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Mary and Jesus in Front Page Headlines

Have you seen the front page of The Bethlehem Daily Star under date line of December 25, Year of Our Lord 1, and of The Jerusalem Daily News (Extra! Extra!) under date line of Sunday, April 9, A.D. 30? Here are some of the headlines from the Star: "Angels Hail Birth of Jesus in Manger—Shepherds Regain Voice Following Startling Visit—Great Joy Prevails in ‘Town of David’—Story of Manger Miracle Told Over and Over as Groups Collect." "Astrologers Quake at Child’s Destiny—Say Tragedy Will Stalk Steps of Holy Infant." "Local Village Receives Great Honor—City of Bethlehem in Historic Locale—Many Significant Events of World Have Occurred in Little Town." And here are some even more sensational from the front page of the News published in the Holy City on the day of Jesus’ resurrection: "Nazarene’s Tomb Found Empty!—Crucified ‘King of Jews’ Seen Alive, is Report—Death Now Vanquished! Cry Converts—Heavy Stone is Rolled Away from Tomb Entrance as Guards Sleep—Body Stolen!": Pilate." This covers the right column story, and the headlines of the left column Friday crucifixion story are no less sensational: "Earthquake Rends City as Prophet Succumbs—Dies Nobly in Place of Gang Leader—Governor Weakly Surrenders to Mob Allegedly in Pay of Priests—Jesus Forgives Slayers." And though less sensational, equally striking are some of these in smaller type for other, briefer, stories: "Local Weather Experts Fail to Explain Earthquake." "Centurion Resigns to Join Disciples." "Prominent Pharisee Admits Being Born Again." "Newspaper Starts Sweeping Inquiry." "Religious Leaders Refuse to Comment."

Now there is something!

These two front pages ought to do something for you. Besides the stories and headlines, there is an editorial in the “Easter” issue beginning “Last Friday the city of Jerusalem witnessed what we believe will go down in history as the world’s most atrocious crime . . .” Besides, the staff photographer of the Bethlehem Star managed to get in a beautiful “shot” of Mary and the Babe surrounded by a half dozen angels, and the front page picture of the Daily News (yes, of course, it had to be a Sunday edition: April 9, A.D. 30!) displays a fine cut of the burial of Jesus with superscription, “Final Scene in Grim Golgotha Spectacle” and this legend beneath it: “Did this man come back from the grave? is the question uppermost in the minds of the world today. The above photo, taken last Friday, shows the body of the Nazarene being removed to His tomb, from which it is alleged He resurrected Himself. At the left are Nicodemus and Joseph of Arimathea, Sanhedrins reputed to be secret disciples of Jesus. With them are Mary, mother of Jesus, and a few of the prophet’s followers who did not flee.”

Yes, you have guessed it. The whole is an advertising stunt. Someone conceived the idea of getting up and getting out and selling to ministers a full-sized front page newspaper sheet, twentieth century American style, with the crucifixion and resurrection story as of that date sprawled all over the seven columns, and with appropriate advertising material for the minister and his church on the reverse side. The sheet is to serve as an Easter Greeting. And the same for the story of the birth of the Savior in the Bethlehem Daily Star as a pastor’s Christmas Greeting to his people and to other prospective church members of the community!

When first you receive it, you scan it with interest. Here is something new, something “different.” You cannot deny there is something “fresh” about it! But, upon reflection, you turn away, if not in disgust, then in deep disappointment.

This sensational, commercialized utilization of the sacred story of the birth and of the crucifixion and resurrection of our Lord is repellent to the sensibilities of the believer. A careful—or even cursory—reading of these two front pages shows them to be covered with unhistorical elements, improbabilities, and unpsychological features. But even making allowance for all these, one feels that conveying the events of the birth and death and resurrection of our Lord through the medium of the modern front page newspaper story and headlines can serve no other purpose than to cater to the sensational without in any way promoting the cultivation of a truly historical and spiritual attitude toward Christmas and Easter.

The deeper meaning of Christmas and Easter is not conveyed in this form. It cannot be. When an attempt is made to do so, either one of two things happens. In the style of spot-news front page narrative on these sacred events of long ago one either completely misses the deeper thrust of the events as intended by the sacred writers, or else, one has to fall back on the language of Scripture and its careful biblical interpretation. Both of these are demonstrated—unwittingly, I take it—in the first columns of these two sheets. The Jerusalem Daily News in its Golgotha story of April 9, A.D. 30, has this significant passage: “The Daily News’ corre-
respondent, upon interviewing several persons in the crowd, found a rising spirit of indignation against the crucifixion and a mounting sympathy for the prophet." This sentiment completely misses the real thrust of Good Friday and Easter for the Christian.

One prefers the first column of The Bethlehem Daily Star with its headline announcing the fulfillment of prophecy as foretold by Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Micah, but one also soon discovers that this column is different from all the rest. It is not a newspaper column. It consists of a string of Bible quotations. This is getting closer to offering the real message of Christmas. But in this form there is no room or justification left for the sensational news and headlines material that mark this particular form of religious advertising and lend it its peculiar piquancy.

How refreshing on Christmas, Good Friday, and Easter to turn from the spectator, observer, critic approach of the headline writer and newspaper reporter to the attitude of the suppliant, worshipper, and believer at the manger of our Lord, at the cross of Calvary, and at the empty tomb on resurrection morn.

C. B.

The New Missionary Challenge

If EVER the challenge of missionary service was urgent and insistent, that time is now. The great commission has stood unaltered throughout the centuries since Olivet, but the urgency of the call to disciple the nations is intensified by the world situation which obtains in a given period of history. The Christian Church—and particularly the Church in America—is challenged today as perhaps never before to bring the Gospel to the nations still without Christ. Doors closed during the recent war are opening up again. The need of the Gospel, both as the power of God unto salvation for individual souls and for the well-being of the nations, is greater than ever. The forces hostile to the Gospel are as active as ever. Superstition and nations, is greater than ever. The forces hostile to the Gospel are as active as ever. Superstition and

The only message that can meet the realism of our day is the message of the Word, which has never flattered man but has ever exalted the supernatural, saving power of God to redeem the sinner, thus restoring him to his sonship as a child of God. Noth­ing less than a God-centered and God-glorifying missionary outlook and missionary program will do. A tremendous responsibility is imposed upon those who claim to have been enlightened from above and believe that to them has been entrusted the truth of the Gospel in its richest and purest form. All our boasting about the glory and the pre-eminence of Calvinism is but sounding brass and a tinkling cymbal if we do not exhibit a missionary enthusiasm second to none. The unpardonable contrast or separation between Calvinism and missions which has sometimes been very real in certain Calvinistic circles is a standing indictment against those constituting such groups and may only prove that what we have at times boastfully graced with a superior name is so far forth an inferior article, if not a caricature.

Let us not indict one another, but if we recognize a deficiency on this score, let each of us put
his hand in his own bosom. It must be admitted that progress in theology has not always gone hand in hand with progress in missionary enthusiasm. It must be confessed that advancement in the attainment of Christian culture and education has not always gone forward with a proportionate concern to bring the message of salvation to others. Have we at times, as we grew in knowledge and culture, lost our first love for the winning of souls for Christ? We would give the lie to the contention that loyalty to the truth and contending for the faith once delivered is in conflict with a passion for souls and a loving devotion to the task entrusted by our Lord in the great commission. It is well. But have we given the lie to this false contention, not merely in an argument, but by the eloquent deeds of a living testimony for our Lord and Savior? Let us be honest and admit that our being busy about many excellent things has at times been the occasion, if not the cause, for some neglect in personal testimony and missionary enthusiasm for the faith we hold precious.

Today there comes to us a new missionary challenge. We need missionary interest, intelligence, and enthusiasm in our homes, churches, and schools. Not the least in our colleges and seminaries. Thank God, there are visible the beginnings of a new spirit. It must be impressed upon those preparing for Kingdom service that there is not the great difference between those who stay at home and those who go abroad. Consecration, self-denial, the seeking of the lost—these qualities must characterize those laboring in virgin fields among heathen peoples, but those who stay at home no less. I fear we are all guilty on this score. Then, too, is it not time to stress the need for men of the greatest God-given talents and endowments for the mission fields no less than for the home fields. The pernicious idea that some men are "too good" to go to the mission field ought to be rooted out.

The carrying out of the missionary task of the church may indirectly have been promoted by the recent war. Thousands of Christian young men from America have seen the world. They have become cosmopolitan in their interest and outlook. They have seen the conditions of paganism in foreign lands. They themselves have in many cases come to a crisis and have been led by God to a decision to devote their talents to the spread of the Gospel. Out of young men like these will and must come many capable and consecrated missionaries. Already there are hopeful signs in this direction.

One of the most heartening recent developments among the Christian students of the land is the planning of a Convention for Missionary Advance under the auspices of the Student Foreign Mission Fellowship. As many will remember, the Student Volunteer Conventions, formerly held quadrennially in this country, were great rallying centers for missionary fellowship, missionary enthusiasm, and missionary intelligence. Sad to say, these conventions fell under the blight of modernism and the heart of the Christian Gospel was repudiated. At the Tenth Quadrennial Convention held in 1928 at Detroit this was sadly in evidence, as the present writer, at the time a Faculty delegate, can testify. In Hocking's volume Re-Thinking Missions this defeatist philosophy of missions came to classic expression. Even since that time a pall has been hanging over the entire missionary enterprise. Jerusalem and Madras sounded a different note, as the powerful book of Hendrik Kraemer, The Christian Message in a Non-Christian World, can show. The great student missionary movement of America must break completely with every form of compromise and modernism and stand for the full Gospel of supernatural grace as revealed in the Scriptures.

Here precisely lies the significance of the forthcoming Convention for Missionary Advance. The Student Foreign Mission Fellowship is an affiliate of the Inter-Varsity Christian Fellowship, an organization wholly and uncompromisingly committed to the supernatural Gospel of the saving grace of God in Jesus Christ on Calvary's cross. Dr. Samuel Zwemer, one of the stalwarts of the Faith in former student volunteer conventions, is listed in the advance publicity as one of the speakers. Many missionaries from various fields throughout the world will be present. The convention is scheduled to be held December 27 to January 2, at the University of Toronto. Expenses for student delegates are held down to a very reasonable figure. The publicity states that only 500 students can be accommodated. Information may be had by addressing: Convention for Missionary Advance, 30 St. Mary Street, Toronto 5, Ontario, Canada. It is sincerely to be hoped that at least a thousand students may be accommodated. May this prove to be the beginning of a great movement in the Christian student world of America and Canada for the recruitment of consecrated men for the mission fields of the world, and for their enthusiastic and prayerful consecration to the only Gospel which can save a perishing world!

C. B.
The Reaffirmation of the Virgin Birth

Henry Schultze
President of Calvin College

IT IS strange how the greedy hearts of men have leaped upon the great festivals of the Christian Church and turned them into gold—gold that sears their souls so that they become insensible to the priceless gifts of God. Christmas itself has been subject to this commercial seduction. There are few men, indeed, who can join the heavenly choir and sing, on the morn of the twenty-fifth of December, "Glory to God in the highest and on earth peace among men in whom He is well pleased." Honesty would require that we paraphrase it so that it becomes, "Glory to man in the valleys and on earth the exchange of gifts among men seeking good will."

Such an observance of the birthday of Jesus leaves us on the twenty-sixth of December with an empty purse, a heavy charge account, with presents that we cannot use, and with empty, aching hearts. An inventory taken after the twenty-fifth leaves us almost invariably with the impression of tragic disappointment. There was one thing we lacked and that was the Babe of Bethlehem.

The Revision of the Apostles' Creed

One of the saddest commentaries on the Christian world of today is that it no longer fights for the truth that Jesus was born of a virgin. This means so much for the existence of the church and for a proper observance of Christmas. To maintain a proper respect for the virgin birth calls for a militant attitude on the part of God's people.

Some thirty years ago the orthodox Christians fought back considerably when there was a determined effort on the part of various biblical scholars to have the Apostles' Creed revised. Those who pleaded for a revision felt that we could no longer honestly confess that Jesus was "conceived by the Holy Ghost and born of the virgin Mary." They actually challenged the right of the church to retain in its public creed this fundamental article contained in the oldest of all Christian creeds—an article based on the express declarations of the gospel according to Saint Luke and Saint Matthew. It was granted that it was perhaps a good thing to retain something of the poetry and mythology associated with the Christmas story, but it should not be retained as an article of faith. Let me select just a couple of citations on this matter.

Here is one from Soltau: "Whoever makes the further demand that an evangelical Christian shall believe in the words 'conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the virgin Mary' wittingly constitutes himself a sharer in a sin against the Holy Spirit of the true Gospel as transmitted to us by the apostles and their school in the Apostolic Age." Soltau must have had convictions on this matter. To teach the virgin birth is to sin against the Holy Spirit! What a tremendous indictment against Isaiah, Matthew, Luke, Paul, and the long line of faithful witnesses since the birth of the church!

Here is another citation in which the one insisting upon the virgin birth of Christ is not accused of sinning against the Holy Spirit but of hindering Christian progress. It is from R. J. Campbell. "The credibility and significance of Christianity are in no way affected by the doctrine of the virgin birth, otherwise than that the belief tends to put a barrier between Jesus and the human race, and to make him something that cannot properly be called human... Like many others, I used to take the position that acceptance or non-acceptance of the doctrine of the Virgin Birth was immaterial because Christianity was quite independent of it; but later reflection has convinced me that in point of fact it operates as a hindrance to spiritual religion and a real living faith in Christ. The simple and natural conclusion is that Jesus was the child of Joseph and Mary, and had an uneventful childhood." Campbell's position is that the less we think of the virgin birth the better it will be for our spiritual life. And Campbell's position seems to be the practical conviction of the majority of those called Christians today, judging from the almost absolute indifference they manifest to this central theme.

Pursuant to the conviction of such men as quoted above, many scholars were faced with the fact that the story is there in the Bible for all those who wish to read and believe. They took it upon themselves to account for the presence of such biblical passages. The reconstructionists have run through the usual gamut of theories by means of which undesirable parts of the Bible were accounted for. The stories were built up from Old Testament prophecies. They constitute Jewish-Christian interpolations. They are of early mytho-theological origin. They were a

1 The Birth of Jesus Christ, p. 65.
heritage received from the pagan world. But none of them satisfies the fair-minded scholar who is not prejudiced by the conviction that such a miracle is impossible. Yet it seems as if the voice that cries out "Jesus was born of a virgin" is silenced. And no one seems to think it worth while to fight the theory, for to all practical purposes it is dead. The Church that discontinues the struggle has given up the fort.

The Scientific Impossibility of the Virgin Birth

Many of the so-called "open-minded" folks are led to disbelieve in the correctness of the virgin birth records on the basis of its scientific impossibility. When the scientists claimed that it could not be, that was sufficient for many. It is about time that we prick the bubble of the infallibility and omniscience of science. Science must be spelled out with a capital S. It is the final authority on all matters of truth. Even the long list of misjudgments and miscalculations with which the history of science is spotted does not seem to deter our faith in Science. It was Harry Emerson Fosdick who quite correctly ridiculed this position when he said that some people think that the highest honor that can be paid to God is to say that a few scientists still believe in Him.

But there have been and still are scientists who are willing to conceive of the virgin birth. There is a man like Huxley, an out-and-out evolutionist, who wrote a paper on parthenogenesis, which is to say, on reproduction by means of unfertilized eggs. In it he granted the possibility of the virgin birth, and the Christian world hailed his declaration with delight. It did not bother these Christians that Huxley by his theory undermined everything that the Bible had to say about it. He took the virgin birth out of the realm of the miraculous.

Prof. Romanes also essayed on scientific grounds to prove the possibility of the virgin birth. Science maintains, said he in effect, that there are certain forms of fungi and of plant lice that reproduce from eggs that have not been fertilized by male spores or cells. But Romanes has performed no service to Christianity. He too would make the virgin birth a natural process, or deny it.

The importance of the virgin birth lies precisely in its so-called physical impossibility. The moment any man, scientist or other person, waters it down to a natural phenomenon, however unusual, the event loses its significance. It constitutes a direct intervention of God into the natural course of events or it is not what the Bible teaches. Let us continue to insist that it is a scientific or physical impossibility, but that it lies within, and only within the potency of God.

The Significance of the Virgin Birth

After many years of apparently vain discussion about the possibility and the impossibility of the virgin birth, men have gradually permitted the problem to rest, as if this doctrine had no important bearing upon Christian thought in general. A person was left to believe or not to believe as seemed good in his own eyes. But the necessity of reaffirming our faith in this doctrine becomes apparent the moment we discuss some of its implications.

There is the doctrine of the pre-existence of Christ. It is a matter of cardinal importance that He existed from eternity; that He left the glory of the Father and assumed the form of a servant; that though He was rich, yet for our sakes He became poor. There is an almost endless series of such biblical references indicating that before the incarnation He was. There could be no willing sacrifice on His part unless He was there before His birth to make the sacrifice. And if Jesus was not there before His birth He could have been no more than a mere man. Strangely enough, that is precisely the conclusion at which the deniers of the virgin birth arrive. He is for them a peerless teacher, a spiritual leader, a faultless example, a great reformer, but He can in no sense be divine. Gone is the one who is mighty to save! Gone is the Conquering Hero of the poor and afflicted! Gone is the Jehovah who came to redeem His people! All that we have left is a man—an unusual man, perhaps—but withal a man. If the virgin birth does not mean the injection of God into this world, then God has not come into this world of sinful humanity. Christ's birth then deserves no more than the scant notice that it receives today. He was then just a man who was born under rather unfavorable circumstances. Without the reaffirmation of the virgin birth one cannot affirm the divinity of the Christ.

The Sinlessness of Jesus

There is another very important doctrine that is being neglected because of the denial of the virgin birth. That is the absolute sinlessness of Jesus. This involves a tremendous truth. We can have confidence in the perfection of Christ's sacrificial work only when we are sure that He did not have to suffer for His own sins. Jesus could never have presented acceptable sacrifices to God if His own heart and hands had been stained with sin. Sinners are by nature enemies of God, and no enemy can atone for himself, to say nothing about paying the debt of others. We believe that Jesus could die for us because He did not have to die for Himself. One can never explain the sinlessness of Jesus except on the basis of His divine paternity. You may deny that Jesus is sinless, but then you are not on scriptural basis. "It is a flawless character that the gos-
pel presents to us. Jesus Himself, while so pure and unerring in His judgment of sin in others—laying His finger on the first uprising of sin in the sinful thoughts and desires—is yet without trace of the consciousness of sin. He confesses no sin, seeks no forgiveness, knows no repentance. He puts Himself as Saviour over against all others as sinners needing salvation. His apostles and disciples who knew Him best declared Him to be free from sin. 'He did no sin,' says Peter. 'In Him was no sin,' says John. Paul, repeating their testimony declared, 'He shall save His people from their sins.' Matthew reports that that is the reason why He should be called Jesus. Luke, bringing the holiness of Jesus in direct connection with His miraculous conception asserts, 'Wherefore also that which is to be born shall be called holy.'" (Orr) Thus we have a sinless One in the midst of a sinful humanity. How can you explain it? Can a defective tree bring forth perfect fruit? It was Professor A. B. Bruce who insisted that, "A sinless man is as much a miracle in the moral world as a virgin birth is a miracle in the physical world." It is not because He was born of the virgin who is alleged to have been immaculate that He is sinless, but because He was conceived of the Holy Ghost. The heart of the miracle lies not specifically in His conception. That seems to have been a normal, natural process. It lies precisely in the conception. That is the heart of the miracle, and therein alone can one find some satisfaction in explaining how a sinless One came into the world. It was due to the fact that God inserted into the course of human history the sinless One, the Only Begotten of the Father. That too was a miracle and yields to no scientific explanation.

Let us be done with exchanging the undeniable facts of history as recorded in Matthew and Luke for a myth that finds its origin in the pagan worlds. Let us be done with exchanging the unsearchable spiritual blessings announced to us by the angels of Bethlehem for a few material gifts exchanged with well-meaning relatives and friends. Let us be done with substituting the thoughts of man for the thoughts of God in this season. Let us reaffirm that Jesus was "conceived by the Holy Ghost and born of the virgin Mary."

---

**Kleine Klaus, Pilgrim**

EW have been the years of his pilgrimage, almost seven to be exact. But Bunyan should have known him for the enrichment of his priceless classic. A walking, sometimes a running, commentary in sun suit or corduroys is beneficial in any manse. The problems of the manse are definitely related to the problems of the pants and what goes with them.

* * *

Kleine Klaus has done it again. This morning he shaved, using two parts of a wooden Erector set as a razor. In keeping with his preference for seeing everything, he stands before the vanity mirror and sets to work. He never cuts himself like his father, and he is careful that no bristles fall on the rug. When he is finished he walks around for a short time like a trailing cloud of glory.

This desire to shave is another sign of his decadent age. Where are the beards of yesterday, and where is the lost dignity of hidden faces? Ministers and even seminary professors walk about beaming through pink, cherub skins. Where are the venerable beards of John Ruskin, Alfred Tennyson, Dwight Moody, Charles Darwin, Herman Bavinck, and Buffalo Bill?

Kleine Klaus can lay claim to a great-grandfather little known but well-bearded. Around his saintly beard legends sprang up. There is the story that several of his grandchildren were lost in it for three days with as much adventure as Hansel and Gretel's. And there is the tale of two fleas that had taken upon their abode there. Each morning when they met, the one said to the other:

"Say Stanley, have you found Livingstone?"

Such glories will never be for Kleine Klaus. Smooth did he come, and smooth will he go, led astray by bad examples in a time of levity when even at an Ecumenical Synod all chins are smooth.  

* * *

Kleine Klaus is a collector. His zeal as such is fed in part by an inner prompting and in part by the grace of others. The inner prompting makes him somewhat of a scavenger, and the grace of others makes him akin to a public dump. The results are about the same.

The little one wades through his father's waste basket daily, and the Elder Klaus wades through the wreckage. Kleine Klaus knows there is a place for everything; he does not know that everything should have its place. Only yesterday I found a
shriveled ear of corn on my desk, and I mistook it for one of my sermons.

Kleine Klaus is a collector collecting. He goes into raptures about certain kinds of headgear. Caps are part of his delirium. One day I called for him at the home of friends. As I stepped into the living room, I thought I saw a turtle on the rug. It turned out to be the little fellow wearing a steel helmet, the weight of which might crush the skull of a sturdier anthropoid. He was swinging a billy, directing imaginary traffic. It reminded me of David and the armor of Saul, and you might add, Saul’s tent.

Something else has come into Kleine Klaus’s possession recently. Someone gave him a Colonial Bakery cap, just the thing he wanted to play Greyhound driver. It is a bit large, and it keeps his knees warm on cool days. It also makes his ears stand out like the wings of a B-29. He wears it under parental protest, and when you watch him in the neighborhood, it reminds you of Birnamwood coming to Dunsinane.

Then he has an overseas cap so full of celluloid pins that it looks like a skull. It is a whole gallery of heroes and heroines from Superman to Blondie of whom Carlyle never heard. And what the collecting of those pins has done to the Elder Klaus is beyond words. He has had to eat bins full of a certain breakfast food, and his sermons have been marked by an energy and a drive that may spell a raise in salary.

The little one also has an overseas pin with two stars. When he wears it, it protrudes like an antenna, and we have to steer him around so that he does not crowd people off the sidewalks and does not knock cans off the shelves in grocery stores.

Kleine Klaus is also a collector collected at his best in corduroys. What is there about pants that fascinates boys and me and eludes even Shakespeare? It very likely is a composite of many things. Included in the mystery is the little, active bodies that get tangled up in them; the likeness to a shelf as that of a turtle and the chambered nautilus; a wee bit of philosophy about the outgrown shell by life’s unresting sea; and the simple droopiness of drawers that affects me no less than Falstaff and Ichabod Crane do. Have your pick, but handle the burden of the mystery with care.

Kleine Klaus likes his collecting best when he is collected in overalls. You can lecture him on what the well dressed boys wear. Mothers usually do. Fathers are slightly less concerned. You can defend Eton suits, the smart things that appear in the best ads. He is not impressed. He is warned about holes in the knees. He sheds a tear when a pocket must come down; but he is consoled when it is only the left pocket for the right knee. When the last pocket has to come down, his chin also comes down, and one has to be careful not to sew it into the patch. This vanishing of pockets is the ultimate in sacrifice. There lies an illustration for next Sunday’s sermon.

There was a time this past spring when we thought we had converted Kleine Klaus. He was not at all impressed by his new Eton outfit until he discovered a back pocket. That did the trick, but our triumph was brief. How can you keep a little boy from carrying most of his universe in such a pocket? How can you make him understand that he may look a bit deformed or may appear like Halley’s comet or a model T Ford pulling a big trailer? I am stumped and his mother despairs.

Kleine Klaus is of the earth earthly. He loves dirt like a worm, a thinking worm. (Pascal will not object.) When all the children play cemetery, he must, of course, be the grave digger. They sit around prim and clean, watching him burrowing in the furrows. And no one knows how close he comes to the skull of poor Yorick; but his mother knows with tears how much of the grave he carries with him into the kitchen.

Kleine Klaus is also of the earth earthly in that he is more mechanist than poet. Something of the latter is in him, but more of the former.

He is a mighty hunter. In the mellow season of loneliness when the trees are flaming torches, and great splashes of beauty lie on the hills, he, like thousands of men, will hear the call of the outdoors. He will not start the rabbits from their lairs, nor will he hear the honking of wild geese in arrow formation against a moon-filled sky. He will not become tense at the whir of pheasants, nor will he track the deer.

But he will carry a number on his back. It is the work of his hands and a foot long on cardboard. Suspended on safety pins it will go with him to and from school for every eye to see. It is the fruit of invention, the slight ripple of the poet on the surface of the mechanist, the harbinger of better things, we hope.

Let those older hunters who envy the unerring eye of Daniel Boone and Davy Crockett take a lesson from Kleine Klaus. Last autumn when I asked him to bring home some pheasants, he stepped out of the back door, and just like that he had three birds. So effortless it was, though the noise he made sounded like a chattering machine gun. Not for him the shattering blast of the shotgun. Nothing less than rapid fire for him. O, Kleine Klaus is a hunter. Not much bigger than a rabbit, smaller than a deer, he trudges the cuffs off his overalls and the soles off his shoes. There is a smudge across his nose, and his hands caress the good earth and coal dust, but his eyes are blue and big with wonder.

His shoes are as open as slit trenches, and when he comes home from tracking his world, there are enough stones in them to start a rock garden or a driveway. In less than a year the neighbors can have the surplus. It is only a matter of keeping them out of the vacuum cleaner. No longer a scep-
tic, I can readily understand and accept the feats of oriental fakirs who walk on nails. The evidence is before our eyes and on the rugs daily in the manse.

The hunter must have his eye on the object, and Kleine Klaus does. There is no question about his hunting, but his objects are limited. Occasionally the poet peeps from the folds of the mechanist's overalls, but more often the mechanist selects unerringly just a few things. Driving on the parkway of Chicago we called his attention to the rolling lawns, the varied trees, Lake Michigan to the right, and the unforgettable sky-line to the left. But he was hunting taxi-cabs and license plates. On the corner at Marshall Fields he danced at sight of cabs and double-deck busses. Driving north of Holland and beyond Muskegon along the scenic drive we called his attention to the magic of autumn's lavish beauty. But the road was too lonely. He yearned for cars and called for towns and cities where the gas machines parade. At Tulip Time in our city he saw, not tulips, but Tulip City taxis, and stood wide-eyed before some discarded models. There is little of the rustic swain about him. He prefers Main Street and Fifth Avenue to any meadows where the willows bend over meandering streams. For him all lyric, epic, and dramatic poetry is summoned up in the back-fire of a coughing jalopy, a broken bumper, and a "crash-up." I have difficulty staging these things for him, for insurance companies are hard stewards to tangle up with. He is neither poet nor peasant though there are rare occasions when there are glimmerings of each.

My heart, how will it be with Kleine Klaus in the full years we wish for him? Let him be a Nimrod with an eye for many objects.

It is really unfair to say that he has nothing but wheels in his head. He is fond of drawing and will bring home a leaf for tracing and coloring. He draws houses with many windows and bird-houses with stoves and smoking chimneys. The latter will mean a revolution in the ways of birds. They will soon be carrying kindling and chips of coal in their bills.

He also likes books. "Blaze and the Gypsies" is his Homer and Shakespeare, and a book of Bible stories with colored illustrations is part of his daily menu.

All these things mentioned make his university and fill his universe, although his preferences remain. He still thinks his father is not the glorious person he might be if he were a truck-driver. How accurate the observations of one three degrees removed from a suckling may be. It is the beardless seminary professors who could have put a stop to this years ago.

* * *

Kleine Klaus is a Christian. He likes to go to church and twice each Sunday. His eyes are brimming of tears when he cannot go in the evening; but they shine when he can. He will never have a perfect attendance record in Sunday School. But his church record is nearly perfect although the Lord does not give any pins for that.

Let him be all that he is. Let him be a hunter. We only hope and trust that as such he will track the highest and best that time and eternity offer. Bending over the varied trails, may he also lift his eyes to distant horizons. And may he see Orion the hunter, and Arcturus on its chain, and get star-dust on his nose from looking. Let his feet stray on the milky way, on autumn leaves, and on the sand dunes, but not on my garden.

As the earth turns and the years swing into high, let him walk the paths of goodness and truth. There is good hunting there. "Wherewithal shall a young man cleanse his way? By taking heed thereto according to thy word."

We hope he will say: "With my whole heart have I sought thee; O let me not wander from thy commandments." Hunting big game is nothing to this, the search for God.

When all the little Nimrods are trained to be good hunters in the blessed fields where the great Companion directs, it will be much better for them and for the world. Many who once were young Nimrods so full of expectation are sleeping now on foreign fields and in the deep because some have sought the wrong game and sought it destructively. And that is why they sleep "where poppies blow" and where they never grew and never shall. They were little once, and they adored trucks and taxi-cabs and license plates, and traced maple leaves and colored them. But because men were thoughtless and heartless, and lost the sense of God's wonder, and sharpened the swords of evil, the glory departed, and millions of young men became old in death.

Shall we ever learn? Must all the little Nimrods, who shoulder pop-guns and shoot straight from the imagination and ride the chase on tricycles festooned with crepe streamers, come to that inglorious end again? God forbid and man prevent!

God will forbid and man can prevent if the budding lives of childhood and youth are stored with the lore of the eternal. There is the Word, the best guide-book for all their hunting ways. In it there are unexplored reaches where adventure piles on adventure. It lets down the bars and opens the way to the great unfolding spaces and the thickest woods where life is not appearance but reality. There the beaten and unbeaten tracks lead to the real conquest so far above the winging of birds and the wounding of hares. There God finds the self which seeks Him.

Kleine Klaus, little Christian pilgrim, mechanic but poet too, your paths lie before you, grottoes and caves, uplands and summits, and valleys that stir the pioneer's blood. In all your searching and finding always hear the Voice of your Guide and keep close to His hand.
Liberty and Intervention

Cornelius Van Zwoll
Teaching Fellow
University of Michigan

The walls of Jericho are not the only ruins brought about by the prophetic trumplings of history. Ideas as well have fallen prey to experience and experiment. In government the practise of democracy has been seriously challenged. For political democracy has fallen short of a competent answer to changing social conditions. America faces an imbalance created by technical maintenance of political democracy alongside a persistently oligarchic industrial system. And as long as government, labor, and management operate on different bases, democracy in its true sense will not prevail.

The problems of a maturing capitalist system have of course been widely recognized by all three factors in addition to the general public itself. An attempted solution to the resultant frictions has been the judicious but firm intervention by the government in the regulation of various social relationships not traditionally assigned to the State. The trend has been towards collectivism, scientific planning and management. Collectivism is however far removed from democracy. If democracy has failed in America, is collective security the best alternative? In what form of government does the greatest value to the modern community—and individual—lie?

A chief concern is to crystallize an opinion on the relationship of state intervention to personal liberty. By intervention is meant an assumption by the state of functions previously denied it. By liberty is meant that freedom of the individual to attain the highest possible degree of moral and intellectual development in addition to the profitable and humane pursuit of his economic welfare. The radical changes in the relations among government, society and industry, and the growth of various competing theories of political adjustment to new and complex social conditions seem to demand an inquiry into the nature of human liberty and the propriety of intervention by the state in an effort to preserve the equilibrium of social forces within it.

Case Against Intervention

Traditionally the functions of the state have been limited to maintenance of peace and order, protection of life and property, and guarantee of civil rights. Beyond this, individualists maintain the government has no right to “interfere” with the lives of citizens. Such individualists passionately fear the sacrifice of individual liberty to an arbitrary and irresponsible government. In the socialist state, for example, there was pronounced failure to reconcile government with liberty. And in the Communist state another reduction of individual liberty is involved.

It is further argued that state intervention for the solution of social problems is a proposal to substitute external legal control for internal ethical self-control; and that the state exercises power without wisdom. A kind of laissez-faire democracy alone would satisfy those who fear any modification of the old status quo.

Now a pertinent question with respect to this opposition to state intervention is: What kind of people present these arguments, and why do they present them? First, those responsible for the arguments are comfortably situated under present conditions and view any intervention as a threat to those social and economic conditions on which their own security and prosperity are based. They also mouth these arguments who blindly oppose change or fall prey to the specious arguments of the first class. These people overlook the fact that opposition to change is conspicuously inappropriate in a democratic society, which operates constantly toward a reasonable compromise on critical issues.

Second is that class of anti-interventionists who denounce intervention as the desperate attempt of an exhausted capitalistic system to reconcile the contradictions and antagonisms of capitalism with the peaceful progress of society and thus save the system. To the contrary, it is held that the free development of society demands a new kind of state, not a repaired or exaggerated old one. This criticism is the opposite of the first. Intervention here is considered anti-social, because the existing form of the state is outmoded, whereas the bourgeoisie considers intervention as evil meddling with a well defined organ of society, the state.

Third are those who believe society will by natural evolution adjust itself to critical situations, and that a minimal state ought to concern itself with purely political functions. On this basis they abhor intervention as an unnatural and coercive effort to interfere with natural social processes.

Are Objections Valid?

Are the objections to intervention valid? The question involves this corollary: What is the purpose of the state with respect to individual liberty? To this one may answer with the authority of the
American Constitution, the tradition of Greek philosophy, and the Christian faith, that the purpose of the state is not purely restrictive but also liberative, to promote the general welfare so as to release the individual for the fulfilment of his moral and intellectual development. If this be granted, the next question to pose is whether state intervention does actually involve liberation, or restriction, of the development of the individual. First of all, be it conceded that indiscriminate intervention is prima facie undesirable. But such intervention is prevented a priori in our constitutional democracy by a careful system of checks and balances, an alert populace, and a reviewing judiciary.

So long, therefore, as the spirit of democracy invests the form with vitality (and if it does not, individual liberty will not be at a premium), we may consider the question of "discriminate" intervention on a relatively abstract basis, whether it be liberative or restrictive of social good. Before proceeding to a direct answer to that question, however, it must be pointed out that: (1) Intervention is by no means always restrictive. The positive intervention of the state in providing goods, facilities and services not obtainable through other sources can certainly not be termed a curtailment of individual liberty or a restraint of freedom. (2) Actual restrictions of the government may be negative only in form, but positive in effect. Thus a restraint on criminal practice or anti-social contracts is restrictive, to be sure, but positive benefits accrue to the individual, increasing his opportunity to pursue life, liberty and happiness. (3) State intervention may restrict the freedom of a minority guilty of social abuse of their individual liberty. In this case the state protects every individual in society against the few who threaten to corrupt social relations. (4) Finally, suppose government intervention does curtail liberty and hamper the individual in his free expression of natural impulses. Only the most sanguine humanitarian would deny the necessity of external discipline for individual internal depravity. Human nature is corrupt and limited. Corporate society by experience and intelligence has learned the value of restraints for individual and group.

What is the conclusion? Thus far, that it is quite possible to conceive of harmless, indeed beneficial intervention. Lack of the possibility of intervention would in fact make society a prey to oppressors of every sort who in their unrestricted "liberty" would exercise license unlimited by law or conscience to work its will on society.

Is there then no danger in intervention? Yes. There is the danger of substituting the legal judgment of the state for the ethical and social conscience of the individual. It is well-known that by thoroughly "legitimated" manipulation of the first magnitude may be committed against the state and society. Therefore state intervention cannot be accepted as a kind of ersatz morality. It must definitely retain its status as a legal aid to the moral and intellectual development of the individuals in society. Intervention will, of course, express in a sense the "social morality" of the state, but such a morality is never so acute or effective as individual morality. Too much of the essence of moral relationship has been lost in the process of compromise and agreement. And even good "law" can always be "interpreted."

State Intervention
— Qualified

If we can, with the qualifications noted, accept the idea of state intervention within the framework of constitutional democracy, what are the implications of such an idea? We thereby embrace the theory that a democracy admits of and in fact presupposes conscious peacable social change rather than inevitable revolution as the answer to social crises. After all, when social forces move out of the necessary equilibrium, the real test of democratic government is not its staticity in such a case, but its flexibility to absorb the new relationship by conscious, intelligent readjustment. This is an important implication of state intervention, for it is an indirect but nevertheless clear reaffirmation of our basic beliefs in the dignity of men, the consent of the governed, and the promotion of the general welfare by just distribution of social gains to all elements of society. Intervention becomes then a denial of revolutionary rejection of the state on the one hand (Communism) and of helpless inactivity of the state (laissez-faire) on the other. It becomes an assertion of reason and conscience, and of liberation, and of social self-discipline.

A basic assumption of state intervention in a democracy must be, however, that the populace itself define in a general way the nature and extent of such intervention as a safeguard against totalitarianism. Furthermore, vital democracy demands that the populace be ever capable of limiting, expanding, or ejecting from government such intervention as it may periodically approve (as in the case of the New Deal, the War powers of the president, and wage and price control policies).

The principle of the common welfare of the whole state also modifies the problem of intervention. That is an obvious statement to make, and yet it presents a difficult problem of objectivity to any government. For a state is strongly conditioned by the dominant classes within it—in our democracy, by the great industrialists, or by labor, if you like. The ideal of common welfare hence requires a perspective, a judgment, a selection which is most difficult of achievement by a government which is by nature a reflection of the dominant influential vocal elements of society. It requires reflective intelligence to determine and effect fair policies under such circumstances. It is hardly necessary to point out that contemporary government administrations have too frequently displayed anything but reflective intelligence. And yet this ideal must
be pursued. For nothing can be so dangerous as partial government to a constitutional democracy whose guarantees are the ultimate creed of its citizens. If these guarantees are ignored, or "interpreted" to the benefit of any segment of society, such a government invites a radical reaction not only to the administration but perhaps even to the state itself as constituted.

**Social Justice and the State**

Social justice is a common ideal. It requires careful definition, deliberate planning, and wise development in a democracy. Intervention as a means to social justice may be necessary—if intelligently and wisely undertaken. For intervention under the conditions described above is nothing more nor less than the considered agreement of the masses to expand the function of government to regulate some of the phases of collective life which by reason of increasing complexity and extent have receded from the bounds of satisfactory private control and therefore require the concerted action of the state in the interests of all society. This is no revolutionary dogma. It is the doctrine of conscious change in an alert democracy to meet new conditions in a new era. The very valuable concepts of the dignity of man, the value of personality and of individual liberty must be preserved. But they must not exclude the ideal of social justice, which is after all essentially united to these other concepts. The facts of our civilization today demand not regression to autocratic government or the decline of democracy and liberty. But they do require new approaches to the problem of government to insure the liberty and democracy which formerly required less conscious effort to maintain.

One of the basic assumptions of democracy is that the gains of society are properly the gains of all its members. This is a simple statement of fair distribution of goods. Yet even with the extension of government interest in the farmer and the laborer, distribution remains the chief problem of government—properly so, because it is a problem of public welfare and social justice. It is a problem which has been demonstrated to be not answerable by private individuals or enterprises. The alternative to state intervention is either indifference (and consequent disintegration or revolt of society); or regimentation of these interests by private groups with the consequent probability of further injustice, abuse, and partiality by exercise of uncontrolled power based on wealth or position. Government intervention in health, public works, education, safety, industrial relation, and "social security" has emerged in late years as a sine qua non of our modern society.

**Planned Society and the Democratic Process**

State intervention is the people's answer in a democracy to the progressive disturbance of the balance of social forces. Government as conceived in the Constitution and in Scripture is not just restraint of evil in the negative sense of courts of law and protection of life and property. It involves also promotion of the moral and material welfare, which today requires participation by the state in functions more or less satisfactorily assumed in less complex stages of our society by private enterprise.

Democratic government is a matter of rapport. An alert society will demand that its leaders both interpret and represent it in government. Thus it becomes improper to speak of intervention, for there will be no cleavage between the government and society. Government will be the agency of society to enact its will. Sovereignty resides in the people. It is separate from but expressed in government. Therefore a state will be governed more efficiently through an active democratic process than by experts calculating percentages and ratios apart from the living force of the populace. A planned society under scientific management without the consent of and supervision by the governed cannot substitute for intelligent and informed popular government. For in the democratic and Christian scale of values, collective security and administrative efficiency are secondary to, and in a sense dependent upon personal liberty. For liberty implies initiative, free discussion, and effective policy.

**The Considered View**

The ideal of social welfare demands a community of free and responsible persons in the sense that they must be free from the unjust conditions imposed by an imbalance of social forces, and responsible both to their individual and social conscience for their exercise of privilege and use of opportunities. Justice as a supreme end of the state is not confined to the criminal courts but extends to human relations in every sphere. Industrial and political liberty must go hand in hand; otherwise political liberty loses social significance. It is time for America to achieve spiritual and social unity. The era of special interest is best behind us.

This discussion has given no carte blanche to state intervention in social spheres traditionally foreign to state control. It is conceded that state intervention may actually become a menace to personal liberty. (1) If intervention is adopted as a dominant-class weapon to perpetuate an anachronized system, personal liberty will probably suffer, for state intervention in such a case will only artificially and temporarily modify social injustice. It will not guarantee social justice. (2) If the elements of society are capable of and willing to reach a new working agreement and a voluntary harmony by
which all society will benefit, state intervention would be not only officious and superfluous, but downright threatening to the constructive forces within society. (3) In case a social conflict reaches dangerous proportions and public welfare demands immediate state intervention, well and good. But if the social forces involved in the conflict regain their sense of balance and justice either by enlightenment or social coercion, then the state ought to withdraw with the proviso that future conflicts in that field will be brought under state control if they overstep the established bounds of general welfare.

It is sufficiently apparent therefore that intervention per se has no character, either good or bad. It is only in a particular political and social framework that one can intelligently sanction or repudiate a very specific kind of intervention on such conditions as those outlined above. But intervention in a democracy is inescapable. It is in effect an extension of democracy to all functions of society, a conscious continuation of constitutional guarantees.

Between laissez-faire democracy and collectivism lies the workable possibility of a process in which all the components of society apply the democratic principle to all social—not just political—problems. In this process the state, as the comprehensive and impartial representative of society, must take the initiative. That is to say that the public must actively engage in the democratic processes of discussion, decision, and supervision to empower the government to deal effectively with social needs.

The inner check of the Puritan conscience is still valid for individual morality. But for our complex society, social ideals must be recognized by the state. "State intervention" properly conceived and developed is in the best tradition of the values of Christianity, democracy, and the ideals of personal liberty and social justice.
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Some Thoughts on Labor

We Are happy that today we have those who are thinking along the way as they are living in our complex world. We are happy to have those who in our labor world today are taking a position and are doing so on the basis of principle. All such, however, while they have formulated principles and have taken a position on the basis of their principles, still need encouragement at times. I therefore take it as a privilege to be able to make a short contribution toward the maintaining of this position and the propagation of the principles upon which it is based. There will be predominantly three thoughts which we shall consider. First, we have problems. Second, we have principles. Third, we have progressions.

We Have Problems

First of all then, let us center our attention in the thought that we have problems. The first problem that we meet is that of providing for our daily needs. This most of us have to do as laboring men. As Christian people we know that there is God's providence—His almighty everywhere present power whereby He provides for all His creation, and therefore also for us, created in His image. This providence of God, however, includes man's responsibility to work. God chose that man should work already in Paradise before the entrance of sin. Much of the joy of his life was to be found in keeping and dressing the garden. After sin, however, the responsibility of man to provide for his daily needs became a problem, for he had to do so in a hostile world. Work then became labor, and it was in the sweat of his brow that he was to provide for his needs and those of his dependents. That man is in a hostile world today does not only mean that he has the thorns and thistles in nature to make it difficult for him to get his bread. It also means that he must find his place as a laboring man in a complex world composed of sinful men with evil tendencies and practices. So we find that every man, and especially the Christian man, has the great problem today of providing for his needs in a sinful world order which presents opposition and difficulties.

This problem of provision immediately—broaders out in our complex world to be, "How shall I provide for myself and my dependents in the great in-
dustrial world?” Truly today we have an industrially complex world. This complexity indeed brings many questions. It brings, first of all, the question “What shall I do?” That is, “What shall my life task be in this complex industrial world? What will be the nature and the character of the work that I shall daily perform and, by performing it, gain my daily needs?” A greater question soon follows, however, That is, “What may I do?” The question for any Christian is not only “What shall I do as a life’s vocation or task?” but “What may I do as a Christian in this great complex industrial world?” The man who is an employer is faced with the question, “What shall my policies be as I carry on my business today?” The laboring man faces the question, “What may my practices be as I enter this great industrial world? What is an honest day’s work? When am I loyal or disloyal to my employer? May I enter into the prevailing practice of unionizing of laborers? May I too find some good principles and purposes and accomplishment in unionism today? How much evil by way of principle, goal and activities, do I see in the Union movement?” Today in this post war period, this problem of the Unions is becoming far more involved because of its comprehensive character, its possible evil practices, and its tendency to become our national enemy No. 1 in so many ways. All these factors definitely bring to man this problem, “How shall I provide for my needs in the present day complex industrial world?”

For the Christian this problem becomes a greater one still. For him it is not only “How shall I provide?” nor yet “How shall I provide in a great industrial world?” but rather, “How shall I provide for my daily needs as a Christian? How shall I be a son of Israel today? How shall I live according to all the principles and commandments of God and do it well and to the honor of God in this present life?” It is not only a problem of provision but rather provision according to the law of God and in a manner which may have the blessing of God resting upon it and may be for the furtherance of the Kingdom of God also in the sphere of industry and labor.

We Have Principles

We, however, do not only have problems. We also have principles. In a general way I think we may say that America may be divided into four groups. There are the unprincipled, the non-principled, the principled and the Christian-principled. These four groups need very little elucidation. The unprincipled are those who act as if there is no law at all, and they are definitely a law unto themselves. Their practices are generally toward evil. The non-principled are the ones who pass along life’s pathway not catching even a glimpse of the higher things of life and the principles which should rule men also in the industrial world. The principled are those who in every sphere, and also in the industrial sphere, have ideals. They have underlying principles which guide them in their relationships to their fellowmen industrially. The Christian-principled are those who not only have general humanitarian principles but especially have goals, ideals and laws which are founded upon the word of God and the teachings of Jesus Christ and the leading of the Holy Spirit.

America should recognize the unprincipled as deadly enemies and traitors to our country. She should instruct the unprincipled that they might be raised to character in life, and seek to raise the principled ones to higher levels still. And, by all means, she should admire the Christian-principled. In all of this we, as Christian people, have a great challenge. Our voices should be raised to point out the unprincipled as our deadly enemies. We should be instructors of the non-principled. We should do all that we can to raise the principled to the level of Christianity and the principles of God’s word of truth. And surely we should admire and encourage all those who catch the vision of our Christian principles as they apply to these needs today.

As we go along our way today, we are glad to have Christian principles as we face our problems. We are happy, first of all, to know the fundamental principle that labor is honorable. As Christians we have never berated labor. We have never extolled idleness. The Christian ever acknowledges that it is an honor to work. Yes, it is an honor to work hard, diligently and persistently even for nothing more than merely to provide. This principle has far reaching significance today. In the light of it we may definitely say that one of the cries of labor today is illegitimate. I am referring to the cry “Let us work 40 hours and be paid for 50.” The principle that labor is honorable would demand that if a man labors for 40 hours, he should receive 40 hours’ pay. If he labors honorably 50 hours, he should be paid for 50. It is quite impossible to believe that we may be paid for 50 hours when we work only 40.

A second principle which we are happy to have in the face of our problems today is that God has not taken man out of the world. He has put him into the world—yes, also in this complex industrial world. Christ Himself prayed, “I pray not that Thou shouldst take them from the world but that Thou shouldst keep them from the evil one.” An abiding Christian principle is that the Christian is in the world in every sphere to be as the salt of the earth and the light of the world. That is, he is in the world to be there as an influence and guide. Asceticism has never been a part of true Christianity. To retreat has never been Christian. To withdraw from the world in its industrial complexity today would not be Christian. It would not be Reformed nor Calvinistic either. While we know that this is a general principle, we are ashamed to say that in many ways it has not been put into practice. It is impossible according to this principle for a Christian to live his own life and leave the
world to the power of darkness and let sin rule there. It would be the way of least resistance to find some way in which we could provide for our daily needs and escape the industrial world and its problems. This, however, would not be according to real Christianity. Christianity must have an influence, above all today. It must seek to let the principles of Christianity be felt in the complex industrial world in which we live today. Christians must enter into it to be felt and to lead, showing the way to good, revealing the true and only workable principles and policies. Without this light we may be sure that our industrial world will go in the wrong direction. Without a doubt labor has gone in a wrong direction to a great measure because Christianity of America and of the world has failed to live according to this great principle.

The third principle that we have with which we meet our problems today is that while the Christian is in the world, he may not be of it. He must be in the world and still not become conformed to it. He may not be one with its evils and evil practices. It is true this seems to be a paradoxical principle and has often been taken to be so. But in essence it is not paradoxical. I am certain that we can also say it is not impossible. By grace it is possible. God's grace can enable us to fulfill our God-given duty to go into our world even today to let our influence be felt and still not be a part of its evils. It is this great principle in regard to labor problems today that our synod has definitely maintained. What we need today is to keep this principle ever more clearly before our eyes. You know, and I know, of men who have been pressed by the labor problem. And what do they do? They withdraw. They cease to be a laborer. They separate themselves from the problem and thereby they fail to be the Christians that they ought to be. We ought rather to remain in it but while we are in it, raise our voices against its evils, hold forth the better principles and deviate from evil policies. This principle has led to the birth of such an organization as the CLA. This organization seeks to remain in the world industrially but yet not to be of the world. It is a labor union which has a determined policy not to ape the evil unions of our country nor follow their false principles. The high goal of this Christian endeavor is to enter into the labor problem today to provide much of that which the laboring man needs but, at the same time, to do it according to the principles of Christianity and to do it in a way which may be to the honor of men morally and ethically, and also to the glory of God. It feels convinced that it must rise up against the evil practices of the non-Christian world and open a good way for the attainment of man's needs. Here is the great challenge which lies before every Christian laborer today—unite as Christian men with Christian principles to accomplish these great objectives!

There is Progression

And thirdly, let us think for a moment on the thought that we have progressions. Yes, we have great progression in the movement of labor in the world today. The labor party is much in control in the country of England. The power of labor has increased to an almost unbelievable extent in our own country. There is progression in the number of men that have been unionized. There is growth in its voice and power. We need but think of how at present our large nation stands almost strangled with strikes of great magnitude, tying up our national resources and threatening to tie up our entire network of transportation. It seems as if our nation stands like a child waiting upon the turning of the strong hand of the father. But I also want to say that I believe that we do definitely have progression. By that I mean to say that we have growth in the evil of the labor movement. And that which is evil cannot stand long. Evil is that which is based upon a false and insecure foundation. It is therefore sure to fall. I believe we may say that while there is progression or growth in unionism in America, inasmuch as in many ways it is based upon evil and growing in evil, it is that much nearer its end today than it was before. The other evening I was playing with my daughter, building a tower with the blocks she had on the floor. I began to pile them one upon another. From all appearances the first block was lying even and a good foundation for building was laid. As I began to build on it, it appeared as if my tower was going to stand. But as I continued to build I noticed that it began to lean. The higher I went the more it leaned until at last it fell to the floor with a crash. The tower was built on an uneven foundation. It could not stand. So too, inasmuch as much of our unionism of today is built upon an evil and unprincipled, and therefore uneven, and unstable foundation, it is sure to fall. And while it is progressing today, we may see that it is progressing toward its final crash.

We are also encouraged to see progressions in our own endeavors. We have the Christian Labor Association. That is something which we did not have in other decades when labor problems were somewhat acute. The voice of Christian labor has been heard. We regret greatly that so many have failed to respond to this call and have followed into so-called neutral unions. But we are happy to see some turning from them—some who are holding high the principles of Christian labor, some who have united to let the voice of Christianity be heard in these complex problems of labor today.

I hasten on in conclusion to say that I believe we may find also one further progression. That is, we have progressed to see that it is the Christian working man that must make our Christian position be known and established. It is the Christian laboring man himself that must take his stand, form
his Union, exercise his rights, and be a Christian working man in this complex world. We have come to know that we cannot expect our problems in labor today to be solved by our spiritual leaders. After all they are spiritual leaders whose task it is to preach and develop true spirituality out of which all true Christian endeavors arise. We must have Christian labor leaders today. It is with labor as it was with the Christian School. The Church can encourage. The Church must give moral, spiritual and perhaps even financial support. But it is the body of Christian men that must organize the Christian Labor Union as well as it is a body of Christian men that must organize the Christian School Society. The Christian School movement has been successful because it has had its men of character, personality and power who have labored hard, and who have won over the interest of fellow Christians to the worthy cause. We are beginning to see today that our labor problems must be met in the same way rather than by so much legislation in our ecclesiastical assemblies. This is a definite progression. The more we progress along this line, the more we will find the solution to the problems which confront us today.

The Voice of our Readers

THAT FIRST REFORMED ECUMENICAL SYNOD

November 7, 1946

Dear Dr. Bouna:

Many reports, comments, editorials and other articles of appreciation and warm approval have appeared about the First Ecumenical Synod held in this country. As I perused them with keen interest, I'm sorry to admit that none of them impressed me favorably; none of them expressed my attitude or sentiment at all. May I state why?

First of all, only three churches of all the many Reformed groups were represented. Only three groups of all the churches of Jesus Christ here upon earth! To me that is a very sorry spectacle. For instance, why not also have invited churches such as De Christelijke Gereformeerde Kerk of the Netherlands? And the newly-organized church (which for the lack of a proper and permanent name) I shall merely refer to (as we in the Christian Reformed churches here seem to love to call them anyway) the "Schilder-group"? And the Reformed Church of this country. And the orthodox brands of the Presbyterian churches of our country? And, yes, I may as well add them as not, and I'm certainly not ashamed to include them, why not also the Protestant Reformed Church of this country? Had a gathering of such churches been called and at such gatherings a serious attempt been made to see how close we really stand together on fundamentals, and convince ourselves, as we should, that after all, the things which have separated us into various denominations were not of a serious nature; I say had such an effort been put forth, I would have thanked God and felt a real enthusiasm and warmth for such a noble, Christ-like endeavor.

Secondly, in the "testimony" of this first ecumenical synod I read "... the church will have to discharge her calling with fear and trembling, pursuing her course without any feeling of self-sufficiency." It seems to me that the fact that only three churches convened without even as much as inviting some of those mentioned above, and also that not a serious attempt was made or decided upon to seek re-union with some of the groups now regarded as "outside the fold" of the "Reformed" churches, points a little in the direction of "self-sufficiency." The impression is created that the three groups convening are (perhaps with a possible exception of the most recent orthodox Presbyterian group with which Dr. Stonehouse and Rev. R. B. Kuiper are connected) the "cream of the crop" when it comes to true, faithful, "Calvinistic," Reformed church organizations. That impression is most definitely created, and THAT impression does not impress me too favorably.

It seems to me that had this "synod" really aimed at more unity between the groups now so sadly and needlessly separated from one another, thus striving earnestly to help realize what the Head of the Church once petitioned of the Father, "Father, that they all may be one," that then something much more worth while would have been accomplished. Some may object, but those other churches would not have been willing to convene with them. That would be their business and certainly not to their credit. Or, someone may add: but the differences would not have been ironed out anyway because time has taught us that it will be futile to attempt reconciliation between the so-called "schismatic" groups, and the pure, unadulterated, un-erring Reformed denominations which gathered in ecumenical sessions.

However, such a gathering has never been called, and only by attempting to get them together would we really know if such groups could be impressed by the brotherliness, the warmth, the Christ-likeness of the spirit of "let's get together"; let's talk things over; let's see not how much, but how little we differ. Let's consider that our aloofness toward one another is not to the glory of God nor of Him Who redeemed us, whose we are.

You can rest assured that the Head of the Church, our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ, will smile approvingly at such endeavors, and that, even though an outward and formal re-union of churches would not be the immediate outcome, at least much of the now existing bitterness and sinful aloofness would be removed and a warm glow of love rekindled.

Cordially,

Grand Rapids, Mich.

Albert Piersma.

EDITORIAL COMMENT

Dear Mr. Piersma:

Thank you for your communication. We welcome exchange of thoughts and opinions. There is not too much of it in our magazine. Perhaps your letter will start an interesting discussion. Meanwhile, a few comments.

1. Who would not share your hopes and prayers that the various groups of the Reformed household of churches might come closer together? Who that loves the Reformed Faith can be happy about the divisions of Christendom and especially the divisions in the Reformed Churches?

2. However, such divisions—apart from those that are purely geographical and racial—have a history. In many cases they are deeply ingrained in historical, doctrinal and other differences. It is easier to utter a few pious phrases about the desirability of forgetting such differences than to put the hand to the plough and take practical steps to face them.
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3. It is rather strange that the only three denominations of the Reformed fold which recently have taken some definite action toward ecumenicity should be criticized for having done so. It would appear that they deserve commendation for having made a start. For it is only a start, as has been stated again and again in the sessions of this First Reformed Ecumenical Synod. Its preparatory and foundational character is repeatedly mentioned in its records.

4. It may well be questioned if anything would ever come of a Reformed ecumenical movement to which from the very beginning every possible group that is Reformed in name (whatever it is in reality) would be invited. Anyone having a larger view of the thing and of the movement that this Synod has undertaken would be the first to say that it is too soon to send the movement on the rocks. The attempt to begin carefully and modestly and to extend the group gradually if possible would appear to be a more promising move than one suggested in your letter.

5. It is very unfair to find fault with the three participating churches for having called this preparatory Synod of their three constituent bodies without having invited many more. Let us be practical and look at the facts. These three bodies did not proceed to “exclude” anyone. There simply was no common counsel—nor could there have been—on the part of these three groups to select, including certain bodies and excluding others, the proposed constituent members of this movement. At no time before the calling of this Ecumenical Synod was a meeting called which determined whether invitations were to be sent out to some and not to others. These three bodies, having lived together in the intimate fellowship of close church correspondence as Reformed groups, had corresponded from time to time on the need of meeting together for the joint discussion of doctrinal and other issues that call for clear thinking and courageous action in the face of the dangers and opposition to the Reformed Faith in our modern day. They felt a common need. They felt a common tie, scattered as they were over three continents. Is anything more natural than that this group should take the first steps leading to joint counsel and joint study with a view to the main issues that are to be had only at the expense of loyalty to the Faith once delivered are wont to make. Dr. Romig of the Reformed Church in America speaks in precisely such disparaging terms, as last month’s editorial on the subject indicated, but no one who has read his bold denial of the Reformed doctrine of original sin will be deceived by his disparaging words in the supposed interest of a genuine ecumenicity of the Reformed type. Any ecumenicity that is to be had only at the expense of wholesouled loyalty to the great truths of the Reformed Faith may well be repudiated as a false ecumenicity.

6. It is apparently overlooked by some critics that the first and dominant motive of this Reformed ecumenical effort does not lie in the desire to simply unite bodies now living apart. This is not essentially a church union movement among the Reformed, even though one fondly hopes that groups now living apart may be brought together in various forms of fellowship. The actual motive behind this movement and the driving power that has called it into being is the desire to stand unitedly for the Reformed Faith in the face of dangers and opposition, and to bear united testimony for that Faith in the modern world. Is it strange that the need of this is felt especially by those who have the same general conception of the Reformed Faith though dwelling in three different continents? The hope that many other Reformed groups may join the movement is fondly cherished, but at least a beginning, the only natural beginning, has been made, and for that we may well be grateful.

7. The question which church groups bearing the Reformed or Presbyterian name are to be invited into this movement will indeed be a most difficult one to solve. That is the problem which the existing group now faces. But we may rest assured that if all groups bearing a Reformed or Presbyterian name and officially claiming to have a Reformed creed had been sitting in on some first conference, as is suggested by some critics of the present movement, the whole movement would have been drowned in the rapids of the First Reformed Ecumenical Synod that it has left no doubt as to its present stand and future course in this matter.

THE O. P. C. AND THE UNIVERSITY PROJECT

Dear Dr. Bouma:

November 20, 1946.

You are fair in having the other side of the controversy about OPC affairs reported was properly commended in the letter of Louis E. Knowles (Nov. issue) who said: “It is refreshing to have the other side of the controversy that undeniably exists in our church represented in your pages.”

Permit me to comment on Mr. Heerema’s criticisms of my report. Mr. Heerema’s defense of the Guardian’s manner of raising and handling issues, which I reported had been objected to in the General Assembly of the OPC almost every year in the past seven, breathes the antipathy that periodical has at times displayed in dealing with the Fundamentalists, who are brethren in the Lord. He cites instances in which he says the Guardian did deal with certain issues with “tact and charity,” but then adds comments which being interpreted are, “It doesn’t do any good; they’re hopeless.” This spirit is different, to my way of thinking, than the attitude revealed by the Christian Reformed Church in seeking to influence the Fundamentalists in the National Association of Evangelicals. As one who has followed the fortunes of the N.A.E., let me say that I believe the Christian Reformed brethren who have represented their church in the councils of that organization have succeeded where the Orthodox Presbyterian Church has failed. They have gained the good will of Fundamentalist leaders and have had a profound effect in directing the activity of the N.A.E. into the proper channels.

Many in the Orthodox Presbyterian Church believe they owe a great debt to their Fundamentalist background: the missionary zeal of Fundamentalist brethren is, under God, responsible for their presence in the Church of Jesus Christ. These men would pay that debt by patiently seeking to win them to the glorious system of truth which they have found in the Reformed Faith.

A protest is in order against Mr. Heerema’s assigning of motives to those who have revived The Witness. He says: “I dare say that Mr. Gray and those who think like him in the
church have criticized the Guardian in the ‘Clark case’ not so much for the fact that it discussed the merits in the case frankly, but rather because it took a position which was not agreeable to those who support Dr. Clark’s views.” It seems to me that only God has the right to make statements regarding men’s motives.

Mr. Heerema’s question, what connection is there between the fact that Dr. Clark nominated Dr. Machen as moderator of the first General Assembly and the accuracy of Dr. Clark’s doctrinal conceptions, is presumably directed at me. I was simply stating an interesting fact. The juxtaposition of that fact against facts of the recent controversy over his views makes a very strange combination, a fateful twist of events in the unfolding of history. Let me explain further. A caucus of leaders had met prior to the First General Assembly. Those leaders included Dr. Machen and certain men involved in the present controversy. These men were zealous for a pure Calvinistic church as is manifest by the series of articles to which Mr. Marsden and others on the Board of Trustees called that motion “immoral” because they alleged it was a circumvention of the intent of the constitution which lodges the power of calling meetings with the Board of Trustees. But he failed to add that in the view of other members of the Board of Trustees the adjourned meeting was legally not another meeting, but a part of the same legal meeting. Furthermore, to these men, whose sincerity no one would doubt, a denial of that right of holding an adjourned meeting guaranteed to every corporation by the law of Pennsylvania, would amount to an attempt to abrogate in effect the very law of the state under which the constitution must be administered. That would be a serious circumvention of the law indeed.

At the subsequent meeting on October 17, Mr. Marsden revealed that the law of Pennsylvania requires a quorum for a meeting to be legal. In the course of declaring that the actions taken at the June meeting were consequently not legal, Mr. Marsden admitted that the June gathering did the only legal thing it could, namely, adjourn to meet at a later day. At the October 17th meeting, which was subsequent to the dismissal of Dr. Rian, those gathered informally voiced strong opposition to the policies of the Board which resulted in the dismissal of Dr. Rian.

The Association was thus at an impasse. The framers of the constitution did not envision an annual meeting which would be attended by anything like a majority of members scattered all over the continent. They intended that the group which gathered at the call of the Board of Trustees should transact the business of making recommendations which the constitution vouchsafed to it. It was therefore somewhat startling to hear Mr. Marsden and other members of the executive committee who had spoken so loudly about the Association members circumventing the constitution, recommend that in view of the fact there was no quorum present at the regularly called Association meeting, the Board ignore the recommendations. This was labeled by one member of the Board a “circumvention” of the constitution similar to the one Mr. Marsden had called “immoral”. By another member of the Board it was called “fighting fire with fire.”

In view of this impasse and in opposition to the policy of the majority of the Board which resulted in the dismissal of Dr. Rian, a number of members withdrew. Among these were merely “Clark supporters” in the Orthodox Presbyterian Church. They included: Bishop Howard D. Higgins and Dr. Robert K. Rudolph of the Reformed Episcopal Church, Dr. John R. Richardson and Dr. E. E. Hough of the Southern Presbyterian Church, P. E. Jobson of an independent church, and Dr. Lawrence B. Gilmore and Rev. Richard W. Gray of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church.

Dr. Rudolph, professor of theology in the Reformed Episcopal Seminary, has released his letter of resignation which includes the following reasons:

3. "An increasing understanding that the leadership of the majority is incapable of running a University with the many minds that would have to compose its sincere and Calvinistic Trustees and Faculty, when that leadership has taken part in seeking to bring heresy charges against such a staunch and well-known Calvinist and believer in the Westminster Confession as Gordon H. Clark, Ph.D. Dr. Clark who has been falsely accused
of disloyalty to the Reformed Faith because the leadership of our majority charged him with (their own misunderstanding of) the implications of his theological and epistemological position, not because of proven denials of or disloyalty to any provision of the Westminster Confession. Who in Faculty or on Trustees would be safe from such persecution? What University could possibly function in the midst of such division upon such points?"

These resignations together with the impossibility of the Association getting a quorum for a legal meeting open the way for the Board of Trustees to proceed with a measure of unity to try to prove Dr. Rudolph wrong by establishing a university. The Orthodox Presbyterian Church, however, has not yet attained this unity despite the dismissal of the Complaint by the last Assembly. Since then the Complainants have vigorously opposed two candidates for licensure and ordination. One is Alan E. Tichenor, who for several years taught at Westminster Seminary, the other is Thomas Gregory. Both men have declared a sympathy with the views of Dr. Clark. Perhaps the Committee appointed by the last General Assembly will be able to produce a report which will dispel the clouds of confusion that the light of the Truth might shine upon all.

This lengthy reminder that we are still in the Church Militant, will serve, I trust, for the enlightenment of the readers of the Forum and the glory of the God of Truth.

Sincerely,

RICHARD W. GRAY.

FROM OUR CORRESPONDENTS

INDIA AND AMERICA

611 Evans St., S.E.,
Grand Rapids 6, Mich.,
October 18, 1946.

Dear Mr. Editor:

A SERIES of unforeseen shipping delays in Calcutta and Bombay foiled our plans for sailing for the U. S. by the end of April, and it was not until three months later that we finally got away. A kindly veil had better be drawn over the plight of close on a thousand civilian passengers crowded into a vessel which in normal times would not carry more than a third of this number. Neither will mention be made of the stormy passage of the monsoon-whipped Bay of Bengal, or of the scarcely less uncomfortable four days in the Western Pacific when our gallant "Victory" ship labored in the trough of two angry typhoons. Suffice it to say that the sight of the world's largest suspension bridge across the Heads near San Francisco was hailed with obvious delight by nearly everyone on board, American and alien alike.

Having been asked to set down some impressions of this my second visit to America, perhaps your readers will pardon me if I indulge in a little pertinent speculation on the general subject of ships that go down to the sea. For instance, what connection could there be between the palpable bungling which appears to characterize the working methods of so many who sit in high places in maritime circles on the one hand, and the recent non-stop labor disputes in the U. S. Merchant Navy on the other? And then, has the steadily dwindling export trade between America and other solvent countries abroad anything to do with the constantly recurring strikes in the maritime, steel, automotive and mining industries? The visitor to your shores, however sympathetic he may be, wonders if American bureaucracy and labor are not, between them, unwittingly killing the proverbial goose that lays the golden eggs—in this case, the harassed but enterprising business man anxious to push his manufactures all over the world. Speaking for India, I would like to assure all concerned that the wide-awake Indian importer is equally keen to buy quality machinery, automobiles, tractors, and many other categories of merchandise from America which he regards as the only manufacturing country left in this weary war-bom world. I might add that as soon as our unit of currency, the Rupee, is uncoupled from the somewhat sickly Pound Sterling, India will have a reasonable amount of the coveted Dollar currency for trade purposes.

Let me now turn to less somber and depressing aspects of my second visit to America, perhaps your readers will pardon me if I indulge in a little pertinent speculation on the general subject of ships that go down to the sea. For instance, what connection could there be between the palpable bungling which appears to characterize the working methods of so many who sit in high places in maritime circles on the one hand, and the recent non-stop labor disputes in the U. S. Merchant Navy on the other? And then, has the steadily dwindling export trade between America and other solvent countries abroad anything to do with the constantly recurring strikes in the maritime, steel, automotive and mining industries? The visitor to your shores, however sympathetic he may be, wonders if American bureaucracy and labor are not, between them, unwittingly killing the proverbial goose that lays the golden eggs—in this case, the harassed but enterprising business man anxious to push his manufactures all over the world. Speaking for India, I would like to assure all concerned that the wide-awake Indian importer is equally keen to buy quality machinery, automobiles, tractors, and many other categories of merchandise from America which he regards as the only manufacturing country left in this weary war-bom world. I might add that as soon as our unit of currency, the Rupee, is uncoupled from the somewhat sickly Pound Sterling, India will have a reasonable amount of the coveted Dollar currency for trade purposes.

Let me now turn to less somber and depressing aspects of this weary war-torn world. I might add that as soon as our unit of currency, the Rupee, is uncoupled from the somewhat sickly Pound Sterling, India will have a reasonable amount of the coveted Dollar currency for trade purposes.

...and much better informed about foreign countries and their inhabitants; I find the people more friendly and courteous to strangers. Your returned servicemen—I dislike the term "G.I." as applied to your splendid young men who have helped to defeat the forces of tyranny and darkness—seem to have grown up overnight, so to speak, from boys into men of poise and resource; it is gratifying to note that many thousands of them are receiving sound higher education on college campuses which their eager feet would probably have never trod had it not been for the impact of a world-shaking war; I admire the truly Christian submission to God's sovereign will by families which have lost kinsmen in the war.

Your towns and countryside are perhaps a little shabbier than of old, but how could it be otherwise after nearly four years of unparalleled war effort? Your trains are probably not so swift or as comfortable as they were a decade ago, but one applauds the reintroduction of many former "Flyers" and the inauguration of entirely new and fast "Streamliner" services between important cities. Your automobiles, though many of them are obviously "pre-war," appear to be more numerous than ever. An Indian compatriot's recent remark: "Why, America moves on wheels," strikes one as epitomising your country's genius for speed and inventiveness.

One is, however, aware of a number of strangely incomprehensible lacks. Why, for instance, should there be a shortage of textiles and soaps when the U. S. has the world's greatest resources in the raw materials that go into those products? And whence the lumber scarcity when America has possibly soldered in the Orient and the comprehensive coverage of so many problems? The visitor to your splendid young men who have helped to defeat the forces of tyranny and darkness—seem to have grown up overnight, so to speak, from boys into men of poise and resource; it is gratifying to note that many thousands of them are receiving sound higher education on college campuses which their eager feet would probably have never trod had it not been for the impact of a world-shaking war; I admire the truly Christian submission to God's sovereign will by families which have lost kinsmen in the war.

Your towns and countryside are perhaps a little shabbier than of old, but how could it be otherwise after nearly four years of unparalleled war effort? Your trains are probably not so swift or as comfortable as they were a decade ago, but one applauds the reintroduction of many former "Flyers" and the inauguration of entirely new and fast "Streamliner" services between important cities. Your automobiles, though many of them are obviously "pre-war," appear to be more numerous than ever. An Indian compatriot's recent remark: "Why, America moves on wheels," strikes one as epitomising your country's genius for speed and inventiveness.

One is, however, aware of a number of strangely incomprehensible lacks. Why, for instance, should there be a shortage of textiles and soaps when the U. S. has the world's greatest resources in the raw materials that go into those products? And whence the lumber scarcity when America has possibly larger forest mileage than any other country? One has to confess that it is still all very puzzling to a visitor from overseas, even after several weeks of inquiry and observation in various directions.

Thanks to the large number of ex-service men who have soldiered in the Orient and the comprehensive coverage of news from that part of the world during the past few years, India with her many problems appears to enjoy a much greater share in the American public's interest now than was the case a few years ago. One would, however, wish that some accounts published in certain secular journals were more accurate and a little less sensational. In this connection I sincerely hope that some, at any rate, of the 319 young Indians who were our shipmates across the Pacific will be in a position to lectare objectively on the Indian situation to their American fellow students and so help to promote better understanding between our two nations. These students, who include half-a-dozen women, I may add, have come to American and Canadian universities for two years post-graduate study in various subjects, mostly technical. They represent the cream of our junior intelligentsia and have been sent mostly at the Indian Government's expense, the ultimate aim, as I understand it,
being to gear our industries up to Western standards of efficiency.

Side by side with the fact of India "being right on the map" with the general public over here, is another strong impression which gives us great satisfaction to missionaries. It is a new-found awareness for some Christian groups of the spiritual needs of impoverished people in distant lands. One also rejoices in the increasing realization of responsibility on the part of the Church Militant to reach out after Christless millions. We feel that this is as it should be in the present age of widespread apostasy. It is a healthy sign that the grace of God is operating in the lives of many of His children. May the Lord grant to everyone of His people the realization that it is their duty to ensure the proclaiming of the Good Tidings so that He may be gathered into the Christian fold.

May I wish you and the Forum family much blessing in your work, and express the hope that we may be able to meet now and again and enjoy mutually helpful fellowship during the year or so that we shall be among you.

Fraternally yours,

ARTHUR V. RAMIAH.

EGYPT AND PALESTINE

113 Sharia El-Kasr El-Aini
The American University at Cairo
Cairo, Egypt
October 16, 1946

Dear Editor:

NOW that cooler weather has at last descended upon Egypt, the time is opportune for political incidents. The summer for the most part passed quietly. Negotiations for British withdrawal from Egypt continued at a snail's pace. The prime minister, Sidky Pasha, apparently exasperated with the state of affairs and pressed on all sides by disagreements in his own delegation negotiating with Great Britain, offered to resign a few days ago. Since no one else was prepared to accept responsibility for forming a new cabinet, he was prevailed upon to continue in office. Several of his colleagues resigned. From the talk of others, it appears that many Egyptians there is a great deal of skepticism whether the English will really pull out. Some of the Egyptians in the lower middle stratum of society have expressed the opinion that the rich pashas and beys really do not want the British to leave Egypt since withdrawal would undoubtedly require many economic adjustments and might bring about a tremendous deflation. Further, as long as the British remain, their lives, fortunes, and property are safe. The government has ordered all state schools and universities to remain closed throughout October, and early November in order to prevent organized student demonstrations which so often in the past have become riots. There seems to be a general feeling that education will suffer badly during the coming year from the late opening of school and from irregular classes.

The Palestine Affair

The Palestine situation, as we see it here from Egypt, is as fluid as ever. The Truman handling of the Palestine problem has cost the United States something in the loss of good will although America is still the most popular country in the world as far as Egyptians are concerned. A local sheikh, a teacher of Arabic, summarized pretty well the point of view which many Egyptians hold about the American government's approach toward the Palestine imbroglio. He felt that the president's pronouncements were made for domestic consumption, especially to placate the thousands of Jews in America whose votes he covets. Nevertheless, there is no telling when in the heat of some future Palestinian incident the fury of the crowd may turn against American institutions in this part of the world because of the president's ill-considered statements. The feeling among Americans who live in these parts is that the president would do well to keep both his mouth and his hands out of the Palestine affair. In their opinion the president might as well try to give the United States back to the Indians as to re-establish the Jews in Palestine as a distinctly Zionist state.

The Speech of ex-Secretary Wallace

The recent Wallace fracas has been keenly watched by Egyptians. The American way of life to people out here—as they see it in American institutions and residents here and as they read and hear about it at home from newspapers and magazines—represents how democracy works. Economic tensions in the United States, political corruption, and disdain in foreign policy mean not only failure at home but also failure abroad. On the arrival of two ships from America at Near Eastern ports recently 135 missionaries, for educational service in American institutions in this part of the world. Numerous other missionaries arrived to take their places in nearby fields or in transit to other more remote places. Travel conditions have improved somewhat; yet it is surprising how long re-adjustment after this war is taking. Often weeks are required to arrange for transportation to other areas in Africa, although to be sure during the war it sometimes took months.

Omissions in Egypt

There are several denominations and church groups that sponsor missionary activities in Egypt. The largest mission is that of the United Presbyterian Church of North America whose work in Egypt includes several hospitals, educational institutions (including primary schools, secondary schools, and two junior colleges, the American Girls' College in Cairo and Assuit College in the south), agricultural demonstration centers, evangelism (preaching, personal work, young people's groups, visitation, etc.), and a seminary for native pastors and teachers. Under the aegis of this mission there has been organized an indigenous evangelical church with its own ecclisioal organization. Almost the entire membership consists of converts from Islam or their children. In addition to the United Presbyterian Church there are several smaller missions sponsored by other American church groups such as the Church of God, the Apostolic Assemblies of God, the Seventh Day Adventists, and a small number of independent, so-called faith missionaries. There are two leading English missions in Egypt, both of which are rather extensive in scope. These are the Church Mission Society of the Church of England and the Egypt General Mission, a faith enterprise. Of these groups only the Egypt General Mission seems to have made a really serious and thoroughgoing effort to work directly with Moslems on an evangelistic basis. Others have made an occasional sally among Moslems and have accepted and done what little could be done with Moslem children who attended mission schools. In addition to these missionary efforts there is the non-denominational American University at Cairo which aims to be a Christian service institution to Egypt and seeks to reflect the Christian philosophy of life by awakening a social consciousness in its students, by interpreting the ideals of the Christian message to those who come into its environment, and by demonstrating the best that western Christianity has been able to develop in the arts, sciences, and education.

Churc hes in Cairo

Among the churches in Cairo where Americans living here worship are the following: the Scotch Kirk, a church that is organized and maintained by Scotch people who are in business
or in government service in Cairo, and that is affiliated with
the Church of Scotland; the All Saints Cathedral of the Church
of England, which is a very low church in its worship services;
and the American Church of Cairo, whose services are held in
the American Mission Building (United Presbyterian) and
whose membership consists mostly of American missionaries
and educators stationed in Cairo. At the present time only
the All Saints Cathedral is headed by a resident clergyman;
the Scotch church engages chaplains of the Church of Scotland
who are on duty in or around Cairo. American missionaries
and other ordained men in educational work have charge of
services in rotation at the American Church.

At the beginning of October the fall season of work com­­mented again. Missionaries on vacation in Alexandria or
Cyprus returned to their posts, and classes at the American
University and other educational institutions were in full swing
again. Although there is always a skeleton staff on duty
during the summer, the actual working year in a hot cli­­mate like that of Egypt runs from early October to early June.

Sincerely yours,
EGHERST LUBBERS.

SOUTH AFRICAN LETTER
University College,
South Africa,
October 16, 1946.

Dear Dr. Bouma:

We are over here following with the keenest interest all
reports on the preparatory ecumenical Congress of the three
Reformed Churches—yours, ours, and our mother country's. Prof. Dr. S. du Toit, one of our representatives, has
so far written two very interesting letters to our Church organ
Die Kerblad; Prof. Stoker has written to friends and family
here most informing private letters. Both report on the hearty
reception they received from your people, and both are struck
by your people's friendliness and homeliness. But both long
to be back in our own sunny and happy South Africa. They
find the States extremely expensive at the present time. We
over here sympathize with our delegates in the distressing dis­­appointment in not obtaining return passage to South Africa.
It must be an extremely trying experience to the three and the
two women who accompanied them. We hope naively that they
will be on their way back long before my letter arrives over there.
I must on behalf of all South African Calvinists thank you, Mr.
Editor, for your interesting editorials in The Calvin Forum
and more especially for those on the ecumenical meeting.

Two very important matters have been occupying our minds
over here since I wrote my previous letter, and to some extent
they hang together.

Population Trends

During May of this year we had a national census in South Africa.
Up to now only general figures have been made known.
In due course the full particulars will be published by authority.
I shall have to write you at some later date about these interest­ing
 particulars. According to the published figures this vast
Southern part of the African continent has a population all told
of only 11,258,858. This fact, viz., thin population, gives rise
to the second problem. Of the total population again only
2,335,460 are whites (Europeans) and 8,923,398 non-whites.
The non-whites, again, comprise 7,735,809 natives (Kaffirs),
28.61%, and the other non-whites by 17.59%. From these fig­­ures it is quite clear that our main
problem really is can best be judged from the following figures:

In 1901, 1,519,488—4,697,815; 2,003,857—6,596,689; 2,335,460—
7,735,809. In these 35 years the white population increased by
83% and the native by 92%. The natives are gradually getting
more of the better of the whites, both proportionately and in absolute numbers. An interesting corollary is the fact that the old
charge of European attempts to exterminate the native is
proven completely false. On the other hand, under the tutelage
of the whites the natives have had the only chance of increasing
their numbers. The sad consequence of the European Christian
principle of "let live" in South Africa is the ultimate domi­­nation of the native over the white. Statisticians over here are
prophesying that in 1961 the relative figures for whites and natives
will be more or less 4% to 14½ million, in 2016, 7% to
28 million, in 2051 14½ to 53 million, and in 2066 26 to 100
million.

Another alarming fact disclosed by the census figures relates to the urbanization of South Africa—this applies to the natives as well as to the whites. Our rural areas are gradually becom­ing
more or less denuded. Whereas some 100 years ago we were practically a rural nation, we are now right at the other end of the pendulum. Here are some revealing figures. In 1936 there were in the 25 largest cities of the Union of South Africa 966,148 whites and 870,282 natives; but in 1946 the numbers have increased to 1,260,842 whites and 1,288,099 na­tives. If things go on developing along these lines the natives will outnumber the whites in South Africa this very near future.

In 1936 there were 1,141,000 natives in all the South African
towns and cities, but in 1946 there was practically this number in
only the largest 25 urban areas. In this decade the whites increased in these 25 cities by 32% and the natives by 47%.

The Race Problem

South Africa is becoming black and urbanized—a country of
black cities and black rural districts! This black danger must
be met by the whites. But there are only two ways of doing so:
by an increased birthrate amongst the whites and by wholesale
immigration of whites. The first way can for all practical pur­­poses be ruled out—unmistakably modern is the tendency
towards a decreasing birthrate amongst the whites! The sec­­ond way seems to be the only solution—but thereby hangs a
sorry racial tale!

We have in South Africa not only the racial problem between
whites and non-whites, but also the racial problem between
European nationalities, particularly the English and the Dutch.
As a white population we are already rather cosmopolitan, but
our national constellation differs completely from that of the
States. You are a nation composed of people coming from
practically every European nation, but a united nation—every
immigrant to the States seems to side with us as all immigrants show, especially after this war,
a marked tendency to become Anglicized; if they are East Euro­­peans or people from Roman Catholic countries, we, as Protes­­tants, consider them essentially unassimilable. And there is
 quite different. The English coming to South Africa remain
Englishmen; even the Germans try to remain Germans. There
are really no South Africans, if we exclude the only real South
Africans, viz., the Afrikaners! To us, Afrikaans-speaking peo­­ple, there is a real danger in any form of immigration. To us
the essential question is: who will the immigrants be? If they
are English, our future as an Afrikaner race is endangered;
if they are Dutchmen or Germans, we are not sure if they will
side with us as all immigrants show, especially after this war,
a marked tendency to become Anglicized; if they are East Euro­­peans or people from Roman Catholic countries, we, as Protes­­tants, consider them essentially unassimilable. And there is
the rub! We are between the devil and the deep blue sea: if we
do not encourage white immigrants, we are doomed as Europeans; and if we do encourage European immigrants, we are
doomed as Afrikaners! We, that is the Afrikaans-speaking people, favour immigration but demand the introduction only
of assimilable people and naturally of people who will strengthen
our Afrikaner numbers.

We in the university world are in the throes of yearly exami­­nations and promotions. This must serve as an apology for this
short newsletter.

With kind regards,
J. CH. COETZEE.
Book Reviews

ROMANS


This book is by far the best of the three volumes I have read of Griffith Thomas. It offers considerably more than one would be led to expect from a 'devotional' commentary. Experience has taught me that the term 'devotional' is sometimes used to cover a multitude of illustrations, superficialities, and practical observations as a poor substitute for solid exegesis and respectable interpretation.

The author has correctly discerned the fact that Paul is in the habit of touching on a topic upon which he later enlarges. Cases in point are his treatment of the advantages of the Jew which are discussed briefly in Romans 3 and enlarged upon in Romans 9 to 11; and his first reference to the doctrine of election in Romans 8 which is elaborated in Romans 9.

Commendable discrimination is evident in such statements as the following: Faith is the condition, not the ground of salvation. When it is stated that Abraham's faith was counted for righteousness, this does not mean that faith is equivalent to righteousness since Paul is here dealing not with the ground but with the method of obtaining righteousness. Righteousness is more than forgiveness; the believer is not merely a pardoned criminal but one who has been re-instated in a right position before God. Circumcision did not confer but confirmed righteousness; it was not a means but a seal of righteousness; it was not a condition but a ratification.

What Griffith Thomas writes on the alleged contradiction between Paul and James, I found very helpful:

"At first sight the emphasis by the former on Faith and the latter on Works, both using Abraham as their example, might seem to imply a contradiction, but a more careful study of the use made of Abraham by the two Apostles enables us to see that their teaching is not contradictory but complementary. It should be noted that St. Paul refers to the events recorded in Genesis xv., while St. James deals with those recorded in Genesis xxii., some forty years afterwards. As, therefore, according to St. Paul, Abraham was justified by faith in the first instance, he must have been living a life of faith all those years as a justified man. Then at the end of that time (Gen. xxii) his faith was proved by his works, and by works his faith of forty years was perfected and brought to its culmination. There is therefore no contradiction between the two Apostles. They are dealing with two different aspects of faith. St. Paul is emphasizing faith as against legalism; St. James is emphasizing works as against formalism. The former uses Genesis xv, to prove the necessity of faith, the latter uses Genesis xxii. to prove the necessity of works. St. Paul teaches that work must spring from faith, St. James shows that faith must be demonstrated by works. One lays stress on faith as against merit, the other on works as against mere orthodoxy. And when we realize that St. Paul is writing about non-Christians with a view to their acceptance, and St. James about Christians with a view to their acceptability, we see that, so far from any opposition, there is a beautiful harmony between them. It has been well said that St. Paul and St. James are not soldiers of different armies fighting against each other, but soldiers of the same army fighting back to back against enemies coming from opposite directions." pp. 131-2.

Coming to the great fifth chapter of Romans, the author correctly observes that hitherto Paul has been dealing with sins but now deals with sin. In this chapter he makes a direct head and tail of the two heads Adam and Christ we have the spiritual and theological illustration of the great modern principle of solidarity. Obviously there is some causal connection between Adam and his descendants. "The reference, however, is not to guilt, which is personal and cannot be transferred, but to an evil nature which he [should be 'they'—J.W.] inherited from Adam." Hence the author states that it is not the purpose of Paul to teach here Original Sin, but assuming it as a fact to show how divine grace overcomes it in those who are united to Christ. Precisely for this reason, too, Griffith Thomas adds at this point that thus we get the vital truth of the inseparable connection between justification and sanctification.

We do not deny that Paul uses the term 'righteousness' in a large sense of including justification, sanctification, and, to add the third which Griffith Thomas mentions, consecration. But the author should have remembered at this point also that bene distinguit bene docet. It is precisely the relation between the guilty sinner and Adam and the justified sinner and Christ that Paul is here discussing and the specific point to be considered is the justification of the ungodly. If there is one section in Romans where Paul is projecting the idea of guilt in distinction from justification, it is Romans 5:12-21. Paul is not merely assuming the doctrine of original sin but is definitely projecting it; the question of the evil nature of man is for the time being out of Paul's line of vision. The author would not have missed the crucial point if he had paid close attention to the argument in Romans 5:12-21. Notice, for example, the gradation: (1) Through one man sin entered into the world. (2) The trespass of the one. (3) Through one trespass. Consider moreover that although there was sin in the world before Moses' promulgation of the law, yet sin is not imputed when there is no law. Yet sin brings death so that the presence of death is the proof of the existence of sin and the guilt of sin. How then account for the death of those living between Adam and Moses? Did they sin as Adam sinned? Paul says that they did not. Yet they died. We are therefore compelled to the position that the one trespass of the one man Adam sufficed to bring death to all men. Precisely because the one sin of the one man Adam sufficed to condemn all men, the righteousness of Christ could be imputed to those who believe on the Lord Jesus Christ. If the writer had a better appreciation of the significance of God's covenantal dealing with all men, he could not have written: "Hence, nothing that we have inherited from Adam settles our eternal destiny, but only our use of that nature." Proceeding, we should find equal occasion to make remarks about the author's treatment of Romans 9 and Romans 11, but the above may suffice as an indication both of the good points and the weak spots in this commentary. —John Weidenaar.

ON PETER'S EPISTLES


The main purpose of this book is to help Christian people in their meditation of the Scriptures and also to furnish material for closer Bible study. The outlines are to be used with Bible in hand. Part I deals with the life and character of the apostle Peter, and Part II furnishes a commentary on his two Epistles. The volume is replete with practical observations which are doubtless intended to justify the sub-title, which describes the book as a 'devotional' commentary. This does not mean that the author is ignorant of the Greek original or that he does not busy himself upon occasion with some of the exegetical problems involved. The manner in which he does so always indicates that he is primarily interested in the practical, personal, and devotional aspects.

Here are a few samples of his exegetical efforts. In elaborating on the great confession of Peter, the author favors the
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view of T. M. Lindsay who wrote: “The rock on which the Church was to be built was a man confessing, not the man apart from his confession, as Romanists insist, nor the confession apart from the man, as Protestants urge,” (page 25). On the Gates of Hades the writer observes: “The usual interpretation of ‘gates of Hades shall not prevail,’ as indicating the futurity of all active opposition to the Church, while true as a fact, seems scarcely possible as an explanation of the text. Gates do not fight. They open and shut; and our Lord here promises that not one of His followers shall be kept back from Him by the power of the grave (cf. Rev. 1:18, ‘I have the keys of . . . Hades’), p. 25.” The author also leans to the opinion that Peter was wrong in adding another apostle in the place of Judas Iscariot since Paul was the twelfth apostle.

I found this book the least satisfying of three I have read of the author. The set-up could be improved; candor is spelled faulty. The author is not at his best in this volume and the format seems to reflect this.

JOHN WEIDENAAAR.

NEW TESTAMENT GUIDE


The author of this Guide has performed a great service to the church in giving it a concise and handy outline of the N. T. Scriptures. Since our individual and group studies so often tend to become piece-meal tastings of the Word, this book will certainly prove to be a valuable aid to anyone who sincerely wishes to master the contents of the N. T. and to see the fundamental unity of its message.

The basic outline of the book which is presented on page fifteen is as logical as it is brief. It tells us that the theme of the N. T. is the Kingdom of God, and successively introduces us to its founder (in the four gospels); its early history and rapid progress (Acts); its doctrines (the epistolary writings); and its present condition and future development (Revelation).

In the case of each book the exposition includes an identification of the writer and his readers, while the aim and the theme are projected and illustrated in the outline. The ministry of Jesus is presented teleologically in a harmony and also microscopically in the outlines of the individual Gospels. Withal a very definite picture of the program and work of the founder of the Kingdom is projected.

It is, however, especially in the treatment of the doctrinal part of the N. T. that the author wishes to excel, since he feels the need of a guide especially in these matters. He sets forth his aim thus: “to give a synthetic sketch of the contents to show the main lines and its relationship to the other books in the N. T. canon” (Preface). And we note that by far the greatest part of the Guide is devoted to this matter (pp. 35—160) and rightly so, I think, since—as the author himself states—they constitute the doctrinal interpretation of the facts and events recorded in the Gospels and in the book of Acts” (Preface).

The writer proves himself a master of outline and the book breathes brevity. The author presents us with a compendium of N. T. teaching. Sometimes, indeed, one becomes so much aware of its skeleton character that the bones rattle. For example, the books of Acts and Revelation escape with scant treatment, two and three pages respectively. In the case of the latter the five historic interpretations are stated and the actual contents given in seven terse statements totaling twenty-six words. This is then concluded by a set of questions and class-room projects.

My reaction to this treatment—though I greatly admire the terseness of the author and his remarkable penchant for succinctness—is that the contents do not live up to the title. We have here an excellent outline, a fine handbook, but a Guide is wanting. In fact, a teacher seems to be presupposed for the use of the book. And it would serve as an excellent text for Bible instruction in our Christian High Schools and Colleges. More than that, many preachers would welcome this volume for their mid-week Bible Study Class.

But, someone objects, what kind of guidance do you expect from a N. T. guide? Well, to give an example, in presenting the miracles of Christ the author should have devoted some space to the very idea of miracles as the revelation of God’s power for the redemption of man’s soul and body and environment. To what end the factual knowledge of all the miracles performed by Christ without a proper understanding of His divine power over nature, disease, death, and demons? And why enumerate and classify all the parables and the teachings of Jesus unless we learn to understand the meaning of all prophecy, viz., the insertion of an authoritative interpretation about God, man, and the universe.

I merely advert to these matters because they suggest themselves to me under the caption—Guide. Others may disagree and I hasten to say that my qualification is in no way a depreciation of what has been accomplished by my colleague.

In passing it cannot be amiss to mention the danger of using secular terminology uncritically as happens in a question on page 33: “Why did the experiment of communism fail?”, when the author is referring to the time when all things were held in common under the motivation of love. To confound this with communism as we see it today in the world is certainly not without great hazard.

HENRY R. VAN TIL.

CHAPLAIN’S ACCOUNT


It was with a good deal of joy that this erstwhile chaplain read the story of the living Word in the dying world as told by Chaplain Glasser.

And Some Believed gives us a very trustworthy picture of the work of an orthodox chaplain in World War II. The author very ingeniously creates an aura of suspense in what might under ordinary circumstances be considered a matter-of-fact recital of events. This animation is provided by presenting the foolishness of preaching as a plot which unfolds itself in the characters of men who are saved by contact with the living Word.

Our Chaplain carried out his divine commission in season and out of season, exhorting with all long-suffering and doctrine. He was convinced that the gospel is the power of God unto salvation unto every one that believes in an atomic age as well as in the days of Paul. His record is the evidence. It is well written!

The author deserves our highest praise for the way in which he carried out his commission during the war and our appreciation for having provided us with a record of the triumphs of the cross. Be sure to get a copy of this book. Gather the family around the hearth some fine winter evening and magnify the matchless grace of God who saves to the uttermost.

HENRY R. VAN TIL.
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