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Prostituting Christmas

The other day there was a little commercial magazine in my mail. A prettily printed advertising medium full of pictures of homes and their furnishings. The whole thing was cleverly done, for Americans are clever advertizers. I was ready to deposit it where so much of this kind of mail has to be deposited—the waste-basket—when my eye spied a page whose top half was adorned with a beautiful silhouette of two kneeling, large-winged angels adoring and worshiping a little baby whose dark, silhouetted figure stood out sharply against the bright background of a large white star. There was a halo around its quire, of man, of man; and it was a December issue. A prestige symbol of Christmas appears on the December page of this magazine.

It is the Nativity as it takes place thousands of times every year, and the Savior becomes at best a pretty symbol of what man essentially is or ought to make himself to be. And so that definite article is rather significant. We celebrate Christmas because of what happened once in human history, once-for-all in the manger of Bethlehem, where—O miracle of the ages!—God became flesh. Then we adore the Christ. Then we will understand that even our "innocent", sweet little babies have need of the cleansing power of this Savior. Then we will not be fooled by the soothing words of humanistic poems about "Nativity", a universalized human experience, but we will rejoice in "The Nativity" of the Son of God for our redemption.

How such humanistic burning of incense on Christmas to the universal experience of man fades into insignificance when the Christian believer meditates upon the Gospel story with its own interpretation. And how truly the meaning and the spirit of it all was expressed by Milton in his Ode on the Morning of Christ's Nativity:

This is the month, and this the happy morn
Wherein the Son of Heaven's Eternal King
Of wedded maid and virgin mother born,
Our great redemption from above did bring;
For so the holy sages once did sing
That He our deadly forfeit should release,
And with His Father work us a perpetual peace.

That glorious Form, that Light unsufferable,
And that far-beaming blaze of Majesty
Wherewith He went at Heaven's high council-table
To sit the midst of Triunal Unity,
He laid aside; and, here with us to
Forsook the courts of everlasting day,
And chose with us a darksome house of mortal clay.

Yes, it is only the difference of the definite article, but what a difference!

Albert Schweitzer, a Noble Pagan

Albert Schweitzer is very much in the limelight. He may bury himself in the African bush for years, but at no time does the Western civilized world lose sight of him. He is unquestionably a genius. A man of his stature does not appear too frequently. Here is a master musician, a great Bach scholar, a doctor of
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philosophy and theology, a prolific writer on theological and philosophical subjects, a doctor of medicine, a medical missionary, a great humanitarian. One is impressed by the strange combination of the highest intellectual culture of the West with the simplest life far from "civilization" in the bush and on the river bank of French Equatorial Africa. Here is a man who devotes the greater part of his life to alleviating the pain and suffering of simple natives in Lambaréné hospital and who from time to time steps into the limelight of European civilization with a book on Bach, or on The Quest of the Historical Jesus, with a lecture on Goethe on the bicentenary of the latter's birth, or with the second volume of his Philosophy of Civilization.

It is no wonder Schweitzer captures the imagination of people. But we Christians may well be on our guard not to lose our head over him. By our judgments over a man like Schweitzer we not only judge him, but also ourselves and—what is even more important—the great verities of the Christian Faith. For Albert Schweitzer, for all his nobility and human unselfishness, is but a noble pagan. No, he is not a pagan historically. He is brought up in the Christian tradition and is known as a Christian missionary. No man could have set a greater example of unselfish service for his fellowman than he. But it is possible to be noble and unselfish, and yet to deny the heart of the Gospel and to be an enemy of the Lord Jesus Christ. We are ready to recognize the noblest products of God's common grace in this world full of contradictions, and to recognize them for what they are, but no Christian that knows what Christianity is can confuse a life in the service of the Gospel of redemption through the Lord Jesus Christ with a life of humanitarian morality for the alleviation of the suffering of fellow-mortals. Our mission hospitals are the product of the Christian Gospel, but as soon as the mission activity has been reduced to humanitarian service on the part of our medical men, even if they carry the name "missionary", then the very Gospel has been denied and there is essentially nothing Christian or "missionary" about the enterprise any more.

Has one the right to speak thus about Albert Schweitzer? Sad to say, one does not only have that right but it is his duty. It is his duty in these days when people do not know the difference between humanitarianism and the Christian Gospel, when the lonely man who is known as "the Prisoner of Lambaréné" is lauded and held up as an example of a great missionary. If you wish to know what Schweitzer believes, read such a book as The Africa of Albert Schweitzer with its intriguing pictures, by Charles R. Joy and Melvin Arnold, who visited him at Lambaréné hospital on the Ogowe. They have caught his spirit. And then read the closing essay in that book from the hand of Schweitzer himself on "Our Task in Colonial Africa." Then you will know how he views the missionary task. And above all read his latest and most scholarly work The Philosophy of Civilization (New York, 1949, Macmillan). There is no Gospel here in all the three hundred and forty-four pages. The terms God and Jesus have lost all biblical meaning and appear less than half a dozen times in this book. God is "the infinite Will-to-live" (p. 285). What he thinks of Jesus may be gathered from this sentence, one of the very few containing the name of the Savior: "There was only one tiny church, the community of the Quakers, which attempted to defend the unconditional validity of reverence for life, as it is contained in the religion of Jesus." (p. 340) The essence of his philosophy and religion, is reverence for life. (See pp. 78, 283, 309)

However noble its garb, this is nothing but the old Pelagianism and moralism of Kant over again. There is no personal, transcendent, self-revealing God here, no supernatural Christ, no gospel of redemption. Man saves himself by the will to live. He loves all life, animal life included, and that is the very essence of the religion of Jesus. For any Christian to call this Christianity is to call God a liar, to repudiate His Word, to trample upon the blood of the new covenant, to do despite unto the Son of God.

Yes, Albert Schweitzer, we will honor you for your humanitarianism, for your unselfish devotion to the alleviation of the physical suffering of mankind. But we will not follow your God-denying and Christ-dishonoring interpretation of religion. Essentially you are preaching another gospel than that which Paul preached, and the verdict of the greatest of all self-denying missionaries is upon you: "Let him be anathema!" You are a noble pagan. You are not a Christian missionary. You have corrupted the story of the manger of Bethlehem beyond recognition. Your Christmas is at best a humanitarian festival without the Christ of God, the Savior of men, the only Hope of the world. C. B.

World Council Turned Down

A most gratifying decision was taken recently at the General Synod of the Reformed Churches (Gereformeerde Kerk) in the Netherlands in session at The Hague. This Synod is not to be confused with the Reformed Ecumenical Synod of Amsterdam, with member-delegates from all over the world, on which we have commented editorially in an earlier issue. That Synod lasted two weeks and closed on the evening of the nineteenth of August. The General Synod of the Reformed Churches in the Netherlands convened immediately upon the close of the Ecumenical Synod and faced a docket of no mean pro-
portions. It was the privilege of the present writer to serve at this assembly as fraternal delegate from the Christian Reformed Church. He can testify that the reception was most gracious and the fellowship with the brethren most pleasant and profitable. When after a stay of three weeks he returned to America the Synod had plowed less than halfway through its immense docket. Two matters of unusual importance were the efforts at reunion between these Reformed Churches and what for lack of a better term we shall simply call the Schilder group, and the matter of the attitude of the Reformed Churches to the Ecumenical movement, more particularly to the World Council of Churches. Reunion efforts have been going forward throughout the sessions on the installment plan, but the matter of the World Council came to a climactic decision during the seventh week of synodical sessions on Wednesday, the 5th of October.

The significance of this decision can hardly be overestimated. To appreciate this one should know the status of the matter at the time it came to the General Synod of The Hague. There were two reports before this body, both of which had been printed and circulated for some time, even before the Ecumenical Synod took up the matter. The majority advised joining the International Council of Christian Churches, being strongly opposed to the World Council. A minority report declared itself in favor of joining the World Council, not because it did not have serious objections against that World Council, but because it believed that the Reformed Churches should let their voice be heard to guide the movement in the right direction. These reports had been circulated for some time when the Ecumenical Synod of Amsterdam met, just before the Synod of The Hague, with this problem of the World Council one of the most important issues on its docket. In this way the Amsterdam Synod paved the way to a large extent for the Synod of The Hague. Since all the professoral advisers of the Ecumenical Synod were also present in similar capacity at the Synod of The Hague and there was even a similar duplication of a few delegates, the value of the extensive discussions at Amsterdam for the Synod at The Hague cannot be overestimated.

The outcome of the Amsterdam Synod (as related in an earlier editorial) was to the effect that an effective blow had been delivered against the minority sentiment of those favoring joining the World Council. However, it was decided that a study committee was to be appointed to report on the World Council as well as on the N.A.E. and the I.C.C.C. Also a letter of objections went forward to the Netherlands Ecumenical Council, an affiliate of the World Council. The whole of this was a compromising position, but it was the best that could be had under the circumstances, and it was clear that a powerful thrust away from the World Council had been delivered by the addresses especially on the part of the American and the Dutch delegates (the latter not to be confused with the Dutch professoral advisers.)

This was the status of the issue at the time it was taken up at the Synod of The Hague. The present writer took occasion to refer to this subject in passing in his closing address at the time of his departure during the third week of Synod and referred to it as the only matter on which he found the stand of some of the leaders seriously disappointing. Finally, during the seventh week of its sessions, this matter came to full discussion. There was a large audience present and the session that evening did not close until the matter was finished at the hour of 11:15. Synod had no sympathy at all for a weak stand over against the World Council. Even a compromising motion to await the outcome of the decisions of the next Ecumenical Synod (not scheduled to meet until 1953 in Edinburgh) was defeated. The final vote which maintained the stand of the previous Synod, meaning no rapprochement to the World Council, was clear and decisive. Forty-five against four—with every vote recorded individually. On the matter of joining the N.A.E. or I.C.C.C. it was decided also by a large vote not to take action but to await the outcome of the study to be undertaken by the committee appointed by the Ecumenical Synod.

All of this means that the Reformed Churches of the Netherlands have taken a strong stand against the World Council and that the matter of the advisability of joining the N.A.E. or the I.C.C.C. will be a matter of study for the next few years. This means that, barring the younger mission churches of the Reformed Faith in Indonesia, all churches participating in the Reformed Ecumenical movement are now in substantial agreement. Further study of the subject can now go forward with a view to joining some organization like the N.A.E. or the I.C.C.C., or possibly, some united organization springing from the merger of the two.

In closing we would like to emphasize what was the gist of last month's editorial on the subject, that the first and primary emphasis for us as Reformed people must fall on the Reformed Ecumenical movement as coming to expression in the Reformed Ecumenical Synods. Moreover, that we cannot in consistency with the Word of God isolate ourselves from a wider ecumenicity with all who are orthodox, truly evangelical. And finally, that our stand over against the World Council with its inclusive membership and policies must be uncompromising.

As for the orthodox ecumenical movement, it is becoming increasingly clear how urgent it is for two such movements as the N.A.E. and the I.C.C.C. to get together.

C. B.
The Theological School
At Kampen

The growth and progress of a revived Calvinism will, humanly speaking, depend largely upon the growth and progress of the leadership in the Reformed and Presbyterian Churches that are true to the Faith. That means that the Colleges, Seminaries, and Theological Faculties occupy a key position. One of these loyal seminaries in the family of Reformed Churches is the Theological School at Kampen. This Seminary was the training school for the ministry of the Church of the Secession in Holland until the merger of the Secession Church of 1834 with the Church of the Doeleantie of 1886. (The latter is known outside of Holland to many as the Kuyper Church.) When this merger took place in 1892 the united Church known as de Gereformeerde Kerken in Nederland retained its Seminary at Kampen, though many of its future ministers were educated at the Free University of Amsterdam. The history of this dual system of theological education is deeply interwoven with the fortunes of the Gereformeerde Kerken of Holland. Convictions and prejudices and sensitivities having their roots in this dual system have been the source of much trouble, friction, and even schism. The recent Schilder-defection cannot be understood without this background.

Today the Kampen Seminary is emerging from the blow it has received through the schism of the Schilder group. Two deposed professors and many students in 1944 participated in the founding of another seminary at the same place. When we speak of the Kampen Seminary we refer to the historic institution still located in the same building in the Oudestraat where Bavinck and Honig taught Dogmatics and where so many of the earlier ministers were educated at the Free University of Amsterdam. The history of this dual system of theological education is deeply interwoven with the fortunes of the Gereformeerde Kerken of Holland. Convictions and prejudices and sensitivities having their roots in this dual system have been the source of much trouble, friction, and even schism. The recent Schilder-defection cannot be understood without this background.

The recent General Synod appointed two new professors. Dr. J. H. Kroeze was chosen in the place of Professor J. Ridderbos, who at the end of next school year will receive honorable emeritation by reason of age. The other appointment is one that has been watched with some interest. The situation was an unusual one. This concerned the chair of Dogmatics which at one time was occupied by Dr. Herman Bavinck (before his departure to the Free University in 1902) and after him by Dr. A. G. Honig. Successor to the last-named had been Dr. K. Schilder, the moving spirit in the recent lamented schism. Since his deposition in 1944 the chair of Dogmatics had no occupant. Dr. K. Dijck, the occupant of the chair of Practical Theology but a dogmatician in his own right, has since borne the double load of his own field and that of Dogmatics. He was hence the acting professor of Dogmatics from 1945 to 1949, but asked to be relieved of this extra burden. The Synod of The Hague has just appointed to this important chair the Rev. Dr. A. D. R. Polman, at present pastor at Alkmaar. Dr. Polman, who is 52, is an outstanding leader in the church, having been delegated to both the Ecumenical and the General Synod of this summer. He has written a number of works, the more scholarly of which is his doctor's dissertation on Predestination according to Augustine, Thomas, and Calvin and a commentary on the Nether land Confession, of which so far two volumes have appeared. Its title is: Onze Nederlandsche Geloofsbelijdenis. This last-named work gives evidence of great erudition and wide knowledge of the original sources of the Reformed Theology. We have learned to know Dr. Polman at the two recent synods as a man of conviction, of learning, and of great clarity of thought. He also takes a strong stand against the danger of diluting the Reformed Faith.

We extend our hearty congratulations to both Dr. Polman and the Kampen Seminary. We also rejoice in the fine relations existing between the theologians at Kampen and those at Amsterdam. Recently arrangements were made by which Dr. Wurth of Kampen goes to Amsterdam two hours a week to lecture on Ethics and Dr. Berkouwer in similar fashion comes to Kampen once a week to lecture on recent currents in theological thought. Dr. J. H. Bavinck has from the beginning taught Missions at both institutions.

Amsterdam, Kampen, Apeldoorn, Stellenbosch, Potchefstroom, Grand Rapids, Philadelphia, Edinburgh—may they all (and many more) be centers of living and powerful influence for the promotion and spread of the Reformed Faith! C. B.
The Star of Bethlehem

Henry Schultze
President Calvin College

It is not the writer's purpose to enter upon the problem of the character of the star that guided the wise men from the east to the Manger at Bethlehem. Suffice it to say that scientists, devout and otherwise, have failed to give an explanation on the basis of natural astral phenomena that does justice to all the facts presented in Scripture. The wise men who were brought up in an area and in an age when great advances were made in the science of astronomy were not likely to be fooled in this matter. They knew their stars sufficiently well to detect the difference, the supernatural-ness, of the sidereal appearance which guided them to the newborn King for the purpose of worship. The only trustworthy record of the appearance of this star is found in the Gospel of St. Matthew. There it is indubitably presented as a divine act of special revelation for the purpose of introducing the Christ to a Gentile world. It is as supernatural as the heavenly revelations that came to the people of God by the way of angelic announcements. Let it be a special revelation. Then the astronomers and astrologers will look in vain for conjunctions of heavenly bodies that will explain all the facts of the record as we have them in the first Gospel.

The Appropriateness of the Symbol

I am, however, interested in the appropriateness of the symbol for the occasion. Symbols are, of course, conveyors of ideas, of revelation, if you will. Indeed, the earliest forms of divine communication with man were, for obvious reasons, preferably in symbolic form. Even words are but symbols that can be read or heard. They are but vehicles of communication. And all symbols are selected with the intention of conveying ideas in such a way that the people for whom they are meant can best receive and retain them. In order to consider the appropriateness of symbols one needs to get at the connotations associated with them by the recipients.

All great movements, even those that are not religious in character, usually adopt a symbol to stress certain aspects, ideals, or characteristics of the group. The Buddhists have the lotus blossom and the wheel; the Hindus, the swastika; the Moslems, the crescent. Christians have the cross, and the Jews the star. Some of these reappear in history as national symbols, even in very recent times. Fraternities, unions, political parties and many others all have their symbols, which are supposed to be revelatory in character. Hence the use of symbols as a means of conveying useful and significant information appears to be as old as history and as wide as the world.

Certainly there were many in Old Testament times. The Bible student is familiar with the cloud by day and the light by night, the Shekinah, the Ark, and ever so many others. The star was a symbol long before the coming of Christ. It is said that there was the symbol of a six-pointed star placed on the Ark of the Covenant, and engraved on the shield of David. It formed the seal of Solomon. Even to this day it is found in Jewish synagogues and tombs throughout the world. It received significance in the Christian Church when it became associated with the Christian festival of Epiphany, held in commemoration of Christ's manifestation to the Gentile world. This feast is held twelve days after Christmas and is associated with the visit of the Magi.

Symbol of Deliverance

Turning to the Biblical association with the star, it is evident that the symbol is well chosen. First of all there is the concept of deliverance. That is unquestionably the meaning of Numbers 24:17: "There shall come a star out of Jacob and a sceptre shall rise out of Israel, and shall smite the corners of Moab and destroy all the children of Seth." The prophecy continues in that vein, indicating the complete destruction of the enemies of God's people. This concept of deliverance is associated with that of the slavery of Israel. They shall perish if a strong deliverer is not presently forthcoming. This is an appropriate connotation. The Star of Bethlehem is a Mighty Redeemer. That was acknowledged by the wise men. The joy of the Jews of Christ's time was rooted in the conviction that Jesus was to deliver them from the enemies of Israel. It was but a small matter—as in many other cases where a material or earthly event prefigured a spiritual one—to carry over the idea to the realm of spiritual slavery. Jesus was the star who was to strike asunder the bands of the sin-bound people. The idea of the Babe being the great Jewish king who would do wonders for the contemptible Jews was not entirely foreign to the wise men. That is evidenced by the fact that
these important visitors at the manger called Him the King and paid homage to Him as One who is to be worshipped. The recognition of a deliverer could not have been far from their minds. Zacharias, the father of the forerunner of the Christ, stressed this redeeming aspect of the Messiah when His tongue was loosed by the grace of God. In the post-New Testament period the early Christians and Jewish writers identified the Messiah with the star of the Messiah and persistently emphasized His redemptive aspect where He is called Savior. This is also the aspect of the Christ emphasized by the angel in his report to the shepherds (See Luke 2:11).

**Symbol of Royalty**

The star referred to by Joshua is not merely a redeemer, but he is also a mighty king. The association of the star with the sceptre prepares us for that sort of association. He is the recognized Sovereign. Indeed, that is the aspect of the child that appealed to the wise men. They called Him the King of the Jews. Herod feared him as a future King. He was, indeed, to be a great deliverer because He was a mighty king who could crush all opposition. In the Targum Onkelos, Numbers 24:17 is rendered: "Then a king shall arise out of Jacob and the Messiah shall be anointed out of Israel." In Pseudo-Jonathan it is rendered: "When the mighty king of Jacob's house shall reign and the Messiah the power-sceptre of Israel shall be anointed." It is of significance that these renderings of the star-passage in Numbers are in terms of kingship. This same emphasis may be discovered in the annunciations and the responses to them as recorded in the Gospel according to St. Luke. In these responses the qualities of leadership and sovereignty are effectively ascribed to The Star to which the star guided the wise men. In this connection let me take a brief excursion.

There are evidences in other history than that of the New Testament which reveal the idea of leadership as indicated by the symbol of a star. In the birthright of Alexander the Great, the Magi prophesied from a brilliant constellation that the destroyer of Asia was to be born. He was to be a great military leader. Even to this day the same general idea of leadership is associated with people whom we designate as stars.

**Symbol of Illumination**

There is still another thought associated with the idea of a star namely, that of illumination. Stars are the lights of darkness. When the two great luminaries close their eyes, as it were, the stars “take over.” What light there is, is starlight. There are New Testament references to periods of divine visitation in terms of the withdrawal of the light of the sun and the moon. Things seem at their worst when even the stars fall from heaven (Matt. 24, Rev. 6, 8, Ezek. 32). The period is calamitous because even the stars are fallen. It is utterly dark. This is the period when the stars should come out and shine. The world then needs illumination desperately. Jesus was the Light that lighteth every man that cometh into the world. That He was an illuminator is clearly indicated by such passages which refer to Him as the morning star. It arises in the dark and heralds a new day. Peter refers to Him as the “day star.” And his reference to Jesus as the day star indicates that here again the transference from the material to the spiritual meaning is readily made. Peter urged that his readers take heed unto the “more sure word of prophecy until the day dawn and the day star arise in your hearts.” The general idea that the world was exceedingly dark when Jesus came into it is well known to every Bible student. Men lived in the area of moral, spiritual, economic and political darkness. Christ is repeatedly referred to as The Light. He is a night-illuminator. That is the reason He can be referred to as the Star.

**Symbol of Guidance**

A corollary of the preceding idea is this, that He is a guide. The star of Bethlehem by which He was symbolized and which reflected Him, served in the first place as a guide. It directed the Magi to the source of all light, redemption and power. It guided them to the place of worship. Stars of the night from time immemorial have served as guides to the mariners and the weary traveler on an uncharted journey. Such a conception of Jesus as our guide through this dark world is a very familiar one to the Christian. Jesus commands that Christians follow Him. He directs His people to the throne of grace. He leads His sheep. He Himself is the greatest interpretation of Scripture. He, indeed, is its fulfillment.

The star that directed the Magi is of little moment except in so far as it symbolized the real Star. The early Christians were not far afield when they began to look upon Jesus as “the star of the Messiah,” as the real Star of Bethlehem. The great miracle was not the strange luminary in the sky, but rather the infinitely greater Luminary in the manger.

---

THE CALVIN FORUM * * * DECEMBER, 1949
Poet and Public

Henry Zylstra
Professor of English
Calvin College

So far as the people, the mass of the people, are concerned, contemporary poetry hardly exists. Even you, mon cher lecteur, if you are still with me after reading my title, will probably admit that you read no modern poetry and that you suppose you can neglect it without missing anything of importance. You have heard of the difficulty and of the daring of modern verse, and have about concluded that poetic sensibility as it manifests itself nowadays is either a singularly private or a dangerous thing. Though you cannot say that you have encountered the lines, you perhaps agree with William Butler Yeats:

The ceremony of innocence is drowned;
The best lack all conviction, while the worst
Are full of passionate intensity.

What you saw of contemporary poetry you did not understand, and having by resolution once or twice undertaken to puzzle out a page or two, you felt that the poet was not being very cooperative, and in the end you left him to his own devices.

If this be true, your attitude is that of the average American. My guess is that the average American—and I mean the average tutored American—can at best manage one short quotation from Millay and Frost and Sandburg, something, it may be, about a candle burning at both ends, a boy swinging on birches, and fog that comes on cat feet. But confront him with a list of modern poets, drawn up at random, like this one: William Butler Yeats, Siegfried Sassoon, Walter de la Mare, Leonie Adams, Elinor Wylie, Robert Lowell, Edith Sitwell, Robinson Jeffers, Marianne Moore, E. E. Cummings, Wallace Stevens, Dylan Thomas, Stephen Spender, Karl Shapiro, Peter Viereck, Michael Roberts, Muriel Ruykeyser, William Carlos Williams, Louis MacNeice, Richard Eberhart, and C. Day Lewis. Show him such a list, and ask him from how many of them he can visualize a single complete poem. My guess is that except to a limited group of poetry fanciers, people who collect poetry as others collect French dolls or Australian postage stamps, and except to a group of practising literary people—writers, professors, and English majors at college—those names are as meaningless as a similar list of active archaeologists or lieutenant colonels in the Army.

What am I saying? Merely this that in these days the poet and the public do not meet. The poet says that he cannot abide a mass culture or cater to it. He says that he cannot produce greatly or communicate significantly in a texture of language and dogma shaped by a strident commercial press, a noisy cliche-ridden radio, a popular taste formed by interested business and expressed by Hollywood and Video, and a sense of life compounded often of sentimentality bent to the uses of propaganda. To the poet, consequently, the success of popular education seems a myth, and his evidence for thinking so is the public indifference to poetry. To the public, poetry seems a game played by a malcontent elite for the amusement of its members. Snob, says the public to the poet; beast, says the poet to the public. And the two do not meet, at least not in that frame of mind.

* * *

The tokens of this breach between artist and society, between the poet and the people, are many. Sometimes the poet, in protest against a standardized culture, moves into what he thinks is a better climate of values. This may take the form of an expatriate movement, such as that which Henry James started and which gained momentum from the departure of Ezra Pound, T. S. Eliot, Richard Aldington, and so many others. In much the same way the romantics of an earlier era had been exiles too. Three of England’s best romantic poets died out of England, at least two of them, Byron and Shelley, because they could not tolerate the public mind, nor the public mind them. They assembled in knots on the continent, thrown upon each other for community, just as Wordsworth and Coleridge were in their Cotswold island of retreat, or the members of the Schlegel circle at Jena, or the transcendentalists at Brook Farm. Thus also, in the interbellum years, the poets sought out their kind, sometimes deliberately flaunting bourgeois mentality, establishing islands of sensibility in worlds of moralism, whether on the Parisian Left Bank or at Greenwich Village. Quite aware of what Wordsworth said of the poet, that he is a man “of more than usual sensibility,” they gave only lip-service to the rest of what Wordsworth said, namely, that “he is a man speaking to men.” They began speaking to each other. Little magazines flourished: Blast, Hound and Horn, The Egoist, Transition, and others. Thus the poet lost contact with life, cut himself off from communication, and talked to himself about
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himself in lines hardly ordered by an obfuscating technique. And even as the poet moved into an eccentric privacy of feeling and statement, the public lost the modifying influence of the poet's sensibility, and became better prey than ever to the forces making for a mass mentality.

An appalling symptom of this cultural schizophrenia was an event of the past summer. The poet, Ezra Pound, looking for a villain in the general disintegration, and driven half-mad by his problem, had in time of war taken to Radio Rome and blurted out phrases bristling with invective against what he construed as a Jew-dictated and dollar-fomented war. He praised Mussolini and Hitler, condemned America and Roosevelt, and at war's end was summoned home to stand trial for high treason. He was saved from sentence, it is supposed, only by an intervening declaration of insanity. A group of literary people, meanwhile, acting as a Committee of Fellows in American Letters for the Library of Congress, voted his *Pisan Cantos* (1948) "the highest achievement in American poetry in 1948." His bitter anti-democratic and anti-Semitic sentiments thus crowned with the laurel by an officially national institution, the public was aroused. A Congressional Committee took note and told Mr. Luther H. Evans, Librarian, to stop all awards. The Committee explained: "We think it's bad policy for the government . . . to be giving prizes and awards, particularly in matters of taste." This surely is a dramatic demonstration of the rift between poet and public, and, though the Committee must be diplomatic, the "matter" is one of dogma rather than of "taste."

Say that the rift between artist and society is more or less present in every time. Say that such a man as Milton, republican as he was in his sympathies, nevertheless addressed his *Paradise Lost* to an audience which was select but few. Point out that the metaphysical poets of the English seventeenth century, struggling also with the disintegration of old faith and traditional thought, wrote verse which was forbidding in its technique and limited in its appeal. Show that Wordsworth, whose *Lyrical Ballads* had met with no response in 1798, undertook in 1800 to explain his failure: "... a multitude of causes, unknown to former times, are now acting with a combined force to blunt the discriminating powers of the mind . . ." Maintain that Browning and Blake were not luminously self-evident to all who ran and read in their day. Conclude even that fine things are for fine sensibilities, that poetry is at bottom an aristocratic affair, and that when the call comes for the music of verse, the beast, Public, like Bottom in Shakespeare, is likely to demand the tongs and bones.

All this is true, of course, and in a way it is true also that the history of poetry is a sort of tacking and veering between poetry which by definition almost is popular and poetry which by definition almost is learned. The poet, if he be poet and not poetaster, if he be genius and not talent, is always superior in sight and insight to the average man. Shakespeare to his groundlings quite as much as T. S. Eliot to the modern many. But the point is that Shakespeare despite his individual superiority had infinitely more in common with all sorts and conditions of men, whether above or below him in the social hierarchy of his time, than Eliot has with the many of whom he says,

Here were decent godless people,
Their only monument the asphalt road
And a thousand lost golf balls.

Those "causes . . . blunting the discriminating powers of the mind," of which Wordsworth with prophetic inspiration spoke, have gone on apace, and the public's indifference to poetry now is greater and more widespread than it ever was before.

All the earmarks of the contemporary poetry, inevitably expressive though they are of communal disintegration, are well calculated to widen the breach. These are some of them: extreme subjectivity, pre-occupation with self, self-consciousness; erudition, sophistication, refinement upon refinement of sense and statement; technical experimentation and virtuosity; radical socio-political feeling accompanied, in the poets, by conversions to Marxism, Catholicism, Conservatism, Mysticism, Classicism, and the like; schools, coteries, and cliques; and general "difficulty." Such earmarks would seem to be enough to make the poets themselves responsible for their obscurity. But they are not alone responsible. As Pound once said, "When something is wrong with the arts, it is not wrong with the arts only." The best historians of recent verse, Elizabeth Drew and John L. Sweeney, in their *Directions in Modern Poetry* point to the real cause of the difficulty, the real cause also, I think, of the gap now separating poet and public: "The great nineteenth century writers were the last who appealed to all social grades, who could feel that they were addressing a homogeneous society which shared the cultural tradition of which they were themselves the embodiment, and to whom they could speak in the language of common human experience." The contemporary poet, in short, finds it hard to be eloquent in Babel.

Concerning the "difficulty" of contemporary verse, Eliot once remarked that it is the product "not of individual aberrancy but of social disintegration." The modern poet, unless he be an imposter taking advantage of chaos to dazzle and mystify, is difficult not because he wants to be, but because he must be. All the sincere writers, except those who in the end prove to be merely traditional
and to lack vitality, tend to confirm Eliot's judgment. Herbert Read, for instance, means every word of his remark: "It is almost impossible to be a poet in an industrial age." Robert Graves, struggling with the problem of adequate form in both poetry and prose, points to a similar cause: "... the age into which I was born, in spite of its lavishness of entertainment, has been intellectually and morally in perfect confusion." William Empson, too, who has lately published a volume, as Eliot had done before him, accompanied by the author's explanatory gloss, is another poet who is not cultivating unintelligibility simply to be unique. "All that I would like to be," he explains, "is human, having a share in a civilized, articulate, and well-adjusted community." And Wystan H. Auden, also among the more difficult of the moderns, confirms the analysis: "It is impossible that a writer can do his best except in a community united in sympathy, sense of worth, and aspiration."

* * *

This whole problem of the schism between poet and public is of course of no moment to those who, in Wordsworth's perceptive phrasing, talk of poetry "as a matter of amusement and idle pleasure; who will converse with us as gravely about a taste for poetry, as they express it, as if it were a thing as indifferent as a taste for rope-dancing, or Frontiniac or Sherry." But poetry is vastly more important than that. It has its uses also in that education of man which is his end. The songs of a people have a lot to do with its laws. Shelley was quite right in calling poets the unacknowledged legislators of the world. And Arnold insisted justly enough that, what with the retirement of religion and the advance of science as a substitute for philosophy, "we shall have to look more and more to poetry to interpret life for us."

It is ironic of course that precisely when the people need poetry worst it is least available to them. There is no denying that the retired religion, confused reason, and demoralized ethics of the contemporary culture make for a poetry which is either unimportant or important but popularly unintelligible. Plainly popular education must succeed where it has failed before. This breach between the poet and the people is the evidence of its failure. A democratic community must have a commonly disseminated sense of what its idea is, what its dogma, and what its tradition. When a community has such an idea and ideal, particularly when, as Yeats said, the ideal is held up by an authority, the poet and the people can meet again. The poet does not himself want to be that authority. He does not want directly to be the legislator. He does not want to be the reformer. It is, in fact, a part of the pity of the whole situation that in "unsettled ages" the poet is forced to put his poetry either to one side, or else to radical and unpoetic uses. But what the poet naturally and properly wants most to do is simply to deepen and extend the fundamental sense of life underlying a culture, and so to preserve it. Some of the poets are doing this in our time, but they are doing it with extreme difficulty, and they are not being understood. They need the support of religion, philosophy, and ethics. For, as Pound said, when something is wrong with the arts, it is not wrong with the arts only.

---

**But When In Time**

But when in time the season slips aside
To leave the woods dismantled and the fields to die,
And over all the searching winds can find
Only the sad, slow sweep of swallows across November sky,
Mourn not the end of silver music drop o'er worn gray rock,
Forget the flash of tanager, the shrill of flippant jay.
Another season soon will dawn when snow-flakes,
white winged, flock
Among these unfamiliar trees to end this empty day.

---

Grand Rapids      Marie J. Post
Christianity and the Race Problem

Ralph J. Danhof
Minister Neland Ave. Church
Grand Rapids, Michigan

I HAVE been asked repeatedly what my reactions are to the race problem in South Africa. Fully aware of the fact that we have spent only seven weeks in the Union it would appear rather presumptuous to state that we have the answer to the intricate race problem confronting the present government headed by Dr. D. F. Malan. Besides, we should also be aware of the fact that our own country has its own race problem, and the reply might be forthcoming “clean up your own back yard” before you attempt to tell others what to do with a problem similar in many respects, but in many other aspects much more difficult.

Attempted Solutions

The race problem in South Africa has a long history. It began soon after the Boers and the British arrived at the Cape. The migrating Kaffirs, Zulus, and Bantu tribes headed southward came into conflict with the whites travelling northward. The intermingling of the whites and blacks in the Cape territory already had resulted in a coloured race, better known as the bastard race, who today are found in great numbers in the Cape Province. That was the first penalty the white race had to pay for their sin. The abolition of slavery eventually led to the importation of Asiatics, “Indiërs,” who today exploit the less cultured natives and give rise to race riots. This is today the second penalty the white race must pay for the political error committed in the past. The third complication is what to do with the native, the so-called “Naturel,” who also were intruders and sought to lay claim to the territory they had invaded, coming into head-on collision with the migrating northward white race.

It is not difficult to understand that the white race from the very beginning of their history in the Union of South Africa assumed the attitude of a superior race, and followed the policy of consigning the blacks to segregated territories. The tremendous cultural difference between the white and black races was so self-evident. In addition there was also the element of hatred induced by the Kaffir wars. The whites had suffered loss of women, children, and cattle; and fear on the part of the white race for eventual native domination led the white minority to assume the role of the better and master race and to segregate the natives.

How to solve the race problem was considered from the very beginning. On the one hand there was a political group willing to pursue the program of providing eventual equal rights among the races in matters political, ecclesiastical, and social. On the other hand stood the firm resolution of others to drive all natives back to the hinterlands of central Africa. Then there was the compromise position for example of General Botha, who desired to maintain both races in the same territory, but to pursue the strict policy of segregation against the natives within definite territories. An example of this policy is found in Basutoland, an English protectorate. The history of South Africa is marked by a constant conflict between the British and the Boers on such matters as dominion status, development of industries, native rights and relationships, policies of segregation, etc. A complete documented history of these quarrels has just been published in the recent book of Dr. P. Van Biljon, Grens­bakens Tussen Blank En Swart in Suid-Afrika. The writer seeks to show that the policy of segregation was frequently hindered by the shifting and changing political maneuvers and conflicting purposes imposed by the British. At all events we can safely state that the documented evidence brought to light again by Dr. Biljon clearly indicates that the present policy of racial segregation and racial apartness and guardianship advocated by the Nationalist Party, headed by Dr. Malan, roots way back in history. The policy is not new. Rather the policy adopted long ago to effect apartness after a period of guardianship has been the aim of many Boers and even of many British for a long period. The original Constitution of Transvaal states, “There shall be no equality between black and white, either in church or state.” Striking it is, indeed, that both religion and politics assumed the same racial policy.

Two conflicting racial policies have existed side by side in the Union from earliest times. The positive policy, better known as the liberal view, is in favor of assimilation and equality and is strongly advocated by such men as Hoernlé, Smuts, Hofmeyr, Brookes, although it must be admitted that there are differences of opinion as to the degree of assimilation and equal rights. Over against this liberal view has stood for years the view crying for the adoption of strict apartness and guardianship and the eventual establishment of separate states outside of the territory of the white race. These
conflicting policies also have their own histories. The more liberal attitude cannot be separated from the European rationalism and naturalism and the philosophy of Rousseau which infiltrated into the Union and served as a mighty restraint to put into effect the original plan of complete territorial segregation.

The Policy of Segregation

The racial policies pursued today by the Malan government are virtually a return to an original plan adopted at the time of the early settlers, that whites and blacks should not live together in the same territories. Early history also knows that various agreements were drawn up between whites and the chiefs of the blacks in which both parties would respect each other's territories, and the charge is that the black races violated these agreements and provoked the Kaffir wars and their own ultimate subjugation. Racial policies adopted by the British during their domination of the Union territory had also much to do with the Great Trek of the Boers in 1836. The Boers were definitely opposed to eventual equality between whites and blacks. The Reformed churches have always stood for this position. (Cf. P. J. S. de Klerk, Kerk en Sending in Suid-Afrika, p. 167. Regverdige Rasse-Apartheid, chapters 1, 2.) The advocates of the apartness policy are convinced that the real salvation of the natives will only be accomplished thru apartness in the economic, the social, and the political realm. Dr. Biljon says that complete territorial segregation is the only remedy for the survival of both blacks and whites. In opposing the program of assimilation he maintains, "Those who advocate assimilation must bear the consequences and realize that indirectly they are the enemies of the natives" . . . "that two groups highly diverse in character and structure must have a home on the same land and come to separate development in order to retain that home." (pp. 463, 465). The clear conclusion is that the Nationalist Party today is actually putting to expression what for many years was prevented by the liberal program of racial policies. Cronje even says that the British element in the Union is more and more swinging in line with the program of Dr. Malan.

The policy of apartness and guardianship is deemed to be in full agreement with the teachings of the Bible. Dr. Nicol, a strong supporter of the Nationalist Party program, seeks to make clear that segregation of the natives into their own territories does not imply that the white race will wash their hands and leave the black race to his own desperate lot of poverty and cultural degradation. The idea is that the superior white race must assume the gracious role of guardian and lift the immature and still undeveloped and uncultured natives to a level of self-government, and that when this has been attained the role of the guardian ceases, but until such a time the ward must be willing to be subservient to the exercise of Christian guardianship. But, I cannot fail to note that Dr. Nicol strongly supports his policy of racial territorial segregation as the ultimate goal because of fear of ultimate reprisal on the part of the black races. Apartness and guardianship must be pursued with speed because of fear that the black races will soon overrun the whole of the Union territory and make life for the white race impossible. The white man's self-preservation is at stake, and to preserve the white race from extinction apartness and guardianship and complete territorial segregation must be carried out, for, says Nicol, otherwise there is surely coming a St. Bartholomew night. (Regvaardige Rasse-Apartheid, p. 38). Fear dominates the white race, at least for those who give thought to the race problem. The whites are frightened by the prospect of being engulfed by a black supremacy, and to still these fears the policies of social ostracism, segregated reserve, native locations, pass systems, low wages, poor housing, colour bars and restrictions to keep the natives from skilled labor, curfew laws, fewer educational facilities and recreational opportunities, small unproductive areas of land, have been inaugurated to keep the native in his place and conscious of the white man's supremacy.

That I do not exaggerate the condition of the black race permit me to quote a few words of the former prime minister, General Smuts. He said in 1921, "The whole basis of our particular system rests on inequality . . . we have never in our laws recognized any system of equality. It is the bed rock of our constitution." In 1933 Smuts said, "I cannot forget that civilization has been built up in this country by the white race, that we are the guardians of liberty, justice and all the elements of progress in South Africa. The franchise is the last argument, more powerful than the sword or rifle; and the day we give away this final protection we possess we shall have to consider very carefully what we are doing." In 1942 Smuts proposed to take a holiday from the old ideas which brought nothing but bitterness and strife to his country, and he proposed "to fashion a variegated but harmonious race pattern in South Africa." The price Smuts paid eventually was defeat at the polls.

Is Segregation Justifiable?

Dr. Cronje seeks to defend the policy of Apartness and Guardianship on the basis of racial differences between blacks and whites. He reasons that assimilation of two races decidedly different is impossible. Cronje asserts that the black man is
physically constituted to live in a hot climate, has wide nostrils, and the additional sweat glands are all indicative of a different human being. He is not quite certain of his ground as to the difference in intellectual abilities between whites and blacks, and remarks, "If this difference cannot be said to be a matter of intellectual inferiority, it at least means a distinct difference in intellectual type." The black man is too abstract in his intellectual capacities, too temperamental and too emotional. (Regvaardige Rasse-Apartheid, pp. 108-113) The summary of Cronje's reasoning is that it will be better to keep the two separate (p. 114). Cronje harbors great fear that western culture will totally corrupt the natives, and the upshot of it all is, that the Bantu must not cease culturally to remain Bantu. The Bantu must remain Bantu in order to maintain and to develop whatever is good in Bantu culture (p. 120).

It would, indeed, be very foolish of me to contend that the white race in the Union of South Africa today is not the superior race. But the present white superiority may not be construed in terms of some kind of a "super-race." Nazi Germans were obsessed with that idea. I grant that the present plight of the native is decidedly that of the inferior, and that of the white race that of a superior. But, must the race now in the inferior position forever remain satisfied with such a line of demarcation between the races? Is there a real basis in fact for the reasoning of a superiority of whites over blacks? If so, on what basic reasoning must it be maintained? If we accept, as every Christian must (and science also agrees with this Biblical truth), that all men were created by God out of one human pair and out of one blood, it must follow that one race is not inherently superior to other races.

Whether a man is black or white does not determine superiority or inferiority. Other factors must be considered. The race prejudices which exist today are not based on mere differences in color, nor on physical differences. We must rid ourselves of the prejudice that the black and other races who now hold inferior places among the nations are by their very nature incapable of taking their place on the same level with the white race. All attempts to even classify mankind into different racial groups prove unsuccessful. Color does not furnish a sufficient basis for any classification. In addition to the color of black, yellow, white, there are endless intermediary shades. Color of eyes, the twist or curl of hair, and shapes of heads do not determine anything that is really basic. Deniker recognized twenty-eight racial groups, but Franz Boas only two. Ales Hrdlicka, one of the great anthropologists of our times, recognizes three race groups, and among these three racial stocks he found a variety of greater or lesser subsidiary divisions. Yet, he is even ready to admit that there always remain peoples who simply do not fit into any of the three groups. Says he, "They are either intermediary between or an old blend of two or more stems or races." The latest scientific evidence regarding race as discovered by modern research simply dispels the notion that there is such a thing as a superior race and a group of inferior races merely on the basis of change in color of skin or certain physical differences. We have become so accustomed to assuming a certain priority which attaches to an individual with a white skin and we readily take on certain race prejudices which belong to the group of which we are a part. Many of these prejudices are based on definite evaluation which are ingrained in our own culture. Children rarely display race prejudices, and it is not until they reach the adult age that they adopt the prejudices of their own cultural group.

All Races of One Blood

Both science and the Bible are in agreement that the human race came from one blood and from one common stock. The question arises, how then account for the great differences and diversity among races of mankind? Much has been made of the diversity of color, religions, ethics, social and family customs, biological differences such as skin texture, shapes of heads, form of hair, cephalic index, etc. Since the confusion of tongues invoked by God after the attempt to build the tower of Babel man has become a wandering being. Cuber says, "Students of race history are now rather well agreed that races probably originated as a result of mutation, isolation, and inbreeding." (Sociology, p. 286) He adds, "... there is no satisfactory single criterion for the classification of races, because there are no pure races and because the races are so basically similar in the first place" (p. 286). The deductions that have been frequently made do not hold up in the light of modern scientific research. Cronje must also revise his views as to wide and narrow nostrils as though these matters would indicate that the black race for that reason must continue to dwell in a hot climate and the whites in a colder climate. The Arab with his narrow nostrils lives in the hottest place on the earth. The attempt to prove that the I.Q. of whites is far superior to the I.Q. of blacks is only true under present circumstances as they prevail in many parts of the world. I wonder what our white I.Q. would be under the circumstances under which the black man has had to live for centuries? Scientific tests show that "numerous tests of such equalized groups have been made and they have shown conclusively that there are no significant native intelligence differences between negroes and whites when both have approximately the same opportunities to learn the kind of material found in the test." (Cuber, p. 287)
In considering the differences in races we are dealing with two vital factors which must be kept distinct. We are physically what we are because our forebears were what they were—plus, of course, the unexplained mutation of the genus and changes in physical environment which work slowly through the years. But we also are what we are in every other respect in all our mental traits and in our manners and customs because of the social, cultural, religious, educational environment in which we have lived and which molds us into this or that social group. The native of Africa cannot change his color of skin, and in that sense his blood does tell what he is, but his blood does not have to determine his language, his religion, his ethical standards, or his love for his country. Differences in color do not necessarily determine the mental and moral qualities. A black man is just as capable of attaining a high I.Q. as a white man, and is equally capable of moral soundness as a white man. To make “race” mean differences in mental characteristics and moral qualities is an assumption which cannot be proved from facts, and must be relegated to the region of unsupported theories and assumptions. Modern science has defended the truth of Scripture that all races are of one blood. This means we are all blood brothers, but race prejudice can run very deep. Dr. Cronje wants me to believe that for mere biological reasons the marriage of a white and a black will lead to bodily disharmony and that such mixing of blood lends a predisposition to their offspring for certain lung ailments. (Op. cit., p. 86) Let us then listen to the testimony of biology on this score. The blood of negroes is constitutionally no different from that of a white man. The chemist cannot even tell whether the blood in his testing tube is that of a white, black, or yellow race. The types O, A, B, AB, are precisely the same in all individuals. Also in this serious matter the Bible agrees with science that God made all men of one blood. No verdict of superiority or inferiority can be based on color. Professor Boas says, “. . . it never has been proved that form of head, color, hair, and form of nose have any intimate association with mental activities. On the other hand the study of cultural forms shows that such differences are altogether irrelevant as compared with the powerful influence of the cultural environment in which the group lives. Anthropology provides no scientific basis for discrimination against any people on the grounds of racial inferiority, religious affiliation, or linguistic heritage.” (Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences, XIII, 25: “Race”).

Purity of any race is an undiluted myth. The move of Hitler to exterminate the Jews as an inferior race and to exalt the Aryan race could never be defended on the basis of Scripture or of science. There is no pure race today. All the known races today are the product of mingling of different peoples. Clyde Kluckholm says, “Virtually all human beings are mongrels.” Now such a statement does not seem to be very complimentary for the white race, but it is in agreement with the purpose God attained when He confused the tongues of men. The descendants of Shem and Japheth as well as the children of Ham are a diversified group of peoples, and racism based on superiority and inferiority of any ethnic group remains a mere assumption. Even the race of the Jew is not a pure race. The Scripture vindicates this very clearly. The purpose of the book of Ruth shows that king David had the blood of a Moabitess running in his veins. The blood of Rahab, the woman of Jericho, was also absorbed in the people of Israel. Even in the veins of our Lord, the Saviour, flowed a mixed blood.

The Biblical Argument

The Reformed Churches of South Africa are in full agreement with the policy of racial territorial segregation. Evidence for this position I gave in a former article. The policy of apartness and guardianship is considered the teaching of Scripture. A brief review of the arguments for this position appeared in a previous article. We must reckon with the progressive nature of divine revelation. If this were not the case it would be very simple to prove the legitimacy of polygamy and of slavery. During Civil War days preachers had little difficulty to find texts in Scripture to defend slavery, and the preachers of the north with equal acumen found their texts to disprove the rights of slavery. They did not always reckon with the progressive nature of divine revelation. I do not accuse Dr. Groenewald of this fallacy. However, it is argued by him that in the light of Acts 17:26 the unity of the whole human race is established, but he likewise contends that God has willed the diversity of races to be continued, and deems that Genesis 10, 11, and Deut. 32:8 are proof for this contention. He says, “This principle is important. Not only the origin of separate nations, but also the geographical territory for each is determined by God.” (Regvaardige Rasse-Apartheid, p. 46)

Dr. Groenewald claims that each and every nation must maintain its apartness and separateness, and to prove this assertion the dealings of God with the nation of Israel are advanced. National identity and national boundaries had to be maintained. Blood purity and national apartness were prerequisites for the well-being of Israel as a nation. Groenewald says, “A wholesome nationalism and national pride is always encouraged. Paul glories in being a Jew and rebukes those who desire to make themselves other than they are.” (p. 51) There must be no mixing of blood, and the social separation between races and people was maintained by Jesus. Believ
ers and unbelievers are not to be yoked together. It is averred that "also between Christians of various nations the national, social, and religious differences remain." (p. 55) The Gospel of Jesus is intended only to effect a higher spiritual unity. Eph. 4:4-6; Gal. 3:28. The spiritual unity does not destroy the natural differences among races. Says Groenewald, "When people of various nations become Christians, the natural differences are not cancelled, but the possibility is created, in spite of these differences, for them to have fellowship together on a higher plane, viz., that of the spirit. Humanity, like a body with a diversity of members, viz., the various nations, continues to exist in spite of the experience that all have become one in Christ." (p. 59) Groenewald admits that the more privileged and Christian nations must carry on vigorous mission work and bring a Christian culture to the less cultured and undeveloped nations. The guardian must serve the immature and assist the weak and so fulfill the law of Christ which is love to our fellowman. But he maintains, "A policy of apartness even when press­ed to the consistency of territorial segregation cannot be said to be in conflict with the principles as found in Scripture." (p. 65) Unity in Christ of a black and white believer means a higher spiritual unity, but it also means for Dr. Groenewald that the native Christians must remember that they are black of skin and must remain behind the territorial border­ers the white guardian has established for his wards. It will mean that if the apartness policy is carried out that the native Christian living in the Cape Province will be moved to a territory in which the native Christian had to submit to the subjugation determined by the white man. What can this be except white domination?

Is White Domination Justified?

Christianity does not condone domination of one race over another. Biologically all men have de­scented from one blood, and the redemption of Christ is precisely intended to break down the barriers which sin has created and to remove the sordid trail of color discrimination, economic enslavement, Jim Crow distinctions, wage discrimina­tions, poor housing, etc. Christ came as a world Saviour to seek lost souls out of every class of peo­ples, nations, and kindreds. It took a special vision to teach the apostle Peter that Gentiles were to be considered on a par with the Jews. Paul is called to be primarily an apostle to the Gentiles. In the Gospel all nations must share equally. Certainly these believers become one in Christ. But does not Christ design to remove the consequences of such sins as slavery and polygamy? The sins of men produced these inequalities, and the progressive charac­ter of divine revelation which reaches its clear heights in the New Testament indicates that Christ did not deem the value of man to be found in any racial origin, mongrel as it is, not in the intel­lect of man, not in any social position, but in the relation­ship a man sustains to the Gospel. All races are of equal value to Christ, and this should be plain from the mission command. It should also be clear from the events which transpired on Pentecost, when large numbers of all types of people are gathered into the Church. It should also be clear from the task Philip must undertake with the black man rid­ing in his chariot. It should be clear that the cleavage brought to pass through the confusion of tongues was not intended to remain a curse, but that the Gospel of Christ preached to all nations equally inten­ted to remove the curse of sin in every sphere of life. In the epistle of Philemon Paul returns a runaway slave to his master, but the letter clearly speaks of returning a brother in the faith to a brother of the same faith. On the basis of the ethics taught by Christ and the apostles no room was left for the practice of slavery. Moreover, in the light of Colossians 3:11 it is difficult to maintain that the barriers of color can be maintained in the Church visible.

My good South African friends would not think of admitting a converted black man to the same com­munion table with themselves, but I do not see how such a position can be maintained. I do not mean to hold that it may not prove to be advisable to organize separate native churches, but mere color of skin should not under any circumstances deprive a native Christian from exercising Christian fellow­ship and engage in Christian worship with his white brother in Christ. How can it ever be maintained that people who share the higher spiritual unity in Christ should also not share in equal rights before the laws of a State, and also share in economic life in equal measure, in cultural, educational and social privileges? This does not mean advocating inter­mingling of blood, miscegenation. The social ostrac­ism which miscegenation provokes as well as the educational, social, and cultural differences, may prove a sufficient safeguard.

All nations are of one blood, and through the Gospel all races again attain to a unity in the Spir­it. The grace of God does not change the color of a man’s skin, but it does intend to remove the racial prejudice and other discriminations rooted in the Fall of man. The converted black man is just as much a part of the body of Christ and the Kingdom of God as the white race, and the meaning of re­demption is precisely that every man, regardless of color, is supremely worthwhile to God. Every man in the sight of God is of equal worth. Blood, pow­er, intellect, culture, and civilization are in them­selves finite and particulars which are oft select­ed to indicate superior worth. The value of the in­dividual lies in his relatedness to God. All other
valuations are based on human judgment. Sin undoubtedly has brought certain racial priorities and privileges to one race at the expense of another race, but Christianity in its ethical practice cannot condone human barriers induced by sin. Racial characteristics and physical origin do not determine the spiritual family of God.

The idea of apartness and guardianship must lead to an emphasis of lordship and domination on the part of the white guardian. Human nature being what it is will not be willing to relinquish an age-long domination of the black ward. There is danger that the tenure of guardianship will never cease. Apartness and guardianship seem tenable in theory, but it appears to me that centuries would have to roll by before the white race would agree that the ward had reached maturity and capability of self-government. We must remember the native of South Africa does not at present possess the intellectual ability of the Indian who after many years of British domination finally succeeded in attaining rights of self-government. Will the white race be ready in South Africa to give up his land necessary for territorial apartness? Will he be ready to labour without the cheap help provided for centuries by the natives in the diamond and gold mines, on his farms, and industries? Does the white race by its program of apartness actually expect to provide an area occupied by natives who are self-supporting, self-governing with total exclusion from interference by the whites?

If I were one of the natives living in South Africa I would prefer total separation from the whites in view of the past history. Assimilation with the whites will not free me from white domination and white discrimination. I can easily understand that many natives today are in favor of apartness because it appears the lesser of two evils. Will the white race be willing to give the black race all the educational, cultural, economic, religious, legal, commercial rights on a patch of the earth which the black man can call his own? That is precisely what apartness and guardianship imply. I can understand that the natives will say, let me see the white race in the Union of South Africa rise to the occasion and prove the truth of his promises. Will the Nationalist Party actually be able to persuade the white race to undertake this gigantic program? Will it mean the rise of two new nations, the Coloured (Mulatto) and the Bantus?

[This is the third and final article in the series on the race problem in the Union of South Africa.—Editor]

From Our Correspondents

CALVINISTIC ACTION COMMITTEE

THE Calvinistic Action Committee (C.A.C.) takes very seriously the modern burden of ecumenicity. It watches very closely contemporaneous developments as, for example, the Reformed Ecumenical Synod. At the same time it has an area all its own which may even overlap occasionally with that of the church.

The C.A.C. is interested in more than conferences. Conferences are an opening wedge into the life of the Calvinistic world. Other activities must be undertaken. It is very obvious that we may not lock our doors while the great ongoing stream of ecumenical life is passing by. Opportunity knockes but once.

There are great ecumenical possibilities that require a thorough and sympathetic discussion. Do we need an international Calvinistic Action Committee upon which we find representatives of all devoted Calvinistic groups? Will members of such a committee keep each other informed as to activities, publications, problems for mutual deliberation and action? Will such information reach both the professor leisurely lecturing over his lecturn and the sincere man at his tool bench who refuses to consider his task only to be that of wage earner? Will such an International encourage leaders to fight for the right and the helpless? In our limited correspondence we believe we sense a great sympathy for "something like that." The trouble is that all this work is voluntary, carried on by men who are up to the hilt in regular duties. It must go on at all costs!

Activities of the Committee on Literature

The C.A.C. is undertaking a project referred to in an editorial sometime ago. When this is further underway it will be plenty of time to tell the public.

What we are interested in particularly now is the project of the dissemination of Calvinistic literature throughout the world. Remember in all that is written in this article the fact that we are just scratching the surface and that we have made only a very small beginning. We harbor no pretenses. At the same time we believe this is also a fact that there never has existed a society for the distribution of Calvinistic literature for the avowed purpose of ecumenicity. We wish to take the Bible seriously: "speaking the truth in love", only since the distances are so great we must resort to printing. In fundamentals we are reaching out for ecumenical convictions which will undergird us and serve as a witness in Christ's name to the world and even to other ecumenical movements.

God used His own occasion to arouse this ideal. Post-war poverty made it mandatory on our part to assist our brethren elsewhere. Even though people themselves could afford to buy books, governmental prohibitions of sending moneys across borders made such impossible. Necessity was the mother of our ecumenical ideal.

In this connection the committee wishes to thank a few families of ministers of the Reformed Church who have donated splendid books, in one case a whole library, to this cause as splendid books, in one case a whole library, to this cause as governmental prohibitions of sending moneys across borders made such impossible. Necessity was the mother of our ecumenical ideal.

In this connection the committee wishes to thank a few families of ministers of the Reformed Church who have donated splendid books, in one case a whole library, to this cause as well as one of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church, who likewise has made generous contributions of his own writings. Some of these used books had no specific value for students in other countries and were converted into cash. From this money new books were purchased, written by Calvinists. These were sent throughout the world.

No doubt it is of interest to the public to know that we have about fifteen centers in the world: Japan, Korea, Ceylon, Australia, France, Germany, and Hungary. We are sure Potchefstroom University, South Africa, would be pleased to be in-
cluded, since its splendid library was totally destroyed by fire recently.

Responses from several places indicate great appreciation for this aspect of ecumenicity. It is commonly felt that truth is ecumenical and that it requires cooperation to ascertain it in the shifting challenges of life.

Requirements

Each package that has been sent contained a form letter holding the recipient morally responsible to do either of two things. In the case of a library then the librarian must display the book, and professors in a given subject must include it in their reference. If a classis, presbytery, or society, a responsible person must circulate the book in that group. This we know is being done. If we did not send certain groups books there would be no chance for certain pastors, as in Germany and Hungary, to read anything new. It would be regrettable that in this swift age of ours our Reformed brethren should "vegetate" only upon the past or rechew the cud of memory.

New Angles

In life's own mysterious way, shall we say in God's own way, each activity is self-enlarging. We are positive that this is true of Calvinistic Activity seriously prosecuted. There are three seed-thoughts we wish to give as examples.

We have renewed our contacts with the Calvinistic Society of France, sponsored by the late Dr. A. Lecerf. We have sent them a few books and pamphlets. Already the Rev. Mr. Marcel is sending us as a courtesy three books: one the papers of the late Dr. Lecerf, and two of his own writings. The point is Calvinism believes in exchange, or in ecclesiastical language, mutual supervision. It flourishes best where there are divided highways of sending and receiving. One way roads lead to stagnation.

The second thought that is obvious is that these books should be placed in a library accessible to all who wish to study Calvinism. This is a hard matter for the writer to say since he is an alumnus of Calvin, but he sincerely believes (and the other member of the literature committee graciously concurs) that Calvin College and Seminary Library should house and display all the outstanding Calvinistic literature of today. There should be one "Mecca" of Calvinistic learning accessible to the pilgrim. Will not this also work in the direction of a Calvinistic University? Surely university and ecumenicity will make splendid bedfellows.

The third thought is the possibility of an annual contribution by national Calvinistic Societies which will then entitle each contributor to any outstanding Calvinistic publication in a given nation. This has been suggested by one of South Africa and merits consideration.

At any rate we want to have these balloons sent up by means of THE CALVIN FORUM throughout the world and await the reactions of all interested.

The writer also appreciates the splendid cooperation of his fellow-member of this sub-committee, Dr. M. Eugene Osterhavon of Hope College. He also serves as treasurer and custodian of books received.

Holland, Mich.

Jacob T. Hoogstra

NATIONAL UNION OF CHRISTIAN SCHOOLS

November 12, 1949

Dr. Clarence Bouma, Editor:

THE CALVIN FORUM

Grand Rapids, Mich.

The twenty-ninth Annual Christian School Convention was held in Denver, Colorado, on August 16, 17, and 18. It had been advertised as the greatest Christian school event of the year, and it proved to be just that. Delegates and visitors came to Denver from all sections of the country. They taxed the housing facilities of the hospitable Denver people beyond the limit. Some of the delegates had to stay at hotels and tourist cabins.

The committee on registration reported that approximately two hundred delegates and visitors had registered. Only a small minority of the Christian school boards failed to send representatives.

Details of the convention proceedings need not be given here. A complete report, very well written by Miss Diane Swierenga, appeared in the November Christian Home and School. A few of the items may be repeated since they are of special interest to the readers of THE CALVIN FORUM.

A panel discussion on federal aid to education proved to be enlightening. The discussion was limited to the question, Should our Christian schools accept federal aid if it is offered? Neither the members of the panel nor the delegates were ready to recommend Christian school participation. The opinion was that certain related problems have to be studied carefully before a final decision on this matter can be reached. Two of the problems specifically mentioned were the trend toward federal control and the separation of Church and State.

The house of Delegates once again voted to stand by a former decision, that the National Union of Christian Schools stands committed to the Reformed world and life view. This decision may sound strange to some readers. It may be looked upon as a vote of confidence in the Board, since the Board has been steering in the direction of a distinctive type of Christian education. The decision was occasioned by a question which is raised quite frequently, Isn't a broad creedal basis sufficient for the Christian school movement? There are many who argue that it is.

When one begins to think of the philosophy of man in his relation to God that must serve as the basis for Christian education, however, he begins to appreciate the difficulties. In the final analysis we must choose between two philosophies for our children even in the sphere of Christian education. Are our children to be educated by and exposed to a philosophy that assigns first place to God in all spheres and areas of life or a philosophy that builds for man some kind of throne, high or low though that throne may be. The National Union of Christian Schools stands committed to the first of these alternatives.

Lost the readers conclude that this decision was the work of a comparatively small number of Christian school supporters, we call attention to the widespread support which the program of the National Union of Christian Schools has been receiving. A year ago it was decided to create an Educational Foundation. The purpose of this Foundation is to give financial support to the educational program proposed by the National Union Board. A very important part of that program is the publishing of Christian textbooks. An appeal was made for the sum of $100,000. The response was generous. More than $124,000 was contributed by over 22,000 donors.

This kind of support encourages the Board of the National Union to expand its program. Just recently Rev. Edward Hoerema joined the staff to serve as public relations secretary. His special qualifications for the work as well as his training will, with God's blessing, do the cause of Christian education much good. He stands ready to help those groups that are interested in promoting this cause.

The Christian school enrollment figures for this Fall have been tabulated. Eight new Christian schools were opened bringing the total to 133. The enrollment in these schools increased from 22,570 in September, 1948, to 23,970 in September, 1949. This represents an increase of more than six percent. Eighty-eight of the schools reported increased enrollments.

Yes, the Christian school movement is gaining steadily. Have we reached the enrollment peak? Personally, I don't think so. We will have to go. Education that is not of first importance either. Of greater importance is our ability to make an impact upon the world in which we are living. That is the challenge that faces us.

Cordially yours,

John A. Van Bruggen
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INTERNATIONAL FELLOWSHIP OF EVANGELICAL STUDENTS

The first International Student Summer School, conducted under the auspices of the IFES, was held at Ballaigues, Vaud, Switzerland, August 8 to September 4. Students from Holland, Belgium, France, Switzerland, Germany, Denmark, Australia, Great Britain and the United States, some of whom were doing for the most part in French and German. Speakers and leaders included M. G. Radne, M. J. M. Nicole and M. Raymonde Brunel of France; Herr Eric Bauer of Germany; Dr. René Pache and Mr. and Mrs. Hans Burki of Switzerland; Dr. Minor Stairs of Belgium; Mr. Frederick Crittenden, Miss Margaret Footo, Miss Jean Stoneleigh, Miss Eva McCarthy and Dr. H. Martin of Great Britain; Miss Anne Béguin and Mr. and Mrs. C. Stacey Woods of the United States. Although this conference was conducted for Christian students several attended who felt that they had never personally committed themselves to Jesus Christ and did so in the course of the four weeks. It is too soon to assess correctly the value of these weeks of training. It is proposed, however, in the summer of 1950 in conjunction with evangelical camps of National Evangelical Unions both in France and in Germany, that for the French and German-speaking Europeans respectively there be conducted similar summer schools under European leadership. Leaders and speakers as well as students at Ballaigues expressed the hope that this type of Bible-centered summer school for three or four weeks in length may prove to be a solution to the problem of the need for Biblical student leadership in Europe of an uncompromising character which could result in the development of more effective student witness on that continent.

Visit to Europe

Mr. C. Stacey Woods sailed for Europe April 11, returning to the United States on September 17. He joined Dr. Douglas Johnson, general secretary of the British Inter-Varsity, in Great Britain and together they attended the IFES Executive Committee meeting in Norway. From there they visited the Sveriges Evangeliska Student-och Gymnasistorelse in Upsala, Stockholm and Lund. They also spent a few days in Denmark. Upon Dr. Johnson's return to Great Britain, Mr. Woods spent three weeks in Germany. He visited the Universities of Munich, Stuttgart, Darmstadt, Mainz, Marburg, Münster, Göttingen, Hamburg, Erlangen, Heidelberg and Tübingen, as well as a number of other centers. Part of the time Mr. Hans Burki was with Mr. Woods and throughout the itinerary he was accompanied by Herr Ernst Schrupp and Herr Gerd Rumler of the Student Mission. Many of the meetings held were under the auspices of the Student Gemeinde. This visit afforded a clearer understanding of the student situation from a Christian viewpoint in Germany and was helpful in arranging for the German delegation to the IFES summer school at Ballaigues. Mr. Woods reported that he believed that in Germany there was need for student initiative and leadership and for general concentration upon the large majority of German students who, apart from nominal church membership are out of vital touch with the true Christian community. The months of June, July and August were spent in France and Switzerland at the camps of the G. B. U. de France and the IFES summer school at Ballaigues.

Holland

Mr. Jan Dengerink reports that the Calvinistische Studentenbeweging will hold a European Student Congress August 18-26, 1950. Speakers will come from Great Britain, Norway, Germany, France, Holland, and the United States. National Evangelical Unions are invited to correspond with Mr. Dengerink regarding details of the conference and official delegates. His address: Mr. Jan Dengerink, Calvinistische Studenten-Bewe­

Finland

In requesting prayer for the Student Christian Federation of Finland, Mrs. Karin Lujanen, foreign secretary, writes, "At the beginning of July there was held the Scandinavian Leaders' Conference and the Student Conference of Finland. We had the great joy of having Prof. O. Hallesby again in our midst as well as some other leading personalities of the Scandinavian evangelical movements. We thank God for their strong message and rejoice for the blessing we received. About 200 students came from Denmark, the Faeroes Islands, Iceland, Norway and Sweden. The Student Christian Federation of Finland consists of seven unions of which the largest are in Helsinki, the capital of the country, where the State University of Finland, the technical high school and other high schools are located. In addition, we have unions in Turku (Abo) and one in Jyväskylä. The president of the Student Christian Federation of Finland is Dr. Theol. Osmo Tillila, Professor of Dogmatics and Dean of the Theological Faculty at the University of Helsinki. Our vice-president, Dr. Theol. Martti Simojoki, is also a teacher at the same university."

Japan

During the summer months organizations of the Inter-Varsity Christian Fellowship of Japan progressed to the formation of a committee composed of the following members: Miss Irene Webster-Smith, the Rev. Roy Hasegawa, Miss Yokoi and Mr. John S. Schwab, treasurer. Excerpts from reports of Mr. Hasegawa and Mr. Schwab follow: "No doubt you have heard about the IVCF summer conference we had July 13-20 for seven full days at Oppama. The Lord richly blessed us during that time. This year we limited the conference to Christian college students for we planned to use the whole time teaching and training these students for leadership in campus evangelism. There were about forty students from different colleges and universities. We began the day with our individual Quiet Time from 5:30 to 6:30 a.m., and then until 7:15 we had prayer together. The morning was divided into three study periods—a survey of the New Testament, a study of the Book of Romans and Campus Evangelism. The afternoon was left free for recreation. After supper, there was a Student Forum Hour when the students brought up many problems which troubled them concerning their personal faith and campus evangelism. This was followed by an evening service on the Holy Spirit as related to Christian living. "During the forum many questions came up which would not concern students of any other country, for the situation in this country is so different. There were many questions about idolatry, Communism, atheism, higher criticism, etc. In many cases the student happened to be the only Christian in a Buddhist or Shinto family, so the question often arose i.e. whether he could be the best kind of a testimony under such circumstances. One girl, who was converted in January, said she was the daughter of a Buddhist priest. Although her father did not oppose her becoming a Christian, she had to continue living in the temple and doing things which a Christian observer might think were idolatry. Since she was such a young Christian, it was still hard for her to know just where to draw the line. The one period a day for this Forum was not enough to cover all the questions so toward the end of the week we sacrificed recreation time for two extra sessions.

"We wanted to make sure that these students got such important issues straightened out before they left the conference. All of the students were unanimous in declaring that this year's conference was just the thing they needed to become strengthened in their faith and receive necessary preparation for the work of the fall. "During the last three days of the conference, the Spirit of God in a wonderful way burned the message of unconditional surrender into the students. The last night we had a campfire meeting. For two and a half hours without interruption,
students testified of great blessings and over half told of having made unconditional surrender to Christ. One student confessed he had been lying about receiving money for books and had used it for cigarettes. One student told of having been a ‘secret’ Christian for a while, but of the resolve to begin to testify openly.

“The leaders of the conference were Miss Irene Webster-Smith, Dr. W. A. McIlwain, the Rev. David Tautada, the Rev. Watanabe, the Rev. and Mrs. Roy Hasegawa and Mr. John S. Schwab.”

Mr. Hasegawa also writes of another conference, “my wife and I were asked to help at a young people’s conference down south in August. There were many students in this group also. I had the joy of leading several fine students to Christ during that week. Among them was the son of a prominent Buddhist priest in that area. Strange as it may seem, this young man told me that his father encouraged him to go to church because Christianity seemed to have more to offer to the youth of Japan than Buddhism. On my last day there, one university student I had led to the Lord came bringing a friend. I was surprised to learn that his friend had never heard the Gospel or read the Bible before. I spent three hours with him opening the Scriptures. He was truly hungry spiritually, for he gladly drank in everything said. In the end, after I had prayed, he began to pray without any urging and right there accepted Christ as his Savior.”

Mr. Schwab concludes his letter with word regarding future plans for the Japanese work. “The work among university students is expanding greatly now. The room in one of the main buildings in the heart of the student district is crowded out every Saturday night. Many of the auditoriums here were destroyed during the war and very few have been rebuilt. A large auditorium, office, library and living quarters are urgently needed for the fall months. Plans are being laid to hold mass meetings in the universities with the help of 16 mm Sound Gospel Films and to tie in the contacts and interested inquirers into a Bible class immediately with a missionary. “Prevail with us for these needs and for additional Japanese staff members and Spirit-filled Japanese interpreters to help.”

**China IVF Continues**

Mr. Calvin Chao has written fully of present conditions in China for our prayerful consideration.

“China at the present time is a land of changes: conditions, politics and lives. For the latter we are truly thankful, for to this end we do our work.

“Conferences held in Nanking, Shanghai, Kowloon, Hongkong and Canton were times of great blessing. Especially were they a means of blessing in Shanghai. While not a few of those attending had become weak in their faith because of the new stimuli at large in the city and because of materialistic teaching, it was reported that many of those attending the conference left with a new determination to stand fast. The training classes and subsequent Daily Vacation Bible classes which were held were a great blessing both to the children and students alike.

“As you can see, the work is still going on in Communist territories, but in spite of the promise of religious freedom, the freedom is very limited.

“No evangelistic meetings can be held on the university campuses, and the missionary staff are limited in their efforts toward this work as far as the actual campus is concerned. Personal work is being carried on with greater effort than before, also Bible classes. We are trying to build up the young people’s work in the churches so that we can reach the students in this way, as many young people go to church in Shanghai. So far we are happy to report that there has been no persecution with violence.

“Our workers find it very difficult to travel from one place to another, so they have to remain at their stations. In some places the Communists have forced preachers to take up some manual labor as well as preaching as they do not look upon preaching as a work, but so far this has not been enforced in the cities.

“The cost of living, particularly in Shanghai, is very high. Rice is sold at fifteen cents or more a pound American money. Our workers have only received a third of their salaries. One thing that we are very thankful for is that remittances are still able to be sent inland, even to occupied areas. We are happy to report that our Chinese workers are all prepared to stay at their posts, so also are most of the foreign staff.

“Students in Free China are just as receptive to the Gospel as before, so we are making the most of our opportunities and redeeming the time while we are able by organizing short term Bible schools to train Christian laymen. The one in Kowloon is the first one of its kind, and is now into the eighth lesson and has so far been most successful. Each lesson brings an increase in the number of students. It seems that the original 120 students do their own advertising, so we always see new faces. There is a mixture of old and young. Both men and women attend the classes, and so far there has been a steady attendance of 96 per cent.

“As a result of the Bible school we hope to send some of the young people back into China to preach the Gospel, not by having big meetings and drawing crowds, but by winning them one by one and so build up a work by a sure and steady way.

“We are hoping very much to publish literature so that, even when mouths are stopped from preaching the Gospel, the students and people in general will have something from which their souls will be fed and built up and established. As there is no ready literature in China we would have to translate some of the good books or write some for ourselves. This is the reason why we chose Hongkong as our base, so that we might be able to reach into all Chinese territory and also keep in touch with our friends around the world. Here we are able to get all the printing done to put our plan into action.” Mr. David Adeney also urges prayer that many students in China may be given the wisdom and purpose of heart of Daniel in these days.
VER since the great Reformation of the 16th century, which, barring the launching of the New Testament church, is doubtless the most significant and far-reaching event in all history, there has been no lack of able defenders and apologists for both the Roman Catholic and the Protestant position, each aiming to justify their viewpoint, approach, and eventual elaboration and application thereof. Protestantism is toto, regardless of the great variety of accent and historic manifestation: creedal denominations, sectarian, independent churches, is for Catholicism damnable heresy, guilty apostasy, revolt against the only God-ordained and ultimate authority here on earth: the Roman Catholic church, and consequently that church does not hesitate to continue to hurl its anathemas against all those embracing the Protestant faith. We are living in a period of earnest longing for and of exceptional activity in the direction of ecumenicity. Witness the preparation, conferences, and discussions by those who claimed to be and who were recognized by Protestants generally, to be its leaders and spokesmen, that culminated in the organization of the World Council of Churches at Amsterdam last summer! To formulate a platform inclusive enough to embrace the great variety of churches it aimed to represent and for which it is to speak, was a matter of nervous anxiety. At best they could only arrive at generalities which allow for wide divergence of interpretation. Specific, clear-cut, unambiguous language had to be avoided for that would prove to be divisive. It is very clear that the concern was more for oneness, ecumenicity than for adherence to biblical truth which can be the one and only basis for ecumenicity. Palpable proof for this fact is evidenced by the invitation sent to the Roman Catholic church to participate and a seat left open for that church. One may claim that this is a charitable attitude, and that with God all things are possible; yet anyone with the slightest acquaintance with Roman Catholicism, her doctrines and practices, her aims and ambitions, her pretensions and claims, must admit that a return to historic biblical Christianity puts too much of a strain on even extraordinary credulity to make sense. For our quarrel with Roman Catholicism is another religion. While there is a considerable distance travelled between Trente and the present day, this must not be exaggerated nor employed with the design to convince men that Catholicism has shifted ground, for her claims, pretensions and presumptions have remained unaltered. There has indeed been development since Trente, certain doctrines have been defined: witness the crystallization and promulgation of the dogma of the immaculate conception of Mary in 1854 and that of papal infallibility in 1870, and not to assume the role of a prophet, but the rather great probability of another doctrine shortly to be announced, possibly in the Jubilee year of 1950, viz., the Assumption of Mary. In spite of this development, the Roman Catholic church claims that there has been no change, no innovation in these matters, for it only represents a proclamation, a mere precise formulation of what has always been believed, and their apologists do not find too much difficulty in substantiating new doctrines from the rather copious store of traditions, which for the Catholics stands on a par with the Bible.

This book of Dr. Berkouwer is especially timely since there is today extraordinary activity among Roman Catholics to propagandize their faith and to make converts for their religion. Indeed they are on the march today! In a day of great superficiality and wondrous ignorance as to fundamental protestant principles, if you will, ignorance of the very genius of genuine evangelical Christianity, the gospel of free, sovereign grace, among the rank and file of those who are nominally distinguished as Protestants, it is especially in such a day that many converts are made to Catholicism. The spirit of relativism, of indifference, of what is supposed to be the spirit of charitable tolerance to all religious people, whatever their beliefs may be, is the most dangerous foe to true evangelical Christianity, and it affords on the other hand golden opportunities for a determined, close-knit system of Catholicism to reap a harvest. Add to this the doctrine inherent in the whole system of Catholicism, that man by virtue of infused grace, imparted by the vehicle of the sacraments, is enabled to merit salvation, and we can understand why men will turn to Catholicism. Protestantism, Evangelical Christianity, proclaims the sola fide, sola gratia gospel, and this shatters man's pride; it rests man's whole case on Christ; it tells a man to seek for his life not in himself but solely and wholly in Christ. This removes the last prop of autosoterism. The words of a great saint are so true and so exact: the name of Christ shuts out all human merit.

Dr. Berkouwer has given us a very scholarly and solid study of some of the aspects of the continued debate between Roman Catholics and Protestants. It does not claim to be exhaustive. This would involve volumes. Rather the author has given us a penetrating study of those elements of Roman Catholic teaching which are currently in focus, are now receiving accent and emphasis. Not only is this work a thorough orientation of the matters central in the debate at this time, but the book simply abounds with scholarly observations and insights, judged in the light of the apology of the Reformers of the 16th century, the creedal standards of the Reformed churches, and all of this together in the searchlight of the final and ultimate criterion of judgment: the infallible Word of God. This production is the work of a keen scholar, and it is a work for students and such who have enjoyed some scholarly training. The style is rather heavy; the book is well-documented; German citations abound. It is a storehouse of information and the argument is compelling and vital. In each instance Dr. Berkouwer has probed to the central core, the very heart of the issue and then in the light of the Word has unmasked the presumptuous claim and doctrine of Catholicism and answered their criticism of Protestant conviction.

It is the author's claim that there is a fundamental, a radical difference between Roman Catholicism and Protestantism which renders an atomistic analysis of certain fragments inadequate as an answer and as defense. Only by probing the matter to its depths and seeing its relation to the total structure can one arrive at a synthetic analysis of the problems and questions concerned, and only such labor will convince that Catholicism is another religion. The uninitiated will doubtless counter with a remark like this: but do not the Catholics with us, and vice versa, we with them, recite the Apostles' Creed; do we not together subscribe to the Chalcedonian Symbol, do we not both confess that the Word became Incarnate at Bethlehem, that He suffered, bled and died for our sins, and the like? Indeed, we do just this and yet that cannot be an adequate protest, words, placed in the context of either Catholicism or Protestantism, yields an entirely different conception and view, so that while apparently we are saying the same thing, we are actually saying something much at variance. The abyss that
separates us is unbridgeable, save on one condition: that Ro­
man Catholicism undergoes a complete reversal, an entire revo­
lution of her fundamental positions. Of this there is not the
slightest indication at this time.

Dr. Berkouwer gives scholarly treatment in eight brilliant
chapters of the following themes: Unmovable Authority; The
Guilt of the Church; The Controversy Concerning Grace; The
Controversy Concerning the Assurance of Salvation; Ave
Maria; Communion of the Saints; Incarnation and Catholicism;
Confusion and Prospect. Each chapter is a volume by itself,
giving evidence of thorough, solid, scientific treatment; of
clear, penetrative insight into the real problems concerned.
In order that the book might remain within reasonable bounds as
to length, the author has condensed the argument, so that the
product is a rare example of pithy, highly concentrated, meaty
material. Each chapter might easily be expanded to a sizeable
volume; it could well serve as a textbook for advanced stu­
dents. It is utterly impossible to give an adequate treatment
of this solid work within the bounds of a book review. Each
chapter is worthy of a review in such thoroughness and length
as that given to most books.

The more profound apologists of both camps have ever sought
to reduce the fundamental difference between Catholicism and
Protestantism to a single, all-determining truth, and then to
view the whole structure of either view from that one point of
departure. The present reviewer believes that a good case can
be made for more than one such fundamental truth, a position
which for one will be unquestioned truth, while for the other
the source of all error. So, for instance, the Protestant might
build his apology against Roman Catholicism from the point
of biblical anthropology: the conception of the image of
God in man. It is our firm conviction that Roman Catholicism
has deviated at this point from Scripture, and that this error
is vitally related to and interwoven in the whole texture of
Catholicism.

G. Brom, the Catholic apologist, claims that the most funda­
mental difference between Rome and the Reformers lies in their
different view of the incarnation. Not, of course, as if he would
claim that the Reformers denied the incarnation, and that the
Roman Catholics accept it. It is not a difference as to acknowl­
edging the fact of Christmas, but a difference as to the signifi­
cance, extent, width and application of this mystery of the Word
becoming flesh. It lies in the difference of view as to the
"function" that the incarnation fulfills in the total structure of
Christian faith. According to Catholics the church is the pro­
longation of the incarnation; the church is progressive incarn­
ation; consequently it is not uncommon among the Catholic
writers to find the church, the visible body here on earth, to
be identified with Christ; the church is the fulfilling of Christ.
In passing, this must be carefully distinguished from the Pro­
estant persuaas concerning the doctrine of the mystic union
with Christ, and of Christ's Spirit indwelling the Church, His
bride. G. Brom charges that Protestants have a shrunken
view of the incarnation; that we have not seen the full signifi­
cance and width, the full reality of the incarnate Word. This
is the arch heresy, the deepest fountain of all misery, the chief
source of errors in Protestantism, according to G. Brom. This
shrunken view of the incarnation, he claims, is the fruitful
source of all separation in Protestantism, issuing into such
antitheses as "matter and spirit; science and faith; church and
state; morality and religion; art and society; culture and
cultus; psychology and logic." Indeed, he would characterize
the whole of Protestantism in one word; "solism"; the Re­
formers would be satisfied with nothing less than pure spirit:
"the Bible without the church; faith without authority; congre­
gation without the law; churches without images; essence
without form; in a word, soul without body.

Berkouwer claims that this view of progressive incarnation
in the church has strong affinity to idealistic Christology, which
owed much to Hegelian philosophy. It is true that while
Hegelianism concerned itself only with the idea and not with
the historic fact of the incarnation, and over against that
Roman Catholic persuasion confessed the real union of God
and man in the historic Christ, yet even so there is strong af­
finity between Rome's view and this idealistic Christology, as ev­i­
denced in the fact that that element of the universal principle
is given much prominence, "die alomvattende twee-eenheid
(Brom) waarop alle orde berust, de vereniging der natuur en
moedeling van Kerk en Tempel" (p. 276). This is according to Brom the secret of Cathol­
icism. "Hier is de katholieke seer, versadigd van misterie,
geleden van wonderkracht en onoverkomelijk voornemen van godaat." Says Berkouwer, the church is then the sphere of the incarn­nation. Obviously the implications of this viewpoint are far­
reaching and profound, and the tremendous claims built on it
by Roman Catholics stupendous! Berkouwer unmasks this
error and demolishes the presumptions it prompted.

Berkouwer contends that the very core, the heart of our con­
flict with Rome centers about the gospel of sovereign, free
grace: the sola fide, sola gratia evangeli. This was already
clearly seen by the Reformers of the 16th century and even
though the emphasis and accent may shift a little in each age,
fundamentally our battle with Rome will continue to be fought
on that front. That is the contention of this scholar and it
runs like a golden thread throughout the argument of this
masterful production. A gospel that allows merit cannot simply
be a gospel of pure grace, no matter how subtle the distinc­
tions, and the scholastics certainly did not fail to provide
the latter! Catholicism is a substitution for the gospel of
sovereign grace; it robs God of His honor and denies the all­
sufficiency of the merits of our Saviour in the realization of
our full redemption; it is another religion. How desirable it
would be that all Protestants would recognize it!

We congratulate the author upon this scholarly and timely
contribution.

W. H. Rutgers

A CALL FOR CONSERVATISM

CONSERVATISM REVISED: THE REVOLT AGAINST REVOLUTION, 1815-
1849. By Peter Viereck. New York: Charles Scribner's
Sons, 1949. 187 pages. $2.50.

SINCE the end of the war, we have had a batch of titles on
the era of the Congress of Vienna of 1815. Here is one which re­
stores the leading figure at Vienna, Prince Klemen­
s von Metternich, restored him in the Austrian Empire. It
works him over as an exponent of political conservatism, that is, conservatism in its broad sense.

It makes an impact. The argument is convincing. Viereck
is anxious to conserve "proportion and measure," and "self
expression through restraint." He wants "preservation through
reform." The soul of conservatism is its "reverence for the
dignity of the human soul." Conservatism is not synonymous
with "immobility." Nor does it seek to block genuine social
reform. But, mind you, it must be reform, and it must be
genuine.

Viereck, professor of history at Mount Holyoke College,
proves that early nineteenth century liberalism issued into
rabid nationalism which in turn has produced serious threats
to human liberty. This is demonstrably true. But we are not
completely convinced of the thesis that nineteenth century lib­
eralism bears the blame all alone, or that it stands thereby
entirely condemned. It gave birth to privileges and liberties,
possibly superficial by Viereck's definition, but precious never­
theless. There must be phenomena other than the liberalism
of that day which are responsible for our twentieth century
socialism and radical nationalism.

The effort to make out Metternich as a great and con­
structive conservative is careful and convincing. The book is docu­
mented with citations of "chapter and verse." There was a
good side to Metternich. Obnoxious as were his personal
morals and personality, he was prophetic in foreseeing the
harov that the coming nationalism would work. We have
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blamed him for policies which should be blamed on his em-
perors. Metternich actually believed in establishing parlia-
ments, provided they were planned with care and caution.

Viereck calls for a "revolt against revolt." We must revise
conservatism in order to understand its argument and its pro-
gram. Conservatism is the "political secularization of the doctrine of original sin." It should be to politics what "clas-
sicism is to literature."

All of us Calvinists are conservatives in the deeper sense.
When we differ in our politics, it is on what Viereck would prob-
ably call superficialities. Viereck does not seek to legitimize
the old laissez faire regime with its indifference to humane
social reforms. "In fact, American social reforms are usually
more timidly moderate than what European conservatives in-
troduced two generations ago." (Italics mine.)

EARL STRIKWERDA

CALVIN'S OWN COMPENDIUM

INSTRUCTION IN FAITH. By John Calvin (1537). Translated
with a Historical Foreword and Critical and Explanatory
Notes, by Paul T. Fuhrmann. Philadelphia: The West-

This compendium of the Reformed Faith, originally writ-
ten in French, has been, called, by Dr. B. E. Warfield,
"the foundation-stone in the edifice of Reformed cate-
chetics." Long lost because it was so soon replaced as an in-
struction book by Calvin's Catechism, one copy was rediscover-
ed in 1877, in Paris. The present publication is the first ap-
ppearance of this interesting and important document in the
English language.

As the editor and translator explains in his Historical Fore-
word, this Instruction Book is Calvin's own Compendium of
the teachings of his Institutes of the Christian Religion, based
on the first edition of that classic of the Reformation Faith.
Calvin wrote it to give positive content to the anti-Catholicism
among the common folk of Geneva, and to help bring order
into the religious chaos that prevailed there when he came.
Beginning with a statement regarding the purpose of man's
creation, thus providing the approach to the study of Chris-
tian doctrine which was later used to such good advantage in
the Westminster Catechisms, Calvin set forth here the sub-
stance of the Christian Faith in thirty-three short articles, de-
voting a large part of his handbook, as was traditional in
Catechetical literature, to an exposition of the Ten Command-
ments, the Apostles' Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and the Sacra-
ments, but placing these expositions in a framework and con-
text that brings out clearly their significance for Christian
faith and life.

For those who find it difficult to read the Institutes with
profit, and for those whose knowledge of the various heresies
Calvin combats in his larger works is too slight to appreciate
his extended polemics, this volume is invaluable for learning:
to know what is the core of the faith that Calvin stood for and
taught. It is an authentic Reformation document which can
well be put into the hands of the half-informed and misin-
formed critics of Calvin's theology to put an end to some of the
unfair abuse that has been heaped upon it, and to culti-
vate something of an appreciation for the Biblically-controlled
and God-glorifying piety that marked the life and works of
the great Reformation theologian. Also despite its age, the
book may still serve its original purpose in helping the young
Christian to come to a systematic understanding of the teach-
ings of the Scriptures on salvation. For all these purposes
this work is admirably suited. Its brevity and conciseness, its
clarity of definition, and its devout simplicity all help to make
it so.

To the translator and editor, Head of the Department of
History of Christianity at Gammon Theological Seminary
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GESENNIUS REISSUED

HEBREW AND CHALDEE LEXICON. By W. Gesenius. Translated
by S. P. Tregelles. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Pub-
lishing Company, 1909 pages (including Index). $10.00.

Gesenius, the celebrated theological professor and
scholar at Halle in the 19th century (he died in his 57th
year in 1842), ranks high in the field of Hebrew and
Chaldaic lexicography. His many-editioned lexicon was trans-
lated into the English by J. W. Gibbs in 1824 but at that juncture
Gesenius' scholarship had not ripened; by E. Robinson
in 1836 but it was characterized by haste and an uncritical at-
titude towards Gesenius' rationalistic views; and by the pre-
sent translator in 1846 at the beginning of the era of Higher
Criticism. Tregelles is avowedly more conservative than his
translating predecessors; in fact he is more conservative than
Gesenius himself and takes it upon himself to warn his lexi-
con users against his neologistic tendencies. These strictures
are carefully bracketed. And so this is a very useful tool, both
philologically and theologically, for the conservative student
of the Hebrew language.

That is not to say that Gesenius is a lexicographer without
a peer. Hebrew scholars are generally agreed that for more
elaborate word-studies, for more extensive use of cognate lan-
guages, for more of Biblical theology and Hebrew syntax, that
larger and later work of Brown, Driver and Briggs excels.
But Brown, Driver and Briggs, although under revision at
present, is not easily procurable today. Hence the value of
this nonbulky attractively bound reprint of Gesenius, whose
lexicographical work is marked by exactness, clarity and san-
ity of judgment. The translator has enhanced its value by ap-
pending a very exhaustive English index.

JOHN H. BRATT

ZIONISM RECONSIDERED

PALESTINE IS OUR BUSINESS. By Dr. Millar Burrows. Phila-

J ust when most of us have begun to consider the State of
Israel a settled issue, Dr. Burrows tells us that Zionism is
morally wrong, that Israel is in Palestine illegally, and
that all Christians should be doing something to right the
wrong done to Palestinian Arabs. His argument is that Zion-
ism is morally wrong because it does a grave injustice to the
native Arabs of Palestine: it denies a people the right
of possession—the only legal claim any state has to a land. Dr.
Burrows thinks that all Christians should now be doing some-
thing about the thousands of Arabs made homeless by the
Arabs have the right of long term
possession—the only legal claim any state has to a land. Dr.
Burrows tells us that Zionism is morally wrong because it does a grave injustice to the
native Arabs of Palestine: it denies a people the right
in peaceful possession of the land that they and their ances-
tors have occupied for more than a thousand years. He claims
that Israel is in Palestine illegally because she has no right-
ful claim to the land. The Arabs have the right of long term
possession—the only legal claim any state has to a land. Dr.
Burrows thinks that all Christians should now be doing some-
thing about the thousands of Arabs made homeless by the
Jewish occupation of Palestine.

This is a well documented, unemotional argument. It does
well in debunking the cloak of sanctity and humanitarianism
that beclouds the cause of Zionism. Its biggest weakness is
that it has appeared too late.
WHAT OTHERS SAY...

I have only recently learned of your fine organ and am deeply interested in becoming better acquainted with The Forum. I wonder if you would be so kind as to forward as many sample copies as you can possibly spare...

John F. Horne, Jr.
Brookdale, Md.

Like most Forum readers, I suppose, I rarely write in about the good things in The Forum. I should like to do so now. The Forum is generally an excellent magazine and I enjoy reading every issue. I have enjoyed especially your series on Capitalism and Amry Vandenbosch's article on Indonesia. The forum on Le Coq's remarks also seems an example of a form that has excellent possibilities. It may interest you to know that I recently wrote TIME and asked them, mainly out of curiosity, whether they could give me the name of some person or institution where I could find out about the revival of Calvinism in late years: and they referred me to Calvin College. This, I think, shows as did TIME'S story last year on your article, that our church's time for isolationism is past.

Name Withheld

I enclose draft for twenty-two dollars, covering one year's subscription to your magazine on account of the following eleven members of the Free Presbyterian Church in this country, including our missionary now ministering in South Africa. Your magazine is greatly appreciated by those of us in this country who have access to copies, and the following subscribers feel that it is their duty and privilege to be able to subscribe thereto, that they may better be enabled to appreciate the position of those who stand "steadfast in the faith once delivered to the saints" in another portion of God's footstool.

Norman Kerr
Greenwich, N. S. W.
Australia

Your excellent magazine continues to be the most stimulating and helpful of all the welter of Christian literature that comes my way. Keep it up.

Ted Benson
Wheaton, Ill.

WHAT DO YOU SAY?

No, we are not soliciting your compliments.

But if you feel The Calvin Forum is worth-while, how about sharing it with your intelligent friends in the form of a Christmas Gift Subscription?

Send us correct names and addresses of your friends and Two Dollars for each such gift subscription. We do the rest.

A Christmas gift that lasts the year around.