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All One Body We

In a brief series of articles we have been asking, “What is the Christian Reformed Church?”

The serious student who asks that question is soon confronted with the fact that there is somewhat less than perfect agreement among the members, teachers, preachers, and writers of that church. This disagreement crops up at various places. Instances of it which occur to us at the moment are the question of labor unions, the problem of divorce, and the question of common grace. The line of demarcation between the adherents of one view and another is not always drawn in the same place. But there is enough consistency about the matter to warrant our speaking of two schools of thought among us. At that point, the question seems to be in order, “Which of these two schools of thought represents the Christian Reformed Church? Which is in harmony with her past, and with which does her future lie?”

Our contention in this article is that the essence of the Christian Reformed Church lies precisely at the meeting point of these two schools of thought. The Christian Reformed Church consists in these two together. We have on other occasions pleaded for a sense of unity among the members of the church. We have been heartened and gratified by the warm response such pleas have met. But such unity can be expressed far more consciously and realistically if we are aware of the nature and bounds of our oneness with each other. It is therefore our purpose, in this third and concluding article in this series, to examine our diversity in unity historically, to see something of its nature, and to seek to assess its implications.

I

The interplay of these two schools of thought cannot be understood except against the background of the ecclesiastical history of the Netherlands, especially the modern history from the Afscheiding in 1834 to the present day. In a very valid sense, the Afscheiding is the “rock whence we were hewn.” The Christelijke Afgescheiden Kerk is not an ancestor to be ashamed of. This Dutch progenitor of the American Christian Reformed Church, despite the smallness of its numbers, was not a divisive sect, but a Reformed Church, with a very respectable claim to be the Reformed Church of the Netherlands. The State Church had been transformed into a royal puppet, in which the liberty to preach what one would and to ignore the confessions was exalted to a principle and enforced by royal authority. As one Dutch scholar remarks, “1816 [reorganization of the Dutch State Church] marks the overthrow of 1618 [Dordt].” It was against this aggressive “leervrijheid” that the secession took place, and the leaders stoutly maintained that they had not separated from the Reformed faith, but were the true defenders of it. The basis of the church was not narrow; it was as broad as the great Reformed creeds. But such latitude as denied those creeds was repudiated. The defense of those creeds has constituted the heritage of that church and its successors to this day.

But agreement on this basic position did not solve all problems for the seceders, nor guarantee unity among them. There were differences of personality and outlook among them. Hendrik De Cock, whose church was the first to secede, was a man committed to the Reformed faith, to whom the Church was a dear and inviolable institution, and for whom secession was a weighty problem of the conscience. In Hendrik Scholte, on the other hand, the non-ecclesiastical influences of the Reveil were strong, and he actively sought secession. Among the other seceders, Brummelkamp on the one hand consistently sought cooperation with the Hervormde Kerk, particularly in educational matters. The leaders of the Kruisgemeenten (Churches under the Cross) on the other hand, were strongly inclined toward independentism, and in a little while began to ordain lay preachers. Such diversity left its mark upon the church, occasioning several unfortunate divisions and later reunions which were incomplete and only partially satisfactory.

The early Afgescheiden Church thus represented something of a balance between those who were very reluctant to sever the ties with the State Church and those who were inclined toward independentism. It was a balance of moderates, however. Some people of conservative opinions remained in the State Church, while the more extreme independents soon severed ties with the Afgescheiden also. That is to say, some were so reluctant to leave the State Church that they simply did not leave it; while others thought so lightly of this step that they broke off communion even with those brethren who had gone through the Afscheiding with them.

We find here two schools of thought, which we shall call “right wing,” represented in its extremier

---

1 L. Praamsma, Het Dwaas Gods.


form by the Kruisgemeenten, and "left wing," represented by those who remained in the Hervormde Kerk. The very terminology, "right wing" and "left wing" occasions some difficulty. From the standpoint of dogmatic theology, there is little choice but to call the Kruisgemeenten "right wing" — i.e., hyper-orthodox. From the standpoint of church polity, however, their independentism would seem to stamp them as "left wing" — i.e., as radicals who were willing to alter the ecclesiastical setup on slight provocation. By the same token, the men who sympathized with the Afscheiding, but remained in the Hervormde Kerk, must be called, relative to the Afscheiding itself, left-wing in theology and right-wing in polity. We have chosen, for the sake of convenience, to speak of right and left wings in the doctrinal sense. But the point is that in both senses the Afgescheiden Kerk was a middle party, but a middle party which included something of both emphases.

The interplay of these two streams of thought continued. In 1869 a union was effected between the Afgescheiden Kerk and the majority of the Kruisgemeenten, by which the Christelijk Gereformeerde Kerk was formed. Those of the Kruisgemeenten who continued their separate existence were the precursors of the present Nederduitsch Church. Out of this union of 1869 came a church with only small pretensions to culture and scientific theology, but with a real piety and a flourishing congregational life.

The Doleantie in 1886 introduced a new element into the picture. Once again, the question involved the status of the Reformed creeds in the State Church. The deposition of Abraham Kuyper and others came about over the question whether those who denied the Reformed faith could be admitted to membership in the Reformed Church. The new denomination represented higher levels of education, culture, and social standing than the Afgescheiden heritage, and there was relatively greater emphasis on intellectualism, in contrast with the experiential piety of the Afgescheiden. Hopes for union between these two conservative Reformed bodies were immediately expressed, and were realized in 1892, despite some misgivings on both sides. The present Christelijk Gereformeerde Kerk of the Nederlanden arose among them over the question of union with the Reformed Church in America. Almost without exception, the ministerial leaders of the immigrants favored the union of 1850 and its preservation in 1857. Those who formed the Christian Reformed Church in 1857 were a small minority. In this origin of the Christian Reformed Church in America almost a century ago the two emphases, which had so much in common, underwent a parting of the ways. This parting of the ways is a fact to be regretted rather than justified in our day — but regretted the more because the separate ways have become more and more separate with the passage of the years. While cooperation between the Reformed Church in America and the Christian Reformed Church has advanced on some fronts, a real meeting of the minds seems to become increasingly remote.

All of these points of view have had their impact on the Christian Reformed Church in America. Many forces have tended to move that church even closer to conservatism in theology and separatism in polity than the Dutch Church was. The immigrants of 1847 were of relatively pure Afgescheiden stock, but a division soon arose among them over the question of union with the Reformed Church in America. Almost without exception, the ministerial leaders of the immigrants favored the union of 1850 and its preservation in 1857. Those who formed the Christian Reformed Church in 1857 were a small minority. In this origin of the Christian Reformed Church in America almost a century ago the two emphases, which had so much in common, underwent a parting of the ways. This parting of the ways is a fact to be regretted rather than justified in our day — but regretted the more because the separate ways have become more and more separate with the passage of the years. While cooperation between the Reformed Church in America and the Christian Reformed Church has advanced on some fronts, a real meeting of the minds seems to become increasingly remote.

3 It comes as something of a shock to learn that the Kruisgemeenten, within the first decade after the Afscheiding, already came forward with the charge that certain Afgescheiden preachers were teaching a universal and well-meant offer of grace to all people who live under the Gospel.

4 Dr. Henry Beets, in an article on the Christian Reformed Church in the Christelijke Encyclopaedie, definitely links the influence of the Kruisgemeenten with the founders of the Christian Reformed Church.
The American Christian Reformed Church was “right-wing,” and tended to become more so because of the influence of the environment. Immigrant religious groups generally manifest some fear of their environment, and the Christian Reformed Church was no exception to this rule. Fear of the environment comes to definite expression in more than one article dealing with the threat to the Reformed faith posed by American methodism and activism. The almost passionate adherence to the Dutch language on the part of some of the immigrants is an equally clear indication of that fear.

And when World War I and the rise of a new generation broke down something of that language isolation, articles and decisions against worldliness increased in number. 6

It was through continued contact with the Netherlands that this new denomination derived its theological vigor. That contact existed from the very beginning, but became closer as the years went by, and the Christian Reformed Church won the battle to be regarded as the continuation of the Afspoediging on American soil. Because of the continuing close ties between Dutch and American churches, the enrichment of the stream of conservative theology in the Netherlands served also to enrich the American church. Generally speaking, also, that contact with the Netherlands brought about a broadening and stabilizing effect upon the American Christian Reformed Church. That the contact was close is evident from the fact that the American church adopted the Conclusions of Utrecht in 1908, three years after their adoption in the Netherlands, and that various doctrinal controversies have run a somewhat parallel course on both sides of the Atlantic. 6

The interplay of the two schools of thought in the Dutch Church is thus also a phenomenon in the life of the Christian Reformed Church in America. The “right-wing” tendency was manifest very strongly in the early years of the Christian Reformed Church, but growing contact with the Netherlands was at least one main factor in progressively modifying it as time went by.

III

On both sides of the Atlantic there has been a determined effort to remain true to the Reformed creeds, in fact as well as in name. An absolute, living allegiance to these creeds has been the characteristic of the Gereformeerde Kerken on one hand and the Jansenists on the other. Both have been concerned with the question of common grace, although not with exactly the same aspects of this problem, since the early 1920’s. Renewed immigration is helping to continue the parallels today.
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our stand; it is here that we wish to express our heartiest concurrence. The differences within our ranks are of the sort indicated above. They are bounded by the limits there laid down. And we are richer, not poorer, because of the existence of such differences. We find here a cause for rejoicing, in that we are all one body, though not all the same member; we are one ministry, not the less, but the more because there are diversities of gifts. What is the Christian Reformed Church? We are one body, with more than one way of looking at the world we live in, and we are happy that we can call each other "brother" within the bounds of the Reformed faith.

IV

At this point, the unprejudiced observer may feel moved to ask, "What is so wonderful about discovering a sort of unity in so small and insignificant a body as the Christian Reformed Church?" One can understand such a question in these days of broad ecumenical movements. But the unity we have been seeking to describe is not as insignificant as it might seem. Let us try to suggest some of its wider implications.

In the first place, we take great satisfaction from the fact that the basis for this unity is sound. This is a much more important consideration than mere numbers. The soundness of this basis lies in the fact that its doctrinal principles come from the golden age of the Protestant Reformation; that the Reformation itself resurrected and maintained the purest in Christian tradition; and that the foundation of those creeds and that tradition is in the Word of God. Nor has this unity degenerated into that of a dead orthodoxy, in which the definition of doctrinal soundness becomes narrower and narrower; in this respect also the unity is sound, for it leaves room to the intellect to live and inquire and breathe.

There is reason for profound gratification, secondly, in the realization that we are not alone. Prominent mention has been made in this article of the affinity between our church and the Gereformeerde Kerken in the Netherlands. We stand on the same basis with that church. And that denomination, while not perfect, has made an enviable reputation for itself as one of the most vigorous and active in our fellowship.

The third aspect—and perhaps the most optimistic of all—in this situation is that it gives us a basis for seeking a still broader fellowship. In these days of ecumenical agitation there is real point in asking anew the question, "What is the true Church, and where is it to be found?" The consideration of the breadth and narrowness of our own constitution gives us an approach to an answer to that question.

It is an answer not quite as Pharisaic as that which says, "No doubt we are the people, and wisdom shall die with us." But it is also an answer with deeper historic roots than those of an ill-defined Fundamentalistic ecumenicity. And at the same time it is much closer to the essence of the Church than is a modernist inclusivism. This—a conception of the Church as broader than our own denominational boundaries and yet narrow enough to include some definite standards of the truth; a conception of the church as diverse throughout the world, and yet possessing a unity which is somewhat more than a vague idea—this, it seems, is the direction in which our destiny beckons; and the prospect is a pleasing and intriguing one.

These are some of the lines which ought to be followed in the century to come. Our unity in diversity—or diversity in unity, if you will—must be clearly recognized, openly stated, preserved, and perfected. The confessional aspect of it must certainly be defended; doctrinal defection or indifference would be a suicidal goal for the church. But, at the same time, the breadth within the confessions must also be defended and preserved. Some think that one of these emphases is much more important than the other. Some proponents of one view are impatient with, and even sometimes suspicious of, the adherents of the other. But the fact is that both views, both emphases, are absolutely necessary. And if, as seems likely, we cannot preserve both without having enthusiasts for the one and the other, then we are fortunate in the possession of both types of enthusiasts in our ranks. Long may they flourish!

But this is only a matter inter nos; movement within a closed circle; the confrontation of ourselves; and that is by no means enough. We must enlarge the place of our habitation; we must lengthen our cords and strengthen our stakes. We must include those who are like us in respect to the doctrinal position discussed in this article; we must include all of them, quite apart from any consideration of their national background or their race. We have talked a good deal about this, but we must get to work and do something about it. We must give to many more people the opportunity to be like us, to be one of us, than those to whom we have extended this opportunity in the past. America must be confronted with the Reformed faith and given an opportunity to decide for it or against it. We have not yet done this to a significant degree. People talk in admiring tones about our phenomenal growth in the past ten years, but we know better. The disturbing fact is that, apart from immigration, we have not perpetuated ourselves! To do this task rightly will necessarily involve some changes. Whatever in our system is non-essential to the Reformed faith and at the same time a stumbling-block to our inquiring neighbors, that must go! This is not to advocate a change in our character. Our character must remain the same; it must even stand out more plainly than...
it has. It is the idiosyncracies that must be cast off. We must speak realistically to our American neighbors, or we will die. We may die slowly, because we make diligent efforts to hold our own. We may even appear to grow, because immigration swells our numbers. But this is life by blood-transfusion, and it cannot go on indefinitely. The Church of Jesus Christ, as represented by ourselves, cannot profitably regard itself as a sick person, with little purpose in life beyond keeping alive. She must grow or decay; she must evangelize or die. There is no third choice.

Further, we must explore ways of communicating with others who are like us in essentials and who differ in minor items. Nor should we too quickly decide what are essentials. There are many in the world today whose creational background differs in some respects from ours; but some among them are like us in the vast majority of the elements of those creeds, in the loyalty which they show to their creational bases, and in their assessment of the contemporary situation. They are one with us; and that unity should come to the fullest possible expression. Where nothing but minor differences of a practical nature separate us, we must seek union. If that union is really desirable in our eyes, we must be willing to sacrifice a bit of sovereignty in order to attain it. As some modern writers on ecumenicity have pointed out, the fact to bear in mind is that churches have to die in order to unite, but the consolation is that those who have done this have seldom, if ever, expressed regrets concerning their action. Several names of denominations suggest themselves as possible subjects for union discussions. It is not our responsibility or intention to list or discuss those denominations now. It is enough if we have come to accept the fact that the question to ask today is not why we should get together, but whether the reasons for staying apart are adequate or not.

And finally, some better way must be developed to express the unity of Reformed Churches throughout the world. The brightest hope is the Reformed Ecumenical Synod, which must advance in significance for the member churches. Calvin Seminary must acquaint Christian Reformed theological students with the life and heritage of the sister churches throughout the world. There must be exchange of teachers and exchange of ideas, and the exchange of students must be increased. South Africa and Scotland, to mention just two possibilities, must be included much more realistically in this outlook. Our Committee on Ecumenicity and Inter-Church Correspondence, the Calvinistic Action Committee, and other like bodies must be given much greater prominence. Our publications must set themselves resolutely to the task of speaking for the Reformed faith, with the whole world as a possible audience. And all of this, of course, can be successful only if there is a reciprocal interest on the part of the other truly Reformed denominations. Let us be obsessed with this grand idea—we are one; let us say so to the world. Unity of organization may come later; it will come more slowly in some respects than in others. But let us get busy immediately with the task of making as much of a unified testimony to the world as we can—and that not as a sidetrack, but as a main element in our activity.

Looking back and looking within are profitable, but not enough. We must look outward and forward. We have a wonderful heritage, but there is ample room for improvement, for growth, for service. If to an improved outward and forward look, we add an increasing emphasis on

"the upward glancing of the eye, When none but God is near"

there are many wonderful experiences still in store for the Christian Reformed Church and her brethren in the faith, until the day dawn, and the day-star arise in our hearts.
Augustine's Contribution to Constitutionalism in Government*

S. R. Kamm
Wheaton College

It is peculiarly appropriate that this celebration of the birthdate of Augustine should include a consideration of the political philosophy of the Bishop of Hippo. Twentieth century developments in political thought and action have again raised the issue of the totalitarian state. To many, the all-inclusive claims of a People's Democracy, with its Communist base, is a new phenomenon. Actually, it is a return to the political principles of the pre-Christian era.

Augustine lived in a day when the principle of political totalitarianism was rudely shaken by the superior physical strength of the barbarian hordes. Votaries of the universal empire of Rome sought to lay at the door of the Christians the blame for imperial weakness. Since Christians did not subscribe to the totalitarian views of pagan Rome, it was openly alleged that their defection had alienated the ancient civil gods and thus weakened the state. Not only was Rome facing annihilation; the whole order of life was about to collapse.

It is to this charge of disloyalty that Augustine addresses himself in The City of God. His defense involves a thorough-going analysis of the pagan society of his day and a forthright presentation of a Christian view of human history. Woven into this account is a consideration of the basic principles of government. It is with that particular phase of the argument that this paper is concerned.

The ancient world brought forth three views of the nature of government: (1) That of the ancient empires, which sought to present the government of men as the management of the private estate of a local or territorial deity. In this system all the process of government was carried on at the deity level; the patres (priest-king) or divinely-generated ruler performed the mediatorial functions of ruler on earth. Men were part of the private patrimony of the deity, or the sheep of the divine shepherd. (2) The Hebrew or covenantal view, which sought to show government as a beneficent provision from the hand of God. In the early period of Hebrew history the prophet-judge frequently performed the mediatorial function; later its exercise was divided between the priesthood and the King. The elders of the people joined with the priest and the King in confirming or rejecting policies of state. The "Law" served as a unifying framework of reference in revealing the nature of the covenantal relationship with God, as well as a guide to priest, King and people. (3) The classical or scientific view, which looked upon government as "natural" to man either by virtue of his identification with a closed order of nature, as with Plato, Aristotle, or Polybius, or by virtue of his own natural rational character such as with Cicero. In the former it is argued that government arises of necessity either in answer to man's rationally concerned need of some form of mutual exchange (Plato), or because man possesses certain instinctive drives that impel him toward social intercourse with its accompanying political institutions (Aristotle). With Polybius the forces which impel toward government are external to man, but he is powerless to change them. The "fortuitous concorse of atoms" in the physical world is transposed to the fortuitous association of men in states. Government in every instance, in the mind of this scientific school, is mediated through some force of nature resident within or outside of man. All that man can do is to retard those degenerative forces and tendencies which are universally recognized in all of nature including the institutions of government.

To Augustine the various classical views left much to be desired. His own tireless pursuit of truth for his personal life led him through the maze of contemporary religions long associated with these broader schools of thought. Moving through an early period of sensualism he was attracted to Manicheism, with its identification of evil with the material, and later to Neo-Platonism with its emphasis upon the intellect as the path to freedom. None of these satisfied him; in fact, his restless nature did not come to peace until he found it through faith in the atoning work of Christ. Immediately his whole perspective changed. He saw the entire world in a new light. The certainty for which he

*A speech delivered at the Conference on Augustinian Thought at Wheaton College on November 12, 1954, on the occasion of the celebration of the sixteenth centennial of the birth of St. Augustine. Dr. Kamm is a professor in the division of Social and Political Sciences, Wheaton College.


sought was now to be found in the person and work of Jesus Christ.

II

Augustine's political philosophy is to be traced directly to this radical change in perspective brought about through his conversion to Christianity. This was not simply an intellectual re-orientation, as had been his acceptance of Neo-Platonism. It was a change so thorough and so radical that it led him to propose (a) a new cosmology, (b) a new epistemology, and (c) a new social theory with its consequent view of the state and government. All of these views are destined to influence not only the theology of the day, but also the total complex of Western culture for more than a thousand years. Indeed, the perspective set forth in Augustine forms part of the great constitutional heritage of all free peoples. He is that which kept alive the Biblical pattern of the institutional separation between religion and politics and thereby laid the basis for the modern doctrine of limited or constitutional government.

How did Augustine arrive at his understanding of the nature and function of the state?

1. Augustine saw human life and institutions within the perspective of a Biblical cosmology. He rejected both the ancient view of a polytheistic pantheism, which looked upon the life of the universe and men as embraced totally within the life of the gods, as well as the doctrine of the classical scientists that all life, including that of man, was to be found within the orbit of nature, although it was fully recognized that man did not entirely respond to that orientation. Each of these views gave a "fixed" character to the order of life as then conceived. Rather, Augustine went back to the view recorded in the Hebrew scriptures, namely, that both man and nature are part of a created order of life. Man may be distinguished from nature by virtue of his immediate essence—reason—and his eternal essence—spirit—or soul, but he is not determinately set over against Nature, even though somehow bound by it. For man and nature are both manifestations of the creative will of God. Hence, neither man or nature are eternal, as the classical writers had assumed, but are contingent, that is, subject to the will and rule of the Creator. This gives a temporary or contingent view to the universe which did not prevail among any of Augustine's contemporaries outside the church.

A cosmology of this sort gives rise to a view of history which thoroughly undermines the view of either the polytheists or naturalists. Origen had earlier raised an objection to the "binding" nature of the cyclic view of history by pointing out that in it no concept of change or progress is possible. Augustine, building upon the epochal framework of Bishop Eusebius' earlier Ecclesiastical History, sought to show that the order of history was the order of progress—progress toward the realization of God's will among men. This progressive movement was characterized by conflict between two great societies or communities: Civitas Dei and Civitas Terrae. Progress does not come through the destruction of the evil by the good, as in Manicheism, nor by the achievement of synthesis through the antagonism of thesis and antithesis as in Hegel or Marx. Rather, progress is achieved as the community of those who love God become conformable "to the image of His Son" (grow in grace), while the community of those who love self either surrender to the grace of God or face ultimate damnation at the hands of a righteous God.

This view of history allows for no provincialism, not even for that of a Thucydides or a Polybius. It demands that men be conceived as a universal order, each one of whom plays a part in the unfolding drama of God's redemptive purpose. True, they are divided into two great communities, but it is the moral and spiritual groupment that is fundamental. Political states are, therefore, merely temporal.

2. Augustine viewed knowledge from the perspective of faith rather than that of reason. Religious faith, averred Augustine, brings illumination. God is the true teacher. Without religious faith one cannot be said to possess true knowledge.

It is interesting to note how Augustine arrived at this conclusion. He had sought diligently with the Neo-Platonists for the arché of intelligibility—the principle whereby the transcendent and the immanent—reason and experience—might be brought together. The nous to him was never a very satisfying postulate whereby the arché of being and the arché of becoming might be fused into the principle of intelligibility. The nous or mind was too limited an approach to the problem of meaning, Augustine's conversion experience opened the door to a spiritual basis of understanding—the Person of Christ, himself.

Ancient cosmologists had operated upon the assumption that knowledge was a gift of the deity. The Hebrews found in the fear of God "the beginning of wisdom." The Ionian philosophers rejected all such transcendent sources of knowledge and sought to show that nature was the source of under-

---

10 *Proverbs* 2:5-6.
standing. Nature, they contended, bore within it the principle of being, or origins, the principle of becoming, or behavior, and the principle of intelligibility or understanding. Plato found the latter in the universally transcendent principle of the "idea," or nous. Given this mental fixation, one might aspire to knowledge, for "idea" was not only open to the prehensibility of man but was also capable of leading man to perfect knowledge.\footnote{11}

Aristotle had endeavored to make man's task easier by asserting the presence of the idea in the essence of every object of nature. Polybius found knowledge in the evolutionary unfolding of the process of natural growth or development. Observation and reason made such knowledge prehensible. Cicero, leaning heavily upon the Stoic principle of natural law, found in man's reason the door to that knowledge which was contained in the universal law of nature. In each of these theories of knowledge nature was assumed to be eternal in the sense of being permanently fixed, and man was asserted to be capable of fully apprehending all those meanings which nature was said to reveal. To put it in another way, man was assumed to be capable of saving himself through knowledge derived from nature through his own capacities.

To each of these assertions Augustine's own personal experience gave the lie. He, as others before him, found the way of intellectual salvation one of disappointment and frustration. His own personal experience of salvation through faith in the atoning work of Christ led him to earnest inquiry concerning the Biblical view of knowledge. Here he found the principle of archē or being in the Person of God, the Father; the principle of becoming or behavior in the Person of Christ. The Christian Trinity became to Augustine the open door to all knowledge. Sapientia or Christian wisdom became the basis of all understanding. Classical science, which professed to be in search of causes but had been able to engage only in description, now had a framework within which to evaluate its observations. Christian wisdom would afford a basis for value determination.\footnote{12}

III

It is in the light of this Trinitarian or Christian doctrine of wisdom or knowledge, as well as Augustine's Biblical cosmology, that one must approach Augustine's view of the state. It is observable immediately that Augustine has not cast away the forms of classical science in the realm of political speculation. Rather, he submits them to the process of Christian illumination.\footnote{13} Augustine opens his exposition of the state with a quick review of the classical ideals concerning political life. The state has a social basis, for man is driven by his own nature to seek the society of his fellow men. He observes, with Aristotle, that the basis of all human society is the home or family and goes on to point out that a close relationship exists between civic peace and domestic concord.\footnote{14} The state or city is the next largest association of human beings for political purposes (the intermediary phratries and gens had largely disappeared in Augustine's day). And now he must recognize the changes observed by Polybius and Cicero—the world state or community held together by the hand of Rome. It was true that people were often separated by differences of speech, but Rome had superimposed her language upon a large enough number of people so that a real political community existed.\footnote{15} Here Augustine recognizes the cultural foundations of the state which have formed the basis for the modern concept of the nation state.

But this to Augustine is mere description. What is the purpose of the state? Why can it compel men to obey? What is its relationship to other associations of men? How may its work be properly evaluated? These are questions which Augustine essays to answer in the light of Christian sapientia.

It is important now to examine Augustine's sociology. Already we have observed his tendency to think of men as making up a universal society. But that is a view of men in terms of being or origins. In terms of behavior or becoming men are characterized by a tendency to congregate about two objects of their love: God and self. To the former he assigns the label: community of God; to the latter, the label, community of earth.\footnote{16} These communities are not directly visible to men for they are moral groupments. They do have an objective manifestation in the visible Church and the visible state. That is not to say, however, that the church is the Civitas Dei or that the state is the Civitas Terrena; rather, the church and the state are symbols of these moral societies.\footnote{17}

It is difficult to portray the significance of Augustine's sociology upon the political thought of his day as well as upon our own. Classical sociology, following its scientific methodology, has always conceived of society as a fixed principle of human life buttressed by the natural force of human propagation or the rational force of efficient satisfaction of human needs such as the means of livelihood, shelter, education or protection. All of these matters are external. Augustine perceives that a man is made to love, that he responds with his whole person to overtures from either God or the suggestions of the inner life, and that these are the forces around which men are polarized into corporate, living groups.

12 C. N. Cochrane, Christianity and Classical Culture, pages 432-444.
13 Ernst Cassirer, The Myth of the State, page 84.
14 City of God, Book XIX, Chapter 16, page 412.
15 Ibid., Chapter 7, page 405.
16 City of God, Book XIV, Chapter 28, pages 282-283.
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Since this is true, it can no longer be said that the state provides the “good life,” that it embraces the totality of human existence. Gone is the classical scientific dictum that man outside the state is either a god or a beast. In its place is erected a new conception of society: man externally can live the life of the human community, but internally he can do so as a citizen of the Kingdom of God.

Augustine’s sociology provides a new framework within which to erect an understanding of the nature and functions of the earthly state. Classical writers had long wrestled with the problem of obedience. Why should a man possessed of reason and desiring freedom of expression submit to the restraining influences of the state? Augustine’s Christian sapientia provides the necessary illumination. Man was originally free and equal in this life. The Fall came and with it man became subject to sin. Then it was that dominion, the power of one man over another, was justified on the ground that it was both a punishment for sin and a remedy for the chaotic condition thus initiated. The political order is justified, then, as an agency of external restraint because of the imperfections of man’s inner nature. It is both penal and redemptive in character. Viewed in this light the ruler or magistrate took on the Biblical character of a servant of God. 18

This line of reasoning lends a negative character to the argument: Man must submit to earthly rule primarily because it is necessary to restrain the evil tendencies in men. Is there no positive challenge to men in the life of the political community? Is it in his answer to this inquiry that Augustine rises to a level of thought which far exceeds that of any of the classical thinkers. Earlier apologists for the state had found its great end or purpose in the maintenance of justice and the preservation of harmony and tranquility. Cicero, in his Republic, had asserted that Rome was a true republic because it was an expression of the common will for the maintenance of justice. Plato, also, had argued in The Republic that the primary purpose of the state was that of the establishment of justice or harmony among its members. To these contentions from pagan writers Augustine replied that both were in error. Rome, said Augustine, was never a true republic because “true justice had never a place in it.” 19 He amplified his position in the assertion, “true justice has no existence save in that republic whose founder and ruler is Christ.” 20 Augustine’s premises in this instance are based upon an analogy similar to that used by Plato in The Republic. There the Greek philosopher had asserted that the just man was he who was governed by his reason. Augustine, using the same figure, asserts that justice is manifested in the life of the individual only “when the soul serves God” and “exercises a right control over the body.” 21

Only the redeemed, then, may know of true justice. By this assertion Augustine endeavors to show that only the regenerate man can speak of justice in the full.

IV

Does this mean that the Roman republic, or any human state, may not lay claim to the establishment and maintenance of justice? Not at all. There is an earthly justice just as there is an earthly state. Therefore, a human republic can be recognized. Such a political entity can be identified as “an assemblage of reasonable beings bound together by a common agreement as to the object of their love.” This object can embrace such practical objectives as peace and harmony in civic life. “... the earthly city...” writes Augustine, “seek an earthly peace, and the end it proposes, in the well-ordered concord of civic obedience and rule, is the combination of men’s wills to attain the things which are helpful to this life.” 22 What the earthly state may not lay claim to is the maintenance of absolute justice and absolute peace.

This assertion lays a definite constitutional limitation upon political authority. It declares very definitely that the state may not essay to provide for man all of the needs of life. Neither is man to respond with his entire affection to the state. Man cannot realize justice, or the “good life,” in so doing. Augustine has placed a binding limitation upon the claims of the state to authority over men. It can demand of men allegiance only in the fulfillment of those objectives which relate to temporal or human society. It can in no way lay claim to those matters which are of an eternal or spiritual nature. The right to worship God, then, becomes a constitutional or legal restraint upon political power.

There is another aspect to this phase of Augustine’s thought which must not be overlooked. The late professor Cochrane cites a passage from one of Augustine’s writings which, in effect, declares that the safety and security of a state is only to be found in a Christian community.

“It is here,” he declares, “that the safety of an admirable state resides; for a society can neither be ideally founded nor maintained unless upon the basis and by the bond of faith and strong concord, when the object of love is the universal good which in its highest and truest character is God Himself, and when men love one another with complete sincerity in Him, and the ground of their love for one another is the love of Him from whose eyes they cannot conceal the spirit of their love.” 23

God’s elect, the ecclesia, become the foundation for a true commonwealth. It follows, therefore, that men living in Christian fellowship are the basis of all true government. The quality of a state is to be measured by the Christian character of its citizens. 24 Even though the state be limited in its purposes by the divine nature of justice and the claim of God

---

18 City of God, Book V, Chapter 24, page 105.
19 City of God, Book XIX, Chapter 21, pages 414-418.
20 Ibid., Book II, Chapter 21, page 36.
21 Ibid., Book XIX, Chapter 21, page 415.
22 Ibid., Book XIX, Chapter 24, page 418.
23 Ibid., Book XIX, Chapter 17, page 412.
24 Christianity and Classical Culture, page 385.
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to the total allegiance or love of men, it does not follow that the state is limited in the scope of its control of those matters which make for earthly peace. The state may make war in an effort to punish the sins of those who violate the law, but it must not use its force for selfish or imperialistic purposes. The state also may control property. Augustine's argument in these premises goes back to the idea that sin created necessity for dominion and that such dominion is now exercised through the state as one agency of control in society. Property rights are either divine, i.e., absolute, or human, i.e., changeable, in character. Since we live in an earthly society, human law controls property and therefore the state can change the series of relationships at will.

This position with respect to property lays the basis for much of Augustine's view with respect to the relationship between the members of the City of God and the state. There is also tied in with this view the idea of the objectives of the City of God and the State. Both cities are in search of peace, the one eternal, the other temporal. Hence, the Heavenly City, although a pilgrim in a strange land or a captive in a strange city, must needs give attention to the laws of that land or city. Augustine says in one place:

The heavenly city, while in its state of pilgrimage, avails itself of the peace of the earth, and, so far as it can without injuring faith and godliness, desires and maintains a common agreement among men regarding the acquisition of the necessities of life and makes this earthly peace bear upon the peace of heaven.

Inasmuch as the members of the "City" enjoy the advantages of the civic peace it is necessary that they assume certain responsibilities toward the continuance of that peace. For this purpose the true believers are admonished to pray for Kings and those in authority, which, he recalls, was the advice of St. Paul to the early church, and to be obedient, which was the command of Jeremiah to the captive Jews in Babylonia.

Are there any limits to the Christian's obedience to the authority of the State? Is the true believer ever justified in resisting the authority of the State? These are questions which St. Augustine does not attempt to answer directly. We have a suggestion in the preceding quotation that there are certain limits to his adherence, but as to what he is to do when those limits are reached nothing is said except the implication that he would obey God rather than man.

V

What is Augustine's contribution to constitutionalism in government? I think with Foster that it is simply this: No state may demand absolute allegiance from any citizen. This places the exercise of the powers of government under a very definite re-

26 City of God, Book XIX, Chapter 15, page 411.
27 Ibid., Book XIX, Chapter 17, page 412.
28 Ibid., Book XIX, Chapter 26, page 419.
the needs of man. Neither of these restraining influences can long continue without the Christian sanction or illumination of Augustine. Without it reason becomes personal prejudice and sentiment becomes insipid wishful thinking. The whole matter is brought to issue in a situation such as the McCollom case. Here the Supreme Court of the U.S. is obliged, so it believes, to indirectly grant atheism the status of a religion in our democracy. It was not Mrs. McCollum's son's freedom to worship God that was in jeopardy, it was his freedom not to worship God that was hindered by the embarrassment of being left alone in a classroom. The late Justice Jackson recognized the anomaly of the decision and expressed the hope that the Court would later be able to clear up such issues satisfactorily.\footnote{Illinois ex rel Vasher McCollom vs. Board of Education of School District No. 17, Champaign County, Illinois.}

It, therefore, behooves us, as lovers of constitutional government in a "free" democracy, to remember again the contribution which Augustine has made, and, trust God, shall continue to make to our political freedoms.

A 'Kafir' in Kashmir: II.*

The tranquil, peaceful, sleepy Vale of Cashmere has seen startling changes within our generation. Within the years since my first missionary vacation in Kashmir in 1939, and even since my last visit in 1951, there have been terrors of thrones and usurpations of powers. Within these years Kashmir changed from a great Mohammedan feudal State, ruled by a Hindu Maharajah under the cautious eye of Great Britain, to a great battle ground between India and Pakistan in the form of a chaotic State "on the fence," with the Maharajah feuding the country and acceding to India; in turn to a great Socialistic experiment ruled in part under a Constitution by a Muslem Prime Minister, Mohammed Abdulla, who was co-operating with Hindu India as Kashmir's overlord, while Pakistan held onto the Kashmiri territory bordering her borders, only to see within the last few months the overthrow of Abdulla and his imprisonment, as he sought a quasi-independent state for Kashmir, with India under Nehru now holding the reins, while Pakistan still protests from the side-lines, threatening war if need be.

It is all so different from the peaceful days of 1951 when I penned my notes on the upper deck of the houseboat on the bank of the Jhelum.

Kashmir, Land of a Muslem Majority

I looked from the window of my houseboat moored on the bank of the Jhelum river which flows through the heart of Srinagar. The names of the proprietors of the intriguing shops along the bund were almost all Muslem. Suffering Moses' display boat lay before me. The name might seem to indicate an Israelitish refugee in anguish, but I knew the proprietor to be a Mohammedan with a family name of Safdar Hussain Musa. 'Musa' is the Persian and Arabic for 'Moses.' To Lord Robert's ears a few generations ago the family name of his Muslem friend sounded like 'Suffering Moses.' The affectation nickname stuck and has been capitalized. The other shops—Abdul Aziz, the Rogue of Kashmir; Subhana the Worst, rugmaker; Mohammed Shah; Mohammed Joo; Mohammed Ramzan—all reminded us we were in a land predominantly Mohammedan.

As I wrote the season of the great Fast of Ramadan had arrived. At the unearthly hour of 4 A.M., the Muezzin awakened us daily with the melodious call to the faithful: "There is no god but Allah! Mohammed is the Prophet of Allah! Awake, O Faithful, awake! Prayer is better than sleep!"

For one lunar month the faithful eat and drink before sunrise, and not another drop of water or morsel of food crosses their lips until the Muezzin informs them the sun has set. Kashmir is overwhelmingly—seventy-seven percent—Muslem. And yet Kashmir has been under Hindu rule for one hundred thirty years; the first thirty under the oppression of the Sikhs, and the last one hundred years—since Britain sold this matchless kingdom for less than five million dollars—under Hindu Maharajahs.

The rule of the Maharajahs was one of maladministration and oppression, government by favoritism, caprice and nepotism. Kashmiris were not accepted as recruits in the army nor for office in His Highness' Government to any great extent. Few of the tillers of the soil owned the land. They worked for absentee landlords for a fourth of the proceeds.

Kashmir in Revolt Against Autocracy

It must not be supposed that throughout the ages all Kashmiris meekly submitted to oppression as their fate. No doubt in every age some adventurous
souls tried to revolt and to marshall their brethren to make a stand for freedom. Their efforts were short lived, their pre-mature graves unmarked, due to fear.

In 1931 India was in the throes of a civil disobedience movement against Britain. This affected the freedom loving people of Kashmir, who began a heroic struggle against autocratic oppression on July 13, 1931. This was resisted by the Maharajah's Government. July 13 is still celebrated throughout the State as Martyrs' Day. Though many paid with their blood, the movement could not be suppressed.

In 1931 a champion of the people's rights arose, Mohammed Abdulla by name. From 1931 onwards Abdulla led the reactionary elements fighting for freedom and a more democratic government in Kashmir. He was jailed seven times, his last trial for treason against the realm in 1947 resulting in a sentence of nine years imprisonment.

In 1932 the agitators formed the 'Muslem Conference,' in which a Legislative Assembly of seventy-five members was constituted. Hindus and others were asked to join as the Kashmir freedom movement from the beginning refused to think of a government based on one faith alone. In 1938 the organization became the All-Jammu and Kashmir National Conference.

In 1944 a Constitution was drawn up on democratic-socialist principles. The preamble to the Constitution gave as the object of the new order the raising of the people of Kashmir from "the abyss of oppression and poverty, degradation and superstition, from mediaeval darkness and ignorance, into the sunlit valleys of plenty ruled by freedom, science and honest toil, in a determination to make our country a dazzling gem upon the snowy bosom of Asia."

The Constitution guaranteed to all freedom of conscience and of worship, freedom of speech, of the press, of assembly, of street processions and demonstrations; sought to guarantee the right of employment at standard wage; fixed hours in industry; envisaged old age security; proclaimed the right to education for all, equal rights for women, equal rights for all before the law, protection of personal property, and required universal compulsory military service. Almost every principle stipulated had been denied them to that date and was still being denied them.

The National Conference began training a people's militia called 'Peace Brigades,' a 'rabble in arms,' ununiformed, poorly equipped, dressed in tatters, but nevertheless the beginning of a great peace army.

The Constitution-making activities of the National Conference were, of course, not recognized by the Maharajah's Government, which opposed every attempt at wresting from its hands one iota of its autocratic and oppressive power. Autocrats lived in unbelievable oriental luxury while the average Kashmiri—the ninety-six percent living in impoverished villages and almost all illiterate—had an annual cash income of $2.50 per head, perhaps an all-time low for the entire world.

Sheikh Mohammed Abdulla, as he was popularly known, the leader of the revolt, was thrown into prison on a nine year sentence. He was serving this sentence as a traitor against the legally constituted government of the Maharajah when the 'Kashmir Question' arose suddenly before the world's eye in 1947. He was reluctantly released by His Highness the Maharajah to lead a popular resistance army, the Kashmir militia formed from the Peace Brigades, against the invader. His highness fled at the advance of the raiders toward Srinagar. Men and women rushed to volunteer for military service under Abdulla's temporary government.

How the Kashmir Question Began

The Kashmir problem is intimately linked with the relinquishing of Britain's control of British India and the partition of greater India into two nations, India and Pakistan. India, becoming a secular democracy, is nevertheless composed predominantly of individual citizens who are Hindu or Sikh. Pakistan is composed predominantly of individual citizens who are Mohammedan. At the time of the partition, August 15, 1947, several millions of each minority group were included in the two newly formed majority group nations. Millions of Hindus and Sikhs were residing in what became Pakistan; millions of Moslems were resident in the newly formed India.

Horrible atrocities were committed by individuals of each majority group on the members of the minority group in their midst, the atrocities occurring on both sides of the newly designated border. These atrocities were committed by individuals, and were contrary to the wishes of both governments and in defiance of pleas and stern pronouncements against such atrocities. Ten million people migrated across the borders toward their brethren in faith.

The departure of the British had other far-reaching results. British India had consisted not only of those two great areas which became India and Pakistan on August 15, 1947. There were some five-hundred-sixty-two 'Indian States,' some Hindu, some Moslem, all independent, ruled by Maharajahs, Rajahs, Nawabs and other potentates. These Indian States had the choice of either acceding to India or to Pakistan, or of remaining independent. Independence was out of the question for most as they were landlocked, had no seaports of entry or exit, could not defend themselves against possible enemies in the future, and could be liquidated with a stranglehold by their neighbors at any time. Most of the Princely States acceded at once to either...
India or Pakistan, their nearest neighbor or brother in faith.

The independent State of Jammu-Kashmir was one such State, the second largest in India. It is extremely important as its borders touch on India, Pakistan, the Soviet Union, China and Afghanistan. Jammu-Kashmir chose to remain 'on the fence,' to think the matter over. The Hindu Maharajah might incline to India; the Muslem majority might incline to the Muslem nation, Pakistan; the Kashmir Conference party asked for time in hopes of wresting independence from the Maharajah before they decided their allegiance. Perhaps there listened before their eyes the hope of becoming the third independent nation, free alongside India and Pakistan, as the terms of partition allowed this to any of the Princely States. The Maharajah asked for a 'Standstill Arrangement' with both India and Pakistan.

But, in addition to India and Pakistan and the five-hundred-sixty-two Indian States, there were in the former British India certain territories, loosely administered, never really controlled by and fused into British India up to the time of partition. These were 'tribal territories,' areas administered by tribal chieftains, areas in the far northwest of British India, lying adjacent to or inside the newly formed Pakistan. The tribesmen were normally armed with swords, spears, home-made rifles manufactured in the village gun factories, and a few modern rifles captured in raids on military personnel. Tribal territories usually had few roads and the tribesmen did not generally own motor vehicles. No tribesman could possibly enter Kashmir without crossing Pakistan territory. The tribesmen were Mohammedan.

Great Britain had kept the tribal territories relatively quiet by cash subsidies paid to the chiefs and tribesmen. With the departure of the British these subsidies ceased. Pakistan, herself torn by partition disturbances, problems and communal strife, was unable to pay the tribesmen to keep the law. The tribesmen looked about for some other sources of income.

There lay Kashmir, with the possibility of rich loot easily captured, as the Kashmiri is known the world over as a craven who literally weeps at the slightest hardship that befalls him, and has no record of ever having put up a successful resistance against an invader. To add fire to the enthusiasm of the tribesmen for loot, there was also the fictitious 'cry of anguish' coming across the border from their 'Muslem brethren being oppressed' by hated Hindus and Sikhs, being 'slaughtered by the sword.' That their Muslem brethren in Kashmir outnumbered the minority three to one; that the minority could persecute the major group only at great peril to their own lives; that the matter might be just the reverse, atrocities by Muslems on Hindus, made no difference. Here were all the possibilities of making this a 'jihad,' a 'holy war' to relieve their brethren from distress and relieve the inhabitants of rich loot. Lorry loads of loot would replace the cash subsidies which they had formerly received to keep the peace.

**The Raiders Invade Kashmir**

Over Pakistan territory and across Pakistan's border "the raiders" swarmed by thousands into Kashmir, looting, burning, destroying, abducting, and raping women. Their most alluring goal was Srinagar, the capital city, with its rich loot. Up the main highway from Pakistan they streamed, looting smaller cities and villages on the way, sending the loot back home to tribal territory across Pakistan in lorry loads. The invasion of the raiders had early lost its "holy war" characteristics. Muslem homes were attacked, looted and burned, and Muslems refusing to give up the loot were ruthlessly killed.

Baramula, thirty-five miles from Srinagar, proved the looters' own undoing, for here they paused too long to loot and slay, and to celebrate their victories on defenseless people. I have visited the valley and the convent at Baramula where the raiders killed 3,000 Kashmiri inhabitants. I viewed the graves of the nuns and of the retired British army Colonel and his pregnant wife whose naked body was thrown down a well. The convent was desecrated and images smashed; Kashmiri women were abducted; the mosques, temples and Sikh gurdwaras were converted into brothels for the lusts of the invaders. Not a house was left unmolested; many houses were burned; two hundred eighty lorry loads of loot were carried away.

Had they not tarried almost a week at Baramula, the Srinagar air field and the rich city of Srinagar would have fallen into their hands like a ripe apple, for the stores are loaded with rich goods. The raiders were able to approach within five miles of Srinagar, to the very edge of the airfield. The Kashmir militia had been nobly fighting a defensive action, delaying the advance, contesting every mile of the road from Baramula. But they could not have held another twenty-four hours without assistance. Srinagar and Kashmir seemed to be doomed.

Up to this tense moment on the twenty-sixth of October, 1947, Kashmir had been faced by three possibilities as to her future status: she could accede to India; she could accede to Pakistan; she might remain independent. With the advance of the raiders to the gates of Kashmir the third alternative, independence, seemed impossible, and the second a bitter solution forced upon her by a Pakistan-supported invasion.

Sheikh Abdullah had been released at this critical time to rally the defense forces. He had hoped
Kashmir could achieve freedom from autocracy before she decided the question of accession to either dominion. There seemed to be no alternative. The Maharajah, supported by Abdulla's National Conference party, acceded by telegram to India and requested immediate aid or it would be too late to save Kashmir. India at once flew in soldiers to Srinagar, landed them at Srinagar's airfield, scarcely knowing if it was still in friendly hands, and by a hair's breadth saved the capitol city and ultimately Kashmir.

During the weeks following it was observed that the influx of raiders and other Muslem groups across Pakistan's frontiers into Kashmir did not abate but rather increased. The invaders no longer carried primitive rifles, but now were armed with flame throwers, anti-aircraft guns, Mark V mines, and some carried walkie-talkie radio sets.

**International Diplomacy on the Kashmir Question**

The voluminous telegraphic and postal correspondence, the newspaper interviews and United Nations' testimony records on the Kashmir Question from September 4, 1947 onwards, will forever remain as documentary evidence available to historians. It forms a fascinating study in the international diplomacy of an independent state in its death throes (Jammu-Kashmir under the Maharajah), two nations just emerging into independence (India and Pakistan), and a new dependent State (Jammu-Kashmir) asserting its rights before the world's highest tribunal, the United Nations. Some of the data is before me in the form of Publications by the Ministries of Information of Jammu-Kashmir and India; other data consisted of a booklet of copies of the telegrams and cablegrams that kept the air humming during those critical days. It is impossible to weigh in the balance the pros and cons for the rights of India over against Pakistan. The course history has taken I indicated in the opening paragraph of this article. India holds the rich valley of Kashmir by force of arms and right of cession to India by the Maharajah, with Prime Minister Sheikh Mohammed Abdulla in prison as being too rabidly nationalistic. Pakistan clings with her armies to the rugged country touching her borders. United Nations observers on both sides of the borders watch for any breach of the peace.

India has forged ahead by leaps and bounds in the family of nations within the last few years, a leader of Asia. Pakistan is finding her place in the sun, although her recent history has witnessed an upheaval in her government. Kashmir is walled off from the world, her vital link via the Jhelum river now blocked just below Baramula where the river becomes a Pakistani stream.

**“Solomon Once Visited Kashmir.” Return Visit Requested**

Legend states that Solomon saw the Kashmir valley blocked at the natural mountain outlet below Baramula. He waved his wand and the barriers crumbled. Today Kashmir valley is again blocked at the very same spot. A return visit and more Solomonian wand wavings are again urgently required.

Economically Kashmir has been very dependent in the past on the roads leading through, and the river flowing through, that part of British India which is now Pakistan. The two chief overland highways, over which an overwhelmingly great part of her imports and exports passed—the Domel road branching to Abbotabad and Rawalpindi—and the Jammu road via Sialkote—are now completely closed to travel into and out of Kashmir. The great waterway route was down the Jhelum. The Kashmir timber transport down the Jhelum river to Jhelum City, which is now in Pakistan, has entirely ceased. Formerly the timber were simply dropped into the Jhalum river, and found their way down to agents who drew them from the water at Jhelum, an amazingly cheap transport to an abundant market.

Today the huge barges of logs and cut timber, bearing a small percentage of the former timber trade, must be pole up the river instead of floating down. The bargemen groan and pray in singing grunts of antiphonal song to their holy saints as they laboriously push the barges upstream. Then the barges must be unloaded, the timbers again loaded on lorries, and transported by expensive imported gasoline over a 9,000 foot mountain pass down to the distant Indian railroad and their markets. This same mountain road via Banihal Pass and through Jammu to Pathankote is the only real link with India. It is the solitary lifeline for Kashmir today, except for the air service between Amritsar and Srinagar.

A friendly alliance with Pakistan will open the river and the vital roads. Work, which has come to a standstill due to the economic blockade, will revive, and the Kashmir citizen will have work and food and will prosper. In return for such an alliance with Pakistan the Kashmiri citizen fears his country may become a vassal state of Pakistan, become an Islamic dependency. Hindus would have few rights in such a set-up, and it is also unlikely that any of the present Muslem leaders in Kashmir will be prominent in a Pakistan-dominated Kashmir. Harsh words have been spoken. Muslem brethren have been estranged by the raids.

Although a majority of the population is Mohammedian, Kashmir is no more closely linked culturally and linguistically with Pakistan than she is with India. The last century of rule under a Hindu ruler, even though despotic, has forged ties with India. India, as an exponent of the ‘all-religious-
must-live-in-unity-in-one-State' theory, is more akin to New Kashmir ideology than in Pakistan. A twenty-three percent minority in Kashmir today is Hindu and living in unity with Muslems. Further, the Kashmiri Muslem differs from many other Mohammedans, for many of them were originally Hindus centuries ago.

If by a popular plebiscite Kashmir accedes to India, the present Muslem leaders of Kashmir will remain as the heads of government and a socialistic experiment will continue, to the benefit of the common citizen, it is hoped. But the Kashmiri is always aware that with the passing of time the preponderance of Muslem population may gradually shrink as Indian nationals enter this beautiful country protected by an Indian government. Some day the ratio may favor non-Muslems and he may be a minority in his own land. He will no doubt demand safeguards.

The common Kashmiris to whom I have talked—the tailors, shikara-wallas, small merchants selling their home-made wares and pestering one in his houseboat, the 'butchers, the bakers, the candle-stick-makers' of Srinagar, fear many things for the future.

The father, mother, sister, brother, aunt, uncle and cousin of officials get good jobs. Formerly poor men, they now have vast estates, economically, socially, culturally, religiously Kashmir must be on friendly terms with both India and Pakistan if she is to prosper. How can she do it? "Call for Mr. Solomon! Paging Solomon! King Solomon!"

Present Trends in O. T. Theology as Represented in the Albright Influence

Leon J. Wood
Grand Rapids Baptist Seminary

Among trends in contemporary Old Testament scholarship, one of the more significant is headed by William Foxwell Albright of Johns Hopkins University. This survey is an attempt to give in brief compass a sketch of the Albright position as it relates particularly to Old Testament history and to point out some of its contrasts with the older Wellhausen type of view. The writer, in 1949, wrote his Master's Thesis on this subject, entitled, "Hebrew Monotheism in Connection with Albright's Position and That Traditional to the Wellhausen School," and intends in this survey to use that material freely, even to the extent of direct quotation in several places.

It is well first to give indication that there is what may be called an Albright school of thought coming into existence today. Dr. Frank Cross, former student under Albright and one whom Albright has indicated in personal correspondence with the author is qualified to speak for the position, writes, 'there is an Albright school coming into being today: a school far wider than Biblical studies, and one I fully expect to be dominant in another generation.' Further, Cross states, 'The extent of the influence of Albright's impact upon Wellhausenism cannot yet be measured. In the field of Catholic scholarship, and to some degree in England and particularly on the Continent, Albright has already become a dominant figure...the wider area of Albright's scholarship is more appreciated outside of America.'

The reason for the wide acceptance which this recent view is receiving lies in the character of its principal source of information: that source being archaeological discoveries in Bible lands. The reason why this source, which of course has been a principal fountain point also for Wellhausenism for sometime, has led Albright to his contrasting position today is that, as he himself tells us, 'Though archaeological research goes back over a century in Palestine and Syria, it is only since 1920 that our material has become sufficiently extensive and clearly enough interpreted to be of really decisive...'

1 Quotation from personal letter received by author, Jan., 1949.
2 Idem.
value.” And also, as he further points out, this material and these interpretations have not been in keeping with the older Wellhausen presentations on many points. And the reason Albright is today the leader in this school of thought, rather than someone else, is, in the words of Cross, “Because of his dominating leadership in the fields of Palestinian archaeology, Near Eastern history, comparative religion, and comparative Semitic languages.”

He further writes in this connection, “No Biblical scholar in America has been able to rise as a suitable disputant.”

Before touching on a few main features of this new position, it is necessary to indicate something as to the philosophic and theological viewpoint from which it takes its roots. Not only is a knowledge of this viewpoint necessary for the understanding of the position, but this viewpoint of itself provides another aspect to the trend which bids likewise to be of marked significance. Here there is appearing a union between two branches of theological pursuit, both of which are making an important play in contemporary thought. The one is, of course, that with which this paper deals, namely the Albright view in the field of Old Testament studies, and the other is that of neo-orthodoxy in the field of Systematics. That union is being made in that the Albright school seems to be finding a congenial theological atmosphere in neo-orthodoxy in which to work as it pursues its endeavors in the field of Old Testament history. Albright is himself an adherent of the neo-orthodox type of view. He says of himself that as a Christian theist he mediates between neo-orthodox and neo-Thomists, with important differences from both. Again he writes, “I have much sympathy for the Neo-orthodox position.”

Cross says of him, “Albright’s theological position falls somewhere between Neo-Thomism and Neo-Calvinism.”

Now the question rises as to what extent this theological position has made influence upon the historical studies of the man. Has he been led thereby in his work to a recognition of supernaturalism in Israel’s history, which thing would be highly regarded by conservative students, but would at the same time throw him open to the charge by traditional critics that he was merely acting as another conservative apologist? The answer is that he intends not to be so influenced. Cross writes in connection with the matter: “It must be most urgently emphasized that Albright is an historian most akin to the positivists in methodology though admitted with theistic assumptions forming a background.”

Albright himself gives us, “To the extent that the writer (himself) deals with historical problems, he employs the same analytical and synthetical methods which have proved so successful elsewhere in reconstructing the historic past . . . these methods are logically identical with the scientific methodology of the natural and social sciences.”

The reason why he can proceed as a naturalist in his historical work, while at the same time being a supernaturalist in his theology is of course due to the type of supernaturalism to which he holds; a type which confines the understandable theological influence to the realm of “superhistory,” leaving time to be explored solely through naturalistic lenses as if there were no supernatural, since if there should be we could not understand it anyhow. The very term of self-classification which Albright uses in naming his own view brings out the same fact: it is “rational conservative,” which name Cross explains as follows: “The ‘rational’ applies to his rigorous scientific methodology; the ‘conservative’ applying to his theological position and his appreciation of Biblical records as sources of history.”

We come now to look briefly at the view itself, and limit ourselves to four major aspects of it. We shall treat the view first as to its position regarding the “documentary theory”; secondly, as to the historicity of the patriarchal period; thirdly, as to the question of monotheism in Israel; and, fourthly, as to the writing of Deuteronomy.

Taking the first of these, now, it may be stated very quickly that Albright does hold to the existence of documents in the Old Testament, and, what is more, assigns them to much the same dates as the Wellhausen school. For instance, writing concerning the date of the so-called J and E documents, he says, “So we come again to the accepted date between 925 and 750 B.C. for the original content of both J and E.”

It appears, then, that on this score he is quite in line with the older thinking of the Wellhausen group. However, it should at least be mentioned here in passing that he differs markedly from them in the type of argumentation by which he is led to accept this view. Something of this difference will appear when we deal later with the question of the writing of Deuteronomy.

Coming now to the second of our topics, the view as it pertains to patriarchal history, we give first a statement regarding the pre-patriarchal time. This we take from the Thesis mentioned in the first part of this paper, where we read, “So far as the stories found in the first eleven chapters of Genesis are concerned, we find little change with Albright from the former group. For whenever he speaks of these stories, which again is not often, he too speaks of them as myth. For instance, he classifies the creation story as being among the ‘creation myths’ which

---

3 Archaeology and the Religion of Israel, p. 37.
5 Idem.
6 From the Stone Age to Christianity, p. vii.
7 Quotation from personal letter received by author, Jan., 1949.
9 Idem.
12 From the Stone Age to Christianity, p. 190; cf. his Arch. of Pal. and the Bible, pp. 144-165, for detailed accounting.
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were held 'among primitive tribes in both continents,' etc."

Regarding the patriarchal time proper, we continue to quote directly from the Thesis: "We do find appreciable change, however, with Albright over the representatives of the former view (Wellhausen) when we come to treat the patriarchal age. Albright himself tells us this in clear language as he follows a statement regarding Wellhausen with the following words: 'Practically all of the Old Testament scholars of standing in Europe and America held these (Wellhausen) or similar views until very recently. Now, however, the situation is changing with the greatest rapidity, since the theory of Wellhausen will not bear the test of archaeological examination.' And again he writes, 'So many corroborations of details have been discovered in recent years that most competent scholars have given up the old critical theory according to which the stories of the Patriarchs are mostly retrojections from the time of the Dual Monarchy (9th-8th centuries B.C.)... The figures of Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and Joseph appear before us as real personalities, each one of whom shows traits and qualities which suit his character but would not harmonize with the characters of others.'

We come now to the third of our topics, that regarding the existence of monotheism in Israel. First we observe that Albright is in agreement with the Wellhausen type of thought in believing that monotheism did have a beginning with Israel as over against the conservative view that monotheism was never the fruit of development. However, he differs considerably from them as to the time of this beginning. Whereas the older view has continued to maintain the non-existence of monotheism until at least the days of Amos, Albright places it even so early as Moses. Since he does, we may limit our treatment of his view of monotheism's rise to the Mosaic time. Again quotation is made in this connection from the Thesis: "What does Albright have to say regarding the Mosaic conception of Yahweh?" In coming upon our answer, we find it to be in contrast, indeed, with the former (Wellhausen) position. For it is not a polytheism, which he assigns to the leader of Israel, neither is it a henotheism, which the most moderate critics hitherto have made out, but it is a real monotheism.... His own words on this score are as follows: 'If the term "monotheism" means one who teaches the existence of only one God, the creator of everything, the source of justice, who is equally powerful in Egypt, in the desert, and in Palestine, who has no sexuality and no mythology, who is human in form but cannot be seen by human eye and cannot be represented in any form — then the founder of Yahwism was certainly a monist.' And in another connection he speaks similarly: 'Mosaism is a living tradition, an integrated organismic pattern, which did not change in fundamentals from the time of Moses until the time of Christ; Moses was as much a monotheist as was Hillel, though his point of view may have been very different in detail.' Another statement of his, in that it bears on the point of universality which the critics have long contended arose with Amos, will be of further value in this connection: 'Still another equally original characteristic of Yahweh is that He is not restricted to any special abode. As the Lord of all cosmic forces, controlling sun, moon, and storm but not identified with any of them, His normal dwelling place is in heaven, from which He may come down, whether to a lofty mountain like Sinai, to a shrine like the Tabernacle, or to any spot which He may choose.'

Finally we come to his view regarding the writing of Deuteronomy. Once again we find him differing markedly from the Wellhausen presentation. We quote further from the Thesis: "It should be noted that Albright's idea for the writing of Deuteronomy... is very different from that of Pfeiffer. Albright speaks of the writing as not being a 'pious fraud' as the former view has long done, but as being a genuine return to the spirit, and even the writings to some extent, of Moses. His own words are: 'In the light of these extra-Palestinian parallels the Deuteronomic movement of the late seventh century appears somewhat differently from the interpretation given it by the school of Wellhausen. Instead of being a progressive reform based on an advance beyond previous levels of religion and cult, it was a conscious effort to recapture both the letter and the spirit of Mosaism which, the Deuteronomists believed, had been neglected or forgotten by the Israelites of the Monarchy. The theory of De Wette and his successors that Deuteronomy is 'pious fraud' is contrary to ancient Oriental practice; the materials contained in the book were really believed to go back to Moses and probably do reflect, in general, a true Mosaic atmosphere.... Another major difference between Albright and the older type of view concerns the matter of unification of sanctuary, already spoken of in an earlier connection. Albright does not believe that this unification idea was brought forward for the first time in the day of Josiah, but rather he thinks it was emphasized, as in Deuteronomy 12, in the ninth century already. He writes: 'in our judgment, it (Deuteronomy) was
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13 From the Stone Age to Christianity, p. 128.
15 Arch. of Pal. and Bib., p. 129.
16 Ibid., p. 145.
17 Stone Age to Christianity, p. 183.
21 Ibid., p. 196.
22 Thesis, pp. 34, 35.
written down as a unit, in the ninth century B.C., and was edited in the reign of Josiah or later... It is probable that Shechem followed Shiloh as the cult-center of the Joseph tribes, and that the famous passage concerning the unification of cult in one place (12:8ff., compared with 11:30) was originally intended to uphold the position of Shechem (following Shiloh). The passage is certainly too vague to represent an original composition of the time of Josiah, for the purpose of ensuring Jerusalem a unique position as a cult-center." 24 And, further, in commenting upon the fact that this position takes away a great deal from the Wellhausen position, he says, "If we admit the necessity of some central shrine at the beginning of Israelite history, we have already torn the foundation from under the Wellhausen theory. There is then no further difficulty in admitting Deuteronomy, including the nucleus, at least, of chapter XII. 25, 26

By way of summary now, it may be observed from the foregoing that there is unquestionably a definite line of cleavage between the Albright presentation and that of the older Wellhausen group in many respects. True, in respect to the "documentary theory" he seems to differ little from them, except that the type of argumentation by which he is led to it varies from theirs. However, when we look at the other

24 Archeology of Palestine and the Bible, pp. 155, 156.
25 Ibid., p. 162; cf. pp. 146-162 for full treatment of this question.
26 Thesis, pp. 73-75.

Book Reviews

Reinhold Niebuhr, Christian Realism and Political Problems, (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons; 1953). 203 pp. $3.00

There is much in this latest collection of essays by Reinhold Niebuhr which those already familiar with his writings will recognize as being present in earlier works, notably the Gifford Lectures, The Nature and Destiny of Man. In this new volume, however, he sharpens and elaborates several of these ideas in the light of history subsequent to the publication of the earlier volume. All of the essays were either given originally as addresses or have been published in such magazines as The Journal of Religious Thought, Christianity and Crisis, The Journal of Religion. These are the titles of the essays:
Faith and the Empirical Method in Modern Realism
The Illusion of World Government
Why is Communism so Evil?
The Anomaly of European Socialism
The Foreign Policy of American Conservatism and Liberalism
Ideology and the Scientific Method
Democracy, Secularism, and Christianity
The Christian Witness in the Social and National Order
Augustine's Political Realism

The Editors regret that the following important paragraph was inadvertently dropped from Dr. H. H. Meeter's review of John T. McNiell's THE HISTORY AND CHARACTER OF CALVINISM, in the January, 1955 number of the Calvin Forum.

To this reviewer it is a matter of regret that Dr. McNiell is of the mind that "a recovery of the spirit of Calvinism does not require a restoration of the whole system" (p. 433). After speaking of the condemnation of Servetus, whose death is rarely defended by any Calvinist today, he makes clear his meaning further on the spirit of Calvinism when he states: "Nor can its spirit any longer be reasonably held to be tied to the doctrine of reprobation, or to any specific treatment of the divine decrees or to any assumption of the inerrancy of Scripture. Its true spirit is found in faithful response to the Scripture revelation of a sovereign and redeeming God. While much may be abandoned, the renewal of this vital principle truly means the revival of the Calvinist spirit, and it may well prove the most creative force in twentieth-century Christianity" (433). It is this commentator's mind that precisely the failure to defend the entire system as espoused by the early Calvinists of Westminster and Dort has tended to weaken Calvinism's effectiveness, and why will not history repeat itself unless we do insist on a full-orbed Calvinism?
Love and Law in Protestantism and Catholicism

Coherence, Incoherence, and Christian Faith

There is, it seems to me, one dominant thread which unites the essays as a group. That thread is this: the distrust of abstractions, of speculation without roots in reality, of inflexible system foisted upon mankind as being adequate to interpret facts of every description. Aware of the ideological taint which infects every such effort to account for scientific and social phenomena, Niebuhr exposes with his usual penetration especially contemporary manifestations of the perennial effort to interpret the historical process by a principle deduced from the process itself. Included in his criticisms are these: Communism, Thomism, Movements for World Government, Barthianism, Manchester laissez-faire economic theory, the pretensions of modern science in its efforts to use the scientific method to account ultimately for all of human behavior, Christian rationalism, Liberal Christianity.

Communism, for example, has seized upon the pseudo-principle that social harmony will be brought about when the old order is compelled to give way to the new through the abolition of property through revolution. Advocates of world government are misled into thinking that the wish for world stability is proof of its practicality. Liberal Christianity has formulated elaborate schemes for ending injustice and insuring the common welfare, but has involved itself in "a graceless and inflexible legalism." The free enterprise economy has falsely applied principles from the natural sciences to human affairs, and has opposed many social changes which were directed towards establishing a broader basis of justice.

The difficulty with one and all of these system is their idolatrous confidence in their own wisdom. There is in almost every instance an over-simplification, a suppression of some facts which defy inclusion into the system. There is a disregard for the concrete situation, a lack of respect for reality. Even theological systems have been subject to the ruthless pressures of history as their inadequacies have become apparent.* There has been in these efforts a lack of self-examination, of the critical attitude, and complexities have been lost sight of. The individual proponent in these attempts at systematization has loomed large; there have been too many instances of presumption, too many instances of the association of the single man and the idea. The errors, says Niebuhr, are fruitful for calling attention to "the existential intimacy between idea and interest in human affairs." Passion, egoism, pride, ruthlessness, lack of charity have marked these efforts at system-building.

And yet Niebuhr is willing to acknowledge the modicum of truth in many of these efforts. Thus, the Manchester school of economic thought, despite its erroneous assumptions "that the desires of men are chiefly economic and essentially ordinate and that the market place is a sufficient instrument for the coordination of all spontaneous human activities," was productive of two salutary effects: (1) the promotion of articulation between social groups without political interference, which served to advance that flexibility so important in a healthy democratic society; (2) the recognition of the validity of secular occupations and ends as being morally respectable. Again, though Niebuhr takes issue with Kierkegaard and his 'hazardous subjectivity,' he nevertheless approves his protest against the Hegelian principle of historical interpretation, and notes the residual Pauline teaching in the importance Kierkegaard places on getting to know oneself as he is known of God. Moreover, he has this to say about the effect of Existentialism in general: "... existentialism is a natural revolt against the too-simple meanings of traditional rationalism, and logical positivism expresses a skepticism too radically obscured by idealism."

Niebuhr, then, takes the empirical approach to political problems as being essential to the accommodations of interest and the preservation of justice in a democracy. Ideas like these are frequent in the essays:

In the one world there are many worlds, realms of meaning and coherence; and these are not easily brought into a single system.

... the total of reality is more complex than any scheme of rational meaning which may be invented to comprehend it.

Niebuhr also emphasizes repeatedly the uniqueness of the historical moment, "... the endless variety of historical occasions and configurations." And in such matters a pragmatism informed by a Christian conscience, humility, sanctified wisdom, and the Biblical account of human behavior, with its insistence on the essential pride and egotic taint which has corrupted us all, is, according to Niebuhr, the least dangerous course to follow. The futility and hollowness of traditional schemes and systems verifies the wisdom of this procedure. Still with his eye on the necessity of Biblical insights, he puts the issue in practical terms in this way:

... we have no guidance amid the intricacies of modern power politics except as the older disciplines, less enamored of the 'methods of natural science,' and the common sense of the man in the street supply the necessary insights.

Niebuhr explains in the final pages of the book that he has been speaking in the name of a kind of 'biblical realism' for which he is willing to accept as a complementary descriptive term that of "neo-orthodoxy." He asserts that this position improves upon Kierkegaard "by taking the coherence and causalities of life and history more seriously," and avoids the 'biblical literalism' and the negative attitude of Barth towards the disciplines of philosophy and the sciences.

Niebuhr's formulation is made in terms of a dialectic and an existentialism informed by Christian thought. His basic problem is the tension between man as free spirit and as object in nature. This 'middle state' of man predisposes him to one sin or another, either that of denying his freedom by giving vent to sensuality, or by denying his finiteness. His new picture of man is that of a quasi-autonomous being, 'created by God, [but] not maintained by His fiat from moment to moment.'

Neo-orthodoxy as Niebuhr outlines it makes several radical breaks with traditional theology. He is quite explicit about these departures, more so than he has been in some of his previous works. What are these defections from historical orthodoxy? They are apparent first of all in the right he assigns to the empirical approach to science. He speaks convincingly about a 'biblically grounded experimental realism.'
he furnishes the principle by which he rejects and accepts the events of Biblical record:

We do not believe... that revelatory events validate themselves by a divine break-through in the natural order. Traditional theology, with its emphasis on mystery and meaning beyond the rational coherences of this world, suggests Niebuhr, if I understand him correctly, lacks proper respect “for the order and meaning of the natural world...”

A criticism of Niebuhr’s conception of time was made several years ago in these columns. And the theological formulations outlined above are no less disappointing. But what is as striking as the boldness of his theological innovations is his thorough familiarity with the history of Christian thought, and his acceptance of a large body of traditional orthodox belief. These seem to have entered into the texture of his thought despite his many reservations about the major tenets of the Christian faith. Impressive, for example, is his discussion of sacrificial love as the ultimate resolution of the contradictions of life. He speaks much, too, of grace, transcending justice, of self-realization through self-giving. But it cannot be denied that he has disallowed some of the theological principles upon which these rest. Nevertheless, it would be an act of irresponsibility while recognizing his deflections from theology to ignore the profoundly Christian insights and inspired wisdom from the pen of this great scholar.

Steve J. Van Der Weele
University of Wisconsin

J. H. Bavinck, INLEIDING IN DE ZENDINGSWETENSCHAP.

DURING the past few years some excellent volumes have made their appearance on the book market, especially the ones written by certain Dutch writers. We are referring to the superb work of A. G. Honig which deals with the comprehensive approach of mission methodology, and also the books of J. H. Bavinck such as Zending in een Wereld in Nood, and The Impact of Christianity on The Non-Christian World. Now we have been privileged to read this new work of Bavinck, which treats some of the same subjects found in the above mentioned books but in a more systematic and scientific manner.

This book has three main divisions: First, the theory of missions. In this section the reader is given the main scriptural arguments, both from the Old and New Testaments, as to the why and wherefore of missions. Second, the Elenctic, which is derived from the Greek word: to put to shame. Herein the writer shows that the missionary must ever be aware that he must cause people to become conscious of their sins as well as of the judgment to come. “In the theology of the kerk van onze dagen zich opnieuw wenden naar haar verheven taak, om teemiddelen van een wereld, die in de greep van de boze ligt, het heilige blylschap te verkondigen, de opoef tot schuldbelijdenis en bekeering, de opoef ook tot het geloof in Jezus Christus” (p. 247). Finally, we have the history of missions, and this part is concluded with the worthwhile chapter on missions and the future.

Being a staunch defender of the faith, the writer has sought to guide us in our mission principles along definitely Reformed lines, and everyone who is still able to read the Dutch language should be urged to read this book.

In our day when we are literally besieged with so much literature about the indigenous method with such titles as “Let Paul show us how,” “Saint Paul’s Method and Ours,” and many others, wherein the authors attempt to show us we are going awry in our mission work, it is interesting to note how Bavinck refutes such argumentation. Let us quote a few of his statements on this score:—“Men kan op zendingvelden in Midden-Afrika of ergens op een eiland in de stille Zuidzee niet navolgen de methode, die Paulus in zijn dagen, in zijn wereld, onder zijn omstandigheden gekozen heeft” (p. 86). “De Bijbel geeft ons wel het ‘Wat’, van de predikking, maar het ‘hoe’ van de predikking moeten wij langs andere wegen te weten komen, en daarin moet elke zendeling zijn eigen weg trachten te vinden” (p. 86). “... het is duidelijk, hoe moeilijk het is, paralellen te trekken tussen het zendingwerk in de kerk der apostelen en dat in onze dagen. En nog moeilijker is het op grond van die paralellen conclusies te trekken ten aanzien van de lijn, die wij te volgen hebben” (p. 199). All this is same advice, and we trust that many in our circles who are so overcome by Roland Allen’s indigenous method will read this book and become more balanced in their approach.

The second section, which deals with the elenctic, is especially worthwhile. The thought of sin and evil is not a strong concept in the minds of many natives, and there is always the danger of being too sympathetic on that score; but the reader makes it clear that Christianity means nothing until people become conscious of what sin really is, for Christ means nothing until we become aware of our need of Him. New missionaries will enjoy this section, and will be able to profit much from it.

The last section, which treats the history of missions, is also very enlightening, although we wish that the last chapter could have been amplified somewhat to include more on the power of the Word and the great assurance of Christ, “lo, I am with you always.”

From his vast amount of reading and his experiences as a missionary, one feels intuitively that the author is well versed in his subject. However, some of the subject matter is drawn out because the difficulties to apply certain methods is illustrated by constantly giving detailed accounts from such fields as Africa, Burma, and other places. This causes the reading to be too detailed, and the reader loses sight of the aim of the chapter. One notices this particularly in the section on “Oude en jonge kerk.”

One thing we have not been able to understand, and that is the writer’s paragraph concerning schools on the mission field. After rereading this section and asking others for their interpretation of it, I find that they too consider it very ambiguous. Is he referring to covenant schools or to mission schools? If he is referring to mission schools, and that is the way it strikes me, he surely has had a change of mind. When we read Zending in een Wereld in Nood we noticed how he had quite a paragraph to show the propriety of mission schools, and how these institutions could serve as a great auxiliary to the cause of missions. It was right in line with his whole approach to mission methodology, and it helped to crystallize our thinking on that matter. Now, apparently, the author has had a change of mind, and states that schools should not be established until the native Christians are responsible for them. This is stated in one short paragraph. What has caused this change? It seems so entirely out of line with the rest of his approach as to proper mission methods. To state it very mildly, the reviewer is very disappointed on this score; that is, if my interpretation is correct; and feels that the author should have amplified his stand and given cogent reasons why he had a change of mind. We cherish the hope that if and when a second edition is printed Prof. Bavinck will rewrite this paragraph and...
revert back to his former stand, which is far more reasonable.

A book like this deserves a bibliography, and we wonder why it was omitted. Certain authors are quoted and also duly acknowledged in the footnotes, but a student of missions desires to benefit from the author's bibliography. We trust this will be included in a future edition.

How thankful we are that the church of to-day is more awake to her missionary task, and naturally, as Christians, we desire to do mission work according to God's revealed will. Dr. J. H. Bavink's book can help us much in this respect, and our hope is that some day it will be translated into English.

J. Van Bruggen, Crown Point, New Mexico.


The author, Dr. David Hedegard, a Scandinavian, an influential member of the International Council of Christian Churches (ICCC), appraises the modern ecumenical movement in the light of the Bible. This is the specific purpose of writing the book (p. 12). He does not apologize for his concurrence with the reformers regarding the Bible, since their conception of the Bible is nothing short of the Bible's own claim of its own authority (p. 12). Their teachings in reference to the Bible cannot be brushed aside as a mere human theory.

A sweeping survey shows that the author touches upon the following subjects as a basis for his appraisal: Christianity, The Church, Unity, The Bible, Growth of the ecumenical movement, including the rise of the Faith and Order Movement and the Life and Work Movement, Missions, the World Council of Churches (WCC), and some of the top-ranking ecumenical pioneers and their ideals. He then sets forth the goal of the WCC, and finally concludes with a chapter on the evangelical movements with a special plea for the ICCC.

This book represents a respectable and objective defense of orthodox ecumenicity, and, as could be anticipated, a special plea for the ICCC. Whether our attitude toward the WCC or the ICCC be pro or con, this book is worthwhile reading.

In his appraisal of the Life and Work Movement, especially the Stockholm Report, he begins with praise for the zeal of the committee in opposing social and industrial injustices. We note this factor with intense appreciation since we orthodox are justly strong in condemning communism, but perhaps soft-spoken in our wrath against economic evils. The common man must know we can be touched by any evil, any sin, without respect of persons. His criticisms against the Stockholm report are pertinent (pp. 94-97): 1. The greatest need is not the Christian way of life, but the Gospel of Christ; 2. We cannot study social-ethical problems regardless of differences of faith and order; 3. The program is that of liberal theology that avers: "not doctrine but life"; 4. The subjects of that program are outside the task of the church. At this point the author shows a Lutheran-tinted theology and approach and seems to equate the Lordship of Christ over all of life with the "Social Gospel." It can be, but need not be.

We agree with the author that the Bible is the criterion of all ecumenicity. But the question that we face today is:

What does the Bible teach? What example does the New Testament church give? Rightly, he does not honor Tradition as a source of authority. Would membership in the WCC be contrary to the Word of God? According to the last paragraph of his book, he counsels strongly against apostasy; and we are fair, we believe, when we refer this apostasy to the WCC. What must we say of those who adopt an evangelical faith, but deny verbal inspiration? These people speak of the authority of Scripture, and also include in their presentations, "according to the Scriptures." Dr. Hedegard simply says that the neo-orthodox interpretation of Scripture is contrary to the plain intent of Scripture itself. His thesis is our thesis, without a doubt, but we believe that we must present our position in a more understanding way in this matter. For example, is it contrary to the Bible merely to discuss with those who differ on fundamental issues even though the apostate church may be there in the making?

This leads to another observation. Dr. Hedegard, in common with many critics of the WCC, Roman or orthodox, studies the theological positions of the members of the WCC. We must, however, remember that the positions of the leaders, often extreme and liberal, are not necessarily the position of the WCC. The assembly determines what is officially the WCC's position. "The Message" of Evanston has startled many, for example. But the value of these motley positions is the indication of the atmosphere, the company, and the direction of its leaders. But granting all this, we agree with the author that leaders are architects of a new church structure. And the WCC is bigger than its assemblies.

It has been said that Europe is witnessing a resurgence of reformational and evangelical theology. Says Dr. Hedegard: "I report: Modernism in the old sense of this word is not dead. But today it is not the leading theology. The leading theology is neo-orthodoxy" (p. 47).

The author also discusses the doctrines of the church. He points out the difference between the one visible church of the New Testament and the divided church of today. And if all the churches would become one organization, the prayer of Jesus would not thereby be fulfilled (John 17:22), since Christ does not pray for the unity of the churches, but for the unity of the believers or Christians (pp. 36f.). The real unity is spiritual, which must manifest itself visibly.

In discussing the growth of the WCC the author quotes Dr. Karlström, who avers that the modern ecumenical movement would be unthinkable without the neo-orthodox movement. This trans-denominational theology, especially of the Bible and of the relativity of the confessions, has made it possible to eliminate or to tone down denominational differences. To illustrate this would take us into Barthianism, but to note the point he makes is of sufficient interest.

The writer denounces the WCC for its approaches to the Roman Church. He condemns any intimations that the Reformation was a sin or, as William Temple asserted, a one-sided emphasis. He denies that true ecumenicity should begin before the time of the Reformation, as both Rome and the Greek Orthodox insist upon.

Does the WCC plan to be the one church? There are extravagant claims of Jones and Van Dusen that easily affirm that position. We can easily understand that Hedegard calls attention to a man like Van Dusen who calls all
that is precious to us "distilled nonsense." Imagine that such a man would spearhead the church and a unified mission to call men to Christ!

But his book was written before Evanston reiterated its position that the WCC does not seek to be a super-church. Still openly it is set forth that there should be a corporate church in the future. How these two can be separated, of course, no one can really tell. No wonder that Hedegard eyes all this with suspicion, since men are men, and lovers of power. He quotes an author who seeks for a corporate church along the lines of the Anglican setup in England. He also uses as an illustration, to show that the ideal of one church is not only a pet dream of his, the new Ecuemical Church in New Mexico in which everybody gets what everybody wants, and the preacher is there only to please the customers. Such an ideal is also incorporated in the NCCC of Northern California.

What would happen if the spirit of Paul and of a Luther should return to this earth: Das Wort Gottes sollen Sie stehlen lassen!

Jacob T. Hoogstra


This volume first appeared in 1922. The commentary was written particularly with ministers in mind, to give them the best suggestions for sermonizing. That purpose certainly has been achieved. No, don't purchase this book if you are looking for those sermon outlines, complete with illustrations and all, which are so often in vogue in our country. Grosheide has written a commentary, not sermon outlines. But as a commentary it is most suggestive and helpful.

The name of the author is in itself a recommendation for the book. Grosheide has been favorably known in the field of New Testament scholarship for a generation.

In a lucid introduction he sets forth the historicity of this gospel, touches upon the synoptic problem, and, more particularly, presents the meaning of this particular gospel.

For the rest, the commentary is strictly exegetical. In a scholarly fashion he establishes the genealogy of our Lord—that he is of the seed of David. The sermon on the mount, the parables of the kingdom, the concept of the kingdom in Matthew, and the term Son of Man, all of these are presented to us with many suggestions for sermonizing.

For those who read Dutch this book is a veritable gold mine. It is most heartily recommended.

C. Huissen

BOOK BRIEFS


McNeill, in his recent work on Calvin, calls him a "great personality who has been spiritedly attacked and defended through four centuries." And true it is. Many a charge and accusation has been leveled against him. Included among them are the charges that he was cold and intellectual, severely logical, bereft of emotional warmth, was one who changed religion from an affair of the heart to an "affair of the head." This little work, a series of devotional articles on Hosea, Joel, Amos, Obadiah, and Micah with accompanying prayers, gives the lie to that charge. So too the Golden Booklet of the True Christian Life, a translation of Book III, Chps. 6-10 of the Institutes by Prof. H. J. Van Andel. The heart of John Calvin throbbed with warmth of piety and Calvinism, if it be true to the name, must be of the same stripe. Religion is first and foremost the communion of the soul with God.


Roman Catholicism is and always has been an aggressive religion. It is a force to be reckoned with in every age. It seeks constantly to make encroachments upon Protestantism. Its zeal is exemplary, but many of its tenets, unfortunately, are unScriptural. So the author contends in this pamphlet. He does so convincingly and yet charitably and honestly. So often we compare the worst in others with the best in ourselves. Not so the writer of this brochure. The official positions of Roman Catholicism with respect to God, the Bible, the Pope, the Lord's Supper, Mary, Purgatory, and Marriage are stated. The author contends that, although in such matters as the Trinity and the Deity of Christ we stand much closer to Rome than to liberal Protestantism, yet the former has departed in many important respects from the teachings of the Word of God. Popular in presentation and yet thorough-going in analysis and critique, this little pamphlet is a valuable contribution to Protestant apologetical literature.

John H. Bratt
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