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The Democratic Method and the Christian School
A Discussion

WHEN Mr. Cornelius Bontekoe of the faculty of the Eastern Christian Academy, Paterson, N. J., published his article "The Democratic Method in the Christian School" (THE CALVIN FORUM, Feb. 1942), he initiated a discussion on principles and methods for Christian education which can prove to be of great benefit for all lovers of the cause. Our appreciation at this point is no expression of either agreement or disagreement—it is emphatically an expression of appreciation for his readiness to submit the ideas which he had formulated on the basis of his teaching experience about the need for a more satisfying methodology in the class room of the Christian School.

For that very same reason we are equally appreciative of the frank and clear way in which the Rev. Mr. Nicholas Monsma has given expression to his convictions on this score and has formulated some serious misgivings about the plea of Mr. Bontekoe. (THE CALVIN FORUM, May, 1942) Mr. Bontekoe's reply in the same issue may have cleared up some of the passages appearing in his earlier article, but we feel certain that both he and the Rev. Mr. Monsma are convinced the subject which has been touched upon in this trio of articles is deserving of further discussion being of far-reaching importance for the cause of Christian School instruction, as well as Christian Education in general. With this in mind we then asked Dr. Jaarsma of the State Teachers College at Slippery Rock, Pa., for an article on the subject (see THE CALVIN FORUM, June-July issue) and have since invited a number of educators connected with the Christian School system in our country to formulate their reaction to the fundamental issue raised by Mr. Bontekoe and to give our readers in this way the benefit of their study and school room experience.

We are happy herewith to submit no less than five such contributions. We believe this opens up a good many angles of Christian School philosophy and methodology which can not but be fruitful for everyone concerned. The open and frank discussion of the deeper issues involved in the cause of Christian education is a crying need of our day. Christian education must be truly Christian and grounded in the distinctly Christian principles and objectives that determine the entire teaching and learning process. In so doing Christian educators should be thoroughly abreast of their times and should at no time mistake mere traditionalism for sound Christian principle or method.

For some years there has been going on a great experiment in Christian school education in our country. It is more than an experiment—it is the embodiment of a living conviction on the part not only of Christian educators but of Christian parents, pastors, and church leaders as well. We refer to the Christian School movement in the United States, a movement which has founded scores of schools, both of the primary and of high school grade, in which the God-centered world and life view of Christianity is the basis, the heart, and the driving power of the entire curriculum and in which the Christian convictions and the Christian personality of the teachers are considered a prime requisite for effective teaching and pupil guidance. The National Union of Christian Schools, in which this movement heads up, the various Christian Principals' Clubs and Christian Teachers' Conventions, and the Christian Home and School Magazine are a few of the agencies which seek to promote the development and expansion of this great cause.

In the face of the present-day situation in the educational world two things are sorely needed. The first is to make ceaseless propaganda looking to expansion of the movement and the winning of those who are groping around for a satisfactory solution of the educational problem. We are convinced—and the Christian School movement is the tangible expression of that conviction—that no solution can be had for the problem of "religious education" except in a system of schools in which God is recognized as first and last and in which a positively Christian philosophy of man, of the child, and of the educational aim and objective is honored and put into practice.

But there is equally great need of another—constructive—attack of the Christian educational problem on the part of proponents of the Christian School movement. They must turn the gaze inward. They must become self-critical in the best sense of the word. The Christian principles of education of which the Christian School movement is the concrete embodiment must be recognized not as so much dead capital but as living realities. And as such they must live in the consciousness of all who are Christian educators. If they do not live and grow and lay hold of the souls of men, they will deteriorate, fossilize, petrify. There is great need
of frank and open discussion of the principles and methods that should control the Christian School teacher and should be embodied in the curriculum and the teaching activity. Silence on this score is not wholesome. Discussion will help clarify our ideas. It will challenge us all to listen to others. It will bring out the dross and the gold in the crucible of thought and evaluation. The Calvin Forum believes wholeheartedly in such discussion. This month we gladly set aside our editorial columns to the presentation of five different views on the subject under discussion. We thank the contributors and hope that others will make their voices heard in what may prove to be one of the most valuable discussions that has yet appeared on the pages of our journal.

C. B.

Mr. C. Zijlstra
Principal William Street Christian School
Kalamazoo, Michigan

I am pleased to avail myself of this opportunity to express my hearty accord with the change of emphasis suggested by Mr. Bontekoe's article, "The Democratic Method in the Christian Schools," which appeared in the February issue of The Calvin Forum. There is certainly no place for a spirit of autocracy in our Christian Schools.

Misunderstanding of the import of the democratic method, as evidenced by the reaction of the Rev. Monsma, might have been prevented by a more careful definition of terms. I believe that we may assume agreement upon the definition that democracy is that system in which the rights of the individual are respected. If we accept this definition, it follows that we agree that the democratic method in education is that educational procedure in which the integrity of the individual is recognized.

A bit of ambiguity is introduced into Bontekoe's article when he states "The issue before us then is the introduction of more democracy into our schools as an improved method of teaching. However, this does not mean that we should consider introducing more, if any democratic philosophy (a modern expression which is found, e.g., in John Dewey) which is humanistic and anti-Christian." To adopt a methodology without an accompanying modification in philosophy is an impossibility if we are to be consistent. Besides, it is extremely dangerous to adopt a practice if we do not recognize it as a natural consequence of our philosophy. Methodology should be a reflection of a philosophy.

But why, after all, fear either a democratic method or a democratic philosophy if democracy is nothing more than a system in which the integrity and worth of the individual are recognized? Do not we already have such a system? Is not Christianity just that? Let us note a few democratic sentiments in Scripture: "And God said, Let us make man in our own image"; and: "What is man, that Thou art mindful of him? . . . For Thou hast made him a little lower than God." Isn't Ephesians 6 a clear commentary on the rights of individuals: "Children, obey your parents in the Lord" and "... fathers, provoke not your children to wrath"; "Servants, be obedient to them that are your masters according to the flesh" and "masters, do the same things unto them, forbearing threatening." In fact, does not Scripture abound with references to the rights of individuals. If, then, we fear the term "democracy," why not just say that we have a Christian philosophy, for it is the most consistently democratic system of thought of all ages, and Christianity in action is the democratic system.

Of course we must reject emphatically the anti-Christian systems of thought advanced by such radicals as John Dewey. But I, for one, am unwilling to recognize them as the democratic philosophy. What these proponents of the so-called "democratic philosophy and practice" forget is that every system must operate within certain divinely established bounds. Dr. Jaarsma has rightly pointed out that even these men grasp for guiding principles but fail to recognize the only infallible objective rule, God's special revelation—the Bible. Any "democratic method" which fails to recognize divinely established norms is as sure to fail as did the "authoritarian method" which made the same error.

In conclusion let me repeat that I am in hearty agreement with the intent of Mr. Bontekoe's article to recognize the rights of the child in the school and of the teacher under supervision. I regret that space limits prevent my touching upon the Rev. Monsma's reaction and Jaarsma's logical and lucid exposition of the democratic method.

Mr. Mark Fakkema
General Secretary National Union of Christian Schools
Chicago, Illinois

Educational thought—especially in America—is dominated by John Dewey. The terms, "democracy" and "democratic" are key words in Dewey's educational philosophy.

By way of explaining "democracy" Dewey makes the following statement: "Democracy is more than a form of government; it is primarily a mode of associated living, of conjoint communicated experiences." Dewey's "democracy" is a new social order—a new way of life—which has not as yet been realized. He looks to the schools for the realization of his new order. Says Dewey, "Education must operate in view of a deliberately preferred order."

The "democratic method" is the kind of education which is proposed by Dewey to usher in his democratic ideal.

It is noteworthy that Dewey's democratic ideal is not only opposed to the present social order but it
is also anti-Christian. In presenting Dewey's position Dr. R. L. Cooke, in his splendid book entitled Philosophy, Education, and Certainty, quotes the following passage from Dewey's book, A Common Faith, page 84: "Historic Christianity has been committed to a separation of sheep and goats; the saved and the lost; the elect and the mass." Commenting on this fact Dewey continues, "I cannot understand how any realization of the democratic ideal as a vital, moral and spiritual ideal in human affairs is possible without surrender of the conception of the basic division to which super-natural Christianity is committed."

Granted that Dewey's democratic ideal is anti-Christian, could we not use certain aspects of his democratic method which he would employ to realize his admittedly anti-Christian democratic ideal?

It is plain that we cannot use his methodology for the purpose which he has in mind. But can we not employ some of his methods to attain our own ideal of life in a democracy?

This question offers a challenge to a number of our teachers. Should we encourage them to accept this challenge?

In considering this question we would begin by making three observations:

1. The Christian school has a distinct Christian objective. To reach this objective it employs a distinct Christian methodology. Its objective is God-centered; so also are the means which are employed to reach this objective. (According to Scripture "all things," and this includes methods as well as objectives, are of God, through Him, and unto Him.)

2. All truly good features found in anti-Christian thought are essentially foreign to the thought pattern which contain them. The "good" of Christian thought is not borrowed from anti-Christian thought, but the "good" of anti-Christian thought is borrowed from Christian thought. All true good is in God and in Him alone. In other words, a developed Christian school methodology includes in its proper Christian setting all the good which we may find in the methodology of worldly institutions.

3. For us Christian teachers to be inclined to adopt what we consider to be "good features" in an anti-Christian educational program is to confess that we lack a fully developed Christian methodology.

Instead of encouraging our teachers to go a-gleaning in foreign fields, I would rather encourage them to cultivate their own pedagogical field so that in course of time a Christian theistic educational philosophy may be developed which will embrace the coveted features of anti-theistic thought. After all, why live off of our neighbor's victory garden when we can have one of our own?

It is possible that certain aspects of the field of Christian methodology have gone to seed. If so, let us adopt the necessary corrective measures. Imperfections in our own garden are all the more reason for us to stay at home and set our own house in order.

But this is not all: The separate and distinct people of God in the days of old were prone to marry the daughters of the Canaanites, who were committed to the service of foreign gods. This had disastrous results for the people of God as far as their separateness and distinctiveness was concerned. If we as a separate and distinct school movement adopt methods which were designed to serve ends foreign to our purpose, our separate and distinct school movement is likely to experience similar disastrous results.

What the people of God of today need is more faith in God and more faith in the institutions that are based upon His infallible Word—not more faith in Egypt and the horsemen thereof.

What the people of God of today need is a clearer vision of the glory of God which distinguishes them from the world—not a greater appreciation for idols which would tend to unite them with the world.

What the people of God of today need is such a vision of the glory of the institutions that separate them from the world that they are willing to do as much for the perpetuation of their Christian institutions as the political world is willing to do for the perpetuation of its institutions—establish and maintain an educational system. Unless our separate and distinct life is transmitted by a separate and distinct daily preparation for life, we will jeopardize both the Christian institutions and the faith in God which we above all hold dear.

Mr. Henry Kuiper
Principal Sheboygan Christian School
Sheboygan, Wisconsin

I gladly consent to give my reactions to "The Democratic Method in the Christian School."

It was extremely difficult, I would say impossible, for me to appraise the article as a whole. This baffled me. I finally concluded that my difficulty arose from the fact that the author in contrasting the authoritarian with the democratic method of teaching is contrasting two methods which are not absolute opposites, as he implies.

Jaarsma, in his excellent article, "Democracy, Authoritarianism and Christian Education," says as much when he states, "It is a mistake to contrast the authoritarian and the democratic method. The democratic process is not free from authority, of the kind that appeals to basic loyalties and norms. Not even Dewey escapes an absolute when he makes the scientific method the clearing house for all controversial issues."
The word "anarchial" rather than "democratic" is the opposite of "authoritarian" and "dictatorial" would probably pass as the opposite of "democratic."

In passing I would suggest being wary of appropriating labels pinned on us by those who are unappreciative of and even hostile to our conception of education.

As to my reactions, the author scouts the idea that the teacher in the Christian school should insist on absolute obedience. I can well understand that a teacher in a school system which does not recognize the law of God as an absolute standard of conduct would hesitate to insist on absolute obedience. Any other standard is relative, subject to change, imperfect and man-made. But how can a Christian teacher do otherwise than submit himself to and insist that his pupils submit to the will of God, which is never arbitrary but eternally the same, and in perfect agreement with man's deepest needs? Obedience to be worthy of the name must be absolute.

I can well see how the lofty conception of absolute obedience may be abused. It may be abused if the teacher insists upon absolute obedience on the part of the pupils and has not accepted it as a standard for his own life. It is abused if the teacher insists upon absolute obedience in his own right and for himself instead of for God. Pupils should be conscious that the teacher regards himself as a steward.

We certainly agree when the author says that self-discipline cannot be gained by repressive measures. The inevitable result of repression in the classroom is reprehensible expression outside of the classroom. Discipline should be natural, and the teacher that is natural in the classroom will get the best results judged by a legitimate standard which is not perfect silence.

The author makes a plea for patience in teaching discipline and rightly so. One thing that makes discipline a problem for the child is that the standards in the home are often at variance with the standards in the school and the standards of one teacher differ from those of another.

A mother does not become impatient with an infant learning to walk, may he fall ever so often. A teacher has patience with a child learning how to read. Why should we be overcritical of a child who is learning the far more difficult task of self-discipline and expect perfect mastery without repeated errors as he learns?

I do not find myself in agreement with the author when he says teaching should be child-centered rather than subject-centered. He speaks of the subject matter as though it is unimportant. Nine-tenths of what the child learns at school he forgets, he contends, and too much time is devoted to memorizing.

I can understand that relativists place little value on subject-matter. What is considered true today may no longer be true tomorrow. Then why give it much attention.

The Christian school has a teaching content of eternal truth in Scripture. Knowledge of the truth is what makes life significant. Consequently the Christian school places great emphasis on subject-matter. Assimilated knowledge becomes part of the child.

By the same token the Christian school does not shy at memorizing. It realizes that it has a teaching content which is eminently worth retaining.

Besides, childhood is the best time to memorize; the mind is retentive and the child is not overburdened with other tasks.

The sharp criticism directed recently at the schools of the nation by the army schools was based on the fact that students had forgotten the fundamentals. The fact remains that the best way to retain the fundamentals is by memorizing essentials.

Neither am I altogether certain that nothing should be taught except what can be linked up with childhood experience. I would be the last to deny the child his childhood. Infancy, childhood, adolescence, and adulthood are not divided into separate compartments. Life is one. Isn't it important to give the child a vision of life as a whole? One of the greatest satisfactions of my teaching experience has been when former pupils came to me many years after they had graduated to tell me they had found present use for something they had learned in school.

One of the most telling points of Bontekoe's article to my mind is the last one in which he pleads for participation of the entire faculty in curriculum building. Faculty control of instruction should make the teacher more fully conscious of contributing to the advancement of a great cause.

In conclusion, Bontekoe has made a strong plea for the democratic method of teaching in the Christian school. On the basis of common grace I believe that the Christian school may and should appropriate ideas which will promote the cause wherever we find them. After thoughtfully reading Bontekoe's article I do not believe that, whatever its merits may be, adopting it lock, stock and barrel, would not give our schools all the benefits Bontekoe promises.
the democratic method to produce a higher percentage of good or unusual teachers. Education does not necessarily fluctuate according to patterns apparently implied in its methodology. The "authoritarian" method may produce some very democratic individuals and the "democratic" method can produce tyrannical men. Our Calvinistic authoritarianism in its present Christian day school has produced the most democratically organized school system in America.

As educators we may not just explain these paradoxes away. Neither should we assume the attitude of the eighty-one year old geometry instructor who wrote on a form requesting information as to his professional qualifications, "Thank God, no education courses." We should do as Jaarsma does in his eclectic article in the June-July issue and try to pick out the good and the bad in all systems of educational thought. Yet to me the logical conclusion of these paradoxes is that it is not the teacher that makes the learning experience; it is not the method of teaching that makes the learning experience; it is not the student that makes the learning experience; nor is it anything else in the environment or in heredity that makes the learning experience; but rather it is the combination of all these factors that creates one unique learning experience. It seems to me that in the willingness to accept this conclusion, in the readiness to face its implications and meet its responsibilities, we find the contribution of the progressive school.

This means that in a class of thirty pupils we have thirty unique learning experiences going on. While these learning experiences may be similar in content they can also be poles apart. To assume then that in teaching certain subject matter most of the pupils are having positive learning experiences is mere wishful thinking or plain ignorance. John Dewey puts it this way: "The trouble with traditional education was that it emphasized the external conditions that enter into control of the experiences, but that it paid so little attention to the factors which also decide what kind of experience is had." (Experience and Education, p. 39).

It is to be admitted that this view complicates educational methods exceedingly. It will mean more, not less, education courses for teachers. Yet it is a realistic and responsible position to take. The progressive school tries to meet this responsibility not only, but recognizes also that the task of education is again complicated and extended over what it was in the past by the demands of universal education and the complexity of modern society. This has far-reaching implications for many of the things previously mentioned in Bontekoe's contribution, as e.g., curriculum development, evaluation of the learning process, administration of school plant and teaching personnel, length of school term, etc. The progressive does not therefore take comfort from the fact that pupils learn regardless of controversy and adverse conditions, but rather points to what they are learning and to the thousands schools have failed to educate.

Will the "democratic" method as the progressives conceive it, succeed in achieving its goals? I think not. Any method based on faith in the complete efficacy of education is doomed to fail. Religion is a necessary and vital factor in completing any educational picture. Proponents of the progressive schools recognize this and are ready to make provisions for religion in their curricula. But they have no room for the absolute God of the Bible. Their very philosophy of education excludes Him. We must therefore remember that our Christian philosophy of education puts different content in educational terminology—essentially their meanings are in conflict. Try harmonizing your Christian concept of "environment" or "free and open mind" with the concept that these same terms bring to the mind of the progressives.

This all points, it seems to me, to the imperative need of organizing our own principles of education with its concomitant methodology. Here is a task that probably ought to be financed and directed by our National Union of Christian Schools.

Mr. John A. Van Bruggen
Principal Oakdale Christian School
Grand Rapids, Michigan

In reading the articles of Mr. Bontekoe and the Rev. Mr. Monsma one wonders whether the apparent disagreement is not due to a confusion in the meanings attached to certain terms.

Mr. Bontekoe denounces the authoritarian method as being all wrong and leading to disastrous results. Rev. Monsma rightly objects that the teaching of authority is not bad, that there should be a place for authority in Christian education, and that genuine Christian teaching will lead to a respect for authority.

But to Mr. Bontekoe the authoritarian method seems to be synonymous with the teaching of mere facts and the resultant stifling of personality. While poor teaching of the "pouring in of facts" type is frequently justified by its proponents as being in harmony with the doctrine of authority, this does not necessarily make it so. Even authority, if it is to be meaningful and appreciated, must be understood and not learned as a mere fact.

Mr. Bontekoe's quarrel then is not with the teaching of authority but with the colorless and stifling fact-teaching so often engaged in by unenthusiastic and "matter-of-fact" teachers. In this quarrel he does not stand alone but has the support of a host of Christian teachers and ministers who want more than historical faith and dead orthodoxy, the inevitable results of teaching that emphasizes only facts.
Again, Mr. Bontekoe leaves his readers with the impression that the democratic method means having the pupils discover truths and draw conclusions for themselves. Very likely that is the reason for Rev. Monsma’s assertion that such teaching “assumes a great deal too much with the pupil. It assumes that the pupil has the ability to discover the truth not only, but also the inclination and the willingness.”

The numerous statements made by Mr. Bontekoe to show his aversion to the humanistic conception of the child present clear evidence that his democratic method does not mean setting up the child as the final authority. Perhaps he should have referred to his democratic method as teaching by means of pupil experiences. He wants life’s relationships experienced in the school. The child is to learn by doing. The classroom must be changed “from a reciting ordeal into a laboratory where the teacher guides the student in learning how to think and work.” In this contention he has the findings of psychology on his side.

If the present writer is correct in his interpretation of Mr. Bontekoe’s article (and he apologizes if by this writing he does violence to the original thesis), then the discussion of the relative merits of the inductive and deductive methods of teaching is somewhat beside the point. As Dr. Jaarsma very ably points out, it would be more correct to speak of the psychological vs. the logical approach.

The two extremes must be avoided. They have already been referred to by Brederveld in his discussion of Bavinck’s Pedagogical Principles. On the one hand, “maintaining the principle of authority does not imply that every truth is to be forced upon the child, that he believe everything purely on authority, and that he may never attempt to see things for himself, to investigate and to evaluate them.” On the other hand, “the problem may never be disposed of by a rigid attitude that everything the child is to accept must first have his approval through self-seeing, self-investigation, and self-evaluation.” We fear that the former of the two is more frequently indulged in than the latter.

To the charge that one method is wrong and the other correct, Brederveld would answer: “After all, in how far the teacher shall impart knowledge or have the pupil find it is merely a question of teaching technique. . . . Again it makes very little difference whether we label the child’s own investigations self-activity or a modified form of a teacher’s way of imparting knowledge.” The particular method to be employed will undoubtedly be dictated by the response of the individual child, the age of the child, or the subject matter that is taught.

The best safeguard against extreme indulgence in one method or the other is to return to our basic aim of education so beautifully stated by Bavinck: “That the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works.” Then teachers will look upon the child as a growing organism that must be developed in accordance with God’s plan. That will help to avoid a consideration of subject matter as the end of education or a conception of the child as an end in himself.

---

**Peculiar Patriotism**

Our country calls to the colors.  
It is blasted from east and from west:  
This land so luxury-laden,  
This land that we love best.

Our country calls to the colors  
The strong, the brave, the true.  
There are some who love their country,  
And some who say they do.

Our country calls to the colors;  
And brave ones battle and die.  
And the country keeps a’calling.  
Soon t’will be you and I.

And while this country is calling,  
And the foe is gaining each day,  
And liberty is in peril,  
And bondage coming this way,

There are hundreds and hundreds  
Of a strange and yellow herd,  
Who are trying and trying and trying  
And trying to be... DEFERRED!!

—Albert Piersma.
General Revelation and The Holy Spirit

Peter G. Berkhout
Practicing Physician
Paterson, New Jersey

There are several reasons why a discussion of this subject is highly necessary. The evaluation of General Revelation and its relation to Special Revelation, together with the general work of the Holy Spirit, have always been problems that faced Christians. That was true in the early Christian church. That evaluation of General Revelation again became a problem at the time of the Renaissance and the Reformation. But it is also an acute problem today. There are more and more of our young people that are moving and working in spheres that do not belong to that of Special Revelation. We are thinking of those who devote themselves to politics, political science, economics, the various natural sciences, medicine, law, business, music, art, literature, etc. How must these people view General Revelation? What relation does it have to Special Revelation? For two thousand years thinking Christians have pondered on these and related problems. Do not expect of us to settle these problems in a brief discussion.

What Is General Revelation?

Let us first see what is included in General Revelation. We may say that it includes all that God has revealed to men outside of Special Revelation: that which God shows us about himself, the beautiful arguments for the existence of God, natural law, the revelation of God in history and in the experiences of the human race, in art, science, and even in philosophy and religion. In short, all that is good and true and beautiful, and is not contained as such in the Scriptures, is the General Revelation of God.

As far as the arguments for the existence of God are concerned there are Christians that have very little use for them, especially since they have been attacked as proofs by Hume and Kant and found wanting. However, let us not forget that as arguments they are of great, if not of inestimable, value. As far as the unbelievers are concerned they are so important that they will render them without excuse. “For the invisible things of him since the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even his eternal power and Godhead; so that they are without excuse.” For the Christian’s salvation they may be of little value in themselves, but, after regeneration, they become like zeroes following figure one.

And let us not forget that even for Hume and Kant they had great value. Just after Hume had overthrown the proof for the existence of God from the argument of design he seemed to think that his argumentation was but cavil and sophistry. He says, “Consider, anatomize the eye; survey its structure and contrivance; and tell me, from your own feeling, if the idea of a contriver does not immediately flow in upon you with the force like that of a sensation.” And as far as Kant is concerned, he may have cast the proofs out through pure reason but his practical reason took them in again as arguments through the backdoor. For, upon the statue of Kant we find these significant words of his: “Two things fill the mind with ever new and increasing admiration and awe, the oftener and the more steadily we reflect upon them, the starry heavens above and the moral law within.” Here Kant points really to the revelation of God in nature and the testimony of the Holy Spirit within us. And if thinkers like Hume and Kant, as well as Scripture, consider the arguments so significant, do not let us minimize them.

Natural Law and General Revelation

There are many Christians who think that General Revelation consists of nothing else than what we have described thus far. However, there is much more included in it. The next important aspect which we wish to emphasize is that of natural law. This term is used in contradistinction from divine law as found in Scripture. Grotius was one of the great exponents of natural law. He calls it “the dictate of right reason.” The locus classicus in Scripture for natural law is Romans 2:14—“For when Gentiles that have not the law do by nature the things of the law, these not having the law, are the law unto themselves.” It would be interesting here to compare the categorical imperative and the autonomous morality of Kant with natural law. The Greek New Testament uses here the very words auto-nomos. It has been said that Grotius was the scientific founder of the school of natural law. For two centuries, the seventeenth and the eighteenth, natural law was emphasized, and it culminated in such significant movements as the declaration of the natural rights of man.

From this we are apt to conclude at once that the idea of natural law was emphasized too much and that people went to extremes. But is it not also
possible that our forbears in their antagonism went to the opposite extreme? Dr. Hepp says in his Testamentium Spiritus Sancti: “The struggle during the 19th century about the great problems of theology have had at least this beneficial result, that our eyes have been opened regarding the manifold one-sidedness of the views of our fore-fathers.” Is this not also true in regard to natural law?

August Lang, in Calvin and the Reformation, has an interesting chapter on “The Reformation and Natural Law.” In that chapter he discusses how it was possible that natural law could “spring up on the ground of the Reformation, take such deep root and put forth such wide-spreading branches.” The thrust of his argument is that Calvinism, it is true, stimulated man’s liveliest activities in every field, but it did not give a clear-cut exposition of how the Christians had to adjust themselves in this world in which there still may be found so much that is good, even among the unbelievers. The best explanation they could find was that of natural law. Particularly Melanchton with his communissimas formas, or the most usual forms of natural law, stressed this “dictate of right reason.” We still have this problem with us.

The Further Scope of General Revelation

Besides natural theology with its rational arguments for the existence of God, and natural law, God’s General Revelation also includes what He teaches us in history and in the experiences of the human race. We find that General Revelation in science, philosophy and even, according to Dr. H. Bavinck, in the non-christian religions to some extent. In other words, all that is good and true and beautiful in this world must be looked upon as the General Revelation of God. Dr. Warfield says in the International Standard Bible Encyclopedia under General Revelation among the heathen, “His providence still ruled over all . . . And His Spirit still everywhere wrought upon the hearts of men, stirring up all their powers . . . to their best activities, and to such splendid effect in every department of human achievement as to command the admiration of all ages, and in the highest region of all, that of conduct, to call out from an apostle the encomium that though they had no law they did by nature . . . the things of the law.”

We hope that we have described sufficiently the extent of General Revelation to make you realize how important it is. At times I hear or read the statement that we also have a General Revelation but that it does not amount to very much. The clergy should realize that many of us live almost entirely by that light. Practically all knowledge obtained in the field of science and medicine throughout the ages was and is derived from General Revelation. Those who do not devote their lives to the pursuit of theology often feel discouraged when they are told that, after all, General Revelation does not amount to very much. Some of them become definitely anti-clerical on that account. Let us also not forget that all Christians, the ministry too, live by the light of General Revelation and by natural law to a large extent. We cannot say that the Christian lives by Special Revelation and the unbeliever by General Revelation. The Christian lives by both.

General and Special Revelation

Let us now see what the relation is between General and Special Revelation. It is not true that in Paradise man lived only by a natural revelation. Natural revelation is not sufficient. Nature at most teaches us that there is a God but it does not tell us who that God is or what He is. For that reason Adam needed a supernatural revelation before the fall. God came down and communed with Adam. It may also be said that General Revelation, particularly where it speaks to us of God, is a supernatural revelation. At any rate if a natural revelation was not sufficient even in Paradise, that is much more true after the fall of man. A Special Revelation became absolutely necessary.

However, some make too much of Special Revelation or do not use it rightly. The statement is made repeatedly that we should read and study General Revelation only through Special Revelation, which is then compared to a pair of spectacles. We fear that often in reality we are told to look at nature through the clouded or colored spectacles of some theologian or system of theology. For example, the Catholic, the Lutheran, and the Reformed theologian would each have us look at nature through his particular colored spectacles.

The statement of Calvin that we should look at nature through the Bible as a pair of spectacles has been misquoted and misapplied. The Bible is absolutely necessary for salvation and if we wish to place everything in creation sub specie aeternitatis, in the light of eternity. But we do not always need the Bible as a pair of spectacles. As Calvin himself says in this passage in The Institutes, we need Scripture “to direct us properly to the Creator and for salvation.”

The Bible itself tells us about the method of using General Revelation. In Isaiah 28:23-29 the prophet relates how God instructs the farmer directly in nature to plow, harrow, and sow. He does not have to put on biblical or theological spectacles. And the prophet exclaims that this is a wonderful thing to behold.

Scientific Method and General Revelation

The same principle holds true in all non-theological fields to a very large extent. For example, I do not believe that the natural scientist should put on biblical or theological spectacles when he goes into his laboratory. It may be impossible for him to get rid of all preconceived notions, but he should not give in to them. He should be,
The great French physiologist Claude Bernard had written above the door of his laboratory, "He who enters here, let him lay his imagination aside, and when he leaves let him put it on again."

The scientist first gathers facts. Then he classifies these facts and there finds the law of nature that governs them. Then he sees whether his hypothesis, theory or law of nature fits the other facts. And finally the Christian scholar places this all sub specie aeternitatis, particularly by the use of Special Revelation.

We believe that this is the safest and the correct method. Scripture has often been endangered by being misused. For example, when the English obstetrician Simpson began to use anesthesia in his work, the theologians of his day told him that this was contrary to Scripture because God had said to Eve, "In pain shalt thou bring forth children." Simpson ingeniously silenced them by the retort that when God operated on Adam by removing a rib He put him to sleep too.

Do the Spectacles Need Spectacles?

This brings us to the statement of another truth. If the Bible is compared to a pair of spectacles it needs another pair of spectacles to read those spectacles. Some of the bitterest controversies have raged because of the various interpretations of Special Revelation. That is one of the reasons why Grotius in his, The Right of War and Peace, emphasized the law of nature as one of the foundations of international law. Grotius published his great work in 1624 when the bitter religious wars were raging in the name of the ius divinum, divine or Scriptural law.

Does not the same hold true today? We talk so glibly that all that the world needs is to turn back to God or to the Bible. It is an oversimplification. Even if all people became Christians, would all problems be solved? As far as the Catholic church is concerned we have at present a pope in Rome whose hands are dripping with the blood of a murderer of innocents; who, as papal secretary of state, permitted, if not encouraged, the bishops of Italy to bless the cannon that were sent to Ethiopia. See the scholarly work of the English Catholic historian Teeling, Pope Pius XI and World Affairs, p. 138.

But the Protestant church has not solved the war-issue either. By leaning too heavily on Romans 13 they have made Christians to act at best like servile low-grade morons of international hoodlums. I am not blaming Scripture but the wrong interpretation of it. It indicates, however, that those that are so ready to minimize General Revelation should look with shame upon the little they have been able to accomplish with the use of Special Revelation. Many Christian scholars have pointed out that unbelievers often put us to shame with their contributions to the solutions of problems. Scripture itself says that the children of darkness are wiser in their generation than the children of light. We should do more often the garb of the penitent Publican and return in the true sense to the God of General as well as of Special Revelation.

We have expressed ourselves so strongly in order that we may arouse ourselves out of our dogmatic slumber. General Revelation is not subordinate to but coordinate with Special Revelation. The one sheds light upon the other. The Christian needs both, and the better he knows both and the relation between the two the greater his view will be. Just as the Creator in His inscrutable wisdom has given us binocular vision, as if for greater perspective, rather than a narrow cycloptic view, so we have a twofold revelation. There is more than one window through which the human soul may be enlightened. We believe in the idea of the round-table or the forum. The theologian, the scientist, the artist, the historian, the philosopher, etc., should all sit as knights at the roundtable and make their individual contributions. The scientist should not lord it over the theologian nor the theologian over the scientist. That does not mean that we are syncretistic in the evil sense or dualistic. There may be a duality but no dualism because we have a twofold revelation. It is the same Holy Spirit, the Revealer of all truth, who is the unifying force behind all revelation.

The Holy Spirit and General Revelation

This leads us to the third consideration of our discussion, viz., that the Holy Spirit is the Author of General Revelation. We have a general as well as a special testimony of the Holy Spirit. And as in Special Revelation we have a testimonium externum and internum so we do in General Revelation. Kant points to these succinctly when he speaks of his admiration for the starry world above and the moral law within.

Christians as a rule know very little about the general testimony of the Holy Spirit. Dr. Hepp says that when he began to write about it our people in the Netherlands were so surprised about it that they thought a meteor had appeared in the dogmatic heavens. If this was true in the land of Kuyper and Bavinck, the Castor and Pollux of revived Calvinism, it is even more true of our people in this country. We have met educated graduates of our Calvinistic institutions who were surprised to hear that, for example, the genius we find in this world is the work of the Holy Spirit. We should emphasize this more. These people who deny common grace or minimize General Revelation are really desiring the work of the Holy Spirit. If our young people, who devote themselves to the non-theological fields, realize that there is ever so much in those spheres that is the work of God, and that it is their duty to place it all in the light of eternity, they will be filled more with Christian idealism in regard to their work, and God will be glorified.
When asked where we get that idea of the general testimony of the Holy Spirit, we reply that we learn that from Scripture above all. When the tabernacle had to be built you read that Bezalel and Oholiab were “filled with the Spirit of God.” Now, if it required the Holy Spirit to qualify these two to build the tabernacle, it must have been even more true of those that built the temple: Hiram, the King of the Phoenicians and his artisans; since the temple was much more complicated.

**Calvin and General Revelation**

Calvin believed strongly in the general testimony of the Holy Spirit. When it concerns the spiritual things in the field of Special Revelation Calvin states that the unbeliever does not understand any more about them “than the braying ass about musical symphonies.” But when it concerns the things in the sphere of General Revelation he says:

> Whenever, therefore, we meet with the heathen writers, let us learn from that light of truth which is admirably displayed in their works, that the human mind, fallen as it is, and corrupted from its integrity, is yet invested and adorned by God with excellent talents. If we believe that the Spirit of God is the only fountain of truth, we shall neither reject nor despise the truth itself, wherever it shall appear, unless we wish to insult the Spirit of God; for the gifts of the Spirit cannot be undervalued without offering contempt and reproach to the Spirit himself . . . And shall we esteem anything laudable or excellent, which we do not recognize as proceeding from God? Let us, then, be ashamed of such great ingratitude, which was not charged on the heathen poets, who confessed that philosophy and legislation, and useful arts, were the inventions of their gods.”

Then Calvin also uses the illustration of Bezalel and Oholiab, and continues:

> “We need not wonder if the knowledge of those things, which are most excellent in human life, is said to be communicated to us by the Spirit of God. Nor is there any reason for inquiring, what intercourse with the Spirit there is enjoyed by the heathen with their gods, who are entirely alienated from God. For when the Spirit of God is said to dwell only in the faithful, that is to be understood of the Spirit of sanctification, by whom we are consecrated as temples of God himself. Yet it is equally by the energy of the same Spirit, that God re-plenished, actuated, and quickens all creatures, and that according to the property of each species which He has given it by the law of creation. Now, if it has pleased the Lord that we should be assisted in physics, logic, mathematics, and other arts and sciences, by the labor and ministry of the impious, let us make use of them; lest, if we neglect to use the blessings therein freely offered to us by God, we suffer the just punishment of our negligence.” See *Institutes*, Book II, Chapter II, sections xii to xvii.

God the Father is the originating cause of all things, God the Son is the mediating cause, but the Holy Spirit is the consummating cause. We should see in General Revelation the work of Christ, the Mediator of Creation as well as the Mediator of Redemption. Christ is the Logos, the light that enlightens every man coming into the world. But that work is consummated by the Holy Spirit who proceeds also from the Son.

We feel inclined not to agree with those who speak of the mandate of nature and take it in the sense that the creation outside the pale of Special Revelation is merely like a tree that has been cut off at the roots and that all that we now see is similar to that of a dying tree with just a little life left in its dying and decaying branches. The Holy Spirit, through General Revelation, operates positively and actively in the creation. The unbelieving world in a certain sense must glorify God, even though unconsciously and perhaps unwillingly at times. If the hidden flowers of the woods bloom to glorify God why should not man, created in His image, the king of creation, do this? The creation, due to the curse, may now produce pungent instead of luscious fruit, but fruit nevertheless, to the glory of God.

**Some Questions**

We have expressed ourselves briefly and at times aphoristically. Many questions remain to be answered. We shall mention only some directly related to our discussion. You may ask us whether we do not believe in the absolute antithesis. We do. But that absolute antithesis is found in the heart and life of the true believer,—the fight between the old man and the new man, the uncompromising struggle between Christ and Belial. There is also an antithesis between believers and unbelievers that should not be minimized, but that antithesis is relative in this life, thanks to the general work of the Holy Spirit.

The question has also been asked us whether it is not true that we do not understand a fact completely until we understand it theologically. We agree. But it is also true that we do not understand a fact until we know it in all its aspects, scientific, artistic, etc., otherwise we may have an empty theological shell.

Another important question is whether it is not the duty of the Christian in the field of science to begin as well as to end with Special Revelation. It seems to us that we have made it clear that it is not necessary always to start with Special Revelation. We have two types of Christians among us. The one type I would call the *a priori* Christian and the other the *a posteriori* type. The former always wants to start with Special Revelation, the latter is not satisfied until he finally has placed everything also in the light of eternity. It seems to us that both finally come to the same conclusion. Theology may lend itself more to the former method, but science, philosophy, art, etc., more to the latter. One of the main reasons why we object to start always with Special Revelation is because it makes all the fields of human endeavor dependent upon the theologian who alone with his special training is able to tell us what the principles of Scripture are. The theologians are not omniscient. They have often given us a wrong lead.

One more problem which presents itself is that of faith and reason. Some Christians say that we should live by faith only. I would call these the “or” Christians. For them the question is faith or
reason. It seems to us that we should be “and” Christians who believe in faith and reason.

In conclusion, let us see the importance of General Revelation, particularly because it is the work of God, just as well as Special Revelation. They are coordinate and subordinate only to the Holy Spirit.

Let us realize the importance of the testimony Spiritus Sancti generale, externum et internum. Let us make more propaganda for the idea of the knights of the round-table, the forum. And do not let us forget that the Hiram and the Phoenicians of today also should contribute to the building of the temple of human knowledge.

Calvinism and the Covenant
The Covenant Doctrine in Church History

D. H. Kromminga
Professor of Church History
Calvin Seminary, Grand Rapids

O f all the Christian doctrines perhaps not one receives less public attention than the doctrine of the Covenants. There are in all likelihood many Christian theologians who, while recognizing it, never think of it as one of the great, major, Christian doctrines. Both facts, that in a vague way the Covenant finds general Christian recognition, and, that a definite and clear conception of it is practically limited to the Reformed persuasion, contribute to this neglect. Attacks upon the doctrine and its defense ordinarily do not center around its larger and more fundamental aspects but are limited to such details as more immediately concern and determine Reformed practice. For Calvinists it is high time, that more attention be paid to the doctrine in its larger aspects, lest these be forgotten; and we rejoice to see it get public attention to some degree of late. Just recently a particular phase in the history of the doctrine has been treated at length in an as yet unpublished thesis by Dr. P. Y. de Jong, and a volume published some three years ago by Perry Miller of Harvard on The New England Mind gives much attention to the role played by the doctrine of the Covenants among the early New Englanders. My aim is at this time to stimulate interest in the doctrine of the Covenants among the readers of THE CALVIN FORUM by briefly dwelling in three consecutive articles on the prominence of the doctrine in Calvinism, its functioning in the history of the Christian Church, and its major values as seen in the light of its historical operation.

The Covenant
Essential to Calvinism

It is almost superfluous to state, that the doctrine of the Covenants belongs to the badge of genuine Calvinism. For our country one is tempted to say, that this doctrine is the badge of genuine Calvinism. I make this statement in full awareness of the fact, that it is exposed to an immediate challenge. Everybody is agreed, that the marks of Calvinism are the famous Five Points of Doctrine, which the Synod of Dort in 1618 and 1619 formulated against the Arminian heresy. Total depravity, unconditional election, limited atonement, irresistible grace, and the perseverance of the saints—these are the things which Calvinists teach and preach in distinction from other Christians. When he hears Calvinism mentioned, every American with any theological orientation at all will think of those Five Points. To the American mind, these Five Points of doctrine are the sum and substance of Calvinism. It is this erroneous and unhistorical notion, which makes it so difficult for us Calvinists in America to gain a sympathetic hearing when we mention Calvinism.

For the Calvinism of the Five Points without the doctrine of the Covenants is a truncated Calvinism; and of this truncated Calvinism the story is out, that it has been tried out in the religious history of America for well over two centuries, and that it has been found wanting. True as this story is of the mutilated Calvinism, it is a pity that it operates to predispose the American mind against the real full-orbed Calvinism.

Calvinism does teach the Five Points, and without them no genuine Calvinism is conceivable. These Five Points set off Calvinism from that defection from Calvinism which is known by the name of Arminianism. For that reason the Five Points are shared by Calvinists with all Calvinistic sects which reject Arminianism, whether they be Calvinistic Baptists or Calvinistic Methodists or Calvinistic Congregationalists. But what not one of these Calvinistic sects shares with the genuine and full-orbed Calvinists is precisely the unimpaired and undiminished doctrine of the Covenants. The antipedobaptism of the Baptists is in itself the indication of their departure from the Reformed doctrine of the Covenants, and the experientialist emphasis of the Calvinistic Methodists and the Calvinistic Congregationalists operates in the same direction. Historically all three groups, the Congregationalists, the Baptists, and the Methodists, have branched off from the Genevan type of Protestantism; and the very fact of
their branching off discloses a fundamental divergence in view from original Calvinism. If we desire to keep our Reformed heritage pure, we shall have to be continually on our guard not merely against the leaven of Arminianism, but also against those defections which because of their rejection of Arminianism still lay claim to the Calvinistic name.

The Covenant in the Reformation Age

The scarcity of mention of the Covenant in the Christian creeds outside those of the Reformed type is surprising and has not yet received an adequate explanation. For Holy Writ is so full of the idea of the Covenant, that we actually call both its parts Testaments in virtue of the Covenant. The abrogation of the Old Covenant and its replacement with the New goes hand in hand with the proclamation of their unity at the introduction of each: by God's promise to Abraham that in his seed all the nations of the earth shall be blessed, and by Peter's assurance to his Pentecostal audience that faith in Christ would procure for them the gift of the Holy Spirit, since theirs was the promise and their children's and "to all those that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call." The connection between the two dispensations of the Covenant is so close in the one Mediator, Jesus Christ, that no one can commemorate His atoning death in the rite which He has ordained for that purpose without being reminded of both dispensations by the cup of the New Testament in His blood. All Christians are of course aware of all this, and therefore there can be little express rejection of the Covenant among them, if any. What surprises, is the paucity of references to it in the non-Reformed creeds and the almost total absence of any development of a doctrine of the Covenant in them beyond bare mention as, for instance, in the Lutheran Formula of Concord.

Altogether different is the history of the development of the doctrine of the Covenants in the Reformed persuasion. Zwingli had hardly passed away in the battle of Kappel, when his successor at Zuerich, Heinrich Bullinger, began the formal literary development of the doctrine. He conceived of religion itself as summed up in the covenantal relationship to God. Calvin took up the idea and made large use of it in his doctrine of the Church and the Sacraments. Ursinus and Olevianus, the co-authors of the Heidelberg Catechism, were adherents of the federal theology. Ursinus distinctly recognized a Covenant of Works antedating that of Grace, and Olevianus spoke of the same as the Covenant of the Law, of Nature, and of Creation. Together with Olevianus Musculus, Polanus, and Martinius emphasized the connection of the Covenant of Grace with divine election. Gomarus and his opponent Arminius both recognized a Covenant of Grace, and Cloppenburg is credited with clearly grounding it in an eternal Covenant of Redemption. He also conceived of the Covenant of Works as a gracious addition to man's relationship to his Maker purely as a creature and clearly recognized the fact, that in the Covenant of Grace Christ meets for His own the demands of the Covenant of Works. Thus within about one hundred years after the beginning of the Swiss Reformation the doctrine of the Covenants ran its course to completion.

The Covenants in the Westminster Confession

In the British Isles there were theologians who prepared for the inclusion of this doctrine in the Westminster Standards. Among them were Ball and Blake and Preston and Rollock, while Ames was a connecting link between the English and the Dutch Churches. Since about 1560 Reformed Creeds had begun to make mention of the Covenant or Covenants, as the Erlauthaler Confession of the Magyar Church and the Heidelberg Catechism of those years, and the Irish Articles of 1615. Finally a well-rounded doctrine of the Covenants was written into the last of the great Reformed Creeds, the Westminster Confession of 1647. Its seventh chapter deals with the subject of God's Covenant with Man. First of all it distinguishes from the natural duty of obedience, which man by reason of creation owes God, the fruition of God as added thereunto by a voluntary condescension of God by way of covenant. This Covenant of Works, broken by man's fall and defection, God replaced by the Covenant of Grace, wherein He freely offers unto sinners life and salvation by Jesus Christ and promises to all those who are ordained unto life His Holy Spirit, to make them willing and able to believe. This Covenant or Testament of Grace was differently administered in the time of the Law and in the time of the Gospel; but, however its administration differed, in substance it is one and the same under the various dispensations.

In the next chapter, which treats of Christ the Mediator, the first section deals with the Covenant of Redemption, though without using that designation. It is there declared, that "it pleased God, in His eternal purpose, to choose and ordain the Lord Jesus, His only-begotten Son, to be the Mediator between God and man, the Prophet, Priest, and King; the Head and Savior of His Church, the Heir of all things, and Judge of the world; unto Whom He did, from all eternity, give a people to be His seed, and to be by Him in time redeemed, called, justified, sanctified, and glorified." Thus the Westminster Confession has the three Covenants, that of Redemption, that of Works, and that of Grace in its two dispensations; that is, it has all the elements which are recognized in a well-rounded doctrine of the Covenants. The history of the development of the doctrine of the Covenants reached its close with the great epoch of Reformed creedwriting.

The Covenants and the Canons of Dort

Of the Canons of Dort we usually think as a statement of the wellknown Five Points of Doctrine with-
out realizing that in those Canons these Five Points appear interwoven with the full round of the doctrine of the Covenants. Fact is, nevertheless, that the Five Points are there unfolded precisely in the context of the doctrine of the Covenants, so that they cannot be rightly understood and properly evaluated apart from this context. There is, of course, not any particular section of the Canons that is specifically devoted to an exposition of the doctrine of the Covenants, but incidental to the exposition of the Five Points of Doctrine to which the Canons are devoted they give scattered remarks and reflections of various aspects of the doctrine of the Covenants which the Arminian heresy was affecting and altering. When gathered together, these remarks and reflections rather fully cover all the major aspects of the doctrine of the Covenants. The Canons of Dort can therefore be said to contain not merely the Five Points, but also the doctrine of the Covenants and to indicate the close relationship and the organic unity between the two.

To begin with the Covenant of Grace, it is mentioned expressly at least five times. Paragraph 17 of the first Head of Doctrine mentions it, when it declares children of believers to be holy not by nature, but by virtue of the Covenant of Grace. Under the second Head of Doctrine paragraph 2 of the Rejection of Errors mentions it, when Christ is called the surety and mediator of a better, that is, of the New Covenant. Paragraph 4 presents something in the nature of a definition of it, when the doctrine is defended, that the New Covenant of Grace consists in this, that by faith in so far as it accepts the merits of Christ we are justified before God and saved. The very next paragraph mentions it yet again in denying its coextensiveness with the human race. And, finally, the first paragraph of the Rejection of Errors under the fifth Head of Doctrine mentions it once more in its denial, that the perseverance of the saints is a condition of the New Covenant, which before his final election man must meet by his own free will, instead of being a fruit of election and a gift of God, procured by Christ's death.

The Covenants of Works and of Redemption

Next to the Covenant of Grace also that of Works finds mention. It is true, the term is not used, but the matter is expressed. The very first Head of Doctrine starts out from the Covenant of Works, beginning with the statement, that, as all men have sinned in Adam, lie under the curse, and are obnoxious to eternal death, God would have done no injustice by leaving them all to perish and delivering them over to condemnation on account of sin. According to paragraph 2 of the Third and Fourth Heads of Doctrine the corruption of Adam is communicated to his descendants with the sole exception of Christ not by means of imitation but by means of procreation; and again the legal terminology of the Covenant appears, for this is said to come about according to the just judgment of God. Under these same Heads of Doctrine the first paragraph of the Rejection of Errors again implies the Covenant of Works, since it maintains the position, that original sin is by itself sufficient to condemn the entire human race and to deserve temporal and eternal punishment. Apart from the juridical relationship established between Adam and his descendants in the Covenant of Works it would naturally be impossible to speak in this connection of judgment and condemnation and punishment.

In similar fashion the second Head of Doctrine operates with the doctrine of the Covenant of Redemption. In its eighth paragraph the declaration is made, that it was the free counsel and the gracious intent of God, that Christ should redeem with His blood all those and those only, who were chosen unto salvation from eternity and were given the son by the Father. Also the first paragraph of the Rejection of Errors under this Head of Doctrine implies the Covenant of Redemption both in the formulation of the error which is condemned and in the choice of the texts in support of its condemnation. The error that is condemned is the teaching, that Christ was ordained to the death of the cross without the assurance of the salvation of anybody; and the rejection of this error is based on Christ's allegory of the Good Shepherd and His enlargement on it in John 10. Finally, both the unity and the diversity of the two dispensations of the Covenant of Grace are taught in paragraph 7 of the third and fourth Heads of Doctrine in the declaration, that this mystery of His will God disclosed to but a small number under the Old Testament; but that under the New He reveals Himself to many without any distinction of people. According to this declaration it is the same mystery that is disclosed in both dispensations, but the circle of the recipients of the disclosure was small under the Old Testament and is wide under the New.

A Distinctive Mark of Calvinism

From all this it is abundantly clear, that the doctrine of the Covenants belong to the distinctive marks of Calvinism just as do the Five Points. For Calvinists of Dutch antecedents the doctrine of the Covenants finds its fullest and clearest creedal formulation precisely in the Five Points as formulated by the fathers at the Synod of Dort. In fact, the Five Points can be said to be intelligible only against the background of the doctrine of the Covenants. And, since the clear profession of the doctrine of the Covenants sets the Calvinists off from all other Christians, we may be sure, that any alteration in the conception of the Covenants or any deviation from the accepted doctrine concerning them is bound to alter the meaning and significance also of the Five Points and to take a man away from genuine Calvinism. In our country, where the name, Calvinism, so readily awakens the remembrance of
the Five Points without a suggestion of their organic connection with the doctrine of the Covenants, it is of the highest importance for us, clearly to see that organic connection and boldly to emphasize it.

In my second article I hope to attack another erroneous and unhistorical popular notion. It is the idea, that the doctrine of the Covenant has had very little historical significance beyond setting off the Reformed Churches from the rest of Christendom. In the creedal sense this is true enough; but the notion overlooks the fact, that the doctrine of the Covenants is not merely a creedal doctrine but is first of all a biblical truth. God's revealed truth is operative not merely where it finds recognition, but it is operative just as well in the effects that show up where it is neglected. With this in mind I hope to trace the operation of the doctrine of the Covenant in the history of the Church of Christ from the beginning to the present. The review will of necessity have to be brief and sketchy, but this limitation need not mean that it will not suffice to establish the point which I seek to make.

Chronicle of Art

Calvinistic Masterpieces Recognized
After 1918

The legend has been spread by the eighteenth century rationalists first, and then by the nineteenth century liberals, that Calvinism is hostile to art. Real art came from the old Greeks and was revived by the Italian Renaissance. In painting and sculpture the line had to be a smooth curve, visible to the eye, not hidden below the zigzag or the rugged contour. In architecture the high or French Gothic was barbaric, the low Gothic found in Flanders and Holland was a distortion of the high Gothic, and, therefore, worse. The main line in building should not be the vertical and the diagonal, but the horizontal. High or medium roofs were tasteless, and pillars should adorn not only public structures, but even private homes and porches. In music the eighteenth century dictated the elaboration of the polyphonic so that the melody would be just as unrecognizable as the simple line in architecture and furniture. In the nineteenth century Bach, Beethoven and Brahms, at present honored as the three greatest musicians of all time, were soon discarded for the oversweet products of the postromantics. The sturdy Genevan and German chorales were set aside, and a number of mediocre, and often monotonous gospel hymns were introduced in the church services which made for sentimentalism and Arminianism. In literature the stirring patriotic folksongs of Marnix and Valerius were declared to be unsingable and unpoetic, and the short didactics of Cats and Huygens were looked upon as the futile efforts of would-be moralists without aesthetic value. It was the heyday of the novel and the romance, the one over-sexed, and the other over-fantastic; of the short story full of unexpected adventure, or sarcastic criticism; of the short lyric depicting the religious, moral and artistic defeatism of the last generation. And, most unfortunate of all, even Calvinists were often ready to join in the grand chorus of the Humanists and to tell the world that Calvinism and art had nothing to do with each other. The only art in which the Calvinists had excelled was painting. But their painting was baroque, that is over-sensual and Italian in origin. Even Dr. Kuyper in his Stone Lectures argues that Calvinism was too spiritual a system of thought to produce a new art.

How did the change in artistic and public opinion come about? Why do modern art critics now say that Dutch painting, architecture and music, and even Dutch poetry of the seventeenth century in so far as it was new, show a different spirit and a different technique? It is true, they are slow to recognize the tremendous impact of Calvinism on the Dutch mind. They want to explain the revolution in art—for such was the movement—on historical and natural bases. It is the Eighty Years War for civic and religious liberty! It is the marvelous spirit of enterprise by which the Dutch became supreme in colonization, in commerce, trade, industry, and agriculture, and—least, not least—world politics! It is the Dutch soil, and the climate, and the sunsets, and the dunes with their rich vegetation, and the polders, canals, lakes and rivers, and the mills and the ships! Religion and ethics and philosophy had little to do with this, least of all Calvinism! But the fact remains, after all, that certain Hollanders of the seventh century who happened to be Calvinists, produced a rare, a unique, a superb, a novel, a world-shocking art, a new type of painting, a new type of music, a new type of architecture, and a new type of poetry. Since religion and culture move in two watertight compartments, according to Occam, and his modern followers, this new art has nothing to do with Calvinism, but the facts, the “bald” and “brute” facts, the “neutral” facts, the “undeniable” facts—terms of which liberals of all shades are very fond—the facts are there, that there were at one time Calvinistic artists, and that they produced masterpieces!

How did it come about, this change in public opinion? For one thing, the revival of Catholicism was back of this. Before there was a new valuation of Dutch art, there was a new appreciation of Flemish art. The Catholic scholars have been busy
for over fifty years to point out that it will not do scientifically to call the Middle Ages dark and Flemish painting crude. There was a Renaissance not only in Italy, but also in the north, in northern France, in Belgium, and in the Netherlands. Moreover, there was a Renaissance even in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, revealing itself in the rise of the cities, of the guilds, of the universities, of the high Gothic, of new trade with the Near East as a result of the Crusades, of a new philosophy unfolded by Thomas Aquinas and Dante. Finally, the early Middle Ages did not only see the fall of the Graeco-Roman civilization, but also the rise of a new Christian culture, for in those days the church, the school, the farm, and society and government had their new beginnings in feudalism. In other words, Catholic scholars have made plain to the world, that there was a great Catholic civilization long before the French Revolution, and even before the Reformation.

The next change came soon after the first world war. The Flemish soldiers who had fought in the Battle of the Marne had to be rewarded by a great exhibition of Flemish painting in London. And, only a few years after, the English put on a colossal show of Dutch art. The voice of Wilhelm von Bode had been long a voice in the wilderness. But now English, French and American art scholars began to pour out their new visions. And at last Karl Scheffler, foremost German art critic, declared that there was no painting like Dutch painting, and that Holland was the most beautiful country in the world. What no peace movement had been able to bring about, was accomplished by the world war and its aftermath. Italian art is now in the background. Flemish and Dutch art are hailed as the finest, and Dutch painting as the climax of the world's culture.

In line with this new valuation of Dutch painting is a new appreciation of the architecture, music and poetry of the Dutch seventeenth century Calvinists which is simply amazing. Here is an opportunity for Calvinists all over the globe to make capital out of humanistic scholarship. This opportunity is not limited to Dutch art. There was also Calvinistic art in France, Germany, Scandinavia, Scotland, and Switzerland, the birthplace of the Genevan psalter, and, moreover, there were great Calvinist scholars, statesmen, colonizers, theologians and philosophers in those days. It is no wonder, therefore, that also Calvin has come to his own, and that he has been praised as a genius, as a thinker, and as a gentleman. We, Calvinists, are getting there! For two centuries we have been taunted by the humanists and naturalists that Calvin was a tyrant, that the Synod of Dordt was a robber synod, and that the Calvinists were enemies of art and scholarship. The liberals are now willing to grant that Calvin was a great leader in religion, politics, ethics and philosophy; that the Synod of Dordt was right when it cast out the Arminians; and that the Calvinists of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries have produced masterpieces that were not only greater than the products of Catholic artists, but that were the real beginning of modern art. Let us take a deep breath now that the tyranny of the past is over! Let us thank God for the salvation He has wrought! And, let us go forward with new courage. For His is the kingdom—also in art and scholarship—and the power and the glory for ever!

Bombers

God's bombers in the sky
Not made by human might,
Substances in air
Make these huge birds of flight.

The clouds God's bombers are
Producing rain and thunder—
Wind and hail and hurricane
Bombers without number.

—Aurene Pousma.
Unrealistic Tower Builders

THERE is a man whose name is mentioned only three times in the New Testament, but in that threefold mention his whole life's secret is set forth as clearly as though limned in red. "Demas and Luke, my faithful fellowworkers," says Paul in Philemon. "Luke, the beloved physician and Demas" he says again in Colossians. "Demas hath forsaken me, having loved this present world," is the sad judgment of II Timothy. Demas first—then only Demas—then Demas forsaking! As though a sinister curved line upon the graph of Demas' life record stood before our eyes.

Is it perhaps because Luke was associated with Demas that he alone of all the Gospel writers records this brief parable about the tower-builder? "For which of you, desiring to build a tower sitteth not only, but laced a foundation and is not able to finish, all that behold begin to mock him, saying, 'This man began to build and was not able to finish.'"

The inference is clear. Christ demands something of His followers. If you start along that road and lack the staying power to see it through you succeed only in making a fool of yourself. What is the secret of the failure of such a tower-builder? Unwise? too general. Lack of foresight? That may be impossible. It is lack of realism. The tower-builder was building a dream-tower.

That lack of realism involves first failure to see things through. Modern young parents know all about giving their children a good start in life. Vitamins, special foods, expensive clothing, excellent medication—but when the years of budding spiritual consciousness dawn, comes a voice from the ultra-modern citadels of child-care, "Do not force any one set of religious convictions upon your child, let him find his own way to blessedness!" And forthwith the tower-building tools are cast aside. But today a younger generation is arising to mock its unrealistic tower-building parents.

Those young people start out to build the towers of their homes. They are authorities on romance, but in the emotional froth of romance ordinary intelligence is obscured, and their beautiful dream-tower fails to attain reality, and when the grim news of rifts and quarrels circulate, they are the laughing-stock of their friends.

Our age lacks staying power, it lacks the power of devotion. It lacks that which carried Paul from the Damascus road to the testimony of II Timothy, "I have fought the good fight, I have kept the faith."

That lack of realism means failure to see life as it is. In the rosy haze of a temporary artificial prosperity we are likely to forget the economic tragedies of about a decade ago. But the forces that produced them are with us still: the dry-rot of class-privilege, the destructive flame of individual greed, the age-old conflict between the rights of man and the laws of God. Capital set out to build its tower and overlooked the need of the recognition of the common man, and the top-heavy structure collapsed. Labor is geared to build its tower at the expense of capital and is likely to see its dream castle the laughing-stock of future generations.

Militarists set out to build their tower on the seizing-power of arms, and failed in the realism to see that such tactics mean loss all around. Pacifists set out to build their tower on the assumption of innate human goodness and their un-realism has played them false.

In the church, the doctrinarians built their tower without regard for the practical application of Christianity to the crying needs of a social and political chaos. Social-Gospelites built their tower without realistically acknowledging the need of atonement, regeneration, and sanctification.

All-and-all our age has built its towers without a realistic appreciation of the fact of sin. Oh, they know about it. They talk about it in blunt terms in every "realistic" novel, but they talk about it without seeing it for what it is.

We are pleading for genuine realism. Realism that sees life whole. We have had enough of the realism that takes the whole of life and squeezes out of it all that is true and beautiful and then offers us the ugly distorted wad of pulp as a "real" portrayal of life as it really is. That is no more realism than the realism of the blind men of Hindustan who each seized upon a part of an elephant and proceeded to describe the whole in terms of his part.

We need such realism especially today. Surely the greed of nations is real, but so is Christ! Surely sin is real, but so is salvation! Surely human degradation is real, but so is the sanctifying power of the Spirit!

Napoleon's cavalry officers tethered their horses under Da Vinci's "The Last Supper" in the cathedral of Milan. As they did so, we can hear their coarse aspersions upon the impotence of that "pale Galilean." They no doubt considered themselves realists. But history has proved them unrealistic tower-builders. Napoleon and all he stood for has been and will be forever crushed under the power of that same serene Monarch of the Cross, the Prince of Peace!

ALA BANDON.
Christian World Voices

A Netherlands Letter from London

Woldingham, 10th September, 1942.

The Rev. Clarence Bouma,
Managing Editor of THE CALVIN FORUM,
Grand Rapids, U. S. A.

Dear Sir:

WITH great pleasure have I read the June number of THE CALVIN FORUM which you kindly sent to me, and in order to express my gratitude to you, I take pleasure in sending you herewith an article for publication.

Contrary to a heading in the above mentioned number which was “Dutch Calvinism in the Shadows”, I headed my contribution “Dutch Calvinism in the Light”.

I will call upon my brother, Mr. D. De Wit, of Redlands, (Cal.), to pay the subscription for your very interesting paper, such in view of currency restrictions, and I would be much obliged if you would put me on the mailing list.

May the Lord bless your fine work for Calvinism.

With kind regards,

Yours very truly,

CHR. DE WIT,
Member of the Extraordinary Advisory Counsel of the Netherlands Government.

Dutch Calvinism in the Light

THE hand of the oppressor rests heavily upon the people of the Netherlands. Unprovoked aggression, invasion, destruction, economic looting on a grand scale is the classic way of German imperialism, which is on the march to world-domination.

But far more severe than the material misery, common to all countries occupied by the enemy, is the spiritual suffering of the Dutch people. Certainly, there were many things in the life of the people that could not stand the test of the law of God.

Thousands of our people had forsaken the service of the Almighty and had followed the path that leads to destruction.

Even among our Reformed people there was much worldliness. The Church of Christ has not always been faithful to its high calling. We did things we ought not to have done, and we left things undone which we should have done.

There were many idols in our life. Idols of envy and intolerance. Idols of pride and prejudice. Lack of brotherly love and of compassion for those dwelling in darkness.

But the humble and contrite heart will be silent under the chastising hand of God. For the Lord will command His loving-kindness in the daytime and in the night His song shall be with me, and my prayer unto the God of my life.

That is the secret of our salvation, for promotion cometh neither from the east, nor from the west, nor from the south. But God is the Judge; He putteth down one, and He setteth up another.

The Calvinistic spirit is a fighting spirit. This has always been so. In the long, long struggle for our liberty against the Spanish empire, the mightiest in the world, it was the Cal-
The Scripture Readers, whose meetings are attended by hundreds of lads, often find a desire for sound literature and we seek to supply this need and thus spread the dear Name and fame of Jesus amongst those who may early be called upon to give the supreme sacrifice for home and country. I met one yesterday. He came specially while on leave, to visit the Library. The first few words disclosed his desire to spread the truth amongst the young and rising generation. He wanted books on the scripture, guidance as to choice, and information as to how to be of help in making the Library known. He echoed the statement of Dr. Martyn Lloyd Jones that “the half had not been told him” and said, “Shall we bow the knee in prayer to God”. I felt knelt to him in fervent love for Jesus’ sake and believe God will help us together, to give satan’s kingdom a more severe shaking. I wondered if there are perhaps many American lads coming over who would be glad to contact such facilities as we are able to offer? Do you think some mention in your magazine might reach some? How wonderful it will be if the dark and dread background of this conflict be relieved by the knowledge that those who fight so faithfully for their country and for the cause of justice are supremely loyal to the Sovereign King of Heaven through whom final and lasting victory over every foe is assured.

Evacuees

As you will see from the enclosed God does not overlook those who are snatched, while in childhood years, from their homes and families. Case after case has come to my notice of the Holy Spirit working amongst those who come from homes in which the very name of God was banned save in oaths and curses, and one cannot help seeing the wisdom of God’s providence in bringing them under a gracious influence, there to find a never-failing Friend who both loves and searches out the souls for whom He died on Calvary.

But I must close.

With kindest regards and love for Jesus’ sake,

JESSE WILLIAMS.

From Australia

“The Manse”,
8 Myers St.,
Geelong, Victoria.
8th August, 1942.

Dear Dr. Bouma:

We have now been at war for three years, and our way of life has been greatly changed since 1939. Day by day we become more impressed by the grim road that lies ahead. Our northern towns have been bombed by the enemy many times, and lately his raiders have extended their operations further south. The possibility of invasion is always present but the people of Australia have gained confidence everywhere.

Rationing and other war restrictions have affected all of us, and while some adopt the attitude of ‘eat, drink, and be merry,’ others are speculating on the form the new world order will assume.

Russia, Communism, and Calvinism

The gallant stand of the Russians against Hitler’s Germany has directed the attention to the great social experiment in the U.S.S.R. and many seem to think that it will form the foundation on which the New World will be built.

By the narrow gauge through which liberalism views the world, the social achievements of the Soviet Union have been translated as Practical Christianity, with the result that the latest contribution to liberal theological thought places the emphasis more than ever on good works, and even the Atheist is pushed into heaven against his will. The sacrificial death of our Lord Jesus Christ is completely lost in the greatness of human achievement. Dean Hawlett Johnson stresses this point in his book, The Socialist Sixth of the World. The Dean uses the following illustration as an unanswerable argument. “Tolstoy, we are told, once asked Maxim Gorky point blank: ‘Do you believe in God?’ Gorky replied ‘No’. Let me paraphrase Tolstoy’s reply, ‘You say you don’t, and you believe you don’t; in reality you do. Every word you write tells me so. It is not what a man says, or thinks he says, but what a man is, that speaks the truth; your whole being tells me you believe in God.’

Liberalism either questions Gorky’s honesty, or places him in a stage of mental ability that it is essential to tell him what he believes.

This renovated modernism, with its anthropo-centric philosophy, for the most part is the accepted message for to-day. I am persuaded that the Reformed Conception of the Political Order should be restated and presented as the solution for the world’s problems. The tendency today in Australia is to concentrate on Social Science at the expense of man’s spiritual nature. Not that this is a new development, but present conditions are forcing men to think of a new world order. A social science that repudiates the spirituality of man must eventually subject all things to the state, and threaten the natural rights of man to use his rational powers for the acquisition of knowledge, and in its application in the worship of a Creator, exercising his private judgment and liberty of conscience. It also threatens the intrinsic and positive aspect of the Reformation, namely, the exposition and propagation of the substance of Christianity, repudiating all human authority and speculation in matters of religion, and acknowledging the Holy Scripture as the only standard of faith and practice. Dr. V. Hepp of Amsterdam said, “By virtue of creation according to God’s image every personality has sovereignty in himself. On that account Calvinism does not tolerate tyranny or dictatorship, because sovereignty has been given to man in society. Except the sovereignty which God laid down in creation, He has also, by means of Common and Particular Grace, imposed many varieties of sovereignty. All these limit one another.

American Soldiers and Sunday Amusements

The presence of American soldiers in our cities and American planes overhead, together with the exploits of American airmen in the Far North, give us an added sense of security. With one or two exceptions, with which you are no doubt already acquainted, the troops on the whole are a very fine type, and certainly their conduct does credit to America. Unfortunately certain people interested in organized entertainment, are using the presence of American soldiers as an excuse to open theatres on the Sabbath. In the past, organized entertainment has been forbidden by law on the Sabbath Day in Australia. In the press various views were expressed by different sections of the community. It was strongly hinted that it was the desire of the High Command that the troops should be entertained. This brought the following reply from General MacArthur. Lieut.-Colonel Charles H. Morhouse, M.C., A.D.C., writing on behalf of the General said, “General MacArthur is very concerned over what appears to be a misapprehension that the question of Sunday entertainment for the troops arose from his Headquarters. Neither he nor his Staff have in any way concerned themselves in this matter, for it is known that it has been a recurrent problem in Australian history for many years, and it is felt that the presence of American troops is being used to open this question with renewed vigor.
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"I assure you that no one is more anxious to retain the sanctity of God’s Day than General MacArthur, and this view is the one held in general by the entire American nation".

While America and Britain are calling for a second front in Europe, we in Australia are waiting anxiously for our land forces to take up the offensive against the Japanese. Many of us have loved ones who are in the hands of the enemy, and this undoubtedly distorts our view of strategy and disposition of armed forces. I am sure there are many anxious hearts in America, for the welfare of their boys in Japanese prison camps, who wait and long for the offensive as we do. We have every confidence in General MacArthur, and feel sure that his statement on his arrival in Australia was no idle boast, when he said that he was going back to the Philippines.

Australian Calvinistic Society

The annual meeting of the Calvinistic Society was held in the Presbyterian Assembly Hall on the 31st July. Professor John Gillies was again elected president. Preliminary arrangements were made to hold a Calvinistic Conference next year. The work and influence of the Society continues to advance, and if war conditions permit, the Society will publish a ‘Reformed Theological Review’ in October.

Warmest regards,
Yours very sincerely,
ARTHUR ALLEN.

Presbyterian Church of New Zealand

Maori Mission, Reporoa,
Via Rotorua, N. Z.,
June 18, 1942.

[Rec’d. Aug. 24, 1942.]

Dr. C. Bouma, Editor
THE CALVIN FORUM.
Grand Rapids, Michigan.

Dear Dr. Bouma:

I t is now some months since last I gave you news of events in Church life in New Zealand. Through the entry of Japan into the war communication with America is threatened, and in some sense we feel the isolation which it brings with it. However, on the other hand there are many things which seem to draw us closer together. Brigadier Hurley, first United States minister to New Zealand, has been one of the Maoris. He joined the Home Mission Staff of our Church in 1914, and commenced work among the Maoris in 1918, being appointed Superintendent in 1933. His life has been one of singular devotion to the native people of our country, and his name is a household word among the Maoris. Mr. Laughton is a born linguist—his ability in this direction being readily acknowledged by the natives, some of whom admitting to me that he speaks the Maori language better than themselves. A work which will remain for all time as a monument to the Rev. Laughton’s intense fervour in the interests of the spiritual welfare of the native race is his “The Maori Service Book.” I had Mr. Laughton here conducting our last Communion Service and I must say it was a hallowed time. In calling the Rev. Laughton to her moderatorial chair the Presbyterian Church of New Zealand commemorates one hundred years of missionary activity among the Maoris. Our Church was later than other denominations in venturing into this field, but due to the devotion and sacrifice of many missionaries a great work has been performed. We who labour in the Maori field today can testify to the foundation work of the first one hundred years. As I am more isolated now than previously, I can only give you impressions I have formed from reports, etc., that reach me. What I have given you may only be a tributary and not the main stream of Church life out here. I trust that it serves its purpose though of bringing New Zealand before your readers.

Yours sincerely,
JOHN N. SMITH.

From the New Hebrides

Presbyterian Mission, Tonga, New Hebrides, 9th April, 1942.

Dear Dr. Bouma:

I WRITE to thank you for all the good things you continue to send us in the columns of THE CALVIN FORUM. I fully concur in the head-note which Dr. Craig placed over the reprint of Dr. Berkhof’s article in the October, 1941, issue of OCTOBER, 1942 * * * THE CALVIN FORUM
Christianity Today. Dr. Craig's tribute was a re-echoing of one's own sentiments.

Out here we have no facilities for sending forward money to the U. S. A., and I have had to ask Angus & Robertson, Ltd., of Sydney to arrange for the payment of my subscription for 1942/43. No doubt you shall receive a Postal Order in due course.

I have at last procured Calvin—or rather, my father has procured it for me. This is the Westminster Press Edition with the Introduction by Dr. Warfield. I am now anxious to secure a good life (or lives) of Calvin and any separate volume published on Calvin and Missions. I believe E. Dumas's standard work does not exist in English. If that is so, it would seem to be a great pity. I would value any advice you could spare the time to send me hereon.

I would like to join in the chorus of appreciation of the series of articles on the Sabbath Issue. When in college I never emerged to clear views on the relation of the Christian under the New Covenant to Law in general and to The Law in particular. I did my Old Testament thesis on the Deuteronome but got bogged down on the Sabbath question! The summary of Dr. Van Til's paper on Common Grace and Prof. Carl Ernst's letter on the Sabbath Question were contributions of real merit.

On the other hand I feel sorry for the Editors of the Evangelical Quarterly of Edinburgh. The effect of the war is no doubt being seen in the quality of the articles. This Journal has made an immense contribution to my knowledge of and zeal for our Reformed doctrines, but just at present it seems the Lumhukuti people decided to camp in the bush. Wet weather sent them out. I am glad to know that they are not in one of the more obscure spots, and here in our District we have alternated between pleadings and threatenings in dealing with the native reactions. It is difficult to see how we can hope to have one's own sentiments.

The general scare-atmosphere has diffused itself over the most obscure spots, and here in our District we have alternated between pleadings and threatenings in dealing with the native reactions. Our folk here (not the avowed Christians) take panic quickly. At one stage, not long since, a large section of the Lumhukuti people decided to camp in the bush. Weather sent them scuttling home again after a couple of days. Nothing happened, of course, and the laugh was definitely on them. We do laugh at them sometimes, especially when they ignore the only reliable source of information on the Island (our radio) and give heed to their own 'Bush Wires!' There are three major evils on Tonga and the most common of these is lying. It is all but universal.

About half our New Hebrides Mission personnel is now out of the islands; a few families were away on furlough when things took a serious turn last December, and a few have since evacuated. It is difficult to see how we can hope to have Synod at Nguna in June as was originally intended.

I say nothing further of the war, except that I bless God for that national comradeship which you have extended to us. May the Lord preserve His people and preserve His Church.

Ever yours sincerely,

J. GRAHAM MILLER.

India

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

Dear Sir:

VENTS have marched swiftly forward since I last wrote in these columns some fifteen weeks ago, and India, as one of the main bases of operations for the armed forces of the United Nations, finds herself in the front pages of many of the world's best known dailies. And as the world's radio commentators appear to keep the listening public posted almost from hour to hour with all the salient details of happenings here, there is little that an amateur scribe like myself could add to informed America's knowledge of Indian affairs except some comment "from the inside".

Well, Sir Stafford Cripps has come and gone, his unique mission having almost passed into history. The Cripps Mission failed for two main reasons, the lesser being the lack of anything new or constructive in the way of a scheme for an interim administration until India becomes a fully fledged Dominion after the war, and the other a more ominous cause of failure, the deep-rooted and apparently irremovable distrust of some of the main political parties for one another and the British. But the Mother of Parliament's gesture in sending us Sir Stafford has not been in vain as the Indian public and many ranking politicians have been awakened to a sense of realism and urgency regarding the country's plight caused by the sinister shadow of Nippon looming over it.

But the general political situation is still far from reassuring, a great deal of confused and wrong thinking being prevalent. Mahatma Gandhi, for instance, with pitifully poor judgment, is insisting that the British and the Americans should leave this country to herself, and that Indians should have the right to conclude any treaty or agreement they wish with Japan or any other country, and that if Japan should invade India, Indians should resist the invasion by non-violent means.

One stands aghast at such a pronouncement from a man who has been for many years India's number one leader. Let a leading daily speak for all true patriots: "How grievous a betrayal of the cause of freedom this view is must be apparent to every citizen who knows that liberty must be defended unto death itself if it is to be preserved ... ."

I must, however, ask my readers not to make the mistake of taking Gandhi, Nehru, Jinnah, and Azad too literally, as those men, along with their henchmen, are tied hand and foot to their respective party machines and therefore cannot be said to represent the millions to the extent that they claim. But, fortunately, we have men of the calibre of Sir T. B. Sapr, M. R. Jayakar, R. Paranjype, C. R. Reddy, Sir K. V. R. Naidu, and last, but by no means the least, C. Rajagopalchariar ("C. R."), as he is known to most South Indians) who, audaciously breaking with the Congress party, has raised the standard of a National Front that is positively and openly anti-Fascist as well as anti-non-violent, and out to fight the Japs tooth and nail. It is perhaps on the collective shoulders of this small but able and influential group of realists that the chief burden of ruling the India of tomorrow will fall.

America and India

In spite of the large number of resident American missionaries and business people who have left India for the U. S., a great many still remain at their posts, and this number is being augmented every few weeks by the arrival of "many thousands of Uncle Sam's troops" promised to us by Col. Louis Johnson, your President's Special Envoy.

Delivered at New Delhi on April 23rd, and broadcast over a nationwide radio network, Johnson's speech was easily the most impressive heard from any responsible international statesman for a very long time. To the apatent it clearly bore the impress of Mr. Roosevelt's genius for saying the right thing at the right moment. Much more, the speech went a long way towards allaying certain unfortunate misconceptions that have grown up in the minds of large sections of ill-informed, enemy-propaganda-fed folks regarding America's "Imperialist aims" and "the country's plans concerning the establishment of U. S. vested interests in India". A sentence like the following, culled from the speech, will not, I think, be easily forgotten by responsible Indians: "To the successful prosecution of the war and to the perfection of a noble peace, I pledge you the most earnest efforts of the people of the United
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States and of their great leader, and to those high ends we have dedicated our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honour."

The sending to India of the U. S. Technical Mission under the leadership of Dr. Henry Grady is regarded as an earnest of your Government's desire to help us gear up our industrial war potential to the tempo of this most amazing of world wars. Dr. Grady and his four technical experts, who must now be back in America, were welcomed with gratitude and genuine appreciation by all save the wilfully prejudiced, more especially as Dr. Grady (whom I mentioned in my letter of last October) made such a favorable impression on most people during his previous visit to these shores.

Fresh evidence of the very real good-will existing among many sections of Americans towards India and of their evident desire to understand our problem is afforded by a correspondent from Allahabad who tells of a most interesting message sent by the famous physicist, Prof. Arthur Compton of New York, on behalf of American Friends of India, and addressed to Dr. Herbert Rice, of the Allahabad Christian College, and a number of other public men, including party leaders and scientists. This message says, “American Friends of India join in the prayer that India finds the means of co-operating with Britain. They believe that India's freedom is possible only with the United Nations victorious.”

This growing spirit of friendship between our two nations is naturally very gratifying to the writer who went to America six years ago as a humble ambassador from Christian India and who, since his return, has striven to interpret American thought and the American way of life to his compatriots, Christian as well as Hindu and Muslim, and to bring about a better understanding between your splendidly virile civilization and our own ancient culture of which we are so proud.

Fresh evidence of the very real good-will existing among many sections of Americans towards India and of their evident desire to understand our problem is afforded by a correspondent from Allahabad who tells of a most interesting message sent by the famous physicist, Prof. Arthur Compton of New York, on behalf of American Friends of India, and addressed to Dr. Herbert Rice, of the Allahabad Christian College, and a number of other public men, including party leaders and scientists. This message says, “American Friends of India join in the prayer that India finds the means of co-operating with Britain. They believe that India's freedom is possible only with the United Nations victorious.”

This growing spirit of friendship between our two nations is naturally very gratifying to the writer who went to America six years ago as a humble ambassador from Christian India and who, since his return, has striven to interpret American thought and the American way of life to his compatriots, Christian as well as Hindu and Muslim, and to bring about a better understanding between your splendidly virile civilization and our own ancient culture of which we are so proud.

The obituary of the late Rev. William Stuart came as a great shock to us as we opened the February number of The Forum a few weeks ago. And although my small tribute to this big-hearted Christian will appear in print possibly nine months after his death, I would like to say that, having had the privilege of knowing Mr. Stuart and of enjoying the charm of his personality and his genial wit, I feel sure that the passing of this fine scholar and gentleman will be long felt at the Christian High School as well as among a wider circle of friends, right out beyond the boundaries of the Christian Reformed community in Michigan where I happen to know he was loved and respected. “He being dead, yet speaketh” is no doubt true of this great soul whose influence touched so many young lives.

Back-to-God Hour

Started by the Buchmanites about four years ago, the Moral Rearmament movement appears to have died a natural death, largely unmourned. But one rejoices to observe the growing realisation in the Protestant Church the world over of the need for a spiritual awakening and regeneration. This general urge appears to have taken shape more recently in the initiation of various more orthodox movements in Britain and America. The “Back to God Hour” broadcast over a chain of eight stations as reported in your March number, just in, makes interesting reading and I would like to wish the sponsors much blessing in their new venture. Surely the need for people to get back to the habit of worship, the study of God's Word, and to prayer is greater than ever in these dark days.

Trusting you and your friends will have a profitable time at the Calvinistic Conference which will be commencing in a day or two, believe me,

Fraternally yours,

V. RAMIAH.

Book Review

THE BASIS FOR DEMOCRACY

This book is a symposium on the democratic way of life. It contains the essays and discussions of the Second Conference on Science, Philosophy, and Religion held in New York, September 9-11, 1941.

The purpose of this conference is to discover a more secure foundation for democracy. This foundation can be provided by the “co-operative endeavors of scientists, philosophers, and theologians” (p. 435). Democracy and religion are to be defended against the destructive forces as Communism and Nazism.

The authors of these essays are scientists, philosophers, and theologians. We must also include literateurs and lawyers. Among the philosophers we find men like Th. M. Greene of Princeton, the Panpsychist Charles Hartshorne of Chicago, the Pragmatists, Empirists, and the Thomists. Among the theologians we find men from Andover, Nels F. S. Ferré, from the Jewish Theological Seminary of New York, the Talmud scholars Ben Zion Bokser and Simon Greenberg. From Princeton, J. A. Mackay, and others.

Let us begin with the scientist. What contribution can the scientist make to the defence of democracy? This seems to be the problem. The scientist has concerned himself very little with the stream of life passing by his laboratory doors. He was the pure scientist of facts. But tragically enough Hitler took these facts and reduced them to implements of destruction, destruction even of the liberty of the scientist that was prerequisite to make the discoveries possible. The scientist must halt in the world of facts. He must step out of his laboratory, or, rather, plunge himself into the stream of life so he may direct it in safer channels. He has no blueprint of the future but he has the ability as a scientist to give direction to civilization. If the reviewer may here inject thoughts from other pages of the book, there is a wholesome demand for more philosophical and theological appreciation to see life as a whole and not only from the windows of a laboratory.

Next the philosophers make their contribution to the defence of democracy. Pragmatism realizes that life is a continual process of adjustment to new situations. Consequently Pragmatism is the ideal and flexible form of philosophy to satisfy the needs of flexibility in a democratic way of life (pp. 113, 115). Empiricists as well as others do not hesitate to tell us what religion is and what its function must be in a democracy. It is a path of life in which terms and concepts must be seen in their true symbolic character. The Thomists of today feel the need of eternal truths as first principles, such as natural law, the rights of man, to guarantee a solid foundation for the superstructure called democracy. Others feel that life needs liberty for expansion. Hence, democracy demands liberty for the advancement of the arts and sciences. Another makes this observation that we need first of all science, then philosophy and religion to utilize these data, and then education to perpetuate this scientific knowledge in our educational system (p. 513). That is, first we get the facts, then their interpretations, and their perpetuation.

The Religionists also speak. We have very little on Calvinism. Once mention is made that we need the dynamic per-
sonality of a Calvin, especially that of a Luther. New Eng­
land sermons are quoted, many of the deistic period, stressing
the sovereignty of God and the value of the individual for
democracy. But the great field of Calvinistic democratic enter-
prise, if we may thus classify the activities of Kuyper and
Colijn, seems to be unknown.

There are very valuable studies on the Talmud, Patristic
literature, and Thomism regarding the value of man. Besides
this approach, that the doctrine of the image of God in man
is congenial to democracy, another note is struck in the re-
ligious and theological contributions to political development.
Jefferson may have followed Locke and Rousseau. No doubt
Rousseau followed Locke in his conception that all men are
equal, but Locke still believed in God the creator of all men.
Although modern democracy may have been fed from human-
itarian visions, its rootage is still in the faith that God is the
Creator of all men.

The religious approach is in a general way to this effect.
The major premise is: Equality is the essence of democracy.
Secondly, God created man, hence He made him equal. This
the Talmud teaches, this Thomism teaches, etc. Thirdly, the
Talmud, or Thomism, therefore, contain the very principles
of democracy.

In evaluating this book we must remember that we are
dealing with a symposium. The only unity that can be found
in the book is the determination to defend democracy. The
one great question remains: in spite of racial differences in
presuppositions can there be a concerted action? Is William
James correct: We are not interested in the roots but in
the fruits? This book is a valuable contribution in many fields. It gives
us a cross section of opinion on current problems. It presents
a lofty attempt to undergird democracy with a sound found-
ation. In doing so, it brings home to our age that the modern
rush to the laboratories and the exodus from the classrooms
in philosophy and theology are extremely dangerous. It tells
us to think on the requirements of peace as well as of war.
Perhaps the alternatives, world democracy or totalitarianism,
may be a little too simple. Still we must think about the
world of tomorrow. This book also emphasizes the fact that
scholars are morally bound to contribute to the world of to-
morrow. Finally, we can discern a certain development in
the definition of democracy. Is it political? Social? Cultural?
All of us are guilty of using the term loosely. Its varied usage
indicates the need of further explication.

At the same time there are certain things a reviewer can-
not pass over. Any criticism of the book is a criticism of the
conference. Of necessity such a conference must produce a
book full of contradictions. This is particularly true in the
philosophical and theological enterprises. A Thomist must
have his unchangeable first principles. A Pragmatist must
have none of these. In fact, such would be a deathblow to his
pragmatism. Although we do not accept the alternative first
principles of pragmatism, we cannot see how a pragmatist
on his basis can be a defender of democracy. He must assume
that democracy has a permanent value. He must assume that
liberty and conscience are inherent rights. Theoretically litter
would be the best exponent of pragmatism applied to his own
advantage. No doubt, a pragmatist needs democracy but de-
mocracy would fare better without pragmatism. Hence in
permitting pragmatism, which democracy must, it is under-
mining its own foundations.

This book also abounds in abstractions. Terms as liberty,
natural rights, natural law abounds. The assumption seems to
be that all men accept these terms uncritically in about the
same way.

Although we can commend the conference in its attempt to
define democracy, we must confess that the conference did not
grapple critically enough with its own definitions. Glibly de-
mocracy was defined as a social pattern. If democracy becomes
more than legal equality, will democracy not possibly infuse
something into modern life that of necessity will destroy de-
mocracy itself? Is it not conceivable that an alleged demo-
cratic culture could be imposed upon dissenters the moment
democracy is defined socially and culturally?

There may be another related self-destructive force at
work. Since Bacon, especially since Kant, there has been a
battle between science in the rights of personality. Should
be vaccinated or should we allow the parent to object? Mod-
ern democracy may add another element: authority. Will
our government insist upon forcing personalities to submit to
the data of science? (Compulsory sterilization of prisoners).
In how far will the irrefutable data of the scientist be thrust
upon the community through the power of the state? Will
religious convictions be overruled? This problem is presented
in the book as a possible contribution but not as a problem.
This triangle of science, personality, and authority somewhere
 touched upon is one of the greatest problems of modern
democracy.

There is also some non sequitur reasoning. Suppose the Tal-
mud and Thomism are correct that God created men equal,
does it follow that we must have a democracy? Of course not.
Centuries of Thomism failed to eventuate in a democracy.
Besides, democracy implies the rule of the people (demos) the
citizens. How will the individual and created rights of a man
of necessity fare better under the rule of a demos, a people,
than under a monarch? Perhaps so, but does it necessarily
follow? Did the mob respect Jesus Christ? Then, too, can
we jump logically from the individual image-bearer to the
demos, or people? All that this implies is that there are con-
genial elements in both systems that gravitate to democracy.
The history of the Jewish race indicates that it was more
democratic than many other races. The Thomists on the other
hand are in duty bound to relate all their com-
plementary remarks about democracy to the papal encyclicals
that unabashed demand the very destruction of our American
liberties.

In retrospect: will such a conference help us a good deal?
Time will tell. At present it is still self-contradictory. If
self-contradictory presuppositions can produce unified action
it augurs well. Then we have reverted to the pragmatism of
William James. We have the fruits without the roots. Or,
may it be possible to defend something which to a degree
seems to be common to both for the sake of present expediency?
Perhaps we may have to give up our philosophical and theo-
logical quests for certainty. Perhaps, on the contrary, we
may have to look to France not to unite too loosely all diver-
gent and hostile opinions under the same flag called democracy.

Do Calvinists believe in democracy? Indeed! But they do
not found that belief first of all upon the dignity of man or the
equality of man's creation. Thomistic humanism may do that.
They must emphasize a democracy that is only a re-
democracy. They should set forth a democracy from the point
of view of the sovereignty of God. Briefly, this would follow.
The Sovereign has laws for each area of life. The State has
its boundary lines. The home is an area in itself. Now de-
mocracy demands that we recognize that each area has its
own laws and liberties. Hence we insist upon a democracy
that sets forth the principle of liberty. As far as the State
is concerned let each man have the liberty of conscience.
The State may not compel man to accept the truth with the edge
of the sword. As far as the church is concerned let the
church recognize this liberty legally but not necessarily morally.
Morally the church must fight error with the sword of truth, the
Word of God. Its method is preaching. Democracy must demand
that every area must work harmoniously without fear of loss of
liberty to do so. Each area must accept the sacred trust to
have the liberty to spend itself to help men to the honor of
God. Lest we appear too negative, we have added this sketchy
sketch of God in man
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