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Congratulations, Potchefstroom!

Our faithful South African correspondent, Dr. J. Chr. Coetzee, who has kept Forum readers informed for some years on religious, educational, political, and cultural conditions in the Union of South Africa, this month in his letter brings us the good news of the decision of both houses of Parliament that state-subsidized Potchefstroom University College will soon be recognized as an independent University with power to grant its own degrees and without in any way compromising its Christian character. The recent decision of the Upper House gave final approval to the Act under which this institution will operate as such legally and the actual effectuation of this promotion will take place under the authority of the Ministry of Education some time next year. We share in the joy of Board, Faculty, students, and supporters of this institution for Christian higher education and extend our most sincere congratulations!

For Americans, not acquainted with South African conditions, it calls for a little explanation to understand what this decision of the Union Parliament means for the Potchefstroom University College. As many of our readers know, this College (together with the Theological School located in close proximity to it) constitutes the institution for higher education of “Die Gereformeerde Kerk van Suid-Afrika”. There are many similarities and parallels between this “Gereformeerde” Church of South Africa and the Christian Reformed Church in America. Both, of course, are of Dutch origin. Both find their beginnings in a migration and a secession which soon followed. The American migration was the emigration from Holland under Van Raalte and its settlement in Western Michigan in 1847. The South African migration was the big trek of the Boers, constantly strengthened by Dutch immigrants, from the Cape to Transvaal, also at the middle of the previous century. Both churches had their beginning in a secession from the mother church, the South African group seceding in 1859 from “Die Nederduitse Gereformeerde Kerk”, and the American group withdrawing from the Reformed Church in America, which they had joined under Van Raalte only about seven years before. Both churches recognized the Church of the Secession in the Netherlands (now known as “De Gereformeerde Kerken in Nederland”) as their spiritual mother, kept in close touch with its leaders, and called their ministers for some decades from this communion. Both churches soon founded a Theological School of their own, the South Africans in 1869 at Burgersdorp (later transferred to Potchefstroom), and the American body at Grand Rapids. Both started with a handful of students and one professor trained in the Netherlands: the Rev. D. Postma at Burgersdorp and the Rev. G. E. Boer in Grand Rapids. In both cases out of these small beginnings there has grown a Seminary for the training of the denominational ministry and a full-fledged collegiate institution whose faculty and student enrolment has numerically outdistanced the affiliated seminary ten, fifteen, or even twenty times over. To these external facts we may add the deeper statement that both these Seminaries and Colleges are devoted to the development and propagation of the Reformed, or Calvinistic, view of God, the world, and human life, and that they consider this to be the only justification for their respective existence as institutions for higher education.

But if there are striking similarities between Calvin College and P.U.K. (this being the affectionate abbreviation for the Afrikander “Potchefstroomse Universiteitsskole”), there are some significant differences not so well known to many Forum readers, and these differences account in large part for the uniqueness of the happy occasion our Calvinist brethren in South Africa are celebrating these days. This uniqueness consists in its relation to the state, i.e., the federal government, or the Union of South Africa. Calvin College, though recognized as a degree-conferring college by the State of Michigan, is entirely independent of the state, both the State of Michigan, and the Federal Government at Washington. It is not a public or state institution for higher education. P.U.K., however, is. Having been organized in 1919 as the Potchefstroom University College for Christian Higher Education and made eligible for federal subsidy, two years later, in 1921, it became a constituent college of the University of South Africa. This meant that this Christian college became a public institution combining internal autonomy with government regulations and government control, as well as government support. One can understand this only against the South African background. In the United States the secularization of all public education has gone on pace for almost a century, so that state-controlled and state-supported education has become religiously “neutral” and an institution for Christian education (whether lower or higher) is neither state-controlled nor state-supported. Denominational colleges with their own religious views and ideals are considered “sectarian” from the point of view of the state. But in the Union of South Africa there
has always been a large group (in fact, the majority of the Dutch Afrikanders, that is, the Boers—in distinction from the British) who pleaded for Christian-National education and hence for a combination of public, government control and support with the Christian character of the educational institutions.

It has been the ideal of P.U.K. to combine these two, viz., to maintain its distinctively Christian character and at the same time to be recognized as a government supported institution of higher learning. That this was not easy to attain, even in South Africa, was apparent. For though the Christian-National ideal of education is widely accepted and practiced there, the liberal, “neutral” point of view has for a long time been formulated in the highest law of the Union. From the nature of the case, the government cannot—so we would say in the United States—support any institution with a religious “bias”. Public education must be public, and no religious prerequisites can be insisted upon, neither in the case of the teachers nor of the students. The significance of the present achievement for Potchefstroom Calvinists, but they have been willing to put up with it. We are not informed just how the provisions of this “Conscience Clause” actually operated, but perhaps in practice it was not difficult at least until now to safeguard the Christian and Calvinistic character of the faculty personnel. However, this might change at any time, and under the law there was no protection for those who wanted to maintain the Christian and Calvinistic character of the teaching once a breach was made.

The significance of the present achievement for Potchefstroom is that the Union Parliament has approved a charter for Potchefstroom under which the Christian character of the institution is safeguarded as far as the appointment of faculty members and other personnel is concerned; under which, moreover, the public, state-supported arrangement continues; and by which P.U.K. now receives the state-recognized power to confer its own degrees.

The meaning of this last element can again be understood only in the light of the unique South African policy obtaining until now. As stated above, P.U.K. in 1921 became a constituent college of the University of South Africa. Because we have no such arrangement, this is difficult for us to understand. The University of South Africa was not a university such as we think of, but it was the collective name for the government agency under which the constituent colleges (of which P.U.K. was only one, others being located in other parts of the Union) functioned and from which their students had to obtain the degrees. This meant that the constituent colleges could offer their students courses, but they could give no degrees. It was definitely understood that such colleges could confer such degrees upon becoming independent institutions, (i.e., universities) and they could become such independent, degree-conferring institutions as soon as they met certain requirements of number of departments, faculty personnel, number of students, standard of scholarship, and financial stability. To attain this objective has been the hope and ambition of the Potchefstroom institution for some years. But while striving to reach this goal, they were equally determined not to agree to an arrangement under which they would in their new charter as an independent, degree-conferring, state-supported institution still agree to the “Conscience Clause” under which they have operated so far.

So they drafted their own charter for submission and approval to the two Houses of Parliament, and in this charter the “Conscience Clause” was altered to the extent that in the appointment of faculty and administrative personnel (or in its dismissal) “the Christian historical character of the University be maintained”. It also involved the retention of the complete name of “Potchefstroom University for Christian Higher Education.” There was opposition by the “liberal”, “neutral” faction in Parliament, but they were outvoted. The charter was approved, and it is noteworthy that both Smuts and Malan supported it. This means that P.U.K. now is recognized by the Union government as a university with power to grant its own degrees; that this institution continues to receive appreciable support from the government; and that, though a public institution open to all students, it has the freedom and the right to determine for itself who are to be appointed to (or dismissed from) the teaching or administrative personnel in harmony with the historical Christian character of the institution. Potchefstroom is now an independent, degree-conferring public institution for Christian higher education—an impossible combination under the laws of the government of the United States.

Congratulations, Potchefstroom!
We rejoice with you in the progress of Calvinistic higher education!
C. B.

Jeno Sebestyen
Called Home

The third of June an unconscious cancer patient breathed his last in one of the hospitals of Budapest at the age of sixty-eight. It was the end of a life of courageous and undaunted witnessing for the truth on the part of the man who is known more than anyone else in
the opening decades of the present century as the leader of Hungarian Calvinism in its unadulterated form. Jenő Sebestyén was a Hungarian and he was a Calvinist, and both of them with all his heart and soul and strength. Born in one of the villages of Southern Hungary, in the province of Baranya, he imbided the pure Calvinism as it still lived in those days among the simple folk of the Hungarian Reformed Church. His devotion to this God-centered form. His contacts with Dutch Calvinism have ever been close. He learned the Dutch language, translating many Dutch Calvinistic works, and spoke it with great ease. He was often called the Hungarian Dr. Kuyper. He was a speaker at many European Calvinistic Conferences. The reader of the Proceedings of the Fourth Calvinistic Congress held in Edinburgh in 1938 will find his fine figure seated in the front row on the photograph adorning this volume. There he felt at home among such kindred spirits as Professor Maclean and Principal Macleod of Scotland, Professor Lecerf of Paris, and Professors Kromsigt and Vic Rutgers of the Netherlands. In Hungary he is known as the founder of the Calvinistic Review (Kalvinista Szemle), a magazine which he edited for years. And in the student world his name was associated with the John Calvin Society Soli Deo Gloria, which he organized in 1936 and of which he remained the moving spirit.

The significance of Jenő Sebestyén lies in his clear and loyal championship of Calvinism in the face of the various perverted interpretations of Christianity as these prevailed in the Hungarian Reformed Church in the first half of the present century. At first it was Modernism; later it was Barthianism. At no time was he deceived into viewing the revived interest in Calvin and the Reformation under the inspiration of the Dialectic Theology as a revival of genuine Calvinism, that is, of the true Gospel according to the Word of God. The ridicule which Barth heaped upon Kuyperian Calvinism, Sebestyén shared in his own Hungary. He was deeply grieved to see the progress of Barthianism in the theological faculties of his native country. When just before the outbreak of World War II I met him at Cambridge, England, where both of us were speakers at the International Christian Student Conference under the auspices of the I. V. F., he unburdened his heart to me on this score and expressed the hope that his Hungarian students might have the opportunity to be sent for advanced study to Calvinistic institutions of learning where Barthianism had not corrupted the faith of the Scriptures and the theology of Calvin.

He rejoiced to see the revival of genuine Calvinism. For him, Kuyper—not Barth—is the true modern interpreter of the Reformed Faith. He promoted ties between Dutch Calvinism and the Reformed Church of Hungary. Two of the daughters of Abraham Kuyper have done much to strengthen these ties through frequent visits to that country and the promotion of the spirit of Calvinism in word and deed, in the form of Christian charity as well as education. Professor Sebestyén also had contacts with American Calvinism. He is well-known and highly respected among the leaders of the Free Magyar Reformed Church of America. Dr. Vincze in speaking in one of his newsletters of the Magyar Reformed Students Association Soli Deo Gloria founded by Sebestyén, informs us that he “is privileged to be one of its charter members.” (The Calvin Forum, August-Sept. 1939, p. 27) We know with what joy Sebestyén greeted THE CALVIN FORUM, of which he became the Hungarian correspondent in 1940. Some of his informative letters may be found in Volumes V and XII of our journal. It was through no negligence of his, but because of the exigencies of war that his contributions appeared not more frequently than they did.

It was a painful experience and a deep shadow over his life that Hungary was torn asunder twice in the last decade, first overrun by Germany, then by Russia. A Calvinist at heart, he had no sympathy either with Hitler or Communism. It grieved him to see his people suffer, but it pained him even more to see the foreign oppressor tear the Hungarian Reformed Church in pieces and sovietize the Christian schools associated so closely with that church.

When Jenő Sebestyén fell asleep in the Lord on June the third, 1950, there came to a close a life of faith, of which Bishop Ravasz spoke at his funeral, and there was translated from behind the iron curtain to the glories of paradise a valiant soldier for God's truth and honor. C. B.
Workmen of Worth*

TONIGHT this Gideon band of three hundred and more moves with stately step from study hall into the world's marketplace of labor. For a fleeting moment they may fondle the last remnants of their student days at Calvin, but the more serious business of daily toil now begins.

Of some it may be said: "Behold, a sower goes forth to sow". Others are ready to give hand and heart to the task of molding the mind and life of the rising generation in our schools. Some are stepping forth to enter one of the time-honored professions. Still others are mounting the ladder to hold the helm in the wheelhouses of industry; while others, deferring the actual task yet a little while, are poised like birds for flight into the higher realms of learning. A few may address themselves to the humbler tasks of being hewers of wood and drawers of water.

Upon joining the ranks of those who labor, the graduate will discover he at once faces and becomes part of the many sided economic problem of the day. In one way or another he will meet such problems as supply and demand, overproduction, the profit motive, adequate return, world markets, security, pensions, and as much more. An indication of the urgency of this general economic problem is suggested by the flood of writing on this subject in periodicals and books, papal decrees, ecclesiastical pronouncements, socialistic experiments, union activities, legislation and even revolutions.

Now we are not so naive as to think that we can with a word solve these problems. Certainly not where one must always reckon with the sinful tendencies of man's heart. However, as children of John Calvin we have a contribution to make toward healing the ills of life's labor. Inherent in our distinctive world and life view there is an attitude toward work which, if put to the test, would out-revolutionize the revolutionists and go far to right the wrongs we have been steeped, means aught, it will mean that we have caught something of the breath-taking scope of all life from God, under God and for God. It means too, that our work both vocation and avocation is never going to be left out in the cold of irreligion. Religion is not a matter that we can carry about locked up in a chapel talk or confined to the Day of the Lord. When a man gets religion, religion gets him—also as a worker. Now in determining the place of our work and our attitude toward it, we take our departure in the mighty drama of man's creation. By virtue of his creation the image of God, the first man had a natural aptitude and ability for work. Moreover he found himself in a created world, where the Creator had left enough work for him to keep him busy as long as the earth would stand. To cap it all, he received a divine mandate, "Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth, and subdue it."

Far from being, as many mistakenly think labor to be, of course, the result of sin, work is rather as Dorothy Sayers, the English playwright, asserts in a brilliant essay, entitled "Why Work", "a way of life in which the nature of man may find its proper exercise and delight and so fulfill itself to the glory of God."

Sin has changed the conditions of labor greatly but in no wise has it altered the divine demand that men work. The injunction given to Adam was echoed in Noah's ears. What is more, redemption by the blood of Jesus Christ and renewal of His Spirit have even helped to make the child of God a better workman. Such a one is fired not alone by the thought that all things are naked and laid open before the eyes of the transcendent Creator with Whom he has to do, but even more by the knowledge of a Gracious God come near in Christ to renew and redeem life for His Praise.

Changing the verse on Calvin's bulletin of last Sunday a bit, we believe

"When once the luster of Christ's cross has fallen on our college halls, men will dare (and joy, I would add) God's work to share and count all else but loss."

II

What this basic position about work in our system of thought involves, may be stated in a series of propositions.

The first proposition is this: Work, so conceived as done for God, under God and unto God, takes on a glorious dignity. Man then no longer merely

* Commencement Address Calvin College and Seminary, June 2, 1950.
holds down a job; he is God's workman. It matters little if he sweeps the floor, maintains the peace or turns small knobs on some machine, he is always a VIP (very important person) in God's world.

There is no common man; all are honored workmen of the Almighty. We are accustomed to making a distinction between sacred offices and secular tasks; actually every secular task has its sacred relationship.

Men may speak of the dignity of labor apart from viewing work as work under God, but pray, what dignity is there, if man is nothing more than a toiler in the race for idle gain, a cog in the whirling wheels of machinery? What dignity is there if his status is that of a slave, and "labor is exacted, light denied?"

There is dignity alone when labor is understood as a creative activity undertaken because God has placed us where He has, and gifted us with abilities to imitate Him, Who, as Jesus said, has been working hitherto.

III

Our second proposition is: Every man should find some form of work, wherein he can respond to the divine mandate and express the gifts and faculties for labor, which he possesses. God has provided periodic rests in the darkness of each day, in the Sabbath of each week and in the two periods of life, youth and old age, but for the rest, we are born to labor. No man should think in terms of earning as much as he can in as short a time as possible in order to retire as quickly as possible. God's scheme of things has no room for playboys. He has fitted us for work and everyone of us should be fighting as does the average farmer, the true scholar, and men in certain professions, for more time to get on with our work, instead of falling in with the popular idea of doing less and less to get on with our play.

There should be no tolerating of idlers. We must return again and again to the marketplace as did our Lord in the parable to seek out the unemployed and put forth efforts to utilize every bit of man-power in the great task of subduing the earth.

We need not be afraid that there will be insufficient work to go around. There are ever new worlds to conquer in world-wide witnessing. There are fields white for harvest in medical study to combat cancer, arthritis, heart ailments, and the like. We may think we have become giants in nuclear division, but are yet babes in the wood in our discovery of this world's secrets. We have just begun to bring every thought into subjection to Jesus Christ. Each one of us can serve God.

IV

We add a third proposition. Since work is the natural expression of our gifts as created beings, we must seek that kind of employment for which we are best fitted and where we may give ourselves wholeheartedly to it.

This does not mean necessarily that the best paying job is the one for which I am best fitted. Neither is the one for which I am best fitted, necessarily the best paying one. The faculties seated before me are an illustration of what I have in mind. You will find here men who could easily have increased their financial return if they had not reckoned with the will of God in the use of their God-given talents. The thing that determined for them however was not, "What do I get out of my work?" but "WHERE CAN I BEST put my talents to work?" That explains in part why they teach at Calvin. This example speaks greater things than any array of words I could muster.

V

We add a fourth proposition. Since we are God's workmen, our work must be done more for service than for return. Our labor must be the medium through which we express ourselves physically, mentally and spiritually. It is the way in which we can serve God.

This sounds revolutionary in a society that views work almost solely as a means to financial ends. Most everyone is madly concerned about greater and still greater returns regardless of service rendered, despite all advertised claims of "service with a smile." Work is not understood as work for God, the means of expressing our talents and proving our worth, but simply a means to gain wealth. It is just this wrong understanding of what work is, that has led to all sorts of maladjustments and misunderstandings, especially in a world moved by avarice and greed. Inevitably it has led manufacturers and workmen alike to stress quantity rather than quality, with consequent overproduction, duplications, glutted markets, layoffs, excess of exports over imports, depressions, wasteful dumping and even wars, cold or hot.

I firmly believe that we must have a thoroughgoing reformation of attitude towards the purpose of our work. We must learn anew to look at it as part of the day to day life lived through God, under God and for God. Instead of working to live, we will then live to work, for we are servants of the Most High.

This does not mean that we are to dissociate our labor from the financial return. The scriptural injunctions still hold; "The laborer is worthy of his hire", and, "Thou shalt not muzzle the ox that treadeth out the corn." In God's Providence labor and return are intimately related. The farmer must sow seed shall he reap. The weaver must weave shall he have a garment to wear or sell. But let every workman remember that he is called first to serve God and then enjoy the reward. Such a man is a workman of worth.
VI

We move on to the fifth and last proposition. When once a man has caught the spirit of working under God, he will have all needful inspiration for work, and work of the highest quality.

Increasingly incentive to work is being taken from man in this modern age. Social security, total employment, sick plans, pensions—all splendid gains in themselves, together with increased governmental supervision, have tended to decrease the worker's sense of responsibility.

What we need is a revival of thought that we are God's workmen, responsible to Him, Who sees all and under Whose eye we constantly live, move and have our being, and to Whom one day we must give account. Such a worker needs no efficiency expert to follow him about. He will not be clock-conscious. He cannot produce shoddy flim-flams, useless for life. He cannot teach indifferently; he dare not do business unethically. Actuated by Christian principles in his work as well as in his worship, he must produce works of excellency and must generally show consistency, reliability and generosity in his labor.

Where a man knows himself as God's workman, he will make a good minister on call twenty-four hours a day; he will prove to be a good doctor, lawyer, nurse, engineer, executive, interested in serving without assurance of a reward; he will make a fine teacher, ready to sacrifice gold, but never a principle; he will make a keen business man with a feeling for quality.

Raymond Calkins in his Romance of the Ministry expresses it thus: "The Christian believer will face his total life with a resolve that he will do all he has to do, if not as well as it can be done, then as well as he can do it. He may be hurried even hurried, but never careless nor slovenly. He will put character into every part of his work and make it an expression of himself, of God's gifts. Little duties will be performed with the same exactness as the larger ones. He seeks to be in all things a workman that needeth not to be ashamed. Whatsoever his hand findeth to do, he will do with all his might."[1]

Such workmen are workmen of worth in God's scale of values. They will return at the end of the day's labors and humbly confess before God: "We are yet unprofitable servants", but in their heart the Spirit will assure them that they have planted their feet on the path that is right.

Such workmen of worth are redeeming life's labors long lost, and making of them songs of praise. They can stop at any point in their labors, bow their heads and hear the Angelus from heaven.

Such workmen are a credit to their Alma Mater and the name of their Maker and Redeemer in heaven.

Such workmen of worth will be the leaders in the struggle to stem the rising tide of pagan economics that knows no other standard than such as is based on greed and avarice, and that leads us from the one extreme of "everyone for himself and the devil take the hindmost" to the other of a "regulated serfdom" of the welfare state.

Such workmen of worth I trust our graduates of 1950 will endeavor to be. Your parents pray for it. Your school has prepared you for it. Your church looks for it. Your God demands it.

I know it is no easy task to carry out such a program in a world that cares not for God, nor for His Word. It is never easy to be reformers. It calls for hard unrelenting tireless toil. But you can do it and you must do it by God's grace.

Do you remember the terrible scene in Hamlet where the uneasy prince first learns the cause of his father's death? He sinks to the ground under the weight of it, muttering"The time is out of joint, O cursed spite That I was ever born to set it right."

Suddenly he realized that his friends Horatio and Marcellus were standing beside him. He got to his feet then and with a brave gesture, linking both his arms in theirs, strides off the stage, saying "Come, let us go together."

There's the world in need, and here's God's will for it. Together we have our work to do for God— with God.

An old Roman coin carried the figure of an ox standing between an altar and a plow—the altar of sacrifice in death and the plow of work. Underneath was the inscription: "Ready for either."

It may be that God has other work for you than work on earth. Nineteen years ago, our class, thirteen strong, stood in the exit of the seminary. Seven months later one of our number was dead. He had been declared a candidate for the ministry, but God declared him candidate for heaven's labors. I pause at this juncture to pay humble tribute to the memory of all those Calvin men and women who have been laid upon the altar of death and translated from this scene of labor to realms above.

Somewhere along the road you, too, will be called to die. Calvin's training envisions service above as well as on earth and always has aimed to strengthen the heart of the students in the conviction: "My only comfort in life and death for time and eternity is that I am not my own, but belong to my faithful Saviour Jesus Christ."

If that is yours, then I know you, too, will this night take your place between the plow and the altar and as a worthy workman of the Lord, solemnly affirm "I Am Ready for Either."

THE CALVIN FORUM * * * AUGUST-SEPTEMBER, 1950

---

Prosperity: Lasting or Ephemeral?

Earl Strikwerda
Associate Professor of History
Calvin College

No ordinary sane individual who goes through a period of personal economic reverses emerges from them in the expectation of thereby advancing his standard of living. But at the end of World War II that is exactly what the American people contemplated—a rise in the national standard of living. We expected it because there is something in the American tradition that relates prosperity to war. Such postwar prosperity has never been genuine and lasting. It is by its very nature artificial and even suicidal. Nevertheless, in this good year, 1950, we are crowding the peak of a postwar boom, and we are enjoying it in characteristic American fashion.

The Pity Of It

In the matter of prosperity and depression there is a bit of idolatry that should come in for scrutiny and censure. It is the bowing down before and the worshipping of the business cycle. To many the cycle is something before which one stands in something like reverence and fear and even trembling. One dares not handle it lest it turn on business and rend it. This should not be. We are stewards, not slaves. We are rational people. We live under the terms of a cultural mandate. We are here to exert ourselves. Disorder, also cyclical disorder, is a manifestation of sin. The idea is to control and to rectify chaos rather than to connive at it.

During World War II we committed ourselves to the principle of paying for it as much as possible as we went along. We endorsed austerity. We converted savings into bonds or loans to the government. Prices were stabilized. Profits were scrutinized. The production and purchase of luxury goods was discouraged. High salaries were frowned upon. Taxes were advanced. And all of this was to the good. It was sensible. It indicated that we understood in a mature way what we were up against. They were a commitment to the idea that we should control our economy rather than have it control us.

Came the end of the war, and we virtually repudiated those disciplines. We admitted in effect that we could no longer stand the strains and irritation of petty privation. We decided to kick our debt along into the next generation. We allowed the price structure to wreck itself, and in so doing we repudiated a rather sizable fraction of our national debt which had been contracted in terms of valuable dollars. The “four” bond dollars which the thrifty are going to get back are not worth the “three” which they surrendered before 1945. This is technically unfair, but fortunately no one seems to be disturbed by it. What is more serious is the fact that we continue to borrow. In an era of amazing national income, we do not have the courage to balance the budget. We refuse to do it because such a decision is synonymous with stiffer taxes and with a drop in our standard of living.

The Debt

It is not that we cannot stand more debt. The Korean Affair may demonstrate that, and that right soon. But what is deplorable is that we cannot take the decision to be good housekeepers in our spending and borrowing. If we were Soviets, the matter would be different because in that economy a government debt is only a word, a term which indicates that a government is in debt to itself. But in capitalistic economies governments contract realistic debts. Our government has to pay its way to individual bond holders, to banks, and to corporations from whom it buys. All of us endorse our ways of doing things, but we must realize that we must go along in good faith. After all, there are limits to this sort of thing called borrowing.

We do not want to be classified with those who are hysterical about the debt. It has not reached really dangerous figures as yet. Moreover, a debt can be a good thing, even wholesome. In a sense it is even a necessity. It serves as a pool or a vault for personal and institutional savings. There are savings or funds which need rock-ribbed security and therefore should not be used as venture money in private enterprise. Besides, there may be some doubt whether private enterprise could use all of America’s tremendous savings. Government, representing society itself, provides a storehouse for savings by permitting the existence of a debt, and thus a place is provided for the funds of insurance companies, banks, investment trusts, religious organizations, foundations, and trust companies. The national debt becomes a measure of our confidence in our future. And flippant though it may seem, a debt such as the one we now shoulder serves to check us in our inclinations to be even more reckless than we already are!

The Part of Courage

What we are calling for is a repudiation of our “free price” structure of the past five years. We
should have stabilized our price levels and thus headed off this “boom”, the results of which can be only retributive and punitive. Mr. Tobin may tell us that this present prosperity is going to continue, but there is more authoritative opinion to the contrary. Business editors have spoken openly (before the Korean development) of the year 1951 as the great question mark. Korean affairs may change the future as to date or chronology, but the reckoning is coming. Actually war psychology will only intensify what may be called the “end result.” Here and there are writers who are venturing that Russian activity in Korea is merely a part of a long-term effort to “jack up” our inflation a bit farther in order to produce cataclysm in the camp of the “capitalistic” countries. We should not play the sucker to such a sinister scheme. Prices should be spiked down right now.

Also we should do a bit of “blue-printing” for the coming “slump” or period of normalcy which must lie ahead. The turn is coming regardless of its name or its exact nature, and it will be ushered in with a quiet whisper. Suddenly, silently, sensible people will come to the realization that as individuals and as a nation we must get back on a pay-as-you-go basis. Our obligations cannot be kept on the horizon or over it indefinitely. Our national living standards must adjust themselves to our debt; our generation must assume its responsibility for its spending, wartime and peacetime. We cannot load posterity indefinitely. The decision to discontinue in this, we say, will be an act of courage, and unfortunately usher in a period of economic reaction.

That depression must be anticipated and planned for. Unemployment insurance and price supports alone cannot put a real cushion under that impact. Of necessity we are again going to need public works projects as a bare minimum. But better still such planning should blue-print far more constructive ways to maintain full employment and thus in turn hold up consumer purchasing throughout the economy. The point is to do something rather than idly wait to see that day.

**Why?**

We need to plan, if for no other reason than to head off irresponsible revolution and political radicalism—the sort of thing that comes in the backwash of a depression. The “lower third” are not going “to take the rap” in a docile manner again, as they did in the thirties. Those people who do the back-breaking work of our world will have to have gainful employment and decent income, or they will spearhead what has been called the “coming American revolution.” Whether that revolution be black in the form of fascism or red in the form of socialism makes little difference. It will be totally unpleasant and totally undesirable, and it will likely be somewhat violent. If it be black, Mr. Herbert Hoover will be looked back upon as a shining progressive. And if it be red, Mr. Henry Wallace will be looked back upon as having been something like a Hapsburg conservative. In other words, that will be a day of trouble and we will rue the day we were so critical of Mr. David Lilienthal.

It is simply childish to insist that we can face such contingencies when they come. That technique worked in this country before we industrialized. It is no longer the part of courage. What is worse, it is reckless, and we cannot afford to be reckless when large fractions of this world have gone and are going down the drains of totalitarianism of one kind or another. This country is made up first of all of people—of humans who react to insecurity and suffering. Corporations can weather depressions because they are only fictitious persons, and the figures in their ledgers are inanimate, be they black or red. Workers and family heads are not so. They leap into action when faced with hunger or unemployment. Historically, people are given to overthrowing institutions such as governments when their children are denied the necessities and opportunities of life. We can go a long way to head off trouble by doing a bit of planning for normalcy—a normalcy that may not be as normal as we should like it. Planning has always been a virtue in the life of the individual. Thrift and planning are good American traits. What we praise in the individual can hardly be objectionable for the group, for the economy. If an individual is encouraged to provide for the possible emergencies of his life, it cannot be culpable for a government to plan for the emergencies which face the nation.

That there is opposition to such thinking goes without saying. In general it comes from those well-meaning Americans who are able to hedge in their own futures. We can understand them. They are people who work hard in their businesses, and have worked particularly hard during the past two decades of depression and war. To them a recession is not a completely fearful thing. They can make their way, as an employee in industry cannot. To the man who has feathered his nest somewhat a bit of a storm is nothing—even though it be in the form of a declining price level. That becomes merely a day when the price of a Chevrolet buys a Cadillac, and the price of a tour in the west would cover also a stay at a dude ranch. These people are well-meaning and have served our country well, but they cannot be allowed to think for the entire economy nor even for the majority. Actually they are a bit status quo in their outlooks. They fail to see that the river of history inevitably washes away the status quo. We must do some sandbagging if we want that future to be safe for our children and for our institutions.
A

ny question about Calvinism is bound to be pertinent today, because Calvinism itself is something of an enigma in our contemporary world. In terms of historical rootage it appears that the largest segment of Protestantism traces its heritage back to Calvinism. It is also widely supposed, and even by many confidently asserted, that of the various types of the Reformation faith Calvinism has been most relevant to the total culture of Western society and has left the imprint of its ideas and ideals on large areas of modern life. In consideration of this it might be assumed that Calvinism enjoys a vigorous life and is widely embraced. But that is not quite the case. For the rigor of its theology and the severity of its ethics it is regarded with more suspicion and distaste, even by its supposed heirs, than any other religious system. The Barthian movement, insofar as it may be thought neo-Calvinist, though it appeared at first to restore some lost credit to Calvinism, comes to be regarded by modern thinkers as underscoring its more forbidding and untenable features. And those who count themselves the faithful adherents of the purest Calvinist tradition, not only bemoan the loss of large areas in which it was once dominant, but also place the judgment of severe disapproval upon new claims of a "return to Calvin," and even deplore the increasing decadence of Calvinism under their own hands. The question about Calvinism is inevitable.

The Personal Question

The topic above is a question within the question, and withal a question from within Calvinism itself. A question is one of those subtle things that has various possibilities. A question might be the surly, snarling, or supercilious explosion of unbelief,—like Satan's question: "Hath God said?" or "Doth Job serve God for naught?" or like Pilate's question: "What is truth?" One might,—and no doubt many do,—ask the question about Calvinism in that spirit. Thus: "This Calvinism, fashioned by that sharp-chiselled man from Geneva, is that a living faith which yet today is relevant to and possesses the life of men; or is it a museum piece left over from the 16th century, but yet cherished by some diehards with a measure of blind devotion?" That is not my question, and I am equally certain it is not yours. Then again, the question might be one of objective, scientific inquiry. One might say: "Let's examine this religious phenomenon called Calvinism. In the light of all our findings about man, God, the world,—what is it, something of a fetish—a glorified but dead tradition—or a real faith in and by which men can always live?" That's not my question either, nor is it yours. Since we are here dealing with religious ultimates, we couldn't approach the question with pure objectivity anyhow. In this area we are pre-committed to the answer; perhaps I should say, pre-possessed by the answer. And after that we cannot very well presume, for ourselves, to follow out the scientific process in quest of the answer.

The question here is not about Calvinism objectively, but about you and me subjectively. The question is not: "What is Calvinism?" That has already been answered in many books and articles and as well in living movements; and I hope it will be answered anew, in contemporary language, in many more books and articles, and as well in contemporary living movements. The question is rather: "What is your and my Calvinism?" You see, the question is not objective; it is personal. It is not an historical question; it is a question about this present urgent moment. It is not a question for academic theological inquiry; it is a question for personal religious self-examination. It is not, like the others, a question that we can disown as irrelevant; it is a question which, under the pressure of a holy compulsion, we must face and answer. It is preeminently your and my question. And because of the relentlessness of the Calvinistic principle of the God who is our Sovereign Lord everywhere, it is a question that pursues us down into every area of our living and thinking and moving. What is it anyhow,—this Calvinism of yours and mine—Fetish or Faith?

The fetish, as you know, is an object thought of as having within itself some magic power,—such as the little metal charm or the rabbit's foot. The fetish worshipper thinks that by a mere external relation to it, such as holding it or wearing it, he gets the benefit of that power. That is the measure of his interest in the thing,—it is useful to him; and in return he needs to give it only a little veneration and bring it a few formal offerings. Now when I suggest a comparison with Calvinism here, I don't propose that Calvinism itself may be regarded as a fetish. Once again the question is about your and my Calvinism, or the relation we bear to it. And our Calvinism is very like a fetish, if we are content to stand in a mere external relation to it; if our chief
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Calvinism is world-wide because people in many nations stand in the tradition. But how they stand is again the crucial question! If we don't get down to the throbbing life of it, and if the power of it doesn't possess and move and govern us, the issue of it all for a living and influential Calvinism will be just about nothing. It is not enough to be a member of a Reformed Church and to know the Catechism. It is not enough to belong to a Calvinist Federation and attend Calvinistic Conferences, and hear Calvinistic speeches, and sing “Faith of Our Fathers” with lusty vigor. It is not enough to go to a Calvinist College instead of a State University, nor to take a course in Calvinism or Calvinistic philosophy. It is not enough to organize Calvinist groups for the discussion of the implications of Calvinism, or for the drafting of a plan of Calvinistic action. And it is not enough to translate and publish the works of the great Calvinists, whether of past ages or of the present. All of that is very good, and we need it; but without anything more, it constitutes only an external relationship to Calvinism. These bring us very close to and press us very hard against the substance of Calvinism. But there is no magic power that accrues to us from the close contact. If we don't get with the very soul of us into the living reality of Calvinism, and live in it and out of it, AND LIVE IT, our Calvinism remains a thing extraneous to us,—a fetish, dead, and of no real consequence either for ourselves or for our world.

To Have and To Hold

How do we stand toward the heritage of Calvinism? That is always the crucial question about any confessional tradition into which we come, or for that matter about Christianity itself. We call America a Christian nation because for the most part our whole population stands in the Christian tradition. But how they stand is quite another matter! There are too many whose relationship to it is merely external—the old home was Christian, they went to Sunday School, they know some gospel stories and the golden rule, some go to Church, many read Fulton Oursler's “The Greatest Story,” snap up the Lloyd Douglas novels, listen to the Goodyear Rubber Company broadcast, and even avow that Jesus was the greatest of all prophets and that Christianity is superior to all other religions. But that is hardly being Christian, unless Christianity is a fetish; and if that is the quality of Christianity here, it is no wonder that American Christianity is so dead and irrelevant and powerless.

The situation is much the same with Calvinism. Historians assure us that Calvinism is the dominant and most widespread form of Protestantism. It is said to have covered Western Europe and North America and South Africa, and in part some other lands. Calvinism is world-wide because people in many nations stand in the tradition. But how they stand is again the crucial question! If we examine the situation in American Calvinism we get a discouraging answer. There are many who can boast a Puritan ancestry; Harvard and Yale were founded to teach Puritan theology; Princeton was founded by Scotch-Irish and New England Presbyterians; the Presbyterian Church is one of the largest in America and it follows Calvin's ecclesiastical order, has the pulpit in the center of the Church, and has the Westminster Confession and the Catechisms; George Whitefield has his admirers in the huge body of Methodism, and Spurgeon his in the huge body of Baptists. But if those external relationships put Calvinism in America, it is only the fetish, and American Calvinism is a dead, meaningless thing. The fact is, historians to the contrary notwithstanding, that in the large American Calvinism is a blown-up non-entity.

If the situation amongst us seems somewhat better, it may be in part because the external relationship to Calvinism is more direct, more solid, tighter. And that external relationship is stronger because we not only have the Calvinist creeds, but we teach them. We not only have the Heidelberg Catechism; we preach it every Sunday. We expect our Church members to know and profess the Calvinist faith. We not only have Calvinistic colleges and seminaries, but they are committed to Calvinist learning. We have Calvinist Federations, Calvinist Conferences, Calvinist Day Schools, and we are getting Calvinist textbooks. There are even rising and significant movements among the Youth in behalf of Calvinism. Thank God for that. But remember that if our relationship to all of that is merely external, if we don't get down to the throbbing life of it, and if the power of it doesn't possess and move and govern us, the issue of it all for a living and influential Calvinism will be just about nothing. It is not enough to be a member of a Reformed Church and to know the Catechism. It is not enough to belong to a Calvinist Federation and attend Calvinistic Conferences, and hear Calvinistic speeches, and sing “Faith of Our Fathers” with lusty vigor. It is not enough to go to a Calvinist College instead of a State University, nor to take a course in Calvinism or Calvinistic philosophy. It is not enough to organize Calvinist groups for the discussion of the implications of Calvinism, or for the drafting of a plan of Calvinistic action. And it is not enough to translate and publish the works of the great Calvinists, whether of past ages or of the present. All of that is very good, and we need it; but without anything more, it constitutes only an external relationship to Calvinism. These bring us very close to and press us very hard against the substance of Calvinism. But there is no magic power that accrues to us from the close contact. If we don't get with the very soul of us into the living reality of Calvinism, and live in it and out of it, AND LIVE IT, our Calvinism remains a thing extraneous to us,—a fetish, dead, and of no real consequence either for ourselves or for our world.

Aha, I Am Warm!

And if we go no farther than to establish a mere external relationship to Calvinism, the second fetish principle of behavior readily follows. Then the chief concern with Calvinism will be to use it for our advantage instead of living it sacrificially and spending ourselves in the service of it. The possibilities on this score are many and various. One might attach himself to Calvinism because it seems to him the surest and best way to heaven. One might continue his relation to it because it is most convenient to stay in the tradition,—“after all, I was brought up here, all my acquaintances are here, and my girl friend is a Calvinist, and it makes a better
home, you know, when both are Calvinists.” One might attach himself to Calvinism for some very solid advantages—good churches, big crowds, fine sermons, a Christian School for the children. One might join the Calvinist Federation for some social advantages, good religious fellowship, and stirring conferences at distant points. One might become a Calvinist minister because theology is a noble and satisfying profession, especially when there’s a well-defined theology, and a solid church with sound discipline, faithful attendance at the services, and a good response. Yes, Calvinism has its advantages. It could be a useful, profitable attachment. And for the sake of all those good things I can see where one could be content with an external relationship, quite apart from deep conviction and a living commitment.

I am very far from saying that these are not a proper and even commendable good, or that we should not seek, even eagerly, these Calvinistic advantages. After all, Calvinism, like any genuine form of godliness, is profitable for this life and for the life to come; and it is commended to our acceptance for the profit it brings to us now as well as hereafter. But I do suggest that it is a question whether these good things are rightfully or really ours, if our relationship to Calvinism is one only of external attachment, and if we are not Calvinists by the commitment and sacrifice of our lives to it by a living faith. The very governing principle of Calvinism is that we are God’s and completely subject to His sovereign Lordship. And the very first principle of the Christian life is that we should deny ourselves and take up our cross and follow Him, not to use but to be used, not to get but to give. And it is precisely there that we are blessed with the whole tremendous profit of godliness. Judas was satisfied with the external attachment, and followed the Lord for the advantage it might give him; and Judas lost everything, not only the miserable 30 pieces of silver, but even his very soul. Peter was related to Jesus by a living, surrendered faith, and when he said: “Lord, we have left all to follow Thee.” Jesus answered: “You shall have a hundredfold back, and in the world to come everlasting life.” That is the principle of profit in the Christian life. When we surrender all, we receive all. When we lose our lives, we find it. When we die to self and live in God, all things are ours.

Our Calvinism is a fetish if we attach ourselves to it for the profit it gives. It is a living faith when, believing God, we live it and count ourselves called to serve it. And I mean, quite specifically, that we are called to fully serve instead of merely to use our Calvinistic heritage. It is a fairly unworthy use of Calvinism, for example, to take over from the labor and sacrifice of other generations a static body of truth and a formalized tradition by which to live our own lives. If Calvinism came to completion in John Calvin or even Abraham Kuyper, so that it needs now only to be picked up and put to its use, then it certainly is a fetish, and if we so regard it it should occasion no wonder if Calvinism were dying all over the world and even amongst us. But if it is a living faith, it stands not to be used but to be served by the consecration of our thinking and living. Calvinism is living when it is alive in us and our faith, and when through us it grows in clarity and scope and power and contemporaneousness.

A more specific form of the mere use of Calvinism appears in the tendency to employ the revered authority of its great proponents to make a point or win an argument. The temptation is the more subtle because of the obvious validity and profit of associating ourselves with the traditions out of which we have come. But we do not best live in or out of our honored tradition, nor serve its continued growth and relevance, by attempting to resolve current issues by reference to the pronouncement of other ages. John Calvin himself is scarcely to be regarded as an authority on the concrete elements of contemporary social and political problems. We learn from Calvin’s principles as well as we may, not without subjecting even these to careful scrutiny, and not forgetting that they need integration into our thought and life to be real and vital for us. But it is the more required that we should reach our own judgments in terms of the application of basic principles to the existential situation, rather than that we should find an answer or any part of an answer in what Calvin once said and did. And in the large it may be said that there is something not altogether credible about the facility with which we quote Calvinistic authorities of other times and other lands to secure a moot point, or to interpret and express a difficult doctrine. It is profitable to call on them for their witness, to be sure, as long as we remember that the finality of the “Thus saith” belongs only to Scripture. But we honor them best and live in their faith, when growing from the fellowship of their minds and hearts, we think and define the Calvinist truth afresh with the hard-thinking efforts of our own living faith. It is not for us merely to lean back on Calvinism, but to move it forward; not for us merely to borrow from Calvinism, but to enrich it. If it is fetish, we only use it; if it is faith, we also live it and serve it.

Only With The Lips

There is one more thing about the fetish principle. It is fetish to think we do a significant service to Calvinism by venerating it with high praise. I think we are a little vulnerable at this point. This is where we really play the superlatives. We proudly designate Calvinism the most consistent, most logical, most penetrating statement of Christian truth; the most Scriptural, most influential, most comprehensive, most powerful religious movement. We have all heard quite a bit of that, and I venture to
say we haven't, in consequence of that, seen Calvinism expand or the world moved, not even in our own communities. No doubt all we say of it is true, but we ought to recognize that we don't add to its stature or extend its strength and power by saying so. And if it is true, we ought to shudder for the responsibility which gives to us the charge of the highest and best; we ought to quicken ourselves to discharge the highest calling that comes with the highest gift; and we ought to fling aside all fear and move on in the confidence that it is the highest and purest truth that will conquer the world. If it is a fetish, it is enough to venerate it. But if it is a faith we will profess it and live it and by it move the world.

**The Living Faith**

Calvinism is a living faith when its truth is the deep conviction that underlies and governs and motivates all of our living. And if it is to be that for us, I propose, by way of coming to a conclusion, that three things must be true.

First of all, we must know it, not just intellectually, but with the spiritual discernment and the love of the renewed mind and heart. In a very real sense it may be said there is no lack of high quality and even contemporaneous Calvinistic literature. But Calvinism fails, even amongst its devotees, for want of the knowledge of it. Here, too, it is true that the people perish for lack of knowledge. Your task and mine, and we ought to confess ourselves faithless for not having discharged it better before, is to study so that we may know; and to study not only with the mind but with the heart, not only with the light of the lamp but with fervent prayer to the Spirit of God who is the pure light of all truth. And that study should embrace not only the books about Calvinism, but the very writings of the providentially given Calvinist geniuses who made it living in the world. But most of all, and first of all, and always, our study should embrace the Scriptures, the ultimate root out of which Calvinism comes, the absolute standard by which it must be honestly tested and corrected, and the very living truth by which it must be informed and clarified and through which it must grow. There is no alternative here. As a faith Calvinism demands a devout study toward the knowledge of the truth which is the substance of our conviction. If we don't pay that cost, we don't have the Calvinism of living faith; we are left with the fetish.

Secondly, if Calvinism is to be a living faith, we must confess it. And I don't mean by confession mere memorization or mastery and a competent expression. I mean the flinging out of a living witness in the spirit of a dynamic and heroic profession of what we believe. The confession of a living faith is the throwing out of a declaration and a challenge to the world, by which we say: “This I know to be true; I live my life by it; I stake my life on it; and for this I will work and suffer and die.” If that is our confession, we will not have to tell people, somewhat academically, and half-apologetically: “Well, now, this is what our Church believes, and this is our view on the matter.” That half-hearted, fetish-like confession always gets us into embarrassment, because sooner or later somebody asks about predestination. And then we have to say: “Oh yes, that's part of the system, too,” and then, with a happy afterthought we add: “But, of course, it must be true, because it follows logically. You see, if God is sovereign, as we hold, then it follows . . . .” We ought to be done with that. To say it must be true and then try to prove it carries no conviction. Ought we not declare what is true by a living witness arising out of a living conviction, rather than attempt to establish a reasonable supposition by argument? The Christian truth does not so much call for the apologetics of rational argument, as it calls for the living witness of the believing and committed soul. “Believe with thy heart, and confess with thy mouth.” That is the Calvinism of the living faith.

But finally, and most important, Calvinism is a faith rather than a fetish, when we seriously live it. And this is ultimately the crucial point in the whole matter. If we don't take the God of Calvinism seriously, or, if you will, the Sovereign God of Scripture—if we don't take God seriously, and bow before Him and serve Him, and give Him our minds and hands, our soul and strength; if we don't yield to Him as our Lord and God everywhere, in everything, at every time—there is not much hope for any revival of Calvinism, nor will there be much more than futility in all of our renewing devices. The soul of Calvinism is the loving subject relation of the soul to God. And if the soul does not take God seriously, as God and Lord, Calvinism is dying or dead.

I sometimes wonder if in our hopes and prayers for a revived Calvinism we don't too often start from the wrong end. We call for more books, more speeches, more definition, more organization, more plan of action. And if we get them, what shall make them live and move? Nothing at all, if there are not men and women who take God seriously. On the other hand, if there were more such men and women, there would be more and better books, speeches, definition, organization, plan of action, and more and better action. What we need most of all is a recovery of an elemental seriousness, the recovery of an elemental sense of call from God, the hearty recognition of his urgent, personal claim: “My son, give me thy heart—give me thyself—give me thine all.” We need a sense of call like that which moved John Calvin to waste his thin frame in hard study, hard work, and sacrificial service; the kind of seriousness that made him brave the politicians and the libertines and the heretics to make God's truth
stand and to make God's will effective in the life of Geneva; the kind of seriousness that made Calvin pour all of his body and soul to the point of his death into the religious heritage which has moved the world and has come to us as both a treasure and a charge.

We often speak, perhaps too much, of the logical consequences of the Calvinistic principle of the Sovereignty of God for all of human life. Maybe we ought to think and speak and live more in the reality of the theological consequence of the living truth that God is our Sovereign Lord. There is nothing very moving about the logical deduction that a Sovereign God claims my service in this or that given area of life. But there is every power, there is God Himself, in the living theological consequence by which I take God seriously and own Him and live in Him, and serve Him as my Lord and my God. And that is the essence, that is the living faith of a living Calvinism.

John T. Flynn Looks Ahead

Lester De Koster
Assistant Professor of Speech
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POLITICAL stakes come high these days, and one of the elements in the bitter struggle for control of the apparatus of the state is the written word. There are those who believe that an electorate well informed by honest discussion of all sides of all issues is the only security for permanence in the democratic order. There are others who believe that the people cannot be trusted with both sides of an argument, but must be propagandized into attitudes and actions. Amongst the latter are those who think that the people can be hoodwinked into believing what they are wanted to believe, and noteworthy amongst these is Mr. Flynn and his widely distributed The Road Ahead.

The Technique
Is Simple

The Flynn method is relatively simple. First, Socialism is a term flexible enough to be indiscriminately applied. Next, Socialism is desperately bad. This is demonstrated by sketching in selectively all the darkest hues of the British experiment. Next, the fate of Britain now hovers over the U.S. in the stealthy machinations of the "Socialist Planners." This useful term is obtained by deliberately confusing Communism, Socialism, Fascism, Social Planning, Industrial Planning, Industrial Democracy, and even 'The Kingdom of God,' so that whatever opprobrium attaches in the public mind to all of these together can be focused on anyone who advocates any measure Mr. Flynn cares to dub Socialist Planning. Thus, the TVA, the Columbia VA, public housing, public medicine, the Brannan Plan, the Marshall Plan, and any social legislation whatever are deliberately planned elements in the deep plot to substitute Socialism for 'the American way.' Let anyone advocate any measure offensive to the delicate Flynn olfactory nerve, and at once this Knight of the American Way is a-horse to impale him upon the horns of the dilemma Canon Kingsley offered Newman: be he one of the vile "Planners;"

"Where Are We Going?"

The cover of my special edition asserts that Mr. Flynn "thought it was about time for someone to answer" that question, "candidly and with blunt facts." He finds John T. Flynn self-elected to do the job. Eagerly he sets out to "describe the road along which this country is traveling to its destruction." Fortunately, however, "we still have in our hands the means of checking this onrush to disaster." That is, so we have on page 7. Four pages later, things are worse, and he italicizes: "And it is a grave question whether or not the program has been already so far advanced that reversal may be impossible." This double-talk may make the unduly sensitive reader suspicious, but it no doubt is only intended to arouse his alarm. He pushes on to see what this "program ... already so far advanced" really is. He must be very patient. Only after 119 pages is Mr. Flynn finally ready to say "how far we have proceeded in this seizure of power over the economic system," and then one discovers that the "program" which so threatens us consists of (1) a dubiously "proved" Federal "invasion" of the field of banking and credit, (2) the TVA, (3) the proposals for public
medicine, the Spence Bill, and the Brannan Plan, and (4) that is all. The cannon so noisily loaded in chapter one goes off 119 pages later with the boom of a toy pistol. But be not misled. It has served its purpose well. For these 119 pages have been studiously employed to pin the red label on the unions, the Democrats, the ADA, and anyone else the author is suspicious of.

Upon examination, the “program” grows even more meager. (1) His reasoning to show the Federal “invasion” of banking and credit may be cited as illustrative of the Flynn manner. Categorically he assures us, “But for the time being the federal power over the national credit agencies on the British model is an accomplished fact.” (134) But one remembers that he has already said, “It (fed. govt.) does not yet have the power to decide what types of loans may be made to private industry . . . It is this which gives the Socialist government of England the power of life and death over every industry in Great Britain.” (131) It would appear, then, that this “accomplished fact” of federal control over credit “on the British model” lacks precisely the most significant element in that “model.” And yet, the federal control “on the British model” is “an accomplished fact.” Perhaps Mr. Flynn is arguing with himself.

(2) In electrical power, “the federal government was generating 9% of the total producing capacity of the continental U. S.” by 1947. The reader may be mildly surprised to find that only 9% constitutes a significant part of a “program . . . so far advanced that reversal may be impossible” but Mr. Flynn assures him that more “is in the works,” (135) a new synonym, no doubt, for program-far-advanced. That the TVA was sponsored by a distinguished Republican Senator who would have had a derisive snort for being characterized a plotting “Socialist Planner,” Mr. Flynn knows right well. It is not the only thing he knows right well which he does not bother to point out, nor let influence his conclusions.

(3) As for proposals not yet law, if they are evidence of how far we now are on “the road to destruction,” or if they constitute a “program” already “far advanced,” they have a degree of reality seldom accorded proposals hitherto. In short, the noise under the bed we are intended to take for a ghost turns out to be a familiar mouse when at last we get him out, a kind of threadbare mouse at that.

The Prisoner in The White House

It is not surprising, however, that Mr. Flynn should find the spook-to-mouse interim a sartorial opportunity to fit a red coat on the Democratic donkey. He is even quite explicit: “By this I mean that from now henceforth the Democratic Party must comply with the plans and demands of the Socialist Planners who have moved into it with their labor battalions or else go down to defeat. That Party, therefore, cannot elect a candidate for President without the aid of the Socialist Planners and without surrendering to them on all their ideological grounds. It is possible to prove these statements definitively.” (93) The cautious reader will think it wise to look thoughtfully at “proof” from Mr. Flynn’s pen, even when billed “definitively.”

New York State serves as the guinea pig. Step One: “The American Labor Party was organized in 1937 by the Socialist Planners,” (unnamed). Two: in 1940 and again in 1944 New York State gave President Roosevelt less Democratic votes than it gave his Republican opponents Republican votes, but the votes of the Labor Party, and its 1944 offshoot, the Liberal Party, were enough to give Mr. Roosevelt the State. Now the denouement: had Roosevelt not been nominated by these parties he would have lost New York. The ‘inevitable’ conclusion, of course, is that he became their “prisoner.” If that isn’t exactly plain, close your mind and consider: either the Democratic candidate gives himself as hostage to the anonymous Socialist Planners, who have the Labor and Liberal votes in their waistcoat pockets, or he loses New York. How delivery of the votes is guaranteed, Mr. Flynn does not say. Quid pro quo is a low business anyhow. What the Democrat does in the other states which do not have strong Labor parties is covered, as we shall see, by Mr. Flynn’s omnicompetence at generalization.

Unfortunately for the theory, however, in 1948 the Socialist-Planner-jailors chose to put Henry Wallace in durance vile and thus cost President Truman the State. In exchange, you might naively suppose, the President got his freedom. Not so. The undaunted Mr. Flynn is verbally quite equal to the occasion and exercises his uncanny aptitude for making meager premises stretch indefinitely by concluding, “I have, I believe, made it clear that the President”—and he means Mr. Truman—“is completely the prisoner of the Socialist Planners among his supporters, who elected him and who could break him pathetically tomorrow if it suited their purpose.” (99) Granny, what big teeth you have!

It may surprise the voters of New York to know that their votes “can be given to a Democratic candidate or taken away at will by the Socialist Planning leaders,” a technique Mr. Flynn might well seek to learn and he could give up writing books like this. John L. Lewis would like to know the secret, too, after some unfortunate experiences with swinging votes to one Wendell Willkie.

Voters in other states, though there are small or no Labor parties concerned, will be pleased to learn that, “what is true in New York is also true in Connecticut, New Jersey, Massachusetts, Michigan, Pennsylvania and other northern states . . . In all these states the Democratic Party must now yield
to them (Planners) on policy. It is their prisoner utterly." (96)

That all this constitutes "proof" of anything save a deliberate desire to misinform, confuse, and smear is open to serious question. On second thought, there is, indeed, something of the medieval romance about it: the idea of President Truman locked in the oval room, perhaps even in an iron mask... Maybe it's a matter of wishful thinking.

"The War On The South"

Inasmuch as Flynn's book is being given wide distribution by a group which dubs itself the Committee for Constitutional Government, the chapter on Negro suffrage contains an element of surprise peculiarly its own. One might, that is, innocently expect a defense of Federal suffrage for the colored folk. But Mr. Flynn reasons that the colored vote, if permitted to reach the polls, would be given to those ubiquitous Socialist Planners. "But first of all they must get for these vast hordes"—a genteel description—"of Negroes the right to vote." (101) He has not noticed in his copy of it that the Federal Constitution already has a 14th and 15th Amendment. Is, therefore, the "true liberal"—could Mr. Flynn mean John T. Flynn?—"going to put his weight on the side of the revolutionary Red drive to recruit the Negro"—that fighting for simple Constitutional rights is "revolutionary" is a remarkable conception—"in order to swell the ranks of the army of Socialist voters who will be used to complete the destruction of our political and economic system? Or will he say that this Negro question must be subordinated to the greater one of preserving our political and economic civilization? Will we hurry the Negro to the polls to set him upon a path which will end in destroying the liberties of us all—white and black alike?" (103)

A more cynical rhetorical flourish is difficult to imagine. That it is sponsored by a Committee which calls itself for Constitutional Government compounds the ignominy. The Constitutional Amendments did not envisage that a Negro should need the imprimatur of Mr. Flynn to exercise his right of suffrage; and if Mr. Flynn does not believe in the Amendments as they stand let him urge their repeal. Reasoning as he does under the guise of defending the Constitution, after he has said on page 37 "There are things of the spirit which are the core of our culture. And one of these... is human freedom... And what does this involve? It involves the right to choose our rulers..." gives the reader a kind of moral nausea. Nor is it helped when he asserts as the first of the principles by which we can stem the tide to "destruction," that "We must put HUMAN FREEDOM once again as the first of our demands." (152) No Northerner need pretend that he knows the answer to the Negro problem. But intellectual morality is requisite to its solution. It is a nice question to ponder, what a man who can reason so glibly for evasion of Constitutional guarantees to Negroes in 1950 might wish to deny to others in 1955.

"We Must Be Clear..."

The temptation to catalogue examples of Flynn's manipulation of words and facts would push this paper beyond bounds, but at least his treatment of terms should not be permitted to blush alone. He makes a studied effort to confuse distinctions between Communism, Socialism, et al, for purposes already suggested. Thus on page 26, "The great scripture of world socialism is called the Communist Manifesto. But Marx and Engels who wrote it, called themselves Socialists." Mr. Flynn might know that in the preface to the manifesto Engels carefully distinguishes between the two terms, and writes, "we could not have called it a Socialist Manifesto." On page 80, "... there is no need to make too fine a point of distinction between Communists and the Social Planners." Writing of Bishop Oxnam, however, he changes his tune, "But there is no point in calling him a Communist. He is a Socialist." (108) Libel suits cost money. On page 116 he says that "everyone knows" that "industrial democracy" is a "synonym for socialism." Later, "Russian Communism is merely"—why merely?—"a more extreme form of socialism than British Fabianism." (126) E. Stanley Jones "is a Christian preacher who has found a new name for socialism—the 'Kingdom of God'. And, just to slight no one, "Fascism is Fabian socialism plus the inevitable dictator." (149) If you are given to a taste for irony turn back to page 26 and read "... we must be clear about the use of words." Indeed?

Et Cetera

One might continue with examples of distortion, smear, and empty generalization, but enough has been said to suggest the author's method and standards. The reader who cares to waste his time can find others for himself. He might, if he has a good deal of time to waste, compare this book with the same author's latest diatribe against the late President Roosevelt. In that he will find that the Socialist Planners go under the title of Fascist Planners, probably because popular resentment reached a higher pitch in those days if channeled through a pipeline labelled "Fascist." But the methods are the same. That indefinable something which might be called the aroma of a book is the same: arising from the manipulation of facts, the sweeping generalization, the innuendo, the slur, the guilt by association, the disrespect for opponents, the smear, comes a kind of miasmic breath which taints what it touches.
Mr. Flynn and those who support him seem to think that history can be made and unmade to suit the whims of those who have just enough power to try. Some history has been made that way: Senators Pepper and Graham will be absent from Washington next year. But no amount of labelling, propagandizing, and manipulating will alter permanently the basic historical directions, nor cure ills the manipulators dare not diagnose. What Wallace called "the century of the common man," and y'Gasset called The Revolt of the Masses is close upon us, and an order which depends upon its Flynns for survival will not endure. Not until we face clearly and fearlessly the question of why men all over the world are attracted by the 'left' in preference to what they have, can we formulate an adequate program for preserving and implementing the democratic life as we cherish it. Nor, indeed, so long as we pillory those who seek to evaluate objectively our historical situation—as we have lately seen those who wrote objectively about Western relations with China viciously and infamously attacked in the Senate—can we as a common people hope to receive the means to understand, let alone to solve, the problems which the modern world thrusts upon political and social democracy.

A book such as this, which seeks deliberately to group together and to malign together the sincere social thinker and the vicious radical, and which would discredit in advance anyone who deviates from its narrow line, does grave disservice to the cause of genuine democracy, and seriously undermines its ultimate ability to relieve internal tensions creatively.

To follow the Flynns will serve only to so sharpen our internal tensions that some day each of us will face a choice nationally analogous to that Mr. Acheson faces internationally, namely to support Fascist and reactionary brigands because we think they are better than the Communist brigands their own maladministration has engendered. Thus in Italy, Greece, Spain, China and elsewhere we find ourselves forced to support regimes repudiated by large parts of their own people, repudiated in large measure because they sought to sharpen tensions rather than ease them. And those in our own country who disseminate books like this one may selfishly win the hour, but will lose the day for us all. And a church group which commends the author, does not know its own function within the creative democratic order, but affronts the intelligence and moral standards of its constituency.

**Apology**

I sought among my few small words
To capture rhythm's dancing feet.
The wind, successful, steps quadrilles
Across a field of winter wheat.

I tried to fashion glowing words
With colors warm. They passed me by.
Yet see how simply dawn steps down
Trailing bright robes across the sky.

I strained against incompetence
In matching metered syllables.
Yet with what ease each winging bird
Writes poetry across the hills.

**Marie J. Post**

Grand Rapids
Our Goodly Heritage

Addressed to Young People of the Reformed Faith

Charles Vincze
Archdeacon
Free Magyar Reformed Church in America

The lines are fallen unto me in pleasant places: yea, I have a goodly heritage.


The Psalmist considers the course of those who are running after strange gods and are attracted by the practices of other religions. He is satisfied with his religious fortunes. To God Jehovah he says: “Thou art my Lord. In Thee do I put my trust. Thou wilt show me the path of life; in Thy presence is fullness of joy; at Thy right hand there are pleasures for evermore.” Of his religion, as if it were a tract of well-located fertile land, the Psalmist sings: “The lines are fallen unto me in pleasant places; yea, I have a goodly heritage.”

We should have a similar appreciation of, and loyalty to our religion. Our inherited faith should be the stabilizing force in our lives. Instead of changing it for anything else, everything else should be submitted to it. By way of trying to make you appropriate the Psalmist’s religious attitude, I shall name a few characteristics of your own religion; characteristics you would surely and sorely miss if you were not a Reformed Christian.

I

The first one of these characteristics is that confidence and trust, with which churches of Reformed persuasion treat their members as persons capable of grasping and holding on to the truth.

While great branches of Christ’s Catholic Universal Church regard their members as spiritually immature and, therefore, in constant need of a priestly guardianship, the whole Reformed system is built upon a firm dependence on the power of Truth, and upon the conviction that man is created for that Truth.

It is for this reason that churches of the Reformation do not hesitate to place the written Word of God, the Holy Bible, into the hands of the people. It is for this reason, that the spoken language of the people is being used in conducting divine services, on the assumption that Christ died for souls capable of understanding Him, and not for any language adhered to in the interest of an artificial liturgical uniformity. The same respect for God’s revealed truth is behind the fact that the central part of the Reformed Christian worship is the proclamation of God’s Holy Word. Tell the truth as it was told by God through His chosen vessels whose sayings and writings we have in the Bible, and the Spirit of Truth will do the rest in the hearts of men created for the Truth—we maintain. It is on the same principle that Reformed church-members are given a real, constitutional part in the government of their church. The spirit of some churches is distrust and tyranny, that of the Churches of the Reformation is trust in the ability of believers to act freely, in an orderly way and cooperatively for the glory of God.

This spirit of the Reformation has exerted a tremendous influence in doing away with all sorts of tyranny. It paved the way toward the establishment of governments of the people, by the people and for the people. It has always been favorable and it still is the most favorable for producing free personalities deeply responsible directly to God. You would miss this spirit of trust for freedom under God, if perchance you would be swayed from your Reformation heritage, just as much as you would miss it as a citizen, in case—God forbid—the constitutional government of these United States would be replaced by a tyrannical-dictatorial system. Does this not make you say with the Psalmist: “The lines are fallen unto me in pleasant places; yea, I have a goodly heritage!”

II

The second great thing you would miss, if you were not a Reformed Christian, is that directness which our religion gives you in your relationship with the God of your salvation.

Reformed Christianity stresses as no other form of Christianity does that there is but one real authority in heaven or on earth, in life or in death, and that one authority is God the Holy Trinity and He alone.

Consequently, in the churches of the Reformation you do not have to kiss the ring or the feet of any living person; you do not have to wear away with your kisses any painted or graven “image”; you do not have to make pilgrimages to any so called holy places; you do not have to crawl from saint to saint, or from angel to angel. There is but one, The Holy One, who can help you. You do not have to whisper your sins into the tired ears of anyone; you just tell God about them. He knows you, inside and out, anyhow. He is just waiting for you to be honest with Him. As soon as He finds you honest enough, He opens the treasure chests of His mercy and blesses you freely.

This directness in man’s relationship with God is the Lord’s gift to men through the Reformation. It pulled the carpet from under any and all human
pretensions in regards to having a more inside track with God than any honestly repentant sinner can have. It liberated the things of God from being subject to any thickly or thinly veiled commercialism. It liberated the souls of men from the fear of anything visible or invisible, except the holy fear of a holy, but also merciful God. You would vainly search for this spirit of directness and forthrightness anywhere, except in the Churches of the Reformation. Isn’t this reason enough again to say: “The lines are fallen unto me in pleasant places; yea, I have a goodly heritage!”

III

The third thing you would miss if you were not a Reformed Christian is that supreme reassurance which comes to believers from reliance by faith on what God in His Holy Son did for you, instead of having to rely upon what you or others could do for you.

Both the Judaism of Bible times and medieval Roman Catholic Christianity gave support to the belief that man can work out his own spiritual peace and eternal salvation on the basis of his own righteousness. Neither system, based upon this belief, worked. The Apostle Paul said, “No” to it. Martin Luther said “No” to it. Both systems had to fail, because God Himself said and still does say, “No!” to them. God’s “Yes” is His Holy Son, the Lord Jesus Christ. It pleased God to save sinners in Christ. “Neither is there salvation in any other; for there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved.” We must meet God under His own terms. We must meet Him in Whom He gave us the appointment. It is in Christ Jesus, the crucified and risen, and in no-one else. In order to eradicate the last grain of false pride and sinful resistance to His will out of us, God made a self-abandoning faith in what He in Christ did for us, the means of accepting salvation at His hands.

To turn one’s self over to God so completely is not as easy as some, (the enemies of our faith) would like to think or surmise it. It is the very thing, which Adam and Eve failed to do, but which God’s chosen ones in Christ are able to do. Our religion teaches salvation at the highest cost man can pay; at the cost of faith. Everything else is easy, and—of course—ineffective. Our churches are not planting bushes alongside the road to salvation, so that you could beat around them. Our churches, with their characteristic forthrightness, tell you: “Believe, and thou shalt live.” And that is the gist of the Gospel. Are you not glad that your church guides you with the Gospel truth; nothing more and nothing less? Should you not say with the Psalmist again: “The lines are fallen unto me in pleasant places; yea, I have a goodly heritage!”

IV

The fourth thing you would begin to miss the very minute you would cease being a Reformed Christian is the simplicity of Reformed public worship.

The employment of a language most familiar to you tends to make church services simpler. But even apart from the language angle, all Protestant services are simple and self-explanatory. Be it a week-day, Sunday or any special holiday service, or the administration of the Sacraments of Holy Baptism or Holy Communion, or a wedding or a funeral, a striking simplicity is noticeable all the way through. There are no intricate rituals, no dazzling pomps, no perplexing comings and goings, no heaping of veiled symbolics, no priestly or musical side shows, just plain talk, plain singing, plain praying, plain actions.

All this is not for lack of respect to the God of our salvation, but, on the contrary, out of deference to the simplicity of the Author of our faith, the Lord Jesus Christ. Jesus was strikingly simple in all His ways, and He brushed aside the elaborate rituals of Judaism in his day, also the guarded mysteries of the pagan religions, and took the children of men as if by the hand and led them to God and taught them to call Him: “Our Father!” Our churches never waver in the practice and teaching of Christ in the matter of simplicity in worship. This is why there is no revival of ancient Jewish and pagan rituals under the name of Christ in our midst.

This characteristic simplicity also deserves true appreciation: perhaps more so, than it receives. The grateful exclamation of the Psalmist may again justifiably be yours: “The lines are fallen unto me in pleasant places; yea, I have a goodly heritage!”

V

The fifth thing you would miss as long as you lived in case you ceased being a Reformed Christian is that biblical manner in which your church administers the Sacrament of the Lord’s Supper, or Holy Communion.

The way we celebrate the Holy Communion contains nothing more and nothing less, than what the Lord Jesus did, according to the fourfold testimony attesting to it in the Holy Bible, Matthew 26; Mark 14; Luke 22; I Corinthians 11. After having confessed our sins, jointly and openly to God, and having thrown ourselves upon His undoubted mercy, we take the bread and break it and eat it; we also take the wine and drink it, praising the Lord for the great salvation He provided for us in His Holy Son our Savior. That is all. It is simple, because it is biblical.

For over a thousand years this is how the sacrament of the Lord’s Supper was administered in Christ’s Church. In time, however, it was superseded by the teachings and rulings of men. Bread was changed into a piece of thin wafer that does not even suggest properly the life imparting graces of the Savior. The “cup of blessing” was taken away from those not members in the priestly caste; first under the pretense that if the sacramental bread
is really the Body of Christ, then it also must contain the Blood of Christ; then, more recently, under the pretense of sanitary considerations.

In the first place this is a daring attempt at overruling Christ, Who instituted the Sacrament. In the second place it is a belated argument in favor of an unscriptural innovation that was introduced without the slightest thought of sanitary considerations. If churches thus distorting the Lord's own ordinance were really so interested in sanitary considerations, then they would also discourage the indiscriminate kissing of all sorts of religious objects.

Other distortions, bordering on the line of sacrilege, are: 1.) The role of the officiating priest is so construed as to suggest his saving power over the Lord of the Sacrament. It is assumed that at the imprecation of the officiating priest, Christ Jesus, the Second Person in the Blessed Holy Trinity, is bound to leave His heavenly abode and is to make Himself present, bodily, in the Host, that is, the consecrated wafer, now changed into the very Body and Blood of Christ. 2.) Through the idea that the departed may benefit by the earthly celebration of the Sacrament on their behalf, even the holiest of all the holy things that the Lord Jesus saw fit to leave with us "till He come," was dragged down to a level, on which pecuniary considerations may enter the picture and may influence the application of the Savior's freely given gift.

To the reformers, with the Bible in their hands and the fear of the Lord in their hearts, every bit of this arbitrary and false dealing with the Christ-given Sacrament appeared to be just so much damnable error and sin. They abhorred having any part in it. They restored the biblical simplicity of administering the Sacrament to the faithful. To hold on to it is to really honor the words of Christ: "This do in remembrance of me!" But if you would ever part with your Reformation heritage, you would never be in position again to obey Christ's words in their fullest sense. You would have to submit yourself to, and share in the error and guilt of those who allowed human wisdom to take precedence over plainly revealed divine wisdom. Is this not another reason to be grateful for your Reformation heritage, and to repeat, with personal conviction behind them, the words of the Psalmist: "The line are fallen unto me in pleasant places; yea, I have a goodly heritage!"

VI

The sixth thing you would surely miss, in case you were not a Reformed Christian anymore, is that broad sense of solidarity which a Reformed Christian harbors toward all the true believers and followers of Christ.

Whence this generously charitable and charitably generous spirit of a Reformed Christian? It flows directly from the teachings and from the attitude of his church. He is not being taught bigotry under the bold and false assumption that God's saving grace is deposited wholly and exclusively with his branch of Christ's great Catholic Universal Church. The whole is taught to be greater than any part of it. That boldness and blindness, for example, with which the Roman Branch ofUniversal Christendom lays claim upon being the only true church, The Catholic Church, is repugnant to us and is a God-provoking thing in our eyes. It is basically un-Christian. It lacks true respect for the greatness of Christ, for the general character of the Gospel, for the inexpressible greatness of God's heart. It breeds contempt and spiritual pride. It narrows the mind and is the original and foremost cause of a divided Christendom. If the Church of Rome had cared but half as much for the truth of God, as she did for her own aggrandizement and for her own power over the God-created souls of men, there would never have been a divided Christendom. People would have been happy to live together in peace, but when choice had to be made between an ungracious ecclesiastical tyranny and a gracious Christ, the bravest of all souls always knew how to choose.

Even now, while professing to a burning desire for Christian unity, Rome has nothing better for us than dubbing us with the name, "prodigal sons." This is the attitude of the elder brother of the prodigal son. It is an attitude that made him less lovable in the sight of God and man than the real prodigal son. Luke 15. Nay, the spirit of Rome represents in the field of religion such a spirit of exclusivism that is not tolerated in any other sphere of life. In business it is monopoly. In society it is racial supremacy or class rule. In government it is a defilement of the state and, thereby, tyranny. In quest for power on the part of nations it is imperialism.

Our spirit is that of humbleness toward Heaven, charity toward man, and of solidarity and cooperation, even without a forced uniformity, with all the members of the household of Christ. There is more real universality, that is, catholicity of spirit in the heirs of the Reformation, than among the proponents of papal exclusivism. This is why our forefathers stated boldly and firmly: "We are Catholics and Christians!" (Second Helvetic Confession). Not in the sense held by Rome, but in the sense upheld by the Gospel. If you would ever break faith with that Gospel and join the ranks of Rome, you would hear the word, "Catholic," more often, but you would have less, considerably less—at least officially—of the real, biblical Catholic spirit. Let, therefore, no earthly claim dupe you, let no display of power and splendor sway you, but bless God, day in and day out, for your Reformation heritage, confessing with the Psalmist: "The lines are fallen unto me in pleasant places; yea, I have a goodly heritage!"

VII

"The seventh thing you would miss, if you gave up your Reformed heritage, would be your spiritual succession with those who lived and died in this faith."
The very idea of a heritage points to parents and other ancestors. A heritage represents goods accumulated by preceding generations with a view to passing them on to succeeding generations. This is exactly what happened in your case, whether you were born of Reformed parentage or not. As both native and naturalized citizens are ultimately equal citizens, so are church members by birth and confession and members by just confession co-heirs to the heritage of the Reformation. The Reformed Faith and life-view came to you through a long line of physical and spiritual succession. The zeal, the prayers and sacrifices of each preceding generation added to your heritage. Taking hold of that heritage, adding some more to it, and passing it on is the greatest tribute you can pay to those who have gone ahead of you in this faith.

Keep, therefore, that golden chain of spiritual succession unbroken, and if God in His good providence called you to establish a new Reformed Christian lineage, build that chain prayerfully, so that some day others may take up, with you in their grateful thoughts, the Psalmist's testimony: "The lines are fallen unto me in pleasant places; yea, I have a goodly heritage!"

My co-heirs in the heritage of the Reformation, these are some of the things you would most assuredly miss in case you turned your back upon that heritage. But such a thing seldom happens with Reformed Christians who have grown up not only physically, but also spiritually. For adult converts we can always match any other church, most of all the Church of Rome, more than person for person. But something else happens with heart-rending frequency. What is it? The pledging away of yet unborn babes to a faith which at every turn is the exact opposite of the Reformed Christian Faith. It is the faith professed by the Church of Rome. There are entirely too many young men and young women of Reformed heritage who personally would not turn to Rome under any circumstances, but who seem to think very lightly of dooming their children to that Church. This is a most unfair and a thoroughly unnatural thing for future parents to do. It shows that they have no real idea of parental love; all the love they know is just a selfish love, more in the nature of infatuation. Parental love does care for the children, even before it cares for self. It also shows that such individuals have no sound view of what constitutes a full life. They assume responsibility for the physical welfare of their children, but they waive aside the weightier responsibility for their spiritual welfare. This is an attitude of total irresponsibility toward what Reformed Christianity meant, means, and is to mean to the nation and to the world.

It appears that for most of you the time of testing is the period of courtship, including the time while you formulate your plans for marriage. I pray you to pray then as your mother prayed at your sick-bed, and some day you may find yourself praying at your child's sick-bed, that God make you firm in that faith; both for yourself and for your children; so firm that it should remain a blessed privilege both for you and your children to say: "The lines are fallen unto me in pleasant places; yea, I have a goodly heritage!"

For Meredith, Aged One

I almost heard your little heart
Begin to beat, and since that hour
Twelve months have passed, yet still amazed
I stand before that same great power
That formed each perfect finger tip,
Each dimpled cheek, each golden hair,
And since that first beat sounded out
Has kept you ever in his care.
What miracle, what wealth is mine
That I may clasp you to my breast!
That in God's graciousness he placed
You in the arms that love you best!

MARIE J. POST

Grand Rapids
GOOD NEWS FROM SOUTH AFRICA


Dear Prof. Bouma:

I have very good news for you and for your readers who are interested in Christian higher education. This news concerns the Potchefstroom University College for Christian higher education.

As you may know, this is the institution with which I am connected. Since 1921 it forms a constituent college of the University of South Africa. This university is a federal institution and consists of a number of teaching colleges. The university itself grants the degrees. Our institution therefore was not an independent university granting its own degrees. The University of South Africa started as such in 1918. Since then it became the successor to the old University of the Cape of Good Hope, itself instituted in 1873. From 1921 onwards the constituent colleges one after the other left the federal university, each becoming an independent university. In this way the University of Witwatersrand seceded in 1921, the University of Pretoria in 1930, the University of Natal in 1949, and the University of the Orange Free State in 1950. In this way the position of our institution as a constituent college became more and more hazardous; we could not grant any degrees, and students began to drift into the independent universities. In the meantime our institution developed appreciably and it was suggested by a recent commission on university education that the remaining colleges should acquire independent status. As to number of students, number of faculties, and standard of work and research, as well as financial stability, we reached a stage of development that gave us the right to apply for independent status.

University institutions are in our country state-aided. They are controlled by an independent body, a council which administers the finances and receives from the government a grant sufficient to put each institution on a sound footing. The government grant in no way affects internal policy, so that the South African universities are practically free institutions. In this way it came to pass that our institution could go on teaching along Christian lines.

There is, however, one clause in the South Africa University Act of 1916 which applies to all university institutions, including our own. This has come to be known as the Conscience Clause. The clause is No. 25 of Act No. 12 of 1916, and reads as follows: "No test whatever of religious belief shall be imposed on any person as a condition of his becoming or continuing to be a graduate of the University, or a professor, lecturer, teacher, or student of the University, or of his holding any office or emolument in exercising any privilege therein, nor shall any preference be given to, or any office or receiving any emolument or exercising any privilege thereby. (2) No person shall be prevented on the ground of his religious belief from becoming or continuing to be a student or graduate of the University."

The Clause was inserted in our Bill and we, the present staff and council, considered it absolutely essential that this Clause should become a part of our Act. Without it we would not have accepted our independence.

At the beginning of this year our private Bill went to Parliament, consisting of two houses—the House of Assembly and the Senate. This being a private Bill, it was kept out of the party political arena—any member of Parliament could support or oppose it.

The House of Assembly tackled the Bill first. The Bill has 41 Clauses in all. It went without a hitch through all its stages in the House Assembly—wit one exception, viz., Clause 31. All members were willing to give us our full name: The Potchefstroom University for Christian Higher Education, to grant us the right to teach on Christian lines, but the House was divided on the question of appointments to the Staff. The opposition stood pat on the old Conscience Clause of the Act of 1916. A long, very determined, though at no time bitter, opposition was put up. Our Bill passed the House of Assembly without any change, however, the voting in our favor being 7 to 2. In the Senate the Clause 31 met stern opposition, but it was finally passed by a majority of 19 to 16. The final reading of our Bill fell on April 25 and on May 4 the Governor-General signed our Act making us an independent university. The Minister of Education has now to appoint a day, and we have every hope that this day will be early in 1951, perhaps middle March.

By this Act of Parliament we now have received the legal right to call ourselves a university for Christian higher education and to appoint as members of staff confirmed Christians, not necessarily members of any particular Christian Church.

We see here are very thankful and our hearts turn with sincere thanks to our Heavenly Father who has willed that our Bill should pass through the Union Parliament without any change in our wording, particularly as regards the fundamental principle of Clause 31. On April 27 our institution called a holiday and early in that morning we gathered in full force.
as Staff and students in our Hall to give thanks to our Lord and Master for His condescending love and mercy. This service was conducted by our venerable rector, prof. dr. F. Postma, who has been connected with our institution nigh onto 50 years and has been rector since 1921. This was his ideal and we are all very happy and thankful that God has granted him what he has so deeply, sincerely and consistently desired and been working for.

And so, once more, we are exceedingly happy: soli Deo gloria! With kind regards,

Sincerely yours,

J. CHEE, COFFEE.

THE CALVIN FOUNDATION

2460 Almont Ave., S.E.,
Grand Rapids, Michigan,
June 12, 1950.

Dear Dr. Bouma:

This letter is occasioned by a news item which I am certain is of great interest to all Forum readers. After three years of planning, accompanied by extensive publicity in the Calvin Alumni Letter, the Calvin Foundation was born. On June 1, 1950, the charter of the Calvin Foundation was returned to the Alumni Association, hearing the seal of the State of Michigan, thereby signifying the approval of the Michigan Corporations Commission. The Calvin Foundation is more than merely a scheme which enjoys only legal existence. The Calvin Foundation has substance. Wholly unsolicited gifts have given to it a wealth of $10,105. This is indeed an excellent and heartening beginning. The generous gift of Mr. Wm. B. Eerdmans, Sr., gave to the Calvin Foundation its impetus. The Calvin Alumni Association which worked out the details of the Foundation organization hopes to maintain the pace already set by encouraging other gifts, large and small, for it is solely by the generosity of interested persons that the Calvin Foundation can fulfill the objectives delineated in its charter.

The Calvin Foundation is not and can not become another academic institution. It is an organization which will provide the means for creative and scholarly work, but it will not carry on that work itself. It will seek to furnish aids, helps, and opportunities to the alumni, students, and faculties of our schools.

The funds and means for carrying on the activities for such a foundation will be derived from such sources as: gifts of money, annuities, property, works of art, historical papers and documents, museum specimens; acquisition of property of any kind, real and personal, including shares, bonds, and securities of other corporations; assumption of trusteeship of any trust, trust receivings, holding, administering, and expending funds and properties subject to such trust. The foundation will be able to enter into any valid business scheme from which it can realize some financial return.

The purposes and objectives of the foundation are the "encouragement of the study, the development, enrichment and effective dissemination of Calvinism and the reaffirmation of Calvinism as a dynamic force in the contemporary world." To achieve these ends the foundation will provide:

1. The Board of Trustees will be organized into three committees: a projects and planning committee, a publicity committee, and a finance committee. The names are self-explanatory. A full-time, paid executive officer employed by the Board of Trustees shall be provided when the affairs of the foundation have progressed to that point at which the employment of such an executive officer will become necessary. Control of the Calvin Foundation is vested in a Board of Trustees, members of which are elected to their positions in a manner prescribed in the charter of incorporation.

2. The Calvin Foundation is incorporated under the laws of the State of Michigan. Its charter contains a statement of objectives, defines the manner of control, and describes the methods and types of business in which it will be engaged.

3. The Board of Trustees is constituted of fifteen (15) men. These fifteen offices shall be filled in the following manner:
   a. Five trustees will be ex officio members. They are: 1) Mr. Eerdmans, founder; 2) The President of the Board of Trustees of Calvin College and Seminary; 3) The President of Calvin College; 4) The President of Calvin Seminary; 5) The President of Calvin Alumni Association. b. Four trustees will be elected by the members of the Calvin Foundation. Of these four, one shall be a member of the college faculty, one shall be a member of the seminary faculty, two shall be members of the Calvin Alumni Association. The election for this group of trustees is now in progress. This will be completed by September 1, 1950. c. These nine trustees shall elect an additional six trustees to the Board of Trustees under the following conditions: these six shall be elected from three broad functional classifications, namely, two from business, two from the lay professions, two others highly qualified to uphold the purposes of the Calvin Foundation. Moreover, these six trustees shall be chosen, wherever possible, from various typical geographical areas. The manner of their election does not violate democratic control even though their election is indirect. It is thought that through this indirect election the functional and geographical factors will be most readily and assuredly observed.

4. Members of the Calvin Foundation are the following: persons who are active members of the Calvin Alumni Association; persons admitted by a two-thirds vote of the Board of Trustees of the Calvin Foundation; any person serving as a Trustee or holding an office in the Foundation.

5. The charter specifically reads that the Foundation shall not enter into willful competition for funds with Calvin College and Seminary.

Sincerely yours,

William Spoelhof.

THE CALVIN FORUM * * * AUGUST - SEPTEMBER, 1950
The Calvinistic Conference

On March 21st a dream finally became a reality to Rev. David Kerr and myself when some forty-five people gathered in Chalmers Presbyterian Church, London, Ontario, for the first Canadian Calvinistic Conference.

The Conference was opened with devotions conducted by Rev. David Kerr, minister of the Wardville and Kintyre Presbyterian Churches, after which he welcomed all who had gathered.

Five excellent addresses were given on the salient points of Calvinism during the two days of the conference:

The Christian Analysis of the World's Chaos—(Total Depravity)
Rev. W. H. Fuller, Presbyterian Church, Jarvis, Ont.

God's Choice of His People (Election)
Rev. John Gritter, Christian Reformed Church, Aylmer, Ont.

Believers are Eternally Secure—(Perseverance of the Saints)
Rev. Mariano DiGangi, Beckwith Memorial Presbyterian Church, Montreal, Quebec

Reconciling the World Unto God (Lamented Atonement)
Rev. Wm. Matheson, Free Presbyterian Church, Chesley, Ont.

The Grace of God which Brings Salvation (Irresistible Grace)
Rev. Adam Persenaire, Christian Reformed Church, St. Catharines, Ont.

A sixth address was given by Dr. Neil B. Stonehouse, Professor of New Testament, Westminster Theological Seminary, Philadelphia, entitled "The Coming of the Kingdom"—dealing with Calvinism and Eschatology.

Each address was followed by a lively discussion which showed evidence of the interest aroused. These discussions often lasted longer than the address itself, with practically all present taking part.

The Tuesday evening meeting was a Public Worship Service conducted by Rev. Mariano DiGangi, Missionary for the Presbyterian Church to the Italians of Montreal.

During the business session which was held, it was agreed that the Conference was exceedingly successful and that it should become an annual event. The first week after Easter was chosen as the date of our next Conference. It was decided to hold the Second Conference in either Hamilton or London. The committee to plan the next Conference consists of Rev. D. Kerr, Rev. J. Botting, ministers of the Presbyterian Church in Canada; Rev. John Gritter of the Christian Reformed Church; Rev. Wm. Matheson of the Free Presbyterian Church; and Dr. B. H. McNeil, M.D., Psychiatrist and Professor in Western University Medical School.

JOHN A. BOTTING.

Glencoe, Ont.

LETTER FROM SOUTH INDIA


The Editor-in-Chief,

THE CALVIN FORUM,

Grand Rapids, Michigan, U.S.A.

My dear Dr. Bouma:

As I sit at my typewriter on this windy morning to tap out a letter to you, I am conscious of both pleasure and regret: pleasure that it is possible through these South India Letters to discuss current news and problems of this land and the missionary effort, and regret that any missives are of necessity so infrequent.

Life in this once 'unchanging' Orient has become so complex and events move with such rapidity that one wonders if even the tremendous tempo of living in your great and progressive land is not being seriously challenged. The great space of world-broadcasting today tends to confuse one's thinking rather than keep one up-to-date on global events and trends. Not that a busy missionary can afford the time to listen systematically to even one-tenth of the propaganda which the world's transmitters put out every hour and every day, but I am one of those who believe that an earnest Christian worker should maintain a world-outlook if he is to intelligently plan and administer the piece of Kingdom work which God has been pleased to entrust him with.

The Indigenous Church

For the benefit of your readers, many of whom are concerned with the task of Christian missions, I would like to dilate on a new trend which appears to have of recent months captivated the imagination of so many thinking Christians. It is the absorbing subject of the indigenous church in lands which have been until comparatively a few decades ago virgin territory as far as the Gospel impact is concerned. It is obvious that current thought has been profoundly affected by the rapid spread of Communism in China, Indo-China, Indonesia, Malaya, Burma, and other contiguous nations where Christianity has made considerable strides.

Confining myself to the sub-continent comprising India and Pakistan, although the menace of Communism is still unimportant, there is nevertheless a nationwide upsurge of nationalism. This is reflected in a fairly general demand for a national church and a self-governing indigenous church; but, paradoxically enough, there is as yet little talk of a self-supporting church and even less of a self-propagating church, save among a very limited section of Indian Christians. This, to one who has had the privilege of living and working among the sturdily independent peoples of Britain and North America, is an enigma, disappointing as well as perplexing.

As has been mentioned more than once in my contributions to the FORUM, considerable 'devolution' has taken place in the working policies of missions sponsored by the American Lutheran groups, the Canadian and American Baptist churches, the Reformed Church of America, and by British organizations such as the Church Missionary Society, the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel ('High' Anglicans), the London Mission (Congregationalist), and also the Basel Mission of Switzerland (Calvinistic Lutherans). Many partially independent and a few entirely self-supporting Indian churches have resulted, and these are operating with but a minimum of direction from foreign leaders. In the smaller missionary organizations, established less than a century ago, there are very few partially self-supporting and practically no fully autonomous, indigenous churches or church institutions. But, by and large, the spiritual tone of the majority of our self-governing or partly independent church is far from good. There is in these groups far too much disunity and far too little loyalty either to doctrine or denomination. All this, of course, affords fertile soil for ardent reformers bent on sowing church-union propaganda among the uninformed. And here let it be said that the three-year old, infant Church of South India has been but a partial success, there being many warmly supporting it while in the Anglican diocese of Dornakal as many as 30,000 Christians are keeping out of the merger.

The Perils of Self-Determination

Being voluntarily committed for the past 15 years to the task of founding independent Telugu churches (after the Reformed pattern since being received into the Christian Reformed Communion just over three years ago), we have looked around us at the work of other missions as well as introspectively at our own. Some of the independent city churches in centers like Madras, Bangalore, and Bombay have given one hope and encouragement, for they have assumed full responsibility not only for the day-to-day care of their own congregations, but have also been financing evangelistic and
educational missionary work elsewhere. Usually this takes the form of regular help in money for the parent mission which helped to found the particular church or of manning and operating slum Chapels or suburban missions. This is both healthy and praiseworthy on the part of the purely national church, and as a Christian and a citizen of the new India I do praise God for His gracious guiding hand manifest among such educated groups of His people in India.

The situation in most of the rural churches which have attained to independence is, however, very different. Usually comprising poorly educated people, with quite a sizable minority of illiterates, these groups finance the work of their local churches, including the pastor's salary and his home. But it is just here that the Indian Christian differs from his Western co-religionist, and one is tempted to make the comparison with the reputed methods of the old Dutch settlers in Michigan and Iowa! Our self-sufficient churchmen never forget to remind their pastor that he is a paid employee, and he is often bullied into closing his eyes to many undesirable practices within the church. If there is a church council or district committee legislating for a number of local churches, then any complaint made to this body by the aggrieved pastor is usually met by a concerted demand for his transfer to another group. Also, discipline within the church or groups of independent churches is often lax, sometimes woefully so; and, should there be a strict missionary or a foreign-trained man on the local or higher church council, his advice often goes unheeded, and in some cases where the concensus of opinion is against a delinquent church, it just 'pulls out'—perhaps a state of affairs not entirely unknown even in America.

When, however, independence is hastily thrust on a community which is spiritually immature and economically backward, one or more of three consequences follow, largely because of the group being totally unable to afford either a resident teacher or a visiting pastor. They either decline spiritually and fall a prey to predatory Romanist invaders, who ever seek Protestant 'proselytes', or they go back into Hinduism from the fringes of which they were brought in, or again, they survive as a nominally Christian group, proud of their self-sufficiency but tragically emasculated as a body of Christians who once were taken care of by consecrated under-shepherds who taught and preached the Word of God.

The Present Situation

Now, some of your readers may recall my unconditional offer of the mission under my direction to the denomination about three years ago. Negotiations concerning this matter have dragged on for many months, resulting last February in an offer from the Board of a recommendation to Synod 1950 to take us over as a missionary force of three and to build, equip, and staff a training school for Indian workers somewhere in our territory. This offer was, however, conditioned by our acceptance of the new "Strictly indigenous church plan" which has evidently found much favor in the eyes of several of the denomination's leaders. And, although the decisions of Synod 1950, of which we still await news, will have passed into history by the time these lines appear in print, it may be worth mentioning that we have been lead to decline the Board's generous offer of personal sponsoring, since the immediate implementation of the new 'plan' would in our considered opinion result in a situation on our field similar to the one described in the previous paragraph and the disintegration of about four-fifths of our work which has been built up with much prayer and labor during the past two decades. Our experience of the country and our intimate firsthand knowledge of the people compel us to remain for the time being an independent, but Reformed, organization so far as our busy Central Field is concerned. I have agreed to the denomination taking over our Mysore Field subject to certain safeguards for Pastor Stephen Raleigh, who has labored so faithfully under us in that section. We continue in prayer that if it please God, a mutually satisfactory way may be opened in the future for our entire work to become a part of the denominational world-missionary enterprise.

Not wishing to further trespass on your available space, permit me to close this time with fraternal greetings to your good self and the 'FORUM Family'.

Arthur V. Ramiah.

IRISH EVANGELICAL CHURCH

15 College Square East, Belfast, Northern Ireland, 31st July, 1950.

Dear Professor Bouma:

A NOTHING copy of the ever-welcome FORUM reminds me that it is time for me to send you another letter from Ireland. Permit me to say, at the very outset, that I do appreciate your paper, it seems to link one up with Calvinists throughout the world, and I suppose that is one reason why it is published. May the Lord use it to His glory.

I. C. C. C.

I am aware that there is some difference of opinion in Reformed circles concerning the International Council of Christian Churches. And the discussion at the General Assembly of the O. P. C. recently, made it quite clear that there is room for improvement in that Council. However, it seems to be the opinion in my Church (Irish Evangelical) that the I. C. C. C. is moving in the right direction. At time of writing, we are the only British church in the Council. This year we hope to send three representatives to Geneva, and, provided the European war-clouds do not burst this summer, it is almost certain that at least two of our representatives will arrive at Geneva in good time.

Last spring we had a visit from Dr. Henry Pol, Reformed Presbyterians and Irish Evangelicals united in Botanic Avenue Church, Belfast, to listen to an address on the I. C. C. C. by the doctor. Earlier in the day, Dr. Pol had addressed a gathering in the Grosvenor Road R. P. Church, Belfast, following a special session of the Theological Hall. The evening meeting in Botanic Avenue was chaired by Rev. W. J. Grier, (Editor, The Irish Evangelical), and he was supported by Rev. Nevin Lyons of the R. P. Church. It is the opinion of one of our ministers who attended both gatherings, that Dr. Pol gave the cream of quotations and statistics to the afternoon gathering. But it is quite possible that he thought he would be addressing practically the same audience at both meetings.

Rev. E. H. Titcombe informs me that Dr. Pol gave many examples of Modernism's blasphemy. Feddick, Van Duren and Chao, not forgetting Bishop Bromley Oxnam, all came before us as deniers of the supernatural. Had not Chao stated, "Great men like JESUS—a Jew through and through and ..." In the World Council, belief in "Jesus Christ as God and Saviour" was lightly held; modernism dominated; and Rome was welcome. What would happen if Romanists joined and out-voted Protestants? Still Visser 't Hooft, World Council Secretary, was hopeful of "ecumenical development!"

It would have been much better if Dr. Pol could have had a longer stay in Ireland, and addressed more meetings. But we pray that the blasphemy of modernism may be kept before the minds of the Lord's people, and that many may be stirred from their lethargic Protestantism.

Reformed Presbyterian Church

I was glad to meet the Rev. W. R. McEwen from Australia. He was moderator of the Reformed Presbyterian Synod this year. Mr. McEwen has not lost his Irish ways, and, what is much more important, he is alive to the menace of the so-called liberalism which has produced the World Council. However, he would like to see his brethren in the R. P. Church over here becoming fully aware of the danger, and joining the I. C. C. C. It is his opinion that the rather rabid attitude of one or two leaders in the I. C. C. C. towards the World...
Council, has made some of his colleagues chary of the former organization. But he rightly has pointed out that the policy of any organization should not be interpreted by the statements or technique of one or two members. Personally I wish that my R. P. brethren in this province were much more energetic in opposing rationalism, and in joining hands with all who love the Saviour. The R. P. Church is Calvinistic, but recently they have sent representatives to the large, modernistic Presbyterian Church, and have received the moderators of the big Presbyterian bodies of Ireland and Scotland,—both being one in their modernism. It seems to your correspondent that this is hardly a consistent policy, and that it could not be reconciled with membership in the I. C. C. C. But time will tell.

The Reformer's Calendar

Last year the National Union of Protestants (Ireland) issued, by way of an experiment, “The Reformer’s Calendar”. It sold well. This year the calendar has been improved, and will be three-quarters the previous size. These twelve impressive drawings by an accomplished Irish artist, depicting stirring events from the history of Protestantism in different lands, are well worth the price of one dollar. That covers postage, packing, etc. Those who have obtained the 1950 calendar will want to continue with the series. Underneath each drawing are brief historical notes, with appropriate Scripture texts on either side. As well as being a thing of beauty, the calendar is undoubtedly of considerable educational value. This year the notes have been written by Rev. E. H. Titcombe, Belfast,—a staunch Calvinist—and the pictures have been arranged by your correspondent. The calendar is published by the N. U. P. at 26 Howard St., Belfast.

With greetings and best wishes from Calvinists on this side of the Atlantic—nothing can separate us,

Yours in His service,

Fred S. Leahy.

Book Reviews

ALL ABOUT THE TEMPLE


This publication is a reprint of a book written by Dr. Edersheim several years ago. The republication of it indicates a conviction of its worthwhileness and of anticipated renewal of interest in it.

The book takes the reader back to the time of Christ and presents to him the Herodian temple at Jerusalem as Christ saw it, labored in it, and was the fulfillment of its typology. The gospel scenes of Christ teaching in the temple are all recorded and placed in their proper setting. The history of several Bible characters of note are interwoven in the story, as the father of John the Baptist ministering in his course, the Virgin-Mother presenting her Infant-Savior, Simeon and Anna, John and Peter healing the impotent man at the gate called Beautiful. Various references to the ritual found in the N. T. and sayings which reflect customs of the temple are cited. Especially the book of Revelation teems with references to and imagery taken from the temple ritual and its feasts.

The main study of the book is the description of the several parts and the functionaries of the temple. The author does not merely state what and who these are, but we are led into the temple precincts themselves and made to see what happened there. Thus we are introduced into the Holy of Holies, and can watch the High Priest on the Day of Atonement, the Holy Place and the Priests serving in their order, the court of the Priests with the part which each of the many priests performed of the sacrifices, the laws governing purifications. These all are made to pass in review before the reader. Priests, Levites, singers, templeguard, even the nightwatch are elaborately described. Our attention is directed to the offerings for the firstborn, the Nazarite vows, cleansing of lepers, the tithes, the customs at the feasts, the Scapegoat, the determinating of the date of the New Moon, and many other facts of importance which colored life at the temple.

Dr. Edersheim was well qualified to write upon his chosen theme. Being a Jew, well versed in Rabbinical lore, he had a familiarity with the ritual and with its typical significance and the interpretations given in the Mishna which was unusual. He was a Christian Jew and delighted in directing the attention of his readers to the fulfillment of its typology in the Christ. Besides all this he understood the art of story-telling.

This stood him in good stead when he chose as he did to write in a practical vein rather than to present his message in a scholar’s thesis.

He also has proved himself to have been a studious and careful writer. One does not find in his work the many fanciful descriptions of the temple and the city which discolored some popular works on the market today. It is true that there are several very detailed descriptions of chambers reputed to have been found in the temple, the correctness of which many a writer today might call in question. But for each of these descriptions Dr. Edersheim can and usually does refer to some ancient Jewish authority, as Maimonides, the Mishna, Gemara, Josephus and others. As a result, it seems to be the case that this noted author could have profited from the later studies of more recent authors and the discoveries in some popular vein that marks this book, and therefore miss the popular appeal. There are popular works or portions of books written about the temple, but these are often lack the scholarly background which characterizes this work of Dr. Edersheim. One could wish that this noted author could have profited from the later studies of more recent authors and the discoveries of modern times and days, as, of course, he would have, had he lived today. Nevertheless this work will be found to be far and away superior to most semi-popular books of its class by any who may choose to study it and who in consequence may experience the delight of reading it.

H. Henry Meeter.

JEWISH SOCIAL LIFE


This book is a companion volume of Edersheim’s, The Temple, Its Ministry and Services. “In my book on The Temple, Its Ministry and Services, I endeavored to carry the reader with me into the Sanctuary, and to make him witness all connected with its institutions, its priesthood, and its
solenmities. In this book I have sought to take him into ordinary civil society, and to make him mingle with the men and women of that period, see them in their homes and families, learn their habits and manners, and follow them in their ordinary life—all, as illustrative of New Testament Jewry, customs of burial, trade relations in the opportunity to gratify that desire. For such there can scarcely be a book.
The tourist will then observe many more things about that time, having read Dr. Edersheim's book will not diminish the history; at the same time endeavoring to present a new and worth-while addition to his education. Many faulty notions about life in Palestine will be corrected and many new vistas will appear to view.
Not the least advantage which will accrue from the reading of this volume is the information which it will impart regarding the diverse types of inhabitants living in Palestine at the time of Christ. There were not only Jews with a sprinkling of Samaritans, but Syrians, and, not to forget, Greeks and Romans. One must understand these other races in order to appreciate the bitterness of the clash between the orthodox Jew and the Greek-speaking and Greek-thinking educated world.
In consequence also one of the most informing sections of the book will be the one describing the dominant sects of Pharisees and Sadducees. Regarding the former sect Edersheim remarks: "There is no subject on which more crude or inaccurate notions prevail than that of Pharisaism, nor yet any which, rightly understood, gives fuller insight into the state of Judaism at the time of our Lord, or better illustrates His words and His deeds." (p. 213.) The Pharisees began by being the Jewish nation's staunch defenders of the ancient law and traditions of the Israelites as over against the encroachments of the Grecian religion and culture. It defended to that end the teachings of the Rabbis. Of these as originally intended Edersheim has more than a kindly word to say, "the more the Rabbinical code is studied, the higher will be our admiration of its provisions, characterized as these are by wisdom, kindness, and delicacy, we venture to say, far beyond any modern legislation. Not only the history of the past, the present privileges, and the hope connected with the promises—would attach a Jew to his people. Only one thing was awaiting—but that, alas! the "one thing needful." For, in the language of St. Paul (Rom. X:2), "I bear them record that they have a zeal for God, but not according to knowledge." Despite the illustrious beginning of Pharisaism, it developed into a system of pure externalism in the vast majority of its members. The Sadducees were even worse. These were the avowed liberal group headed by the Chief Priests and the aristocratic families of the leading priests." Enough has been said about this interesting book to warrant its recommendation to the readers of the FORUM. The volume is well bound and paper and type are such as to make it pleasant to read.
H. HENRY MEETER.

MAKING WISE THE SIMPLE


"SANCTIFY them through thy truth: thy word is truth." These words from the high priestly prayer of our Lord came to mind as I was reflecting upon the import and impact of the Scriptural study under consideration. The author has given us by way of preeminence a study of the truth of God as delivered by the prophet Amos, the farmer from Tekoa. This is not a character study, an attempt to delineate a man against the background of political and economic history. But we are brought face to face with the message from God for Israel under Jeroboam II, a message which is still relevant today.
The book under consideration is not a commentary on one of the minor prophets, neither is it a collection of sermons though much sermonic material is available. It is a simple study of the Word as the truth of God. It reminds one of the figure described in the first Psalm of the man who delights in the law of his God day and night. The expositions of the message of Amos are definitely written for the ordinary member of the church, but the insights are so profound and the artistry so superior that every minister will find it a delight and an inspiration to read this volume. It is, in my estimation, an example of superior work in Scriptural exposition which is vital and existental for all of us. Truly a book to make wise the simple and to restore the soul!
HENRY R. VAN TIL.

ON THE MIRACLES


To review this book is almost as needless as to introduce an old acquaintance. Surely, scarcely a minister or Bible student of the past fifty years has failed to make a more or less intimate acquaintance with this, the classic reference work on the miracles of Jesus. This, with its companion volume dealing with the parables of Jesus, written in the 19th century by the Archbishop of Dublin, has been reissued in popular form by the Grand Rapids book house of Baker. In doing so, Baker's has done a worthy service indeed. The present volume contains virtually the same explanatory material as the older editions. However, the use of Greek, Latin and other foreign-language reference has been omitted. The omission has improved the readability and popular appeal of the book. It has detracted somewhat from its value as a source book for the thorough scholar. But many ministers and Bible students have access to the older, more scholarly-annotated editions, anyway, and the loss is not insuperable.
As the book is now published, it is an invaluable aid for sermon-making and Bible Class study not only, but becomes an interesting and informative volume for the thoughtful Christian to read at any time.
Anyone who loves the Gospel narratives of the life of Jesus, (and who does not?) will find here a treasure. The price is not prohibitive. We sincerely hope that many reading Christians will find one of these companion volumes by Trench a welcome addition to his gift list.


The author of this book of 225 pages is minister of the First Baptist Church of Malden, Massachusetts, and a member of the Board of Education and Publication of the Northern Baptist Assembly.
The book reflects an awareness of the needs of the modern Christian pulpit, preaching, as it must, to a cynical science-loving generation. The book at hand bears the marks of hav-
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ing been the fruit of actual preaching on the miracles of Jesus.

This probably explains, at least in part, certain features of the author's treatment of the subject. His purpose, as stated in the subtitle, is to present "The meaning of Christ's miracles and their sermon values for today." The purpose is, then, not to enter polemically into the question of miracle as such, nor to establish the thesis that the miracles of Jesus were really miracles. In fact, he shies away from accepting the idea that the miracles of Jesus were intended as signs to prove His deity. His intention is to indicate the ways in which the miracles of Jesus teach us the ethical purpose of Jesus as He walked among men.

Yet this purpose does not entirely explain the author's treatment. There are presuppositions in the book, as there are of necessity everywhere, and these presuppositions determine the central thrust of the whole book—as presuppositions of necessity always do.

The author states a presupposition in his preface (p. 7) as follows: "It (the book) frankly proceeds on the basis of a faith judgment, holding that miracles both can and did happen." And it is quite true that the rationalist will be dissatisfied with the book. The affirmation that something happened that cannot be explained on purely rational grounds is given too often to leave rationalism much comfort. However, the present reviewer must confess his dissatisfaction also that the affirmation of the miraculous is not as strong as it might be. One looks a little wishfully for a strong and definite assertion that Jesus was the eternal Word, the Son of God, and thus the absolute Lord of heaven and earth, though veiled in human flesh; and that His miracles are the result of His creative and omnipotent hand controlling the very destinies of the universe.

We find, on the contrary, such a statement as that comparing the miracles of Jesus with the mysterious though natural powers of electronics (p. 21). We find Dr. Straton saying that we can no more understand how Jesus fed the multitude than we can understand God's daily gift of sunlight (p. 50) and we cannot help feeling that the author feels a little relieved when he can leave the question of the miracle of the loaves behind and proceed to teach how it can serve as the church's guide in being concerned about social and economic questions. Frankly, the author really prefers to believe that God did not ever suspend or temporarily alter a natural law, but simply called into play another natural law that men of that day did not yet know about and this led them to cry "miracle" when it was no more a miracle than floating a needle on water. (p. 75.)

Dr. Straton believes in miracles, even to the extent of accepting the probability of a modern miracle (p. 60). He describes the healing of the ten lepers in a way that only a man who believed in actual miracle could. (p. 88.) And yet he leans as far as possible toward alternate interpretations. He says that we must remember that "men of the ancient world, with their limited and often very naive view of nature, lived in what to us would be considered a fairyland. Anything that could not be explained by the ordinary course of events was neatly classified as a miracle." (p. 14.) A miracle, says he, may still be present though we may explain the event by natural causes. "If God enters the situation, the miracle is still there." (p. 17.) He uses the term "telepathic healing" to describe, and, largely, to explain the healing of the nobleman's son. (p. 95.) He says that the statement "whom Satan hath bound" in connection with the hunchbacked woman of Luke 13 would give some indication that her ailment was of nervous origin (p. 107) leaving one with the impression that this was what is today called "psycho-somatic" healing. The paralytic of Mark 2 and parallel passages, was a man suffering from a "guilt reaction" which may explain his paralysis and so Jesus first declared that his sins were forgiven. (p. 118.) Here too, the author does not say that Jesus actually forgave as God can forgive. He pronounced the forgiveness as any man of God might do. (p. 119.)

The author gives valuable summaries of the alternate interpretations of miracles, but he gives, we believe, too much ground before them. He leaves one feeling on p. 32 that the parabolic interpretation of the miracle of Cana might satisfy him as well as any other. And he does not reject the interpretation of Paulus that the multitudes were fed when they followed Jesus' example in sharing what they had. (p. 49.)

Yet, the book serves quite well the purpose of the author. Those who make sermons on the gospel miracles will find it a valuable aid. Many gists and illustrations germane to the modern scene make the book contemporary and extremely useful. The treatment of demonism (p. 172 and ff.) is, it seems to us, especially good.

Although there is some evidence of the influence of the dialectic theologians, as, for example, the espousal of "vital supernaturalism," "Biblical realism," "ultimate discontinuity" and similar terms, although the author does not seem to believe that Jesus lived and died to atone for sin (cf. p. 26) or that He was uniquely and utterly the Son of God (cf. p. 197), even the most orthodox preacher of today will find here a worthy addition to his shelf of sources on the gospels.

ARNOLD BRINK.

HIGHER CRITICISM ON THE ACCURACY OF ACTS


THIS book belongs to that category of Pauline studies which can be characterized by the designation "recovery" or "reconstruction." Here it is especially the career of Paul that is being "recovered," while another author, R. M. Hawkins, devotes more attention to the recovery of Paul's theology. It is probably not so strange that "the recovery of the historical Jesus," which for a generation dominated much of New Testament study, is followed up by a "recovery" of Paul.

Briefly, it is the conviction of Knox that the picture with respect to the life of Paul, as we find it in the book of Acts, is not entirely trustworthy. It was Luke's intention to present Christianity as the continuation and fulfillment of authentic Judaism. It is for that reason that in the book of Acts Paul is represented as having been educated in Jerusalem, becoming a persecutor of the Jerusalem Christians, converted while on his way from Jerusalem (to Damascus), and receiving orders from the Jerusalem apostles. Now, inasmuch as, according to Knox, Paul's own epistles tell a different story, the testimony of Acts must be discounted, and that of Paul in his epistles must be accepted. Thus, for example, the so-called "missionary journeys of Paul" should be rejected, for their "pattern does not emerge in Paul's letters." (p. 40) The author states: "We may begin by reminding ourselves again that the letters of Paul reveal not the slightest awareness on his part that he is engaged in great journeys."

It is exactly at this point that the author's theory breaks down completely. What! Do not the epistles of Paul reveal the slightest awareness that he is engaged in great journeys? Let us refer, for a moment, to II Corinthians, which the author recognizes as an authentic letter of Paul. (p. 20) Journey-consciousness is written all over this beautiful epistle; for example:

"And in this confidence I was minded to come first unto you ... and by you to pass into Macedonia, and again from Macedonia to come unto you, and of you to be set forward on my journey unto Judea (1:15, 16)."

"Now when I came to Troas ... I had no relief for my spirit, because I found not Titus, my brother: but taking my leave of them, I went forth into Macedonia (2:12, 13)."
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"But thanks be to God, who putteth the same earnest care for you into the heart of Titus ... who was also appointed by the churches to travel with us ... (8:16-19)."

"Thrice I suffered shipwreck, a night and a day have I been in the deep; in journeyings often, in perils of rivers, in perils of robbers, in perils of my countrymen, in perils from the Gentiles, in perils in the city, in perils in the wilderness, in perils in the sea (11:25, 26)."

"This is the third time I am coming to you (13:1)."

This reference to Scripture proves another important point: it demonstrates that between the account in Acts and that in Paul's own epistles there is a very close harmony. In II Corinthians the apostle, as shown in the passages quoted, is conscious that he has been traveling from "Asia" (1:8) via Tarsus to Macedonia, and is on his way to Corinth. This tallies exactly with the account in Acts. See Acts 19:1; 20:1, 2.

Knox should have made a more thorough study of what he himself regards as the most important source, namely, the epistles of Paul.

There is one additional point of criticism which must be mentioned. The reader can hardly fail to observe that the author has paid very little attention to the counter-arguments of conservative scholars. He writes almost as if the contention of the critics had never been answered. One example must suffice. It is found on p. 36: "But Acts makes much of the fact that the scene of this persecuting activity was Jerusalem and Judea. Paul does not tell us, in so many words, the place of this activity; but he does make clear that this place was not Jerusalem or Judea. How else can we interpret his words in Gal. 1:22, 23 ... "I was still not known by sight to the churches of Christ in Judea; they only heard it said, 'He who once persecuted us is now preaching the faith he once tried to destroy.'"

Now this oft-repeated instance of contradiction between Paul and Acts has been subjected to a thorough investigation by J. G. Machen. See his book The Origin of Paul's Religion, pp. 51, 52. Has the author failed to read Machen's argument? Moreover, one might even ask: Has he failed to read very carefully the passage which he himself quotes? Did he not notice the little word "us" in Gal. 1:23? Does not the clause "He who once persecuted us ..." prove beyond any doubt that the apostle himself has a definite memory of the fact that he persecuted believers in Judea?

Knox possesses the ability to write in such a manner that we know what he means. We advise students to become acquainted with his book and to compare it with Machen's. The decision as to the relative merits of the two will not be difficult.

WM. HENDRICKSIN.

CALVIN AS PREACHER


The author of the above mentioned treatise and translation has performed a distinct service to the Christian church by presenting John Calvin as the foremost preacher of modern times. And the Genevan Reformer gained this stature chiefly because of his expository method. Calvin believed it his duty to preach all the contents (Scriptura sola) and nothing but the contents of Holy Scripture. (Scriptura sola.) (Cf. p. 93 of Knox—Calvin's Concept of Preaching.) Calvin's conception of preaching is therefore quite at odds with that of the definition of Phillips Brooks as "the communication of truth by man to man" which is uncritically taken over by Prof. Blackwood of Princeton Seminary. (Cf. The Christian Preacher, New York, 1921, p. 9), who wrote the introduction to the above volume and was the mentor of pastor Nixon. That Prof. Blackwood, in spite of his enthusiastic words of introduction, will not accept the Reformation principle of Scriptura sola et sola is again evident from one of his latest books in which he defines preaching as divine truth voiced by a chosen personality to meet human needs. But such truth does not come exclusively from the Scriptures. The author stresses the fact that "divine truth comes largely from the Scriptures," or, the minister finds the truth of God "first of all, in the Bible" (The Preparations of Sermons, Abingdon-Cokesbury, New York, pp. 13, 44). Such equivocation with reference to preaching would have been an abomination to the Genevan Reformer.

One cannot but applaud the scholarly effort that has been expended by pastor Nixon in translating Calvin's sermons. It is a fine piece of work which ought to appeal to every young Protestant minister. The style is not laborious or pompous, but direct and alive to the modern situation. Such a work was long overdue and it ought to have a stimulating effect on the resurgence of Calvinism in America. For those who still read the Dutch language there appeared a set of five volumes of Calvin's sermons published by Wever at Franeker in 1941. The series was entitled: Het Gesprekide Woord, and the translation was made by two ministers: J. Douma and W. H. v. d. Vegt. It is my conviction that if the preachers of our day would read one of Calvin's sermons a week and study its unaffected, simple exposition of the Word there would be a great change in our churches. What we need is the faith that God honors His Word, the faith to present the Word "not with enticing words of men's wisdom." Calvin took the great commission of Christ seriously when he put aside every temptation to tickle men's ears with flowery rhetoric and instead understood preaching as "teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you." In a sermon on II Timothy 2:16-18 he interprets Paul as not only condemning manifest errors, superstitions and lies, "But he condemneth the disguising of the Word of God: as when men invent subtleties, to cloy men's ears: bringing no true nourishment to the soul, nor edification in faith, and the glory of God, to the hearers" (The Mystery of Godliness, p. 55). Much of modern preaching would be condemned by that standard. This didactic element is well illustrated in a sermon on Acts 1:9-11. After Calvin has emphasized the fact of the ascension and its creedal character he points to the benefit. Christ is in heaven to intercede for us so that we may come with boldness to the throne of grace. "And if this were well understood, there would not be so many superstitions in the papacy. Why do they have so many patron-saints? Why do they have recourse to the Virgin Mary? Because they have never understood why Jesus Christ has gone thus into heaven. "For if they had understood that He went up to be our Intercessor, they would not have said that they are not worthy to offer their requests to God and that therefore they must have other advocates" (The Deity of Christ, p. 237).

This quotation at the same time illustrates the practical and controversial character of Calvin's preaching. He was all for making a direct application of the truth to the daily needs of his hearers. And Calvin did not shrink from designating the enemies of the cross by name. In this he consciously follows
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Paul who mentions Hymenæus and Philetus by name as per­vertisers of the truth and deniers of the Word. (Cf. Mystery of Godliness, p. 55.) And I think we do well to follow Calvin and Paul—and the Lord Jesus, for that matter—instead of heeding the advice of pastor Nixon who would not imitate Calvin in speaking of the pope from the pulpit on the ground that it gives him too much free advertising. Here our author has accepted the “modernistic” notion that “rather than make specific denunciations we should preach the positive truth from the Word of God” (John Calvin—Expository Preacher, p. 126). The Bible is full of specific denunciations (see especially the minor prophets, the gospels, and the epistles) and unless we apply the truth of God specifically we shall not convict men of their sins. This Calvin did in his day and God blessed the preaching of the Word so that Geneva became a Christian community.

There is one other point at which I would take issue with the author and translator. Pastor Nixon asserts that Calvin seldom resorts to a proof drawn from the analogy of faith. (Idem, p. 72.) However, in his last chapter the author assures us that the force of Calvin’s preaching “comes almost ex­clusively from the fact that he was saturated in the Word. He could see instantly the exact relationship of many scattered portions of Scripture.” These two statements, to my mind, contain a contradiction. The great force of Calvin’s preaching was due to his use of the analogy of faith, comparing Scripture with Scripture, thus showing the unity of Scripture and of the faith. Though Calvin did employ the grammatico-historical method, he never saw the truth atomistically and in fragments, but always as a whole, as a system of related truth. Thus he preached. And thus men grew in knowledge of the truth.

It is with a sense of gratitude and of privilege that the reviewer commends these sermons of Calvin to all loyal sons of the true church. S.

CHRISTIAN MISSIONS OR HUMANITARIANISM?

CHRISTIAN MISSIONS OR HUMANITARIANISM? PIONIERS VAN CHRISTUS. Bewerkt door Dr. A. H. Oussoren. J. H. Kok, Kampen, 1895. Price: Fl. 5.50.

The volume under discussion is a symposium. Ten English historical sketches of men and women who were models of humanitarianism were translated into Dutch and edited by Dr. Oussoren, a minister of the Reformed Church of the Netherlands. The Dutch editor of these brief biographies specialized in the history of missions: his doctoral thesis was a critical study of the life and labors of William Carey. His interest in translating these English stories is doubtless due to the fact that most of these stories deal with missionaries. Doubtless that explains his choice of the title of the volume: Pioneers of Christ.

But the title is a misnomer, at least if it signifies missionaries of the cross. For, though the greater part of those here portrayed were missionaries indeed and what is told about them is closely related to their missionary career, the accent of the original writers of these ten sketches is not placed on what was distinctly missionary in their lives, but on their altruistic ent­husiasm and their humanitarian idealism. It is significant that the English series was entitled: “Eagle Omnibus, True Stories of Real People.” Knowing this, one is not too surprised to find that Dr. Albert Schweitzer is one of the “Real People” memorialized.

For the rest it does not admit of denial that the ten chap­ters of this book are well written. They were born of moral enthusiasm and they kindle admiration for the self-denying labors of the ten persons constituting this ten-star galaxy. The authors certainly knew how to write interestingly. Calvin Seminary.

S. VOLKERT.

OTHERWORLDLY ONLY?


With this book a new author makes his debut. We are constantly pleading with our stylists to begin to write, and so we are happy to see another promising author submit to the perils of the pen. We admire his choice of sub­ject since the nature of the church is one of the most burning problems of contemporary Christendom.

Dr. Carl F. H. Henry gives two outstanding virtues. First, this book deals with the heavenly calling and character of Christ’s Church. Second, “the style is popular and compelling, and the content calls loudly for a hearing in our secularized age.” With this we concur.

The “Dedication” of this book explains the character of the subject matter. This book consists of sermons revamped into outline and chapters. The job has been neatly done. Pastoral warnings are frequently heard.

What the author says is commonly accepted among us. Al­though a great deal of labor has been put into the book, nothing new essentially has come to light as far as biblical theol­ogy is concerned. This does not imply that this book is super­fluous. It challenges the average reader, for whom it was in­tended, to become better acquainted with these truths, and to remain a spiritual church. Complacency is always suicidal.

We feel that this book calls for a companion volume, some­thing like this: “Of Another World into This Immoral So­ciety”. The author in this book has not really come to grips with the application of his biblical position in this hostile world. The “Pay-Off” comes when we face modern man a stranger in this contemporary world with an honest challenge to his quietude. Of course the basic need is regeneration, but that does not solve the untold contradictions in which Christians are involved, and to which the church must address itself.

The author owes this non-transferable debt to the public to face with them the applications of his first volume.

Holland, Mich.

JACOB T. HOOGSTRA.

A REMARKABLE FAMILY


This book is indispensable to every student of the James family or of any member of the family. We had, of course, since 1932, Hartley Grattan’s The Three Jameses, a rewarding book. Neither has the later book made it superfluous although Mathiessen, it is true, had access to material not available to Grattan. Furthermore, while the latter limited himself to the father and the two famous sons, the former has given us a biography of the family as a unit, not neglecting the mother, the two obscure brothers, and Alice, the only daughter. We have, therefore, in this book one more family biography, a valuable addition to The Adams Family; the Lees of Virginia; Saints, Sinners and Beechers; and so on.

The writing of such a book is a difficult, a very difficult task, a task, I feel sure, never performed to the satisfaction of the author, and rarely if ever to the satisfaction of the critical reader. Mathiessen’s book has been received with almost universal acclaim. Thus far I have heard only one sharply dissident voice—that of Edmund Wilson in the New Yorker. After some well-deserved praise Wilson speaks of “a certain looseness of method and dishonesty of mind.” I fear the stricatures are not wholly unwarranted but, after all has been said, the book indubitably remains important. Here is the first full account of a very remarkable family. It is not only William and Henry who count. Henry senior is a personality in his own right, and so, for that matter, is Alice. The father emerges from these pages the live man he really was.
And how these Jameses could write. Even the mother, retiring though she was. Witness the letter on page 258, and even more especially that on page 294. Especially interesting is a comparison of the manner of father Henry and son William. Take, for example, this sentence from a letter of William to his publisher, Henry Holt, with reference to his Principles of Psychology:

No one could be more disgusted than I at the sight of the book. No subject is worth being treated of in 1,000 pages! Had I ten years more, I could rewrite it in 500; but as it stands it is this or nothing—a loathsome, distended, tumified, bloated, dropself mass.

Compare that with a sentence from the father to the New York Observer in which he complains about "the stagnant slipshlop which your weekly ladle dishes out." There is more on the same page (page 14) to the same effect.

One fact stands out on nearly every page—the boundless affection of the parents for each other, of the parents for the children, and of the children for each other. And that in spite of the constant exchange of criticism and banter. (See for example, page 99.)

Interesting is William's reaction to Henry's so-called "third manner." On page 337 we read:

I wish I could say hurrah with a whole heart, but this recent manner of yours of using such an excessively small bit of matter, and that so fanciful, to show a great deal of art by, seems to me to be full of peril.

To which he adds (on page 341):

Give us one thing in your older directer manner, just to show that, in spite of your paradoxical success in this unheard-of-method, you can still write according to accepted canons. Give us that interlude; and then continue like the "curiosity of literature" you have become.

And finally, on an earlier page (339) we find this plea:

But why won't you, just to please Brother, sit down and write a new book, with no twilight or mustiness in the plot, with great vigor and decisiveness in the action, no fencing in the dialogue, no psychological commentaries, and absolute straightness in the style . . . I should think it would tempt you to embark on a fourth manner.

But significant of the Jameses is this concluding paragraph: "But a true, a true! I had no idea, when I sat down, of pouring out such a bath of my own subjectivity over you. Forgive! Forgive!"

I can assure the reader of these lines that he will find in this book, which includes generous selections from the writings of Henry the elder, William, Henry the younger, and Alice, a wealth of interesting reading.

This is a Borzoi book. Knopf, the publisher, in spite of adverse conditions, adhered to his very high standards of book publishing. Paper, presswork, binding leave nothing to be desired. Rather than compromise with his standards Knopf simply advances the price. This book, which sells for $6.75, if published prior to the recent war could have been purchased for $4.00.

Considering the effects of inflation, no one can say the book is overpriced. I doubt many readers of the Forum will be as fortunate as I. Some very kind friends, knowing my pre-occupation with the Jameses, presented me with a copy. If they see this, I thank them once more for a royal gift.

J. Broens, N. B. Due to purely accidental reasons this notice appears some considerable time after it was written. It saddens one to report that the learned author of the book recently committed suicide.
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