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The Miracles of the Incarnation

CHRISTMAS is just around the corner. We tend to approach it from the point of its accretions. We busy ourselves with everything except the significance of the event. We play with the idea of good will and peace, of cheer and happiness; and by that very token we are robbed of the deeper values that we fain would enjoy. We get away from the idea that the incarnation is not a natural normal event, but a work supernaturally wrought by God. We do not want to warm up to the proposition that "this is a divine wonder and that it is miraculous in our eyes." Men have been working hard to get rid of its miraculous aspects and thereby have been robbing themselves and those who have given them their ears, of the significance of the day. The commemoration usually left them empty-handed of any worthwhile gifts, and, what is worse, empty hearted. The season is ripe for a reevaluation, a rethinking of the facts, so that we may share the joy of the angelic hosts who properly observed that first Christmas Day.

A Physical Miracle

No one can question the fact that a cardinal article of faith in the Christian communities since the dawn of the history of the New Testament church is that the Lord was conceived by the Holy Ghost and born of the Virgin Mary. Expression to such a conception is found in the gospels and elsewhere in the Bible, and in the Creeds of Christendom. Indeed, the Christmas season gets its very heart from the conception. However, even though no man questioned the fact that men have been and are thinking that the Son of God miraculously came into this world by assuming human nature from and in the womb of a virgin, there are an increasing number of scholars who deny that the idea is based on a fact. There is in their estimation no miraculous birth, but there is the idea of it. The attempts to find an origin for the idea from sources other than a historical fact have been numerous and ingenious. Historians and critics have searched the literature of antiquity and have probed particularly the mythologies of pagan literature and the revelation of Jewish writings; but they have never come near anything that suggests the gospel accounts. There are illustrations "galore" of cohabitation between gods and humans, and human beings and creatures, which allegedly produced kings or semi-gods; but the virgin birth idea is peculiar to Special Revelation. Scientists have vainly probed regenerative processes in the various areas of their research. They have come up with spontaneous regeneration, parthenogenesis, and bi-sexual individual creatures that produce their young without the process of cohabitation, but have not found anything capable of originating the fact of the idea of virgin birth. The reason why this search has been vain is that it is a miracle, a once-for-all event. It represents a divine reaching down into an area controlled by His own laws of reproduction and bringing forth from a virgin a child who preexisted even from before the world's foundation. The situation is simply that the idea of virgin birth rests upon the fact of Virgin birth as we find recorded for us by evangelists who were supernaturally informed of the fact. To deny the supernatural source of our information in this matter is very probably to deny the report. No one witnessed the supernatural aspects of the birth of Jesus. We know of it only because the supernatural Worker on the occasion chose to tell us about it.

Through this physically miraculous process in which the human mother was somewhat of a passive agent, Jesus came into a sordid sin-stricken world. He did not come into glory. He came from glory. He did not come into riches, but he came from riches. He did not come to joy, but to suffering. It is surprisingly strange that God would send His Son into a world of humiliation and even perform a miracle to do it. But that is precisely what the records tell us. Christmas cannot be properly observed until we tie up our Christmas commemoration with the idea of a divine physical miracle to bring His Son into a world that would hate Him, crucify Him—even that very world that the Son came to save. Let not all the accessories that have, like so many leeches, attached themselves to Christmas story, crowd the fundamental thought that Jesus entered into this physical world—that its normal processes have been corrupted—and that nothing less than a divine interruption can set it right again. Sin's effects have reached through and have caused the entire world, physical as well as spiritual, to be corrupted; and it groans even to the present time waiting for the redemption of the miracle that came within its processes but not by it. He is not a product of the world. He came to save it at the behest of the great Legislator. Physical laws could not function to bring in the Christ.
A Moral Miracle

How can we account for the presence of an absolutely sinless One in the midst of a radically sinful humanity? There are men who accept the perfection of Christ but deny His virgin birth. Bruce correctly observes that "faith is ever in a state of unstable equilibrium while the supernatural is dealt with eclectically; admitted in the moral sphere, denied in the physical." However, most men accepting the miracle of His birth physically, accept the revelation of his innocency. But this is often watered down to mean that He is "the best we know." "He is well-nigh perfect," or "His sense of perfection was swallowed up by His sense of divine love." But such sentiments do not cover the absoluteness of His moral perfection. It is obvious that the laws operating in the moral sphere as we observe them naturally produce and develop sinful creatures. Sinful men produce sinful offspring, and sinful environments cultivate sinfulness. But here is the One repeatedly present as sinless, like us but sin excepted—no consciousness of sin. This phenomenon develops from no known laws operating in this moral world. Scholars have correctly observed that His sinlessness in the midst of a sinful world is just as much of a miracle as His physical birth. I am not interested in this brief reflection in the discussions of theologians as to how Jesus being born out of and in a sinful humanity, accepted the sin-affected and sin-weakened humanity and was not guilty of any sin of His own, for He had none, but yet could bear sin of mankind. The point here is that we have a moral miracle. The ordinary course of events did not obtain here. Every other person born in the world was or is a sinner. He was not. Every one else needed salvation. He did not. In the midst of our Christmas observations we stand in the presence of miraculous purity; or our celebration is pure sham. Jesus was born out of a sinful world whose redemption He came to effect. It is here to serve the real movement of history which is to be found in God's redemptive plan. It is obvious that in this presentation the Kingdom is regarded as of prime concern. The rest of the world serves as a matrix in which it develops. It is here to serve the real movement of history which is to be found in God's redemptive plan.

A Historical Miracle

I am calling this third aspect of the miraculous entrance of Jesus into the world historical, because it brought about such a radical change in the course of history. This was felt by some outstanding Christian historians who began to speak of B.C.'s and A.D.'s. And succeeding generations of historians have followed the lead. There seems to be a general consciousness that since the birth of Jesus, history no longer is the same. Here is a turning point. This idea is perhaps most forcibly taught in the Bible itself for it speaks of Christ's coming in the fulness of time. It was the end of a period. The period of creation seems at this time to merge into the period of redemption or recreation. Time is no longer following its natural, usual course. The life and work of Jesus mark a change into a new direction, as it were. Paul seems to have been aware of it when he gave Jesus in the new disposition a position parallel to that of the first created man. They were called by Paul the second and the first Adam. The first Adam headed the human race. He failed in his representative capacity and dragged all humanity with him into ruin. The second part of the divine plan called for the introduction of a new man to occupy the position of a human representative who was to restore the proper relationship between God and man and develop a humanity in perfect accord with God and that will find its greatest objective in the joyous service of God. Obviously the introduction of the second Adam into the world to redeem it is as great a miracle as the creation of man. It meant that the world was not going on its reckless course to doom. Something unnatural, something miraculous had to intervene. That something God did by sending His only begotten Son into the world of time to change its course of godlessness to that of godliness. Time "began to begin again" as it were, only the course of events were to move upward rather than downward.

It is obvious that in this presentation the Kingdom is regarded as of prime concern. The rest of the world serves as a matrix in which it develops. It is here to serve the real movement of history which is to be found in God's redemptive plan.

Let us in the midst of Christmas observations not forget that we are commemorating a miracle in time or a historical miracle of greatest significance. We stand before an event in which time changed, in which the course of history was reversed. It is the occasion of the introduction of the second Adam who proceeded to succeed where the first Adam failed. It is the world's Independence Day.

H. S.

Some Factors Involved in the Problem of Race

The race problem is a most difficult one because, having a history, it is inevitably complicated by non-rational and even irrational factors. In the past white men have overrun non-whites, and for the purpose of more adequately exploiting them have given to them the very things which enabled white men to conquer and exploit in the first place, namely, education, or-
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organization, and machinery. This has now come home to roost, with the result that today the white man is more polite to negroes and orientals simply because he has to be. It is not a matter of a more Christianized conscience.

Conquest and exploitation have gone together with racial pride and contempt for the so-called inferior peoples. This was not, however, confined to the relation of whites to non-whites but extended to the relation between the various white nationalities. Thus the history of Christian Europe, instead of one of peace and good will toward men, has perhaps been bloodier than that of almost any other continent. Of the many wars of the Reformation consider only the Thirty Years War, a war among white Christians which almost depopulated central Europe. In short, the assumption of inherently superior and inferior races has complicated the problem of race not only by causing whites to regard themselves as superior to non-whites but also by causing them to make distinctions among their own kind between superior and inferior whites. The Germans, for example, do not have a monopoly on racial pride.

In America the problem of race is complicated by the fact that the Negro, whether in the North or in the South, in many instances actually is inferior simply because the dominant whites have made him so. Obviously, whenever a dominant group imposes conditions upon you as a member of a minority group, as a result of which you are the descendent of diseased, undernourished, and ignorant forebears, and that from childhood to maturity it is repeatedly impressed upon you that you are inferior, that you cannot even hope to compete, and that it is your calling in life to occupy the lowest place, do the dirtiest work, and mind your manners—then, naturally, whatever your talents and potentialities, it is just about inevitable that you will be the victim of what the psychologists call pseudo-inferiority and pseudo-stupidity. You will act as an inferior because you have been bludgeoned into believing that you are inferior.

Another factor is the American attitude toward miscegenation. (The word itself reeks with associations of corruption). This factor is clearly an irrational one since, strictly, it can hardly be considered a part of our race problem. The American Negro demands no more than social equality, something which has nothing to do with the intermarriage of whites and Negroes. Here the most that is demanded by Negro leaders is that there shall be no "laws of such a nature that white and Negro intermarriages are defined as crimes and misdemeanors. Anyway, the main ambition of the average Negro does not seem to be that of marrying a white. Most of our Negro leaders seem to be discerning enough to distinguish between a right on the one hand, and the right to act upon it, on the other. One may have the right to marry any lady one pleases, but if the lady in question does not herself so please, the right to act upon one's right is obviously non-existent. And most Negroes seem to have sense enough to see this. However, the Negro does feel that there are kinds of rights which carry with them the right to be acted upon, rights such as the right to travel in the same coach with whites, to eat in the same diner, to live in the same neighborhood, to work at the same job or profession, and to attend the same colleges.

Finally, there is, of course, the factor of the Civil War, a war which until only yesterday brought in its wake nothing but poverty and vindictiveness in the South, and materialism and self-righteousness in the North—a war which even today makes a just solution of the problem in some areas of our country almost impossible.

The Sins of the Fathers

The racial problem in general and the Negro problem in particular is largely a matter of the sins of the fathers visited upon the third and upon the fourth generation; and unless we whites begin by recognizing something like corporate guilt, it is doubtful that the American racial problem will be solved at all. "For I Jehovah thy God am a jealous God ..." And if the word jealous here means anything at all, it means jealousy of unrighteousness. Once you admit that the Negro is a fellow creature made in the image of God, your course as a Christian is determined. For you can't get away from the fact that the white race has brutally disregarded the image of God in the Negro and has, accordingly, disregarded God Himself. The Negro problem, however much the practical details may continue to plague us, can be worked out only if we whites view it with utmost Christian humility. And this means that we shall have to come as penitents to a wronged minority. Merely to say that you would not mind sitting next to a Negro brother in church is to betray an unconscious hypocrisy, for that is not the question. The question is: Can we reasonably hope that a sufficiently large number of Negroes will be willing to sit next to us in church? If and when we finally sit at the conference table with the Negro to discuss practical measures, let us first acknowledge that the problem is of our own making, apologize to the Negro, and then pray to Heaven that there will be enough charitable, practical, and wise Negroes.

The problem is difficult and the call to wisdom urgent, but no good can come of the latter until it is first acknowledged that the problem is not the result of the sins of the Negro. White men have invaded Negro lands and there produced a problem; or they have taken captive Negroes to their own lands and produced a problem at home. Shooting
and killing your way into a country and assuming the ownership of lands given in stewardship to others has never been its own justification. Thomas Jefferson in reflecting upon slavery in America said this: “If there be a righteous God in Heaven, I fear to contemplate the future of my country.” This statement seems prophetic of the Civil War and all the evils that followed it. There is no objection to wise and practical measures, but the first question here is this: In what spirit do you propose to be wise and practical? We are the “third and the fourth generations,” a fact which would seem to dictate that our initial wisdom had better consist in a spirit of repentance which will cause us to inquire of the Negro concerning the extent of his injuries and do all we can to promote his eventual healing.

Of course, you may try to get around all this by indulging in irrelevant table talk about superior and inferior races, good and bad protoplasm, glands, the inheritance of “spiritual characteristics,” and what not; but upon scrutiny most of it will appear to be only so much special pleading. “Except your righteousness exceed that of the scribes and Pharisees...” is probably what Jesus would have had to say about it. Strange as it may seem, there are still some people, presumably educated, who can manage to get themselves excited about the Hamitic curse. (The New England slave traders, by the way, used it to justify their crimes against humanity by fancying themselves to be the executors of the will of God). Obviously, the Hamitic curse is no more our business than the Jewish oath before Pilate, “His blood be on us and our children” (the excuse offered by some Nazis in justification of extermination camps). And it would seem a bit hypocritical just now to engage in pseudo-scientific talk about the superiority and inferiority of individuals and races because, allegedly, we must be cool and sensible about the realities. God’s observation might be this: the realities are dirty, and you have made them that way. Anyway, you can’t by-pass Divine judgment by merely being cool, sensible, and pseudo-scientific.

It is to be hoped that both the Negro minority and the white majority in America can manage to achieve at least a semblance of Christian leadership before it is too late. For the most likely alternative leadership for the Negro seems to be the one offered by Communism, a leadership which can at least claim a kind of theoretical innocence of the crimes committed by whites against Africans in the past.

**Inferior and Superior Races**

Of late there has been revived a considerable amount of double talk about superior and inferior races; and about all it has demonstrated is that if you define these terms carefully enough you can make a good case for almost any position you please. Measured in terms of organization, science, and technology, some nations dominated by members of the white race are evidently ahead of some other nations not so dominated. The latter are called backward, although they may include a considerable proportion of whites. Being backward in these things does not, however, mean being inferior. A Hindu mystic knowing what our industrial civilization does to men and women might thoroughly despise it. Plato, like Emerson and Thoreau, would doubtless have condemned it. The medieval world which produced many saints, simply because sainthood was regarded as a mark of superiority, would not have understood it. Now the assumption that greater human ability and character are required to produce industrialists than are required to produce mystics and saints is not self-evident. Accordingly, whether we are to regard mechanical genius or mysticism or sainthood as the ultimate standard by which to measure superiority would seem to be quite arbitrary.

Our science and technology may in the end destroy us just because we lack mysticism and sainthood. For it is simply a fact that the contemporary European and American who does any thinking at all has apparently lost faith in the possibility of a reasonable world. To him every step in material progress merely increases the probabilities of eventual catastrophe. In other words, if a superior race is defined as one which has, among other things, achieved the ability to produce conditions here on earth that could make for total human self-destruction, then certain nations dominated by white men may rightly be called superior. Of course, this talk about superior and inferior races is all rather inconsequential. At least our anthropologists and psychologists seem to agree—or only recently were agreed—that there is a greater similarity between the means of different racial groups than between the extremes within one group, that is to say, individual differences are always many times greater than differences between racial averages. In brief, in comparing any two races the most we can with confidence assert is that they are somehow different, something which, like the difference between men and women, almost everybody suspected long before there were anthropologists and psychologists.

In his *Physics of Politics* the English sociologist, Bagehot, tells about an African tribal chieftain who was absolutely opposed to monogamy because, so he said, it was beneath the dignity of man in that it reduced him to the position of a gorilla. Assuming that a gorilla is monogamous, the chief was undoubtedly right in his facts; but whether these facts constitute good evidence against monogamy would seem to be primarily a matter of history, education,
and temperament. If the chieftain did not like the idea of being domestically on a level with a gorilla, there was clearly nothing more to argue about. Analogously, no amount of argument will ever convince some people that Negroes are human in the same sense in which whites are supposed to be human. Let us assume for a moment that Bagehot had addressed the chieftain with an argument to the effect that monogamy is one of the indispensable conditions for achieving the great white industrial civilization of the West. The chieftain’s answer that he did not like this civilization would clearly have settled the matter, and nothing would have been demonstrated as to just who was inferior to whom. Incidentally, Bagehot also observed that the women of this chieftain’s tribe who happened to be monogamously married were ashamed of belonging to a man who could afford only one wife. One can hardly suppress a grin at the thought of the contempt these ladies would probably have for educated white Americans apparently unable to support even one wife. And it would be hard to prove that their contempt only betrayed their inferiority.

C. D. B.

What the Church Should Expect of Its Department of Missions

“As the Father hath sent Me so also I send you.”

NINETY-FOUR hundred years ago this spring Paul set foot upon European soil. No doubt others besides Paul among Christians visited Europe, particularly Rome, and witnessed for their Lord. Paul, however, was the first missionary to Europe.

What if ninety-four hundred years ago Paul had gone East and had visited Persia, India, and China? Would Jupiter be our God instead of Jehovah? Would the poetry of Homer be our Bible instead of the Word of God? Thank God that Macedonia was the land that called.

But what have we done these ninety-four hundred years with the great privilege of having had a Paul who brought us the Christ? How much would have failed of accomplishment in all these centuries of church history? We can take solace in the fact that the secret counsel of God controls all things and that it was His will that the church waited until the nineteenth century to take missions seriously. Unaware to ourselves we put the blame on God. But we are not here to stand in judgment upon the past. It would be futile and even wicked to do so. We are here tonight to witness a step forward.

Courses in missions have long been taught at our Seminary in a competent fashion. What is new tonight is that missions have become a new department, a new chair. This new department is to us a real occasion for gratitude. Paul had no course in missions and he still remains the peer among the great missionaries of all centuries. Others had no course in missions and they with a simple faith moved the hearts of cities and lands. Why then should we have a mission department? Why should we have a school of missions, a technical school?

Why should we have a chair of missions which will demand that all theological students study the principles, the work, the problems of missions?

The Church Must Grow Theologically

Keep on the canvas of your imagination the picture, the image, of the risen Lord. The Conquering of hell, grave, and death stands before His apostles as they hide behind closed doors. Let that picture never fade when we talk and think missions. Remember the text: “As the Father sent Me.” The King of the Kingdom that is not of this World speaks with authority. The One who is eternal life tells us in this very statement what we shall speak and whom we shall trust. His resurrection is not simply a return to this world as in the case of Lazarus only a few weeks before. He is the King all-glorious who commands.

The thing that strikes us so forcibly is the use our Lord makes of the word “sent.” Especially in the Gospel of St. John and in the fourth chapter of the First Epistle this term bristles through constant use. The famous seventeenth chapter of John is just steeped in the knowledge on the part of our Lord that God sent Him from all eternity. And God did not send only the “Word that became flesh.” He also sent John the Baptist who was designated as the man sent by God. But Christ is the captain, the ruler, the head of all missionaries.

Nothing eclipses the matchless words: “For God so loved the world that He sent His only begotten Son.” The sending of Christ shows a glimpse of the magnitude of God’s love. In God’s eternal plan, executed from the dawn of history, the sending of His Son takes the central place. Missions were thought out in eternity not as an appendix to our Christian faith but, in Christ Jesus, as the duty of the Christian Church. We may not begin our mission talks with Matthew 28:19. We must begin them with

1 Sermon preached by Dr. Jacob T. Hoogstra on August 23, 1951, in the Prospect Park Christian Reformed Church, Holland, Michigan, on the occasion of the installation of the Rev. Harry R. Boer as Professor of Ethnic Religions at Calvin Seminary.
the self-revealing God. It was the Father who authorized, qualified, and equipped the Son, and it is that very risen Son who now commissions us. Christ was always aware of that eternal plan.

That is the reason why Christ knew that He was sent to the house of Israel, and that after His death the cross would gather all men unto Him through the work of the apostles. Frequently Christ tells us that “He came”—He came from eternity with a mission. Knowing that He had a mission from the Father He endured the hardships and deprivations of an improvised manger bed. He made weary treks across a weary country and faced hostile compatriots. He endured the painful blows of the hammers of heathen soldiers, and cried the excruciating cry of being forsaken of God. Now when the hour of resurrection has come, immediately the same impelling love and faith are manifest: “As the Father sent me, so also I send you.”

In the light of the resurrection did He not command to go into all the world to make the name of the Triune God known to all men? Has the church been conscious of this central truth? If the church were, would it not have been more active, and would missions have received a step-child interest as it did at times? That is what we mean when we say that our church should expect from our department of missions a theological growth. We must see missions in the light of eternity. From the majesty of that plan missions should simply radiate in our church.

A cursory glance of all the creeds of the churches will soon convince the reader that in the 1900 years of European missions not one church has included in its confessions or creeds one article for missions. We qualify this by saying: as far as we know. We can explain this historically, but we dare not do so. We know there are references to the spread of the church as in Lord’s Day 21 of the Heidelberg Catechism, and in the difficult Article 36 of the Belgic Confession which suggests that the government be charged with the alien task of missions. But in the light of the times in which they were written they cannot be used as exhibits of a theological interest in missions worthy of this great calling of the church. Even the very name “Christ” so full of missionary potentials (Lord’s Day XII) is limited to our personal salvation and lacks that missionary challenge where it rightly could be heard.²

² In making this observation we recognize the extensive work that the Jesuits have done. The Roman church was missionary minded. But the fact remains that the Roman Church did not produce any mission theology and that it remained a church-centered missionary enterprise especially through the Jesuits. Luther is more guilty than Calvin in his erroneous attitude toward missions. Calvin at heart was as missionary-minded as his contemporary, Loyola. Although he did not know comparative religion as we do today, he knew what the Bible said about missions, the basic needs of the human heart, the lost world, the glory of God. Calvinists regret the limited emphasis Calvin made upon missions, but they need not apologize for John Calvin, especially when they see him in the light of his age.

The Church Must Have Greater Perspectives (I Also Send You)

Christ is saying: I commission you to go into the world. He even breathes upon them the Holy Spirit as a confirmation that He has sent them and that He qualifies them. As the first perspective, therefore, we would emphasize a better appreciation of the work of the Holy Spirit, especially the outpouring on the day of Pentecost. Pentecost does at least two things. It gives the Church an independent voice to speak for God. The Church is God’s voice and no one may muffle it. Secondly, Pentecost prepares the hearts of those who hear that voice in faith to live in Christian unity, to love the same gospel, and to live the same Christian life, all in preparation for the eternal life to come. What the Christian world needs today is faith in the implications of Pentecost. Pentecost will keep us the independent people for our God through Christ. Pentecost will give us the proper equipment for our global task.

Missions today are uniting the world from the center, that is, from the regenerated heart and, therefore, from the Christ. Missions belong to the teaching of the return of Jesus Christ. All nations will be evangelized before our Lord returns. Missions belong to the doctrine of the church. No force in history has been so great in recent years to force the question of ecumenicity as missions. It is the result of missions that has made men and women live similar lives, ethically and even socially, regardless of backgrounds. But we need direction and a firm grasp on some of the dangers. Who does not know the control of modernism in missions? Who does not know the danger to orthodox missions presented by the church bosses of the day? We must keep a global vision. We must guard against compromise. We must remember that what is not worth propagating on the mission field is not worth believing at home.

That raises another problem. How many things do we not take for granted and, when questioned
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about them, label "traditionalism." We forget that most of our traditions were born in strife and had principles to direct our forebears in creating them. New churches will come in our purview. They will ask significant questions as to why they should adopt many things which we take for granted. Our church will be put on its mettle and will be challenged to think through what it believes and what it lives and why it does so! We expect our new department of missions to be a great help with the other departments in our Seminary.

"As I send you" implies another perspective. Christ before his crucifixion faced a nationalism that was steeped in the falsification of the Old Testament covenant faith. That nationalism was bitter and hostile. So Christ will send his church into the jaws of the lion of a religiously controlled nationalism. Behind all the nationalism of the East and of the West lies a religion or a religious philosophy. These upsurging nationalisms ease peoples' conscience today by tolerating Christianity to a greater or less degree. Over against this the church must inculcate, even at the price of martyrs' blood: "We are, as a matter of principle, against toleration!" We do not ask nations who are dominated by a pagan religion, and at best faulty servants of Christ in common grace, whether or no they will permit us to teach Christ. Pentecost and the plan of God unfolding itself in bringing about the return of Christ and the doubtless fact of the resurrection of our Lord who has all authority—all combine to tell us that although all nations should rise up against us, we are independent to speak the truth since we are servants of the Christ who has given us this independent voice. There must be teeth in our theology that dare to bite into the growing opposition against Christianity. After all, missions today are troublers not of Israel but of Buddhism, Mohammedanism and Communism. Missions are a war cry, and the whole church, not only future missionaries, must know it.

The Church Must Have the Dynamic Power for Missions

Our professor of missions is sounding the cry in The Reformed Journal that we need more than money and prayers for missions. We need men and women who are God-consecrated for that eternally planned warfare of the Church upon the City of the World. How can we have dynamic men? What would happen, for example, if the department of missions would work out for us the relation of the church as the institute for the covenant, and the church as a missionary institute. Perhaps the study of this might prove that the better we understand the covenant the better we will understand our duty to be a missionary church.

One thing is positive. If the expression "to send" is so prominent in the Scriptures, and if the body sent is the church which has as its great duty to go in this dark and benighted world, why is mission work not considered one of the marks of the true church of Jesus Christ? (Belgic Confession, Art. 29.) No, we cannot include mission work under the first mark of the church when that is considered in the light of its history. "True preaching of the Word" (the first mark of a true church) was written for self-protection and not for self-propagation. What happens? If we have only the three marks of a true church we develop complacency. We say that we are preaching the Bible every Sunday. We have communion services and are particular about who attend. We discipline those who live irregular lives. We go home satisfied. Would to God that we could be chosen of God as a church to herald to all the churches that a true church has this fourth note: You must execute the command to do missions. Suppose that would be pounded into our souls for a day but for centuries. Many things would follow. The young pastor teaching this would feel the pangs of an uneasy conscience should he receive a call to go to a foreign field, after piously setting forth that a mark of a true church is to do missions. The child in the catechism room would hear the personal challenge. The church able to support a missionary would be ashamed to meet its Lord if it did not send a missionary into the field. What we need is the uneasy conscience that will put fire into the soul of ministers, lay-workers, and all members of the church.

Perhaps we could not append a footnote to Article 29 of our Belgic Confession. A footnote would be an insult to the dignity and worth of missions. If we would add it to the body of the Article we may come into friction with the historical setting of the article. Has the hour come that after 1900 years of European missionary work—revealing a lukewarm attitude at times—the church is now in a position to formulate a new article of faith exclusively centering around Christian Missions? Would not the Reformed Ecumenical Synod be just the body to do that so that all those who are convinced of the truth of the addition to the confession will go back to their respective churches and plead for adoption? Perhaps even though forged upon a Reformed anvil, other churches may respond that we are articulating their deepest faith; and perhaps they too may adopt such a resolution so that the church, alive theologically and active in the mission field, may receive the necessary undergirding for a great mission, for a big battle against the rising tide of nationalism, for a demand that the open door for missions is only open for those who are children of the truth, and that upon such alone will God's benediction rest!

But there is another matter that needs attention. During World War II our ships zigzagged across the ocean for fear of submarines. A zigzag course may be safe for submarine warfare but also when the
submarines” are the conflicting opinions as to method and to the question of the seat of authority. One thing is certain, viz., that a zigzag course gets one nowhere fast, and does not guarantee escape from the fatalities of submarine warfare. What we need is to be clear on the principles of missions and then stick to them. This is not one man’s job. It is the job of the church, of all the departments of the seminary. But it is a job that must be done and be done soon.

If undergirded with the truth of God, if inflamed with the Spirit of God, if with a direct course we sail the turbulent seas, we shall have men of power, vision, and daring. We shall have a church that knows what it wants and will sacrifice home and kin to send ambassadors into deepest heathendom or most cultured American paganism.

Tonight we as a local congregation rejoice that a son of this church will be the first to occupy the chair of missions at Calvin Seminary. In this place our professor of missions was ordained to be the first naval chaplain of our denomination. In this place he was inducted into the office as the first Calvin Seminary graduate to be a missionary to Nigeria, Africa, and as missionary of this church. Now at this place he will be installed as professor of missions. Such is the gracious privilege of this church that every devoted church would wish for its sons and daughters.

We as a congregation, and now as a denomination, pray: Be a professorial herald. Inspire by your teachings and devotion all the seminary students to catch the torch of missions. Through your inspiration may Christian school teachers catch the vision to evaluate civilization in the light of God’s Word so that prospective missionaries may see what is Eastern and Western and what is Christian. Inspire congregations to sacrifice. Study hard to give the church the necessary and unshakable principles in order that the course may be steady. In all humility dig deeply into the Word of God to bring out great truths that will motivate all our mission work. May there be through him, and through all the men in the seminary, an advance in the truth in the warfare against Satan for our blessed Lord. May the church arise and call this day “blessed” and through it confess at least this:

We believe that God the Father has planned from all eternity to send His Son Jesus Christ into this world of sin to reveal his righteousness and his love to lost sinners.

We believe our blessed Lord has commissioned his church to be his voice in this evil world and to call his own to be united unto him. We believe that he is seated at the right hand of God now to send forth his messengers to carry out the great work of the church to the ends of the world before our Lord returns in majesty and glory.

We believe that he has sent the Holy Spirit on Pentecost to equip his church to speak unto all nations, tongues, and tribes, and that the Holy Spirit will ever qualify the church no matter what the opposition may be.

We believe that the church that neglects to do mission work lacks one of the marks of a true church. We believe that a true church, besides preaching the Word of God to her own flock and guarding the sacraments and exercising discipline, must prosecute the cause of missions.

We believe that the church in sending forth missionaries must unite all in a true and living faith through the preaching of the Word of God. We confess that the church must remain the pillar of truth and that it has lost its high calling should it fail to be the city of light in the dark night of sin and ignorance.

We further believe that the church enjoys here and elsewhere the sacred and inalienable freedom given by the risen Lord and Savior to bring the gospel to the ends of the earth. This freedom is not of the tolerance of governments, for the Lord is King of Kings. Should nationalism oppose, or false religions and anti-Christian philosophies seek to close doors, even by threats of life and comfort, we solemnly do declare that the church must carry on what Christ commissioned it to do until He comes to return to judge the living and the dead.

May God grant that we march onward, and that our new professor be a chosen captain with others to carry the battle of the Lord unto the ends of the earth.
Paul Tillich’s “Systematic Theology”

Dr. James Daane
Minister of the Gospel
Los Angeles, California

The publication of Paul Tillich’s Systematic Theology is an event of significance for the entire theological world. This book cuts a wide swath through the theological and philosophical fields of past and present thought. Its penetrating analysis and intellectual vigor make it strong thinking for strong minds. This should not, however, discourage the hearts of readers of modern theologies, for they will find this mature expression of one of America’s most brilliant theological minds easier reading, for example, than Karl Barth.

Conservative theologians should be pleased that this first volume of Tillich’s Systematics has made its appearance. For the dialectical method and its consequences for Christian theology have now been plainly brought to view. In contrast to Barth, whose many Christian elements partially conceal the basic existential-dialectical structure in which he does his thinking, in Tillich, where there is no desire to identify his theology with that of the Reformers (or anyone else), the existential-dialectical structure and its results for the Christian Faith, stand in naked exposure.

This feature of Tillich’s thought should be helpful to conservative students of Barth and Brunner. In view of the expressed disagreements between Barth and Tillich, conservative students of theology will regard it as significant that many of the newer theological ideas they have recently learned from Barth and Brunner, also play a decisive function in the thought of Tillich.

Both Barth and Tillich agree that, 1. Christian truth cannot be stated in propositional form, 2. revelation is an event in which the reception of revelation is itself an essential part of the revelational event, 3. that revelation takes place “once for all,” and yet continuously, 4. that the Jesus of history cannot be identified with the Christ of supra-history in whom revelation alone takes place, 5. that since revelation takes place in the supra-historical realm and cannot therefore be touched by anything human—scientific, rational and historical criticism should be given unhampered application to the Bible and the “historical Jesus,” 6. that within God there is an abyss of possibility, beyond the reach of all rationality, and, 7. that both God and the world must be understood in terms of a timeless correlative relationship.

The acceptance of these ideas (and others) so theologically decisive, by both Barth and Tillich, raises the question whether Barth’s theology will not eventually be compelled to lose either its Christian elements and go all the way with Tillich, or to lose its existential-dialectical elements and go all the way with the Reformers.

This much is certain: the basic issues are being clarified, and it will be interesting to watch for Barth’s reaction to Tillich’s Systematics.

Lovers of Reinhold Niebuhr’s brilliant analysis of modern man and his culture will also appreciate this book for its presentation of the theological footing on which Niebuhr (and Wilhelm Pauck too) does his thinking.

Conservative theologians will also be interested in the adjective, “Systematic.” Dialectical supporters of an open Canon and continuous revelation are not in the habit of designating their thought as a “system.” Tillich’s designation of his theology as “Systematic” is undoubtedly due to the fact that he is more philosopher than theologian. It is not, however, particularly significant since his brand of epistemology undercuts all the significance “systematic” has had in classical theology.

Tillich’s Theological Method

In his Protestant Era (dedicated to Wilhelm Pauck), Tillich admits that “philosophical theology” is an unusual name for the chair he occupies at Union Theological Seminary, but adds, it “suits me better than any other.” In his Systematic Theology, Tillich asserts that his method is itself a constitutive part of his theology, and that in consequence, his theology is no better than his method.

Tillich defines his theological method as a correlation between philosophy and theology. Existence poses questions which philosophy formulates and tries to answer. Philosophy, however, is unable to answer existential questions. At the point where philosophy admits its inability, it cries for Revelation. Then theology begins its task of interpreting Revelation as an answer to the existential questions.

This is Tillich’s theological method of correlation: Existence interpreted in terms of Revelation, and Revelation in terms of Existence.

Since this theological method is, on Tillich’s own admission, a constitutive part of his theology—as so much so that his theology is admittedly no better than his method—attention must be focused on this “method of correlation.”

1 Vol. I, University of Chicago Press. 1951. 300 pages. $5.00.
It must first of all be urged against Tillich that his method is a trick and not a method—unless indeed theological tricks are also theological methods! That it is not unfair to designate his method as a trick is clear from the following observations:

A method of correlation, if it is to be more than a slogan or verbal trickery, must keep a genuine correlation—in this case a genuine balance between Existence and Revelation. If either Existence or Revelation assumes a dominance over the other, the correlation is destroyed. They then stand no longer in equal relationship.

This loss of equilibrium happens, and necessarily happens, whenever the correlative method is used to explain two things which are allegedly irrational in their separateness. If Existence and Revelation are in themselves inexplicable, the inexplicable character of neither is capable of explaining the other. When the claim is made that, nonetheless, the feat has been accomplished, an examination will disclose that one of the factors, which allegedly stands in balanced relationship to the other, has been secretly rationalized and then used to explain the other.

Tillich claims that Existence, the question, and Revelation, the answer, stand in such a balanced correlative relationship. If, however, we urge against Tillich that the question itself determines the answer, Tillich would not disagree. Or, if in the words of the Heidelberg Catechism, we urge that the existential question of man's misery is not known from experience, but from "the law of God," i.e., from Revelation, Tillich would not disagree. The only reason for the surprising fact that he would not disagree lies in the fact that on the one hand he insists that Existence and Revelation are correlatives, and on the other hand he denies it by conceding that it is not Existence but Revelation that first asks and then answers its own questions! But if it is ultimately true that Revelation asks the questions, then it is also ultimately true that his method is not one of correlation. Even dialecticism cannot have this both ways, for here the very nature of dialecticism is at stake! When Tillich allows Being (as the ground and source of Revelation) dominance over Existence, the dialectical dialogue between Revelation and Existence ceases and Revelation is left over with two worlds to explain (as Plato found). God, says Tillich, is beyond Existence.

But God is also beyond Existence. God, says Tillich, does not exist. It is a mistake to attempt to prove God's existence. If God existed, he would be a particular being. To regard God as a particular existent is to rob him of his universality. Once this universality of God's Being is understood, it is demonic, Tillich claims, to say that God exists. Tillich will have nothing of that superficial pantheism which claims that everything is God. Schleiermacher, Tillich contends, was not this kind of superficial pantheist. On the contrary, argues Tillich, Schleiermacher's "gefühl" was an intuitive awareness of God in his undifferentiated unity, prior to the moment in which God breaks up into subject-object. Thus, rightly understood, Schleiermacher's Absolute corresponds essentially to his own idea of God as "Being-itself."

The superficial version of pantheism which claims that God is everything and everything is God, must be rejected, declares Tillich, for God is then reduced to particularities and ceases thereby to be universal. God must rather be understood as Being-itself; this safeguards his universality. And God must be understood as the ground of all particular beings; this safeguards his concreteness. As Being-itself and the ground of all existing beings, God is the Concrete Universal.

At this point two things must be urged against Tillich's conception of God as a Concrete Universal. First, even on this refined pantheistic understanding of God, God is still nothing in particular. Second, because the concreteness that Tillich attributes to particularities is ultimately unreal, nothing is gained in the interest of God's concreteness by introducing the element of resistance against God. It is expressed whenever the particular is exalted to the status of Universality, the finite to the status of the Infinite. 3

Tillich, as will be shown below, that because his method of "correlation" grants Being a dominance over Existence, in the end he can say nothing about Existence that is ultimately true.

Tillich is surely correct when he claims that his method is no mere technique which could be changed without changing his theology! The theological method of correlation is no neutral device. On the contrary, it contains a definite ontology and a definite epistemology.

**Tillich's Ontology**

The theological method of correlation claims that God and the world are timeless correlatives. God must not be understood as existing apart from Existence. To define God out of relationship to Existence is to define God in terms of Essences. But this is a mistake, for it is to create another world behind this world (as Plato did) which then leaves us with two worlds to explain (as Plato found). God, says Tillich, is beyond Existence.

But God is also beyond Existence. God, says Tillich, does not exist. It is a mistake to attempt to prove God's existence. If God existed, he would be a particular being. To regard God as a particular existent is to rob him of his universality. Once this universality of God's Being is understood, it is demonic, Tillich claims, to say that God exists. Tillich will have nothing of that superficial pantheism which claims that everything is God. Schleiermacher, Tillich contends, was not this kind of superficial pantheist. On the contrary, argues Tillich, Schleiermacher's "gefühl" was an intuitive awareness of God in his undifferentiated unity, prior to the moment in which God breaks up into subject-object. Thus, rightly understood, Schleiermacher's Absolute corresponds essentially to his own idea of God as "Being-itself."

The superficial version of pantheism which claims that God is everything and everything is God, must be rejected, declares Tillich, for God is then reduced to particularities and ceases thereby to be universal. God must rather be understood as Being-itself; this safeguards his universality. And God must be understood as the ground of all particular beings; this safeguards his concreteness. As Being-itself and the ground of all existing beings, God is the Concrete Universal.

At this point two things must be urged against Tillich's conception of God as a Concrete Universal. First, even on this refined pantheistic understanding of God, God is still nothing in particular. Second, because the concreteness that Tillich attributes to particularities is ultimately unreal, nothing is gained in the interest of God's concreteness by introducing the element of resistance against God. It is expressed whenever the particular is exalted to the status of Universality, the finite to the status of the Infinite. Of chapter on "The Demonie" in Tillich's The Interpretation of History.

---

3 The "demonic" is the element of resistance against God. It is expressed whenever the particular is exalted to the status of Universality, the finite to the status of the Infinite. Cf. chapter on "The Demonie" in Tillich's The Interpretation of History.
sisting that he is the ground of being. Tillich's God remains an empty Universal, devoid of all genuine concreteness.

Nor does Tillich's Unitarian God achieve concreteness in Jesus. Jesus, as the Christ, is the Final Revelation. Such a Revelation is needed as will disclose the ground of all Being in a particular existing being. This would be a Final Revelation, for as the disclosure of the ground of Being in a particular disclosure, it could be the norm of every revelation that comes through the Bible, Church History, and through every Christian and non-Christian culture. Jesus, as the Christ, is said to be such a Final Revelation.

Yet, argues Tillich, Jesus as Jesus, as a particular person of a particular time and place, is not the Christ. Jesus can only become the Christ by ceasing to be Jesus, by sacrificing his particular, historical existence upon the Cross. As an existent person, Jesus cannot be the Final Revelation, the disclosure of Universal Being. Only through the Cross does he become a picture of the Christ. As one who is under the conditions of existence, neither the person of Jesus, nor any of his words or works, are unconditional. Jesus, under the fate of particularity, cannot be the Christ, Universal Being—that which concerns me ultimately. It is the method of correlation which relates Jesus (Existence) and Christ (God or Being-itself) dialectically, that deprives Tillich's God of genuine concreteness and reduces him to an empty universal.

Tillich's theological method of correlation also accounts for the triumph of empty universality over concrete particularity in his concept of Existence. Existence is Being under the form of time and space. As such, every existent thing has God as the ground of its being. In existence, however, every person or thing is in a state of disrupted being; it has lost its unity with Being-itself. This loss of unity with the ground of its being, produces the threat of pure temporality, of meaninglessness. This threat of non-being adheres to everything that exists. Nonetheless, this separation from God is not absolute. Even in the state of disruption every existent still has God as the ground of its being. Its relationship to God is essentially intact. The threat of non-being, of meaninglessness, is therefore, not real; non-being like Plato's world, is only a shadow. Man's relationship to God is strained but it is not and cannot be broken.

Thus the threat of non-being which haunts every particular existent, is annulled by the universal arms of Being, which as the ground of all beings cannot allow the threat of non-being ever to be more than a threat.

It is because of this conception of Universal Being as that which absorbs the partial reality of existent realities that Tillich can declare that "Hell" is to be a contradiction in terms. If there were such a place as Hell, says Tillich, it would be a particular place. As a particular reality it would have God as the ground of its being. Hence Hell, as complete separation from God, would be a contradiction in terms.

Tillich necessarily believes that all men shall be saved. Since God is the ground of all being, the threat of non-being is ultimately unreal. Hence there can never be any possibility of non-being overcoming anything that has being. Tillich's redemptive universalism is but another expression of the fact that in his theology particularities are annulled by a universal which alone is ultimately real.

Because of this redemptive universalism, Tillich's "ultimate concern" as the existential passion of the existing individual also evaporates. Since everyone is assured a happy ending by the victory of universality over particularity, universality can indeed claim ultimacy, but, it must be urged against Tillich, it cannot claim concern!

Tillich has declared, in his Protestant Era that he could not be a theologian if he could not believe that "justification by faith" means that only forgiveness of all sins, but also the divine forgiveness of a mistaken faith.

For Tillich, then, faith and unbelief, concern and unconcern, are at bottom the same. Just as Tillich's God, as the ground of all being, is an undifferentiated Unity, so faith and unbelief, concern and unconcern, are at bottom without distinction. Shades of Barth!—whose universalism also undercuts the allegedly all-decisive character of faith as decision.

Reformed Versus Existential Ontology
Against the ontology of Existential Theology, Reformed theology must urge that God is Triune. As One, God is the Universal that Reason needs. As Trinitarian, God is that concreteness, which makes him the concrete universal that Reason needs. As such a Concrete Universal, it is not necessary for theologians to involve God in a timeless correlation with Existence in order to achieve concreteness.

On the other hand, this Reformed ontological

4 This, says Tillich, puts an end to all "Jesuolatry." It is demonic to make any absolute unconditional claim for either the person, words, or works of Jesus. Jesus' refusal to make an absolute claim for himself is the meaning of his Cross and the triumph over the demonic in the Wilderness temptation.

5 It is precisely that quality of Existence which Christian theology regards as its "created quality" that Tillich regards as unreal, as "non-being."

6 "Not only he who is in sin but also he who is in doubt is justified through faith. The situation of doubt, even of doubt about God, need not separate us from God. There is faith in every serious doubt, namely, the faith in the truth as such, even if the only truth we can express is our lack of truth. But if this is experienced in its depth and as an ultimate concern, the divine is present; and he who doubts in such an attitude is "justified" in his thinking. So the paradox got hold of me that he who seriously denies God, affirms him. Without it I could not have remained a theologian." Protestant Era, pp. xiv, xv.
conception of God as the reality in which universals and particulars actually exist, allows for a genuine creation in which both universals and particulars can exist. It is only when we grant the possibility that universals, as well as particulars, can exist in created existence, that Existence is saved from that sheer particularity, that meaninglessness, and non-being, which is the only characteristic that the Existentialists can find in Existence since they define Existence as that which cannot contain universals. And it is only when we grant that Existence can contain Universals that it is possible to believe in the reality of the Incarnation, in the Bible as God’s Word, and in the possibility of stating Revelation in propositional form.

It is the ontology concealed in Tillich’s theological method that accounts for his conception of God as Empty Being, and for his loss of the genuine significance of Jesus as the Christ, of “ultimate concern,” of the threat of non-being, and of hell.

**Tillich’s Epistemology**

Tillich’s epistemology is determined by his ontology. The existential ontological principle that Being cannot enter Existence except by a disruption (the Fall) that distorts Being, has as its epistemological counterpart the principle that nothing can be predicated of Being except dialectically. Since the Unconditioned cannot enter Existence except by becoming conditional, within Existence no unconditional statement can be made about the Unconditioned. Since God prior to his disruption into subject-object is undifferentiated unity, all our knowledge since it is of the structure of subject-object, is only an approximate knowledge of God. All our knowledge of God is necessarily dialectical, mythological, symbolical.

Since God, according to Tillich’s existentialism, cannot enter into history, but can only reveal himself through history, God always eludes our knowledge. Since Revelation always takes place within Existence, and Existence and the existing individual receiver of revelation are both a constitutive part of, and at the same time a distortion of Revelation, a true knowledge of God is impossible.

The ontology of the Existentialists drives our knowledge of God into that epistemological “never-never” land, which corresponds to the “never-never” land of the supra-historical (where the Fall and the Cross are ever happening from the viewpoint of eternity, but never actually happen from the viewpoint of time). Existential epistemology is theological scepticism.7

---

7 One wonders whether J. B. Phillips had Dialectical Theology in mind when in his Letters to Young Churches, he translated I Timothy 6:20, 21, “O Timothy, . . . Avoid the Godless mixture of contradictory notions which is falsely known as ‘knowledge’—some have followed it and lost their faith.”

**Reformed versus Existential Epistemology**

Reformed epistemology must freely admit that no purely human formulation can contain the whole of Revelation. But, against existential epistemology, Reformed epistemology must insist that Existence is not of such a nature as to exclude the possibility of a knowledge of God. It must maintain that our knowledge of God (doctrinal propositions, creeds, theologies), although partial, is nonetheless a real knowledge. Against existentialist epistemology, Reformed epistemology must urge that our knowledge of God is not merely mythical and symbolic—mere approximations to truth—but actual knowledge of God possessed of genuine validity. In short, Reformed epistemology must recognize limitations in all human knowledge of God, but it must also insist that this limitation qualifies the extent, but not the validity of our knowledge of God. We do know in part—and the partial character does not destroy the knowledge.

Reformed theology must also understand and clearly enunciate that the possibility of a valid knowledge of God rests on a Reformed ontology which insists that particularities (individuality) are not irrational phenomena inasmuch as they exist within God himself as a Tri-Personal. Only by means of the trinitarian nature of God can the idea of God be kept from being reduced to an Abstract Universal—which needs a timeless world to overcome its abstract character.

On the basis of such a trinitarian God, it is possible to believe in a temporal creation (Existence), which can contain, in addition to particularities (for example, individual man), also universals (a race in distinction from mere individual men, the biblical God of the incarnation, in distinction from a God who cannot get out of the realm of the supra-historical in actual Existence itself). Only on the basis of such an ontology is it possible to retain an idea of God who is no empty meaningless universal, and an idea of Existence that is not reduced to sheer and meaningless particularity!

This age-old problem with which Tillich struggles is not merely a theoretical matter. Mistaken solutions—such as Tillich’s—may be spun out in academic halls, but the consequences meet us in the facts of life and history with an ontology that cannot be evaded. It is not too much to claim that the peculiar form of the theological, ecclesiastical, social-political problems of our times are due at bottom to a wrong solution of this problem.

Purely secular versions of Existentialism, for example, have surrendered all ontological reality except that which is encountered in existence, and are therefore both a capitulation to, and a sophisticated reinforcement of, the utter irrationalism of a generation that believes only in sheer particularity. More religious versions of Existentialism seek to avoid this utterly irrational nihilism of secular
existentialism by positing an Ontological Reality, which is not "Wholly Other" but dialectically related to Existence in terms of correlation. These religious versions of Existentialism result in a redemptive Universalism on the one hand, and on the other, in a loss of a social-religious-political concern—which defect Tillich correctly discerns in Barth, although he is blind to the fact that he himself has no ground to support his "existential concern."

The dire consequence of the wrong solution of this problem also expresses itself in the sheer individualism of modern political liberalism with its atomistic conception of society, and in the sheer individualism of sectarian Christianity with its atomistic conception of the Church. Neither secular nor religious versions of Existentialism, neither political liberalism nor sectarian Christianity have taken seriously the nature of God, nor the nature of creation, as determined by God's nature.

Reformed Theology has the clue to the right answer—but the clue must be developed into a well articulated answer. In its doctrine of the covenant, as an interpretation of the nature of the Divine Life (trinitarian) and as an interpretation of the nature of created existence (most clearly expressed in man's covenantal function, and in his covenantal nature as sexual differentiation within unity), Reformed theology has its finger on its own distinctive character and on the only possible solution to the problem. From here the attack must be launched against a Liberalistic Existential theology and against an individualistic sectarian Christianity.

Aims and Purposes of Christian Trade Unionism

Prof. Dr. W. F. de Gaay Fortman

I

When studying the history of the nineteenth century we cannot help being struck by a most tragic feature. In the great discoveries in the technical and scientific fields the human mind made victories as had not been witnessed for many ages. Human knowledge rose to almost dazzling heights. At the same time, however, the secularization process in the intellectual and social aspects of life, which started as early as the Renaissance, was speeded up in a really appalling degree. Creation, now reckless on account of its enormously increased knowledge and its almost unlimited power to rule and avail itself of the forces of nature, separated itself more and more from its Creator and His revelation in Jesus Christ.

Secularization in the intellectual and social aspects of life! For never would the unheard-of nineteenth century social conditions have arisen, if the Gospel had got sufficient hold of the minds and if the church of those days had understood that preaching and spiritual welfare should exercise its stimulating and reforming influence on the social life too. Thus, conditions arose which have frequently been depicted in strong colors by authors of several countries and which ultimately gave rise to the gigantic economic development of the Western European countries, a development, however, which was bought with the blood and tears of the men, women, and children of the working class of the nineteenth century and the early part of the twentieth century.

Though we must condemn the church of that age, we must not overlook the fact that there were in that church groups of smaller and larger significance which pointed out the danger of the spiritual and social situation, and which, each in its own way, gave out a summons for confessing anew that Jesus Christ is Lord of the whole of human life. In Denmark we think of Grundtvig, whose speeches and writings were like a bugle call amidst a sleeping church and a sleeping people. In Germany our thoughts go to Wichern with its "Innere Mission" (Home Mission) which expressed itself in word and deed, and to such men as Tholuck and von Thadden who pointed away from the Gospel-denying rationalism back to the living Word. In Switzerland attention was attracted by the Revival in Geneva and in Waadtland which, through the inspiring preachings of Cesar Malan, Merle d'Aubigné, and Vinet, restored the Cross and the Resurrection as realities in human life.

In The Netherlands we cannot overestimate the significance of the "Reveil" and the revival of Calvinism, in the struggle for which, men like Groen van Prinsterer, O. G. Heldring, and Abraham Kuyper devoted their lives.

It is in this nineteenth century world, with its alarming apostasy and yet its blossoming of new spiritual life here and there, with its rapidly increasing wealth for the few and pauperization of the many, that the Christian social movement rose. Into this degenerated Western European world, corroded by avarice, this movement made its entry.

This article, originally in the Holland language, was translated and submitted to the CALVIN FORUM by Edwin E. Palmer, a graduate student in theology at the Free University in Amsterdam. The article was published originally by the International Federation of Protestant Workers' Associations.——Editor.
proclaiming that renovation of the violated social relations is only possible by a renewed avowal of the Gospel of Jesus Christ and a living up to it.

Two things were placed in the foreground by this movement. In the first place there was a recognition of the human worth of the worker. Labor must not be severed from the person of the laborer. Manpower is not a mere means of production only defined in a businesslike way, such as a machine, a factory building, or a patent. This labor potentiality is indissolubly connected with man who is created in the image of his Creator and who is called to serve and glorify his Creator in his labor. According to Genesis 1:26 and 27 the real sense of man’s creation in God’s image and after His likeness is: “Man’s having dominion over creation.” The image of God is a task; man has been called upon to have dominion.¹

When the Christian social movement takes into account the origin of the world’s history and man’s creation in the image of God, it does so in order that the labor relations of the twentieth century may be so organized that the workers’ calling to have dominion over creation may be realized.

Side by side with this recognition of the human worth of a worker, the Christian social movement placed the idea of co-operation in the industrial life. The commandment to love one’s neighbor has also its consequences for social life. He who has understood the word of the apostle John—“If a man say, I love God and hateth his brother, he is a liar; for he that loveth not his brother whom he hath seen, how can he love God whom he hath not seen?” (I John 4:20)—can have no peace with the idea of class-struggle as a fact and he must with all that is in him oppose those who want to force upon him class-struggle as a normative principle. Employer and worker are each other’s neighbors because they are called upon to do the same work in the same business and in the same trade.

For both of them, their “having dominion” must come to its own. This cannot be effected in the way of continual struggle but only in the way of cooperation and negotiation.

II

Modern labor legislation began in all Western European countries with restrictions for working hours. Wherever governments took action, this was the startingpoint. It was also the point upon which trade-unionism directed its efforts during the first period of its existence. Obviously it was the destructive effect on the family-life and the endless weariness of a trying day’s labor which were taken into account more than scanty wages.

The significance of the regulations for working-hours, as a rule resulting in a working-week with an average maximum of 48 hours, should be seen not only as a protection to the worker from undue fatigue and consequently as reaching a labor capacity that renders the highest possible economic profit, but as something of wider significance. It was remarkably well denoted by the highest judicial court in the Netherlands, the Supreme Court of Judicature, in a decision of October 26, 1931. In this lawsuit the question was dealt with as to whether the time during which a worker must be present in a store should be regarded as his working time, or the time during which he was actually waiting on customers and was engaged in other work connected with this. The Supreme Court judged in favor of the first, considering that there is a general trend in the Netherlands Labor Law not only to protect the worker from undue fatigue, but also to give him an opportunity to dispose freely of a sufficient part of his time for his own development and for the recreation and interests of his family.

In the regulating of working-hours, the limiting of night and Sunday work and the aiming at half-holidays on Saturdays, the recognition of a worker in his human worth manifests itself. He cannot fulfill his vocation in his labor and in his family when he is worn out by too-long hours or by working too hard. It is not, therefore, ever shorter working-hours for which the Christian social movement is striving. Labor is essential to man. It is in developing the possibilities hidden in creation that he fulfills his godly vocation. The excessive shortening of working-hours results in decadence and promotes indulgence in lower pleasures.

The end in view should not be that a laborer works as little as possible, but that he works as much and as well as possible within the bounds resulting from the recognition of the fact that he, too, was created in God’s image. Yet it may be necessary to assume a further shortening of working-hours in times of unemployment. After all, it is better that as many workers as possible work for a shorter time than is normal than that many workers miss the blessings of working continuously.

That is why the 48-hour week is no dogma. We can safely say that for the normal industrial relations in Western Europe it marks about the right line between the times for working and resting. In countries that suffered badly from the late war and which in consequence have to take full recourse to the original source of making capital, viz., labor, it may be a duty to accept longer hours, the shift-system and such, exactly because labor is man’s vocation. Care must be taken, however, that labor should not become too heavy a burden. And it should be borne in mind that every lengthening of working hours does not heighten labor productivity in the same proportion. Experiments made in the allied countries during World War II proved that lengthening of working hours only within certain limits gives good results. If those limits are surpassed, the daily labor output goes down.

¹ I owe this idea to Dr. A. van Selms, professor at Pretoria. See his beautiful explanation of the Creed “Licht uit Licht” (Light from Light) Amsterdam, 1948, p. 42. (Author)
III

After this great distress concerning working hours had been met, the problem of social insurances was taken up. As for accident-insurance, labor was conceived of as a business, as a means of production, from the beginning. For the doctrine of the “risque professionnel” (professional risk) on which workmen’s compensation is founded, is that just as machinery breakdowns in a factory have to be borne by the owners, so the recovery of a worker, accidentally injured in doing his work, should be borne by the employer.

For the other social insurances, this ground does not hold. Nor for that matter is it the only ground for compensation in the case of accident-insurance. In view of the fact that the worker’s labor is his only source of income, the recognition of the worker in his human worth must lead to the conclusion that the recompense for his labor must suffice to provide for his own living and that of his family, not only when he works, but also when he cannot work, due to circumstances beyond his control. So we now grant children’s allowance when the wages are not enough for workers who have the education of children to pay for. Because these wages as a rule do not enable one to save to pay for medicine, surgery, hospital bills, health requirements, vacations, etc., compulsory insurance must be effected to help pay for these items.

It is desirable to adhere as much as possible to these grounds for compulsory insurance because then the relation between these insurance benefits and the labor of the worker is stressed. It is also advisable that the laborer pay part of the premium. And it is important, too, that labor be responsible to a high degree in the organization and handling of the social insurance. Labor law and consequently the right to social insurance must have in view not only the improvement of the material position of the worker, but also his spiritual uplift. That is why everything must be done to make the worker see that social insurance is his own affair for which he himself is also responsible. Its existence should not cause him to be lax, but should stimulate him to greater effort in order to make the burdens of illness, accident, old age, and unemployment as small as possible to himself and his fellow workers. Especially Christian trade-unionism should impress upon its members that the extension of social insurance does not give freedom to be careless in one’s work, but enables him to do this work with greater devotion and happiness.

IV

In the above we have come across the word “unemployment.” I have no hesitation in calling this the greatest evil in our social order, for it deprives the laborer of that which is both his only possession and the constitutive element of his nobility, namely, his labor. The insecurity of living, which results from the arbitrariness of an employer or an unstable economic system, is paralyzing. The best of social securities is to be found in stable employment. The measures to further this end, such as the supervision of investments and of the establishment and expansion of business enterprises, the forming of a conjuncture fund, the carrying out of public works, and the shortening of working hours are, for the greater part, of an economic nature. This does not mean, however, that only employers and government are entitled to consider and decide about these matters. Labor, too, should have a word in these matters and on the same level as the employers.

For the problems of employment are of a far-reaching social consequence. This, however, is not the chief reason for the right of labor to a co-partnership. Rather, it is the fact that the rate of employment in a country determines the possibility of the worker to fulfill his calling towards God, his family, and his country.

The maintenance of employment is so important, even from a moral point of view, that especially in the present international struggle to reestablish sound economic relations, it may be necessary to accept a lower standard of living, if in doing so, increasing unemployment could be prevented. Of course, I do not mean to say that trade unionism should not give its full attention to the purchasing power of wages and particularly of those in the war-stricken countries. Both the decline of employment and the lowering of the standard of living are evils to the worker, who has always been economically vulnerable. In a country such as the Netherlands, however, a temporary lowering of the standard of living will be inevitable if we want to maintain, in the future, moderate employment and a tolerable living-standard.

Aiming at stable employment gives the workers collective protection. Besides this, individual protection is necessary, not only from unlawful, but also from wrongful dismissal. In most countries civil law does not secure a worker against notice, but does bind the notice, which an employer is free to give, to certain terms. Sometimes the worker has a right to a longer term of notice according as he has been engaged for a longer period. In Denmark, for example, an employee, who has been employed for six months, is entitled to three months’ notice which term is lengthened by a month for every three years’ employment. The maximum is six months’ notice.

Germany has known, since the “Arbeitsrätegesetz” (labor council law) of 1920, a right of the worker to oppose a given notice “wenn die Kündigung sich als eine unbillige, nicht durch das Verhalten des Arbeitnehmers oder durch die Verhältnisse des Betriebsbedingte Härte darstellt” (when
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the notice is unfair and is not made necessary because of the worker's conduct or the circumstances of the business. Arbitration boards were set up to judge the worker's complaints and, if they were found to be justified, to compel the employer to hire the worker again or to give him compensation. The employer could choose between the two.

In the Netherlands a bill has now been introduced to parliament in which the Danish and German systems are combined. If this bill is to become an act of parliament, the term of notice for an employee will be at least a week for every full year that the worker was in his service, with a maximum of 26 weeks' notice. At the same time the worker can appeal to the law if he thinks that the employer has terminated his service "apparently unreasonably." If the judge is of the opinion that the worker is right, he may either award him indemnification or order the employer to re-establish the service. Instead of re-establishment, a financial compensation may be granted.

In my opinion the German regulation is preferable to the possibility of lengthening the term of notice. The latter restricts the freedom of employer and worker too much. If a worker is allowed to oppose a dismissal that is "unbillig hart" (unreasonably severe) or "apparently unreasonable," he is sufficiently protected, and there is no longer the necessity of lengthening the term of notice.

I should like to direct your attention to the fact that in such a case not only is the employer ordered to engage the worker again, but also to the fact that according to the Netherlands bill the worker, if he himself gives notice "apparently unreasonably," may be ordered to go back to the employer. Here we see again the recognition that the relation of labor is not a purely material one, such as other contract relations, but that it has a strongly personal character.

V

Labor law did not develop only by means of acts and regulations but also just as much by means of collective labor contracts, the stipulations of which are being considered as labor law framed by the industrial partners themselves, the employers and employees. Thus the protection of wages insofar as the wage level is concerned, and leaving alone the actual abnormal circumstances in a number of countries, has not become a business of the government only but has also been settled by labor itself together with the employers by means of collective agreement.

The Christian social movement has always promoted collective bargaining because it saw in it a realization of its goal for a worker to have his own responsibility and of its goal to effect a deliberation and cooperation with the employers. It is remarkable that socialist trade unionism accepted it very quickly. In England there was hardly any opposition to collective agreement. In Germany a very great majority accepted a resolution which strongly recommended establishing collective agreement as early as 1899 in the third congress of German trade unions held at Frankfort.

Since that time the development of collective agreements has assumed impressive proportions in Switzerland, Germany, the Netherlands, and the Scandinavian countries. In Germany this development was temporarily interrupted by the fascist revolution, and though conditions in the labor-judiciary field are not yet quite surveyable, there is no doubt that the general trend is in the direction of a re-establishment of collective agreement.

The advantages of a collective-labor-contract may, as far as I can see, be summarized in four points. It should be seen in the first place as evidence of the employers' recognition that in settling wages and other labor conditions the workers have rights equal to theirs. Co-operation between employers and laborers has stimulated a greater harmony in the relations in the same industrial group.

In the second place it brings about stability in labor relations so that labor conflicts are avoided and a regular process in production is promoted.

Thirdly, although it maintains its civil-law character and expires periodically, it does have a strongly durable character, for where once labor relations planning has begun by means of collective agreement, co-operation between employers and workers toward agreement, as a rule, continues.

Finally, it has vigorously strengthened the confidence of the workers. Through collective agreement they have learned how it feels to have a share in the responsibility and to be able to reach a goal. Numerous collective agreements have grown to be real law-codes in which not only fair wages have been established but also pension funds, improvements of the rules of dismissal, vocational training, organs of co-operation in the separate industrial plants (labor-councils), and holidays.

VI

With the introduction of the collective labor agreement and the reform of the right of dismissal we have already partly taken leave of the field of material benefits for the worker, and have shifted to that of the structural reforms of social life. Along with the material improvement of the worker's position, the need for far reaching changes in the social structure has been aimed at by the Christian social movement.

It must be understood, however, that the struggle for new forms of society could not be vigorously carried out until now. But today the sorest material needs of the worker, at least in Western Europe, have been met. That is why it is possible now, more than before, to draw the attention to the great evil of capitalistic development: the fact that the worker no longer bears any responsibility of his own in the process of labor, and consequently has been alienated from his labor and from the community in
which he performs this labor. This state of affairs now constitutes the heart of the social problem.

Different causes that effected this state of affairs can be mentioned. Though we may surmise, according to several researches, e.g., those of Robert Hopper and of Hawthorne, that the percentage of laborers that have a positive aversion of their work is relatively small, yet it is a fact that modern techniques with their strongly sustained division of labor and their mechanization of production, have spiritually estranged the worker from his labor.

Besides, there is the fact that the spirit of capitalism, with its unlimited stimulation of self-interest and its scorn of all moral considerations in the economic sphere of life, has had its destructive influence on the working classes. Countless workers have learned the doctrine of unrestricted self-interest from their employers, and how they did learn it! Then there was, in addition, the fact that social conditions were not prepared to help the working man to utilize his leisure properly when shorter working hours were realized. This will suffice to outline the causes of the spiritual impoverishment of the working-classes.

It is especially to fight this spiritual pauperism that the Christian social movement propagates partnership both in industry and business, and in the social and economic fields. Christian trade-unionism has adopted as its principle: harmonious cooperation of capital and labor. One of these two factors should not overrule the other; together they bear the process of production, and that it why they should also bear the responsibility for its progress together.

The idea of cooperation on the basis of equality inevitably leads to the idea of co-partnership. A laborer is not a part of a machine, but he is a man, created by God and placed in this world with his own responsibility toward God, his family, and the several communities in which he has his task. In the social order he should meet no hindrance to the acceptance of this responsibility.

A worker in these days is exposed to the temptations of a system which promises him almost unlimited improvement of his material position but which, at the same time, not to mention the question of the possibility of realizing the material promises, tends to make him a slave of the totalitarian state. Resistance to this demonic system is, in my view, only possible if Christian trade-unionism right now vigorously sponsors such structural changes in the social system that enable the worker to retain his worth as man and to bear part responsibility in the regulation of economic life, and in doing so to realize again the significance and purpose of his labor. In opposition to the brutal destruction with which communism threatens this world, all those who recognize Jesus Christ as Lord of their life and of the world have the duty to show that the criticism of the Gospel on our social order is far more radical than communistic criticism and that a real recovery and a real reclamation of the violated social relations is not to be attained in any other way than by obedience to the Lord's commandment.

Therefore labor partnership is necessary in national economic policy, in the economic relations in industry, and especially in the places of work themselves, for a laborer carries out his work there. He spends the greater part of his life within its boundaries; it defines his circumstance in life preponderantly. Therefore Hedemann was right when in an essay on "Betriebsgemeinschaft als Rechtsproblem" he said: "Die wirklich das Materielle des Arbeitsverhältnisses betreffenden Probleme haben ihren Sitz im Betrieb als solchen" (The problems concerning the essentially material side of labor relations arise in the places of work as such).

That is why management will have to inform the labor council about the running of the business; the council will have to be allowed to discuss it with them to its full extent and have a right to give advice and to make proposals which may contribute to technical and economic improvement. For the time being I should not dare to give labor councils more powers than these. The limited education which most workers have received will render the execution of even these rather simple qualifications difficult enough. It will be necessary to start intensive training of those who in the future will take their places in the labor councils.

This temporally restricted partnership in business will in the long run grow out to a right co-decision regarding features that are all-important to the continuation of these businesses. There is not any justification for the fact that now the management of a business makes unilateral decisions on those questions without being responsible to anyone. It is my conviction that development of co-partnership in business will be possible if we succeed in impressing the importance of these matters on trade-union membership and in training a sufficient number of unionists in economics, sociology and labor law.

VII

I am quite aware that I have put your attention to a severe test on account of the multiplicity of the problems which I have just raised. I think, however, that I should not do justice to my subject if finally I did not pass the frontiers of the Western European and Scandinavian countries. Since the beginning of 1948 there has been an Indonesian counterpart in the I.F.P.W.A. (International Federation of Protestant Workers' Associations). In establishing this the Christian labor movement has been involved in the great spiritual and social struggle which is being waged in the Far East.

It is obvious that communism, without giving up hopes to conquer Europe, now directs its attention for the greater part to Eastern Asia. It is equally
obvious that the pauperized and downtrodden multitudes in China, India, Pakistan, Siam, and Indonesia will lend a willing ear to the many communist promises of wealth and material expansion.

The Danish ex-minister Arne Spunsen has written a series of articles in the Netherlands weekly, Vrij Nederland, on the Bangkok Congress of the World Council of Churches. Among other things he points out that rumors of fantastic industrial development in Asiatic Russia have made a strong impression on East Asia. “If a person wants to avow his anticommunism in Asia,” he writes, “it is not sufficient for him to say that Russia is governed dictatorially—for the Asiatic countries have never known democracy—nor will solemn declarations have any effect—his only conclusive force will have to be derived from tractors, electrification and schools, exactly the same things Lenin advocated zealously. The thing that made the deepest impression on the intellectuals of Asia was that since 1917 the Russians have taught a hundred million people how to read and write.”

If we want to check communism in Eastern Asia, the pooling of the powers of Western Europe and America with the young independent states in South East Asia will be necessary. But in no lesser degree a positive contribution of America and the West to the solution of the social problems with which the East is struggling is necessary. Raising our own standards of living will have to be postponed to show the East that in the struggle for solution of social problems the Western world really wants to serve the East.

Is it necessary now to demonstrate at length the importance of that small I.F.P.W.A. counterpart in Indonesia? Is not the message of Christ’s Kingdom over the whole of human life conclusive for the establishment of social order in Asia too?

VIII

The multifarious tasks with which the Christian social movement finds itself now confronted sometimes oppress us when we consider our small numbers in our own country and in the world at large and, worst of all, our weak strength and our weak faith.

What encouragement, however, we find then in the word of our Lord! “My Father worketh hitherto, and I work.” (John 5:17).

The Doctrine of the Deity of Christ in the Early Church

John H. Bratt
Associate Professor of Bible
Calvin College

It was a little less than a century ago that Higher Criticism made its first serious frontal assault on historic Christianity. With its presuppositions of naturalism, denial of the supernatural, and the evolution of religion, it hammered away relentlessly at the cardinal doctrines of the Christian faith. One of the bastions attacked was the pivotal doctrine of the deity of Christ and having reduced this stronghold, as they assumed, there was little left to the Christ except an exemplary character and a reputation for peerless teaching. But in so doing religious liberalism was making a radical break with the historical stream. Twentieth century reconstructed “Christianity” is a far cry from first century apostolic faith. Our intent in this article is to note how deeply the belief in Christ’s deity was imbedded in the religious consciousness of the early church. Liturgies, creeds, ecumenical deliverances and “a chain of representative writers . . . assert in explicit language the Church’s belief that Jesus is God.” (Liddon’s Bampton Lectures, 1866, p. 33)

The Testimony of Distinguished Leaders

The age immediately following the apostles is of capital significance because it was so “rich in associations, traditions and instructions direct from the original source.’ (Remensnyder, The Post-Apostolic Age, p. 15) To the Church Fathers was committed the trust of taking the teachings of the Master and the doctrines of the apostles and passing them on without adulteration or dilution to succeeding ages. The full implications of these teachings they were unable to grasp, it is true. It is tremendously difficult to comprehend and evaluate adequately contemporary thought and ideology, and the early church with its promise of progressive enlightenment of the Holy Spirit could but anticipate in a rudimentary way the developed thought of later centuries. Consequently in many cases the Church Fathers do little more than reproduce the very language of Scripture. Those among them who ventured into the speculative were inclined to make too many concessions to Greek philosophy.

And yet these circumstances, coincidental to the historical situation, did not invalidate their capacity to transmit the lofty Christology of the New Testament. To the Fathers, as to the Apostles of the Lord, Christ was very God. Not that His divinity went absolutely unchallenged. Incipient Higher Critics like Celsus and Porphyry and heretical groups like the Gnostics and Ebionites sought by
scorn and ridicule or by specious argumentation to denude the Christ of His divine glory, but they were rivulets alongside the main stream. All agree that we are dealing here not with communities but with individual sects and schools of thought.” (Robinson, W. C., Our Lord, p. 34, citing Kidd, B. J. History of the Church I, p. 91). The main ecclesiastical stream yields unanimous conviction of the deity of Christ.

Listen to a few voices from the hoary past. Polycarp, the venerable Bishop of Smyrna, who reputedly sat at the feet of the Apostle John, prayed to Jesus as God and addressed Him as “Son of God and High Priest, the Only-Begotten, King forever, the Son of God according to Godhead and power, to Whom be an everlasting throne.” (Ad Phil. Ch. 12) Ignatius, the monarchical bishop of Antioch, opened his celebrated Epistle to the Ephesians with these words of greeting, “Jesus Christ our God,” and when explicating the Incarnation put that great truth in these words: “God the Word was truly born of a virgin, having clothed Himself with a body of like passions with our own.” Irenaeus of Lyons, combatant of the Old Catholic Church without a peer, successfully parried the attack of Gnosticism and vigorously asserted the coessentiality of Christ with the Father. He says, “There was one and the same God the Father and Christ Jesus who rose from the dead.” (Adv. Haer. Bk. III, xi 2). Tertullian, the brilliant jurist who was converted to Christianity at the age of forty, put his legal lore and his argumentative genius at the service of his newly-professed faith. Against Marcion he asserted of Christ: “He was the Son of God” (Bk. II, 2). And in confuting Praxeas, not only did he apply Rom. 9:5 (“Who is over all, God blessed forever”) to Jesus, but asked pointedly “Is the Word of God then a void and empty thing, which is called the Son, who Himself is designated God?” (Ch. XVII). Origen, the versatile Alexandrian scholar, maintained that “we sing hymns to the Most High alone and His Only-Begotten who is the Word and God.” (Contra Celsus, viii, 67). Justin Martyr, who acquired his title by laying down his life for the faith, said to Trypho, the Jew, “Christ ought to be worshipped” (Ch. 38) and he stoutly affirmed in his apology: “We reasonably worship Jesus Christ, having learned that He is the Son of the true God Himself.” (Apology, Ch. xiii)

The Post-Nicene age abounds in similar evidence. Ambrose, bishop of Milan and ardent proponent of the Nicene faith, argued the truth of the divinity of the three members of the Trinity from the singularity of the word “name” in the Baptismal Formula and asserted in no uncertain terms with regard to the Second Person, “Christ is God of God, Everlasting of Everlasting, Fullness of Fullness.” (De Fide ii, 15). St. Augustine, of whom Warfield says “he not merely created an epoch in the history of the Church but has determined the course of its history in the west up to the present day” (Studies in Tertullian and Augustine, p. 114) averred in his De Trinitate, a profoundly influential document: “The Son is equal with the Father and is of one and the same substance” (vi, 4)—and in commenting on the Passion of Christ wrote, “He who conquered was both man and God.” (xiii, 18)

The Eastern Church yields the same testimony as the Western on this score. Gregory of Nyssa, adjudged one of the four great fathers of the Eastern Church, applied the attributes and the titles of the Father to the Son and endorsed the truth that “the Only-Begotten is in the Divine Scriptures proclaimed to be God.” (Adv. Eunomius, vii, 2) and John of Damascus, the systematic theologian of the East, expressed the conviction of his communion thus: “We believe . . . in one Son of God, the Only-Begotten, our Lord Jesus Christ . . . true God of true God.” (De Fide Orthodoxe i, 8)

The Testimony of the Liturgies

The earliest liturgies, some of which go as far back in history as 190 AD, including the liturgies of St. James, St. Mark, St. Adaesus, and the one contained in the Apostolic Constitutions, assume Christ’s deity in that they provide for his worship in their formulae of prayer and praise. According to the Liturgy of St. James, for instance, the priest ministering at the altar addresses the Father as “God and Father of our Lord and God and Saviour Jesus Christ” and intones “Glory to the Father and to the Son and to the Holy Spirit, the Triune Light of the Godhead.” (AnteNicene Fathers, viii, 537, 547). The prayer of the Trisagion in the “Liturgy of St. Mark” is directed to the Second Person: “O Sovereign Lord Jesus Christ.” So too in the well-known “Gloria in Excelsis” and “Gloria Patri” both of which were current in the early church. In the former, which presumably originated early in the second century, worship is addressed to Him who is called “Lord God, Lamb of God, Son of the Father” while the latter, a favorite doxology of Christians throughout the centuries, indicates the divine parity of the three members of the Godhead in its opening refrain: “Glory to the Father and to the Son and to the Holy Ghost.” That the hymns of the Eastern Church yield similar evidence is apparent from the Incarnation Hymn of Ephraem of Syria, which contains these lines:

Into his arms with tender love
Did Joseph take his holy Son,
And worshipped Him as God.

Hymns and Poetry of the Eastern Church, p. 191.

The Testimony of the Creed

In the period of Church History which we are but sketchily surveying there were four creedal deliverances of significance. Three of them, the Apostles, the Nicene, and the Chalcedonian Creeds,
The Apostles' Creed, which Kattenbusch calls a “kind of positive precipitate of Paulinism” and which, though not written by the twelve apostles of the Lord, summarizes their beliefs and convictions, states clearly this cardinal doctrine in its second article, to wit: “Et in Jesum Christum, Filium ejus unicum, Dominum nostrum.” In the Arian controversy which raged the better part of a half century, Arius contended that the Christ occupied some intermediate position, higher than man because He was the first of created beings but being created, He was not on par with the Creator. He was “heterousios,” maintained Arius, not of the same essence as the Father. It was in opposition to this attempted demotion of Christ that the first general council which assembled at Nicea in 325 A.D. incorporated this article in its Creed: “one Lord Jesus Christ, the son of God.” The Chalcedonian Creed, formulated some 126 years later, reaffirmed these convictions and intimated that they were standard beliefs, in these words: “We then following the Holy fathers, all with one consent, teach men to confess one and the same Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, the same perfect in Godhead and also perfect in Manhood, truly God and truly man.” So too the Athanasian Creed is very explicit: “Ia deus Pater! deus Filius deus et Spiritus Sanctus.” (Schaaf, P., Creeds of Christendom, Vol. III)

Recapitulation is well-nigh superfluous. The period abounds in testimony to the universality of belief on the part of the Church in the deity of Christ. “The profound conviction cherished by our Lord’s first followers that He was of divine origin and nature” (Warfield, Lord of Glory, p. 3) was as heartily endorsed by the Christians of the 8th century as by the Christians of the first and despite the jibes of Fosdick, twentieth century Christians, as well as those of early church, are not ashamed to subscribe to a “first-century faith.”

From Our Correspondents

The University,
Potchefstroom, S. Africa,
September 24, 1951.

Dear Dr. Bouma,

One of the most important developments in South African politics of more than local significance is the amalgamation of the two parties which form our present government.

In June of this year Parliament, after being in session for more than five months, adjourned until next year. Immediately thereafter the leaders of the two parties in government started discussion for their unification. In our present Parliament there are four parties: two of these, the Reunited National and the Afrikans, form the government, while the other two, the United and the Labour Parties, form the opposition. The two parties in government were originally one, while the two in opposition were always separate parties.

Traditionally, South African politics run on two parallel lines: the so-called South African Party (the S.A.P. of Generals Louis Botha and Jan Smuts of 1912) and the so-called National Party (the Nat. of General Hertzog of 1912). In colloquial usage they were referred to as the Saps and the Nats. During the first World War the English group under Sir Thomas Smartt, the so-called Union Party, joined with the S.A.P. of Generals Botha and Smuts, so that they had three parties—the S.A.P., the Nat, and the Labour.

For some years after the first World War General Hertzog formed the government with his own and the Labour Party, but eventually the Labourites stepped out and the National Party carried on. With the devastating depression in the early thirties Generals Hertzog and Smuts joined hands and formed the United Party which remained in power up to the outbreak of the second World War.

Dr. D. F. Malen and his supporters rejected amalgamation with the S.A.P. and carried on as the National Party. When General Hertzog refused in September, 1939, to declare war on Germany, General Smuts took over the government as leader of the United Party. Dr. Malen and General Hertzog formed the opposition. There were then three big parties—the United Party of Smuts, the National of Malan, and the Afrikener of Hertzog. Those of Malan and Hertzog differed fundamentally on the question of a republic.

After the election of 1948 Malan and Havenga (the successors of Hertzog) joined forces to form the present government. Since 1948 the slight differences between the two parties were losing their importance to such an extent that the leaders felt that amalgamation was not only possible but essential in order to present a common front to the United Party of General Smuts (succeeded by Mr. J. G. N. Strauss). After careful preparation both Party Congresses decided to reunite under the old name of the National Party. This new group has opened its doors to both English and Jewish-speaking members. At the present moment the Labour Party forms a negligible quantity, and politics center around two parties: the United (mainly English-speaking) and the National (mainly Afrikans speaking).

During the last session of Parliament certain interesting signs began to appear. The old simple distinction between Englishman and Afrikanners is gradually fading. Many English-speaking South Africans are beginning to see the point of view of the Afrikaans-speaking, and vice versa. It is worthwhile briefly to state the points of contact and of difference.

It seems fairly clear to a level-headed observer that the majority of South Africans would support the following principles in South African politics: the absolute desirability and necessity of racial unity especially between the English and Afrikaans-speaking sections; the maintenance of white civilization; racial, residential, and social segregation, especially between the European and non-European sections; opposition to Communism and support of Democracy; a generous policy of economic, social, and intellectual development of the non-European peoples; freedom of press, speech, movement, and worship; bilingualism, South African first. On the other hand, I am bound to state that there are still some fundamental differences that cannot be easily brushed aside because they touch the fundamentals of life. Among these points of dif-
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ference I must particularly mention the one between the Eng-
lish and the Afrikaners-speaking sections on the idea of repub-
licanism—the English prefer monarchism, the Afrikaners, re-
publicanism. The second main difference lies in the divergent
views on membership in the British Commonwealth of Nations:
the English prefer membership, while some Afrikaners are in
favor of complete separation. These are to my mind the two
points of difference. I know, of course, that the English think
that the Afrikaners-speaking section aim at other objection­
able things. I might refer to their misconception that we Afri­
kaners favor state worship, unconstitutionalism, repressive
non-European policies and administration, political indoctrina-
tion of the civil service and educational departments. I can
assure my fellow South Africans and our overseas friends
that we Afrikaners do not and can not accept any pattern of
state worship, that we are equally appalled at any form of
unconstitutionalism, that we are shocked at any repressive non­
European policies, and that we oppose all political indoctrina-
tion of the civil service and the educational departments. These
are the very things we as Afrikaners were fighting against
under the old British rule in South Africa.

With kind regards,
Sincerely yours,
J. CHr. CORTEZE.
men free. The New Testament is the true source-book of Christian jurisprudence and statesmanship and the most radical revolution of political life has emanated from Calvary. But the French Revolution sought to free man from his subjection to God and every God-established authority and has thereby placed man in subjection to the tyranny of men. It has given rise to Pseudo-Conservatism, Liberalism, Radicalism, Socialism and Communism. The latter is again scored as a child of the Revolution in Kuyper's last address to the Party Deputies in 1918.

However, Russian Communism not only broke with God and his law but also seeks the disintegration of society as a whole. Whereas the French Revolution still sought the welfare of the people in Constitutional guaranteed liberties, Communism is purely anarchistic and nihilistic. It scorches human personality and human rights. Kuyper calls this the third and final stage of the mania of the Revolution (razerny der Revolution) and he is especially disturbed that President Wilson in a speech of January 8, 1918 expressed his sympathy for this victory of individualistic atomism, this anarchistic violence of the Bolsheviks.

In his "De Kleyne Luyden," delivered November 22, 1917, and immediately published by Kok in Kampen we hear Kuyper, the theologian, addressing a political gathering. The common folk are not the poor only but especially the unlearned. In this connection Kuyper points out that the Bible warns us against the false wisdom of the world in even more stringent tones than it singles out the vanity and peril of riches. Satan for him is not a dealer in gold, but the father of lies. Not worldly goods but worldly wisdom, and science falsely so-called, is the mightiest weapon in Satan's arsenal.

But not only the contributions of Dr. Kuyper are eminently readable and instructive. Those of Colyn, de Wilde, and Schouten are no less so. Dr. Colyn in 1920 spoke of the "delayed dawn" (Toevend Dageraad) of peace and prosperity in which he assesses the Versailles Treaty and the Russian Revolution in the light of Scripture. Dr. Schouten in the last recorded speech of this volume, which was delivered in 1948, is of the opinion that the democratic socialists of The Netherlands are wrong in maintaining that the government can successively take over the economical life of the nation without loss of spiritual, moral and social freedom—without succumbing to the communistic system. "Intermingling or uniting of political and economic power is not the most suitable method for maintaining the purity of political power. This and other considerations lead us to the rejection of the socialistic conception." (p. 286.)

The learned author goes on to say that when political power is applied in favor of some particular economic view not sufficiently tested by proper norms, then things go wrong. But the same is true if economic power is used to serve a particular political theory. Further, the economic and political views are again closely united with the religious views of those manipulating the power of state. Hence the author sees great danger in the accumulation of political and economic power in the hands of the same or of a few persons.

Let this suffice as to the general content. This is a very important and enlightening book for Calvinists everywhere. It forms a résumé and oversight of Calvinistic political action during the space of seventy years in which the Anti-Revolutionary Party of the Netherlands has been active. Its main activity for the first fifty years was in behalf of the School Issue (School-Stryd) which was terminated in 1920 when the free schools with the Bible were put on an even footing with the public schools for public support. Ever since 1889 the Party has been progressively conservative in the matter of industrial organization. Organization is the means to achieve social justice, not an end in itself for the manipulation of power. The question of justice is one that deals with men, not matter. But only those led by the Spirit of God and implicated into the truth of the Gospel can truly know what man is and who he is. A sense of justice and the service of love are required for the fulfillment of our duties toward our neighbor. The spirit of the Revolution destroys and pollutes everything, but the spirit of the Gospel ennables, restores and renews. Therefore the Christian must be filled with enthusiasm for his task in society, since he has the answer for the ills of the world. And our subjection to Christ, the King, must drive us onward in seeking justice and serving in love.

It is refreshing to hear men speak their religious convictions on economic and political issues in the political halls of the nation. In this respect our American Calvinism lags far behind. It will not do, in my opinion, to ascribe our lack of leadership and of principal political approach to the differing milieu in which we live. We must become the creators of a new political atmosphere in Lansing and in Washington. Expediency must make way for principle, cynicism for conviction. Graft must bow to justice and secularism must be overcome by religious devotion and service Pro Rege.

Henry Van Til.