The CALVIN FORUM

VOLUME XIV, NO. 7    FEBRUARY, 1949

Contents

Articles

The Future of the Colleges.................Wm. T. Radius 131
Is Free Enterprise Anti-Christian?.......Clarence Bouma 134
Our Missionary Dichotomy.................Harry R. Boer 137
Bible Reading in Christian History......John H. Bratt 141

The Voice of Our Readers

Historians on F.D.R........................... 144
Another Wisconsin Voice.................... 144
On the Millennium............................ 144
A Christian Philosophy of History....... 145
National Association of Evangelicals.... 145

From Our Correspondents

Presentation Address of Dr. Zsiros..........146
Chicago Calvinistic Discussion Club......147
Michigan Calvinistic Philosophy Club.....147
Christian Education in North Ireland.... 143

Book Reviews

New Interpretations.......................... 149
Glorification of Humanism................... 150
Unpardonable Ignorance...................... 150
Psychiatry for Specialists.................. 151
The Gospel of John........................... 151
A Faith to Live By........................... 151

Verse

Winter Night.................................. 138
The Future of the Colleges

IT IS not at all too soon for us to begin asking ourselves some important questions concerning present trends in college enrollment. And if any good is to come of such questioning we must make a resolute attempt to find correct answers. The question which I propose to raise here is this: What will be the effect on the educational standards of our institutions of higher learning resulting from greatly increased enrollments?

The War and College Enrollment

Everybody knows that the colleges today are crowded as they have never been before. With the great influx of veterans at the close of the war we are all familiar. What has not been generally understood but is now becoming increasingly clear is that the whole pattern of college enrollment has undergone a significant change, altogether apart from the question of veterans crowding our colleges. The picture was somewhat obscured by the dramatic phenomenon of the soldier back from the war beginning or resuming a higher education written by his government. The spotlight fell on the feverish activity, the frequently hastily improvised accommodations thrown up overnight to fit our veteran into a college community. Many a citizen saw his first army barrack when such buildings suddenly appeared to mar the green sward of the sedate campus. And he really rubbed his eyes when the wash waved incongruously on lines strung between the stately trees. But it was a poor sport whose amazement turned to resentment. After all, we owed it to the men who had served us so well. All of that, however, blinded us to the real change which was taking place. What actually began then and has picked up momentum each year is that attendance at college was becoming what high school attendance had been for some years, universal. (Everywhere in this article the term ‘universal’ is to be understood as ‘universal in certain geographical areas’).

It may be objected that a swollen college enrollment, whatever the cause, is one and the same thing. This is by no means so. For one thing, the effect upon the educational standards of the college from the presence of large numbers of veterans would be a short-term affair. And, as a matter of fact, it is generally agreed that the ex-soldier proved to be a diligent student who frequently quickened the intellectual processes of his fellow-civilian student and of his professor. Chancellor Hutchins, the Cassandra of American education, had forecast blight and doom for higher education when college education was written into the GI bill of benefits. There are few educators today who would say that this prophecy has come to pass.

Universal College Education

We must face the fact that we appear to be on the road to universal college education in this country. For good or evil, if present trends continue, college education will be what high school education has now been for three decades, available and practically mandatory for all the youth of the land, universal as defined above. And it is not at all likely that economic depression, if it should come, would greatly alter this trend. Federal funds will be available and will be used for college education as one method of attack on the problem of widespread unemployment.

Now it ought to be occasion for rejoicing in a democratic society when more and more young people have opportunities for higher education. If the people are to govern, it is all to the good that their years of schooling be extended. Even though public moneys are required to insure this, a good case should be made that it is money well-spent. This feeling is finding expression in the country-wide movement to establish junior colleges, to be supported by taxation in the same way that the high schools are tax-supported. If this is the age of the “common man” we must not be too surprised if he demands for his children the educational advantages heretofore enjoyed almost exclusively by the more favorably situated parents. What of it if this raises our educational budget enormously? The potential financial resources of this country are certainly equal to this demand. Were every American boy and girl to be put through college, the cost would still be only a fraction of what we Americans spend for the less substantial values of amusements in the form of movies and sports and, especially, liquor. If universal college education be a good thing it will be a self-liquidating expense. In the total economy of the country it will pay for itself before long. The cost of it all ought not to be cause for great concern; yet along with other observers of the college situation I am very uneasy about the trend toward universal college education.
As to Maintaining Standards

The plain and unpleasant truth which we must face is this, that the presence on the college campus of everybody's son and daughter will work havoc with the educational standards of the colleges. Call it undemocratic snobbishness if you will, but I think it can be shown that democracy itself will be ill served by a lowering of the standards of our institutions of higher learning. Whenever college men get together the talk invariably comes around to this problem of how to maintain decent, I do not say, high, standards of academic work. This is the underlying theme of most educational conferences, whatever may be the announced subject.

The forces which have brought our high schools to their present low level of educational achievement are many and complex. There is no one simple explanation of how over the years this deterioration has come to pass. Yet I think all students of the problem will agree that sheer numbers have played an important role. Why should increased enrollment have this effect? Well, to be brief, education is concerned with excellence, with quality accomplishment in the realm of the intellectual. It must and should be that for reasons we cannot consider here. Now quality and excellence are relatively rare human endowments. If the high school must set its standards within the range of the average, it will inevitably be a low standard. How low that is we need not explain. That it is lamentably low is the testimony not only of the colleges but of business and industry as well. Large numbers of its graduates cannot write legibly, read intelligently, or figure accurately—to mention the most obvious deficiencies. Some would insist on removing the qualifying adverbs from the previous sentence. It would be only arguing in a circle to say that this is owing to wrong methods of instruction, for the methodology itself has arisen to meet this situation of universal attendance.

Thus it has come to pass that the colleges have had to adjust their standards to the level of the entering high school graduates. And the more that enter college the more extensive this accommodation must be. If college registration is going to comprise nearly the total output of the secondary school the adjustment must be total. It is no solution at all to shout at this point, "Flunk 'em out!"

The high schools have long since seen that they cannot meet the problem by this arbitrary expedient. The public that looks the bill will not long tolerate what appears to it to be an undemocratic selectivity. This brings us to an impasse and makes almost plausible Chancellor Hutchins' now oft-quoted, cynical, tongue-in-cheek prescription, "Confer on every American child at birth the AB degree."

What is at Stake

Let us next ask ourselves whether it makes any difference what intellectual standards a college maintains. The question seems almost too naïve to consider, yet apparently the public is little concerned about low academic standards. Still it is the public weal itself which is at stake. If we believe in and cherish our democracy we ought to be mightily concerned with the quality of higher education. Hemmed in closer and closer as we are almost daily by hostile political ideologies we need whatever disciplined intellectual maturity we can muster. Or again, if, as many hold, our democracy is in reality a culture, (heaven spare us!), only technically oriented and concerned only with production, higher education is a matter of paramount importance. But, to leave to one side this aspect of the question, I would like to impress upon the reader the very grave import of the role of the college for the Christian church. And if it is a Calvinistic church we can hardly exaggerate what is at stake. A poor college education from this point of view is not only something negative, a lost opportunity. It is also something far more serious than money down the drain. A poor education is a bad education.

My own college and church points up the whole discussion. If present enrollment trends continue it will not be long before our Calvin College graduates are spread throughout the denomination in numbers sufficient to matter. Those who enter our ministry are, it goes without saying, conditioned intellectually by their college work. The college is the immediate educational background of all the professional schools, and that holds in particular for our theological seminary. I hope in subsequent articles to say something more about what is involved in the concept of higher education in its relation to the professions but here I wish to emphasize the fact that progressive infiltration of college graduates into the church community, or, more accurately, progressive transformation of church members into college graduates, is certain to have an important effect upon the church. And so we would wish it to be. If Kuyperian ideals of the Kingship of Christ are still alive in our midst we shall rejoice to see the educational level of our members raised. Along with our Fundamentalist brethren we believe we are on our way to heaven but unlike them we also believe that we have a cultural task to perform as we journey. Let us assume that we understand what is meant by our cultural task and that we are committed to it. Then as a Calvinistic church we will be very much concerned with the intellectual standards of our denominational college. Too often our interest is limited to the spiritual and moral tone of the college, not realizing that Christianity is something more than Barthian quietism ("Let God do it all") or Fundamentalist concentration on a limited concept of the meaning of sal-
vation. And that very spiritual and moral tone which we are so eager to cultivate cannot long remain Biblical in its quality in a college atmosphere which compromises its intellectual integrity. If we read our American church history aright, we shall see that morality and spirituality cannot exist apart from the intellectual content of Christianity, and whatever other function it may have, it is the specific task of the college to bring to the highest possible development the intellectual capacities of its students.

Our Twofold Ideal

I am tempted to linger a bit longer on this theme. Have I made my meaning clear? The student must make a personal commitment to Christ or else all is lost. The student must meet this Christ and surrender to Him in all his studies. In discussions of this sort we tend to fall into one or the other of two equally untenable positions for a Calvinistic college. The student body in the denominational college easily breaks into two camps. And this split is intensified and hastened by its swollen numbers. The one group thinks that the school is too intellectually minded, the other feels that pietism—substituting the devotional for the intellectual ideal in Christian experience—ill accords with the true function of the college. Before long the division is reflected in the faculty and in the board of control. If the church is conservative there is the strong temptation to throw its weight on the side of the “spiritually minded” element and thus to play it safe, as it supposes. After all, isn’t it better to be a saint than a sage? Still better, I would say, and mandatory if higher education is to mean anything, it is to aim at the production of the saintly sage. We must read St. Paul again. It is hard to be Calvinistic in our higher education program.

In conclusion, I can see no valid reason for denying our American youth four years of schooling beyond high school if we are minded to pay the bill, only let it be a training suited to their abilities. To expose all of them to the same curriculum can only result in frustration for many and mediocrity for all. One likes to think that he sees in the present upward trend of college enrollment the practical realization of the ideal of education for all apart from ability to pay. Surely the financial status of the student ought not to be the criterion for entrance into college. We seem to be caught in this problem on the horns of this dilemma: the tyranny of money which limits education to a few and the tyranny of democracy which tends to destroy values for all. The first of these tyrannies appears to be on the way out; how can we overcome the second?

WINTER NIGHT

If glory almost in excess
Is what makes heaven fair,
Then here alone beside this pond
I might perhaps be there.

The rocks, the stumps, the leafless shrubs,
And all the plainest, drabbest things
Must rival in their robing white
The shimmer of a Gabriel’s wings.

And every tree ensheened in ice,
Except the snow-bowed, moon-kissed pines,
Is doubtless bright as any gem
That in the heavenly city shines.

And God omnipotent, I think,
Would find it a creative strain
To duplicate the diamond sky
That scintillates above the lane.

A frozen hush lies on the hills;
The tired wind has ceased to blow.
I shiver! Yet my kneeling heart
With flaming worship is aglow.

Johnson City, N. Y. 

Vernon Grounds
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Is Free Enterprise Anti-Christian?

This is the second instalment bringing to completion the argument begun in the previous issue under the same title. The gist of the argument in the previous issue may be stated in the following proposition: On the score of the right of private property the system of free enterprise, far from being anti-Christian, is more in harmony with the high ethical demands of Christianity than any collectivistic alternative. The article was chiefly devoted to a discussion of scriptural proof for the soundness of the right of private property. In the following article it is argued that the sacredness of personality and the enjoyment of true liberty are safeguarded and promoted by the economic system of free enterprise.

II

On the score of the sacredness of human personality the system of free enterprise, far from being anti-Christian, is more in harmony with the high ethical demands of Christianity than any collectivistic alternative.

Every collectivist order is an attack upon the sacredness of personality, the rights of the individual. A collectivist order does not consider society as made up of persons, with individual rights, abilities, and possibilities. Socialism, and especially Communism, uses the individual as a mere part of a larger whole, as a cog in a wheel.

With a strange confusion the previously mentioned Christian Student Movement statement says of the system of free enterprise: “We feel this system has depersonalized men by its emphasis upon technology and production above the essential Christian regard for the worth of the individual.” If the statement means to ascribe this “depersonalizing” to the development of modern technology, it is, of course, entirely right. The machine age tends to make machines of us all and to kill individuality, originality, and distinctiveness. But it must be added at once that this evil mechanization of life and persons exists under Socialism and Communism just as well, and just as much, as under the system of free enterprise. It is caused not by free enterprise; it is caused by the machine. Modern man will have to fight this evil under any economic order. It can hence not be an indictment of the capitalistic order of economic society.

It is possible that the C.S.M. leaders meant that this “depersonalizing” is caused by a system of ruthless competition, in which the machine becomes the instrument in the hands of the owners of capital to crush out the life of the weak or to make human beings mere extensions of the tools of production. If this is intended, there is some real point to the statement. There can be no question that under some forms of open and “free” competition in modern industrial society, with the mass production made possible by the machine, the individuals in a trade or industry have at times been treated as tools rather than as persons. But, if this is the intent of the statement, it must at once be pointed out that these evils have to a large extent been neutralized by the social legislation that has been passed in the more enlightened countries in which the system of free enterprise obtains. If one thinks of the rights which labor has obtained in recent years in the United States, he must in all honesty greatly qualify any such accusation as is implied in this statement. Moreover, though these evils are attendant upon the free enterprise system, they are not inherent in it. The very fact that in our country—not to speak of others—they have been largely neutralized is proof of this fact. It is, of course, fully recognized here that for the introduction of such reforms the capitalists in most cases do not deserve much credit, and that the poor laboring classes had to struggle for their rights. But this in no wise invalidates the statement that these evils can be eliminated, and have been eliminated, without destroying the system of free enterprise.

And now, having recognized these facts, it must be pointed out that there is an unmistakable trend toward depersonalizing man precisely in every collectivist system. It is not merely an attendant evil accompanying such a system—it is inherent in the system itself. That is why an enlightened capitalist order, the system of free enterprise as such, is more in harmony with the ethical principles of Christianity than any collectivist system can be. In a collectivist system, the system is the thing—not the men who constitute the system. The deeper reason for this is that every collectivist system of the modern day is essentially materialistic and all materialism suppresses personality, individuality, the image of God in man. The deeper underground of the modern trend toward the depersonalizing of man is the theme of Leslie Paul’s penetrating book,
The Annihilation of Man (13), though his interest and approach are philosophical and religious rather than economic.

Also Walter Lippmann has spoken with real insight of the degradation of man that has been brought about by the spread of modern Materialism and Atheism with their apparently inseparable concomitants of collectivist economies. Historically the battle line is drawn unmistakably between Materialism, Absolute Idealism, and Atheism, coupled with personality-destroying collectivisms on the one hand, and Christianity with its championship of free enterprise, grounded in the rights and duties of the individual man made in God's image, on the other. Says Lippmann: "Collectivist regimes are always profoundly irreligious. For religious experience entails the recognition of an inviolable essence in men; it cultivates a self-respect and a self-reliance, which tend at some point to resist the total subjection of the individual to any earthly power." He characterizes the leveling trend of all collectivism in these words: "Collectivists are profoundly monistic in their conception of life, because they regard variety and competition as evil. They look upon the state not as the dispenser of justice among the various interests of men,—for the idea of justice involves the recognition of an inviolable essence in men;—but as the creator of a unity in which variety of interest will have disappeared."(14) And Canon Barry, with his British background, characterizes the same evil in speaking of the ideal of Bolshevism as "the organization of man-in-the-mass, the New Man, regimented and mechanized, which is to supplant the Christian tradition of men and women as individuals, with souls to save and a destiny to realize."(15)

Individual Initiative, Thrift, Industry

A valuable implication of this recognition of personality on the part of the system of free enterprise and its suppression in every collectivist setup, is the place assigned by each to individual initiative, thrift, industry, and the principle of rewarding each individual in accordance with his effort.

The system of free enterprise champions and cultivates self-reliance and initiative, personal industry and thrift, individual responsibility and accountability, the readiness to take a risk. This is partly grounded in the recognition and esteem of the individual as a human being, and it comes to expression by the application of the sound principle that each individual is rewarded in accordance with his effort and industry. But Socialism by its collective ownership of the means of production, and Communism, which extends the collectivism also to distribution and consumption, undermine all these fine qualities. Those Utopian idealists who in the name of Christianity claim that man in the economic struggle ought to be unselfish enough to live not for his own advantage or that of his family, but for that of the whole community, neither know human nature as created by God nor as it has been influenced by sin. The system of free enterprise, on the other hand, is both sound idealism and sound realism.

The principle of reward according to effort is a sound principle and it is sound both economically and on the basis of Christian ethics. In the Seligman-Nearing Debate on Capitalism versus Socialism held in New York City in 1921 Dr. Seligman stated (and what he said about Russia in his day would apply equally to the subject before us today): "As regards the remuneration for labor, Socialism [read: Communism] preaches equal pay. A bonus, Lenin told us, was something only for bourgeois society. Equal pay means payment according to need. But unfortunately it is not payment according to need but rather according to efficient work that is really productive. Even in Russia today, they have been compelled to give up their original plans of payment according to need and they now have developed the bonus system to a point even unheard of in the United States."(13)

The Scriptural Principle of Reward

That this is also a sound principle in the light of Christian ethics is clear to every student of the Bible. Every Bible student is familiar with the numerous passages which enjoin industry, thrift, faithful application to one's task, and which stress the principle of reward for one's labor proportionate to the effort put forth. Though as over against God no sinful human being (and who is not a sinner?) has any real claim to make, nevertheless God has laid down the law of remuneration for industry, of reward for faithful application to one's task.

Perhaps the finest and most impressive teaching on this subject anywhere in Scripture is found in our Lord's parable of the pounds (Luke 19:12-26). The entire parable deserves careful study in this connection and we so commend it to the thoughtful student. Each servant is rewarded in accordance with the measure of his application, the "production" achieved, the degree of successful utilization of the "capital" entrusted to him. He who produced nothing is punished after the pound of his original "capital" is taken away from him. And when the Lord directs that this pound shall be given to the man who has been successful in making ten pounds, the objection is raised (whether in theparable or by some bystanders listening to Jesus' discourse is immaterial): "Lord, he hath ten pounds." To which the Lord replies: "I say unto you, that unto everyone that hath shall be given; but from him that hath not, even that which he hath shall be

---

(15) F. R. Barry, Christianity and the New World, p. 251.
taken away from him.” (Luke 19:25, 26). These words do not mean that the poor ought to be made poorer and the rich richer, but they clearly mean that those who by thrift and industry apply themselves to their task should be and will be rewarded accordingly, and that those who refuse so to do will even lose that which they had to begin with. This teaching is doubly impressive as coming from the lips of our Lord, who in the oft unequal struggle between the rich and the poor was almost invariably on the side of the latter.\(^{16}\)

The principle of the value and inviolability of the individual and its concomitant of the reward to which each individual is entitled according to the measure of his industry and application lies deeply imbedded in the Scriptures and in all Christian ethics. On this score the system of free enterprise is much nearer to the spirit of Christianity than any collectivist system can be.

III

On the score of the preservation and enjoyment of true liberty the system of free enterprise, far from being anti-Christian, is more in harmony with the high ethical demands of Christianity than any collectivist alternative.

Let us finally focus this argument on the subject of freedom. Proponents of collectivism are wont to ridicule the freedom which the system of free enterprise claims to offer. At least this ridicule was common a few decades ago. And it must be granted that they could furnish much evidence of the prevalence of economic slavery and suffering on the part of the lower classes under the traditional capitalism existing in many countries. Professor Scott Nearing in the debate mentioned above depicted the condition of the workingman under capitalism as one of intermittent starvation and slavery. He linked the intermittent starvation with the periodic panics producing unemployment. And he told his audience that as long as an economic order obtained in which the non-workers in effect said to the workers: “You go work and earn bread and I will eat it”, this necessarily involved a condition of economic slavery for the workingman.\(^{17}\)

Now I have not the least desire to deny that bad conditions for workingmen have existed in the past in many countries and that these still exist in some today. Under a system of unrestrained competition and an industrial order with little or no social leg-

\[^{16}\text{The thrust of the parable of the laborers in the vineyard (Matthew 20:1-16), each of whom receives the same reward though some of them have labored all day and others only one hour, is not in conflict with the teaching of the parable of the pounds. That parable teaches that one is rewarded according to his effort and that each one must put his talents to use. This parable, however, teaches that all the saved will receive the same blessing of salvation, even though some are converted at the eleventh hour and others spend all their life in God's service. “All alike will receive the reward of eternal life, whether they became disciples of the Kingdom at an earlier or at a later period.” (W. C. Allen in International Critical Commentary, Matthew, p. 215. See also Meyer's Commentary, Matthew, p. 362).}

\[^{17}\text{Op. cit., p. 24ff.}

islation to protect the weak from the strong, conditions have existed for a long time and in many cases still exist, which are a grave indictment of the community in which they are found. But before anyone concludes that this is an indictment of the system of free enterprise as such and that some collectivist setup will remedy the situation, he may well stop and think and look at some hard facts. As such I would submit the following.

1. The evils against which many sincere Socialists have justifiably protested and which they would eliminate by a change of economic organization, are deep-seated evils in human nature rather than environmental evils inherent in a system. There is no reason to believe that under Socialism these evils would not reappear, though in a different form and setting. “The Socialist naively argues”, says Walter Lippmann, “that if all property were held in trust for all the people, all property would as a matter of course be administered in their highest interest.” “But,” he points out, “there is nothing in the act of transferring the ownership of productive capital to the community which offers any guarantee whatever that the official managers will not enrich themselves and exploit the community.”\(^{18}\)

To say that these evils cannot be eradicated by changing the economic order is not in any way to palliate them. From the Christian point of view these evils must be exposed and fought. Smugly complacent capitalists who, possibly with pious phrases on their lips, would ignore, minify, or justify such evils, are an abomination to the Lord. To them sermons should be preached on the blistering passages in Amos and other Old Testament books and on the opening words of the fifth chapter of the Epistle of James. These evils must be recognized and must be fought along two distinct lines, viz., by direct action in their own economic community on the part of Christians in positions of influence, and by enlightened social legislation on the part of the government.

2. The curbing of the evils of an unbridled competitive system and of an industrial setup controlled by the machine and large scale production, has gone forward in recent decades in most countries where free enterprise obtains today. Social legislation, first in many European countries, then also in our own country, has effected a tremendous improvement in the condition of the workingman. Although wages in many industries and trades are not yet what they ought to be and could be, and in such cases the fight for better terms and conditions must go forward, in the main we may say that the standard of living of the workingman, especially in our country, is unusually high. And all that was effected under an economy of free enterprise, though it must be fully recognized that many—altogether too many—of the capitalists (whom the late President Roosevelt characterized as “economic royalists”) do not deserve much credit for its achievement. Yet

\[^{18}\text{Op. cit., pp. 75 and 74.}
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it was achieved under the system of free enterprise.

3. And over against this, what is the record of Collectivism? The vaunted liberty which the workingman was to enjoy under socialism and communism has not materialized in the countries which have abolished the economy of free enterprise. In the debate mentioned above it was not hard for Dr. Seligman to read official statements of the Russian regime which were most devastating for the claims made on this score by his socialist opponent.\(^{(19)}\) Not only did he signalize intolerable conditions as far as working hours and the like are concerned, but he quoted Russian government orders which betrayed the tyranny and slavery which existed in this country that was supposed to be a paradise for the proletariat. This is significant. The more so, because the world has learned much firsthand in recent decades about totalitarian tyranny. It is a fair question to ask, how many laboringmen in countries where the system of free enterprise exists today would care to exchange places with the workingmen in Russia.

The boasted liberties of Socialist and Communist agitators appear not to have been realized. And what is worse, in the place of the old regime that has been overthrown there has appeared a new tyranny, the tyranny of the almighty state, the blight of totalitarianism.

This is the new slavery. And it is the product of both Communism and National Socialism. The Socialist, who began by dreaming his Utopian dreams, ends under the heels of the dictator. The country which gloried in the appeal of the Communist Manifesto to the working class to cast off its bonds and unite to achieve its freedom, is today ruled by the iron fist of a dictator who gives no account of his deeds. Mr. Armstrong reminds us of the words of Ortega y Gasset that “the Fascist and Syndicalist ideologies have introduced to modern Europe a type of man who does not want to give his reasons for his beliefs, or even to be right, but simply to have the power to impose his opinions.”\(^{(20)}\) All this is the very negation both of freedom and of the Christian Faith.

The battle that is going on in every civilized country today is the battle between Christianity, democracy, and free enterprise on the one hand, and Marxist Atheism, dictatorship, and a collectivist economy on the other.

\(^{(20)}\) Hamilton Fish Armstrong, “We or They”, Two Worlds in Conflict, p. 13.

Our Missionary Dichotomy

Harry R. Boer  
Missionary Chr. Ref. Church  
Lupwe, Nigeria

The present-day type of missionary organization is of comparatively recent date. Churches and societies sponsoring organizations for missionary undertakings, supporting them by funds, home base personnel and administrative machinery, not to speak of mission journals, national and international organization, are a phenomenon peculiar to the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. In the early centuries of the Christian era the Gospel spread largely by means of the unorganized effort of traveling Christians. During the Middle Ages Rome did indeed send out missionaries, but in the period following upon the Reformation the missionary activity of both the Roman Catholic and the Protestant Churches was closely linked to military and mercantile undertakings. Not until the two great missionary centuries arrived—the nineteenth and the twentieth—did missions assume their present complex form in which the organized independent activity of societies and churches stands in the foreground.

“Real” Missions and Home Missions

When we speak of missionary organization we think almost at once and exclusively of foreign missions. It is one of the remarkable phenomena of the present era in the history of the Church that the word “missions” is virtually reserved for the spread of the Gospel in foreign, non-Christian, parts of the world. This phenomenon we call remarkable because there is a missionary task to perform at home no less important than that abroad. Within the pale of Christendom there has always been a large number of men, probably a majority, who did not accept, or only gave lip service to, the Gospel. That this is so today no observing person will wish to deny. The Church, indeed, recognizes it to so large an extent that under one name or another (Evangelization, Home Missions) organization has been effected to make possible the discharge of its task on this score. In addition to this, independent groups corresponding to the missionary societies are pursuing a similar missionary aim. Nevertheless, the terms “missionary,” “missions”, are, in the popular mind, reserved almost exclusively to indicate the activity in foreign parts. Whatever the reason for this may be—and into this we wish to inquire—the fact is that our efforts to evangelize the world bear a split rather than a unified character. In the church which the present writer serves (the Christian Reformed Church), and which is
typical of many churches on this score, there are sizable Home and Foreign missionary enterprises. Each has its own board, its own administration, even its own space in the denominational paper. What is far more significant is that the dichotomy exists not merely for purposes of administration, but also and no less in the mind of the Church. No one would ever refer to a home missionary as “missionary” simply. Home missionaries are “home missionaires” and missionaries who go to foreign parts are really “missionaries”. In the public mind, if not on paper, one board is the “Missions Board” and the other is the “Home Missions Board”. That is to say, missions, without further qualification, are associated in the Christian mind with work done on foreign fields. If we wish to indicate other types of missions we add an adjective like “Home” or “Jewish”.

Now there can be no harm in a dichotomous or other division as such. Obviously the huge scope of the Church’s task to bring the Gospel to those who dwell in darkness demands some such sort of arrangement. But is that the prime reason for the present general dichotomy in organization? Even more pertinent it is to ask whether this organizational need accounts for the notion among Christians that mission work in foreign parts is one thing, but at home something quite other. Does Scripture warrant this dichotomous attitude? If it be true that the missionary task given to the Church is one task, one mandate, whose beginning is at Jerusalem and whose end is among the farthestorm habitats of earth’s humanity, how can we account for the obviously existing dichotomy? Does this split attitude have any concrete implications or consequences? These are some questions on which this article wishes to touch.

It may seem too obvious to deserve mention that the principle that controls the synod (of the Christian Reformed Church) in allocating administrative responsibility for the several mission fields which it administers is a purely geographical one. If a particular field is in the United States or Canada it is assigned to the Home Missions Board, but if it is outside of these two areas it is given to the Board of Foreign Missions. What makes this principle of selection worth mentioning and looking into is the significant circumstance that the large Indian mission field, although lying within the country and, as it were, in the shadow of established churches is not administered by the Home Missions Board but by the Board of Foreign Missions. When fields were opened or taken over in China and in Africa the already existing Indian Missions Board assumed these new responsibilities and became the Board of Foreign and Indian Missions, now commonly referred to as the Board of Foreign Missions. That is to say, administratively and in the mind of the church, the American Indians are not considered as being a part of that type of missionary subject among which a Home Missions Board is supposed to work. All of which is very closely linked to the general question of dichotomy in missions.

The Christian-Heathen Distinction

In order to understand the reason for this dichotomy it is necessary to go back far into history. The Greeks, who continue to influence both our culture and our theology, distinguished between themselves and the “hoi barbaroi” or the barbarians. They themselves were the élite, the lettered, the cultured. Others, whatever qualities they might possess, were non-Greek and by that fact were regarded as inferior. When the center of civilization shifted westward and Christianity was recognized and in many ways became identified with Graeco-Roman civilization, the leaven of the old Greek distinction was taken over by the culture emerging from the union of Christian, Roman and Greek elements and entered into the Christian-Heathen distinction which was now added to and ultimately came to overshadow the already existing antitheses: Jew-Gentile, Christian-Jew, and Believer-Infidel (Christian-Mohammedan). These latter distinctions were primarily religious in character but the Christian-Heathen distinction, although couched in religious terms and at first chiefly if not purely religious in its connotation, became in course of time a, to a large extent, cultural distinction and to that extent a continuation of the Greek-Barbarian antithesis.

When the voyages of discovery of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries were made, the Christian-Heathen distinction really came into its own and, until recently, remained. It would be difficult to define the concept “heathen” as it existed in those early days, but this is certain, the predominant characteristic of the heathen was that they were queer people. Religiously and culturally they were “different.” The word “heathen” called forth ideas of the exotic, the peculiar, the fantastic. The strangest stories were given credence. Sixteenth century pictures show inhabitants of America without heads, with eyes in the chest, and hair falling from the shoulders. A papal decree declared that Indians have souls and are therefore proper subjects for missionary endeavor. Whether contact was made with highly developed cultures like the Aztec, the Chinese, the Japanese, or with less developed peoples—all were “heathen”. An unbeliever in Europe was not called a heathen, nor a Jew, nor a Mohammedan. These all sustained some relationship to the Christian-European religion and culture. This, we must note, was the point of reference and the standard. Whoever could not be related to it was “heathen”. The European religious-cultural superiority complex put into this uncompromising category all who bore no cultural or religious relationship to it, and on that account became objects of especially cultural curiosity and condescension. A truly religious concern and interest in the heathen, it must with shame be confessed,
did not arise in any large or universal sense until the nineteenth century made its appearance. With the current diffusion of western culture, the growing prominence of oriental and other peoples, and the recognition of the worth and validity of their indigenous cultures, as also the growth of their independence and of their danger to the West, we are hearing less and less about "the heathen." Nothing is quite so taboo in the Netherlands nowadays as to refer to "colonies" or in other ways to indicate the inferiority of the once completely subject peoples in the East and West Indies. In British circles the new trend comes to expression by referring to "nationals" rather than to "natives". All of this has had its effect on the Church, for in it the use of the term is also dying out.

"Heathen" Biblically and Etymologically

Biblically there is little or no warrant for the way in which the word has come to be used. In the English Bible the Old Testament uses it some one hundred forty times, but the Hebrew word from which it is translated is the same word (goi) which is rendered several hundreds of times in other places as "nation". In the New Testament it occurs only seven times and here the Greek word (ethnos) is translated some sixty times elsewhere as "nation". The New Testament passages are: (with ethnos) Acts 4:25; II Cor. 11:26; Gal. 1:16; 2:9, and 3:8; and (with ethnikos) Matt. 6:7, and 18:17. The first passage is a quotation from Ps. 2 and there the word "heathen" apparently includes the kings of earth and the rulers who take counsel together against the Lord and His Anointed. Presumably the writer had those nations and their leaders in mind whose culture was the most advanced of the day—Babylon, Assyria, and Egypt. The contemporary church uses the passage time and again to refer to the godless leaders of great cultural and political entities. The word as here used seems to indicate such peoples and their leaders solely in their hatred of God and of Christ. In the second passage Paul enumerates the occasions of peril he has experienced in the ministry and in one verse speaks of robbers, his countrymen, false brethren, and heathen. There is no reason to believe that heathen here means other than non-Jews, that is, Greeks, Romans, and the people of Asia Minor among whom he labored. In all the Galatian passages the term simply means non-Jew, and in the two Matthew passages there is reference only to the non-believing and to the consequent vanity of the religious acts and being. In short, the New Testament use of the word "heathen" gives it a specifically religious-ethical connotation and the element of cultural antithesis or inferiority does not enter in. On the contrary, in at least one connection it is associated with such as were known to possess a very high degree of culture.

Etymologically, the word "heathen" is derived from the Anglo-Saxon "haeth" and means "country", presumably non-urban, consequently unrefined, crude. The Funk and Wagnalls dictionary gives considerable prominence to its cultural connotation.

Since the term has come to convey an impression of religio-cultural superiority-complex unbecoming to Christian humility, the dropping of its use need not be too much regretted. On the other hand, it cannot be denied that its dying out in the public mind and in the Church constitutes an indication of the increasing secularization of our age, and of a loss of appreciation both for the distinctiveness of the Christian religion and for the type of culture in which Christianity is an integral element. Its exodus from the vocabulary of our day does not mean, however, that the effects of its long use have died. And that brings us again to the question of the dichotomy in missions.

Pride of Possession—Condescending Curiosity

In its missionary thinking the Church of the modern era has apparently been deeply influenced by the old Greek-Barbarian distinction and the subsequent Christian-Heathen antithesis of European thought. It continues to this day to distinguish between "normal" and "queer" mission subjects. Those who fit into the to us congenial religio-cultural complex or who can in one way or another be related to it are the normal, and those who cannot are the queer. The former are given into the care of Home Missions and the latter into the care of Foreign Missions. It is for this reason, we surmise, that Indian Missions in the Christian Reformed Church are administered by the Board of Foreign Missions. The Indian field was the first "missionary" enterprise of that church, that is to say, its first missionary outreach, not for non-Christians as such, but for the non-Christians who are in the "other-than-we" category. The home missionary seeks to enlist ordinary folk, it may be the man around the corner, in the army of our Lord; but the foreign missionary, the man who is "really" a missionary, goes to strange people. Perhaps he will be in danger, he will see unusual things. At all events, he will presumably lead a life of great privation and sacrifice and so he is borne down with gifts and attention and other evidences of esteem that the poor home missionary must do quite without. When he comes on furlough there must be no end of "interesting experiences" to relate because, after all, that is what may be expected from one whose life is spent among the peculiar. The foreign missionary on furlough, therefore, who does not have a stock of "striking stories" to tell is generally considered to be lacking in qualities for good deputation work. So ingrained is the notion of religio-cultural superiority, so largely has our religion of grace been made an occasion for pride of possession, and so inevitable is the condescending curiosity flowing forth from these attitudes that few missionaries or mis-

THE CALVIN FORUM * * * FEBRUARY, 1949

139
sionary leaders feel they can afford to ignore it. It is certainly the bane of much written propaganda. Perhaps the cultural difference should not be ignored but it is unfortunate that the prime reason leading to interest in it should be so earthy and so touched with human pride and complacency.

Testing Some Missionary Attitudes

If this short exposition is faithful to the facts and in a degree, difficult to assess, accounts for the missionary dichotomy in the Christian Church, we may well wonder how Biblical some of our missionary attitudes are. May it not be called an evidence of immaturity in missionary thinking when it is believed that a church is not discharging its missionary responsibility if, over and above its evangelizing activity at home, it does not also have representation on a foreign field? We have one and only one missionary mandate and that one mandate links in one sentence and in one command Jerusalem and the ends of earth. With all our zeal for missions in foreign parts, a zeal so great that it has almost monopolized for this work the word “missions”, it is often forgotten that the place where missions must first come to expression is “Jerusalem”, that is, at home—in our neighborhood, our district, our city, our country. The sanctified judgment of a church’s leadership must decide which fields at a given time should be given priority. Perhaps this priority should lie at home, perhaps it should be abroad. Often a church can assume responsibility on both fronts. The churches of colonial powers like the Netherlands or Britain have very especial responsibilities abroad. Whether the small Protestant contingent in Belgium should concentrate its missionary strength on the spiritual ignorance obtaining among thousands of their Roman Catholic countrymen or apply it in the Belgian Congo should not be a matter for long debate. The responsibility American churches have in bringing the Gospel to foreign parts will always be determined by the measure of their opportunity to do so. But is there not an approach to romanticism and sentiment when it is suggested, as happened in a Board report to the Synod of the Christian Reformed Church, 1948, that a field in India might be taken over because, among other reasons, “there is a demand for a greater amount of diversification in the mission fields of our church”? If “diversification” is a standard for missionary accomplishment and usefulness then how impoverished are our Dutch brethren with only one field in the Orient, and how rich (presumably) is the Christian Reformed Church with responsibilities in China, Africa, among the American Indians, through the semi-missionary South America-Ceylon Committee in those two areas, and now it is proposed to enter India also. One would almost conclude that the desire for the exotic and peculiar (Hindus, elephants, untouchables), that is, for a specific increase in the element of religio-cultural antithesis in our missionary enterprise, is beginning to overshadow considerations of missionary strategy and long range ability to carry the responsibilities involved in present commitments.

No Combined Chiefs of Staff

Another problem raised by this dichotomy is the difficulty it creates from the point of view of the Church’s total missionary strategy and effort in properly distributing the available resources and personnel. If the Church’s missionary task is one there should be unity of purpose and striving with respect to over-all policies and aims. At the present time most churches conduct their missionary task as many nations conduct a war—there is much enthusiasm, general support, but the two military arms, the army and the navy, are not co-ordinated. There is no combined chiefs of staff. But the war is one, and the enemy is one, and the task is one. The only body that comes close to being a combined chiefs of staff in the missionary enterprise of most Reformed churches is the annual synod. But consider how ineffective it is for this purpose. In the course of the 1948 synod of the Christian Reformed Church a total of seventeen sessions was held (a session consisting of a morning, an afternoon, or an evening meeting). Of these seventeen sessions, judging by the published Acts, a liberal estimate would seem to indicate that the equivalent of approximately four sessions was given to all types of missions—Home, Foreign, Jewish, Dutch immigration to Canada, help extended to Reformed churches in South America and Ceylon. These sessions were not held in continuity, but were spread over the seventeen sessions in which with the most bewildering arbitrariness jumps were made from consideration of divorce cases to educational matters, to hearing visiting speakers, to missions, to publication matters, and so on, without end during the course of the synod. There could hardly be adequate concentration on missionary matters and problems by synod as a whole, much less could there come into being a missionary mood and atmosphere to give depth, thoroughness and needful devotion to the deliberations.

The problem of inadequate attention to many matters coming before it will never be wholly overcome by a synod. It is inherent in the nature of the gathering. Much must inevitably be left to the discretion of boards and committees. In this particular connection, however, the question may be raised whether with respect to so large and embracing an enterprise as our total missionary undertaking it would not be wise and profitable to hold exclusive­ly missionary synods from time to time. They need not be held often and should certainly not concern themselves with details of administration. The increasing scope of our missionary activity at home and abroad and the successive crises in these times
of transition would seem to make it desirable for the church from time to time to receive and in turn to give a picture of the whole, and to do this through its central authoritative body. The task of such a synod would be to lay down broad policies, to integrate, relate, and put in proper perspective the total missionary task of the church at home and abroad, to determine strategy, to select, to enlarge, contract or eliminate fields—in short, to provide the several boards, administrators and missionaries with proper frames of reference for the planning and execution of their work.

The problem of the dichotomy in missions poses these and other questions. The limits of space prohibit their further discussion. The writer hopes, however, that something of suggestiveness has been presented which may lead the reader to look further into the questions raised.

Bible Reading in Christian History

"S"EARCH the Scriptures." So spake Jesus in the course of His earthly ministry. He uttered those words in one of His controversial bouts with the Jews and adduced this reason for the injunction, "they are they which testify of me." (John 5:39) The cavilling Jews received the injunction because apparently they were grossly delinquent in investigating the sacred Word and hence they failed to recognize the Christ when He came. It is not addressed to them exclusively however. The command is of universal validity and it is our intent in this article to see how faithful the Christian church has been to this mandate of Christ.

The Early Church

The immediately obvious extenuating factor that presents itself in the early centuries is, of course, the limited number of Bibles that were available for reading and study. It appears from the records that, in many cases, there was but one codex to a community and that copy was under the strict surveillance of the presbyter. He guarded it like a priceless treasure. It is true that wealthy men expended fortunes in the copying of manuscripts of the Word, but their number was severely limited. And yet that does not mean that there was little or no Bible reading on the part of the church community. The people were urged to read it. In the Teaching of the Twelve Apostles, one of the second century handbooks, they are exhorted, "Instruct thyself in the Living Word . . . read in the Law, in the book of the kings and the Prophets; and in the gospels which is their fulfillment." Clement of Rome speaks commendably of the members of the church of Corinth when he says, "Ye know the Holy Scriptures, yea, your knowledge is laudable, and ye have deep insight into the oracles of God." (Epist. ad Cor. 53) Barnabas urges all Christians to "search out what the Lord requires of us" and Ignatius implies that they do when he writes, "I have heard some say, If I do not find it in the Old Testament, I do not believe it in the gospels." They read with a discerning eye and they refused to accept it "in the New revealed" if it were not "in the Old concealed." The people of God must be readers of the Word of God. And the Apologists, who follow hard upon the heels of the Apostolic Fathers, continued the admonition to read; some of them, notably Tatian, Theophilus and Justin Martyr, averred that its reading was instrumental in their conversion.

And then when the monster of heresy reared its ugly head, there were more exhortations to the laymen to read and study their Bibles so as to be better able to detect and confute the errors of the heretics. That in itself is not without significance. Since the heretics used the Scriptures in promoting their views, basing their contentions upon faulty exegesis, it would have seemed not at all strange if the orthodox church leaders had withdrawn the Scriptures from public use and entrusted them to the clergy lest it be adulterated by "profane hands and profane minds." But not so. The orthodox strategy was otherwise. There must be more diligent study of the Word so that the errors might be exposed and the truth might be maintained. Irenaeus, who wielded a trusty sword against the Gnostics, not only drew his potent weapons from the arsenal of God's Word but urged his readers to assimilate that word when he said, "The Church is planted like Paradise in the world; of every tree of this Paradise shall ye eat; that is, eat ye of every Scripture of the Lord."

Neither was Eastern or Southern Christendom different in this regard. Chrysostom, the celebrated preacher of Constantinople, asserted strongly that monks and priests were not the only custodians of the Word and that laymen must be given access...
to it. (Homilies on the Gospel of St. Matthew, II, 10.) In other words, Christianity is no mystery-religion. So, too, the famed Catechetical School of Alexandria. Clement, its first outstanding teacher, urged Bible reading and suggested that the most fitting time for that spiritual exercise was before the chief meal of the day. Origen, his brilliant pupil and successor, recommended that it be read each day from one to two hours. He also deplored the tendency toward a "taedium verbi divini," implying that some in his day had read the Scriptures so extensively that it had lost its zest for them and now it afflicting them with a sense of boredom.

It is noteworthy, too, that persecuting Emperor Diocletian sought to exterminate the Christian religion by destroying its Bibles. He tried to cut the heart of the movement by burning the sacred books. And yet he failed. God treasured His Word too highly to permit men to destroy it and God's people treasured up His Word in their hearts. Eusebius tells of a blind Egyptian Christian that "he possessed whole books of the Holy Scriptures, not on tables of stone, as the divine apostle says, not on skins of beasts or on paper but...in his heart, so that, as from a rich literary treasure, he could, even as he wished, repeat now passages from the Law and Prophets, now from the historical books, now from the Gospels and the apostolic epistles."

Augustine, the theologian and churchman who towers far above his contemporaries in the early church, recommended its reading also and urged that translations be made so that the Word of God might be propagated among the nations. And so the testimonies multiply. The Word of God is to have free and untrammeled course in the hearts and lives of men. It can be said without fear of successful contradiction that in the first millennium of Christian history there was no prohibition or restriction of Bible reading to the laity on the part of the church authorities; on the contrary, the perusal and study of the Scriptures was counselled and advised and the Word was regarded as a "lamp and a light" for all members of the Christian community.

**The Medieval Church**

The picture takes on a different hue however when we enter the Middle Ages. Then it is that the thought develops and gains credence that the Bible is so profound and so mysterious that it constitutes a "peril for the common mind." As early as 1080 A.D. assertive Gregory VII in a letter to Duke Vratislav of Bohemia characterized translation of the Bible into Slavonic as "unwise, bold and forbidden." He had in mind particularly the danger implicit, as he saw it, in divine services held in the vernacular. Latin was, and he intended that it should remain, the linguistic queen in the ecclesiastical realm. Shortly thereafter, sectarianism disturbed the equilibrium of the church. Such sects as the Cathari and Waldenses gained a substantial following and, quite significantly, appealed to the Bible in all their disputes. It to them was their source of appeal. That constituted a jeopardizing of papal claims and hence we find that in 1229 the Synod of Toulouse in its 14th canon forbade the laity to possess the Bible except the "Psalter and such portions of them (Scriptures) as are contained in the Breviary, or in the Hours of the Virgin; and most strictly forbids these works in the vulgar tongue." The Bible in the hands of the common people was regarded with increasing suspicion. Thirteen years after the Synod of Toulouse the Council of Terracona decreed that all vernacular versions must be brought to the bishop and he must consign them to the Biblical funeral pyre. Similar prohibitions were issued at regular intervals in the following two centuries. James I renewed the decision of the Terracona Council in 1276. Later kings reaffirmed the edict and it received papal sanction with Pope Paul II (1464-1471). In England, after Wyclif had passed to his eternal reward, the Synod of Oxford (1408) decreed that "no one shall henceforth of his own authority translate any text of Scripture into English; and no part of any such book or treatise composed in the time of John Wyclif or later shall be read in public or in private [italics mine, J. B.] under pain of excommunication." The Bible was contraband except in the Latin and that language was unintelligible to the common man and in many cases unintelligible to the clergy also. In Germany in 1485-86 the influential archbishop of Mainz issued an edict forbidding the publishing of any religious book in the German language, asserting among other reasons, that the German tongue was not adapted to convey religious ideas accurately.

Those were stern prohibitions. They were not meticulously observed however. Apparently there was widespread and flagrant disregard in many areas. But the prohibitions are indicative of a shift in policy. Here was a studied attempt to keep the Bible in the hands of the clergy and to keep Latin as the exclusive language of the church. Fear seems to be the motivation. When papal authority was threatened and when errors in medieval doctrine and evils in practice were exposed, the Bible was withdrawn from common use. Here was a striking deviation from the practice of the early church. Then the Bible was propagated, even when heresy presented its menacing front; now the Bible was segregated because apparently it had developed into a "peril for the common mind." From now on, unless God intervened, its use, as in other religions, would be restricted to the religious functionaries.

**Since the Reformation**

It is a well-known fact that Martin Luther, the pioneer of the Protestant Reformation, did not set eyes upon a copy of the Bible until he was twenty
years of age. Consequently he remained ignorant of its basic teachings. Such fundamental truths as justification by faith were buried beneath mountains of papal bulls and churchly decrees. It is no wonder that after his eyes were opened to the truth of salvation by grace, he was deeply impressed with the need of making the Bible available to all and his edition of the German Bible was the tangible precipitate of that conviction. Certain it is that the unrestricted availability of the Scriptures is one of the distinctive traits of Protestantism. The Bible is not a monopoly of the organized church who interpret it with the aid of "tradition", but it is God's "free gift to the individual and to the community" and consequently the lectern with the open Bible and not the altar occupies the central place in Protestant houses of worship.

The Roman Catholic church carried forward its Pre-Reformation policy of restriction, albeit with some reservations and fluctuations. In France in 1544 it was stated that translations of the Bible into the vernacular "must in the present be regarded as . . . dangerous and pernicious." Conceivably it might be tolerable in succeeding years. In the "Ten Rules Concerning Prohibited Books" drawn up by the Council of Trent in 1564 (cf. Buckley, Canons and Decrees of Trent, p. 284) it is asserted that "if the sacred books be permitted in the vulgar tongue indiscriminately more harm than utility arises therefrom by reason of the temerity of men" and concedes that versions of the Old Testament may be "allowed to learned and pious men at the discretion of the bishop."

In the 17th century the pendulum veered towards absolute and unqualified prohibition. The Jansenist movement, a movement within the church of France similar to the Puritan movement within the church of England, and especially the publication of Quesnel's *New Testament in French* (Paris 1677) with its moral reflections under each verse gave rise to new stringency in the matter of Bible reading for the laity and led to the issuance of the bull *Unigenitus* (1713) in which seven propositions in Quesnel's book, which advocated Bible reading by the commonalty, were condemned.

The 18th century was marked by some relaxation of policy. The publication and reading of vernacular versions was recommended by the better class of bishops and Pope Benedict XIV altered one of the aforementioned decrees of Trent by stating that "if such Bible versions in the vernacular are approved by the apostolic see or are edited with annotations derived from the holy fathers of the church or from learned Catholic men, they are permitted." The rise of Bible societies in the 19th century, however, precipitated a reaction. There was fresh alarm on the part of the hierarchy and new encyclicals by Pius VII, Leo XIII, Gregory XVI and others, forbidding the dissemination of the Protestant Bible were issued. Indicative of papal opinion is the Syllabus of Errors in 1864 which placed socialism, communism, secret societies and Bible societies in the same category.

According to present Roman Catholic teaching, the Bible is the property exclusively of the church as an organization. That organization, pyramided as it is in the Pope, determines how that property is to be administered. It enacts binding ordinances regulating the use of the Bible by the laity. In other words, the cleavage between Protestantism and Catholicism on this point lies in this, that whereas in Catholicism the Bible is under the church, that is, in subjection to it as an organization—in Protestantism the Bible, even though it is entrusted to the church for the dissemination of its teachings, exists side by side with it and is given also to the individual. He possesses the Bible in the same sense in which the church possesses it. Catholicism maintains that the "Holy Scriptures are not of themselves the immediate rule of faith for the individual; they, like tradition, are only mediated to the individual by the official ministry of the church"; Protestantism, by contrast, maintains that the Bible is God's "free gift to the individual and to the community." Whether of the twain is in better position to fulfill the command of Christ to "search the Scriptures"?
HISTORIANS ON F. D. R.

Dear Dr. Bouma:

I just read the editorial "History Begins to Judge." I wonder whether you have looked into the book recently published by another great professor of history at Harvard, the late Dr. Charles Beard, President Roosevelt and the Coming of the War 1941. His documentary evidence of the activities of the late President F. D. Roosevelt certainly does not bear out your position or evaluation. Quite the opposite!

Cordially,
C. M. Schoolland.

Racing, Wisconsin.

NOTE OF EDITOR: Yes, your editor has read Professor Beard's work. He has been deeply impressed by the fact that the citation of documents and the proving of one's thesis by these documents are two things. Perhaps in this connection it is not out of place to quote a paragraph from the article "The Year in Books" written by an editor of Time (December 20, 1948, p. 109). He writes: "With the exception of Sherwood's history, most of the 1948 books on F. D. R. were from the embittered That-Man-in-the-White-House camp. Historian Charles A. Beard's last book was President Roosevelt and the Coming of the War 1941, an old isolationist's angry, distorted effort to blame U. S. entry into the war on the single-minded efforts of the President. Jim Farley's Story was a peevish denunciation of the President for refusing to play politics Farley's way all the time, and The Roosevelt Myth was the kind of apoplectic hymn of hate that readers could expect from one-time liberal Journalist John T. (Country Squire in the White House) Flynn."

ANOTHER WISCONSIN VOICE

Sheboygan, Wis.,
January 10, 1949.

Dr. Clarence Bouma, Editor
The Calvin Forum,
Grand Rapids 6, Mich.

Dear Dr. Bouma:

You will be interested to learn that the editor of our daily newspaper, Charles E. Broughton, a fearless fighter for his convictions, recently reproduced your editorial "History Begins to Judge", which appeared in the December issue of The Calvin Forum. Needless to say, it did my heart good to see the secular press pay tribute to your keen analysis of a writer stand by his guns, when political foes will not stop at anything but encouraging for theologians who considered research in that direction. The extremes of Maranatha and the events which followed the sad incident rather led ministers to "play safe" and steer clear of premillennial utterances and publications, so that it has become almost an accepted theory that if a minister is thoroughly sound and Reformed he certainly is anything but premillennial. They even went so far as to publicly say that the Rev. Mr. J. Van Andel, the well-known Dutch theological writer, was not premillennial. Well, his booklet, Blikken in de Openbaring aan Johannes, tells us differently.

As Prof. Kromminga has requested the Church to express itself on his views, I hope the Church will not say: "Well, now that the professor has died, we will drop the matter." That we are too near the scenes of his career—his world-wide achievements, to realize his place in history."

I am sure your readers will be interested in this tribute.

Sincerely yours,

C. M. WONDERGRIM.

ON THE MILLENNIUM

Grand Rapids, Mich.,
December 6, 1948.

Dear Dr. Bouma:

BOOK REVIEWS can be very interesting. Such was the one given in The Calvin Forum by the Rev. Mr. James Daane in which he acquaints us with the late Professor Kromminga's The Millennium.

Since the days of the Bultema controversy, which unfortunately led to deposition and schism and all its accompanying unpleasant consequences, I have been strongly inclined to believe that another period of time will be ushered in when Jesus comes again. Acts 3:21, for instance, indicates that Christ will remain in heaven until "the times of restitution". As, according to our leading Amillenarians, "times" usually refers to "years", I am strongly inclined to believe in a period of time to come after Christ's return.

Somehow the Amillennial expositions have always impressed me as being rather evasive and the result of a traditional tendency to over-simplify the picture of the second coming. Christ returns; the dead arise; a long line of people appear at His right hand, a still longer line at His left; the former go to heaven and the latter to hell; the world burns; eternity begins. Everything is then over with. As one minister puts it: "We have no need of a millennium." Perhaps if we were candid he would be ready to admit that he feels no particular need of the Song of Solomon in the Bible, either. As I see it, the first question is not what you or I feel the immediate need of. Often the old argument is heard: "Christ certainly in His glorified state could not come back to this sinful earth." However, the incident of the burning bush shows us that the place where Moses then stood was not called "sinful earth", but "holy ground". He was to remove his sandals.

It is a pity that when the book Maranatha appeared, it had to contain two assertions which conflicted with our creed, at least apparently. Had this not been the case, perhaps the men who recommended and lauded the work at the time (Rev. Hockenga, Rev. Keizer, Dr. Beets, Prof. Kromminga, Dr. Lee Huizinga, and others) could together have adjusted and corrected the main line of reasoning in such a way that eventually they would have arrived at what Prof. Kromminga has presented in his recently published work. As it was, the trend since 1918 was anything but encouraging for theologians who considered research in that direction. The extremes of Maranatha and the events which followed the sad incident rather led ministers to "play safe" and steer clear of premillennial utterances and publications, so that it has become almost an accepted theory that if a minister is thoroughly sound and Reformed he certainly is anything but premillennial. They even went so far as to publicly say that the Rev. Mr. J. Van Andel, the well-known Dutch theological writer, was not premillennial. Well, his booklet, Blikken in de Openbaring aan Johannes, tells us differently.

As Prof. Kromminga has requested the Church to express itself on his views, I hope the Church will not say: "Well, now that the professor has died, we will drop the matter." That...
would be the easier way, but it would not show much concern about the development of the doctrine of the last things. I like very much the striking concluding sentence in the Rev. Mr. Daane's review, when he suggests the possibility that... "the label it bears may be regarded as sufficient for condemnation." Yes, it may. And the fact that a layman here has the audacity to publicly express his approval of the Rev. Mr. Daane's review may also be sufficient for condemnation.

Sincerely yours,

ALBERT PIERSMA.

A CHRISTIAN PHILOSOPHY OF HISTORY

Dear Dr. Bouma:

My review of the late Professor Kromminga's book The Millennium has evoked a number of responses from individuals within the Christian Reformed Church and from individuals of other churches. Some of these responses were vocal, some written, some favorable, and some unfavorable. Some regarded the review a masterpiece of objectivity, some as a rash-like botch of subjectivity; some detected a noble motive, others one not quite so. While none of these have induced a case of suspended elation or of persisting doldrums, I would like to take this opportunity to de-fog the atmosphere that apparently beclouds the motif and content of the review.

I read the book and wrote the review because I was asked to, not because I had any predilections for pre-millennialism— as the review itself indicates.

I am an a-millennialist with an interest in the problem of the philosophy of history. My doctorate thesis was a dissertation on the "existential moment!" in the thought of Soren Kierkegaard, which I am at present rewriting to indicate its bearing on the problem of history. My interest in Kromminga's position, accordingly, is attached not to his pre-millennialism per se but to his broad comprehensive philosophy of history from which I believe both the pre- and a-millennialists can profit. This was the motive that prompted my plea that the book be critically studied. We study the philosophies of history written by Spengler, Toynbee, Tillich and Berridey. Let us read this more Christian, though pre-millennial, interpretation of history.

While I am not capable at this point in the days of my years to pass a final judgment on the biblical correctness of Kromminga's lifetime study, I do not believe I have gone prematurely beyond my intellectual depth when I judge it to be a significant book, which ought not to be sealed and laid to rest, as some declare.

We are, I believe, living in the increasingly constricted narrow of history, in days in which a historical consciousness cannot be evaded. As Christians we have in the Bible the makings of a philosophy of history and as Calvinists, as believers in common grace, we should have a philosophy of history that does more than point to the events of the end-time. A philosophy of history obviously ought to include within its scope the significance of all history and its achievements, both religious and secular. Let us develop such a positive Christian philosophy of history; let us not criticize, and thus speak to the men of our times. For unlike his non-historically minded predecessors who doubted the truth of Christianity, modern man is historically conscious, but doubts Christianity's relevancy.

This interest, Mr. Editor, in the development of a more positive interpretation of history was my motive, and thank you for allowing me to say so.

Sincerely,

JAMES DAANE.

820 Salem Street,
Lafayette, Ind.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF EVANGELICALS

Dear Editor:

The other day I came in contact with a man who was in jail because his son got a zero mark for stating that God created everything, while the Public School textbook credited evolution. The father refused to send his son to such a school where this evolution theory was taught, denying the Creation account of Genesis. That happened recently, and we recognize that since that time there has been an increasing turning away from the Bible and true religion, and a worship of man, and man-centered instruction is furnished from the kindergarten up to the university, throughout the whole Public School system.

As Christians who maintain their own Christian School system we are committed to the position, and have expressed ourselves as such time and again, that we ought to make an impact upon the American people outside our own circles and influence them so that other Bible-believing communions, either separately or collectively, may have their own Christian Schools, so that in this way the paganizing of our nation may be retarded.

We rejoiced that the National Association of Evangelicals in their recent annual meeting not only expressed themselves in favor of Christian Schools, but also voted to create the necessary machinery so that Christian Schools may be established. As an affiliate of the N.A.E. the National Association of Christian Schools came into being and its Board, together with the active and energetic Promotional Director, Mr. Mark Fakkema, and Representatives have exerted themselves with the result that close to one hundred Christian Schools have come or are coming into existence by the end of the year, according to Mr. Fakkema.

However, this Christian School project is all something new for these people. They need guidance and direction in various ways pertaining to Christian instruction. Christian instruction is only one phase in our Calvinistic conception of life. As Christians we are interested in man himself and, as far as we can, we are possibly better equipped and therefore can give guidance to others who are only recently getting their eyes open. These 52 different communions or denominations of which the National Association of Evangelicals consists, can be benefited by our contacts, and our influence upon them may be a boon to the coming of the Kingdom.

Yes, we know many of them have Arminian leanings. Some of them are out-and-out Arminian. But many are so ignantly, and as long as they are believers they are one with us in Christ and we may not say: "Am I my brother's keeper?" nor "Go out and be filled and get warm." As I see it, we must do all we can to help them. We must not forget many of them are babes in Christ, and they need instruction and development in the things of God and true fundamental religion, as it came to us throughout the centuries. Therefore it would be well that our leaders welcome opportunities to speak before their groups. It has been proven by good results that such speaking engagements were much appreciated.

Real instruction and guidance will teach them to see their responsibility in every sphere of life, and if we do not fail here, but make use of our opportunity, we will be benefited ourselves. Thus we will experience that we are able to hold our own and defend our view of life. We will also appreciate what we are taught and by comparison value our Calvinistic heritage.

We need not be afraid therefore that we will be contaminated or lose out in the struggle for the honor and glory of God. History has proven time and again that the Lord is with all who do their duty if it is built upon God's precepts and ordinances. There are no reasons why we should not help others and therefore we should not withdraw from the National Association of Evangelicals, but cooperate with them whenever we can, consistent with our own view of church and social life in every sphere. Let us not shirk our responsibility, but really try and put forth our best efforts to make an impact upon our nation. We have long enough lived in our isolation, and the time on the world clock is getting late.

Grand Rapids, Mich.

M. GRIESEL.
From Our Correspondents

PRESENTATION ADDRESS OF DR. ZSIROS

In the evening service of January 9, 1949, a unique ceremony took place in the Prospect Park Christian Reformed Church of Holland, Michigan. In that service the Rev. Dr. Hoogstra, the pastor of the Church, was presented with a diploma which signified and declared that he had been elected an honorary minister of the Reformed Church of the city of Sárospatak in Hungary. This unique honor came to Dr. Hoogstra in recognition of his deep interest in the Reformed Ecumenical Movement and the practical manifestation of this interest by strengthening the ties between Reformed believers in this country and in Hungary by taking a leading part in the alleviation of the physical suffering of the members of the Reformed Church in the historical city of Sárospatak in Eastern Hungary, close to the Russian border. Professor Dr. Zsiros, who officiated at a similar occasion a few months ago in Calvin College when presenting an honorary professorate from the Sárospatak Theological Seminary, also represented the consistory and the congregation of the Sárospatak Church on this occasion. We are happy to make this historic occasion of the manifestation of a living and real Reformed ecumenicity live on by publishing the two addresses delivered on that occasion. The sermon of Dr. Hoogstra, which in Hungarian translation had already been read that morning to the Sárospatak congregation, a church of some five thousand members, will appear in the next issue of our magazine. In this issue we present the presentation address of Dr. Zsiros.—EDITOR.

Dear Reverend Dr. Hoogstra,
Honorable Members of the Consistory,
Beloved Congregation,
Brethren in Jesus Christ:

This moment is one of the most joyful occasions in the life of our Churches. An extraordinary fact makes this day a joyful day, a day of joy, even of jubilee. The Sárospatak congregation of our Reformed Church of Hungary elected you, Dr. Hoogstra, her honorary minister with great pleasure. This historic old congregation presents you this diploma as documentary proof of this election—an act quite unprecedented in the life of our Reformed Church. In the course of her history, which is full of hard struggles and unspeakable sufferings, this is the very first instance of a Calvinist Church of Hungary electing herself a minister from a foreign land.

The historical significance of this hour is as yet immesurable. Only our ever-living God knows what possibilities may be hidden in this act for the future. One thing, however, is already evident in this moment: it has opened a door to more brotherly relations between us.

1. The great units of the Reformed Church throughout the world suffered from one serious fault throughout their history. In spite of their historic sacred heritage which they had in common, they were separated from each other and even closed doors to wonderful spiritual values they might have shared with one another. What an inexcusable strength of the Word of God was to them in the service which they had undertaken and, inversely, it was the limitations and obstacles which they experienced in their peculiar national character, in their different historical backgrounds and in their individual patterns by reason of their different creeds and confessions. This diversity led them either to a hypercritical consciousness in the sharpest conflict with the very substance of Christianity, or, perplexed in their isolation, they surrendered to various spiritual-cultural movements such as: liberalism, rationalism, and humanism, depriving them of their very vitality, and even of their religious character. As a result their service for the Word of God became greatly weakened and the mission received from their Redeemer and King was not carried out. In this condition the Church has been everything: cultural factor, social organization, economic institution, political agency, but not a guardian, not a leader, not a teacher, not even a physician of fallen souls created for immortality.

Turning away from her original task, the Reformed Church finally became the object of attack on the part of two divergent world powers: the Roman Church on the one hand, and worldly Socialism, built on political and economic vagaries on the other. These powers besiegled her precious heritage received in the Reformation, namely, her clear evangelical life and her greatest spiritual treasure: the wonderful system of faith and constitution of the Church as found in Calvin’s Institutio, the source of which is the Revelation of God itself. And we must confess that these powers were largely successful because there was no ecumenical sense living in the Churches and our sense of responsibility for one another consequently faded out.

That this honor has come to you, Dr. Hoogstra, is not a matter of accident. The Calvinist Church of Hungary sends it to the enthusiastic advocate of the ecumenical movement of the Christian Reformed Church of America, to the apostle of loving hands, who cared for one of our congregations just in her darkest hour, without solicitation on her part, willingly as a true servant of Jesus Christ (II Timothy 2:3). You and your dear congregation received this church into your loving care when the whole world despised and cursed us, when hundreds of thousands in every country cried in reference to us: Let her be crucified! At this point in our deep affliction, you reached down to us, embraced and comforted us. With your loving faith you revived us and with your clear and sound view of history set us going on our way to face the struggle anew.

Never will we forget your encouraging words written to us as secretary of the Calvinistic Action Committee under date of October 9, 1946: “You have a rich history forged on the anvil of a strong Reformed Faith. Each trial, we trust, will only prove that the anvil is made of unbreakable steel. We Christians also know that in our darkest hour Christ is nearest to us. No one can snatch us out of His hands. We pray that your faith will guard your liberty and enable you to pay the cost no matter what it may be. God’s Word tells us that we must stand fast in the liberty in which Christ has made us free. There is nothing more precious than the liberty to make known the full revelation of God’s Word.”

2. This diploma is given to the “minister Verbi Dei” who is serving the glory of the absolute truth of God not only with word and pen, but also deeds, with the destroying of the ancient world and old man and also with the building of a new world and of the new-born man. The emblem of Calvin showed us forth to us, embraced and comforted us. With your living faith you revived us and with your clear and sound view of history set us going on our way to face the struggle anew.

Never will we forget your encouraging words written to us as secretary of the Calvinistic Action Committee under date of October 9, 1946: “You have a rich history forged on the anvil of a strong Reformed Faith. Each trial, we trust, will only prove that the anvil is made of unbreakable steel. We Christians also know that in our darkest hour Christ is nearest to us. No one can snatch us out of His hands. We pray that your faith will guard your liberty and enable you to pay the cost no matter what it may be. God’s Word tells us that we must stand fast in the liberty in which Christ has made us free. There is nothing more precious than the liberty to make known the full revelation of God’s Word.”

Word of God
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in the only norm to which the life of the ALL must accommodate itself.

This conviction has during past centuries given the Christian Church intrepid believers, independent personalities whom no power was able to turn away from a clear faith and eternal truth. This conviction rules your life, Dr. Hoogstra. This conviction was the background and the secret of the life of the Hungarian reformers and galley slaves, whom it was possible to torment, to sell into slavery, to put in chains on the galleys, to break on the wheel, to impale and to burn at the stake, but never to turn away from their faith in Jesus Christ and from this firm conviction. "Si fractus illabatur orbis, impavidi- dum ferient ruinae", i.e., though the world tumbles down upon him, he will not be shaken under the ruins. Thus we know you, Reverend Hoogstra, who confess with undaunted belief in these dark days that the future of the whole world depends on the behavior of the followers of the Lord Jesus Christ. Therefore everything that we do is a duty, and to miss even a single thing is an awful responsibility.

3. It is also in the divine providence that one of the oldest congregations of the Reformed Church of Hungary has chosen you with honorary ministry! This church is the congregation of the great founder of the historic Szárosapatka Academy, Peter Perenyi, who forced the publication of the first "Magna Charta" in Europe in 1557 at Torda (Transylvania). It is likewise the congregation of the princes of Transylvania, the Rákócziůs. These great and true champions of religious liberty in Hungary worshipped God in this church first and then undertook their great struggle for the Word of God. The Szárosapatka Reformed Church treasures and preserves this sacred heritage in the service of the pure Reformed Faith. From this service she is sending her love as a sister in the faith in the form of this diploma. With great pleasure and in firm faith she does so just now when a powerful revival is stirring the entire Reformed Church of Hungary, one starting point of which is the Szárosapatka Reformed congregation.

The seed was sown there by the Holy Spirit. The fields are white and ready for the harvest. "The harvest truly is plentiful but the laborers are few" (Matthew 9:37). This diploma is an invitation to the harvest of our sovereign Lord.

In the name of the Szárosapatka congregation I wish the grace of God upon your life and service, and at the same time I ask you, Reverend Hoogstra, that THE WHEATON COLLEGE FEBRUARY, 1949
was still a possibility that this Danish author was a Christian, though he could not even be classified as an Arminian, but only as a Pelagian. Kierkegaard was so opposed to Hegelianism that he did not express himself on some of the great fundamentals of Christianity. He was so filled with despair and pessimism because of his sins that he did not speak of the risen, nor of the glorified Christ. His influence was detrimental. He stands at the beginning of a long row of outstanding men who may be classified as theologians who fill the old orthodox terms with liberal concepts.

The November meeting was the twentieth on record. Professors Henry Stob and Henry R. Van Til were chosen as president and vice-president. The meeting was very well attended. There were even visitors from Chicago.

Prof. Henry Stob discussed the new booklet of Prof. Dooyeweerd, Transcendental Problems of Philosophical Thought. The speaker said that the vexing problem in philosophy is the one of reason and faith. For classic and modern philosophy reason is the only avenue to knowledge. For Tertullian faith was the only one. For Aquinas there are two hemispheres: nature and grace, each with their own avenue, respectively reason and faith. For Augustine reason and faith are intimately connected. Faith is basic to reason. Faith is the main road to truth.

How does Dooyeweerd work this out? He wants to investigate the fundamental principles or transcendental (of origin, unity, and relation or order) in the way Kant investigated the whole process of knowledge except its origin. Every philosopher believes in these three ideas, if he is interested in an explanation of the cosmos. But the unbeliever assumes that these three are "objective", i.e., that they have the same connotation for all thinking men. The believer must maintain that there is a difference because of the antithesis between believers and unbelievers. For a believer these three are intimately connected with the Trinity. For the unbeliever they are mysteries which he does not care to explore.

But all philosophers give a religious content to these three. The classics speak of Matter and Form, or the World soul. Augustine mentions the Trinity. The Thomists follow the first line for nature, and the second for religion. The Renaissance and modern philosophy speak of nature and liberty or new names for old concepts.

In the discussion the following topics were discussed: the faith of the unbeliever as neutral facts, the order of the knowledge of God and of man, Augustine's and Aquinas' religious basis, Plato's Immanentism and Law Idea.

The Secretary,  
Henry J. Van Andel.

Grand Rapids, Mich.

CHRISTIAN EDUCATION IN NORTH IRELAND

15 College Sq., East,  
Belfast, North Ireland,  

Dr. Clarence Bouma,  
Calvin College and Seminary,  
Grand Rapids, Michigan.

Dear Dr. Bouma:

Once again it is my happy privilege to pen some lines to you and the many readers of The Calvin Forum throughout the world. There is an old saying—"Anything can happen in Ireland," but now that Mr. Truman has been elected to a second term of office, much to the confusion of the "prophe­ts," I feel that Ireland is not the only country where the very unexpected may take place!

Rationalism in North Irish Schools

Quite a sensation has been caused in N. Ireland among Calvinists and "fundamentalists" over the introduction of a new Religious Syllabus to be used in our Grammar Schools. The Syllabus recommends books which are violently rationalistic, and the whole trend of the prescribed course of religious teaching is anti-supernatural in trend.

The Irish Evangelical, monthly organ of the Irish Evangelical Church, has gone all out in the exposure of this Syllabus, which is a threat to the youth of our province and our Protestant Reformed religion. It is pointed out that the Bible of this Syllabus is not the Bible of historic Christianity. The front page heading for this month reads: "An Entirely Different Bible." The article which bears this title concludes, "Our readers will surely see that the Bible of the Syllabus and of the many books we have quoted is a vastly different Bible from that of the historic Christian church. And here we have really a vastly different religion from the historic Christian faith, which is shot through-and-through with the Supernatural.

"May God save the youth of our province from this tide of unbelief."

An Interdenominational Protest Committee has been formed, and is receiving strongest support from the Reformed Presbyterian church, the Irish Baptist church (which, unlike the sister bodies in Britain, is not in the hands of Modernists), and the Irish Evangelical church. So far only one minister of the big Presbyterian church here has really come into the open and opposed the Syllabus, and he is a Scotsman,—Rev. Donald Gillies.

Parents may, if they wish, withdraw their children from religious instruction in the schools, and teachers are under no compulsion to give the teaching. Nevertheless, we feel that the position is most unsatisfactory. The fact is that if this Syllabus is not withdrawn, thousands of children will receive this poison, although many Christian parents will refuse to submit their offspring to such un-Christian instruction.

Belfast Parents Protest

A huge meeting of protest was held in the Wellington Hall, Y.M.C.A., Belfast on Sunday evening, 19th December, 1948. This great hall was packed to capacity and so also was the Minor Hall, Y.M.C.A. Even then hundreds of people were waiting for admission, and so a large open-air meeting was held outside the city hall. The principal speakers were Pastor John Raney (Baptist), Rev. R. Nevin Lyons (Reformed Presbyterian) and Rev. W. J. Grier (Irish Evangelical). The speakers quoted from many of the textbooks and were listened to with rapt attention.

It was announced that a Petition was being forwarded to the Minister of Education; and 1,000 copies of the Petition were handed out at this meeting alone, for the signature of the people.

A Resolution

The following resolution was then moved, seconded, and passed with tremendous enthusiasm:

"That this meeting of citizens filling the Wellington Hall, Y.M.C.A., Belfast, begs to inform the Minister of Education of their determination—so far as it may lie within their power—not to suffer their children and youth of this Province to receive the type of religious instruction in the Grammar School Syllabus and books recommended therein.

"This meeting is not impressed with the argument that the use of this Syllabus is not compulsory. The Syllabus is issued with the approval of certain representatives of the three largest Protestant bodies and with the assistance of the Local Education Authorities, and will no doubt on that account be adopted by most Grammar Schools.

"This meeting repudiates the right of the clerical and lay representatives on the Conference which prepared the Syllabus to prescribe for the Protestant children of Ulster a type of teaching which impugns the authority of the Word of God and is altogether out of line with the belief and testimony of the historic Christian church.

"This meeting recommends parents to withdraw their children from religious instruction in the schools wherever such textbooks as those quoted in accompanying leaflet are used—unless and until sound religious instruction is assured.
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“This meeting of citizens requests that this Syllabus be withdrawn.”

The following bodies were represented on the joint conference which produced this Syllabus:
(a) Church of Ireland (i.e., Episcopal).
(b) Presbyterian Church in Ireland.
(c) Methodist Church in Ireland.
(d) Ulster Headmasters’ Association.
(e) Ulster Headmistresses’ Association.
(f) Incorporated Association of Assistant Masters.
(g) Association of Assistant Mistresses, Incorporated.

On the conference were such notable modernists as Dr. W. L. Northridge, Principal of Methodist Edgehill Theological College, Belfast, and Professor J. L. M. Haire of Assembly’s College, Belfast. Both Northridge and Haire helped in the editing of this detested Syllabus. Non-members of conference who gave, what the Syllabus terms “valuable help,” included Principal J. E. Davey (Assembly’s College) and Dr. A. McCrea, one-time Principal of Edgehill Theological College.

Both these gentlemen are rank modernists, and when we saw such names on the conference list we knew what to expect. Truly those who would deliberately inject rationalism into the young mind, without even presenting the other side, have a tremendous responsibility.

So have we in opposing them. Brethren pray for us.
Yours in His service,

Fred S. Leahy.

Book Reviews

NEW INTERPRETATIONS


The book list for 1948 lists two Hawthorne biographies; since the year marks no special event in the life of Hawthorne one hundred years ago, one might question why two biographies were written in one year. One might even question why a biography of Hawthorne was written. Mr. Stewart has answered the last question: “Hawthorne was a serious minded writer whose works, taken together, constitute in the highest sense a criticism of life. He probed the deepest realities of the mind and spirit, and his meanings possess a freshness of the ages to follow.” Mr. Cantwell, too, speaks of the timelessness of Hawthorne’s writings and of Hawthorne as “one of the greatest, if not the greatest, American novelists.” Yet the above quotations would hardly justify another biography, since there are a number of biographies of Hawthorne in print, were there no new interpretation or point of view to present. Mr. Cantwell definitely states that he is restoring for us the real Hawthorne, who was quite different from the Hawthorne presented to us by his previous biographers, most of whom relied primarily upon Julian Hawthorne’s account of his father. Mr. Stewart makes no definite claim, but one feels that he, too, wishes to restore the true Hawthorne.

The Hawthorne legend, for such the story of Hawthorne has almost become, portrays him as a sad, solitary figure, living in seclusion—an almost morbid man who had lost the warmth of contact with other human beings. “Such a portrait,” as Mr. Cantwell writes, “with its angular shadows, its Greco distortions, its melancholy, its brooding seclusion, is in itself an interesting product of the American imagination, all the more interesting for being placed against a background of an ancient seaport, where the old ships crumbled to pieces tied to the decaying wharves.”

The Hawthorne portrayed by both Mr. Stewart and Mr. Cantwell is no such figure. He emerges from both biographies as much more normal, much more human, much more like the rest of mankind than the Hawthorne of tradition. Both biographers strive to create this impression by relating events from the period of the author’s boyhood, his college years, and even from his so-called “solitary year.” And the reader agrees with Mr. Stewart that “Hawthorne’s boyhood was not as abnormal as has sometimes been supposed.”

Both biographers, too, emphasize the importance in the life of Hawthorne of Sophia Peabody, who became Mrs. Hawthorne.

The picture of the domestic life of the author is painted in deep, rich colors. This was possible in Mr. Stewart’s case especially because of many passages in the letters from Hawthorne to Sophia which have recently been restored. Mrs. Hawthorne’s deletions had made this information unavailable before. There are no other reason for writing another biography of Hawthorne, this would be sufficient. From Mr. Stewart’s biography, particularly, Nathaniel and Sophia Hawthorne stop forth as the Robert and Elizabeth Browning of America, and the reader is enchanted by Sophia Peabody Hawthorne.

To the Hawthorne or American literature student both biographies are important; however, to the reader who is interested in biography as a form of reading matter rather than in information about one particular man or period, Nathaniel Hawthorne by Randall Stewart is a better choice than Nathaniel Hawthorne: The American Years by Robert Cantwell. Mr. Stewart’s volume is more concise and covers the entire period of the author’s life. The biographer, who is Professor of English at Brown University, has been writing about Hawthorne since 1929. His quotations from journals and letters are particularly well selected. The material is arranged chronologically with a careful choice of significant details, and a final chapter discusses Hawthorne’s views, purposes, and importance.

Mr. Cantwell, on the other hand, who was an editor for Time before beginning his biography, writes in a journalistic style, developing his story as a journalist does a newspaper article, which at times is disconcerting to the reader. The account of the appearance of Hester and her child on the gallows reads like a Time account of a coronation. So many characters are introduced in the book that Hawthorne becomes lost in the multitude of lives that supposedly influenced his life. The introduction of so many characters is purposeful, for as Mr. Cantwell says, “This biography differs from other studies in its fuller treatment of people whose lives were linked with him.” However, the book, which seems to dim the figure of Hawthorne at times, makes the period in which he lived very real, for it is full of minute details. Mr. Cantwell also quotes frequently and merges his style so successfully with that of Hawthorne that one is often unaware of having read quoted material.

As was stated previously in this review, Mr. Cantwell states definitely that he is giving a new interpretation of Hawthorne. His biography like that of Mr. Stewart removes many of the shadows from the author’s life, and for that the reader is appreciative. Another phase of his new interpretation involves Hawthorne’s political activities. To quote Mr. Cantwell: “The depth and the nature of his political work is mysterious. That is the true mystery of his life. Loneliness and seclusion were his portion, certainly, but they had less to do with his writing.
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and his view of the world than with his duties in the customs service. I cannot characterize his work more clearly than that, for it is, to a considerable extent, what this book is about."

This phase of the biography, and it definitely colors the entire book, is unconvincing.

Much more convincing is Mr. Stewart's conception of Hawthorne's writings and his view of the world. Emerson and the other Transcendentalists of Hawthorne's time asserted the goodness of men; they were optimistic and painted a bright picture of the possibilities of man. Hawthorne who was concerned with "the truth of the human heart" had a more profound understanding of the forces which motivate man. He saw the power of selfishness and pride; he saw that these characteristics make man lose his feeling of sympathy for his fellow man—until his heart like that of Ethan Brand is a heart of stone. It is these ideas that Mr. Stewart discusses in the final chapter of his book, "Collected Works"; and to the person in whose background the Calvinistic ideas, or as they were called in Hawthorne's case—the Puritan, are particularly important, this chapter is significant. As Mr. Stewart states, "The problem of evil is the greatest and most baffling of human problems." It is this problem that Hawthorne struggled with; any interpretation of the author which fails to recognize the importance of this problem in his life is an unsatisfactory interpretation. In this sense Mr. Stewart's interpretation is unsatisfactory.

The most satisfactory aspect of Mr. Stewart's interpretation is found in the final pages of the biography where he discusses The Marble Faun and speaks of Hawthorne's presentation of the problem of sin in this romance as "the author's theme." In the words of Miriam, one of the main characters in The Marble Faun, this theme is: "Sin has educated Donatello, and elevated him." And through Miriam, Hawthorne questions: "Did Adam fall, that we might ultimately rise to a far loftier paradise than his?" Sin separates man from his fellow men, but it also creates a bond of sympathy and understanding. No thinking human being can fail to be stimulated by the questions which Hawthorne suggests.

A thoughtful reader of Hawthorne may be convinced that he suggests no answers in his stories and romances. According to Mr. Stewart's interpretation, however, he does have a message. The biography concludes with these words: "In the light of the world today no one is likely to impugn Hawthorne's central moral—the importance of understanding mankind in whole, and the need of man's sympathy with man based upon the honest recognition of the good and evil in our common nature." This, Mr. Stewart considers Hawthorne's message, one which the reader feels is also Mr. Stewart's message.

GERTRUDE SLINGERLAND.
Calvin College.

GLORIFICATION OF HUMANISM


The content of this interesting volume is a discussion of the art of Austria, Switzerland, Germany, the Low Countries, and France during the first two centuries of the Renaissance. It is the purpose of the author, now connected with the famous Fogg museum at Harvard, to draw the attention of the scholars and the public to the rich art contribution of Austria and Northern Europe, to coordinate this art with the philosophy, literature, and scientific progress during the period of the Low and High Italian Renaissance, to prove that after all the whole movement in South and North was permeated by the "pantheistic" spirit of the South, and that even Dutch art of the Seventeenth Century—the author mentions only Hals and Rembrandt and supplies no documentation in regard to them—is the product of the pagan spirit which aimed at the "cosmic totality" of life. Man felt himself an agent of the Divine Spirit, a spark of God; life and history were huge mechanisms driven only by a conscious and purposeful world soul dragging along all individuals, but especially the big leaders in Art and Science, to a grand but unknown goal; and nature and the cosmos were beating and humming with an irresistible divine impulse, full of the joy of life for the upper ten who had enough artistic genius to embrace the divine, and enough good luck to spend their lives in grandiose leisure and luxury at the courts of the nobles, or in the mansions of the rich merchants and bankers. The book is a huge effort to establish that the fruit of the Reformation was negligible for culture, and that the classic spirit—dying with Erasmus and Melancthon—was at least for a century and a half the saviour of Europe.

The author has no good word at all for Calvin, and in the words of Erasmus calls Luther the cause of the decline of classical learning and culture. Though the word Reformation is mentioned in the title of one of the chapters, the movement as such is declared to be detrimental to all human progress. Religion of the orthodox type is really a pest for mankind. It means obscurantism. Real light will dawn only if we make classical philosophy our starting point. We must believe in the throbbing world soul of Plato, and must believe that reason is the guide of man. Christianity with its doctrines of the Trinity of God and man, and of sin and grace, with its pessimism and hatred of progress and culture, is the ever recurring cause of the downfall of mankind. In this volume there is an echo of the monstrous idolatry of the Uebermensch of Nietzsche—rub our eyes and ask whether we are living in the middle of the twentieth century, or still in the heart of the nineteenth. Here is one of the last efforts of a die-hard liberalism which still tries to denounce the Reformation, and to ignore or slander Calvin. We are accustomed to the sinister voices of Niebuhr, Barth, and Inge, who try to make Humanism palatable by pouring a modernistic content into our old orthodox terms. But this bold neo-paganism we had almost forgotten, and we thought it had died. All the good in Flemish and Dutch art is the heritage of Italian humanism, not of the Christian Renaissance and of the Calvinistic Reformation—so this book proclaims loudly, though most of the time subtly and quietly. Consul Consules: Let the consuls watch out. We can expect a few more volumes of this type before a third world war will wipe this arrogant classicism from the face of the earth.

H. J. VAN ANDEL.

The Shame of America

The Men tally Ill

This is a small book of less than two hundred pages. When it reaches you by mail it is a small package—a small package of dynamite. Even a little dynamite, however, can cause a considerable explosion. I pray the publication of this book may cause an explosion that rocks our country.

Let it not disturb the reader that the author of this book is a journalist. He is more than that. He is a journalist with a scientific conscience, witness his earlier book, The Mentally Ill in America, a carefully documented piece of historical research widely recognized as an authoritative contribution. He has been granted the Lasker award by the National Committee for Mental Hygiene, "for his outstanding contribution to the advancement of mental health."

The book reminds one of the muckraking days of the Lincoln Steffens era, but we have here muckraking of the highest order. Deutsch, accompanied by a competent photographer, has crossed the country from coast to coast, examining no less than thirty hospitals. The pictures are nothing less than shocking, even for one not wholly unfamiliar with the conditions Deutsch exposes. Somehow one wants to think that we have left conditions such as these far behind.

During the eighteen months he spent on the survey he found the following: Many naked men and women confined in huge filth-infested wards; men tended and untreated, some of them
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undernourished. Sick people bound to their beds. Patients amenable to treatment allowed to die uncared for. Evidence of death due to abuse and neglect. For proof the reviewer refers to the reader to the book itself.

Deutsch has no scapegoats. Indeed, he found inspired physicians and humane superintendents. For Deutsch the villain, the ultimate villain is an indifferent public which fails to provide the necessary buildings, help, adequate professional personnel. Let us hope the facts of this book may reach the public. Our American people are not callous. Our neglect of the saddest derelicts of society is not due to our indifference, no, it is due to ignorance. May the book have a wide sale, and may it stir our people so profoundly that we insist that these pitiable lazarettos lying at our gate shall have adequate care.

He who reads this book with mounting horror and indignation is trebly thankful for our Christian hospitals for the mentally ill. There are no sick people quite so much in need of Christian care as just these. Why is it that we have so many Roman Catholic and Protestant general hospitals over against so few for mental illness? Is that also due to ignorance? For just once I wish I were a dictator. If I were, I would insist that every bishop, every preacher, every teacher, every student, everybody, pass a searching examination on the contents of this little book. But what am I saying? No, were I a dictator I would today, this very minute, set the machinery in motion to remedy the situation, with the understanding that any laggard for a year and a day be given the worst treatment in the worst of these hospitals.

Well, of course, this is absurd. However, if I am right in believing that our neglect of these poor people is due to ignorance, then we may hope that the knowledge provided by this small volume may help to relieve the distress of these, the most pitiable of all men. God grant it.

Calvin College.

J. Broene.

PSYCHIATRY FOR SPECIALISTS


LET it be clearly understood: This does not purport to be a review. The book is too technical to warrant a review in a periodical which after all addresses itself to no one profession. Reviews in due time, (the ink of the book is scarcely dry), will appear in the professional journals. My purpose only is to call attention to the appearance of the book so that the few who may be interested but who do not see the technical periodicals may know of its publication.

The book arouses mixed emotions—satisfaction and dissatisfaction. Surely, there is nobody who would deny that for the past two or three decades Adolf Meyer has been our leading psychiatrist. He has made numerous and important contributions. However, for reasons best known to himself, he has failed to provide us with a systematic treatise on psychiatry incorporating his own distinctive views. Neither, considering he is now in his eighty-third year, is he likely to do so. We have scores of papers, reports, etc., on all manner of topics related to his field, but regrettably, the one thing we should like to have especially from him has been denied us.

This being so we should be grateful to the editor of this book for the signal service he has performed. From the numerous contributions buried in the journals Lieb has chosen fifty-two which, in his opinion, best reflect Meyer's views. Naturally, however well the editorial task may have been performed, it can hardly equal the treatise we so much wish we might have had.

Calvin College.

J. Broene.
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THE GOSPEL OF JOHN


SOMEHOW or other we conservative Christians feel just a bit lost on the moors of higher criticism. We are not afraid to be intelligent, nor are we concerned about truth for sentimental reasons. Yet, on those moors there rise in us the strains of "Home, Sweet Home." Call it a bias, call it a prejudice. No one escapes these, not even the higher or lower critics. We are for truth wherever we find it; but we feel more at home at the manger than in Herod's palace. The Graces is the Pandora when I read those critical studies of the Bible which add up to a neat bit of subtraction. Much as I admire Albert Schweitzer and wonder at the enigma he seems to be, I do not feel at home with those brilliant minds and their satellites who are still searching for Jesus.

How much more at home we feel when we read such a book as John: the Gospel of Belief. It is scholarly; it is conservative; it is very illuminating. Moreover, one feels throughout that the author has been found by Christ and has found Him. And one senses that the two-way finding is not an experience to be hung away in a garment bag.

The book is scholarly and approachable even for the layman. It is profound and simple just as the Gospel of John is. Part I deals with the General Introduction; Part II with the historical analysis; and Part III with the topical analysis. Under the historical analysis the author discusses six periods in the life of Christ: the period of Consideration, the period of Controversy, the period of Conflict, the period of Crisis, the period of Conference, the period of Consumption. We may want to shy away from such a carefully analyzed schematic presentation; but Dr. Tenney makes it work and also makes it stick.

There is also fine material on the internal evidence of structure, on the significance of the structure, on authorship, vocabulary, signs, symbols, and interviews. The writer does not get away from the schematic, but his method is instructive. He wants to show us the exceedingly great revelation of this Gospel, and we are led into the depths.

We feel at home because Dr. Tenney is a conservative scholar. We feel at home because the author does, as a scholar should, to be pricked by the higher critic is rewarding; but to be pricked in heart and mind by the conservative critic is more so still.

As a help to drawing on the deeps of John's Gospel this book is very illuminating. It points away from itself and sends us back to what John has written, as such a book should. Its reading will make the wise preacher, not a borrower, but an explorer. It can do the same for the wise layman.

The book is also well-bound, well-printed, and well-jacketed. The publisher has been smart in giving us this exposition of revealed truth; and he has been kind to our aesthetic sense. We feel at home.

Holland, Michigan.

BASTIAN KRUITHOF.

A FAITH TO LIVE BY


"HE Calvinist believes that when God saves man, He saves the whole man. The whole man must, therefore, be devoted to God's cause. Not only when he is at church, but when he is transacting business, or engaging in political or social activities of any sort. No sphere of his life may be excluded. Life as a whole must be God-directed. Polities, social and industrial relations, education, science and art must all be God-centered. No domain of life in which high morals are not essential! God must control the whole life. Not only individual but social ethics as well is stressed."
This is the immensely important and thoroughly practical message of this book. Christendom needs this message. Over against Catholicism, Calvinism offers a faith that lifts all of man's cultural activity out of the so-called secular realm, and turns it into a godly pursuit. Over against modern religious liberalism, Calvinism maintains a faith that is clear, strong, realistic, and dependable. Over against Fundamentalism, Calvinism teaches not only a faith to die by, but a faith to live by.

Christians living in the conservative Reformed tradition need this message. Our days are clouded over with a sense of impending doom. Many of our latter day prophets are telling us that the clouds will only lift again for the dawning of the doomsday. The times are filled with mighty temptation; a temptation to withdraw from the world; a temptation to give up the Christian cultural pursuit as a hopelessly lost cause and to think of the Christian faith as only something by which our souls shall be saved from the final doom. Dr. Meeter's book is a splendid antidote against this temptation. It shows that Christianity has something to say about living in the world as well as about dying to the "world." Christianity, in its Calvinistic interpretation, has a cultural challenge for any day, even for this critical day; in fact it has the only answer, and a real and effective answer, to the problem of Christian living in a pagan world.

The Fundamental principle of Calvinism is the absolute sovereignty of God. Therefore God's revelation is indispensable, final, and normative for Christian thought and action. The Bible is the rule of faith and life, and the Christian's cultural activity gains its impetus, direction, and dynamic from faith. The first chapters of the book develop this line of argument on a biblical basis, and so furnish a solid foundation for a consideration of the implications of Calvinism for human culture, human culture so defined as to deal "not only with the development of one side of human life, but of all of its aspects." Chapters VI and VII, on The Calvinistic View of Common Grace and Calvinism and Culture, respectively, are of great importance in understanding the Calvinist Christian's view of the world in which he lives, its potentialities, and his responsibility with respect to it. While recognizing the corrupting influence of sin in all human relations and pursuits, these chapters deny to the Christian the easy escape from the cultural task imposed upon man in Genesis 1:28 by the common Fundamentalist viewpoint that culture is opposed to Christianity.

This book is Volume I, hinting that the head of the Bible Department of Calvin College will, in one or more later volumes, consider the implications of the Christian Faith for all the aspects of human life mentioned in the quotation that heads this review. The present volume is limited to the theological and political ideas. The last fifteen chapters of the book are devoted to the discussion of the political ideas of Calvinism, and they bring scriptural principles to bear on a wide variety of up-to-date problems relating to the proper functioning of the state in its relation to its citizens and to other states.

Calvinism, Professor Meeter shows, has a view of the state which gives the government effective power to maintain justice and to promote the common good, yet strictly limits it to its proper, well-defined, sphere, so as to allow for the full exercise of the divinely endowed individual and institutional liberties. In this view of the state lies the answer, too, to the ever-vexing problem of the relation of church and state, a problem which has rivaled the subject of ecumenicity for first place in religious discussions during the past two years.

In the treatment of international relations including the problem of war, the author comes to grips with the greatest political issues of our time. We learn that Calvinism has been beforehand in this department, too, and has a steadying counsel to offer in the face of the panicky extremes that frequently steal the headlines, and amid the confusion of thought and action that commonly characterize discussion of International relations.

The first edition of this book appeared in 1939. The new edition contains many revisions, but they are minor, and are all in the interest of greater readability and improved diction. There is no change of substantial content. Unfortunately the proof reading in this edition is not altogether perfect; a half dozen misspellings mar an otherwise well-put-up book.

This is a good book. Calvin Forum readers who do not possess it will certainly want it. It provides sound and challenging guidance for constructive Calvinistic—therefore solidly Christian—thinking on living issues. Reformed ministers and all who occupy positions of leadership in Reformed circles need it. The book breathes the devout spirit of the God-glorifying Reformed Faith, and shows how that spirit must find embodiment in thoughtful and consistent Christian action. Studious readers will appreciate its scholarly approach, and will find its selected bibliography useful.

But this is not a book for scholars only. It ought to be read by every Reformed Christian. Its style and diction are such that the average reader will readily grasp its argument. The arrangement of the book, and the comprehensive outline included in the table of contents make the volume admirably suited to the needs of serious study groups. At a time such as ours, when Fundamentalism is making serious inroads into many conservatively Reformed circles, the kind of study that Dr. Meeter offers here is well-nigh as basic and indispensable as the Heidelberg or the Westminster Catechism. Professors may teach and preachers may preach and leaders may extol the grand truths and perspectives of Calvinism, but most of the vast areas of human relationships will be virtually unmoved by Calvinism's dynamic until the aggregate of Reformed believers come to cultural awareness. If Calvin Forum readers can do something about getting this book read by the average Christian, they will be doing important service for the Kingdom of God.

It may be safely added that every reader will look forward to the appearance of the second volume.

Holland, Michigan

Peter Van Tussen.