling effects. It is called an "induced state of hyper-suggestibility." Under hypnosis, many a weird spiritualistic phenomenon might find sufficient explanation. For example, the sitters might be hypnotized and would be in a condition to see, hear, feel, or smell anything. Or the medium might, by self-hypnosis, which is not difficult, become hypersensitive to the mental images in the minds of the sitters, or the emanations of a mind concentrating on something, even some distance away, and thus be capable of many of the seeming "miracles" of the seance. Oriental Yogis are of old time adept at self-hypnosis, induced hysteria, immunity to pain, and the like. The real power behind witchcraft may be nothing more mysterious than induced hysteria, which is still mysterious enough. One of Seabrook's friends thrust a hat-pin through his jaws without any apparent sensation of pain, just to prove that a young Yogi who was present was no miracle-worker. A high-school student in Muskegon customarily entertains his friends by fastening safety-pins in his cheeks and feels nothing of it, for the simple reason that there are facial areas where sensory nerves are few. There are many "miracles" that will cease to be mysterious if we knew more about the deeper powers of the mind. The famous "astral body" phenomena of spiritualism now find frequent explanation under the head of dissociation under conditions of fatigue or of nascent epileptic attacks. One case of the latter is very well known to the author, and a case of the former is related by Seabrook. To admit dissociation it is not necessary to accept the spiritualistic view of the constitution of body and soul.

So too, it is becoming more and more generally recognized that there is thought-transference of some kind, even at a distance. So many reliable cases of premonitions and the like during states of peculiar receptivity on the part of one mind, due to sleep or lack of preoccupation, and peculiar concentration on the part of another mind, due to danger, perhaps, are on record, that some such conclusion seems almost inevitable. The E.S.P. experiments have served in a measure to substantiate such a conclusion, although the experiments are unfortunately still too young to posit very much definitely. It seems that we are groping on the edge of a whole realm of mental potentialities about which we knew very little before, and not very much yet. The thing that is so baffling, is that in order to study anything with scientific, laboratory certainty, it should be capable of regular control, but the very effort to tie these fleeting phenomena down to planned occurrence, means that they will escape us. Raupert would make answer that it proves that we have no right to seek such revelations, but have the right to accept only those that come to us unsolicited. It seems to the author that these dimly seen but apparently real increased powers ought to be studied thoroughly before relegating them either to spirit or demonic influence.

"New Physical Frontiers . . ."

It is quite generally accepted that there is such a thing as a relatively reliable amount of precognition or prophetic vision. This has led to the problem of reconstruing our space-time universe. How can events that have not yet occurred be seen in advance? The ancient Oriental philosophy of the Eternal Now which includes a constantly coexistent past, present, and future has been suggested. J. W. Dunne has propounded the theory that "there is within us . . . a consciousness that spreads out fanwise . . . to include the future as well as the past." So we are all able in a slight way to know glimpses of the future, especially in dreams. Alexis Carrell, famous author of Man the Unknown, speaks of a "psychic element" that "exists in some individuals . . . capable of traveling in time." The psychologist Jung speaks of a "slit in time." Seabrook carried on an interesting though inconclusive series of experiments in which his subject during trance states sensed herself going through a door, sometimes into
the future, and sometimes into the past. Einstein has speculated on the relation of time and space and has concluded that time is the fourth dimension of space. If that be true, there is no inherent reason why there might not be some people who are capable of breaking away from the horizontal movement of time from past, through present, to future, and move upward, as an aviator does in space, and view the panorama of time, both future and past.

All this is still very speculative, but it is at least out of the idolatrous, demonistic field of the seance, and into the clearer light of science.

**Ecumenical Calvinism**

**HISTORICAL** cataclysms do not create but do accelerate great movements. No doubt slavery would have died a natural death apart from the Civil War. Great events in history shorten the period of the development of radical changes. This applies also to the new emphasis upon ecumenicity. This war will hasten either the realization or the disintegration of contemporary ecumenicity.

**Contemporary Ecumenicity**

The Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America seems to be eager to be more than merely "federal." Its bulletin seems to be lopsidedly filled with notices pertaining to ecumenicity. One of its auxiliaries, the Women's Co-operating Commission, has sponsored a seminar on Ecumenicity in the Union Seminary of New York City. Even the choice of place for such a seminar, from an orthodox point of view, is an evil omen.

Other organizations are streamlining ecumenicity. Several women organizations are planning to realize a Women's Organization of all the Protestant denominations. Various religious education councils intend to hold an interdenominational convocation in 1944 or 1945 to realize more unity in the field of religious education.

We should not confine our interests to America. The influence of Oxford and of Edinburgh is still felt. There is some good to be noted. Adolf Keller, professor of the Universities of Geneva and Zurich, by having his headquarters in neutral Switzerland, can keep the churches informed and somewhat united. He does so in the capacity of consultant on the World Council of Churches. One thing is certain. In spite of the war the mutual love of Christians in hostile countries has not decreased. We trust that all Christians throughout the entire world are praying for each other, and are planning for the success of the Kingdom of God everywhere. This is the strength of the democracies, but the deathblow of dictatorships. Ecumenicity and Nazi-ism are mutual exclusives.

We do recognize a great value in the work of the World Council. Instead of fostering hatred the glow of love is still kept alive. Nevertheless, we cannot endorse this ecumenical program. That God may use a movement for times like these we do not question. Its blessings we accept gratefully. This does not however commit us to endorse the tenets and aims of this organization. We are committed solely to the revealed will of God recognizing at the same time that God may use any agency to His own glory.

**Vitiated by Modernism**

Let us note in passing the following: 1. The modernistic element in America is more articulate in this ecumenical movement than it is in Europe. The Oxford and Edinburgh conferences have brought to light that we may speak of "Americanism" in religion, or pragmatism in a theological garb. 2. These movements have not adopted as their basis of unity the inerrant scriptures. Their basis of unity is the consciousness of the present-day church. We object to this position at least along three lines. It is an injustice to the claims of the Bible. It is a false conception of truth. If the consciousness of the church is the criterion of truth then tomorrow may condemn what today has sealed with its blood of the martyrs. Truth becomes relative. Relativism is the queen of the church. Finally, Schleiermacher not the Reformation rules the church. We are building upon sinking sands. 3. We object to a modern tolerance of an intolerable inconsistency. The New Testament position is perfectly clear on this point. The Epistle to the Ephesians, the great epistle on church unity, sets forth without any ambiguity that true church ecumenicity demands faith in the same truth, the same baptism, the same Lord, and the same Holy Spirit as third Person of the Trinity. Now it is utterly impossible to say that there is no name given under Heaven whereby man may be saved than the precious name of Jesus and endorse at the same time the fellowship of men who are essentially pagan in their approach to Christianity. If Christ is the Christ of flaming eyes then how can one sit at ease with those who proclaim the Ganges as a source of Revelation as well as the Jordan? A house divided against itself must perish. This inconsistency is tantamount to a denial of the finality of the Christ. Nor can the usual sedative ease the influence of religious education.

**Americanism**

"Americanism" is a byword. It is a word that is so often used in a derisive sense. It is used to denote the abandonment of convictions and principles that are held to be of great importance. It is a word that is often used to describe the tendency of American Christians to be more interested in American affairs than in foreign affairs. It is a word that is often used to describe the tendency of American Christians to be more interested in American affairs than in foreign affairs.

The Epistle to the Ephesians, the great epistle on church unity, sets forth without any ambiguity that true church ecumenicity demands faith in the same truth, the same baptism, the same Lord, and the same Holy Spirit as third Person of the Trinity. Now it is utterly impossible to say that there is no name given under Heaven whereby man may be saved than the precious name of Jesus and endorse at the same time the fellowship of men who are essentially pagan in their approach to Christianity. If Christ is the Christ of flaming eyes then how can one sit at ease with those who proclaim the Ganges as a source of Revelation as well as the Jordan? A house divided against itself must perish. This inconsistency is tantamount to a denial of the finality of the Christ. Nor can the usual sedative ease the influence of religious education.

**Jacob T. Hoogstra**

Minister Prospect Park Christian Reformed Church, Holland, Mich.
pain of conscience. It is obnoxiously childish to hear some say, "I believe the same thing you do essentially, only I have a different way of saying it. I have seized upon the essential point of your faith if only you understood your own position. You should not confuse the symbol with the real." We do not have any need of having this kindly gentleman interpret our own mind, for he may evidence that, if spoken in sincerity, he has not understood his own. We prefer the rough shod modernist who says that if ecumenicity depended upon acceptance of the Bible he would give up ecumenicity.

Reformed Ecumenicity

Although it is our painful task to recognize that Christ is divided in present day ecumenicity, for some say, "I am orthodox," others, "I am liberal," must we therefore conclude that we must seek asylum in isolationism? Over against this explicable attitude we must sound a no uncertain denial. That at least for two reasons. The first one, of lesser importance, is practical. These are some of the problems we must consider. Our government considers the Federal Council spokesman of the Protestant world. As long as we do not have another alliance it is the very logical thing for our government to do. Consequently such questions as the amount of time to be given to the Protestants on the radio may be answered solely in favor of the liberals. The orthodox message could easily be taken off the air. Other questions of similar nature are likely. Then too we owe it to the world to give a clear testimony of the truth. Many pronouncements made as the voice of Protestantism are nothing less than the voice of modernism.

There are also the weightier considerations. We do not believe church union to be advisable. Any attempt may issue into more disruptions than into oneness and fellowship. Still an alliance would give a co-operative unity that would also do justice to the diversity of gifts given to the church. This diversity we must maintain.

Then too we must bear in mind our own standards. We can easily mouth Lord's Day XXI to the satisfaction of orthodox requirements, but unless we live what we teach we better refrain from paying eulogies to lofty statements of faith. Nor can we gain an ease of conscience by teaching that this Lord's Day concerning the church pertains only to the invisible church. That the true unity is invisible no one will deny. Such is the plain teaching of the greatest epistle on church unity, the epistle to the Ephesians. At the same time we must seek to express outwardly what is inwardly one. And church union is not the only way, nor even the only satisfactory way. There may be others. And this is what we may be called upon to explore.

Before we touch upon the real point we may note in passing a threefold stage most of our American thought has experienced. Emerson in his essay on "The American Scholar" also touches upon this. We see the same principles operative in immigrant churches, not excluding our own denomination. The first stage is dependence upon the mother church. The church in the diaspora reads all this mother church produces. It directs its policy according to the practices of that church. The second stage is one of reaction. The church at times wishes to repudiate any ties that may unite it with the mother church in the homeland. Finally after the provincial yoke has been thrown away and a degree of independence has been gained, and a certain amount of confidence that may have been merited has been instilled in the organization, then this church becomes an equal among equals. Personally, this is the ideal stage. This is the stage we believe that our denomination is in. We are not provincials any more. Neither are we reactionaries. But we feel we are Americans who need the entire Reformed fellowship for the glory of God.

Isolationism, Nationalism, Ecumenicity

This is not true only of American life. Our age is a living paradox superficially considered. We are living in a period that witnesses sweeping obliterations of boundary lines. Frontiers are demolished as with a magician's stroke. Consolidation seems to be the keyword to the spirit of our age. At the same time we notice in politics and in religion the growth of nationalism. The Indies were becoming self-conscious politically and ecclesiastically. So was South Africa. Empires are crumbling, new systems are consolidating, and nationalism is flaming its contours upon the religious and political skies. What then? A true Reformed ecumenicity must mean that each nation has a diversity all its own to contribute to the unity of the Reformed faith.

With this as a background we may describe Reformed Ecumenicity as follows.

Reformed Ecumenicity is a church movement. It is the Reformed Church life that seeks to express its unity without causing the diversity to suffer. It confesses that the fellowship is required and blessed by the Lord. It studies and testifies jointly particularly in doctrinal, missionary, and educational matters. It maintains the rights due to the church when such are assailed. It instructs its members in battles that an alliance has in common.

Such Ecumenicity must begin in one's own nation. There will be national considerations that will prompt such an alliance. But with an eye to the future as well as the grandeur of the ideal Reformed Ecumenicity must encompass the whole world. There is no reason to deny its possibility. There must be a Reformed internationalism that will take the teeth out of communism and nazi-ism, as well as inspire the members of the respective constituencies to band together for the one faith in the Lord. Perhaps the day has dawned that in our isolation lies our death. We must remain isolationists as far as...
truth is concerned. That is, we must remain separate unto the Lord. But a separate people can stand together for the Lord’s cause and for its mutual welfare.

How about the church at large? Are we untrue to the rest of God’s people? Any haughtiness or superiority complexes would be abominable in God’s sight. All Christians truly Christians are the apples of God’s eyes. And we do not deny that some kind of ecumenicity can be expressed even in this respect. Let all denominations do as we do. Let all feel obliged to help the church at large. Let us exchange notes. Let us compare contributions. Let us acknowledge our debt and forbid to copyright our contributions. And such a possibility may not be in a too distant future.

**Calvinistic Ecumenicity**

We should distinguish between Reformed and Calvinistic Ecumenicity. The difference in a general way is about the same as the difference between Reformed and Calvinism. These two do not cover the same area.

Calvinism is a system of thought, an ethics, and a program based upon the presuppositions of the Reformed Faith. The Reformed Faith is usually associated with church life. It is the official expression of the faith of the Reformed Churches. Calvinism reminds one of the Kingdom of God in which truth is applied to every dimension of life. Kingdom activities include certain tasks that belong to Calvinism but not to the church. And this is what our nestor pastor and ardent enthusiast for true ecumenicity, the Rev. I. Van Dellen, writes about in *De Wachter* of March the third of this year. With an extremely high regard for his opinion that we should limit our endeavors to this type of ecumenicity for the present we believe that we should travel upon two roads. These roads may run into each other at times. Still both roads will be necessary to have an effective voice in today’s and tomorrow’s civilization.

The contributions of Calvinistic Ecumenicity will be both theoretical and practical. As Calvinists we explore the realms of philosophy, education, ethics, art, theology, statecraft, war and peace, to see the inter-relation of all truth. Each sphere will be both debtor and contributor to each other. As Calvinists we also know that knowledge attained must be put to use, for we do not know of any useless knowledge. Knowledge for the sake of knowledge is idolatry.

**Evidence of Ecumenical Calvinism**

Evidence of ecumenical Calvinism along academic lines may be seen in the organization known as *De Vereeniging voor Calv. Wijsbegeerte der Wetsidee*. Prominent members of this organization in at least three continents are seeking to interrelate philosophy, education, theology, medicine, or any field of human endeavor. Their contributions are being felt in discussions of faith and reason. They study the relationship of philosophy and exegesis. Church history is reviewed from the point of view of a better acquaintance with pagan thought. And we all would do well to watch the relation of philosophy to exegesis not only as it has manifested itself in the past, but also as it is evidenced today. We are thinking of the Baur school of theology inspired by Hegel. This is true also of the latest school of New Testament criticism known as Form Criticism in which men like Bultmann, Dibelius, Kundsnin, and in our own country, Grant, play a large role.

The field is so tremendously great that we need a mighty band to investigate all aspects of Calvinism for today. We need experts in every field who can keep sympathies for all phases of human learning. A defence of Calvinism requires much more than a few archeological proofs that the Bible is true. It requires negatively that we convince our opponents that their position is untenable, and positively that our position alone can grant ultimate satisfaction. This is a big program to be realized through small beginnings. There are organizations quite unrelated interested in various phases of this very problem. And we trust each organization will add to the accomplishments of the sum total of efforts.

Herein lies an unquestionable value in Calvinistic Conferences. Conferences will study mutual problems. They will stimulate local discussions. Besides, a conference can expect members from every denomination for it does not meet ecclesiastically. We can summon the efforts of all true Calvinists throughout our land.

There are also things we can do in a practical way. The Rev. I. Van Dellen in the article mentioned says we could organize a society for higher education. That is we could organize a society for a Calvinistic University. The First Conference went on record favoring such a proposal. To say a university is impossible is to speak without taping all possibilities. To say this is superhuman, we can do nothing but agree. Then we better build in faith. But we must travel the parallel highways of Reformed and Calvinistic Ecumenicity. We must be able to have the best possible faculty.

Perhaps we could have a Calvinistic Council of United States and of the World which would publish all things of interests socially, morally, and academically to the churches and to the world. This is the strength of the sects and of the Roman Catholic Church.

We should perhaps focus our attention on such questions as war and peace. There should be an unanimity of opinion on the peace problems dictated by Christian Ethics rather than mere revenge.

Many more problems and possibilities can be envisaged.
**How to Reach Our Ideals**

Calvinism flourishes best when it does not depend upon an intellectual aristocracy. Every one must feel that one is a part of this movement. Forgetting about the distinction between Reformed and Calvinistic Ecumenicity we can say these things are within our reach.

First of all we must know that Calvinism is under fire. Because of its international character it is the chief enemy of the Roman Catholic Church, of Nazism, and of Communism. Let us not be caught asleep. Let us bring the war to the enemy.

Let us enlist all members of our churches in this enterprise. This we have done. We should not listen to an exposition of Lord's Day XXI of the Heidelberg Catechism and be indifferent to the needs of our Calvinists in France, Germany, Holland, and in the Indies. What can we do? We could have special monthly offerings, let us say in a special benevolent fund. When the war comes to a successful close, as we hope it will, then we can help the Dutch rebuild their universities and schools. If all churches would have a surplus we could encourage the brethren that their faith and my faith is our faith, and that the vitality of this faith must conquer the errors of the day. The Red Cross will supply food, but who will help Dr. Kolfhaus rebuild the German Reformed Seminary or the remnant of French Calvinists regain footing when the old faith will be so sorely needed?

As preachers we should get the long range view of unifying all our resources no matter where in this wide world we may find them. We should feel the unity.

We should also tithe our time in such a way that we do not limit all our work to our own local congregation. We are members of the Kingdom of God.

We should encourage magazines like The Calvin Forum that is performing a modest yeoman's task in giving us news of the entire Calvinistic world. And perhaps after the war it will be possible to publish a scientific monthly of all the Calvinistic Scholars of the world in which all branches of human learning are discussed.

“What do you understand by the communion of saints? First, that believers, all and every one, as members of Christ, are partakers of Him and of all His treasures and gifts; second, that every one must know himself bound to employ his gifts readily and cheerfully for the advantage and salvation of other members.”

---

**A Critique of Pacifism**

Raymond R. Van Heukelom
Minister Reformed Church, Gurniss, Mich.

To write with any degree of clarity on the subject of pacifism requires a rather careful definition of the term. The word is used freely of such divergent views that confusion is inevitable. In this article the word will have the specific meaning of an “opposition to war or to the use of military force for any purpose.”

There are two strains of pacifism. The one is the historical, conservative pacifism of ardent Christians whose love for God and man exceeds their sense of justice and right, and, possibly, of duty. It is with this group that we are primarily concerned. Yet a far stronger group in terms of numerical superiority and in contemporary aggressiveness is the liberal-optimistic, social-gospelizing, section of modern society. This group is not much in evidence since Pearl Harbor but we are not to think that they have been converted. They were the most vociferous immediately after the first World War and immediately preceding Pearl Harbor. When the danger of war threatens or when the effects of war are still directly felt they obtain the greatest hearing and they are not above making capital of their opportunity. The cause of our present reverses and problems must be found in part in the attitude of revulsion against war and a refusal to be involved in world politics which swept across our land at the conclusion of that other great conflict. We lost our great opportunity then by our isolationist policy. If we are not to make the same error again we must consider without bias the fundamental claims which gave rise to the isolationist attitude. We cannot, therefore, ignore the liberal pacifist. Nor can we take an intermediate position. If the pacifist is right in his contentions we must reject all armed conflict. If he is wrong we cannot allow his attitude either to obstruct our total war effort or the program which we will seek to enforce at the conclusion of what we hope will be a successful war.

**Sin Is Real**

Pacifism has no adequate conception of sin. It is significant that this is the constant refrain of a man like Reinhold Niebuhr. In his book, Christianity and Power Politics, under the chapter heading, “Why the Christian Church Is Not Pacifist,” an excellent chapter which every non-interventionist pastor ought to read, he openly avows that “the gospel deals with the fact that men violate the law of love.” Salvation, as every conservative Christian knows,
is not merely a matter of sanctification, but justification, and sanctification only in part in our present existence. Moral achievement, whether by grace or inherent power, is not of such a character as to warrant the faith of the Renaissance in man, which faith lies at the foundation of liberal-optimism. The worst sinners particularly are not moved by conscience to inactivity. Men who knew Japan have warned us for years. We lived in the sense of a security that has proved to be false. Our selfish wishes expressed in pious phrases did not alter realities. What Japan did to Manchuria and tried to do to China she would do to the whole world with the fervor of religious fanaticism and with a free conscience if the rest of the world would only be kind enough to cooperate and turn pacifistic. As long as sin remains, and that it will until the end, we cannot entrust ourselves to pacifism.

All this has become so evident that the pacifist has taken a new tack. It is urged that we are not to act as a nation unless our own hands are clean, (Let him that is without sin cast the first stone). This contention rests on a failure to see that sin is part and parcel of all individual and corporate life. It results either in false self-righteousness or in inactivity, both of which are condemned by the law of love so vociferously proclaimed by the pacifist. Upon this principle the minister could not preach his sermon, “Fear Not,” or “Sin Not at All,” nor could the judge on the bench pass judgment on any case. Must we then remove all judges and revert to lawlessness? That would at least be consistent with the principle. It does not help the cause of pacifism to say that one is individual and the other corporate. Are not judges as well as warriors representatives of society? And is not the claim upon the individual higher than that upon society as such? And if the individual has a right to act behalf of the good even though he is himself a sinner, does not the State have the same right? So it would seem at any rate.

The conservative Christian is as ready to acknowledge that there is a sinful element in all the expedients which the political order uses to establish justice as is the liberal pacifist. But he recognizes that in this life it is impossible to eliminate the sinful element in the political expedients. Therefore this lack of political perfection cannot be made an excuse for political inactivity. Pacifism would have us pass no judgment upon others because we are not ourselves perfect. But duty compels discriminate judgments between social systems and forms of justice or injustice. In terms of the present conflict we may say that the issue is not one of the relative rightness of the United or the Axis nations in their past history, but one of the rightness or wrongness of the present purposes of both and the possibility for righteousness and justice if these purposes are realized.

Frank Buchman thought he had the answer to these objections and could still save pacifism. He declared that “God could control a nation overnight and solve every last bewildering problem,” if we would convert such men as Hitler. But no such happy result characterized Cromwell’s dictatorship nor Bismark’s control over Germany though their Christianity was of a far higher order than the sentimentalism of the Oxford group. Hitler converted remains Hitler the sinner and at best makes him but a believing and forensically justified ruler of a nation that remains sinful with him. The Gospel clearly teaches that even powerful men, when they have done their whole duty as they saw it, must confess that they were unprofitable servants. They and their people, though saved by grace, remain sinners, subject to the possibility of error and evil passions. They do not guarantee peace, justice and righteousness. We conclude that because sin is an awful fact hostile nations are not to be expected to give up their aims when we refuse to resist them; perfectionism is not the criterion for a right to participation in the struggle of the world; and the conversion of a few leaders to a vapid and false Christianity cannot bring the high ends which characterize the Kingdom. Pacifism is possible as long, and as long only, as it closes its eyes to sin.

Not Rooted in History

Pacifism poses as the historical position of the Church and sometimes as that of revelation. The facts do not bear out this contention. The pacifism of the Roman Church rooted itself in a belief that the world was so bad it could not be reformed. The only course open to the truly spiritually minded individual was to withdraw from the world. The modern pacifist, however, hopes to reform the world according to his own pattern. It is perfectly correct to assert that the Church maintained itself by almost purely pacifistic means. It still does so. But this is not the equivalent of pacifism. The Church denied the right to use force to itself, but not to the State. Its writings were never purely pacifistic. The works of Justin Martyr and Irenaeus are not to be construed as denouncing all war but as denouncing personal aggressiveness. Tertullian did condemn service in the army as a regular profession, but not so much because of a condemnation of war as war as because it was a worldly profession. Few Christian ministers urge the army as a way of life upon their youth even now. Origen urged Christians to pray for the army. Clement clearly suggests that those who became Christians while serving in the army need not adopt a new profession. It may be that Paul’s advice to abide in the same calling wherein they were called included the military way of life. Athanasius and Augustine were defenders of the right of warfare and of a Christian to serve in the army as a profession. The leaders of Protestant thought took essentially the Roman position. Luther said: “the prince is intrusted with the sword, not with a fox’s tail,” while Calvin was certainly no pacifist. It is apparent that the modern pacifist does not stand in the historical tradition of the Church.
The history of revelation also indicates that the pacifist is in error. It is perfectly true that God taught Israel a great deal about moderation in warfare, and that the man after God’s own heart could not build the temple just because he was a warrior. We may add that all the emphasis upon peace and righteousness, upon love and justice, which the prophets laid upon the hearts of the Hebrew must still be laid on men’s hearts. We, as they, glorify peace, not war. Israel was not called to be a warring nation, yet it is clear that neither was she called to be pacifistic. As a consequence many a leading pacifist has been driven to the expedient of declaring that the Old Testament is no longer of normative value. The testimony of the New Testament, however, is clearly that the revelation is of one piece. We must have due regard to the progress of Revelation but we are to respect as God’s Word all that was written for us by men inspired by the Spirit. The New Testament does not overthrow the Old. The Bible is a unit and can only be accepted or rejected in toto so that the pacifist will either have to cease quoting the New or accept the positive teachings of the Old. His position, therefore, does not appear to be the historical position of the Church or Revelation.

The Sixth Commandment

Turning to the contentions of the pacifist that appear to be rooted in Scripture we confront the proposition that the Bible condemns all killing. The sixth commandment has been so construed as to make war impossible. But the word used should rather be translated “commit no murder.” It is a word that is never used for killing in war or by judicial decision after due trial. If the commandment meant what the pacifists imply it means they would have to be vegetarians and even then green and living vegetables would be denied them. If the objection is made that the commandment refers only to the taking of human life, the way is opened to further restriction of its meaning. The commandment itself has nothing to say about plant and animal life as being exceptions. Yet we must restrict its meaning for the very context treats of the killing of animals both for sacrifice and for food, and, in addition, tells us that Moses put down an insurrection by slaying three thousand men. The Mosaic Law itself made provision for the execution of criminals and for the proper conduct of warriors. It becomes clear that the commandment refers only to such killings as we in the English language call murder. The answer seems almost too simple but the pacifist must look elsewhere for his supporting arguments.

Does Love Exclude War?

An argument that is less simple and therefore less easily answered is that the law of love as first given by Christ and taught constantly by the apostles makes all war wrong. However, the Bible does not present the law of love as something new in Christ, but as something re-emphasized and deepened. The command of Lev. 19:18 is clear: “Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself.” Jesus used those very words because there were no better. While the people may have assumed that only Jews were their neighbors, the writers of the Old Testament Scriptures had no such limited conceptions. Yet it is obvious that in their time love was not thought inconsistent with war. Jesus took his stand upon the Old Testament. The silence of both Jesus and the apostles on the matter of war indicates that they accepted the position of the Old Testament. Love does not exclude the possibility that war may be necessary. There was stern justice in the Atonement which gave virility to the love most clearly made manifest upon the cross. The parent who loves well exercises discipline. The judge who loves humanity wisely is not afraid to punish the evildoer. Police break up mobs by force because they love order, right conduct, and peace. Even in international relations love will administer discipline by force if necessary in order that justice may prevail and that men may enjoy their God-given rights and liberties. Christian love is not the irreconcilable antithesis of all war.

The Spirit of Jesus

However reasonable the argument may appear, the conclusion, says the pacifist, is out of harmony with the action and spirit of Jesus Christ. Some would even go so far as to ask us to imagine Jesus Christ in a uniform wielding a sword or modern weapon. Of course it cannot be done, but it cannot be done, not because Jesus condemned such action, but because Jesus came for another purpose. The spirit of Jesus is not contrary to the wearing of a uniform. He stood for righteousness, not peace at any price. One has only to read many of the declarations of Jesus directed against his opponents to know that he did not have the pacificist temperament. Even his parables carry a martial flavor. In speaking of the Heavenly Father as the Lord of the vineyard, he says, “He will miserably destroy those miserable men.” As judge he will say to some: “Depart from me, ye cursed, into eternal fire which is prepared for the devil and his angels.” In another parable in which Jesus must himself be the king of whom he speaks the king is represented as saying, “these mine enemies, that would not that I should reign over them, bring hither and slay them before me.”

Every one of the statements of Christ in regard to a peaceful conduct of life are to be interpreted in the light of his life and teachings. Jesus said: “Turn the other cheek,” but on at least one occasion he failed to do so himself and rebuked the man sharply who slapped his face, (John 18:22). The injunctions of the Sermon on the Mount are not to be read as categorical imperatives for they are directed against current abuses. Above all they are to be the prac-
tical expression of the ethical principles of the individual Christian. They are not necessarily the law of the State. If they are categorical Jesus disobeyed his own commandments. We have related one instance. Another follows. He taught, "Whosoever shall say, Thou fool, shall be in danger of hell fire." Yet Matthew records these words of the Master, "Ye fools and blind" (Matt. 23:17). The spirit of Jesus is made manifest in the almost lawless manner in which he drove the animals and traders from the temple. The energetic and masterful Christ of the Gospels is in spirit in perfect accord with the use of force when necessary in the maintenance of justice. It is true that he sent out his disciples as sheep among the wolves, but our missionaries still go unarmed even in militaristic countries. The peace he came to make possible was not the peace between nations but between God and man. That the Spirit of Christ as it masters the life of men will lead them to seek peaceful settlement of their difficulties cannot be doubted. Neither can it be doubted that his attitude was never that they should set aside the demands of justice, especially when in favor of others, as the price of peace.

The beautiful, though somewhat sentimental, contentions of the pacifist cannot bear the light of critical evaluation. In the light of Scripture and of ordinary judgment it becomes evident that his stock contentions are untenable. His arguments cannot move us to evade our duty both in the present conflict and in the reconstruction to follow.

The Call To Us

People of God, work hard
Let us not drift;
In this dread time of struggle
Aim straight; be swift;
Be zealous always for the truth
Join in this battle song:
We're moving onward steadily
To help the right along.

Christians, hardship endure
Grow strong in Right;
That becomes the warrior bold
Now called to fight;
Be dauntless in the conflict
Trust God, nor fear the foe;
People of God, stand arm to arm
The wrong to overthrow.

Dear Christians, be content
Do not complain;
Millions are suffering
Undreamed-of pain;
They look to us for comforting—
Be this our daily plan
To thank God for our blessings
And help our fellowman.

—JOAN GEISEL GARDNER.

Teacher Education in Church-Related Colleges

D: Prof. F., I am considering preparing for the teaching profession, and am finding it difficult to decide which type of school to attend. Will you point out to me some of the advantages of the church-related college as a teacher-training institution?

F: For one thing, the church-related colleges have a relatively small enrollment and, generally speaking, small classes.

D: Yes, I attended a high school of 2000 students, and I have often wondered what it would be like to attend a smaller school.

F: I presume you have reflected on the fact that in a small school there are more opportunities for an intimate, personal relationship between faculty and students.

D: Yes, I have thought of that.

F: This brings with it certain advantages. For example, if you were to take a course in psychology in a church-related school you would feel free because of this intimacy to participate in the class discussion and to talk over problems of personal adjustment with your professor. The teacher in a small church-related college has a vital, personal interest in his students, which goes further than mere instruction because it is rooted in common ideals.

D: Is this close contact found also between students?

F: Yes, in a small college there is more of a spirit of comradeship and friendliness among students, which fosters wide acquaintanceships, many of which develop into life-long friendships. In a smaller student body there is also greater oppor-
D: I think it would be very interesting to influence young lives and to help children to set up aims and ideals for themselves.

F: What aims and ideals do you have in mind?

D: Frankly, they aren't very clear in my own mind. I see some people living for money, some for pleasure, some for power, while others live for religion and social service.

F: Have you set up aims and ideals for yourself? Do you in that state of uncertainty expect to help children to set up aims and ideals for themselves?

D: I never thought of it in that way. Perhaps that's just why I want to be a teacher, so that I can help others to avoid such a state of perplexity. I do hope my college training will clear things up for me.

F: It should, but before we go into that let us talk a little further about this confusion and bewilderment you confessed to a moment ago. Do you think that this state of mind is quite typical of young men and women generally?

D: Yes, since you bring it up, I think that most of my friends are in the same predicament. We hardly know what to believe. We do not have what you called a moment ago "a set of aims and ideals." For this situation I think our teachers are partly to blame. Many of my high school teachers seemed to have no certainty as to aims or goals.

F: Let me interrupt you at this point. I think you called attention to the greatest weakness in modern education. The boys and girls in our schools are, as you have admitted, at a loss to know what is the meaning and purpose of life. The ideals of the home are frequently at odds with those of the school. There is no agreement on this score between the different teachers, either. Such a situation interferes with the development of an integrated personality on the part of the child; in fact, it leads to inner conflicts and disintegration. It is no wonder that confusion and chaos characterize our present-day culture. Bewilderment and disunity confront us at almost every turn of the road. It is evident in a marked degree also in the field of education.

D: Do you mean to tell me that among the educators, whose task it is to give us direction and guidance, this uncertainty and confusion also prevails?

F: Yes, none other than John Dewey, who has influenced American education in our day more than any one else, a few years ago gave the Inglis lecture at Harvard University. What topic do you think he selected? He spoke on the subject: "The Way Out of Educational Confusion." Although we may disagree with his solution, he nevertheless correctly analyzes this confusion as being due to aimlessness.

In viewing the American educational scene we observe that but few attempts are being made to present to teachers a unified and integrated view of life which is grounded in a definite conviction as to ultimate certainty and a scale of values based on that certainty. Courses in the philosophy of education which might meet this need are not popular. Frequently such courses, when they are offered, are largely devoted to a discussion of techniques and practices, and do not come to grips with the basic issues implied by such a course.

Although most of the textbooks in education which have appeared in recent years emphasize the need for a sound philosophy of education for prospective teachers, but very few of them discuss the fundamental principles upon which such a philosophy should be founded.

This superficiality is also evident in educational conferences. Lengthy papers and discussions are devoted to certain isolated and detached aspects of the techniques and methods of education while the basic principles of education as a unitary influence remain untouched. Using military terms, which are so popular today, we may say that in our conferences there has been an exaggerated emphasis on the tactics of education, while sound educational strategy dealing with goals and objectives, in terms of which our tactics must be evaluated, has been largely ignored. I should add, however, the heartening fact that in the last two or three years—partly I take it because of the present world crisis—more attention is being focussed on the "whys" and "wherefores" of education; we educators are being awakened to the fact that the basic issues of goals and ends must be faced. It is obvious that John Dewey is right—we must find a way out of our educational confusion.
F: Let me first answer your question regarding the cause of all this bewilderment and uncertainty. A fine diagnosis of the ills of modern culture, of which I have described certain symptoms, is given in an address by Dr. Mortimer J. Adler of the University of Chicago, delivered at the Conference of Science, Philosophy, and Religion in New York City in September, 1940. The subject of this address is God and the Professors. Dr. Adler holds that science, philosophy, and religion are major parts of European, i.e. Western culture. During the Middle Ages the three were organically related, but in our day they are distinct from one another as quite separate groups. The proper relationship of science, philosophy, and religion, he contends, has not been achieved in modern times; in fact, cannot be achieved because the majority of scholars and professors worship at the shrine of science and deny that philosophy and religion have any real value as knowledge. In their view, all of the problems of life will ultimately have to be solved by science because it is the highest form of knowledge. Dr. Adler, on the contrary, believes that the basic questions of life and culture cannot be solved by the empirical sciences. Science by the very nature of its material and method cannot answer such basic questions as "Where do we come from? Why are we here? Whither do we go?" The answer to these questions is to be found in the realm of philosophy and religion. What is needed, in his opinion, to cure the ills of modern culture is to restore philosophy and religion to their proper place—a place superior to science and not subordinate to it. Only in this way will we again arrive at a unified, integrated view of life; only in this way will "Things be cleared up," to use your expression.

So much in answer to your first question. Now as to the second, "What has all this academic discussion to do with teacher-education in the church-related college?" If Dr. Adler is right, and in the main I think he is, then the church-related college is in a strategic place to clear up much of the confusion present in our day. Our church-related colleges have been established under the auspices of a church for the purpose of teaching and promulgating the Christian religion. These schools have been established on a religious foundation. We may look to them to give the sciences of philosophy and religion their proper place in the scheme of human knowledge. To the extent that the church-related colleges carry on in the spirit of their founders, to that extent will they also strive to place religion at the very center and heart of scholarship and learning, and in so doing will give guidance and direction for integrated living. In an institution where science, philosophy and religion are each given their proper place in an organic relationship—and we may expect the church-related college to be such an institution—there confusion and bewilderment will be cleared up. In this sense the church-related college, where about half of the teachers in our American schools are educated, has a definite contribution to make to teacher-education.

All of what I have said is closely related to one of the focal problems of our day; viz., "The crisis of Democracy." If Democracy is to be saved, it must be defensible and defended because it is right and therefore good. Such rightness cannot be demonstrated by the methods of the natural sciences. Only the truths of philosophy and religion can serve as a basis for the defense of democracy. We cannot reasonably hope to preserve our democratic way of life if we deny our Christian philosophy and religion their rightful place in our system of knowledge.

Consistency?

"So you believe in the resurrection!"
Said my neighbor with a sneer,
As we stood in his sunny garden
In the springtime of the year.

"How can you believe that our bodies,
So worn and frail and gray,
Can blossom in heavenly beauty
On a resurrection day?

"Well, I must go on with my planting,
So much my garden needs;
I'm only just beginning
To sow my flower seeds."

—LAURA ALICE BOYD.
The Australian Calvinistic Society

A MEETING of the above society was held in the Free Presbyterian Church at St. Kilda. Owing to the absence of the President, Prof. John Gillies, M.A., B.D., the chair was occupied by the Rev. Robert Swanton, M.A., B.D., Vice-President. Mr. Swanton introduced the speaker for the evening, the Rev. J. Campbell Andrews, M.A., M.B., Ch. B. Dr. Andrews read a paper on "Some Aspects of Divine Sovereignty." Discussion on the subject was opened by the Rev. Robert Swanton, who was followed by the Revs. J. Legge, A. Allen, W. R. McEwen. The Rev. H. K. Mack brought the discussion to a close. Mr. Evans moved a vote of thanks to the speaker, and the meeting was concluded with prayer.

The following is a brief summary of the paper read by Dr. Andrews.

SOME ASPECTS OF DIVINE SOVEREIGNTY

The ultimate answer to any question relating to the universe and its history is "It pleased God." That is the proposition submitted in this paper. . . . For the Calvinist, be he scientist or philosopher or theologian the answer is found in the active volition of Almighty God. . . . To think right we must begin with God. The theocentric viewpoint is the only safe viewpoint from which to frame a lasting system of thought, be it philosophical, scientific or, for our purpose, theological. Dr. Andrè Schlemmer has unerringly diagnosed the present confusion in the world of thought with its serious and tragic repercussions in the realms of morals and politics today—"the methods that have inspired occidental thought through the last centuries have revealed their common vice. the worm that was in the fruit—anthropocentrism" (Crisis in the World of Thought, p. 56).

Right views of the nature and character of God are the only safeguard against wrong conceptions of His relation to the universe and man; and for the true knowledge of God, our finite minds impaired by sin must gladly accept God's unfolding of Himself and His working in the Word of Revelation. We turn, then, to Scripture.

Scripture sets God upon the throne of universal dominion. . . . In the New Testament the doctrine is implicit throughout and expressed clearly in certain passages. For example, the Lord Jesus recognised and taught divine sovereignty. Regeneration and conversion display it—"The wind bloweth where it listeth . . . so is every one that is born of the Spirit" (John 3:8); and "No man cometh to me except the Father . . . draw him" (John 4:44); Perseverance in the Christian life is possible because "My Father is greater than all and no man is able to pluck them out of My Father's hand" (John 10:29).

God clothes the lillies, feeds the ravens, numbers the very hairs of our head. Pilate is reminded that even a magistrate's authority is delegated—"Thou wouldest have no power at all against me except it were given thee from above" (John 19:11). Furthermore, by His own example, Christ indicated the proper attitude toward God's will. "I thank Thee, O Father, Lord of Heaven and Earth, because Thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent and hast revealed them unto babes. Even so, Father, for so it seemed good in Thy sight" (Matt. 11:25, 26).

Divine sovereignty may be defined as God's right over His creatures whereby He does "by them, for them, or upon them whatsoever Himself pleaseth" (Westminster Confession of Faith, Chap. ii, Sec. 2). It must be distinguished from His omnipotence. Nothing is too hard for the Almighty. An irresistible creative fiat brought worlds into being, and a hand of infinite compass and strength upheld them as poised in space they describe the courses appointed for them by an eternal decree. This last thought expresses the relation between sovereignty and omnipotence. His power gives effect to His decrees. Sovereignty is God's unfettered right. His moral power (exousia) to do what He wills; omnipotence is His irresistible strength (dunamis) whereby He does as He wills. Sovereignty must further be distinguished from immanence. God fills heaven and earth and all things. The universe thrills with His power. The laws or principles which regulate it are the outflowings of divine energy. This should be recognised by the scientist as he studies processes that we call natural, but which are in a sense divine. It is important for the physicist in macro-physics, as he explores space and weighs, measures and analyses stars, and in micro-physics as he analyses atoms. Nor should the biologist forget that life in all its forms is a multiple stream issuing from Him with whom is the fountain of life. By sovereignty that energy and life begin and by sovereignty it may also be withheld, recalled or redirected. Thus He who is in all and through all is yet above all, and recognition of that preserves us from all forms of pantheism.

The nature of divine sovereignty is absolute. God is "most free, most absolute" (Confession of Faith, Chap. ii, Sec. 1). Unconditioned by anything outside Himself, His will is the condition of all things. . . . There is none to whom He gives account, but rebuke is administered to those who dispute His sovereignty and question His dealings. "Nay but, O man, who art thou that repliest against God?" The potsherds may strive with the potsherds of this earth. No law but the law of His own character conditions the activity of this King. That last thought provides the answer to those who object that absolute sovereignty must be arbitrary, capricious, regulated by no law. It is regulated by the law of God's being. God as God is sovereign. He is wise, good and holy and so exercises a sovereignty of wisdom, goodness and righteousness, a sovereignty especially revealed in the salvation of men. God might justly have left man to reap eternally the bitter fruits of his early disobedience and rebellion, but He freely purposed to redeem from destruction. Freely He chose the manner of redemption through the death of His dear Son; freely He ordered the times and circumstances of that great enactment; freely He ordained to life the host of the redeemed; and freely applied redemption to them.

Calvinism sets God upon His throne and sets that throne in the heavens far above all principality and power; it shows that the foundations of that throne are holiness, wisdom, power, goodness and truth; it claims that the dominion exercised from that throne is a dominion of justice mingled with mercy, of grace with truth, of love with holiness, of wisdom with power; it emphasises that the extent of that dominion is unlimited, an element permeating creation, providence and redemption.

What Arminians fail to do is realise man's true condition since the fall. To him as sinner, faith in Christ, love for God, holiness in life, are morally impossible. With faulty views of man's state there follows faulty views of the nature of God's working in salvation. It is held that man may freely accept or reject God's grace. Thus God's saving activity, instead of being sovereign, is limited by the free agency of man. Calvinists, on the other hand, recognize in its stark tragedy the depraved state of man and consequently recognize that salvat...
tion from first to last must be of God and of grace. A faulty anthropology—and Pelagianism, Arminianism, Socinianism and Modernism, are tainted with it—a faulty anthropology leads to a faulty theology. The safe course, then, for all who seek knowledge of God and His relations to men is to begin with God, yield Him the place rightly His, the place the Scriptures give Him, the throne of universal dominion, and all things, men included, will be given due place around that throne.

The Socinian idea of God as being essentially merciful and loving has been revived in recent years. The justice—which is the "habituation of His throne"—as an essential basis of His sovereignty is neglected. God is regarded as the Father of all men, and consequently His sovereignty is marked purely by love. A leading exponent of this view, Dr. A. E. Garvie, writing on Sovereignty in "Hastings Encyclopaedia," states: "A doctrine of the divine sovereignty that ends, as do Augustinianism and Calvinism, in the election of the few and the reprobation of the many [an unfair perversion of both systems] has evidently started wrong—not from a Christian concept of God as revealed in Christ, but from a conception of sovereignty that in every country today which enjoys a measure of constitutional liberty would be repudiated as false. Even a sovereignty today does not yield absolute power. The concept of God's fatherhood ... involves that God will not exercise His sovereignty on which man depends as to deprive him of his liberty." Such teaching is based on a faulty interpretation of Scripture. For example, in commenting on the doctrine of sovereignty as set forth by Paul in Romans ix, the same writer states: "The metaphor of the potter cancels the argument (that God is free to elect or reject individuals or nations according to His will), for the potter does not use the clay wilfully, but makes of each lump what it is fitted to become." This is surely wresting Scripture, for Paul expressly states that of the "same lump" of clay one vessel is made unto honour and another to dishonour. It is not the composition of the clay, but the will of the potter that determines the nature of the vessel.

The point of difference between Calvinism and all opposing systems is that, according to the former—God, and, according to the latter—man, determines who are to be saved. The point at issue is whether God or man shall reign in the realm of grace. Since He reigns elsewhere, it was a curious perversion of the nature of things and of the Scripture Truth to deny His sovereignty here.

It is said that divine sovereignty conflicts with the free agency and moral responsibility of man. We submit that the Bible and Calvinism fully emphasises both. The fact that we cannot reconcile these doctrines does not annul either, but rather shows our limited understanding. The Westminster Confession carefully conserves both. "God has freely and unchangeably ordained whatsoever comes to pass, yet so as thereby neither is God the author of sin, nor is violence offered to the will of the creature. ..." (Confession of Faith). Spurgeon pithily represents the objection and its answer in his "All Round Ministry"—"Man has a will, how they cry it up ... I attribute a kind of omnipotence to the will of man. But sin, has not God a will too? Have you nothing to say about its omnipotence? Is God to have no choice, no purpose, no sovereignty over His gifts?"

Scripture, with beautiful balance, sets human responsibility and divine sovereignty side by side as if there were no conflict, but only perfect harmony between them. They are to be regarded not as contradictory, but as complementary truths. The conflict regarded as necessarily existent between them exists only in the mind of man. For example, when Sennacherib, urged by Just for conquest, invaded Judah, he was but the redoubtable executor of the divine will (Isa. x:7). Joseph's brethren maliciously sold him into slavery to find out later that God actually sent him before them to preserve their lives (Gen. xlv:5). Again the wicked men who, after free and deliberate counsel, compassed the death of the Lord Jesus, were but giving effect to "the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God" (Acts ii:23).

The second objection is that the doctrine implicates God in moral evil, for it teaches that not only the first sin of man, but all consequent evil must have been included in His purpose. But here again it must be noted that to every human act there are two causes, the will of God to do the will of man. The morality of the act is determined by the motive of the agent. Man is actuated by wrong motives in evil acts. God is actuated by holy motives in decreeing and permitting those acts and thus human sin to work itself out to a certain point. Hence the Lord said of Sennacherib's failure to realize the divine purpose of his aggression, "Howbeit he meareth not so, neither doeth his heart think so" (Isa. x:7). Joseph reminded his brethren, "As for you, ye thought evil against me, but God meant it for good to bring forth as it is this present salvation to the present salvation" (Gen. xlvii:20). Moreover, while Peter charged the betrayer and slayers of Christ with the guilt of the foulest crime perpetrated on earth, yet God decreed and overruled that evil to the eternal advantage of innumerable souls and to the glory of His great name.

"I know that the Lord is great, and that our Lord is above all gods. Whosoever the Lord pleased that He did in heaven and in the earth, in the seas and in all deep places." (Psa. xxxvi:5, 6). That to the Calvinist is the last word to all the questions of science, philosophy and religion.

—(The Australian Free Presbyterian).
friendship which ended in a quarrel, as the first quarrel had ended in a friendship. The Meeting of Frederick, the Prussian and Voltaire, the Frenchman, in the midwinter of 18th century scepticism and secularism is a sort of spiritual marriage which brought forth the modern world. These two great sceptics met on the basis that there is no God; on this basis they agreed; on this basis they disagreed. The quarrel ended by launching two European forces against each other, both rooted in the same unbelief. Voltaire in effect said, “I will show you that the sneers of a sceptic can produce a Revolution and a Republic and everywhere the overthrowing of thrones.” And Frederick answered, “And I will show you that this same sneering scepticism can be used as easily to resist Reform, let alone Revolu­tion; that scepticism can be the basis of support for the most tyrannical of thrones, of the bare, brute domination of a master over his slave. The forces of despotism and liberalism have been sundered by well nigh two centuries of warfare, but when confronted by the living God, as Pilate and Herod were 11 centuries ago, they are revealed not as enemies, but allies.

The philosophy of the so-called Enlightenment of the 18th century, man is the measure of things, came to political expres­sion in the French Revolution. This movement “ignores God. It opposes God. It refuses to recognise a deeper ground of political life than that which is found in nature; that is, in this instance, in man himself. The sovereign God is dethroned and sover­eignty is placed on the vacant seat. It is the will of man that determines all things. All power, all authority proceeds from man. Thus one comes from the individual man to the many men, and in those many men conceived as the people there is thus hidden the deepest fountain of all sover­eignty, It is a sovereignty of the people, therefore, which is perfectly identical with atheism.” (Kuyper.) The French Revolution shouted “Liberty, Fraternity, Equality,” oblivious to the glaring fact that in themselves men are most unequal. Inspired from this source, “The nineteenth century took away the religious idea and left a sense that rapidly turned to non­sense ... the vague Liberals of the nineteenth century cut away the divine ground from under democracy, and democracy was left to fall by itself. Jefferson said that men were given equal rights by their Creator. Ingersoll said they had no Creator, but had received equal right from nowhere.” (Cheston­ter.)

Today, God’s judgments are abroad upon the earth. The idol of a false democracy, built upon man, embodied in the French Republic, has fallen.

Geneva is the true home of the liberties of the modern world. Freedom in the state owes most to those who stood for freedom from the state; to those churches of the Reformation whose first concern was to obey God rather than man. “Mo­ dern democracy owes itself to Calvin.” Beyond history it arose in the theology of the decrees of God. The soul’s certainty of its direct predestination—that was what both created and con­trolled the personalism which has been the mainspring of modern democracy.” (Forsyth.) In the sovereignty of God lies the freedom of man. This dogma poured iron into the breast of Huguenots, the Protestants, the Rhineland and Swiss laborers, the beggars of the flooded meadows of Holland, the Waldensians of the snow-clad Alps, the Covenanters of the misty moors of Scotland, the Puritans of the cities of Old and the backwoods of New England—these all bear witness. In the revolutions of Holland, Britain and America, as contrasted with that of France, the knee is bowed to God while over against man the head is proudly lifted up. These were undertaken with praying lips and with trust in the help of God. The democracy of earth must be rooted in the sovereignty of heaven. As com­plementary to the truth that believers are equal in the Church as bought by Christ, men are equal in the world as wrought by God. This latter conviction, latent in the Reformation, came to clear expression in the Declaration of Independence, when the Americans asserted they acted “as endow by the Creator with certain inalienable rights.”

Today democracy is on trial. The false cannot but be over­thrown. Is our democracy the genuine article which is based upon the living God?

The Reformed Faith contends that all departments of life must be subjected to the sovereignty of God. William Vilant was one of those indulged ministers who retained his ease by submitting to Stuart tyranny and misrule in Church and State. Having heard on one occasion of the patient and cheerful endur­ance of the ejected minister, Donald Cargill, he asked a trifle petulantly, “What needs all this ado? We will get heaven, and they will get no more.” But when the retort was repeated to the man of whom it had been uttered, he replied—and the reply is singularly noble: “Yes, we will get more; we will get God glorified on earth, which is more than heaven.”

Melbourne, Australia.

ROBERT SWANTON.

From the Northwest

The previous letter to The Calvin Forum started with the slogan of Rudyard Kipling:

“Oh, East is East and West is West and never the twain shall meet.”

Recent world war developments lead this time to complete the quotation with the perhaps less hackneyed immediately follow­ing four lines:

“Till Earth and Sky stand presently at God’s great Judgment Seat; But there is neither East nor West, Border, nor Breed, nor Birth, When two strong men stand face to face, Though they come from the ends of the earth.”

The unpleasant fact that there were two strong men had evi­dently not been realized generally and the Northwest is increas­ing feelingly very close to God’s great Judgment Seat since the clarion call to war sounded, and Earth and Sky and Sea have met or are about to meet in a deadly embrace. All along the west coast of the North American continent millions stand in breathless awe awaiting the stroke to strike.

With the present means of locomotion distances and geograph­i­cal notions have depreciated in meaning: the points of the compass are spinning madly,—the wind bloweth him wherever the pilot listeth, and the Northwest indeed heareth the sound of the ocean stand sentry. The lines of demarcation drawn by Border, Breed and Birth (in more modern alliteration: Blut und Boden) may be wiped out any day, when two strong men stand face to face, as they come from the ends of the earth.

* * * * *

When this letter in cold print reaches the readers scattered over the globe, they will be able to check the reaction of the Northwest as voiced by an obscure representative of its teem­ing and trembling millions, at a time when in a month more history is made than formerly in many years.

It would seem that people in the states and provinces along the Pacific coast become less sure of themselves and of their institutions; they recognize the emptiness of frills and catch­phrases and get back to first things, if only from fear they may come out of the war a poor second. Perhaps more than elsewhere the cords of death hold people in despair, and pangs of hell, like waves by tempest driven, roll o’er their souls, by grief and sorrow riven, they turn in their distress to God in prayer.

Public calls to prayer were issued to their subjects by Queen Wilhelmina of the Netherlands, by President Roosevelt of the United States, and by King George of Great Britain. Petitions from Churches to municipal authorities for the same purpose were compiled in certain localities, and signed profusely. Church
tions of wider social scope and of deeper ethical incision than
ening intensive consciousness they reduce extensive hunting
on amelioration of social and moral conditions from nobler
dignitaries, as the Roman Catholic Archbishop of British Colum­
bia, Canada, and other Church leaders point in sermons, ex­
tensive extracts of which were verbally cited in the public
press, to national sins as drunkenness and immorality. News­
papers in leading articles and letters to the editors most ques­
tions of social and moral conditions from nobler motives than mere self-preservation.

* * * * * * *

War conditions combat complacency and inertia, and by deep­
ening intense consciousness they reduce extensive hunting
after pleasure, but incidentally they also interfere with church
activities and religious life.

Blackouts on the coast have caused church services to be
either suspended or changed as to time and place of meeting.
Attendance at major church assemblies meeting across the line
between the States and Canada has been rendered difficult or
impossible. For many years the boundary was an imaginary
line: traffic across was as easy as crossing the threshold of a
well-disposed neighbor. For the present, for very sound and
valid reasons, the authorities had to tighten up existing regu­
lations. Who will say them nay? Yet, awkward situations arise
now and then.

Around the Book Table

TWO NEW TESTAMENT BOOKS

A HARMONY OF THE GOSPELS. By Adam Fahling. Zondervan

ANY harmonies of the Gospels have been written.
Here is one more attempt. It is based on the King
James Version. The American Standard (or Revised)
Version is, of course, far more accurate. Viewed from this as­
pect we prefer A. R. Robertson's Harmony of the Gospels. Rev.
Fahling's work has, however, one feature which is commendable:
a distinctive type has been employed for each Gospel. We con­
sider this feature a great improvement on other Harmonies.
The arrangement of the material as here presented does not
differ widely from that which is found in similar
Harmonies. The American Standard Version is, of course, far more accurate. Viewed from this as­
pect we prefer A. R. Robertson's Harmony of the Gospels. Rev.
Fahling's work has, however, one feature which is commendable:
M

The arrangement of the material as here presented does not
differ widely from that which is found in similar
Harmonies. The American Standard Version is, of course, far more accurate. Viewed from this as­
pect we prefer A. R. Robertson's Harmony of the Gospels. Rev.
Fahling's work has, however, one feature which is commendable:

THE HEART OF THE NEW TESTAMENT. By John B. Champion.

The author of this book is Professor of Christian Doctrine
in the Eastern Baptist Theological Seminary at Phila­
delphia, Pa. He is commemorating his fiftieth year in the
ministry. The book discusses the meaning of Redemption.
Among the chapter-headings are the following: Companion
Terms with Redemption, The Personal Viewpoint in Redemp­
tion, The Blood's Function in Redemption, Current Interpreta­
tions of the Cross, etc.

The author denies the penal theory of the atonement. He tells
us that this view abolishes the unity of the Trinity, p. 34. In
his opinion "atonement" belongs to the old covenant, redemption
to the new, p. 41. And even in the O. T. "atonement" is "merely
a figure for forgiveness." He seems to hold that the wrath of
God because of our sins never rested on the Son. The cry from the
cross, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" is
interpreted as indicating merely a "physical forsaking," the
withdrawing of the Father from the life of Christ's body, p. 164.
Several pages are devoted to a refutation of the idea that
Jesus died the "spiritual" death. In our opinion these pages
were hardly necessary. The author's conclusion seems to be
that our Lord merely died a physical death, a conclusion with
which we do not agree at all.

The Classis Pacific of the Christian Reformed Church, com­
prising congregations in Canada and the U. S., met early in
March at Oak Harbor, Wash., but our Canadian delegates were
prevented from attending, owing to changed passport regu­
lations.

Sympathizers with the cause of Calvinism, anxious to attend
the impending Calvinistic Conference at Grand Rapids, Michi­
gan, next June, complain of official immigration mills at Wash­
ton, D. C., grinding slowly.

This vigilant department has delved into ancient history and
has discovered that in not a few cases foreign-born wives of
American citizens, now established in Canada, had omitted for
scores of years to take out naturalization papers in the States
with unpleasant consequences for their so far happy married
lives with ministers of the Word and Sacraments, should they
fail to return to the States within an uncomfortably short lapse
of time.

War eats deeper into the issues and tissues of national and
domestic life than peaceful citizens ever thought possible, and
it is the comparatively innocent ones that often suffer most.

May it all lead, even more fervently than ever before, to
invoke the healing powers beneath the wings of the Heavenly
Dove, which alone is able and willing to whisper peace within.

Vancouver, B. C., Canada.
Dr. G. Besselaar.
March 20th, 1942.

Dr. G. Besselaar.

THE HEART OF THE NEW TESTAMENT. By John B. Champion.

The author of this book is Professor of Christian Doctrine
in the Eastern Baptist Theological Seminary at Phila­
delphia, Pa. He is commemorating his fiftieth year in the
ministry. The book discusses the meaning of Redemption.
Among the chapter-headings are the following: Companion
Terms with Redemption, The Personal Viewpoint in Redemp­
tion, The Blood's Function in Redemption, Current Interpreta­
tions of the Cross, etc.

The author denies the penal theory of the atonement. He tells
us that this view abolishes the unity of the Trinity, p. 34. In
his opinion "atonement" belongs to the old covenant, redemption
to the new, p. 41. And even in the O. T. "atonement" is "merely
a figure for forgiveness." He seems to hold that the wrath of
God because of our sins never rested on the Son. The cry from the
cross, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" is
interpreted as indicating merely a "physical forsaking," the
withdrawing of the Father from the life of Christ's body, p. 164.
Several pages are devoted to a refutation of the idea that
Jesus died the "spiritual" death. In our opinion these pages
were hardly necessary. The author's conclusion seems to be
that our Lord merely died a physical death, a conclusion with
which we do not agree at all.

We are convinced that the author has failed to prove his
point. The view that Christ took upon himself the punishment of
our sins is very clearly taught in Scripture: both Old and
New Testament. The author's attempt to overthrow this clear
teaching is a dismal failure. His style, moreover, is not always
clear. Some of the sentences are too involved.

In this connection, we wish to fix the attention of the readers
on a book which really answers the fundamental
questions regarding the nature of the work of redemption. It is Prof. L.
Berkhof's little volume (only 184 pages) Vicarious Atonement
Through Christ, published by the Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing
Co., Grand Rapids, Mich. We are of the opinion that Dr. Cham­
pion has not read this book. Otherwise, he would not have
written as he did.

William Hendriksen.

ACTS OF THE APOSTLES

The Acts of the Apostles, by Frank E. Allen (Christopher
Publishing House, Boston) is a fine practical commentary on
this important book of the Bible. It is a book of over 800 pages
and is written for the common man, the average Bible student
and not for the scholar. No Greek is found on its pages, though
the author has, of course, carefully studied the original. This
commentary reminds the reviewer of the type of commentary
that the Dutch minister J. Van Andel used to write. Sound in
its theology and in its view of the Word of God; utilizing
the means of Scripture study for practical ends; making the Word
of God live and speak for itself. There are many fine practical
illustrations and applications throughout this commentary. Yet,
at no time is the exposition of the Word sacrificed to homi­
etical illustrations. This is a commentary I should like to see
in the hands of the average church member who makes a study
for himself, or as a leader or member of some society, of this
great missionary book of Scripture. The author is a Reformed
Presbyterian minister at Hopkinton, Iowa. The book sold origi­
nally for $3.50 but may now be had by ordering it from the
author for the special price of $2.50. Address: Rev. Frank E.
Allen, Hopkinton, Iowa.

C. B.
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