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Paganizing the Christian Festivals

The Christian Year with its great festivals is not only deeply imbedded in the consciousness of the Christian Church, but also in the calendar and in the social and the national life of all Christian countries. Christmas, Good Friday, Easter, Ascension Day, and Pentecost testify in eloquent language of the significance of the redemptive work of Christ. In European countries these festivals are accentuated even more than in our own land by reason of the fact that such festivals as Easter and Pentecost are celebrated not one day, the Lord’s Day, but also on a second day, the succeeding Monday, which by that fact is made a national holiday as well.

With the resurgence of the Teutonic paganism in Germany and the complete repudiation of the Christ of the Scriptures and the verities of the redemptive cycle of Christian truth under Nazism, it is not surprising that these national festivals are an eye-sore to the apostles of the Nazi world and life view. Alfred Rosenberg, Hitler’s Kulturminister, the spearhead of this pagan Nazi ideology, has for some time directed his propaganda toward the paganization of these festivals. It is not wise for the Nazi pagans to attempt to suppress these festivals. They have decided to empty them of their Christian meaning and to fill them with a new pagan content. Rosenberg is the philosopher in the galaxy of Hitler satellites. He is the author of Der Mythus des 20. Jahrhunderts, which might, even more appropriately than Hitler’s own Mein Kampf, be styled the new pagan bible of Nazism. In most outspoken fashion he denounced every Judaic influence (and Jesus was to him only a Jew) as well as every trace of Christianity. In the “Thirty-Point Plan”, which is from his pen, he decreed: “The National Church is determined to exterminate irrevocably and by every means the strange and foreign Christian faiths imported into Germany in the ill-omened year 800.”

By this stand and its secret, though virtual, adoption by the Nazi big-wigs, a great stimulus has been given to the revival of paganism and the suppression of the Christian religion. Oswald Dutch in his informative Hitler’s Twelve Apostles (p. 91) tells us: “In many parts of Germany it was possible to observe before Rosenberg’s day inclinations to heathen customs. The cult of Wotan, the worship of Freya and Loki had not been fully stamped out in isolated spots in Germany, even in the most peaceful times before the World War. The distress of the war and postwar years had fostered a return to superstition, the forming of sects, and the return of heathen cults. In many cases, therefore, the preaching of a new heathen religion by Rosenberg fell on fertile ground.”

One point in the Rosenberg program for the revival of Teutonic paganism and the destruction of the Christian Faith is the “transvaluation” (to use a Nietzschean term) of the Christian festivals, which are so deeply embedded in Christian German religion and life. The notorious “Thirty-Point Plan” decrees in point 25: “In order that school graduation of our German youth be given an especially solemn character, all National Churches must put themselves at the disposal of German youth. The Hitler Youth day will be on the Friday before Easter. On this day only the leaders of these organizations may speak.”

When once the Nazis really have their way, there will be no Good Friday in the German churches any more. Nor will there be an Ascension Day. Point 27 of this same document pontificates: “The National Church declares the tenth day before Whitsunday to be the national holiday of the German family.”

How cleverly this propaganda for the paganization of the Christian festivals is carried on may be seen from an editorial which appeared last Christmas-month in Deutscher Glaube, the official organ of the German Faith movement. We quote it from “The Spiritual Issues of the War”, Number 173, February 25, 1943, and offer the paragraphs in full to give a good insight into both the content and the method of this paganizing process and propaganda.

“We cannot separate Christmas from thoughts of peace and love. Peace is the condition of that quiet and abiding creativeness out of which the great civilisations of history grow. This is the meaning of the Indo-German Saga of the King of Peace, of the Nordic Froth, under whose government perfect peace reigned and in whose time the fields brought forth abundant fruit... So also in the time of our German forbears the time of the turning of the year was regarded as holy. This can be historically traced in the Nordic Julfest. The twelve nights between the longest night and the recognisable lengthening of daylight were regarded as especially holy. Our word ‘Weihnacht’—holy night—comes from that. Even at that time Christmas was a season of peace and love in which all enmities were put aside, foes were reconciled and people gave each other tokens of friendship and love.

“For this reason it was possible for Christianity to link its message of Peace on Earth to this old German festival, and to proclaim the Birth of the Prince of Peace, Jesus Christ, as its special content. This was prepared for in the early Church, for from the fourth century onwards the Birth of Jesus in the stall of Bethlehem was celebrated on the day when the Romans celebrated the birthday of the new unconquerable Sun, the ‘Sol Invictus.’
"So the Church adapted itself to the old Indo-German Feast of Sunbirth, Peace and Love. With this Christian content the Christmas festival has taken a special place in the hearts of the German people for centuries. Nowhere in the whole world has the Christmas festival had so rich and deep a meaning as in German lands. For the form and content of this festival are older than Christianity. Therefore the old sacred meaning and value which it has for the German soul must not collapse with the collapse of Christian beliefs and values. Jesus Christ was only one symbol of eternal love, just as Buddha was another. The meaning of Christmas can be won anew, for the roots of this festival lie much deeper in our foundations than the roots of the Christian Christmas. Germanic man believes in Peace and Love not only as set forth in one Person such as Jesus Christ, but as the eternal, continual self-revealing powers of God, which move in the world and work in the hearts of men."

God will keep His church and to the end of time the great Christian festivals will be observed, but there can be no question what the Christian Church is facing on this score if and when the Nazis have their way.

C. B.

United Evangelical Action

The forth-coming constitutional convention of the National Association of Evangelicals for United Action, scheduled to be held May 4-7 at Chicago, brings home to all evangelical Christians that finally a movement has been born that bids fair to become the rightful and effective representative and spokesman for the truly evangelical religious forces in our country in matters not strictly denominational or ecclesiastical but of joint interest and concern to the group as a whole as over against outside agencies, interests, and causes.

Whoever supports this organization will do so prompted by two convictions: the one that the orthodox religious forces (i.e., those who are evangelical in the biblical sense of the word) cannot consider themselves properly represented by such an existing organization as the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America; and, the second, that there are many joint interests which all such evangelical churches have in their relationship to the state and other movements and organizations which make some joint organization representative of these churches desirable and imperative.

Impelled by this twofold conviction, a group of interested evangelical leaders met at Chicago in October 1941 and made preparations for the first convention, which was held at St. Louis in April 1942. The forthcoming convention to be held next month at the La Salle Hotel in the city of Chicago will undoubtedly be of great significance for the future of the movement. It will be the first convention at which regular delegates from churches, boards, educational institutions, etc., will be present, and at this convention the constitution, already tentatively adopted at the St. Louis meeting, will be finally acted upon.

In the course of the past year regional conferences have been organized throughout the country and the response has been remarkable. It is apparent that many denominations, institutions, and organizations within evangelical Christendom have felt that there is need for some united action and that the Federal Council has no right to speak for them. It is heartening to notice that representatives from the most varied orthodox groups can get together on a sound doctrinal platform and agree on the main features of a program of action. There are, of course, many difficulties to overcome, but with prayerful, consecrated, and self-denying action there is every reason to believe that this movement will develop into an effective instrument for united evangelical action.

We shall no doubt hear more of this organization in the future. Meanwhile we advise all those interested to procure a copy of Evangelical Action!, a cloth-bound 160-page book selling for One Dollar, containing all information to date. There is also a monthly four-page Bulletin which offers current news on the progress of the movement. President of this new organization is Dr. Harold J. Ockenga of the Park Street Church, Boston. General Secretary is the Rev. J. Elwin Wright. Headquarters: United Evangelical Action, 120 Tremont Street, Boston, Mass.

C. B.

Roman Catholic Totalitarianism

TOTALITARIANISM is not restricted to the political realm. It is likewise found in religious and ecclesiastical groups. The evil of totalitarianism is not that it considers itself a superior form of the social and political pattern, but that it would rob all other groups of the freedom to propagate their views and would force every citizen into their totalitarian strait-jacket, even to the point of resorting to intimidation and persecution.

That such totalitarianism—though it did not go by that name—was common in the mediaeval and the early modern periods of church history every student of the subject knows. Not only did the mediaeval Church suppress all heretical views by intimidation, threats, and persecution, but also too many of the Protestant Reformers could not at first see the evil of this totalitarianism. Church and state conspired to suppress by violence the beliefs of those who were considered heterodox from the point of view of the recognized form of religion in a given country, whether that were the Roman Catholic or the Protestant form. It took many Protestant countries, and even the founding fathers of our own nation in a new world, some time before they saw the evil of this view and the resultant practice. We need not here speak of the rôle which
Calvinism has played in the establishment of the principle and practice of freedom of worship. It is sufficient to note that all Protestants (if we may ignore the periodic uprising of so un-American and anti-Protestant a movement like the Ku Klux Klan) are agreed that, even if they had the power, they would not think of suppressing the Roman Catholic form of Christianity.

One could wish that the same thing were true of the Roman Catholics. Candor and truthfulness, however, demand that we acknowledge certain plain facts. One such fact is, that the Roman Catholic Church in its official teaching still holds that all non-Roman forms of Christianity are spurious and should be suppressed. The other is, that in every prevailingly Roman Catholic country Protestants are even now frequently subjected to Roman Catholic persecution—and that often of the most vicious kind. Religious and ecclesiastical totalitarianism is still the ideal of the Roman Church. In Protestant countries the Roman Church pleads for religious liberty. It knows that the only way for it to enjoy that liberty in a mixed or prevailingly Protestant country is by recognizing liberty for all. The acid test of their belief in religious liberty can only be made in prevailingly Roman Catholic countries, where Protestants are in the minority. And here the facts do not exactly stand on the side of those who claim that Roman Catholicism believes in religious freedom for all as well as does Protestantism. Let those testify who have lived in predominantly Romanist countries. The recent hue and cry against Protestant missions in such Roman Catholic countries as those of South America is an interesting illustration of the point under discussion. The Romanists want liberty for their church to preach everywhere, but claim that, if a country is prevailingly Roman Catholic, Protestants should be debarred from carrying on their missionary activity within its borders.

This is the practical application of the religious intolerance and the ecclesiastical totalitarianism of the Roman Church. Protestants will do well to keep their eyes open to this evil. C. B.

You Will Want this Book

YOU remember the splendid addresses delivered at the Second American Calvinistic Conference at Grand Rapids last June. The Word of God was the subject of discussion. The glory of God was the keynote of the conference and of every address. The clarification, advancement and propagation of the truth of God was the consistent objective.

You remember how eager we all were to conserve the inspiration and instruction received. Repeated hopes were expressed that these addresses might soon be available for re-reading and further study. These hopes will now be realized. The book is at the binders and will be available just about the time this issue of The Calvin Forum comes into your hands.

It will be a treat to listen again—and that at one's leisure—to such men as Dr. Ockenga, Professor Berkhof, Dr. Allis, Dr. Henry Stob, Dr. John De Vries, Professor Welmers, Dr. Wencelius, and Dr. Crowe. You can feast again on discussions dealing with the relationship and significance of the Word of God for Theology, for Philosophy, for Science, for Education, and for the whole realm of Art and Culture. It will be most inspiring once more to listen to that masterful opening address on the Glory of the Word of God. And it will be very instructive again to sit at the feet of that fine Bible teacher who instructed us in the erroneous methods of Bible interpretation of the higher critics on the one hand and of the dispensationalists on the other, and gave us such a fine appreciation and exposition of the harmonistic method of interpreting Scripture as the tried-and-true method, the time-honored method of the Calvinist.

You will also relish the re-reading of that fresh and stimulating banquet address of Dr. William Crowe on Calvinism To-morrow, or, Where Do We Go from Here? And then there are the brief banquet speeches on the Reformed Faith Today in France, in Hungary, and in the Netherlands. The book also contains all the names and addresses of the four hundred registered conference. There is a conference photo to lend a touch of flesh and blood and living personalities to this volume of God-centered ideas and ideals.

The Conference Committee is interested in having this volume enjoy as wide a circulation as possible and is prompted only by spiritual, not commercial, aims. All the work of editing and even that of handling and distributing is done for the good of the cause, so that the price of this work could be held down and put within easy reach of everyone really interested. One Dollar will buy this volume postpaid. Its title is: "The Word of God and the Reformed Faith."

If you will send a paper dollar wrapped in a sheet of paper with your name and address, the book will be mailed to you promptly when it comes off the press.

Send your orders either to Baker's Book Store, 1019 Wealthy Street, SE., Grand Rapids, Mich., or, if you prefer, simply to The Calvin Forum, Calvin College, Grand Rapids, Mich.

Comments, criticisms, reviews, and suggestions will be gratefully received by the editor of The Calvin Forum, who had the honor of being President of the Conference and is a member of the Editing Committee for the volume. C. B.
Why Talk Peace Now?

Henry J. Ryskamp
Professor of Economics,
Calvin College

"For want of a nail a shoe was lost, for want of a shoe a horse was lost, for want of a horse a rider was lost, for want of a rider a battle was lost, for want of a battle a kingdom was lost, and all for want of a horse shoe nail." This familiar proverb from Poor Richard's Almanac has been quoted time and again in the last few years. Men used it somewhat hesitantly in this country when the war clouds were gathering in Europe. Partly because those who used the proverb failed to make its application to our situation clear, but largely because people were in no mood to listen to proverbs, much less to their application, the quotation carried little warning. After December 7, 1941, millions not only recalled this or similar adages, but immediately caught the lesson which they were intended to convey. We know now that for want of preparation a war may be lost. Although that should have been part of the lesson which World War I taught us, we do not now sufficiently realize that for want of preparation the peace to follow this war may be lost.

Peace Not Made in a Hurry

"This war is not yet over by any means," a host of voices will protest—and thus attempt to drown out the talk of peace. With some justification also. For, our elation over a few small victories having passed, a calm consideration of the hard facts which the war presents, compels us to admit that this may be a long war, one of gradually wearing down our enemies at a terrible cost of life and property to ourselves. We are being reminded, again with much justification, that the winning of this war may demand all that we have, that unless we concentrate every effort on winning it we may lose it, or lose almost all our resources in winning it. So-called practical-minded men are saying, "Let us do the thing in hand and get that over with before we consider anything else. Let us not dream of the future now, let us face the present." "We must do something," we are told. "We must fight, we must get down to bitter reality—put aside dreaming concerning the future."

Any serious-minded person must appreciate the value of proceeding cautiously at a time like the present. Men must realize that in our haste to do one thing we may neglect another. While arguing about the peace, the war may indeed be lost. But it is just as true that while we are fighting we may lose our sense of direction, that just as we may be too much in a hurry in our consideration of peace we may also be too late, that, although there never was a time in history in which men should be more eager to do something, there never was a time either in which men should make more certain that what they are doing is right.

Lasting Peace Not Based on Force

Whatever their attitude toward proposals for the peace may be, men do have conceptions of the making of peace in mind while they fight. With increasing frequency the remark is made that we must not treat our enemies as gently this time as we did after the last war. We must not only subdue them, we must crush them, strip them of every vestige of power, and thus prevent a third world war. Our enemies, according to this point of view, have twice resorted to force to settle international disputes, or to gain their selfish ends. To make this impossible in the future we must first weaken them and then hold over them the threat of superior military strength. Now, while there is reason for such a conclusion, and real necessity for the creation of authority with sufficient force to make it effective in maintaining peace after this war, there is a serious weakness in this kind of thinking. Mere resort to force, superior force on our side after the war, for example, is not the solution to our international ills. Arbitrary exercise of power will but beget further efforts to resort to force. The use of force, as such, settles nothing. Used, however, to give effect, in extremity, to decisions of men which mankind generally regards as just, it is indispensable in this world. Before men may with reason talk of the use of force in the post-war world, they must give consideration to the kind of relationships which the use of force is designed to maintain.

Nor on Easy Adjustments

That hundreds of millions are yearning for the end of armed conflict is obvious. That their attitudes toward the kind of national and international order that is to be set up after the war differ greatly is not so generally appreciated. To millions in Europe who have lost all their material wealth, who have been driven from their native homes, and who have seen one member after another of their families...
sacrificed to a national and world order that always seemed distant if not openly hostile to them, peace must bring more than just an end to armed conflict. They cannot be satisfied with a speedy adjustment of differences between the major powers. They want and must have more than an opportunity "to go on". They want to know now, more than ever before in the world's history, on what basis they are to go on. Such people must be furnished a new basis for living together. For them the making of the peace involves much more than shaking hands and going back to work. It means remaking the old order of which this terrible conflict is but the recurrent expression.

Not Only Preserving What We Have

In this country the motivation of the war effort and the consequent basis for the peace to follow is, as rather generally expressed, that of preserving what we have. While we undoubtedly have much that we rightly wish to preserve, this constant emphasis on preservation is mistaken. It fails to suggest that those things which we wish to preserve, our liberties, for instance, have great value only if they are repeatedly reexamined, reinterpreted, and given new meaning. Perhaps that is what we mean to say when we insist that we are fighting to preserve our liberties. But obviously enough many individuals, and groups or classes as well, do not mean that. And that being the case it is well for us to be reminded that we shall not have won a meaningful peace if it does no more than to establish what we once had or enjoyed, or to permit us to "go back" to conditions that prevailed before the war began.

Real Peace Implies Active Cooperation

War is, of course, open and armed conflict. What we call peace is generally "a way of getting along," a modus vivendi. Certainly the twenty-year period between 1918 and 1938 was one in which the nations accommodated themselves to each other, managed to "get along with each other" without actually settling their differences. They tolerated each other, but the mutual suspicion which this toleration expressed was so general that the whole world was aware of it. Truly amicable relations were almost impossible to find. Compromises, made necessary by dependence upon some intercourse between the nations, were the order of the day. Evidence of real cooperation there was little, or none at all.

Peace, one would think, when listening to some of the current discussion, is a state of quiet, of inactivity, of rest. Our yearning for it is frequently that of the mother who longs for the end of the busy day, or that of the aging couple who long for the closing years of life. We do not realize sufficiently that peace is a condition for living, for living fully, and, therefore, for establishing all of the relations of life, with all their implications and obligations. Such an interpretation of its meaning will, I know, be regarded as idealistic or unreal. And men will—rather summarily, too—insist that such a peace can never be achieved. True enough, perhaps, but unless men put forth a real effort to achieve such a peace they may rest assured as to what the alternative is that they are likely to achieve. We have it now.

It Must Be Won

Real peace can not be established over night—it must be won just as certainly as war must be won. The winning of a war we are beginning to learn requires long and extensive preparation. Unless we prepare for the coming peace it will not be based upon a secure foundation and it will not last. That was apparently the lesson of the last world peace. The leaders of the nations were unprepared to make it, and succeeded in extending the truce rather than in making peace. The peoples of the world, it would seem, were even less prepared. That was the case here. The Congress and the people were not prepared to put into effect the plans of Woodrow Wilson.

The coming peace must be won if it is to be enduring. To win it will mean preparing men's minds and hearts. And this will require the enlistment of the schools, the press, and the pulpit also, in this effort to inform people as to what real peace requires of us. The truly desirable aims and goals of peace must be in the minds of men before they can be won and established by their leaders, for public opinion must support the peace if it is to continue. We must not only win the peace that is to follow the war, we must continue to win it. And that will mean constant reeducation as to what lasting, peaceful, living relations among men and nations require.

Recognizing National Entities

The establishment of an enduring peace will involve a change in our conception of the roles of nations, states, social classes, and even of individuals. Nations are too frequently regarded as mere aggregates which can be easily reduced or increased in size. Armed conflict is the instrument used to pare down one and add to another. They should, however, be regarded as cultural groups with their own cultural antecedents, capable of making their own unique contribution to the life of mankind. In order to do this nations must have, in large measure, the right of self-determination, and they must have sufficient authority and concentration of power to give continuing effect to their way of living. In each nation there must be a governing organization, the state, to maintain order. Security within the nation requires such concen-
dration of power, requires a sovereign head, or government.

The establishment and maintenance of peace means not only the establishment and recognition of national entities, with governments strong enough to maintain order within them, but as one writer puts it, "the logic of order" requires that there be cooperation between such national groups. The history of the last generation proves only too tragically the fact that nations must learn to get along together, and that there must be some way of maintaining order between them as well as within them. The tragedy, however, is this that the state which is, "nationally, the greatest instrument of social security" is, "internationally, the greatest menace to that security." A world in which each state insists on its absolute sovereignty and refuses to make any concession in order to cooperate on a continuing basis with other nations, is always on the brink of war. Nations must learn that the sovereignty of their states must always be exercised with due consideration for that of other states. Each state individually and all states collectively must exercise a sovereignty that is expressive of the highest possible consideration of justice. There is a sovereignty higher than that of any state, the sovereignty of God, which requires that all states separately and together contribute to the establishment of His will.

What has just been said with reference to the political relations between nations applies with equal force to the economic. And what applies to nations applies also to groups or to classes within them. Each group that can make a contribution to the life of society must have its opportunity to function, but it may and must function only with due respect for and consideration of other groups. As real cooperation between nations is necessary if mankind is to live peacefully and actively to serve God, so real cooperation between groups within the nation is necessary if the nation is to grow, wax strong, and fulfill its mission.

Recognizing God’s Law

It goes without saying that what is true of nations and of groups must be true of individuals. In all the relations between men, individual, class, and nation, a new appreciation of and obedience to the laws of the second table of God’s law is necessary if peace is to be won and continued. And if the present world situation reminds us that the commandments of the second table must be indelibly written on men’s hearts, it reminds us that the great precepts of the first table must be recorded there as well. To expect that this will happen is to expect too much. It is hopeful, however, to hear a great regional convention of educators reminded that “when men dethrone God that throne does not long remain vacant. Other gods are enthroned.” Living in accordance with the fullest implications of peace will mean a radical change in the relations between men, but it will also mean a frank recognition of man’s relation to his God.

The Cross

Across the bloody fields of Earth
The cross of Christ appears.
As ne’er before it looms aloft
And points to God.

Oh, Golgotha!
The debt is paid.
The curse removed.
Let men now look, believe, and live!
The men who kill; the men who fight;
The men who die to uphold the Right.
Oh, Calvary!
No blood can equal thine.
His sacrifice—it is divine!
His death leads unto Life!

But now, the times are such
That each day sees increasing loss of life;
That death should mean the price of peace!
God grant that these who yield their all
May know His name and on Him call
To bring about a righteous peace;
That war shall be no more!

Across the bloody fields of Earth
The cross of Christ stands forth
As ne’er before.

—BESS DE VRIES.
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Planning for Higher Education

"EVERYTHING must be planned." That’s the order of the day. And it is becoming increasingly apparent that no one can ignore this order with impunity. Yet it seems so incongruous with the spirit of democracy. It smacks of the idea of regimentation. It issues the injunction that each one of us must modify and adjust himself together with his ideas and predilections so as to contribute toward the realization of a pre-conceived objective.

The other idea of letting things develop as from within still has many adherents. Such men can argue that it allows a greater amount of individual freedom. This may to a certain extent be true. They can insist that there are principles that will work through and will guide and direct toward an undetermined yet desirable end. They have said with a high degree of correctness that the unplanned life will enable each in his own way to make his distinctive contribution to the development of the nation and of the Kingdom of Heaven. Sometimes it is forgotten, however, that by this same token each individual could hinder any real progress.

Unplanned Education

The same general spirit was prevalent in the mind of many an educator. They were sure that the best education was to let each one develop as he might. They were afraid that any other system of education would fail to do justice to the natural bent of the youngster. That pedagogical concept has raised havoc in our educational world. They failed to recognize that the natural "bents" were frequently sinful, antisocial, and indolent. And strange though it may seem, the same absence of educational planning may be found, with perhaps more justification, in the minds of those leaders opposed to the current conception of education as indicated above. They are equally positive that we should not plan in the sense of predetermining a definite objective. All we need to do is to inculcate some sound principles of living and then the objectives will be taken care of. That was and is the idea of many of the advocates of liberal arts today. They feel that the continuation of the teaching of educational fundamentals, whatever these may be, will take care of our needs. Christians will, of course, prefer the second policy. But even at that they will not be in line with the world’s only true Teacher, who had very definite objectives in His educational program.

However, neither of the two policies can be followed today with any hope of success. The impact of economic changes, technological developments, movements of population, governmental controls upon the activities of every individual, and of the realization that men left to themselves will degenerate socially, mentally, economically, and spiritually, is stimulating a type of thinking that is little short of revolutionary. This is particularly true in the field of education.

The Degeneration of Liberal Arts

It is becoming high time that we re-examine and re-define what is meant by liberal arts. In its traditional form it served education well. "Our fathers believed that the earnest study of religion, philosophy, science, and the languages and literatures of the classical world would give the student an initiation into fruitful fields of study and lead to a grasp of that central core of truth which is valid for civilized men." It was also thought by the educators of yesteryear that "education in the liberal arts should make young people conscious of their nature, destiny, conscious of the possibilities that are open to them as human beings and of the weaknesses which so often have thwarted and may still thwart their realization." These citations from War Time Policy of Phi Beta Kappa, by Christian Gauss, express in the main the traditional ideal of education. In America we still give lip service to this conception of education. But the American educational heart is by no means consecrated to that ideal. We have perverted the idea by adding to it, subtracting from it, and injecting almost revolutionary concepts into it. We have quite naively believed that by going to college and studying most anything that strikes one’s fancy, or by not studying at all, we could get an education that would fit our youth to preserve democracy. The curricula in our higher institutions of learning have become a hodge-podge of subjects with no coordination and no real objectives. In fact, some of our large educational institutions have been offering credit courses in archery, tap dancing, golfing, and other forms of sports. This was justified by the declaration that men and women must be educated for their leisure hours which under normal
conditions have been increased tremendously by the development of technology. We have educated as if the method of playing were more important than the spirit of playing. We have also yielded to the clamor that men and women should be trained to become wealthy. We were positive that if education did not help man to earn more money and earn it more speedily, it would by that very token be a complete failure. We had the conviction that higher education was higher because it led to higher incomes. We failed to grasp the practical realization that such education is higher because “it helps raise life to levels above the barbaric and animal and curbs the sheer lust for power, political, social, or economic, over our less fortunate fellows of whatever race or creed.” We also have prostituted education for the purpose of propagandizing some pet idea or ideal even as the totalitarian countries have done. We have had our philosophies, and education was not asked to evaluate them, but to teach them. That is the reason why educators of national repute can be so dangerous and pervert education for the realization of their ideals. And all this took place while we persisted in recommending our education as liberal arts.

The Disservice of the Traditionalists

It is now generally recognized that the emasculation of the liberal arts idea is in part due to the traditionalists. Even though it is true that the older program of education has rendered a far greater service than most of its opponents are willing to grant, yet the blind traditionalism of many of its advocates has done very much toward discrediting the ideal. They have fought for the form and the details of the education of a century or two in the past. They have not sought to strengthen the spirit and the aims of liberal education. They have refused to modify education so as to meet the changing world in which we live. If education is to be liberalizing it must be so for the people in their own time and age. The traditional liberal arts exponents failed to recognize the fact that we are living today in this world and that education must make some contribution toward present-day living. The opponents developed the conception that each individual must be taught to get the most out of this world for the longest possible time. And “the most” was interpreted in the form of materialistic terms.

This disagreement in the field of educational ideals has succeeded in reducing many a faculty meeting to a pitched battle. And the study of the educational trends in the world clearly reveals which party was winning. The liberal arts training was and is losing. Indeed, educational progress is no longer measured in terms of progress in liberal education, but in terms of number of credit-units regardless of the nature of the courses taken, and most anything could be taken as a credit course.

Materialistic-Mindedness

Since the objectives became confused by the failure of the advocates of the liberal arts to give an education that liberalizes for today, the educational program was thrown by the opponents’ reaction into great confusion. It was an easy matter for the vocational people to inject courses that would enable people to secure more than their share of the world’s goods. Vocational courses streamed into the curricula. The sole purpose of such courses was to teach individuals the “tricks of the trade” in as short a time as possible. A leading educator in this country recently said, that “this perversion had reached its peak when colleges in the interest of enticing larger number of students began to publicize the increased money incomes which accrues to holders of their diplomas.” This appealed to the average student looking for an education. People are being taught by the general public that life can only be measured in terms of cash. And “money talks today if ever it did.”

It is obvious that when this spirit is in the world the educational stress will be upon the local. It lends support to Conwell’s theory that there are Acres of Diamonds in your backyard. There is a tremendous truth in his declaration, but it may be questioned whether one should be interested only in those diamonds and only for the sake of self. This educational spirit places all emphasis on the transitory. Long range views are foreign to it. Eternal values make no appeal. It is the here and the now that count. It is forgotten that even the here and the now cannot be properly evaluated without the standards of judgments that God reveals not only in His Word, but also in the history of man. Then, too, it is not strange that in this age the historically relative and unique are the things that appeal and that are taught. Gauss is correct when he states that we have “failed to inculcate in our undergraduates that deeper devotion to those pervasive and fundamental truths which alone can unite us. We have taught this generation to think too exclusively in terms of the temporary and above all in terms of nationalities, and it will now be called upon to make peace in terms of the United Nations”.

Planning in Order Now

Now is the time for the adherents of liberal education to make definite plans. They will never have more leisure than they have today. The demands of the war calls for an education in technique and skills rather than in broad principles and humanitarian sympathies. It is to the eternal credit of liberal arts that they cannot be acceptably used for the promotion of warlike interests. War and liberal arts are uncongenial bedfellows. Be that as it may, the professors of liberal arts are at some liberty now to take the matter of the continuation of their type of education under advisement. This type of education is losing out. It must be frankly discarded
or thoroughly revised. There is no wisdom in hanging on to a lost cause without doing anything about it.

The call of Christian education is for liberal arts. It is not incidental that as long as the Church had charge of education the liberal arts idea was predominant, and that when the Church let go of its education and educational institutions the educational ideals tended to change. Any education that helps a person to live in proper relationship with his God and his neighbor must bear the earmarks of the kind of training that educates individuals to possess broad sympathies, universal concepts of abiding truth, and devotion to eternal principles of rightness and wrongness. Jesus was a teacher without peer. He was not interested primarily in techniques and methods. He taught abiding principles that had universal application. Any education that is local, temporary, relative, and materialistic cannot be congenial to the spirit of Christ. Virtues taught because they constitute the best policy in a given situation may fit in with the educational trend of today, but it is far from the spirit of Christianity which insists a mode of conduct and of thinking must be followed because God wills it regardless of what its consequences for the moment may seem to be for the subject.

**Christianity, Democracy and Liberal Arts**

Christianity is committed to no definite form of government. Yet it is particularly congenial to the democratic way of life. Vice President Wallace seems to imply that the second cannot exist without the first. That is the reason he asserts that “we of the Western Democracies must demonstrate the practicality of our religion. Christianity is not a star-gazing or foolish idealism. Applied on a worldwide scale it is intensely practical.” Now, whether we can agree entirely with Mr. Wallace is another question. But there can be little doubt but what the type of education that preserves Christianity is also best adapted to serve Democracies. A nation of selfish money grabbers cannot long survive as a democracy. The spirit that moves man to get as quickly and as much as possible of the world’s goods for his own private benefits cannot be blessed with a democratic system of government. A nation that becomes a servant of technocracy cannot long preserve for itself “the four freedoms”.

It behooves the liberal arts men to come down out of the clouds to this earth. They must not continue to glory in the past and to bemoan the present lot of their ideals. They must come down to earth and arrange courses permeated with the proper spirit, that will make the liberal arts ideas practical. If this opportunity, now knocking at our doors is not seized, it will pass by probably never to return again.

The problem is to keep the heart and adapt the form to the needs of the age. If we persist in saying that the liberal arts idea can be preserved only in certain courses, we are doomed. But it is not beyond the pale of possibility that the idea can be injected into practically all the courses in any first rate accredited institution. A liberal arts education is not purely, not even primarily, a matter of courses; it is a matter of approach and of spirit.

It seems to me that this is the job of Christian educators. No real Christian education can be other than a liberal arts education. If this spirit of the liberal arts is not planned in the various courses it will not get there. Providence has given us the opportunity to plan such a liberal education. Educators not strictly in the war business can work on this problem in these days of comparative leisure. The effect of every other kind of education in a world holocaust should furnish at least a degree of incentive. And the will of God makes the highest type of liberal arts course imperative.

**Not Death**

Death, you did this, to rob her cheek
Of dawn and roseblush, and fragrance sweet.

You took her graces and sculptured a doll—
I heard your coming, I know your call.

Death, with your chisel you broke my heart
But you could not keep her, she’s heaven’s part.

She is with Jesus Who broke the bars;
She’s bright as a jewel shining as stars.

—JOAN GEISEL GARDNER.
The Christian Philosophy of History

The Nations and the Kingdom

The last two problems mentioned in the previous article are rather intimately related. They are the problem of the meaning of pre-christian gentile history and the problem of the time structure of human history as a whole. For several of our present major missionary problems, with the solution to which the prospects for the future are most closely bound up, apparently were created in pre-christian gentile history. They invite a consideration of both conjointly. We shall begin with the pagan nations before Christ. These nations seem all to have started out religiously with polytheism, while all divergences from polytheism seem to have been later developments. It is these divergences from polytheism which lie at the base of the present missionary problems.

Polytheism and General Revelation

As to the origin of polytheism there are hints in the Bible which will explain it as a universal human phenomenon. They are found in the paradise-story. What would be left over, if from that oldest tradition of mankind the word of the Lord were dropped out in unbelief, as it was by the vast bulk of mankind even before the flood? There would remain precisely the peculiar conglomeration of ideas which characterize polytheism everywhere: a vague monotheistic recollection, a multiplicity of gods, and the lower semi-religious elements of animism and magic. For there would remain the tradition of the trees of life and of the knowledge of good and evil, the tradition of the speaking serpent and of the cherub with the fiery sword, and the vacuum which the rejection and withdrawal of the word of God created. Of course, while it lasted, the presence of God’s special progressive revelation prevented the emergence of polytheism. But at the scattering of the race at Babel polytheism was there ready-made.

That was judgment, no doubt. God was letting the nations go in the imaginations of their own hearts. In view of that fact it is astounding that Paul brackets the Israelitish ceremonies and pagan ceremonies together as on the one hand rudiments and elements of the world and as on the other hand tutors to Christ, Gal. 4. That is grace. How could polytheism function in such a capacity? Perhaps we shall catch a glimpse of this possibility when we note that all the really old national units which came into contact with Israel remained genuinely polytheistic, while all the really old national units which lived beyond such contact modified their polytheism in important respects. China moved in the direction of deism and India advanced toward pantheism, while Persia tried a dualistic monotheism. It is striking, that these three countries have been in touch with the Christian Gospel ever since the seventh century after Christ at the latest, and that yet till modern times the Gospel never succeeded in deeply impressing them: their Christianization still is a hope. But Christianity permeated all the other peoples of the Near East and has been successful everywhere else among all the polytheistic groups which it ever encountered.

The explanation must be sought, at any rate in the case of India and China, in the fact that pantheism and deism operate only with what we call God’s general revelation; the pantheism of India notably with the inner life of the individual, and the deism of China specifically with the realm of society. Special revelations are in either case theoretically out. But polytheism, national wherever it is found, involves a denial of the unity of the divine, of the unity of the world, and of the unity of the race; and in the midst of all this disunity the one thing of which it can not conceive is a general revelation. Revelation must of necessity also break up for it into fragments, given now here and then there. The case of Persia is different in two important particulars. In as far as Zoroaster claimed to have received an oral revelation of universal validity, Parsism is akin to the later Judaism and Mohammedanism. And in as far as it was monotheistic, it should, like Judaism and Mohammedanism, have proven to be intolerant. Instead, it turned out—from political expediency, no doubt—to be tolerant in the years of the Old Persian Empire.

Persian Religion and the Preparation for the Gospel

Both the Persian Empire and its tolerance of other religions played a significant rôle in God’s providential preparation of Western Asia and the Mediterranean Basin for the advent of the Gospel. On the
one hand He reënforced the paganistic belief in special revelations throughout Western Asia by placing Israel astraddle of its most important highway and by giving to every one of the surrounding nations at least one indubitably genuine special revelation of His own at one time or another, as every Bible student knows. And on the other hand, while their religious alterations took the Far Eastern people further away from God, He was running the Western Asiatics through the training of empire-building. It needs only a moment’s reflection to see that empire building is subversive of national polytheism. If the gods can not protect their own people and land from the foreign conqueror, how can they be gods? It is no wonder, that hard upon the rise of the Egyptian Empire followed Akhenaton’s monotheistic reform; nor, that the Assyrian conqueror Sennacherib ascribed the Assyrian conquests not to his gods but to himself and his forebears; nor, that Nebuchadnezzar set up for adoration next to the old Babylonian gods his golden image as the symbol of successful imperialism. When God through His people Israel had frustrated all these attempts of religious re-interpretation to fit the new political situation of imperialism, the next great world-empire, Persia, turned out to be tolerant. Perhaps this was the import of the great Cyrus-prophecy of Isa. 44: 24—45:7. Alexander thereupon advanced from mere toleration to amalgamation, and thus the Graeco-Roman world became the dumping-ground of all the outworn old national pantheons and by the time of Christ was religiously bankrupt. The splendid outburst of Greek speculation to which the Persian Wars stimulated that gifted race naturally hastened this process.

The matter was, of course, far from being so simple as the above brief sketch may seem to suggest. But we have here a case in which the Bible throws very much light on a mystery in the history of man. And the case suggests, that already in the probationary set-up in paradise God had prepared against the day, when His special revelation would withdraw from the nations within the narrow confines of Israel. It suggests also, that through the subsequent ages His providence guided those nations in such a way that the idea of special revelations and oral communications from the divine world did not fade out from their minds. It suggests that thus God preserved at least at one of the high spots of pagan culture an opening for the return of His special revelation in Christ in its completed form to the nations. The withdrawal of His Word from the shattered race was judgment; but the keeping of a door open for its return to them was grace. It saved nobody but itself; what shall we call it but Common Grace?

Augustine’s Conception of the Millennium

The possibility of a future conversion of India and China as well as of Jews and Moslems to the Christ of God is tied up with the problem of the temporal articulation of the history of our race as a whole, of which problem the question of the future millennium is one aspect. There are limits within which the discussion of this problem must be kept. The Bible leaves no room for the millennium of a social gospel which forgets the King in its absorption in the problems of society. Nor does the Bible allow of a millennium which implies and involves a denial of the unity of the Church of all ages and of the present kingship of Christ over His Church. But within these limits the question of a future millennium must still be settled. The Augustinian treatment of Rev. 20 is exegetically hardly defensible. For it involves a transfer of the millennium to a position in the temporal order which does not correspond to its position in the visions of John; to-wit, after the so-called battle of Armageddon and before the appearance of Gog and Magog; and such a transfer is beset with grave difficulties.

A first question is, whether the literary structure of the Apocalypse will allow of it. The seven letters at the beginning of the Apocalypse can be conceived of as having gone forth simultaneously; but the seven seals plainly are opened successively, and the last of them brings seven trumpets, chapt. 8:2. These trumpets again are successive and unmistakably represent a historical sequence, 9:12, 11:14; and the last trumpet brings the third Woe, 11:15. This Woe comprises, among other things, the appearance upon earth, in human history and in succession, of the dragon, the beast and the false prophet, and, at the very end, the disclosure of the great harlot as the silent partner in this anti-divine combination. The 17th chapter, which brings the disclosure of the harlot, brings also her judgment, which God executes through the agency of the beast and its ten royal associates and which seems to entail a collapse of our present age old economic order, chapt. 18. It is the beginning of the judgment of the entire coalition; for chapter 19 tells of the judgment of the beast and the false prophet, which is simultaneous and final, while chapter 20 tells of the judgment of Satan, which proceeds in two stages, a preliminary and a final stage. Between these two stages the millennium is placed. Can it be dislodged from this place without disturbing the order of this whole set-up? One should note, for how large a section of the Apocalypse the order of the appearance of the apocalyptic figures and the reversal of that order in their judgment is determinative: it begins in chapter 12 and ends in chapter 20.

A Suggestive Parallelism

To this difficulty another is added by the fact that between Rev. 17—21 and Gen. 1—11 there is a certain parallelism which should not be ignored without very good and convincing reasons. To see the parallelism, we should note that the order of the
events is reversed, so that what in the pre-babylonian history came first has its correspondence in what comes last in the Apocalypse. The events are not necessarily the same, but they clearly correspond. In the case of the first and the last events in the two series the correspondence fairly shouts at the reader. The new heaven and earth which appear in Rev. 21:1 plainly replace the heaven and earth of which Gen. 1:1 speaks. The judgment of the great white throne in Rev. 20:11 unmistakably is the counterpart of the temptation and fall of our first parents in paradise, Gen. 3. Even the frustrated attack of Gog and Magog upon the camp of the saints, Rev. 20:9, can not well be ignored as being the counterpart of that plan by the break-up of the race through the confusion of speech, Gen. 11:1-9, is so plainly and intentionally suggested by the recurrence of the name, Babylon, that nobody can well miss it.

This same reversed parallelism can also be traced between the intervening events in both Genesis and the Revelation. The grouping, at the close of the millennium, of Gog and Magog in the four quarters of the earth and of the saints on its breadth, Rev. 20:8, 9, suggests a geographical segregation of the people of God and the disobedient at the end, just as we had such a geographical segregation at the beginning from the flight of Cain from the face of the Lord onward, Gen. 4:16. This segregation can not be traced back through the millennium, but at its beginning the nations appear as a religiously uniform aggregate, Rev. 20:3. It appears, therefore, that a separation has come about in the course of the thousand years; and therewith corresponds the opposite process of amalgamation of the sons of God with the Cainites as the race increased before the flood, Gen. 6:1, 2. The binding of Satan in Rev. 20:3 certainly is suggestive of the removal from international relationships of an influence which stimulates men's sinful propensities, and as such it finds its counterpart in the cessation of an operation of the Spirit of God upon human society which tended to restrain mankind's sinful inclinations, which cessation God announces in Gen. 6:3. That binding of Satan has been prepared for by the destruction of his historical agents, the beast and the false prophet, Rev. 19:19-20; and similarly the destruction of a united rebellious race in the flood with the sole exception of Noah and his family, Gen. 6:14f, was the outcome of man's resistance to and God's ending of the Spirit's striving with mankind as a whole.

Together these phenomena in Rev. 12—20 and 17—21 present a respectable obstacle in the way of the Augustinian interpretation of the millennium, which should not just be ignored. Moreover, if one assumes in the temporal order a millennium at the place which corresponds to its place in the visions of John, he gets a balance in the temporal articulation of our human history which otherwise is not there. We are all agreed on the position of the earthly ministry of our Lord and Savior at the center of human history, dividing it into a period ante and one post Christum and dividing God's dealings with the race into an Old and a New Dispensation. We are also all agreed in recognizing in the Old Dispensation one outstanding major incision, which is marked on the one hand by the confusion of tongues, in which God withdrew His special revelation from the race as a whole and, on the other, by the call of Abraham, from whom God began to build up His own nation of Israel for the completion of His special revelation in Christ against the day when the Gospel of Him crucified should go forth into the midst of the nations. Why should there not be a corresponding major incision within the New Dispensation? While, taken just by itself, this consideration is anything but compelling, the fact that the Apocalypse does mention a millennium in a way which is decidedly suggestive of such a major incision in the New Dispensation, does away with this weakness.

The Possibility of a Future Millennium

The question of the possible significance of these apparent correspondences between the series of events in the Apocalypse of John in which the millennium lies embedded and the series of events which the biblical record of the pre-Babylonian history of our race has preserved for us must not detain us now. There is one further consideration which suggests the advisability of leaving the possibility of a future millennium open. Early last year Dr. S. M. Zwemer gave a splendid lecture at Calvin Seminary, in which he argued, that mankind everywhere is now under historical necessity of turning to the Christ of God, on which proposition I would place only one serious stricture; to-wit, that historical necessity alone never is able to effect a real conversion in the spiritual sense. With this reservation the view is thoroughly sound, that God so controls and directs our human history, that at certain junctures nations and mankind in its entirety are necessitated, in their religious thought to move in undreamt-of new directions. What happened to the race at large at Babel, and again what happened to the Western Asiatic nations through the rise and succession of empires, supports and confirms this view. And I am in accord with the lecturer's application of this principle to the present world-situation.
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Our generation has in its own lifetime seen such an introduction of technical marvels, such a general diffusion of knowledge, such tremendous economic dislocations, and such world-wide political upheavals, together with such unparalleled speeding up of the historical process, that the feeling is widespread even here, and doubtless much more so in the conquered lands across the sea, that the old world of our childhood is gone forever. Equally widespread is the wish, whatever the future may bring, that also this overweening imperialism which knows no bounds nor checks and has set the whole world on fire may disappear once for all. However, the great interest of our Lord is not thus negative, but is positive in what happens to His Gospel and Word and Name. The message has indeed encircled the globe; but disciples all nations have not yet in any sense become. What shall it be after the present crisis? Will the Lord come and cut off the historical process, or will He bring that process to a close, as He began it, with a period in which He deals with mankind in its totality in the light of His Word, and now, in the full light of His completed Word and revelation?

The Present Crisis and the Future

It may be, that to that end God is in the present crisis eliminating once for all from our human society several factors which are definitely hurtful and inimical to His cause. I have in mind the great ungodly anti-Christian coalition which occupies so large a place in the latter half of the Apocalypse of John; viz., the dragon, the beast, and the false prophet, and the harlot with commerce fostered by her;—or, to follow the order of their removal: the harlot and her commerce, the beast and the false prophet, and the dragon. The first four of these apocalyptical figures clearly suggest four major fields of social endeavor: the field of religion, the field of economics, the field of politics, and the field of education; and in each of these four fields they represent respectively the products and agents of the influence of Satan. Beyond all doubt the present world-crisis is shaking every one of these four spheres to the very foundations. When mankind awakes from this awful nightmare, it may be that we shall find these four obstacles to the advance of the Gospel which threaten to choke Christ's Church, namely, Modernism, Commercialism, Imperialism, and Humanism, passing out for good, made historically impossible by the course of events. I am not speaking of this war, but of this crisis: this crisis may involve still another and more terrible war; but if this crisis does not lead directly to the final judgment as the next event, let us hope that at least it clears our human world of that anti-Christian combination. In either case the meaning of human history as a whole will then have received important clarification.

[This is the last of a stimulating series of three articles on the Christian Philosophy of History.—EDITOR.]

The Love of Christ

How can a Christian carry on Returning good for ill When even the very act of love Antagonizes still?

How can Christ's one when troubles break In torrents on his head Still glorify his God and sing Praise from a shut-in's bed?

How can a Christian overcome By sorrow upon sorrow Rise up again with faith renewed And wear a smile the morrow?

The love of Christ constraineth us To live our Lord's command; With foretaste of the bliss that waits Us in a sin-free land.

—Joan Geisel Gardner.
Two Approaches in Teaching Organic Sciences

THE organic sciences are part of that larger group of subjects usually spoken of as the Natural Sciences. As such, these subjects deal with facts and phenomena in nature. Indeed, it is urged by some that a science should be purely factual and objective and the impression is often created that the modern sciences are just that. This leads to the conclusion that the sciences give us truth in its most basic form. J. H. Morrison is no doubt correct when he says in his Christian Faith and the Science of Today: “There is a widespread idea, deep rooted in the modern mind, that the science of today is the absolute and final truth.”

This idea that science presents only facts that cannot be contradicted seems to be particularly strong in the minds of young people of college and high school age. Science teachers as well as textbooks lend support to this fallacious idea. They often give the impression that their statements are purely objective, uninfluenced by previously formed conceptions and viewpoints. But even if it were granted that in his observations and tabulations the scientist in his laboratory can be purely objective, it would not follow that he remains objective when he teaches his students or writes his textbooks. A teacher does not fulfil the requirements of his profession when he presents only facts. He must explain, relate, and interpret them and it is in this part of his task that ideas and viewpoints play an important part. Nor are science textbooks purely objective. Unless they are mere work-books, the ordinary run of science texts are written from a definite point of view and in accordance with a set of previously adopted opinions and ideas. This is especially true in the organic sciences. Each author has his convictions and these determine his approach and influence his interpretations.

Questions of Origin

Questions about the origin and destiny of living beings are considered in the modern classrooms and textbooks. From a scientific point of view, the answers to these questions must necessarily be speculative. There are admittedly only two explanations for the origin of things: they have either been created by an almighty God or they have evolved by means of forces inherent in the organisms themselves. The first of these explanations is based on information received from the Bible, the second comes to us through human philosophy, apart from the Scriptures. It is quite impossible to consider the origin of living beings without taking a stand on the subject of creation versus evolution.

It may be urged that these terms are not necessarily contradictory. One might, for instance, speak of an evolutionary creation or of theistic evolution. But the account of creation in Genesis does not permit of an evolutionary interpretation nor does the term evolution, as ordinarily used, permit of the idea of a divine act, unless it be taken in a deistic or pantheistic sense. For a theist, the two terms are essentially contradictory and a teacher considering the origin of living organisms will either ascribe it to a special act of God called creation, or to a gradual series of changes due to factors inherent in the organism, called evolution.

Neither of these theories can be proved simply by objective, logical reasoning. One attempts to prove either the one or the other depending upon which of the two theories he believes to be the more reasonable and acceptable. A Bible-believing Christian will consider the account of creation as given in Genesis as inspired revelation and his approach to the study of the universe will be that of a creationist. An unbeliever, or one who considers the Genesis account as a myth, will put the emphasis on human speculation apart from scriptural revelation and his approach is likely to be that of the evolutionist.

The Creationist Versus the Evolutionist

The two approaches lead invariably to quite different conclusions. To the creationist, for instance, the similarities of structure in the various classes of vertebrates point to a common plan of development and to a common author. To an evolutionist these similarities point to a common ancestry and to the ideas of recapitulation and parallel development.

To the creationist the so-called vestigial organs are vestiges of embryonic development. To the evolutionist they represent organs of more primitive ancestors which have become functionless in the descendants.
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To the creationist homologous structure such as the crayfish appendages have been designed for the performance of various functions to meet the needs of the animal. To the evolutionist they are the classical examples of evolutionary adaptation.

In other words, to the creationist structure precedes function, to the evolutionist function precedes structure. What to a creationist indicates design and purpose, to an evolutionist indicates adaptation and response to the environment.

To the creationist there are limits to variation within a certain group, an idea supported by our present knowledge of heredity as well as by the scriptural statement that God created living things "after their kind." To the evolutionist there are no limits to variation since all beings must have come from one or a few ancestral types.

What to the creationist are evidences of the effects of sin upon an otherwise harmonious universe, to the evolutionist are merely signs of a struggle for existence with an ultimate survival of the fit and an extinction of the unfit.

Whether one teaches creation or evolution is not first of all a matter of evidence but a matter of outlook or approach. It is very important that this difference in approach or difference in viewpoint be pointed out to the beginning students so that they may be on the alert and be able to distinguish between facts and ideas in science.

The Christian's Scientific Task

Lest the foregoing be interpreted as an oversimplification of a difficult problem, it should be stated that it is not intended to be a complete statement of the differences between creationists and evolutionists. It does intend to give the fundamental differences between the two groups. Nevertheless, we should not be satisfied with a proper approach alone, we should let that approach work so as to lead us to definite conclusions. This has not always been done. In the controversy between the two view-points the creationists have been put on the defensive, for in the history of science during the last hundred years the approach has been almost exclusively from the angle of unbelieving philosophy. Consequently, the evolutionistic view-point has been well worked-out and systematized. The pieces of this biological jigsaw puzzle have been arranged so as to fit into the evolutionary scheme and some sort of a definite picture has resulted. While this was going on, Christian thought busied itself primarily with theological and ecclesiastical matters. To this day, a well-outlined and systematized study of the natural sciences from the creationist point of view is lacking. The picture is very incomplete. Many loose pieces are lying around. These should be placed in their proper positions so as to give us a whole and harmonious picture of God's created universe. This represents a challenge which is not easily met. It will require men and women of faith, devotion, insight and scientific ability as well as time and money. But since the honor of God's name is involved no effort should be too great. A clearer picture of this universe from the creationist's point of view will make the revelation of God in nature more meaningful. And by the grace of God it will also be a means to keep many a young mind from the dangers of unbelief and scepticism.

This is not a one-man's task. The combined efforts of believing scientists are needed. It is our hope that the recently organized American Scientific Affiliation may do much to further this cause.

**Question and Answer**

Can brutal wars deter God's men
Can ugly scars prevent us in
The holding forth of God's bright torch:
The lifting of his Holy Word
The Spirit of the Risen Lord!
?? ?? ??

NEVER
this task be left undone!
Ever tho blood in battle run
Even if severed be the hand
That lifts the Bible in dark land,
It shall be plucked from bloody scum
By still another one.

God will not let His message die;
His young recruits prepared fly
Onward and forward with the cry:
Come brutal lust or pain or loss
Christians must rally at the Cross
To keep its banner high!

—JOAN GEISEL GARDNER.
British-Israelism

THE material on British-Israelism is so extensive and covers so much territory in history, fancy, philology, anthropology, archaeology and mythology (legends), that one is at a loss what to do with it. Certain ideas gradually emerge, however, as being dominant in this strange fantasy. The tremendous and mystifying wanderings from the beaten paths of recognized scholarship are intended to be proofs of the relative paucity of ideas. The proponents of the British-Israelite theory travel far and wide in their attempts to establish the identity of the Anglo-Saxon people with the ten tribes of the Northern Kingdom of Israel. It will be impossible to follow them down each by-path, but we will seek to investigate each chief contention, and if these contentions prove to be true we shall accept them with gratitude for the instruction received. If they prove false, we shall have to reject them no matter how flattering the theory may be to our racial ego.

History of the Movement

By way of introduction we present a brief history of the movement. The movement itself does not have the kind of history that characterizes most sects, though it is supposedly grounded in history. William J. Cameron has published an interesting pamphlet How Old is British-Israel truth? declaring that the history of this identification of the Anglo-Saxons and Israel is really continuous from Abraham to the present. From the year A.D. 665 to 1834 over one hundred fifty references to the identity of the Anglo-Saxon people with ancient Israel have been discovered according to this writer. These were published in the British Israelite for 1879-80. Some of those who are supposed to have had this insight into British identity were Tyndale, John Lily, John Sadler, John Bunyan, and Dean Abbadié of Kilaloe, Ireland. However, Cameron remarks in parentheses, "Of course, we do not subscribe to all the statements made by these early writers. We only claim that the idea of extant and continuing Israel as known peoples, has always been held." That may be true and there is no point in arguing the contention, for Israel's identity is not dependent on whether or not some have always held that it could be traced nor on the constancy of the belief that the ten tribes were extant as a distinct people. Hastings' Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics names John Sadler as the first to set forth the theory. He was followed by Richard Brothers. Both the Encyclopedia Britannica and the Jewish Encyclopedia, however, name Richard Brothers (1757-1824) as the first to make a definite statement regarding the identity of Israel and the people of Britain. He named himself the "Nephew of the Almighty," declaring that he was a descendant of David, and should rule over Israel. He was to be revealed as Prince of the Hebrews, Nov. 19, 1795. He was confined for about ten years as a criminal lunatic, but was released and the warrant for high treason was withdrawn. Two of his more important works were, A Revealed Knowledge of the Prophecies and the Times, Wrote under the Direction of the Lord God, 1754, and The Correct Account of the Invasion of England by the Saxons, 1822. He left but two disciples at his death, but one of them, John Finlayson, had won a few more at the time of his own death in 1854. Of poor Richard Brothers Cameron has this to say: "It is not surprising that he, earnest student of the Scriptures that he was, saw the truth also; the mystery is that students more sane than he can miss it."

Cameron admits that modern interest began with John Wilson, b. 1779, a Presbyterian minister, whose work, Our Israelitish Origin, placed the movement on its present footing. This was followed by the work of Carpenter, The Israelites Found, and others of whom Charles A. L. Toten was probably the most famous in the United States, and G. Piazzi Smith, Astronomer Royal for Scotland, in Britain. The chief representative in Britain was Edward Hine whose work, The Identification of the British Nation with Lost Israel, London, 1871, sold a quarter of a million copies.

The movement is not a sect in the sense that it founds churches. Its adherents remain in their own churches, though often they cause trouble by their active propaganda. They seem to be drawn quite largely from the Church of England. "Not that the local leaders of that body subscribe to the movement. Quite the opposite is true. It is rather the organic connection between the Anglican Church and the British Government that exposes its communicants in a peculiar way to the appeal of British-Israel propaganda. And be it said with all kindness of which candour will admit, that it is only those of uncritical faith, whatever their religious affiliation, who are affected." (N. H. Parker, The Ten Tribes and All That, p. 6 f.) The movement goes under...
the name of "The British-Israel World Federation," and in America is known as "The Anglo-Saxon Federation of America," with offices at 601 Fox Building, Detroit, Michigan.

Its Fundamental Teaching

When considering the source material at our disposal with a view to its organization under definite subjects, we echo with hearty agreement the observation of Parker, "There is such a Babel of voices amongst the exponents of the theory as to make analysis difficult." The point of fundamental importance, however, is the supposed identity of the Anglo-Saxons with the ten tribes of the Northern Kingdom. Related to this fundamental thesis are such theories as the identity of the English throne with the throne of David; of the Stone of Scone with the stone on which Jacob laid his head at Bethel; and of the British Empire and the Church of England with the ancient covenant nation-church of Israel, the true Kingdom of God. As a consequence of the acceptance of these theories they believe that the British peoples are chosen of God to dominate the world.

The primary interest of the movement is in the identity of the Anglo-Saxon race and Israel. A number of elements enter into the attempt to establish this identity. First of all, it is constantly asserted that Israel and Judah, or the Jews, are absolutely distinct. This is fundamental and is considered near the beginning of each major work on the subject. We will limit ourselves in this article to a consideration of this assertion. It is, of course, perfectly correct to say that only the southern people were Jews, but it is a matter open to investigation whether this meant only members of the tribes of Judah, Benjamin and the Levites, or included others also. As to the term, "Israel," it is admitted that it is sometimes applied to Judah, but then only in the sense that Judah belonged to Israel in its wider meaning of all the descendants of Jacob. Specifically it is the name that is applied to the ten northern tribes banded together into the Kingdom of Israel. It soon becomes apparent that our difference from the adherents of this movement is not so much in the usage of the names "Israel" and "Jews" as in our denial of the absolute distinction of the two groups included under the terms.

Meaning of the Term, "Jews"

First, there is the statement of fact which can be verified in almost any standard encyclopedia, concordance, or dictionary, that the word "Jews" has a much wider meaning than British-Israelism gives it. Webster defines it as "Heb., Yehudi, one belonging to Judah. Origin., one of the tribe of Judah; hence, any person of the Hebrew race or whose religion is Judaism." Hastings' Dictionary includes the Ten Tribes in the term as early as the time of Esther. Funk and Wagnalls declares that it is the name given since the Babylonian captivity to the descendants of the patriarch Abraham. The American Encyclopedia says: "Jews is the general name for the Semitic people who dwelt in Palestine from the earliest times. At first the name was confined to the members of the tribe of Judah, but was later extended to include all subjects of the kingdom of Judah; and after the Babylonian captivity, to all who professed the Jewish religion, whether dwelling in Palestine or elsewhere throughout the world, provided they traced their origin to the ten tribes of Israel or were converts to the Jewish faith." This statement of fact does not in itself prove anything. The popular usage of the term may be an error. If it is, then Josephus, an ancient authority of whom the writers among the British-Israelites make very much on occasion, is more guilty than we, for, living so near the time of what is critical history for the theory, he at least should have known better than to entitle the history of all the descendants of Jacob as The Antiquities of the Jews. And a greater than he was in error also when he said, "salvation is of the Jews," unless he would not include such a one as Anna who was an Asherite (Luke 2:36).

What weighs even heavier against the distinction is the Biblical and secular data which bear on the matter. One wonders just how much material to insert at this point. A hasty review is unsatisfactory and a thorough review will occupy too much space. We shall content ourselves with a compromise. It is quite obvious that "Israel" both as a term and as a people is not distinct. As a term the British-Israelites admit that even during the time of the separation of the kingdoms it often included all twelve tribes. But neither are we to expect that Israel is distinct as a people. The story of the campaign of Sennacherib against Judah and Jerusalem in 701 B.C., which was ended only by a miracle of deliverance, gives considerable support to the claim of the great warrior that he carried away 200,150 captives from the dominion of Hezekiah. It was only twenty-one years before that 27,290 captives were taken to the same general territory from Samaria. Now it is altogether possible that many of these captives taken in 701 were actually from the Ten Tribes, for it is very probable that Ahaz received part of the Northern territory as a reward for his refusal to enter the league of Israel and Syria against Assyria. But even so, the story makes it very apparent that some of the cities that were taken were definitely "Jewish." The Isles may therefore be peopled with Jews, rather than Israelites, if the rest of the theory can be proved, or with both Jews and Israelites. Parker remarks that "perhaps the original Englishmen were able to do what moderns cannot do; probably they selected their own ancestors and confined themselves to men and women from Bethel northward." It is hardly conceivable that the captives in Assyria were only from the Ten Tribes, or that the larger body taken...
under Hezekiah were kept completely separate from those taken earlier from the Northern Kingdom. Surely the term “Israel” as applied to these captives must include men of Judah and Benjamin.

**“Israelites” Among the “Jews”**

On the other hand, it is just as apparent that the Jews included members of the northern tribes. British-Israelites make a great deal of those early references in Scripture in which mention is made of true believers coming from the Northern Kingdom to worship in Jerusalem. They say in high glee that this does not mean that they came to live there. What is more important is that both Hezekiah and Josiah were interested in the religion of those people. True, the worshippers at the feast proclaimed by Hezekiah went back every man to his possession, into their own cities (II Chron. 31:1). But the important thing is that Israelites still lived there after the deportation which, according to British-Israelism, separated Israel and Judah by distance and time. The small number of captives taken at the fall of Samaria indicates the same fact. Parker estimates that nine-tenths of the Israelites remained in the land, and these became, through intermarriage, the people known in New Testament times as the Samaritans. It is a bit difficult to imagine that none of these people were incorporated into the Jewish people, though the difficulty does not yet prove anything. Yet a definite fact to be reckoned with is that a whole century after the Ten Tribes are supposed to be lost, Josiah still carries on a reform with them. Surely he did not carry out a reform where no one lived.

What does prove something is the clear statement of Joshua 19:1 that Simeon had his lot in the midst of the children of Judah. It appeared that Judah had been given more land than it could utilize and defend so that this adjustment was made by lot. This was a direct fulfillment of the prophecy of Jacob who had declared of Simeon and Levi: “I will divide them in Jacob, and scatter them in Israel.” I Chron. 4:41, in the light of its context which gives the list of the descendants of Simeon, proves that they were still in the land of Judah at the time of Hezekiah long after the Ten Tribes are supposed to have been carried away captive. Dr. Mountain in *British-Israel Truth Defended*, page 117, declares that after all Simeon was small and was finally absorbed by Judah. But that remark makes the absolute distinction between “Israel” and the “Jews” pure nonsense.

What becomes even more decisive is the reunion that takes place at the time of the return from the Babylonian captivity. The total number which actually returned in the migrations spoken of in the Bible was not great, but many may have come in as stragglers. This much is evident from the Bible that the Babylonian Jews settled in Judea. Tiglath-pileser had emptied Galilee of Israelites. Hanan and Aldersmith people Galilee with Benjaminites who really belonged to the House of “All-Israel,” that is, eleven-tribed Israel, and could serve as intermediaries between Judah and All-Israel. It is asserted that there are many reasons for believing this, but unfortunately none of those reasons are presented. What seems far more plausible is that Galilee was repopulated with people made up both of Israelites and Jews who came back from Assyria. The decree of Cyrus permitted all Israelites to return, from Assyria as well as Babylon. Ezra 2:59 shows that some of those who returned could not show that they were of the house of Israel. Obviously these could not have been Babylonian Jews, for ancestry does not become lost in the short space of seventy years. They may have been “Jews,” but if so, they must have been “Jews” from Assyria. The conclusion is that if they could not prove their descent from Israel, surely they must have lost tribal identity also. Again, it is a supposition, but certainly the supposition is much stronger that tribal identity was lost than that the captives in Assyria actually remained distinct and only Jews returned from the North. It is to be noted too that the question was not, “Can you prove you are a ‘Jew’?”, but rather, “Can you prove you are of Israel?” I Chron. 9:2, 3 proves that at least some of the Ten Tribes came back. J. H. Allen really concedes all this when he says, “After all, it is not so much a question of the lost ten tribes, for some out of all the tribes returned to the kingdom of Judah in the days of Rehoboam, the first king of Judah. This is no doubt the reason that the Jews, upon their return from Babylon, offered the twelve bullocks for all Israel, as a burnt offering unto the Lord. But it is a question of the lost house of Joseph, that is, THE LOST BIRTHRIGHT.”

**Later Biblical Usage**

In later books of the Old Testament the terms “Jews” and “Israelites” seem to have the same meaning. They are now once again one people. Haman wished to massacre the “Jews,” but how was he to distinguish between tribes? It is to be remembered that the decree of Ahasuerus was not limited to Babylon. Nehemiah 12:47 states: “And all Israel in the days of Zerubbabel, and in the days of Nehemiah, gave the portions of the singers and porters, every day his portion: and they sanctified holy things unto the Levites; and the Levites sanctified them unto the children of Aaron.” This verse was written within fifty years of the closing of the Old Testament Canon and yet it speaks of “all Israel.” At that time the ten tribes were not lost.

In the New Testament the two terms are used consistently as applicable to the twelve tribes of Israel. There is no indication that part were considered lost. The accusation written above the crucified Lord was, “This is Jesus, the King of the
Jews,” while the Jews mocked Him and said, “He is the King of Israel; let him now come down from the cross, and we will believe him” (Matt. 27:37, 42). Evidently the chief of the Jews considered themselves to be all Israel. The many differing peoples who gathered at Pentecost are called Jews in Acts 2:5, while in verse 22 they are spoken to as “the men of Israel,” while in verse 36 they are designated as “all the house of Israel.” Peter must have had a powerful voice if he was making the inhabitants of the British Isles hear his sermon. Jesus called Nathanael an Israelite and contrasted him with the first who had been filled with guile (John 1:47). Nicodemus was both a “ruler of the Jews” and “a master in Israel” (John 3:1, 10). The lame man healed at the gate of the temple called Beautiful created quite a sensation. Peter addressed himself to the situation saying: “Ye men of Israel, why marvel ye at this man?” (Acts 3:2). Paul considered himself to be both a Jew and an Israelite (Acts 21:39; Rom. 11:1). He spoke of “our twelve tribes, instantly serving God,” before Agrippa (Acts 26:6, 7). In very many places of the Scriptures he contrasts Jews with Greeks in a way indicating that the two terms cover all of humanity. In I Cor. 10:32 the human race is divided into Jews, Gentiles, and the Church of God. If the Israelites were not included among the Jews or in the Church, they did not exist according to the thinking of the writers of the New Testament. This may be the reason why British-Israelism makes so very little of the New Testament. But surely these books of the New Testament are inspired as truly as those of the Old, and here the evidence is conclusive that the Ten Tribes were not lost but were included among those whom British-Israelism calls the “Jews.”

“The Lost Sheep of Israel”

British-Israelism endeavors to fortify its position by declaring that Jesus himself referred to the Lost Tribes of Israel. Christ did use the phrase, “The lost sheep of the house of Israel,” on two occasions, but it is evident that Israel was lost in a spiritual and not in a national and geographical sense. This phrase was used as a directive to whom the apostles should preach, and as a reason why He could not heal the demon-possessed daughter of the Syrophoenician woman. But Christ used the same word “lost” in the house of Zaccheus when he declared that the “Son of Man is come to seek and to save that which was lost.” The lostness of Zaccheus was not that he sat in a tree where Jesus could not see him, for he was at the table with our Lord, but it was a condition of spirit. Surely the apostles in their ministry to the lost sheep of the house of Israel did not travel during that early brief and hurried ministry to the British Isles. Rather than strengthening their position, this phrase does precisely what so many other passages in the New Testament do, represents the Jews with whom Jesus worked as actually being twelve-tribed Israel.

All this, however, merely proves that the two and the ten tribes were not distinct, and the ten tribes were not lost. It does not disprove that the British can trace their ancestry back to the Israelites, though the term must now include representatives from all twelve tribes. The investigation of that proposition must be postponed to a later article. [This discussion of British-Israelism will be completed in two subsequent articles.—Editor.]

Modernism Refuted at Calvary

W e point you to six statements associated with the suffering and death of Jesus Christ which may be construed as stating the elements which are still the stock-in-trade of modern liberal estimates of Jesus and each one is strikingly refuted by its immediate context.

I. John 19:5: “Behold the Man!”

Modernism: The real significance of Jesus of Nazareth can only be found by freeing him from the shackles of an outworn Medieval theological conception of Deity. We must be free to see his superlative humanity.

John 19:7: “We have a law and by that law he ought to die, because he made himself the Son of God”.

From the lips of His enemies, who would not recognize His claim, comes the unquestionable testimony that Jesus did claim Deity. If He did, and if He was not the Son of God, He is not “superlatively human” but a cheap imposter who truly deserved to die.


Modernism: The crucifixion of Jesus was the greatest crime to human progress ever perpetrated, because it was the killing of the greatest Teacher and moral Example that ever lived.


If we have so far missed the meaning of Calvery’s tragedy as to see it only as the death of a great Soul, and are not led to fall at His feet in repentant faith that it was for us, we have missed the meaning of Calvary entirely.

III. Matthew 27:42: “Let Him now come down from the Cross and we will believe on him.”

Modernism: The Cross is the great contradiction which Modernism has great difficulty in
integrating with the idea of a purely human Jesus Who is not the Lamb of God.

Matthew 27:43: “He trusteth in God, let Him deliver Him.”

Never once in the life of Jesus did His faith in God or His power to wield the works of God falter. Since He was not able to save Himself from the Cross we are driven to the conclusion that He gave His life willingly, purposefully.

IV.


Modernism: We must not adopt the old theological interpretation of being “saved from sin”. Our only reasonable concern is to be saved from sinning and from the evils of life.

Luke 23:40-41: “Dost not fear God, thou art in the same condemnation, and justly, but this man hath done nothing amiss.”

Unless we accept the interpretation of a sinless Sacrifice Who paid the price for our guilty souls, there is no meaning to the saving power of the cross.

V.

Matthew 27:54: “Truly this was a son of God”. Cf. Luke 23:47: “Certainly this was a righteous man.”

VI.

Matthew 28:13: “Say ye, His disciples came by night and stole Him away while we slept.”

Modernism: Has actually used this patent falsehood as an explanation for the empty tomb. Jesus’ body was removed and moulder away in some unknown place and thence the myth of the physical resurrection arose.


The entire setting is a clear case of deliberate deception in the face of better knowledge. If the priests really believed their own statement, they would certainly have attempted action against the disciples. But they knew it was not so, they knew the soldiers spoke truly and so a bribe was necessary to perpetrate a deliberate falsehood. Modernism finds itself in delightful company!

ALA BANDON.

Around The Book Table

DR. BAILLIE’S PILGRIMAGE


D R. BAILLIE, professor of Theology at the University of Edinburgh, has made a remarkable theological pilgrimage. He has journeyed a long way to the theological right since he wrote The Roots of Religion in the Human Soul, 1926, and The Interpretation of Religion, 1928. These works show him as being distinctly under the spell of the philosophy of Wilhelm Hermann and the theology of Friedrich Schleiermacher. Both of his latest books, Our Knowledge of God, 1939, and the book under review indicate a decided swing toward the conservative theological position.

This work is really one in the field of apologetics. Dr. Baillie seems to place apologetics on the “other side” of faith (as expressed in Dogmatics.) Unless I am confronted with the fact of God and the varieties of the Christian Faith by God Himself, I can never argue myself into these beliefs. It is with that in the background that Dr. Baillie gives his apologia. The title of the work under review is arresting. Yet confusing, unless we see it in the light of his conception of an effective apologetic today. Such must address itself to those who stand within the inheritance of the Christian tradition but who in varying degrees have disengaged themselves from that tradition and “whose quarrel with Christianity is therefore undertaken from the point of view either of no religion at all or of some very vague and tenuous residuum of Christian religiosity.” We may agree and do agree up to a certain point in the road of our pilgrimage of thought and faith, but then the road forks and we walk apart. Any effective apologetic today must attempt to illuminate that road, especially the point of divergence between belief and unbelief. So the invitation is to walk along the road of faith (belief), and to make plain the nature of the belief of those who believe and the nature of the unbelief of those who do not believe. It is to that task that Dr. Baillie sets himself: to find out just why it is that some in the Christian tradition have rejected the Christian faith.

Dr. Baillie stresses throughout that the difficulties to belief are due to misunderstanding and misconception of the real nature of Christianity, and the failure to see that the road of disbelief turns back upon itself and that one then walks in the same evils which one has tried to avoid. For the author a distinctive personal element is found in such a task, for we all must confess: “Lord, I believe; help Thou mine unbelief.” Dr. Baillie shows a masterful handling and understanding of the fallacies of sheer Rationalism, Irrationalism, and Humanism, and how the Gospel is after all the only real answer to our fundamental questions of belief. These analyses alone are worth the reading of the book.

For the author, God is inescapable from the very moment of our consciousness, which, to him, means a consciousness of divine authority over us. The essence of sin is pride, and it is impossible to relieve our human situation, except through an Atonement provided by God Himself. To be redeemed means release from the power and guilt of sin and Jesus Christ grants us both righteousness and sanctification. As such the Gospel is both relevant and credible.
Dr. Baillie considers the various philosophies of history and concludes that all things are tending toward the Second Advent, the full fruition of salvation, ushering in the eternal reign of glory, which itself is beyond history.

The author sought to make this book very contemporary by putting its material in the light of the present world situation on its ideological side. The Church is the only answer, for "it is only in Christ that we can enjoy full community with one another, and it is only in our togetherness with one another that we can enjoy communion with Christ." Only in this way can we escape the contemporary double evil of a community which enslaves the individual to the state or race, or an individualism which is powerless to resist totalitarianism because it fails to provide satisfaction for the hunger of solidarity characteristic of our present generation.

Dr. Baillie has decidedly taken a conservative stand on the meaning of the Gospel and redemption. He believes in the atoning power of the cross of Christ. Naturally many theological questions are left unanswered by him, such as the meaning of revelation, the infallibility and inspiration of the Scriptures, but he does take a stand on the great apologetic questions. His explanation of the Biblical stories of creation and the Fall of Man as being but mythological representations of important truths, his conception of pre-history, his representation of original sin in terms of individualized pride—to such interpretations we object. As one of my former professors put it—"Dr. Baillie is coming, but he has not yet arrived."

We should not be misled in our evaluation of the worth of this book by the frowns of the pages. The book is well worth careful reading because it leads us into the thinking of one of the keenest contemporary theological minds in Britain, and particularly into the change that has occurred in his thinking. As such the book is something of a spiritual autobiography. Dr. Baillie seeks to present the grounds of Christian belief in such a way as to make clear to others the nature of the constraint they exercise over him. And so there is much of introspective analysis.

One wonders what has influenced Dr. Baillie in the direction of conservatism. Can it be that a present colleague at Edinburgh who is in the camp of dialectical theology has had a wholesome influence on Dr. Baillie, even though in this latest work the latter voices some strenuous objections to the Barthian abjuration of apologetics and its lack of sympathy with any rationalism? I cannot help but hear over and over again the great intonations of the dialectical theology in this work. The resemblance is more than coincidental. I do not thereby make a Barthian of Dr. Baillie, but I do believe that he has been decidedly influenced by that movement.

Dr. Baillie drew on this material of the book, which was then in preparation, for a series of lectures at Princeton Theological Seminary in the spring of 1941. These lectures were exceedingly well received. The attendance was large and grew at each succeeding lecture. There was real appreciation of the content, and the rich Scottish brogue and full humor of Dr. Baillie endeared him to his audience.

JOHN E. LUCHIES.

LANSING, Mich.

VINDICATING FAITH IN GOD

I STILL BELIEVE IN GOD. By J. A. Dell. The Wartburg Press, Columbus, Ohio. 1942. pp. 256. $2.00.

D R. DELL is a native of Ohio and at present is the professor of Practical Theology at the Capital University Theological Seminary (Lutheran) of which he is an alumnae. He has been editor of the Youth's Monthly and the Journal of Theology. Other books by the same author are Re-thinking Religious Education and Sermon Sketches on the Old Epistle Pericopes.

His latest book, which is very readable and shows an understanding of contemporary religious and philosophical thinking, is not intended as a seminar textbook but is written to clarify the real issues of Christianity and to strengthen young people especially who may be assailed by doubts and religious problems. The book is dedicated "to those youthful minds and hearts who ask questions earnestly and sincerely concerning the Christian attitude toward life."

This is a good book; and, I believe, it does achieve to a remarkable extent its avowed purpose. It is a worthwhile book, not because it tells us anything new particularly, but because it is so refreshing to find one taking the great truths of historic Christianity and making them so real in our day. Few books are being put on the market which are as biblical in their emphases.

It is the author's contention that the main thing wrong in the world today is the lack of a living faith in God. He develops the thesis in the early part of the book that we are compelled to turn in faith to God in whatever direction we follow. The author does not attempt to argue faith, but merely to show that we are inescapably driven to it if we would lead satisfying and integrated lives. The great motivating force in our lives must be faith in a God who has revealed Himself, and who Himself is inescapably real, if we would be but honest with ourselves. It is not science that has produced a lack of faith, but a too superficial acquaintance with science and too scant a knowledge of what is to be said on behalf of faith. As man, we once knew God and then lost Him through a refusal to believe, so man can come back to God only through the door marked "Faith." Once we are confronted in our minds and hearts by this fact, then we can go on to live.

It is Dr. Dell's emphatic contention that whether we begin with man's thinking ability or with man's need of faith, with the physical universe or with spiritual qualities, we are confronted with God. We live in a rational universe, yet the source of that rationality is not to be found in the universe. In our world the physical qualities cannot be explained by mere matter or motion. Truth, beauty, goodness, love cannot be explained by a mere reference to dead matter alone, but a Creator wrote into the laws of the world's being the principles of His own life. When we look at order and wisdom, purpose and destiny particularly, we can not find a rational explanation in man or below man. God is both the source and goal of man's purpose. So too, God can be the only explanation for man's personality.

From this approach the author seeks to develop his thoughts on the great truths of Christianity. God is Spirit, incorporeal, omnipresent, of infinite intelligence, unfathomable love, supreme will. We cannot find God by science or philosophical speculation—these only indicate a probability—but if we would know God and His plans for us God must reveal Himself and His Will to us. For us to understand God He must speak to us through man (The Bible) or as man (Jesus Christ). In this way God breaks through into our concept world in a way that we can understand, and the only way we know that God has done this is not through a mathematical proposition but by faith. (At this point one does not find in the author any explicit emphasis on the absolute infallibility of the Bible, although it is an implication).

Jesus is more than a mind of great depth and beauty, compelling the homage of all men, and a man of great religious perception and spiritual insight, so that the Sermon of the Mount, the parable, the Lord's Prayer, the great conversations are more than coincidental. I do not thereby make a Barthian of Dr. Baillie, but I do believe that he has been decidedly influenced by that movement.

From this approach the author seeks to develop his thoughts on the great truths of Christianity. God is Spirit, incorporeal, omnipresent, of infinite intelligence, unfathomable love, supreme will. We cannot find God by science or philosophical speculation—these only indicate a probability—but if we would know God and His plans for us God must reveal Himself and His Will to us. For us to understand God He must speak to us through man (The Bible) or as man (Jesus Christ). In this way God breaks through into our concept world in a way that we can understand, and the only way we know that God has done this is not through a mathematical proposition but by faith. (At this point one does not find in the author any explicit emphasis on the absolute inerrancy of the Bible, although it is an implication).

Jesus is more than a mind of great depth and beauty, compelling the homage of all men, and a man of great religious perception and spiritual insight, so that the Sermon of the Mount, the parable, the Lord's Prayer, the great conversations could have been produced only by Him; but the fact of faith compels belief in Jesus Christ the Son of God, the Messiah. And so Dr. Dell confesses: "I believe that God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself," and thus was at grips with sin and evil which are very real in the world and involve guilt and judgment. That sin came about through the Fall of Man, historically conceived; and ever since man is trying to live in God's universe and be at enmity with the Creator of that universe. That sin does not work, and demands the redemption by Christ through His cross.

Such a faith in God is dynamic, exerting influence on the
whole of man: mind, emotions, will, intellect. A true system of ethics is attainable only on this basis of faith. The Kingdom of God is not a mere social reform but is the ruling of God in the heart of man. The author contends that it is the Gospel of a redeeming Saviour that offers grace that creates faith, that confers forgiveness. This is the entering into the Kingdom. If enough hearts are changed by the Gospel then we will have a society reformed from within, organically. This worthwhile chapter also discusses the meaning of prayer, the tensions in life, and Christian joy.

Our domestic and international problems can also be solved in the way of this faith. Although no millennium can be expected, yet our world should be charted by these great principles: (1) The supremacy of the will of God (good Calvinism); (2) the superiority of spiritual values to material values; (3) the recognition of the importance of the individual; (4) love dominating the good life. The spiritual leaven of the faith of the Christian Church in God can strengthen the faith of the present generation!

JOHN E. LUCEIES.

WOLF-CHILDREN AND EDUCATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY


HERE is a book of genuine scientific importance. First and foremost, it contains, unabridged, the Rev. Mr. Singh’s now famous, Diary of the Wolf-Children of Midnapore, India. Also Anaelm van Feuerbarch’s, “Kaspar Hauser,” being the account of a boy who from early childhood till age seventeen lived in complete isolation. Lastly, Mr. Zingg gives a careful account of numerous cases of feral man and of extreme isolation. (Some thirty-five cases are known.)

Indeed, Zingg has placed us much in his debt by collecting all this material in a single volume. One wishes very much he could have included Itard’s, Wild Boy of Aveyron. Presumably there were copyright or other difficulties making it impossible.

Of the 379-pages in the book the Singh diary alone fills 126 pages, exactly one-third. It well deserves the space. It is a fascinating document. True, it lacks certain information the scientist would like to have, but the entries are nevertheless very revealing. They begin with the discovery of the two girls in a wolf’s den, to the death of the elder of the two children nine years later.

The trustworthiness of the document can no longer be questioned. Not only has it every earmark of genuineness, but Zingg submits so much and such eloquent testimony relative to the writer’s honesty and truthfulness that to doubt its credibility is no longer possible.

The scanty literature on isolated and feral children makes the Singh diary a contribution second in importance to none, not even to Itard’s “Wild Boy” or Feuerbach’s “Hauser.”

Arnold Gesell of Yale in his foreword to the diary well says:

“Furthermore it [namely, Zingg’s contribution] serves to accentuate the unique value of the Midnapore record. There can be no doubt whatever that Amala and Kamala early in life were adopted by a nursing wolf. The elder was subjected in turn to three crises which never have befallen any other mortal child. She was thrice bereft. She was bereft of human care, when she was carried to a wolf’s den; she was bereft of the securities of her wolf life when she was rescued — and by unhappy chance almost starved in the transition; she was pathetically bereft of the security of remiscent kinship when her younger sister Amala died.

“And yet Kamala survived. To an extraordinary degree she survived psychologically and achieved human estate. How could it come to pass? The diary will answer many of the reader’s questions.”

It should be mentioned in passing that Dr. Gesell has written an interpretation of the diary, also published by Harper’s, under the title, Wolf Child and Human Child, that should interest every reader of the book under review.

The story of these wolf-children is irrefutable proof of the tremendous significance of environment. On being discovered, the younger was estimated to have attained the age of eighteen months, the elder the age of eight years. They were wholly animal in their habits. They ran about on all fours, craved only milk and raw meat, possessed no articulate speech, ate and drank by lowering their mouths to the food, and lapped their water. They never laughed. Singh says they manifested a strong “dislike for everything human”.

But, on the other hand, Kamala (Amala died after only a year in the Singh orphanage), during her nine years with the Singhs learned to speak intelligibly, although her vocabulary remained very limited, and in other ways developed to a point possible only for a human being.

While one misses Wild Boy, one is glad to find Kaspar Hauser in the book. It calls for no comment in view of the fact that the case is an old one, and the account, however important, lacks all novelty today.

This reviewer has only praise for Mr. Zingg’s industry in tracing all known cases. The book represents a valuable contribution to the study of feral man. No layman need hesitate to read it. While invaluable to all students of human nature, it is not unintelligible to the layman because of technical terms. And, since in the last analysis not only anthropologists, sociologists, and psychologists are interested in the nature of man, but every human being is or should be, one does not hesitate to commend this book heartily to all.

The profit on the sales of the book, if any, will be used towards the support of the Singh orphanage. The Rev. Mr. Singh died in September, 1941. Mrs. Singh with a daughter is devotedly carrying on the work under great financial difficulty because of the war. If any reader of the review is inclined to help this worthy Christian institution, gifts may be sent to Mrs. Singh, “The Orphanage”, Midnapore, India.

J. BRODN.

BOOKS IN BRIEF

Evangelical Action! A report of the organization of the National Association of Evangelicals for United Action. Compiled and Edited by the Executive Committee. United Action Press, Boston, 1942. 160 pp. $1. Whoever is interested in united action on the part of evangelicals in this country and feels that the Federal Council has no right to call itself evangelical will want to read this book. In an editorial on another page of this issue we speak more fully of this movement. This 160-page book contains everything worth knowing on this movement through the 1942 Conference held at St. Louis. Contains constitution and doctrinal statement, committee reports, roster of delegates, and historical statement of the events leading up to the organization. Besides this there are addresses on “The Unvoiced Multitudes” (by Dr. H. J. Ockenga, now President of the Association), on “Evangelical Christianity Endangered by its Fragmented Condition” (by Dr. William Ward Ayer), and on “The Possibility of United Action” by President Stephen W. Palme of Houghton College.

The Music of the Golden Bells. By George Murray. Grand Rapids, 1942, Eerdmans. 120 pp. $1. Edifying sermons from the pen of a Scotch Presbyterian, which he preached in his Church, the First United Presbyterian, at Boston. The Rev. Mr. Murray has the best of the God-fearing Scotch Presbyterians in his soul, in his ministry, and in his messages. Thoroughly true to the Word of God, these messages can be recommended. Also suitable for reading services in small congregations.

C. B.